COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, July 21, 2010

The Council met at 9:35 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. Deputy Speaker Councillor Nordman, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Gerbasi, Orlikow, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Smith, Swandel, Thomas, Vandal and Wyatt.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are you done, Councillor Steeves there? Fortunately we have no Pages today so Terry will be acting as our Page. We'd like to welcome the guests. We have no special announcements at this time. I guess there's a motion on the Floor for.

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Steeves,
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi,

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

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

MINUTES

Councillor Fielding moves adoption of the Minutes from June 23rd, 2010. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. Okay, we have some delegations.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes. I would like to ask that Council will waive the rules to hear five additional speakers for five minutes each with no questions. One is on the issue of the light rail, and the other four are on the Mosquito Control Program. And I've submitted the names to the Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Tom Denton to the list.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right. Next, you. (Inaudible) Yes, sir.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: It's customary when we allow additional delegations that the addi…no questions be allowed of the additional delegations, of course those on the agenda, time can be questioned.

Councillor Gerbasi: Of course.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That's correct. Yes. Mr. Clerk, should we be reading out these names or we'll just do it at the time at their…at the time? All right, first delegation for today. All those in favour of suspending the rules and allowing extra delegations? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. First delegation, Mr. Ross McGowan from CentreVenture.

Ross McGowan: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mayor, Councillors, my name is Ross McGowan, President and CEO, CentreVenture Development Corporation and I'm here in support of the Portage Avenue Development Strategy which is before you today. The strategy, prepared by CentreVenture in collaboration with the Downtown Council articulates a common vision for Portage Avenue and is intended to compliment and support the OurWinnipeg Planning Process. For

your information, the Downtown Council is comprised of the senior representatives in the Province of Manitoba, the City of Winnipeg, the Forks North Portage, Economic Development Winnipeg, Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, Downtown BIZ, the Exchange BIZ, the Winnipeg Convention Centre, Winnipeg Police Service, and the University of Winnipeg. As you are no doubt aware, CentreVenture has spent the last two and a half years focusing on Main Street, which we believe has now reached at its tipping point. While we will continue our work on Main Street and other areas of downtown, we're now turning the corner on to Portage Avenue, Winnipeg's most significant avenue. Over the past decade, significant public investment has been made on the Portage Avenue with such initiatives as the Portage Street Scaping Project, MTS Centre and most recently the Manitoba Hydro Building. While public investment is often the necessary catalyst of development, our real objective should be to attract and support private investment, the true indicator of economic success and community well being. In order to achieve this objective, it is essential that a comprehensive plan be in place, one that articulates the vision that encourages such investment and most importantly, protects that investment. It's this fundamental principle of events, investment attraction and protection that is a cornerstone of the Portage Avenue Development Strategy. In essence, the Portage Avenue Plan provides focus for development downtown, encourages development of the core, thereby increasing density which, in turn supports a concentrated retail, commercial, residential and entertainment mix. Quite simply, we want downtown to be a better place, unique to the City giving residents and visitors a good reason to stay and invest in the downtown. The objectives of the plan are to one, focus development inward towards Portage Avenue thereby increasing pedestrian traffic that exports existing attractions such as the retail district on Portage and Graham, the MTS Centre, Portage Place, the Bay, the University of Winnipeg and the Winnipeg Convention Centre. Secondly, to identify and support a sports and entertainment and hospitality district as a major downtown attraction. Third, to develop a viable business plan that reduces the impact on public funding by establishing a framework for private sector confidence and further investment. Fourth, develop and commit to a comprehensive investment protection plan, in support of further private and public development that acknowledges and addresses the economic, physical and social realities of the Portage Avenue district. And fifth to encourage participation by all levels of government in support of the plan. Portage Avenue has been segmented into four distinct districts and you will see that in the plan that I believe has been circulated through to Council. They are distinct yet they're complimentary and from west to east we have the University District, the Retail District, the Sports and Entertainment District and lastly the Commercial District. Some of the specifics are as follows. In the University District, this could emerge as the largest contributor to downtown growth and should be better connected to downtown. The plan suggests extending the weather protected walkway system from the University of Winnipeg to Portage Place. This single action would connect the University directly to Portage and Main and potentially add 16,000 people in support of retail, entertainment and residential development. A portion of Portage Place could be converted to class room or lab space, further reinforcing the link and inclusion of the University as a major driver downtown revitalization. The expansion of the University within Portage Place would allow Portage Place management to concentrate retail uses east of Kennedy while offering the opportunity to further explore the development of the pad sites at Portage Place for a mix of commercial and residential uses. The second, the retail district, long since reduced in size from the days of the 50's and 60's, is essentially bounded by Graham Avenue to the south, Portage to the north, the Bay on the west and Hargrave to the east. The retail district could be one of the most significant beneficiaries of the inward focus and concentration of the plan. As change occurs, demand for retail uses in this area would likely increase along with rental and property values, as a result of the shift of the demographic characteristics of Portage Avenue. Supporting redevelopment of the Bay, an integral part of the retail district, in collaboration with the private sector and all levels of government will be a priority of the action plan. Central to the support of the retail district with the creation of a comfortable, attractive and safe pedestrian environment throughout Portage Avenue. The Portage, the Sports Entertainment District is really a focus of the plan and building on the success of the MTS Centre and keeping with downtown revitalization efforts of other North American cities, it is proposed that a concentrated effort be placed on establishing a sports, entertainment hospitality district as the focal point of the new Portage Avenue. While the boundaries may vary depending on the marketplace, the essence is to create an area that capitalizes on the increased density of users and folders of plan that capitalizes on the extraordinary and underutilized resources of the area. Having identified the general boundaries, the next step is to prepare detailed master plan and associated business plan for this district that clearly illustrates the elements of the plan and the costs and benefits of further public and private investment in this area. At a minimum, it is envisioned that the A&B Sound site at the corner of Donald and Portage currently owned by CentreVenture in partnership with The Forks North Portage, would be developed for hospitality and commercial uses. This private sector development would not only add more feet to the street, but would remove blight from Portage Avenue, further reinforcing private sector confidence in rejuvenation of this important street. To the south, we would expect to see greater synergies between the MTS Centre and the Winnipeg Convention Centre. Such collaboration would see the Convention Centre focusing its expansion efforts toward the centre with the redevelopment of the MPI parking lot perhaps as a lot being considered for complimentary hospitality parking, meeting and perhaps even commercial development in support of both the MTS Centre and the Convention Centre. The pedestrian level in this zone connected with the retail district could well be the centre of the Sports and Entertainment District, bars, restaurants, shops, being the catalyst for sustained economic activity in the area which will also include the revitalization of the Metropolitan Theatre. The Office District, being the last area to the east, as the principle anchor, efforts to include this important revenue source should not be lost in our planning. With the recent announcement of the Avenue Building

redevelopment, a renewed sense of confidence has emerged and private land owners will be encouraged to play a role in fostering a renewed sense of commitment to Portage Avenue. Through such initiatives as the Portage Avenue Lighting Plan and their continued financial contributions to the Business Improvement Zone and the tax base, it is anticipated that further private sector investment can be expected in this zone. In terms of the implementation, the plan, making downtown smaller, denser and focused is achievable, and must be supported by the private sector and all three levels of government in order to succeed. Resources are scarce and must be used wisely. As stated earlier, we must have an investment protection strategy that is predictable and vigorously defended. So what does this plan include? One was adopting a mall management approach to Portage Avenue, providing visitors and expectations, visitors with expectations similar to what one would find at a regional shopping centre. Increasing pedestrian comfort by working closely with adjoining hotels and vendor owners, Manitoba Liquor Commission and the Manitoba Lotteries to address and resolve the impact of off site sales within and adjacent to the Portage Avenue Mall. Third, we would develop a sustainable and comprehensive safety strategy for the Portage Avenue Mall as a whole. Fourth, develop and adequately fund a marketing strategy and increase public awareness in private investment. Fifth to support and adequately fund a retail and entertainment recruitment strategy. The second bulk would be to complete the business plan for the Sports and Entertainment District to clearly illustrate the context for the plan. Also, to explore public and private funding opportunities to implement the Portage Avenue Lighting Plan as a major civic attraction. And last to acknowledge the importance and influence that shoulder neighbourhoods have such as Spence and Central Park and continue support for residential, recreational and economic development in these important neighbourhoods.The financial considerations of the plan, the basic financial premise of the Portage Avenue Plan is that we can no longer look at governments as the primary source of revenue. However, a level of funding predictability and stability is required to guide both planning and development. We are therefore looking at various financial models that would be of mutual benefit to the public and private sectors. One model is the current tax increment finance program. We are proposing to explore the notion of designating the Sports Entertainment District as a TIF zone. To act as the economic engine for the overall plan, utilizing underperforming or underdeveloped sites such as the A & B block and surface parking lots in the area have the potential to generate in the order of three to five million dollars a year in incremental property and education taxes. It is this predictable cash flow that is in visions of a potential source of capital to fund initiatives of the University walkway connection, additional land acquisition, street scaping, marketing and the funding for other development initiatives that will no doubt emerge as the plan evolves. Programs and new developments could be accelerated by borrowing against future cash flows from the TIF zone for a prescribed period. CentreVenture would be pleased to lead such a program on behalf of the shareholders of the City of Winnipeg and the downtown partners. It would be reasonable to assume that such a program would be time sensitive in order that the City and the Province realize tax gains after a prescribed number of years or until initial debt is retired. Initial seed capital to kick start the TIF could come from the sale of surplus Provincial or Civic properties or through CentreVenture's borrowing authority with funds to be replaced as TIF funding materializes. The business plan alluded to earlier will more clearly articulate the capital cost and funding requirements of the plan, including identifying potential sources and use of funds. In addition, efforts will be made to engage the Federal Government in participating in downtown revitalization through G.S.T. rebates, Program and Capital Funding or through tax credits for urban dwellers. Other programs, including the Downtown Residential Development Program will be harmonized with the Portage Avenue Strategy, particularly as they relate to expansion of student and marketable affordable housing. And support for existing residential neighbourhoods including the Exchange, Broadway, and Assiniboine that will continue to be the feeder system for Portage Avenue. Of importance to the revitalization effort is a commitment to public parking. We would support a downtown parking strategy as an economic tool to stimulate and compliment important development initiatives that rely on accessory parking. Parking strategy will be integrated into the Portage Avenue Development Plan in a supporting role that promotes investment and will likely be an element of the business plan for the Sports and Entertainment District. So, in conclusion, we have a vision, an overview of how to achieve the vision. The Portage Avenue Strategy, however, is a work in progress. It is time sensitive and requires collaboration to meet an aggressive schedule. Our priorities as CentreVenture and our capacity as Chair of the Downtown Council is one to complete the master plan and business plan for the Sports and Entertainment District by November of 2010. Initiate the Portage Avenue Mall Management Plan, secure the development of the A and B Building, which has been done. Complete Phase 1 of the A&B Sound Block Redevelopment commencing in 2011, support redevelopment of the Bay, support redevelopment of the Metropolitan Theatre for 2011. Export connecting the University of Winnipeg and encourage development of Portage Place pad sites and others that will emerge out through the planning process. In conclusion, we believe that the plan is sound, the partners are committed, the investors are willing. The plan is achievable and together we will get it done. We would ask for your endorsement over strategy and support for moving Portage Avenue into its rightful place in Canada's urban landscape. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Mr. McGowan. Any questions? Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you to Mr. McGowan. Thank you for the presentation. I'm certainly very supportive of the initiatives on our downtown. I do have a question though. Whatever happened to the project at Portage at Main where we were going to, we had a design competition, we had a brilliant design and there

was one property owner we needed to negotiate with to open up at least some of the time, Portage and Main. That just seems to have disappeared from any discussion or anything. I'm just wondering if you can give us any update on that.

Ross McGowan: About, several months ago, a preliminary discussion with a couple of the land owners. It's not high on our agenda at this point in time and could well be visited in the next year or two as the plan unfolds but right now there's no progress being made on that at all.

Councillor Gerbasi: I guess I would suggest that it may be perhaps, should be a little higher on the agenda, but that's my opinion as a representative of the downtown. So I just thought I'd make that point. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Ross, very much appreciate the work that you and CentreVenture are doing. It's exciting and as you can see, you're looking for significant private sector investment. In order to do that, I'm sure that they would like to know that their investments are going to be safe and they'll get some return. Have you thought of any ways of addressing those types of concerns?

Ross McGowan: Yes. As I indicated earlier, Mr. Mayor that is the fundamental corner stone of this plan that we need to give the private sector confidence that their investment is going to be married up with further investment, that we are going to work in partnership with our partners of the Province to address some of the social and economic concerns that are in the area. And we believe that significant progress has been made already when we start to look at the lineup, if you will, of investors that are prepared to look at investing in downtown Winnipeg, knowing that their strategy will be, that our strategy will help protect their investment. We've also had discussions, very positive with your Winnipeg Police Service, Mr. Mayor. Very, very supportive, and in fact, sit on our Downtown Council and they, too, will be working to help protect that investment.

Mayor Katz: One more follow up. I'm wondering whether or not there's been any discussion or there will be, with the MLCC regarding some of the vendor scenarios and what's been happening.

Ross McGowan: Yes, there are. That is a key element and it's in the plan and I was listening to it again on CBC this morning. I guess some of the downtown landlords have expressed concern about that. We believe that there is a responsibility of MLCC and Lotteries to at least engage with us in the conversation about how to move some of these properties further down the line. It does have an effect, as you well know, on investment. And it's time that we at least put it on the table and looked as a collaborative community way of addressing this serious social problem.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all Ross, I would like to congratulate you on the job that you and your Board, your Corporation are doing. And I would ask that you take back my thanks to the Board and my encouragement, to continue on the path you are now taking. I've been around here longer than CentreVenture. I have watched its birth and its many incarnations and many pains. This is the most progress and the brightest hope for our future that I've seen come out of this Board in all the years it's been around. So, please tell them to keep on keeping on.

Ross McGowan: Thank you, Councillor. I'll pass that on.

Deputy Speaker: Any further questions? Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thanks, Ross. I plan on supporting the report as well, the strategy, just as much a comment as a question. In the development of our downtown and natural evolution, it's always seemed to me that the natural pedestrian, sort of human scale flow seems to be kind of through the Theatre District, into the Exchange District, and sort of leading out to Portage Avenue. Just want your re, your assurance that you've considered that in the Portage Avenue Strategy, that whatever you're doing is going to kind of be building on what already exists and augmenting kind of that, natural, I guess vibrancy that we have in the downtown. I'd hate to see our resources going to, just kind of creating something that doesn't support that.

Ross McGowan: That's a very valid comment, Councillor. As I indicated at the beginning, it's not our intention to abandon the rest of the downtown. We believe very strongly that if we focus our energies on certain areas and achieve some immediate results, the Portage Avenue Plan, in fact is a link to the Exchange District and in closer examination during the master planning process. We'll be making sure that that physical link, as well as the social and economic link is made between the Exchange and the Cultural District and other areas of the downtown.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Ross, thanks for coming down today. A great plan and I think good things are ahead for Portage Avenue. I know there's a lot from the works with, you haven't been able to put out yet in public but I hope to see some good announcements in the months ahead. You had mentioned in response to the Mayor's question, the idea of Manitoba Lotteries and MLCC being involved and dealing with the economics of changing some of the uses by, I guess we would refer to as beverage rooms and off sale uses in the downtown. The big thing that comes with that is they do generate quite a bit of revenue so they also generate quite a bit of property tax because the taxes, the assessments are based on incomes flows that come out of those properties. There has been some announcements or announcement recently about the Provincial Government's involvement with the TIF financing in downtown. Could you give us a bit of a sense of how that might work into solving some of these issues that are causing some public intoxication and vagrancy in downtown that's, when people look at investing they want it protected. So on the TIF side of things, how might that play out?

Ross McGowan: The TIF may well be part of the solution, but I would go back to the notion of protecting private and public investment. If we can begin to change some of the uses of these enterprises, presumably that will have a positive impact on surrounding values. So, collectively then you're bringing the value of an area up as opposed to just concentrating on the lost opportunities for short period of time with one of the beverage rooms. I think that goes hand in hand with if you can show some alternatives which we believe we can, we can change the use of some of these facilities and perhaps not lose a lot of tax revenue. I think our biggest bang will come from the larger developments that we've been talking about on A & B and others.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further questions. Thank you, Mr. McGowan.

Ross McGowan: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Appreciate it. Moving on to Light Rail Transit and Bus Rapid Transit. Mr. Thomas Novak, will you join us, please? Next up would be Ken Klassen.

Thomas Novak: I'm Thomas Novak and this is Paul Hesse. We are both representing the Winnipeg Rapid Transit Coalition.

Paul Hesse: So thank you, Councillors, Mr. Mayor. I want to speak briefly to this report that's come back to you. I know there'd been consideration a while back of the question of a hundred thousand dollar report to contaire at LRT and BRT and I don't think this cost a hundred thousand dollars, I certainly hope it didn't. I wouldn't have, in my business, paid anywhere close to that on it. Because it seems obviously quite incomplete and it's frustrating to read as someone who's been engaged in this issue, because it sort of, first of all it cherry picks information, in it. It seems to rely heavily on the HDR report from last fall, which, among other things, said quite clearly that it would not apply, did not apply, to Phase 2 or the Jubilee to Main Street, sorry Jubilee to U of M portion. And then it also doesn't include any of the factors from the report that had said that BRT is better value for money or that it's faster. You don't see that in here. We just see a three page report that's, in my view, totally over simplifies things. So, a few things that jump out, just as a citizen, is that when we're comparing costs this isn't comparing apples and oranges. We're not even comparing apples' and oranges' seeds. We're not even comparing anything remotely similar. If we're going to do street cars and we have our doubts that that's ever going to happen, then we have to consider that there's not only you know, the fact that a maintenance yard will have to be built, the streetcars will have to be built, that tracks will have to be laid. We're also talking about the fact that there may be additional expropriations needed for the facilities to maintain and operate these street cars. And if we're looking at a per kilometre cost we're not including all of those factors because in order to make this remotely useable, we're going to have to convert the part that's being built right now as a BRT system into street cars and we may well have to extend a lot more kilometres of tracks downtown. And the main reason for that is that, think about it as a passenger. If you are starting your journey in St. Norbert or Waverley Heights or River Heights, you may have to take a bus to get to the streetcar line and then you're going to have a needless transfer and then you're going to take the streetcar for a period of time and either at Jubilee or at Main Street or somewhere downtown get off again and transfer again in order to continue a journey. Now, exactly the number of transfers depends on where the track ends and are we just going to do a streetcar from Jubilee to the U of M or are we going to do it to Main Street or are we going to add more kilometres of track downtown? And if we're doing track downtown, I don't see any consideration of the implications of that in this study. What does that mean in terms of adding track on Broadway or Main Street on Portage or Graham? Are there going to be expropriations for that? Is there going to be traffic flow implications for that? This is essentially a three page report that doesn't get even starting to touch on any of these issues that would be involved in that. So, our Coalition is made up of people who want to see a better transit system for Winnipeg, and we're interested in a system that can be built quicker, and this doesn't seem to be a system that would be off the ground any quicker than the current plan that's being built. It would seem to involve more transfers, inconvenient transfers for passengers as you have to go

from a bus to a streetcar, maybe to a bus again. And if there's a higher cost involved which is clear, then does that mean higher fares for users? We certainly have members of our Coalition who wouldn't want to see higher transit fares. So, we certainly think that this report doesn't nearly begin to get into the real issues of building a streetcar Rapid Transit system. But I just want to also touch on the proposal to do this as a Private Public Partnership under the P3 Canada Fund and I did read the Mayor's comments in the Free Press the other day on this in response to the Head of Bombardier who said that it cost more money for the private sector to borrow for a P3 project on transit than the public sector and I believe that to be true and I've worked with private public partnerships in a law firm in Toronto and I've seen how these things are structured and how they are financed. But I also noticed the Mayor's comments that maybe this could be done as a design build, simple design build, P3 which basically means a tender process. Well, you can look up the requirements for the P3 Canada Fund and it makes it quite clear that design build is not an option, so simple tender process is not an option for the P3 Canada Fund. It has to either be financed privately or operated privately or both. So then the question for Council is, does this mean we're going to build a Rapid Transit system that's going to be operated by an entity other than Transit or Winnipeg Transit isn't going to be operating Transit any more? Or, are we talking about having higher costs as seems perfectly clear, and as the head of the streetcar manufacturer, Bombardier says it will? So ask you to consider that as well. So, I think that this report isn't really worth the paper it's printed on. I ask you not to support it.

Thomas Novak: Your Worship, Councillors. As the members of the Winnipeg Traffic Rapid Transit Coalition puzzled over the latest EPC proposal concerning Rapid Transit, we didn't know if we should call in Sherlock Holmes to help us or Ghostbusters. The proposal on the floor today might be called the Case of the Phantom Rapid Transit System. The citizens of Winnipeg have been maneuvered into believing that our Council is leading a debate over the relative merits of buses or street cars. But in reality, given a close examination of the facts of the case, it appears that what we are debating is nothing more than the fantasy, a fantasy out of our Mayor's imagination, or the ghost of an idea that has haunted this Chamber for over 50 years, but that has always failed to materialize. At best, we might say that we are debating a virtual Rapid Transit system. Sit down at your computer and take your pick, high speed bus, snazzy looking streetcar or nuclear-powered rickshaws. With one click of the mouse, you can see the sites of the City blur by and in seconds arrive at downtown in front of the new stadium or the U of M, but in the real world you are still in your home in front of your computer. The members of the Rapid Transit Coalition fear that the current proposal and the current debate is no more than election year rhetoric. Before the election, we have a shiny new plan. After the election, we find that it was all smoke and mirrors, because there is no cash to make it possible. Your Worship, Councillors, the commuters and citizens of the City of Winnipeg have been around this ferris wheel countless times over the last fifty years. Many of us fear that we're being deceived again. That four years from now we will still have a truncated transit way, that we will still be debating buses, trains or no transit ways at all and that visionary business people who have spent years planning exciting projects for transit oriented development along one seamless complete corridor, will ultimately give up in disgust. Why is it a phantom corridor? What else could it be? Despite the promise to finish the corridor by 2014, despite the fact that the new stadium is supposed to open in a year, not one cent has been allocated for Phase 2 in the Capital Budget and the City has even removed all mention of Rapid Transit from the infrastructure priority list. Perhaps because we have been heeding the advice of business leaders who say that P3 funding is more expensive than public sector funding. Two years ago in September 2008, Your Worship, you worked out in a most admirable way, with your Provincial and Federal partners, an agreement that made it possible to construct Phase 1 and that committed all levels of government to the completion of a bus way, all the way to the University of Manitoba. The Province and Federal Cabinet have made it clear that they stand by the agreement. Unfortunately, our City leadership has had endless changes of heart and earlier this way in removing the transit way from the City's infrastructure priorities, our City Council appeared to reject the very agreement that was signed with so much fan fare just two years ago. The unity and consensus of 2008 has been replaced with frustration, cynicism, polarization and anger.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are you almost done, Mr. Novak?

Thomas Novak: I am almost done. What we propose is a compromise. We believe that the Mayor's proposal to examine other means of Rapid Transit are a good idea for future corridors. We propose that we look at Rapid Transit for future corridors and that we today, accept the $130 million the Provincial and Federal Governments have put on the table. Make the completion of the Winnipeg's first Rapid Transit Corridor a reality. If 130 million is not enough, the Members of this Coalition will be happy to lobby, join the lobbying effort to get more money on the table from the senior partners. We believe this is a worthy and reasonable compromise to which the great majority of the citizens of Winnipeg will say amen, and the Members of this Coalition will be among the first to celebrate this City Council as the first in the history of Winnipeg to finally assure the completion of Winnipeg's first Rapid Transit Corridor. Let's get on board. Let's get the job done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Mr. Novak. Mr. Ken Klassen, in opposition. You have five minutes, sir.

Ken Klassen: I've come here today to urge you to reject the Administration's Report. I've worked in the public sector for twenty one years for the Provincial Government, the Federal Government in Ottawa. I spent a few years serving on the

City of Winnipeg's Environmental Committee. I've never seen a report that's so incomplete and misleading as this. The Administration's report is a gross misrepresentation of the HTR report that the City commissioned. But before I get into more specifics, Mr. Mayor, I want to remind you of transaction plan for Winnipeg here, a 17 page election platform that you ran on when you first became Mayor. There's only two references to transit in here. One is for free buses for seniors, the other one is for improved downtown transit. There's no single mention of Rapid Transit, be it BRT or LRT or street car. If we fast forward to your second, 17 page election platform, single reference to transit, no new promises on transit, no references to LRT, BRT, or any form of Rapid Transit. I'm having difficulty understanding why you are so interested suddenly in Rapid Transit. Could it be the election? I don't know. When we look at the Administration's report, this is a major, major decision. This report affects not only the completion of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor which we know there's minimum of $220 million. The five initial corners have been proposed in the OurWinnipeg Sustainable Transportation Study. We don't know the exact length or cost but I would guess that they the average maybe 12 kilometres each, times 5, that's 60 kilometres and they're probably going to total between 2.2 and 6 billion dollars. So this is a huge decision, Councillors, huge, about having a preferred option for Rapid Transit. We're expecting the Administration's Report to reflect that, in fact it doesn't. I know that there's Members of this Council who have made statements that Bus Rapid Transit doesn't work. It doesn't attract more riders. It does a poor job of attracting additional development. In the Administration's Report how many other studies other than the HCR report does it refer to? Not one. Not one. If we look at the definitive study of BRT verses LRT, that was done by the US Transportation Research Board looked at 26 cities that had completed and have operated BRT systems. Their conclusion, the case study summarized here demonstrates that BRT does work. It can attract new riders and induce transit oriented development, can be more cost effective and probably greater operational flexibilities than rail transit. Mr. Mayor, if you actually look at the HTR report that was done and you read the Administration's Report, I can't believe the disconnect between the two. If you go to the HTR report on the very first page, page one executive summary, the table clearly shows that the benefits of BRT are double that on annual basis of LRT. Not reflected in the Administration's Report. The Administration also fails to point out that the HTR report only looks at Phase 1. There's no analysis whatsoever comparing BRT and LRT on Phase 2. None. And what the Administration's Report does, is it cherry picks numbers out of the HTR report and what it does is it takes a graph and it talks about the benefits of LRT but it doesn't talk about the costs and what's important is in that cost. In HTR's report, clearly says the same thing as two other reports that have been done previously for the City, one for Transport Canada, one by MKI Consultants, that BRT makes sense. It's cost effective. Three of three reports says BRT makes sense for Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor. No reference at all in the Administration's Report, so the Administration also, it doesn't say anything about BRT elsewhere in Canada. I've heard some Councillors claim that BRT is not being invested in by other communities in Canada or the U.S. Well, that's complete fib. We know that for example, in New York region they start at 1.4 billion dollar BRT system and the news release for that they said some severe BRT Rapid Transit system launched September 2005. The total transit vehicle boardings has increased 44 percent and have been accounts for millions of square feet of mixed use transit oriented development. In Ottawa, has the most extensive BRT system in North America. Their BRT system has seen ridership increase by thirty percent when a population only went up by eighteen percent. Look to Minneapolis, south of us. They're building as we speak right now, Mr. Mayor, two BRT projects in the Twin City's region, one on Cedar Avenue and the other on I-35. They are looking at BRT for six other regional corridors, nine corridors along regional streets are also being studied. The Administration's report talks about Portland and street cars in Portland. Forgot to mention that Portland also has BRT and is planning more BRT lines. The other problem that I have with the Administration's Report, it doesn't talk about the delay that this will result in. Okay, I'll wrap up in about three sentences. The P3 Canada Fund takes six to nine months for the next call for the expressions of interest, nine to twelve months for detailed submissions of selections of projects, 12 to 18 months for public tender, public consultation, detail design, 18 to 24 months for construction commissioning the project. Means that citizens will see the second phase of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor completed in the spring of 2014 or maybe the fall of 2015. So I guess, wrapping it up, I'm asking you to do a few simple things. Stop dithering in the delays and the paralysis by analysis. Accept the overwhelming evidence that BRT is a viable alternative. Number two, finish what you started, finish off Southwest Rapid Transit Corridors of BRT. Number three, you know, acknowledge the limitations of the P3 Canada Fund. Number four, be technology neutral. For future corridors, examine BRT, examine light rail, examine street cars that's fine, but do not have a preferred option. No one else does that. Minneapolis doesn't do that. Portland doesn't do that. Toronto doesn't do that. Vancouver doesn't do that. Calgary doesn't do that. (Inaudible)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, Mr. Klassen, we get the point.

Ken Klassen: And that's it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. All right do we have any questions for Mr. Novak, Mr. Hesse or Mr. Klassen? Questions? No questions? All right. Thank you vey much. In favour of the Rapid Transit, we'll call on Mr. Paul Larson followed by Mr. Reg Alcock. Mr. Larson, go ahead. You have ten minutes.

Paul Larson: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Your Worship, Councillors, I'm Paul Larson, Director of the Transport Institute at the University of Manitoba. Pleased to be here today. At the Transport Institute, essentially, our mission is to facilitate prosperity, mobility and sustainability with transportation research and education. And certainly an issue such as urban transit falls right within that realm. So I have a few remarks around those three themes of prosperity, mobility and sustainability in support of the report. In terms of prosperity, this is the realm of things economic, and it's well known in the literature and with examples, cases around the continent, that in terms of infrastructure costs, there is a tendency for LRT and the general rail schemes to be a bit more than rapid bus than bus schemes. A well known fact, however, with respect to operating costs, and operating costs in terms of both labour productivity and then fuel economy, this is where the rail in general, LRT, tends to shine. And particularly with respect to the way we generate electricity here in Manitoba, this would give us an edge in terms of the fuel economy of rail, vis-à-vis bus. I suppose another factor is these uncertain times of fuel prices, they tend to be volatile but they tend to also go up within that volatility. So any fuel efficiency benefit will simply increase as time goes on. Another element of the prosperity is what we might call the multiplier effect. There is a fair amount of evidence that light rail or in general, rail, increases a multiplier effect through the stations. The rail stations have a much greater ability to sort of stimulate and inspire further economic development vis-à-vis a bus type counter parts. So there's that. Now, let me move on to the mobility dimension, which is really the social dimension within transportation. Again, in this case, generally speaking, bus, buses are more flexible than railcars similar to within the freight realm, trucks are more flexible in terms of origin, destination than rail as well. However, there is ways through routing, positioning of stations, to make rail appear more flexible or make rail more like bus in terms of this flexibility. Essentially, what I'm talking about here is and frankly, neither bus nor rail address this completely within an urban standpoint. You and I as passengers have a door to door problem. I need to get from my house to my office, or my house to a store, a mall or wherever it is that I'm going. Neither bus nor the rail tends to offer that. So there is a need for sort of feeder lines, whether people are walking or some other park and ride, et cetera, that are still in play. In terms of another key, and mobility to mention is simply the capacity, the capacity of rail tends to be superior to that of bus. There can be numerous cars pulled by one locomotive and just move more people down the line, all together. And this sort of feeds back to the issue of both fuel economy and labour efficiency as well with respect to the LRT option. Another aspect of ridership began, keeping in mind that the passenger public has a door to door transportation problem and again related to the ability of rail stations to foster economic development, sort of quite on their own, is that rail tends to attract more riders. There's more of a gravity feed into rail stations as people wait for the train and engage the train. One can imagine a park and ride schemes. It's funny, working at the University, everyone complains about parking but we have a very large parking lot that often times is not utilized and one can certainly imagine a park and ride schemes linked to facilities such as the University, to feed the rail system or you know, have the park and ride right at the rail station. Another element of, among many, but to be brief here, another element of the mobility aspect of rail vis-à-vis bus there's fairly strong results of the greater comfort of rail travel for the passenger compared to bus and then this certainly does relate also to the ridership characteristics. One interesting question in ridership I suppose and in an un-answered question in Winnipeg although in other jurisdictions there's a fair amount of evidence on ridership impacts. The current numbers are, what, roughly eight percent of weekday trips within Winnipeg by the public are on public transit. So the interesting question is how high can that go? How high could that be pushed via the, an effective transit system, whatever that is, how high can we push that of eight percent? There's certainly are ways to make public transit more attractive. Now let me then move on to the third of my general points on sustainability or the environmental impact of things. It's, there's a wide body of evidence suggesting that light rail, rail schemes are more environmentally friendly than their bus power counter parts and this certainly is linked to the whole fuel economy issue these days. The air pollution, noise pollution as well is another factor. And again, this we have this sort of more pronounced perhaps here in Manitoba given the way that we generate electricity, vis-à-vis some other jurisdictions. Another aspect to this and I think particularly with respect to the sustainability dimension that we have to ask ourselves is just what is our time frame here? And it was previously mentioned is our time frame until the next election? Is it five years? Is it a hundred years? And I guess I would say that the longer that our time frame under consideration, the more the benefits of light rail vis-à-vis bus become apparent to me and it's wrapped up in things like sustainability, and frankly for that matter, the prosperity as well, if we're generating more economic activity around rail stations. And so I guess another element of the sustainability to mention that's, is mentioned in some academic writings, making this compare, somebody, I haven't seen it in a lot of the consulting type reports, but the impact, good estimates of the impact on light rail on reducing congestion, when one of the major causes of greenhouse gas emissions with an urban environment is congested traffic on the roadways, trucks, cars, buses idling, waiting to move. So with that, I would say one thing that we should ask ourselves is, how do we increase weekday trips on public transit above eight percent here within the City of Winnipeg. I think one thing that the start has been made uncertainly is looking at things by corridors, key corridors that have been identified. There's been discussion about specific routes that might serve those corridors. These sorts of decisions will have a paramount impact, the placement of stations and such. What is the, if the City were to move forward with LRT what is the most sensible first route, perhaps, to pursue? These sorts of questions. And again, building perhaps on one of the previous speakers, there is quite a wide body of evidence in other jurisdictions, some of the jurisdictions are could be viewed as similar to Winnipeg, certain other ones are wildly different than Winnipeg based on perhaps their size or the lay of the land but certainly activities in places such as Edmonton, Calgary, Ottawa where in all cases there is really a

hybrid approach. There is a combination of Light Rail Transit and Bus Rapid Transit and of course basic bus transportation to serve the needs of the public. So with that I will stop and certainly, if there's time, invite questions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We'll have questions after Mr. Alcock and then you can come forward. I'd just like to point out Councillor Steeves and I like your suit so. (Laughter) Mr. Alcock.

Reg Alcock: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Your Worship and Councillors, I want to take advantage of the fact that I'm here just to do one additional thing and that is to simply thank all of you. Every person in this room, the Administration, and even members of the media were enormously helpful to me and continued to be helpful to me as I try to teach about this stuff about how you make decisions and all that and your willingness to meet with students and mentor them and all of that has been a great benefit to the work that I do. So thank you and I particularly am saddened that Speaker Lazarenko isn't here because he was tremendously helpful. It's interesting, you know, I decided in the end to come here. I kicked myself for not coming down here when you were having the debate on P3s because I have a great deal of interest and knowledge. I research on that area and I, like a lot of people sat back and watched it. I get to watch it like a sport now, watch what you do and kind of comment on it to others, but you don't really have to put me skin in the game. When I saw this one come up, there are two elements to this. I signed off on Bus Rapid Transit. I was part of the Federal program at that time that was in favour of it, right? So why am I standing down here now saying, wait, you know, I'm down here to speak in favour of light rail, and it's in part, I mean there are a whole bunch of pieces to it. I spent a ton of amount of time right now studying public decision making and the nature of the elements of the pieces that needed to be part of good quality public decisions. I think we are remarkably well served in this City and in this Province by the quality of our Administration. And underneath all of this, I see Senior Administrators in the City signing off on this report. Yeah, I mean, I suppose the Mayor could be a bit of a Sven Galley and just so that dictating what everyone should do but I fundamentally don't believe that. That's not my experience in public management. Yes, there is a political debate out there. Yes, there's a campaign coming. I have to tell you I try to stay completely out of partisan stuff since I was involuntarily retired a few years ago, but I was deeply alarmed at the announcement at the other day and the suggestion that we would sole source from New Flier. Not because, I love New Flier. I think Paul Soubry is one of the best managers in this country, frankly. I think he would be alarmed that it would destroy New Flier. Any kind of local preference would be, it's that very simplistic policy frameworks that I think hurt us. You are building a backbone for the City. This decision isn't about moving a few people from downtown to the University which of course is my favourite area because I used to represent that area but what you're doing is you're building a concrete spine that will define the City for the next century. I mean these routes are not trivial investments and they have a huge impact on development and the structure of the City. And you're sitting here, in a way, I think, that's comparable to colleagues of yours a hundred years ago sat around in the older Chamber making decisions about the size of the viaduct. It didn't need to be that big, it didn't need to cost that much but they were building an infrastructure with an eye to what was happening fifty years hence and it has served us enormously well. Similarly, you're doing the same thing. The evidence I defer to my colleague at the University who researches in this area, who understands this area far better. I defer to the very good work that was done by the Administration who have come to the conclusion that this is an important decision for the City and I would urge you to make it. I think there are elements in the recommendation that's before you that call for further examination and expansion of the analysis that I think is important. You're not making the decision to write the cheque today, you're making the decision to have a very hard look at what I believe is a very important, positive choice for the City. And I can, I've got another minute I could eat up. I'm trained to speak in forty minute lots (laughter) but I think that's really what I wanted to say. I just want to add my voice to this debate and this decision because I think too often the focus of the debate is too narrow and we miss opportunities to make this a great city. So, thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Reg. Mr. Larson, Paul, would you like to come back up? Do we have any questions? Councillor Browaty, Councillor Vandal next.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. Questions here's for Paul. As an alumnus of the Transport Institute Internship Program, I'm aware that the Transport Institute does a lot of economic impact studies on things like the airport, the trucking industry. It's been argued that perhaps there could be a material effect on the bus manufacturing industry specifically on New Flyer Industries. There's a lot of jobs at that stake here in Winnipeg. Do you think there would be a material detriment to the City of Winnipeg if our Bus Rapid Transit system became a Rail Transit system if we use a manufacturer from outside of the City? Would those, detriments be made up by additional economic income around the rail transit stations?

Paul Larson: Yes, if I understand the question, the impact of essentially the vendors selected for material to, and with special reference to New Flyer, my view is I think I share Reg Alcock's view that if something of this magnitude certainly would be put out for proposal and we know that New Flyer is certainly a leader in the global bus market, with customers all over the world, and certainly, I would anticipate that they would be a bidder on any sort of a bus vehicles, and perhaps a successful bidder. But I guess you know from the standpoint of that any such project would be put out for bid, it's a foregone, I mean we're assuming that New Flyer would be the successful bidder. Moreover, with New Flyer's

capabilities and I believe also his, Mr. Alcock mentioned, they are dealing in global markets and certainly, they are hungry for business, everyone is hungry for business. But I don't think that we would, it just to me it's not a factor that would be that personally I would consider the impact on one of our companies.

Reg Alcock: Do you mind if I add to that? I personally believe and I'm not going to speak for Paul Soubry, I think it would hurt the Flyer. I mean the, if New Flyer supplied every single bus of the City of Winnipeg. It's still a small fraction of the buses that supplies and what's the number one thing that Gary Doer is now sitting in Washington trying to fight? Buy local. Buy local in the U.S. which squeezes us out and makes it much more difficult for New Flyer to compete in that huge market that it has to be successful in. If we reinforce that on our side, we're just…we're in a race that we're not going to win.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you. Thank you both of you for coming here this morning. Are you saying that we should be breaking up the kilometres of recently poured concrete spine to lay rail?

Reg Alcock: Who? You saying that?

Paul Larson: No, I intend to it was the reference to the southwest corridor is. Right, which is…sorry. No, and certainly this is an interesting and complicated issue. I think what I would suggest is that most of the cities that we might benchmark against again, Edmonton, Calgary, Ottawa and others, have hybrid systems, you know, so generally speaking, the, you know, essentially, the more high density the corridor, the more rail tends to shine. Now, it turns out that that is one of our high density corridors where a certain path has gone down so yeah, this is an interesting issue. But I'm certainly not suggesting to, yeah, no tear up the concrete.

Reg Alcock: He is an analyst not an engineer but I do think the rail needs corridors also that the decision is to go with rail, I mean, yes it would be some conversion cost but it's not a complete loss. You've got to have a foundation. You've got to have a road bed and everything else and there may be other uses, companion uses for it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi. Oh, I'm sorry Dan, go ahead.

Councillor Vandal: So what you're saying, essentially, Mr. Larson is that it makes sense to finish what you started and consider alternatives or modalities for future lines, that would be the reasonable thing to do.

Paul Larson: Yes. And again, I'm not intimately familiar with how far down the path we've gone, but yes. I mean, so then the question would be, you know, is any current infrastructure in place adaptable to, you know rail verses bus? But yeah, certainly a factor within the decision framework would have to be where we're at today, in terms of infrastructure all throughout the City, the lay of the land and certainly including any recent move on the Southwest Corridor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I know this debate is being framed as one modality against another and I think that in itself is part of the problem. Some of what we're trying to say is that all modalities should be considered in any so-called objective transportation strategy. So that's what this motion before us today says that we prefer one modality. So unfortunately anyone who speaks up about that is labeled as against LRT which is quite unfair. I think we'd all be very happy if we had an LRT system over the whole course of Winnipeg but the reality is we have to govern with, and you, Mr. Alcock, know, that things have to be paid for, and you know how much they cost. And do you object to finishing the spine which is, by the way, convertible to LRT according to a study. We have…that's been made public. So, wouldn't it make sense as a, from your political experience, to finish something that the alternative is three times the cost? We don't have the money. It's not going to happen. And the cost will only multiply as the years go on, so doesn't it make sense from a practical governing point of view, where you've been in that position which is a lot of perhaps you supported the initial project in 2008, you know that we get that job finished and then perhaps convert this later. And of course study all modalities in the LRT, in the transportation mass plan we're doing a year from now?

Reg Alcock: I don't want to step aside from it completely but I mean, in part that's the nature of the decision of this Council is going to have to make. I do think it is, I think that the magnitude of this decision is such that, while I don't want to dismiss any cost. We don't want you know, we don't want to incur any larger costs for taxpayers than we absolutely have to. But if you apply that thinking only to this, you know, we could build a Museum of Human Rights in a bunch of portables and stick it down to The Forks and do good work on human rights but we wouldn't have built something that would be iconic and do us proud. The bridge we built, you were part of that debate. We could've built just a little path across the river but we said no, there is something else going on here, there are other elements to this and with this one

I think it's even more so. I think, I did a lot of work on boundaries and the impact of natural barriers on them when I was before I got into politics. They do define the City in some very profound ways so you're making some very large decisions. Yes, I'm not the engineer, I am not qualified to answer, "Could you run you know, finish that thing and run rail down it?" I can't see why not but that's not really within my scope. I mean I defer to the wisdom of the people who sit in this room and I want to say something that concerned me about a previous comment. This constant slagging of the public servants. It happens all the time in the public debate. It happens federally, provincially and locally. We are enormously well served by the people who spend the time and have the luxury the time to become experts in this and yes, you act as a constraint on them the same way that the elected officials at other levels that act as a constraint to their public services but they also have a lot of important things to say.

Councillor Gerbasi: Well, I wish we would listen to our experts at our own Winnipeg Transit Department because I don't think they were particularly involved in this report in front of you. (Inaudible) Because we do have some expertise. Their name's on it that they were consulted but that doesn't mean that they were a large part of it, but I'd also like to ask you if you were aware, first of all that there was an HDR study that said the cost benefit, not just cost but cost benefit over all was two to one in favour on this particular corridor. As I say, I support looking at LRT in all of our corridors going forward. And also, that the development all along the corridor that's being built is happening. There's a 16 story infill high rise being built on Donald Avenue. There's public processes beginning and design charrette all along the Fort Rouge Yards where the corridor is being built. The LRT stations, public houses are being the stations are being built like high end LRT stations and there have been studies and I'm a member of the Canadian Urban Transit Association and there have been studies which show that if you build it to that level of a high level with tunnels and overpasses and LRT type stations, you will see the same benefits or very similar to LRT and all our studies have shown us, (inaudible) so do you...

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there a question?

Councillor Gerbasi: My question is, are you aware of all of that and the specifics of this particular corridor which is what each transit decision needs to be about?

Reg Alcock: Well, if I may, I was with you right up until the last part. I mean, I do think that the decision on this specific corridor has to be seen in a larger frame. It has to be seen in the nature of the entire system. I think that's important. I also think that while BRT is, it's a useful tool, I lived in Ottawa, although there's other elements as to why that system was built in that way which have more to do with national security, but, it is a more, it, there will always be bus, but where are we going to be twenty years from now?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Fielding moves that, excuse me, Mr. Alcock that we extend the question period so that we can hear Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Swandel and then we'll cut it off. Thank you. (Inaudible).

Reg Alcock: Sorry about that. I. (Inaudible)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Well, I asked the Clerk and we can extend the Question Period. What's the will of Council? All those in favour, extending question period? Those opposed? Ayes have it.

(Inaudible)

Reg Alcock: Did you say there was a question for me? Well, I mean, I think I gave a possible response I would like to give to Councillor Gerbasi and it would be, you said there was another Councillor, Mr…? Yeah.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

(Inaudible)

Reg Alcock: Yeah

Councillor Gerbasi: That's fine, I heard you.

(Inaudible)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right, thank you gentlemen. We appreciate it.

Reg Alcock: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Now we will have two of the individuals who added as five minute delegations, Judy Wasylycia-Leis and Tom Denton, five minutes, no questions. Judy Wasylycia-Leis opposed the report and Tom Denton in support. You have five minutes.

Judy Wasylycia-Leis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mayor, Councillors. Morning. I'm here obviously to speak about Rapid Transit. A debate that has been going on for a very, very long time and so I will keep my remarks very brief. In fact, I think we've been talking about Rapid Transit for, in this City, one way or another, for longer than many of you were born, right? How many born before 1958? I won't ask that question. The merits of a subway as you know, were defined and debated by City Council way back in the 1950s. So, half a century later, the debate over Rapid Transit continues still. And I think it pains many of us that we are still talking about this issue despite the hundreds of thousands of dollars spent on studies and despite the years and years of debate. Where I feel encouraged is that I know that these many, many debates are ultimately about how to make our City stronger. And that of course, is the job of City Hall. But it's my firm view that the City we all care so much about, will be best served if we can bring this long debate to an end, and instead, get this project finished so that we can finally move on. We need to end the debate and move swiftly in one direction on this file, and we have to do it for two reasons. One, because we owe it to our kids and the next generation of Winnipeggers to leave them with a modern, vibrant city that will serve the needs of Winnipeg families well into the future. And secondly, because there are many other priorities, whether it's keeping our communities safe, fixing our roads, improving our community services that demand the attention of this Chamber, too. And I have yet to meet a City Councillor who doesn't already have too much to do and not enough time to focus on everything that needs attention. So if we can put the endless delays and debate over Rapid Transit to rest, we can allow a little more space for the many other high priority items that we need to deal with. And I, I've taken a very clear position in this debate. And I want you to know today that I believe absolutely in building on Winnipeg's strengths and standing up for what Winnipeg is known for around North America. And that is the most innovative producer of next generation Rapid Transit vehicles anywhere on the continent. And I want to tell you, despite what you are led to believe that, in fact, I along with anyone else who's fighting on this issue believes in value for money and an open tender process. And that's why this debate is so important, because in fact, you have two choices. You have a choice to go down this path of putting on hold the Southwest Corridor half done and pursue another option that is not based on Manitoba's strengths and will cost at least half a billion dollars more by all accounts. And put at risk the 130 million that's already on the table in terms of Federal, Provincial participation. So, I believe that we should proceed with the project that we have money for, the project that the overwhelming majority of studies have supported. You've heard them again today. The project that we know is realistically achievable, because it is hundreds of millions of dollars less expensive than rail. The project that best reflects the present day realities about the density of our City, the project that gives us a real opportunity to keep more of this very significant public investment right here in Winnipeg. Most of all we have to keep moving forward with the plan that we have on the table. We've got to end the delays and finally, get the first line done. And I think everybody I've heard today, pro and con, have said the same thing. Get the first line done as planned, and I think we have an obligation to stop paying consultants and start getting the project completed. Councillors in this Chamber have been pushed and pulled on this issue relentlessly and I don't envy you that and I'll just finish up by saying, if I am elected this fall, we will have a fulsome discussion in this Chamber about finally putting the Rapid Transit discussion to rest and instead putting our focus on getting the project done. But regardless of what happens, allow me to implore you above all else, please, let's do all we can to minimize the time we spend on yet more debate and more studies and instead do all we can to get this project up and running. The best transit system is the one we actually finish and that should be our focus. Thank you very much.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Ms. Wasylycia-Leis. Mr. Tom Denton in support of the report.

Tom Denton: Mr. Speaker, Your Worship and Members of Council, I really appreciate the opportunity to be here this morning, and I don't often sit in the Gallery. And the other thing I appreciate is the good humour that I sense around this table. So I congratulate you on that. I live in Old St. Boniface. Councillor Vandal and I share a neighbourhood. I vote for him. I am Executive Director for the Immigrants Sponsoring Programs of Hospitality House Refugee Ministry. Our office is at Main and Magnus in the Catholic Centre for Social Justice. I love this city and I happen to think it has the most character of any Canadian city. My comments about the matter at issue are very broad brush. I'm not into the details. This is big picture stuff. The LRT proposal is a visionary one, and visionary ideas always run into controversy. After the Tribune folded, my partners and I thought Winnipeg deserved a second newspaper and so we started The Winnipeg Sun. The nay sayers were many and all the smart money said it would fail. It didn't. That was thirty years ago. The MTS Centre, the Esplanade Riel, the Canadian Human Rights Museum, the new Stadium, have all been recent visionary projects, with their share of detractors. But thankfully, the visionaries have prevailed. Winnipeg is going to be a much larger city than it is today. Our Provincial Government has constructed the most successful immigration program of any Province. And it continues to grow. Today, it lands here more immigrants than the next five smaller Provinces all added together. Most of these come to Winnipeg. This City Council was visionary in 2002 when it established the Winnipeg Private Refugee Sponsorship Assurance Program, as a mechanism for stimulating the City's growth. That Program still operates, although some of you may have forgotten it. Today, that vision has resulted in probably sixty percent of all the

private sponsorships of refugees into Canada, coming out of Winnipeg. And we have only two percent of the country's population. We're punching thirty times our weight. My own small work that last year brought in one hundred twenty nine immigrants, within two or three years, will be landing at least one thousand new immigrants a year in Winnipeg. Joining their families already established here. The City's growth will escalate. Immigrants create jobs. We will continue to have one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country. We will be well poised to handle better than most cities, the impending labour shortage caused by Canada's low birth rate and baby boomer retirements. Big cities have rail-based transportation systems. They are one of the hallmarks of successful character rich, world class cities like Winnipeg. That's why I commend this initial LRT proposal to you as a visionary one whose time appears to have come. It is something that we can build on. Thanks very much.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Mr. Denton. All right. Having said that, we're going to move on to the Mosquito Control Program and our first speaker is Glenda Whiteman in opposition to Report 9.

Glenda Whiteman: Good morning. Mr. Mayor, Mr. Speaker, Councillors, media and members of the public. Today, I'm going to provide you with a brief current fares lesson for everyone here and hopefully for the public. I send you a link for the presentation at 5:30 this morning and I must have made some small error and I will send that to you again this afternoon and hopefully it will work, but the presentation is the visuals and the references that accompany the written presentation which you received. For those of you who don't know, my name is Glenda Whiteman and fortunately I really am a history teacher. I'm here to tell you once again, Councillors, how silly you're being. And I've been doing that since about 2002, the first time I became aware that elected officials were foolish enough to try to remove buffer zones. That was an embarrassing moment for Winnipeg. And here you are embarrassing yourselves again and this time in an election year. I guess some of you have forgotten that the protests against the chemicals happened when public servants like you try to remove the buffer zones. That is when you try to take away people's right to breathe. The Mayor's Campaign Strategy is quite amazing. Imagine running on the same mosquito reduction promise twice and expecting the people to be stupid enough to believe you again. I guess you're banking on the fact that pesticides significantly reduce IQ and that was presented to Winnipeg at the Earth Day Forum by Patricia Molten. You can find that reference in the presentation, I hope. And you bragged about taking care of the problem then in an environmentally friendly ways. You hired a man who bragged about how being environmentally friendly could actually save Winnipeg money in the long run and you voted unanimously in this chamber in 2005 to accept his strategy which was to eliminate chemical larvicides and phase out adultciding by 2008. And that's in here. And Mr. Steeves is quite amazing in his own right and for those of you who don't know my maiden name is Steeves so I'm going to take the liberty to take a shot at Mr. Steeves today. He's privileged to live in a special bubble all of his own. He lives in a world where it's funny to pretend you're a lobbyist for the Pfizer Corporation and in his bubble, air doesn't move. I imagine that it must've been like that in the gas chambers too. The birth place of malathion and I quote from Santa Stein-Graven who also came to Winnipeg to present her findings a few years ago. She says like the chlorinated pesticides, organophosphate poisons played a starring role during the war but as villain rather than hero. Developed by a German company as a nerve gassed, members of the first generation of organophosphate poisons were tested on prisoners in the concentration camps of Auschwitz. Buffer zones have historically been offered along side Mosquito Control in Winnipeg as a middle of the road compromise to appease those who don't wish to be exposed to repeated applications of nerve toxins. Buffer zones have been a requirement since the clean environment commission hearings in 1982, pardon me since the pesticide use permit process was established after the clean environment commission hearings of 1982. It's worth noting that at about that same time the rest of the country stopped using adultciding as a method of mosquito control and it's also important to know that not all of the recommendations of the commission were implemented at that time such as number 9A from Page 99 which states adultciding must normally be confined to parks and recreation areas and should not include residential areas. Moving on to some of the human health effects, very quickly I'm just going to quote for you from the Canadian Cancer Society. Again the link is in your reference document. And they state, "Our position is based on the growing body of evidence suggesting a connection between pesticides and cancer. The cosmetic or non essential use of pesticides may cause harm and provides no health benefit." According to the precautionary principle when an activity raises threats of harm to human health or the environment, precautionary measures should be taken even if some cause and effect relationships are not fully established scientifically. They go on to tell you how you can reduce your risk from pesticides and from the Canadian Lung Association, I excerpted this from their website, how do pesticides get into our bodies? Cosmetic pesticides can enter our body through skin contact, by ingestion, swallowing them or by breathing them in. How can they hurt human health? In the short term, they can be a problem people who have multiple chemical sensitivities or people who have lung diseases. They can set off an immediate physical reaction such as an asthma attack. You'll hear later from some people who have had that problem. And they're also a problem in a long term. They go on to give you some symptoms of pesticide exposure such as headaches, fatigue, shortness of breath, vomiting, loss of consciousness, long term adverse effects on behaviour, and the nervous immune and endocrine system. We know that that's happening in Winnipeg, and forms of cancer such as known Hodgkin's Lymphoma. We certainly know that that's happening. Leukemia and soft tissue sarcoma, specifically to malathion. I'll tell you about Servlets health effects from the PMRA, that's Health Canada. They also warn you to look for nausea, dizziness, confusion, headaches, weakness, diarrhea, eye, skin, nose or throat irritation and breathing problems. The

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health tells us it's a tumourigen, nutrigen, and a reproductive effecter. From the Province of Manitoba, the material safety data sheet tells us malathion is a organophosphate compound which inhibits chlorine estuaries activity. Signs and symptoms may include weakness, tightness in chest, headache, blurry vision, non reactive pupils, excessive salivation, excessive sweating, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, abdominal cramps, muscular fibrillation, convulsions, pulmonary edema, possible cardiac arrest and death. These people tell us the same things but they also point out this is the New Jersey Department of Health hazard of substance fact sheet. Malathion can affect you when breathed in and by passing through your skin. High or repeated exposure may damage the nerves. You asked for some best practices and I would like to congratulate you on the best practices that you approved in 2005. We used to have some in the city. You experimented with dragon flies. That was a really great idea and you had some other best practices such as approving our biological larvacides. Around the country, Quebec was the first province to ban the use and sale of malathion and today five provinces have enacted provincial pesticide legislation even Saskatchewan is getting the idea. They have instituted pesticide free parks. No other major cities in other Canadian provinces are still using adultciding for nuisance mosquitoes. And this brings me to the recommendations. Is that how much time I have left? Thank you very much, okay. This is the most important part of the presentation and I'd like you to know that these recommendations are based on the ones that came from the EPC, drafted by the EPC last week, and this version is…has been approved by members of the public so this is not just my own idea that I've conjured up, okay? So the recommendations we'd like to present to compliment yours or contradict yours perhaps, number one, that the City of Winnipeg adopt the recommendation of the clean environment commission of 1982 and instruct the Winnipeg Public Service that adultciding must normally be confined to parks and recreation areas and should not include residential areas or if you're not going to accept that, then at the very least, that the public…Winnipeg Public Service request the Province of Manitoba to increase the size of the buffer zone currently stipulated in the 2010 pesticide use permit. You'll be hearing later a little bit about the history of the buffer zones, the size of the buffer zones has always since about 1969, corresponded to the size of the swath. So when the equipment changes and the manner of application changes, the swath size changes therefore the buffer zone size changes. It's traditionally been that. It's based on these three studies that you have the quote for and the effective down wind swath with these nearly microscopic droplets when applied by ground equipment is usually considered to be about a hundred meters. That's from Roy Ellis in 1992. However, when doing my research for you for this today I discovered another quote by Roy Ellis from the use of malathion URV for West Nile vector management. This…pardon me, this was requested by B.C. And in this we see that droplet drift of malathion UOV apply with truck-mounted UOV sprayers would be up to 800 meters. So number two, that the City of Winnipeg Public Service request the Province to amend the minimum criterion of fogging of three consecutive days of greater than 25 nuisance mosquitoes to three consecutive days of greater than 100 nuisance mosquitoes. Traditionally I think all of you hear and Council know that it's been policy, unwritten policy that 100 nuisance mosquitoes is what triggers adultciding. Three, may I continue?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: How many more do you have?

Glenda Whiteman: You wrote seven. We have…I can shorten them. I don't have to read the…

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Just headline them for us.

Glenda Whiteman: Okay, very well. Thank you. Number three, that you request the Province to increase the 48 hour notice time. That's to assist sensitive individuals or families who have to get out of town, find a place to go get make all the arrangements and get off work. Number four, that you review and make process changes to increase public awareness of an access to the buffer zones. Increase awareness of the precautions as per PMRA, cleaning up afterwards and commence fogging operations after sunset or after 10:30 and cease before sun sunrise. Again Roy Ellis explains most effective time for adultciding is after sunset. Number five, to increase the service level through the budget process to adapt a meaningful public education strategy that will reduce the 50% of mosquitoes that hatch on private property by encouraging potentially subsidizing biological larvaciding. Bring back the team project that was one of the best practices that you were following and where did the money go for that? You didn't hire anybody for a year.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Spare us the editorial, ma'am. Just (inaudible)…

Glenda Whiteman: Okay, Number six.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: One more. Number seven.

Glenda Whiteman: To move to biological control by 2011 and to phase out Dursban and then you have some resources explaining how toxic Dursban is.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Ms. Whiteman.

Glenda Whiteman: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Nick Ternette for five minutes.

Nick Ternette: I need that mike (inaudible). I can't get up there. (Inaudible) Do you want me to do that? (Inaudible) Mr. Speaker. Mayor Katz, members of City Council. Councillor Gordon Steeves called me to Brett Favre of politics here in Winnipeg and it's kind of cute. But Brett Favre was a very successful quarterback for the Green Bay Packers. So I do appreciate that particular comment. I've come out of self imposed retirement today primarily to talk to you about the pesticide issue because it affects me personally and has affected me personally. The seven point recommendations by the Administration regarding mosquito control are in my opinion the most regressive moves that I have seen in a long time. Concerning Point 1, requesting the department to reduce the size of buffer zones (inaudible) stipulating the size of that reduction is to me passing the buck to the departments rather than standing up for your own beliefs. Why don't you indicate what you really think you want to do? You were the ones who originally passed the buffer zone, size of the buffer zones so you ought to take responsibility to decide telling the departments what you actually want to do instead of forcing the departments to do that decision. Even the Free Press suggest that this approach is extremely arbitrary, neither scientific or fact based. And even more, the Free Press argues that Malathion is truly safe then why do the Province allow buffer zone of any kind in the first place? You ought to be concerning that issue. Relating to Point 2 and Point 3 that the Province amend the minimum criteria for fogging from three consecutive days to two consecutive days and reducing the 48 hour notice of fogging to 24 hour notice, simply allows more people to be fogged that do not wish to be fogged and abdicates again the decision from the City to the Province because of I think of the upcoming October election, you don't want to take a stance (inaudible). Furthermore, Point 5 allows you more fogging per cycle in terms of Point 4, the APR process to minimize abuse of the system. Well, I would like to ask the question what evidence is there that there has been an abuse of the APR system whatsoever? Not a single set of evidence's been produced on that and no study has been done. Furthermore, I think that particular point that you're arguing about discriminates. Don't tenants have the same rights as home owners not to be fogged? The impression here clearly is home owners are important and tenants are irrelevant and we're not going to take tenants into consideration. That reminds me of the old days, when in the old days about 167 years ago, when only home owners could vote and tenants could not vote. Think about that. On the other hand I am supportive of the fact that the City will ask the Province for more money to phase out the larvicide Dursban within two years instead of four years and move till it's a 100 percent biological and I mean biological, non toxic is what I think is important control larvacide. It needs to be non toxic except for the fact that I've discovered in my own research that 100 percent biological larvaciding was there started in 2007 based on your own program, not in 2012. It was five years behind. In fact, what this Council or previous Council had actually passed and that disturbs me immensely except…unfortunately, the synthetic permethrin and malathion are still being used if you look in your own report in the larviciding program and unfortunately both of which are cancer causing agents. In fact, US EPA has classified...or classified I mean that is determined, permethrin as a carcinogen that is toxic to insects, honey bees and cats and animals and many animals tend to be outside when you're doing fogging and or larviciding and also as suggested as Glenda has indicated there is evidence that malathion is associated with cancer and the cancer is associated with and that's why I'm here personally it's non-Hodgkin's lymphoma which is what I have, which I had to battle twice, and which I may still get again. Non-Hodgkin's is the fifth largest cancer in Canada and is one of the fastest growing cancers here in Manitoba. That is determined by the kind of rates that you have. Why? Because of the use of pesticides of all which even the cancer care doctors have identified as one of the leading causes of non-Hodgkin lymphoma. There is specific evidence linking farmers who use pesticides of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, as well as postal workers and newspaper delivery people which I was for 20 years, delivering the Winnipeg Sun daily, that I exposed to pesticides and especially Malathion and whatever else on the long term is accumulative, it is not just one time in the spring. And there is documentation related in significant increase of cancer in these and these professions of people who are exposed to it. So first of all, I'm completely and we're all completely supportive of Glenda's seven points and recommendations however I would like to add one more recommendation. If the City is not prepared to do a thorough policy review of the mosquito control, this is just a generalized paper just like the LRT paper is. A thorough mosquito review then the Province ought to do it and I would suggest that you…the recommend that they do it then and determine first of all, whether there are safe and effective alternatives permethrin and malathion as well as scientific studies and I want doctors and nurses and others involved comparing health costs. My health costs in terms of my (inaudible) of cancer is probably between 100 to $200,000 of taxpayer's money. Think about that. Even if only ten people get cancers because of all the fogging that's a million dollars in the health cost care. Comparing health cost for those who contract cancer indirectly as the result of the mosquito fogging vis-à-vis the heath cost of those who contract the West Nile Virus. I think there has got to be thorough research done far more before you simply pass the kind of recommendations you're doing. Thank you very, very much.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Ternette. Any questions? Seeing no questions? Thank you Ms. Whiteman, Mr. Ternette. We're going to invite the following people to come and give up to five minutes, no questions though, on in opposition to Report 9, Josh Brandon, Anne Lindsey, Alon Weinberg and Olga Krywyj. Mr. Brandon.

Josh Brandon: Thanks very much. Thanks, Mayor, Council, Speaker. Thanks so much for waving your rules to allow me to speak today. I think we can all agree that we're looking for some good mosquito control policy for the City of Winnipeg and I think we can all agree that that means limiting the number of mosquitoes, especially nuisance and disease carrying mosquitoes while at the same time ensuring that we have maximum safety for human health and for the environment. I think that should be our shared goal going forward. I was here last month and I spoke on this issue and at that time I raised two concerns. I was worried that we are rushing ahead with developing a policy on mosquito control without a proper review of the science and without proper public consultation. And you know I've looked at what some of the other preceding Councils have done when they tried to develop changes in Mosquito Control Policy. I was really impressed with some of the in depth consultation that's gone on in the past, you know, asking stakeholders and bringing in scientists and you know, current and former mosquito control people contributing substantial reports on what the effects of mosquito control are. So I was hopeful that maybe something like that would be happening here. As well, I thought I was concerned last month that the directions being given to the public administration were overly focused on fogging and not broad enough, not looking at the full range of options that we have for mosquito control. And I think we really do need to look at this as a comprehensive plan integrating public education, integrating source reduction and other methods of mosquito control, not just solely focusing on one aspect of it. Now, at the time last month, I was promised by the Mayor that we would be looking at these issues and that the report that the public administration would produce would answer all the concerns that I had. And so, I was hopeful but at the same time, I was skeptical because the report said you know, come back in 30 days. Well turned out to be 21 days that they were given for that report and so I was wondering, okay well how really are we going to get that broad consultation? How are we going to get that thorough review? And unfortunately, I found that when the report came out last week a lot of my concerns were realized. The proposed plan basically ends up being just a call for a reduction in buffer zones, a speed up of fogging applications and a crack down on what the report alleges are abusers of the buffer zone registration process. As well, there is a request for money from the Province to expand biological larvacideing outside the city limit. I thought this was particularly concerning because you know I think we're all in agreement that the Province needs to contribute in this area. It's an important area, because it's priority not just for the City of Winnipeg but for the whole province that we move to more environmentally benign methods of mosquito control. But, I was concerned that there seems to be according to the report an extra $929,000 for increased chemical fogging but when it comes to plans to switch to biological larvacide control, the City is just going to turn capping hand to the Province so I thought that that suggested some bias priorities and I really think that the priorities that the City sets should be based on science and not on political expediency. The effects of the buffer zones in particular I think has been a really controversial part of the Mosquito Control olicy here in Winnipeg. The report found that the effects of the buffer zones are hard to determine. That's what the report said. There actually wasn't any substantial research on the effects of buffer zones and what the effects of buffer zones on mosquito populations are. So, despite that, they are rushing to reduce the mosquito at…reduce the buffer zones. Now I just have...I'll be really brief I've just got a couple of points here. It seems to me that just last weekend we saw in the Free Press and Nick referred to this editorial as well, it was saying that we shouldn't be proceeding willy-nilly, we should be conducting a thorough review of our Mosquito Control Policy but that's not what we're seeing here. We're seeing a concentration on increased chemical fogging. This was supposed to be the Mayor and Council that dealt with the mosquito issue authoritatively. We were going to have the mosquito Mayor and unfortunately with this report it seems that we're looking at acting willy-nilly on this issue and so in voting on this report I'd ask you to consider if we want this to be the willy-nilly Mayor and the willy-nilly Council…

Mr. Speaker: Wrap up Mr. Brandon, please. Time's…

Josh Brandon: Or are we going to take this issue seriously?

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Josh Brandon: Thank you very much.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Anne Lindsey, five minutes no questions.

Anne Lindsey: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mayor, Councillors, staff, members of the public, thanks for having me here today. On June 23rd, Council asked for a report from the Public Service as you know on the Mosquito Control Program and requested recommendations on amending the program to reflect best practices. Two weeks later, the report and the recommendations were tabled and it seems to me strange that the recommendations that were provided don't seem to follow from the content of the report. Rather, they mysteriously seem to reflect the public comments and proposals that have been made over the last little while by several Councillors. First, it's worth noting it appears the City is already using some of the so-called best practices for a mosquito control program as set out by the American Mosquito Control Association. For example on page four, we read that the Insect Control Branch has been implementing the international standard for larvae and adult mosquito control through the AMCA's best practices and on page five, base requirement of having three consecutive days of a minimum of 25 nuisance mosquitoes is based on the biology and emersions rates of

adult mosquitoes and is quote an international standard from the AMCA that most jurisdictions use. However, the recommendations in this area is to reduce the notification period to 24 hours with only two consecutive days of minimum numbers. This would appear to be a departure from best practices and there's no evidence or justification for such a departure provided. A lack of evidence to support the recommendations again appears in the proposed increase in service levels to cover the entire city in two to three nights instead of the current four to five nights even though it would cost an estimated one million dollars more and further the recommendation that the so-called anti pesticide registration process be amended to quote minimize potential abuses is not backed up by any evidence of any abuse taking place. Certainly in the past, citizens have used creative methods to ensure that people who wish to protect themselves from spray drift were able to do so by means of petitions and so forth. This was in the day prior to the convenient internet procedure that the City subsequently and appropriately created to facilitate registration. I want to note here that that procedure though is still not very convenient for those seniors and other potentially vulnerable individuals who do not use a computer. In fact, I've been asked on several occasions by a couple of seniors in my neighbourhood to assist them with that process. The recommendations in the report such as requiring in person registrations or having a registration day or week actually appear to be transparent attempts to make the process more difficult. The proposal that registered letters should be sent to property owners address to confirm primarily registration addresses as Nick suggested says that only property owners not renters should be permitted to register and that would create I think a dangerous precedent. However if the City is interested in sending registered letters, it's worth noting in the past objectors have suggested that citizens should not have to sign up every year that in fact a registered letter can be sent to objectors each year to ensure that they are still on the list. This would probably be a cost saving measure for the department. I have a couple of other general comments before moving to the contentious issues of the buffer zones. First, I absolutely support the proposal to move to 100 percent biological larvaciding. This move is long overdue as you know. Oh my, too much stuff. Okay, second I've learned of repeated violations of the Manitoba Conservation Permit which states that they should turn the trucks off if pedestrian traffic may be contacted by spray drift. The number of those violations suggest that additional training is necessary for staff. Third I've referred to the 2005 Insect Control Strategy which was already referred to, had some excellent recommendations and I believe the best practices would indicate that they should be reinstated. Buffer zones. You've heard that we've had them since we stopped using DDT. There was no analysis as you were told of how the City is affected all these programs affected by the buffer zones. No indication, either positive or negative and yet the recommendation is for to reduce the buffer zones. Why do we have them? The Clean Environment Commission Report 1982 which has already been referenced by Glenda put it very well. I'll leave you to read that but one quote is "Mosquitoes may be a terrible nuisance but it is not self-evident that a person has the right to a maximum abatement of the nuisance" and once the decision to include residential adulticiding in the program is taken, people should be allowed to register their objection, all reasonable precautions should be taken to prevent insecticide from getting on to the excluded properties. I certainly sympathize that people are troubled by mosquitoes and those who fear for the spread of disease. Let's be clear however that we are not talking about disease carrying mosquitoes. I'll be very fast. Others have justifiable concerns about the potential long term impact on their health. Buffer zones provide an absolute minimum of protection to those members of the population. I have here some letters that were sent from the Ontario Human Rights Commission and Canadian Human Rights Commission indicating that agencies that use adultciding and mosquito fogging agencies have a duty to accommodate people with disabilities. And I'll refer you to those and finally I'll just say duty to accommodate is the law but it's also the spirit in which we claim we want to live. We have the Canadian Museum for Human Rights being built here in Winnipeg and I really wonder if we're going to thoroughly embarrass ourselves by flagrantly disregarding the Human Rights of the minority of our population.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Ms. Lindsey.

Anne Lindsey: Thanks. I recognize you have a difficult job and I wish you the best in making a good decision. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Alon Weinberg. You have five minutes.

Alon Weinberg: Thank you. Good morning.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You don't have to bend in.

Alon Weinberg: Fellow citizens, Mr. Speaker, the Chair, Mayor Katz and fellow Councillors. It's great to be here today at the fringe of the fringe, Venue 25 if we will. It's a lovely festival going on. The way I understand having come down here instead of using up more of my buddy pass is that some angry residents of the City have phoned Councillor Steeves and I'm sure other Councillors demanding the City will get rid of all those mosquitoes already and assuming that you know in this little chamber they control all of nature that the buffer zones are somehow preventing this and we have to put down that minority. Mosquito control, in general, if you consider the environment and nature, and where we live, is a myth and it's a mistake to keep perpetrating it. We live in a flood plain with clay soil surrounded by wet lands that if it were to drain would destroy the ecology of the lakes around here and the fresh water hydrology. So really, to

continue to feed into that panic and hysteria because people are getting bitten by mosquitoes is not the way to go. What we need is some leadership from this Council and we need leadership in our society in general to start to look at how we can deal with the fact that we live in this place and it's probably one of the most extreme cities on earth for temperature and for mosquitoes and for all these other factors. So it's a really beautiful day today and I wish I didn't have to come down here and I wish you didn't all have to sit here. In fact, couldn't the whole Council move its sessions on lovely days like this into a nearby park? But there are a lot of bugs and it would be noisy. Maybe they could have large gazebos. Ah, gazebos. Why don't we have a ton of gazebos in this town? If we were actually redesigning according to nature, Winnipeg would have a thriving gazebo culture. People would be parting on the weekends, hey your gazebo or my gazebo? Corydon Avenue, all those beautiful cafes would have screens around them because it's a mosquito infested city and we all know that for few weeks in summer. You're not going to get rid of them by crushing the rights of minorities. Let's take a redesign approach that is ecological and deal with reality and stop obfuscating where we live, obfuscating where we live. So, let me go on. If I'm not mistaken, on June 22nd and this is an article Bartley Keeves wrote so I hope that this is accurate. (Laughing). No because it wasn't a quote, it wasn't a quote, it was just verbatim. It wasn't a quote. It says it wasn't a quote, it was narrative "the Mayor also said he is open to the idea of replacing the pesticide malathion with permethrin, surmising Mayor Katz, Ottawa may outlaw malathion in the future." Why would we possibly surmise that Ottawa would outlaw something that you've told us all these years is safe? And that you keep telling the people in your wards is safe? It breaks down really quickly into malioxon which is ten times more toxic. It's a human right to breathe clean air. I echo Anne Lindsey's comments that people have been fogged. Last September when we had a very warm and late mosquito season in budget using season, there were people sitting on Sherbrook street while the foggers came down Wolseley and down Westminster. People were still enjoying their drinks I think you were there as well Councillor Browaty, one of those evenings as you recall. Anyway people are getting sick from this and a lot of people are not informed. If the City even valued people's human rights to even know about the fogging program, they would put up signs. The City is able to put up signs every time the streets are cleaned because cars might be affected but when it comes to people, the City can not even be bothered to put up signs assuming everybody is getting an e-mail notification or listening to CJOB hourly which is not the case especially in areas like the North End where people are out later and are getting fogged and don't know a thing about their human rights and they don't know what these chemicals are doing to them either. Anyway there are alternatives. Like I say we could start to redesign and offer out of the $850,000 that are given to large chemical companies every year, subsidies for people to put screens on their poaches, to build gazebos, put things in parks, redesign as much as we can of the City around reality and nature because you're not going to win the war of nature. Look into the work of a German scientist, Dr. Hans Levin, I don't know if you've looked into that before rousing at the public in fear. He looks at things like sterilizing mosquitoes. I'm not sure ecologically it's the best approach, but I'm sure you have the resources to figure that out. And finally like do it yourself culture where people have to learn how to protect themselves. We need much more education on that. Leadership is required in a time of divisiveness. What I see of Council is an exacerbation of the divisiveness on this issue and what we would like to see all of us as citizens of the City is a Council that takes that role of leadership seriously and works to actually bridge the gap and come up with a mosquito control policy that is not based on the election year toxic populism. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Mr. Weinberg. Olga Krywyj, you have five minutes.

Olga Krywyj: Thank you. Good morning, members of the media, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mayor Sam Katz, Councillors and staff. My name is Olga Krywyj. I'm a person with a disability who lives in the downtown core of Winnipeg and grew up for most of my life living in the Winnipeg's North End. Allergies considered a disability under the Canadian human rights code i.e. environmental illness and sensitivities to chemical particulates. It is a human right to breathe clean air. I am entitled by law to work place accommodation and accommodation in my living space, a right to a chemical free breathing space. The Manitoba commission for human rights has a sign in their reception area if you've ever been there, asking visitors to please refrain from wearing scented products as they may adversely affect those with environmental chemical sensitivities. My parents were immigrants and survivors of the holocaust. They witnessed atrocities in the concentration camps. Human beings were fogged to death in gas chambers with a chemical which is in the same family as the chemical we are currently using, malathion to fog for mosquitoes. One-time exposure to a chemical can mean a lifetime of sensitivity. We're building a brick and mortar monument to protect human rights, the Canadian museum for human rights. I stare at it daily out the window of my balcony. What good is it if there is no one to enforce the violation of the basic human right to breathe clean air? Why do other provinces uphold this right? Yet, Manitoba does not. If I may use an analogy, let's go back to the days of smoking and nonsmoking seats on airplanes. How absurd was that? We should not be talking about reducing the number of nonsmoking seats on flights i.e. reducing the size of buffer zones but rather should be talking all together about nonsmoking flights and ending the spraying of citizens all together with a toxic carcinogen. We should be protecting those who cannot speak for themselves, children with developing lungs, pets and wildlife. The City of Winnipeg just implemented a by-law where it is illegal for adults to smoke in a vehicle with children present. How is secondhand smoke a carcinogen, any different than the toxic particulate inhalant chemical, malathion? I've been fogged since childhood living in the North End where my parents didn't know any better. They didn't speak any English. We were out while the trucks were spraying, fogging, playing. We had no idea. The citizens of Winnipeg have a

right to breathe clean air and right to remain healthy free from asthma, heart and lung disease and cancer. I have an invisible disability. My friend Nick Ternette's disability is visible. We build wheelchair ramps and accommodate those people with visible disabilities, a very small percentage of the population, maybe one percent. Why are those with invisible disabilities, i.e. allergy and asthma, not accommodated by the City of Winnipeg yet they are accommodated in work places, in living spaces and other provinces across Canada. All Canadians have the right to breathe clean air. Maybe we should have a retractable gazebo built over the City. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, ma'am. Council, we have at least 35 minutes worth of delegations. Is it your will to continue past the twelve o'clock hour? Complete delegations? Okay, we will, Council. All right, Mr. Sheldon. Yes they may not go there full 10 but it's…absolutely, we'll be lowering the…okay. Sheldon Sturrey, Okay. All right, Sheldon Sturrey, Janice Lukes, Anders Swanson and Mike Davidson are our speakers, if you could be prepared and ready to come.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Sturrey, we'll be asking you for ten minutes and we won't be going over that. Thank you.

Sheldon Sturrey: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mayor, City Councillors. I'm here this morning to speak on the recommendation that doing business in Winnipeg By-law be amended to prevent…issuance of temporary trade show licenses that allow cash for gold places to come into this city and not what has happened in the past since July of 2009 as these companies have been coming in on a monthly basis, some of them opening as many as three locations which has happened in June and May and April, where they came in and operated out of the Canad Inns at Polo Park, at Club Regent and Fort Garry as well. These companies did not have to comply with any of the same regulations that businesses such as mine have to, where we have to report any items, record identification and hold items for 15 days. They were allowed to come in and they were here over one weekend and not having to do the same requirements as any brick in and mortar store business in the city had to comply with. I guess since July of 09 when I first brought this to…when they first started coming into the city, they have averaged, I guess, 12 to 16 different licenses that have come in where they've operated. The only benefit to the city at that time was just receiving $250 for a license fee that said nothing else. My license fee is substantially higher than that again these businesses don't have to comply with records of acquisition or disposition or identification, photographs and holding any items for 15 days which, the Winnipeg Police Services, at least if we hold the items for 15 days, they have a chance if there are…if there is stolen property, that can be recovered, or if there is sellers remorse, they can in fact come back and receive their items. These other places they are here for the weekend, not having to comply with any of that and they are gone with you know, no chance for sellers remorse or for Winnipeg Police Services. I asked that this thing be passed that these shows are no longer allowed to come in and that's really it. It's a short thing. I've been doing this for about a year so hopefully this will be approved and this will be the end of these temporary cash for gold pieces. Than you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any questions of Mr. Sturrey? Seeing none. Thank you, sir. Appreciate it. Janice Lukes, regarding the Chief Peguis Trail Extension Project. Thank you.

Janice Lukes: Good morning, Council, Good morning, Your Honourable Mayor, good morning. I'm here today also beside me is Sigrun Bailey, and Louise Balaban, Co-Chairs of the Northeast Pioneers Greenway. My name is Janice Lukes for those of you that don't know me. I'm speaking on behalf of the Winnipeg Trails Association which is a coalition, a volunteer coalition of 26 plus organizations of trail builders and trail users. Winnipeg Trails Association advocates for the vulnerable road users. The vulnerable road users is a term that MPI associates with pedestrians and cyclists in context with motorized vehicles and that's what I'm here today to speak about in relation to the Chief Peguis Expansion. I'm not registered in support. I'm not contesting the Chief Peguis Expansion. I recognize we are building the expansion to freeway standards as it is part of a bigger picture, a bigger transportation hub and inner ring road, part of centre port that it will link into and to facilitate the movement of transportation trucks hauling vehicles semi-trailers. I'm here today to implore to you to when you, as you enter into the detailed design discussions with the P3 partner that you select, to increase the level of safety specifically at the intersection of this freeway, and Raleigh and Gateway and the Northeast Pioneer's Greenway Trail, to incorporate and a grade-separated crossing verses the current design of red and green lights at this key intersection. The Winnipeg Tails Association and many of our colleagues that work with pedestrians, cyclists, we have grave concerns that the current level of safety is inadequate. I want to explain to you intersections I'm sure you are aware of them that they have the highest rate of vehicle accidents and the highest rate of pedestrian and vehicle accidents. And just to clarify, this intersection, the Northeast Pioneer's Greenway Trail will be dissected by this freeway. The Northeast Pioneers Greenway Trail barely built two years ago is in Manitoba. The most highly used five and half kilometres of trail from pedestrians to kids, from kids in strollers, dogs, seniors, cyclists, families. This is a showcase trail that Mr. John Buhler and Mayor Sam and I was there and many of us were there for the sod turning, it connects communities like no other. It is so well used and under the stellar guidance and leadership of both Sigrun and Louise who have put in countless volunteer hours. They have raised tens of, thousands of dollars to develop this trail from a rail line to a trail with amenities, benches, shade canopies, trees, signage and lighting. This is a showcase trail that we have now. Arguably the best rail to trail conversion in Manitoba because it's being so embraced

by the community. This trail will be intersected by the Chief Peguis Expansion with vehicles travelling at 80 kilometres an hour. Again, this expansion is part of an inner ring road linking to a larger network along with carrying the commuter traffic that the northeast quadrant of Winnipeg is seeing an increase in. It will have transport trucks, semi truck to trailers, hauling vehicles at 80 kilometres an hour. Pedestrians and cyclists on this trail will approach this intersection. This intersection has four lanes of traffic and it's got two uncontrolled access and egress points coming, people coming on and coming off this freeway. We're not debating the safety of a red light and green light. There are many levels of safety but in light of the nature of the traffic on this freeway and this trail. Both the pedestrians and the vehicles at this inter section we ask that a higher level of safety be incorporated into this design and let it grade separation be used instead of red lights and green lights. And why, I had the question why are you only coming forward now to talk about this now? In 2008 was the first open house that we had on this Chief Peguis Expansion and at that point in time Bill Larkin was the Director of Public Works and we passionately, I know I passionately talked to him, please, please when you build this thing, have a grade separation at this Northeast Pioneer's Trail because we saw the potential of this trail would hold. Countless times we've been asking Mr. Kevin Nixon, City of Winnipeg Active Transportation Director, please, make sure this is included, please make sure this is included. Last week, following the $45 million announcement of the increase in funding to do a vehicle grade separation only then it was confirmed to us that we would not be receiving a higher level of safety at this intersection, that there would be no grade separation for vulnerable road users. And because it's a P3 and I don't even want to get into the P3 debate, but because it's a P3, non-disclosures, confidentiality, secrecy is involved and we understand that because of the competitive nature and everything that's involved. I was involved in the Disraeli P3. It's very, very upsetting to only know for sure now that this isn't included. It's summer. I can only come today. Apologize, I would've come to Standing Policy and EPC. I'm in the middle of three birthday parties, one at one o'clock as we speak. Anyways, yesterday I had a great discussion with the director of Public Works and it was…it was shocking to understand that right from the very start when the City put their wish list of items together of what they wanted in this P3 project that never, never was this higher level of safety included that this separated, grade separated pedestrian intersection, that wasn't even considered because it was deemed a hard sell by the City or by the area Councillor, Jeff Browaty. So because this was never included, the Province couldn't come to the table and the Feds couldn't come to the table to help fund this grade separation. They look at what the City wants. The City didn't deem it important enough to put it in there so it's not even considered in the funding picture. And I've been involved from the start on the P3 with the Disraeli and understand that process that was three days of design charrette lock down. So, shame on you, Mr. Browaty for not telling us up front a year and a half ago when you knew that there was no grade separation. There was going to be included in this. All along we have been led to believe we will have the opportunity to give input and that there could…that could possibly be a possibility, but right from the start it was not even on the table and we've all been led to believe and fought that there would be this opportunity and there isn't at this point. And shame on you, Mr. Browaty, for not going to bat for the residents of North Kildonan and demanding a higher level of safety at this intersection. Mr. Clement, bless himself, he…he…when the Charleswood Parkway came about, he went out. He never had this busy corridor. He ensured that there was a pedestrian overpass, cyclist overpass.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Two minutes.

Janice Lukes: We were ensured that by October 2007, all the people in North Kildonan are aware that the level of safety that is desired by many wasn't included initially off the bat. Mayor Katz, together we have made, together we've all made phenomenal progress on Active Transportation, unprecedented and I've talked to you a lot about this, and it gets me a little choked up here. But it just seems that when we get to these big design multimillion dollar infrastructure projects, we stumble. It's disheartening. We stumbled at the beginning on Disraeli and we had to go through all of that and now we're having a stellar solution. We stumbled at the beginning of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor. Boy did we stumble on that one. But we all recognized the fact the gap but from what we originally were proposed to get, we are getting a hundred percent better now. The pathway system is 100 percent better because we had to come back in dialogue on this and now we have this unbelievable next set of infrastructure going in and we're still stumbling on it. Like this is, this is…it's very disheartening and it's…it's incomprehensible that the Active Transportation Advisory Committee of which I'm a member, we never had any presentation on this $110 million transportation project. We never had a presentation, we never have…were asked our opinion, we never were able to give input.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thirty seconds.

Janice Lukes: Until last week when we asked to have a presentation. There is a much bigger picture which my colleague, Anders Swanson will talk about with Birds Hill and beyond. But I'm imploring you today, please, please consider the vulnerable road users, the pedestrians, the kids and the dogs, the parents, the seniors. When you get into the detailed design of this P3, this is a huge opportunity. We've seen the cost of retrofits. Yes we can put it on our wish list but.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Janice Lukes: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Anders Swanson also in support. Five minutes.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Let's roll, sir. Five minutes.

Anders Swanson: Hi, everybody. My name is Anders Swanson. I'm a member of the City of Winnipeg Active Transportation Advisory Committee, the Province of Manitoba's Active Transportation Advisory Group, the River East Neighbourhood Network Trails Committee when I get a chance to get out there. I think I'm in good standing. The Mayor's Environmental Advisory Committee and I'm the coordinator of One Green City whose project is essentially to build a network of safe, efficient and direct Active Transportation routes through the City as soon as possible. On that note last time I was here, was before the big announcement of the building of this network and I want to say thank you to each and every one of you because you've all played a part in making that happen and we've got lots of exciting things to come. I want to address a couple of things here. One hopefully is addressed relatively straightforward in the pictures that I'm presenting to you but the first one is about transportation as time not distance. I don't know if how many of you have a fetish for transportation engineering and who aren't transportation engineers, but I'm one. I grew up in Island Lakes and when I was a little kid (laughing), that's right. I grew up in Island Lakes and interestingly when I was a teenager my commute was the same as my dad's. And the reason for that is that people see their commute in terms of time not distance. My dad's commute was 10 minutes. He lived way on the…he worked way on the other side of the St. Boniface Industrial Park and I went to school in Windsor Park. I went by bike and my dad went by car, obviously. When we lived there Bishop Grandin Greenway… or Bishop Grandin Boulevard rather had just opened. I don't know how long ago…I didn't yet develop my fetish in transportation engineering at that time. And you could fly down that Boulevard for sure and I remember going lots of places especially Superstore for hours and hours with my mom. And for them it was great because for them, I'm ten minutes from every where and that's the mentality that when you drive every where you kind of get into and everybody knows this how far away is Portage la Prairie? It's about what 67 kilometres in my estimation but if you're in a car, everybody says it's about half hour away, right? When you build a system like this, what ends up happening is that you're essentially encouraging people to go farther and carry weight farther and what ends up happening is that it's less efficient. I understand there are numerous reasons for doing this, transportation streamlining et cetera, getting the cars off the local neighbourhood streets. But the fact remains is that there is no such thing as reducing car usage and making less local traffic other than what's called transportation demand management and the bridge that I've showed in that picture and this idea is the pinnacle of transportation demand management. I understand you're dealing with the city where the largest percentage of people driving their cars and have to be accommodated, et cetera, right? But the fact remains is that if we don't do something about the fact that people don't get to go where they want to safely by bike or under their own power or by bus or anything else that will fill up. There's a couple of errors in the report that was submitted to Council that I'll have to draw your attention to. On page six, regarding the implications of the recommendations, the grade separation alternative is the best…is in the best interest of the City because number four, reduced greenhouse gas emissions by eliminating start and stop traffic associated with signalizing distractions. I used believe that, too. Honestly, I thought that was true but the problem again is and if you look down at the next paragraph and I think it's obvious now, since opening traffic volumes on Chief Peguis Trail which opened in 1990 have grown to approximately 26,000 vehicles per day. Those 26,000 vehicles emit greenhouse gases. It's a fact and the more you encourage people to only do that, the more greenhouse gases there will be. The quicker you make it in some places, the more drivers there will be and at the end of the lines there's places like downtown, the North End, Elmwood, everywhere else that is going to collect all those cars. There is nothing you can do to ultimately streamline everybody and streamline all the lights. People have to cross intersections. There can't be a bridge every where, but there can be a bridge here for bikes and pedestrians and I'm appealing to you when you consider the cost of the overall project that you should be setting aside at least two, five percent to build not grade intersection for the Northeast Pioneer's Greenway. If you check that first mock up I did, you'll see how close Birds Hill Park really is. If you ever look at the picture of all of the bikes that are going there and that went there for the Folk Fest Ride which I had the pleasure to be the mechanic on. People want to do it and they want to do it despite the fact that it is really tricky to do it. We had to have a police escort et cetera, et cetera to cross the intersections and stuff but it's close enough essentially that people will do it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Anders. All right we have some questions. Councillor Vandal, where did he go? Well, okay.

Councillor Vandal: I've had my question answered if that's all right.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: First of all, first of all to Janice and Anders, thank you very much. Janice, I know you are aware of what we went through and the assistance we got from the private sector to do the Northeast Pioneer's Greenway Trail and I want to know if you are…I think it's only fair that I make you aware of the fact after some of your comments that actually, Councillor Browaty came to meet with me about this situation and there has been a meeting with the department to address this very concern. It is…it has happened just recently but I want you to know and the department right now is looking at ways to alleviate this potential risk factor, shall we say and I want you to be very cognizant of that and it was…I wasn't even aware of it. It was Councillor Browaty who brought it up to me. I just want you to know that.

Janice Lukes: Thank you. I've got a bit of optimism.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Do you have any idea what the order of magnitude costs are for.

Anders Swanson: If you look at the last picture that I submitted, the nice pretty one of the bridge in Burnaby. That's just one bridge. There is another bridge that looks exactly like this, one out in Minneapolis. I thought we could probably, maybe change the design up a little bit otherwise all the postcards people won't know where it is. But those were both built for a cost of about 1.5 to $4 million. The one in Minneapolis and these were built about two years ago, probably inflation a little bit et cetera. But both of those are very doable. The one in Minneapolis crossed a railway track as well as a freeway and that one in Burnaby if you look kind of in the background, it's kind of a cool picture, it's very difficult to get pictures like that that really show what it is. This is an architectural photograph because this one won design awards, et cetera, but essentially it will show you that the…what do you call that, the span is about similar to what's being considered here and you'll note that in my mockup there's…I'm actually asking or two bridges and the reason for that is that if the Chief Peguis Trail, no two, two, oh the Province is working on those. That's the cool thing is that…no seriously the Province has already approved one flyover over the 59 and there's existing cause way at Dunning. They've already spent I don't know how many million dollars to build that Ashfall Trail around the floodway if you ever get a chance, but the cool thing is we have a sort of dearth of tourist draws to Winnipeg. I don't know if…I used to live in Ottawa where we have millions of tourists. This is a really cool thing that we can do it which is to say you can bike safely out to Birds Hill Park. It's a beautiful park. It's close to the city, the easiest way to get over the city. So I'm asking for two. One, if the Chief Peguis, if the Chief Peguis Freeway is going to have transportation demand management and actually encourage people to eventually choose options for certain trips that intersection at Raleigh is also going to be relatively busy and scary so that's something we've got to think of as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any further question?

Councillor Vandal: Just so I'm clear 1.5 to 4 million times two?

Anders Swanson: Again my…it's a fetish not a professional like I say…

Janice Lukes: This is 1.8.

Anders Swanson: That one…

Janice Lukes: This is 1.8, two years ago in Burnaby. Same span.

Andres Swanson: Yeah. So…something like that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: What year were those bridges built?

Janice Lukes: 2008.

Anders Swanson: Both of them were 2008 so it will be a bit more expensive now but compared to the cost of the overall project and I think the real benefits, I think it's really worth doing.

Janice Lukes: And if you think when the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor goes in, people like us in St. Norbert will get to go on that pathway through, the Forks, all the way up North Kildonan to Bird's Hill and will I do it? You bet I will with Councillor Swandel from St. Norbert.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right, we have one last delegation, Mike Davidson. Regarding the, in opposition to the Assiniboine Park Conservancy Management Agreement. Go ahead, Mike.

Mike Davidson: Good morning, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mayor and Councillor, staff. 500 always appreciate the opportunity to come to City Hall and express our views. CUPE Local 500 members have been providing valuable service in Assiniboine Park for many decades and there are close to 200 Local 500 members, your employees at its peek time who work at the Zoo, the Park, the Conservatory. Our members are proud that they are City of Winnipeg employees and they must choose between remaining City employees or report to a new employer, the Conservatory Board. This decision has added stress to these workers and these families. The park also uses the services of other city departments. These departments are Public Works, Water and Waste and Community Services. These city departments provide many needed services such as snow clearing, pruning trees, grooming cross country ski trails, they paint the street lines in the park, making repairs to various buildings including the plumbing and heating, repairing broken water lines, welding metal, a park patrol and perform other services in the park and in the zoo. Assiniboine Park is considered by many visitors and Winnipeg citizens as one of the main attractions to our city. A number of events take place on an annual basis, such as floral exhibits held at the Conservatory, annual picnics such as the Teddy Bears Picnic, Boo at the Zoo, cricket matches, visitors to the zoo and much, much more. Many citizens use the park to jog, have lunch at noon time, bike rides, have picnics, enjoy family get togethers, cross-country skiing in the winter and that's just to name a few and the list goes on and on and on. The park and zoo has also experienced a growing infrastructure deficit for decades and that's not the fault of this Council here, that's something that this Council has inherited, but this has been going on for decades and decades. Many of the zoo enclosures are outdated and they need renewal. The tropical house for example is very, very old. Our maintenance members, your employees have done a great job of keeping that building up and running. It hasn't been easy to do. The new added expansion of recreation infrastructure and improvements only enhances the beauty of Assiniboine Park and the Zoo and we welcome that. And Local 500 does however have a few serious concerns about its members, welfare and the public ownership of the park. Aside from labour relations and transition issues, there are matters that should be examined in our view. We question why the park had to be handed over to a private board in order to fundraise for the many upgrades needed. A fundraising board was used at the downtown Millennium Library and the City of Winnipeg was still the employer and its operational remained publically owned and operated. We also have concerns that user fees in the park and zoo will increase substantially. These concerns have merit and I'm sure you can appreciate the uncertainty that this situation has created. The Local does wish to express its willingness to work with the new employer. The Conservancy Board wherever possible and CUPE Local 500 appreciated being included in the many work place meetings in order to ease the uncertainty and stress in the workplace and at home. Our members have many questions. They were concerned about what they would be doing next year and the year after and we appreciated being allowed to take part in these joint discussions. They were very important. And I cannot express the feelings that many of our members are experiencing about no longer being the City of Winnipeg employees. They are very proud of civic employees and in some cases their parents, grandparents worked in the Park and the Zoo for generations. Their dedication and commitment to the profession is outstanding. Their track record providing these front line services does not go unrecognized and is very much appreciated by the citizens of Winnipeg and on a personal note, I just want to say I'm very proud of the members that have worked in the a park in past generations and they currently do a great job despite everything that's going on. They want to be able to provide the very best services to visitors to the park and to the citizens of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any questions for Mike? Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mike, thank you for being here. As you know we heard this at EPC. I just want to ask if there's been any change because when I asked you last time at EPC, some of the key issues, it was my understanding, some of the key concerns of CUPE were being addressed by EPC and you told me they were moving in a very positive direction. To your knowledge has anything changed whatsoever or are we still moving in that same direction? Our pensions, et cetera, et cetera.

Mike Davidson: Right. Our negotiations are, I would say are going relatively well, issues such as the pension issue and benefits, our collective agreement moving along with the new Conservancy Board is going well.

Mayor Katz: I just wanted to make sure. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any further questions for Mr. Davidson? Having said none. Thank you, sir.

Mike Davidson: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right, can I have a motion to adjourn until 1:30? Councillor Swandel, we'll see you at 1:30.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of July 21, 2010, at 1:30 p.m.**

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillors, we've got lots to do and a short time to do it in, so, if we can call the meeting back to order. And EPC report, Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: EPC.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: EPC, please.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 30, 2010**

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

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. That was June 30th. July 7th. (Laughing)

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 7, 2010**

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 8.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Stand down No. 5? Any others? All right then and we'll move 1 through 4 and 6 through 8. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

**Item 5 - Light Rail Transit / Bus Rapid Transit Analysis
eFile - TT-8**

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Go ahead, Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I will introduce the report. First of all, I think it's important to address exactly what this report is asking for, Mr. Speaker. There seems to be a little bit of confusion. Number one, it asks Council to endorse Light Rail Transit as a preferred mode of Rapid Transit. I'll repeat that again, a preferred mode of Rapid Transit. It doesn't say "the preferred mode". There's a big difference and it was specifically worded that way. That's number one. Number two, it asks the Public Service to continue to do due diligence on LRT by examining in greater detail the five Rapid Transit routes identified in the sustainable transportation strategy as they prepare the Transportation Master Plan, to identify potential candidates for implementing LRT technology and also to ask the Chief Financial Officer to continue discussions with P3 Canada on potential funding for an LRT project. Something which both P3 Canada and Minister Toews have confirmed is an eligible project for funding consideration. I'd also like to add, Mr. Speaker, if approved, P3 Canada funds up to 25% of eligible costs with no monetary cap. Mr. Speaker, the whole purpose here is we want our city to be better. We want our city to be attractive and we want our city to grow and prosper. We're not planning for today. We're not planning for tomorrow. We're planning for two decades from now or more. I heard several one delegation in particular Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to quote them, "There's no cash to make it possible". That was Mr. Thomas Novak who said that. He was referring to LRT light. There is no cash to make it possible. Well, he is right. There is no cash to make it possible as it'd been reiterated on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, even though people used the number $130 million. It's $126 million, Mr. Speaker. I don't think $4 million to anybody here in the floor of Council, it's pocket change. That's what we have available. For a project that's $220 million in 2010 dollars. If I take that and use a six percent inflation rate, that project, Mr. Speaker is now $250 million. If I take what the department uses, which is a 10 percent inflation rate, it's $270 million. I will ask the question once again. Where is the money? Two hundred and seventy million dollars. Where is the money? Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that if you talk to any expert around, they will tell you the worst decision ever made, according to transportation experts, was the decision to rip up rails, worst decision ever made. I think there's unanimity on that. And Mr. Speaker, what this is truly all about is something that they call vision. When Premier Duff Roblin, may he rest in peace, came up with the idea of the floodway. Do you think he was embraced with that, Mr. Speaker? He was ridiculed and the term "Duff's Ditch" was not an endearing term at that particular point in time. We all know the benefits of Duff's Ditch. We also know not long ago, there was a vision by True North to build the MTS Centre. There was a great deal of criticism, Mr. Speaker. I think we all know the value of the MTS Centre. Yours truly, Mr. Speaker, tried to build CanWest Park, a great deal of criticism. Members of Council and the Mayor were against it. I think people now see what a valuable asset that was and how it was one of the building blocks to rejuvenating our

downtown. It's all about vision, Mr. Speaker. It's all about planning for the future. And these are the kind of decisions that we have to make, and I look forward to hearing some very good debate on this topic, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know, what's very difficult about this debate is that it's been framed as a debate between BRT and LRT and I don't think that that's what this is really about because we…it's not that. It's about having Rapid Transit that's practical and is actually going to happen. And what do we as a Council need to do to actually make that happen, hopefully within our lifetimes? So, it's not…it's been framed that way as part of a political, you know, framing for an election campaign, and obviously, as a transit advocate and others here who have advocated for transit for a long time, we would like to see LRT. We would like to see BRT. We would like to see whatever. And. so I just want to put that on the record so that that's clear to people. First of all, the study or the report in front of us is seriously flawed and doesn't make the case that it's supposed to be making. It lacks transparency and it lacks honesty. And the sources referred to at the very beginning of the report say that its conclusions talk about discussions and conversations. That's the reference. Like, how can a private backroom discussion referred to without being related back to a research report or anything be referred to as information and not explained further? But I'll give you another example of what's wrong with this report in front of us is the cost benefit analysis which compares specifically LRT to BRT in Phase 1 of the southwest corridor. It's referred to in here. It was done by HGR in 2009 and the actual findings are 2-1 in favour of BRT and that looks at the economic development. It looks at the ridership. It looks at all those things and it says it's that BRT is the right technology in that particular corridor. So, but the report ignores that and cherry picks out other information and misleads people on that. It's very unethical and I'm very concerned about that. We as Councillors have to make decisions based on administrative reports and I'm not beating up on the administration because I believe that there is a political editing that goes on and I believe there is grey areas within our administration that are putting reports in terms that meet the political will rather than the objective facts and that is very, very wrong and that needs to be said. But the recommendation of the report says that we should view LRT as a preferred mode of choice, as the Mayor just said, a preferred mode of choice for future corridors and I have no problem. I think we should look at LRT in all of these future corridors but we shouldn't look at one over another. We should look at them all objectively. It's research. It should be objective and I think it's a terrible idea to predetermine any kind of technology over another. Each corridor should be looked at individually for the best option based on cost, density and available existing rights, right-of-way and the Transportation Master Plan should be objective and research based on data. And it should be about providing excellent, fast and convenient transit service to the people who live in Winnipeg. Now this is what as we said earlier by one of the delegations, Portland, Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Toronto, all of them do that. None of them have a policy that says we prefer BRT or we prefer LRT or we prefer subways. None of them have a policy that says that. So I don't know why we need that policy if we're going to objectively look at all of them and those places are building all different modes from BRT to LRT to street cars. What…but what really concerns me the most and I think this is what's going on here and this is the shell game that's being played is that those of us who care, who really care about public transit want to see it actually happen. And every time we wait and every time we delay, it costs us more. In 2004, it was cancelled. That was a $51 million project. We're building basically the same project for 138 million and it's 2010. I don't want to keep repeating that. We can't afford it. The other part of these…that concerns me is the P3 as a source of funding. There is a lot of risks to this as it's been pointed out. We can't apply for this immediately for another year. It's only 25 percent of the capital costs where as the Building Canada Fund is usually a third or even as high as 50 percent so if we were using the Building Canada Fund, we could get more money. And there's only $800 million for the whole country, so if you divided it per province, we would get only about 40 million. We've already got 23 million for the Chief Peguis Trail just now and I don't know what makes us think we're going to get enough money from this P3 Fund even if we could, in order to build a light rail or streetcar program, and if you check the application fund as somebody else earlier mentioned, it can't be a design/build. It would have to be design build finance and or operate in order to be eligible. It's very clear so we're moving into territory that no one else in Canada is doing in terms of…no one has used that fund for a transit project according to the Canadian Urban Transit Association so far. And private financing is more expensive than public and the idea of having a separate privately run part of our transit system is something that if you're going down that road, I think you should talk to the citizens of Winnipeg and the riders of transit and do some consultation before you go in sort of some kind of extreme policy direction that has never been discussed or agreed upon by anybody. So this source of funding that is touted as, it's okay we can build it down the road is very shaky and there's a lot of issues and complexities to it. The primary source of infrastructure funding is the Building Canada Fund and a gas tax and this Council voted to take Rapid Transit off its list of priorities for the Building Canada Fund and direct all that money to new road projects. That's what's really happening. Where the rubber hits the road is where you're spending the money. That's what this Council is doing, you can say you want LRT all you want, we all want to study it in the Master Plan but where is the money going to come to pay for it? And I still haven't heard this P3 Fund is not an answer to that. Our agreement on the gas tax was only to spend 10 percent of it on public transit. If you look at other provinces, they're spending 50 to 100 percent of their gas tax on public transit and transit from the provinces and they're spending almost all their Building Canada Fund or a lot of it, Vancouver, Toronto, Ottawa, Edmonton, they're all spending their Building Canada Fund on transit project because that's a priority for those cities

and I don't see Rapid Transit as a priority. You just voted, most of you to take it off our priority list so it's contradictory and it's manipulative and it's confusing to the voters to have…it sounds like we're all in favour of LRT when we're spending all of our money on a freeway system and other things. There is $130 million on the table and this is another thing that is totally illogical. If we can't afford to finish the BRT corridor to the University how can we afford something that costs more than it? Like, that's illogical. It's irrational. And I'm not surprised that the public is confused. I'm confused. I don't understand how something more expensive makes more sense than something we can't afford so that does not make sense from a financial status. I'm also frustrated that…I also believe that this Council could work with the other levels of government to bridge the gap to make something happen if we wanted to. That's what we did with the first phase. We didn't have all the money there, sat down and negotiated it. If you want something to happen, it will happen. I guess that happens with freeways because that's something you want to happen, so that happened. We've got 40 more million dollars there. No problem. So like, show me Rapid Transit's really a priority. On the…the Mayor has quoted… the other thing that bothers me is this put down of our own, you know, you talk about respecting our own staff and our own projects. We have a project that's…(inaudible) and on budget…

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

Councillor Gerbasi: And there's a tunnel being built, there's an overpass being built and they're doing a fabulous job and we're crapping all over. We're saying it…our Mayor is saying it doesn't work. Well, tell me how a 16 storey infill development on Donald doesn't work. Tell me how design charette that's going on right now for the infill development, all along the corridor whether for Fort Rouge Yards is not working. Tell me that the LRT tyke stations aren't going to be attractive to people. I'm sorry, what we're doing was a good decision. I think you made the right decision in 2008 and so did Mr. Alcock and everyone else has supported it at the time. So it's not a fair presentation of the facts to say that BRT doesn't work and LRT does. You know, if you talk to experts, they both work depending on how they're done and BRT can be just as effective in increasing ridership where it's built, the way it's being built right now with tunnels and underpasses and LRT tyke stations and infill housing all around it. We're doing it right so let's accept we've done something right there. We can still look at this and other corridors and this corridor is convertible to LRT. So in conclusion after 30 years of detailed study and analysis, there's been two cost benefit analyses in the last 10 years. There's been two Rapid Transit task force for my Council. They've all said to finish this project to the University of Manitoba and now we're going to wait a couple of years and think about it and look at other corridors. We're going to have a half built corridor and I would be the happiest person on the planet if you were going to convert that corridor from the downtown build it all the way through and to the university. I know it will cost a billion dollars but if you want to extend the track, the full length and make it functional as an LRT system. I'd be dancing a jig but you've spent all the money on the freeway system. You've taken it off our priority list and I urge you to not just talk and let's act, let's act by making this an infrastructure priority. That's where the rubber hits the road. I urge you to reconsider your approach with the Province and the Feds and get to work talking with them to make it happen. Just one final sentence. The Transportation Master Plan, that will be ready next year is the place to study all possible transit modalities including LRT street cars. I think we should have a downtown circulator system. I agree with that. But let's finish what we started. Let's not stop halfway, change our mind and pay three times as much to do it in a couple of years. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would first like to rise. I will be supporting the motion before us in terms of light rail. I personally think that the light rail system is the best option for our citizens and I think at the end of the day what we want whether you support BRT or support light rail, we want to ensure that people are using mass transportation and I personally think this is something that will work. We all know the debates mentioned here how long it's been going on for, whether it's just in the BRT, it went on for a long period of time two years ago, we of course decided to take action on it. I was actually the only member of Council to not support BRT at the time and the reason why at that time point is number one, I thought it was too expensive for the benefits that were there and I wasn't convinced that people were going to get out of their cars and get into a bus system but at that point I also did reference the fact that I liked the light rail system and I do think that light rail is something that people will consider you know, getting out of their cars and using the system so, I'm very happy about the change. I think you deserve some credit, Mr. Mayor. You know, you talk about division and fighting a battle, I think this is something that our citizens are embracing as well. What I really don't understand about this issue, some might say not a lot to…don't support my positions on it but overall you know, at the end of the day, we're talking about betting people out of their cars and into taking public transportation, okay which is I think is a very positive thing. So I don't really understand why the big opposition to this. You know, I think everyone can agree that light rail is something that is going to work and can get people in there. I don't think there's any disadvantages to it. And, if you look at the debate of why we started this initially, it was exactly there, to find some solutions to get people out of their cars and into some transit situations and I think light rail answers that. I think it's something that's been embraced by our citizens. I think to a certain extent there is the folks on Council and It think they've got hardened positions on this which is great, you know. They respect my opinion, I respect theirs but they are vested in this BRT system, Councillor Swandel used the word drunk on BRT which I generally tend to like that

analogy of it but over all I think they are vested in one system over the other and really don't want to look at any other systems that are there that can take a look. Now, the other item that I think is important is in terms of the cost. And at one point I'd heard that four to five times greater for light rail so at that point when I'm thinking myself about issues of whether you support or not, give you some pause, okay. It's going to cost a lot to happen. But as you can see, the dollar figures for our project, light rail have dramatically gone down to the fact where it's within a range of where you can get where it's $50 million or $38 million per kilometre for both systems. So the costs have dramatically gone down and I think it's in play now. It's in play that you can take a look at both the systems. Provincial support. That's been another barrier that we've talked about. Obviously the Provincial Government has taken a position on BRT. I know some of the members of Council, you know obviously that close political affiliations and we've been speaking to those members and that's your right to do as such and that's fine. But I think that at the end of the day I'm willing to stand up and have as a mandate as light rail. Where I'd like to stand up before and I think to be quite honest with you, that is something that we'll have to do and if the citizens of Winnipeg support candidates there, therefore light rail I think the Province is going to be hard not to press to understand and to support something like this. So that's I think important. The P3, the finances for this deal I think are represented an opportunity for the City. Officials have already said that they will consider projects like this, there hasn't been any in the past but what's the problem with the first project that's there? They're saying they're willing to consider. Why wouldn't we consider? P3s won't ensure the projects first of all get done on time, on budget which I think is a very good thing for our taxpayers and gets the projects done. Another element of the LRT which I like more than the BRT is in terms of the environmental side of things. We talk about buses, diesel buses or whatever you're going to use versus the light rail. I think there is no question that the light rail system would be more environmentally friendly, in my opinion, than the BRT system that's there. I like the thought of the five new having a long term plan, whether that's done in the transportation process that Councillor Gerbasi was talking about, but plan it out for the future. Where are you going to have LRT? I think it also puts the City a little bit on the map. It allows us to grow. It's one of those other things. You have a few things that you know you have something like IKEA that comes to town and then people start talking, you have things like a light rail system and I truly think it gives you a little bit of sizzle. It does as the City as opposed to BRT. It's going to get people out of their cars and it's you know are going to allow more development to happen in some of these right-of-ways where people are going to have and I think overall it's a better system, a cleaner system, a system that will actually allow people to get into the Rapid Transportation system. There's a few speakers that also came out actually before I go into that I do want to tell you a story. I've been out to door knocking quite a bit lately for the election campaigns and I ran into a fellow that had talked and had asked me his number one concern was about BRT and I said, "Okay, well obviously there is a big debate that's going on right now the LRT and BRT. He was passionate even though he was from St. James which is the area that isn't necessarily going to benefit from the first wave of the BRT. You know, I said that was his number one issue and I said, "Well, what is your sense of this?" and what he had said in you know, essentially was he wanted a better transportation system whether it's BRT or LRT makes a difference. And I a hundred percent agree with that. You know, if you can get more people out of your cars, it's a good thing whether I'm going to take a BRT system or a Rapid Transit. I mean I've got a busy life and there's a lot of citizens and our people, maybe they don't take it, it gives people options that gives them a chance. If you get a better system at a better price or close price to do it, let's do it right as opposed to what's do…what's on the cheap. So what this constituent had said is do what's right and you know, at the end of after our conversation that he agreed that the Light Rail Transit he thought was in the best interest of our citizens. I also want to touch upon a couple of things. There's a couple of speakers that came here, Reg Alcock that came here and Paul Larson, who is with the University of Manitoba Transportation Institute, you've got some experts that gave clear indication of what their thoughts are. I mean, they are right at the University of Manitoba so they know exactly what works but some pretty credible information especially the fellow that's from the transit authority that talked about the developments that are there, the use for it, how this can help our community, and the thought processes that more people are going to get on the LRT than a BRT system and Reg Alcock has also said what I thought was very interesting in terms of his comments. He was the original one that signed the deal from the Federal Government to get the money for the BRT, so this is something that he is vested in. That's part of his legacy as a federal political minister, I guess, from the federal level and he's changed his opinion on it so obviously he thinks that the system works well, too which I found very interesting. So in conclusion, I think that the LRT is a much better proposal. It offers some long term choices for citizens. I think it's an opportunity that we have to do something that's right. I think the price has come down. I think the price is within reason to do it and most importantly, I think it's something that will actually get people out of their cars and into a system and I think it's just much more preferred having, and that's allowed me to be moved to be opposed to BRT because I didn't see the benefits and the cost of something that would support something like an LRT, so with that I encourage all my Council colleagues here to support LRT process. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Fielding. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: I'm going to start with a homily and explain it. A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush and for those of you who are not from a hunting and gathering background. I'll explain what that means by means of another story. When I was a young child and was hunting with my father and younger brother, my younger brother said to my dad, "Dad, where is the best place to get a partridge?" And my father said, "In your hand." and what we are doing now

by going off on another track is we're throwing away real money for pretend cash. If we really want a better system, we need to do what's doable. As I was saying about a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush, there is all those partridges out there that you can wish for but they are in the bush. You actually have to get one if you want a good supper. And you actually have to get a grant if you want a better transit system. And we actually did that. We got some money for our better transit system. And waiting costs money. I can remember the first report that I can remember was done by Chris Lawrence when he was chair of, at that time, it was known as Works and Operations Committee, and it came out there, recommendation for Bus Rapid Transit system. And we didn't have any money at that time, but that was the recommendation, came from the committee. It took many years of asking, pleading, begging to get the Federal Government even interested in giving us money for any kind of Rapid Transit system. Yes, they came up with money for Calgary, yes they came up with money for Vancouver, but we didn't get that. When we finally got some money, $43 million, it was given back, by this Mayor, who said this wasn't a priority. They wanted to build a parks and recreation facility and while I think building parks and recreation facility is laudable, that wasted time, that wasted money and we still don't have any type of Rapid Transit system available. And now, when we finally got the money again to get started again, this is going to happen again. And the money is going to be given back and said, “Oh we want this pot and by the way this pot, this P3 pot hasn't ever been used for light rail system.” So what makes you think you're going to get it? Why stop what we're doing now, when people are so anxious and so excited about getting something, putting it back and say, "I like the birds over in that bush." Well, we don't know whether they are ever going to get there. And, there are so many problems with P3s. You heard one of our delegations talking about another issue and the problem she had getting information about P3s. You heard me stand up again and again, wanting basic information about what happened in the Charleswood Bridge. Still don't have the information that I need to make a good comparison between city-built bridge or Provencher Bridge and the Charleswood Bridge. Don't have the information there to make a good cost comparison and with all the secrecy and all the problems around accessibility with P3s I’m not willing to go there at all. But the Building Canada Fund is here and now and it’s in our hand and you heard another delegation can say $12 million more per kilometre and this is a person who does this for a living. We've never hired this person but they've been hired all over North America and they've given us the benefit of their knowledge for free and they say that $12 million per kilometer isn't the total cost. That there are other costs and they highlighted them, you all listened to them, I’m not going to repeat what they said but it isn't the total cost. So why would we do something that's at least one-third more now, in basic differences, and that may have some other things added on, doesn't make any sense. It's puzzling to say the least about why this would be thrown away again, and I have to say that those of you who are going this route need to fess up, because what you're saying is regardless, when you voted last month and when you're doing it this month, that transit isn't a priority. You would rather spend $40 million on an overpass to make vehicular traffic go a lot faster through a neighbourhood than you would to get people off the single family vehicles and into multiple transportation vehicles and lower the wear and tear on our streets and get people safely to their work place in mass transit. Because you're pushing it back and you're pushing it off, and that's not the first time this has happened, and it's sad and it's depressing and I won't be supporting this clause, thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Thomas. Councillor O’Shaughnessy.

Councillor O’Shaughnessy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And my friend, Councillor Thomas, I can't help but take one tiny little shot. The free advice you quoted is worth every cent you paid for it. When I was a young man (Laughing) Hey, she was talking in gathering. Come on. Winnipeggers saw ourselves…Winnipeggers saw ourselves, hopefully I suppose we did see ourselves in a category with Toronto, Montréal and Vancouver. Many thought ahead of Vancouver at the time. Second tier of cities which we are probably really in of Edmonton, Calgary, Ottawa and Halifax. You know, Vancouver has the sky train, something absolutely fantastic. I don't know where they get their money from. Toronto has every mode of transportation known to man, woman or child. Montreal has a phenomenal subway system, and they are clearly the lead three cities in Canada. Edmonton came along and Calgary, smaller than Winnipeg at the time, and somehow managed to get major light rail lines. Now Ottawa is getting it. You know, the little town out east. Halifax will be next. And that puts us right there with Quebec City, St. John's, Victoria, Saskatoon, Regina and Hamilton, till they get it and then we'll be right there with London and Windsor and Moncton and Charlottetown. Can Red Deer be that far behind? This city, I believe, has finally got it right. It started I suppose when Susan was Mayor, it started with the Ballpark which she opposed but it was the right thing to do, it worked and it wasn't sitting there as an outmoded hydro substation any longer. We got an arena that people opposed and is now what are we? One of the top concert venues in all of the world, never mind North America. Now, when the Provencher Bridge was built, what did people call it? You know, the porta potty on the red or something. And what is it? It’s the symbol of our city. The physical symbol of Winnipeg is that bridge. Every time something is shot, the TV shot, whether it's the old hockey or anything that's happening national, that bridge is shot. It's magnificent. Now we're getting the new stadium, I think. They have broke the ground yesterday morning I think. And IKEA is building here. We're on the commercial side which is kind of great to see. And we're now talking about the bus. Continuing with all this first class upward movement, we're talking about the bus. I tended to talk a long time ago, motivational speech where someone said you shoot for the stars, you may fail and hit the moon. You aim for the moon, you could miss and hit a tall building. Aim for a tall building and you miss, you get a nice house out there. But if you aim for a bus and miss, you're going to shoot yourself in the foot and that's what I see happening here. We have

turned in the right direction in this city in the last 10 to 15 years. We're moving ahead, and to say to limit ourselves for the next 30 to 50 years to the bus, to me, is aiming for your foot. Guess where you're going to get yourself shot? Light Rail Transit like the subway, like the sky train is a form of a classless society. Everybody gets on them. Everyone moves. It doesn't matter if you own the company or sweep the floors for the company. Not a lot of the owners, professionals et cetera are on the bus. We are going ahead with Phase 1. There is nothing says here that we're not going to go ahead with Phase 2. Any luck, it will have some tracks on it by the time it gets (inaudible), but it may not but nobody is saying stop, nobody is saying anything isn't going to happen. This is, what is our first choice? And my first choice for myself, for my daughter, for all of Winnipeggers is not to intentionally shoot ourselves in the foot.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Councillor O'Shaughnessy. Any further speakers? Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. I'm rising to actually support the LRT as a preferred choice. And it was difficult because the debate has been if you support BRT then you don't support LRT and if you support LRT, you don't support BRT and it is polarizing debate which I believe has a lot of politics involved. I don't really care. I'm trying to look at the facts and what's going on what is the right choice to make. You know, we can speak from the hill top and yell about this and that as much as we want but really what is the proper process? Well, I think everybody in the city would like it see LRT. It has many benefits. Can we afford it? Well, again it raises a question. So in…as that debate is kind of winding its way through, I just want to point out that there really are, presently, presently, cost effective alternatives that we could put in place that are alternatives to street cars, not the monorail, the street cars that we can put in place that will only decrease costs but obtain much of that economic spinoff that we've been talking about. Again we're not talking about monorail. We're talking about which I think would have a much higher impact. We're talking about street cars, okay. These alternatives are BRT, bus oriented. They are futuristic in design, they are completely green, and I believe at this present time they are better use of our resources. This alternative does not require tracks, therefore we can use that money to fix up our roads, parks and sewer upgrades. We must continue to reinvest in our existing infrastructure as we keep talking about our infrastructure deficit. They are futuristic in the fact that these new buses that are out there and I've seen them. I've gone looking at them. I've gone to different web sites and I've also gone to New Flyer but they have sun roofs. They have Wi-Fi. They have doors that open on both sides. They have rising and lowering platforms. They have everything that I have been able to figure out that a streetcar has except they don't need tracks. So hopefully they won't be as noisy. So the only difference I see between the proposed streetcar. I'm not talking about LRT. I'm talking about streetcar specifically. That is something that deems cost effective and existing BRT technology is I guess one needs wheels and one needs tracks. This new BRT plus system I call it, they are green because they run on the exactly the same infrastructure as the streetcar. The overhead wires which when I first read that I was quite horrified to see that kind of I would say pollution in my sight lines, my glorious blue sky. I don't really like all those overhead wires. I was really hoping the LRT debate would come back with the monorail because I find that's just kind of pollution for my eyes. I love my blue sky, however there is in reference to cost. We have to be realistic and I think streetcar was one option but again its move that LRT debate from monorail to the old clunker bus and I'm talking about right here, right in the middle, okay. The economic spinoffs of the BRT are already occurring as we mentioned and with enhanced BRT systems with proper stations. It was mentioned new technology, that kind of activity will actually increase the economic benefits and we should easily convert. All this infrastructure is there now for when we decide economical to put tracks in. We can do the streetcar if that's so demanded. That's fine, but again we can get the wires up. We can get the platforms in. We can get all that going for it and it doesn't say that we're not going to do that so I'm pitching this alternative so we can get the project moving. We all want to build a system that we're proud of. And I'd love to see Winnipeg as I say with a monorail system. That would be my first choice however it's been deemed too costly. I didn't…the LRT report was not exactly what I was hoping for. I didn't actually support an LRT light report I thought we were getting an LRT report and we would have a different type of, different options we had. We didn't get that. I got an LRT light report. Again, that's so vague, it's not really to me a good analysis of different LRT systems but again it's just a choice. It's not the choice. This can be a visionary project. There can be easily converted as I was mentioning to new technology for the things such as cost for the monorail goes down. We've just said LRT prices are going down. Well, maybe we'll get this BRT plus modern place. We can wait a little bit and then have a monorail. That would be awesome. I think we'd all prefer that, but again maybe we'll have streetcars in some spots. Again, we are not exclusively do one exclusionary project and through this, through an open tender process I believe that companies such as New Flyer would be able to, be able to put a tender forward that I think Winnipeg would be very, very proud of it. The technology is out there. I had to look myself to go find it but I did find it and you could easily find it yourself and I'll be more than happy to provide it to anybody. Therefore, since it is I believe more cost effective, equally as futuristic. I would say more green because you don't have to lay down all that track which is very…which is stainless steel. You're using up a lot of resources to do that and the concrete so you have to…there is some green alternatives but again if we're talking about just greenhouse gas emissions. They're equal. They're using exactly the same system of electricity which I agree we need to be using electricity. I a hundred percent agree with that, but again, we are not excluding BRT. We are not excluding BRT plus, we are not excluding LRT minus. We're looking at all options and that is something that I can support however we need to get the project done, so again I don't know where all this extra money is going to come from. I'm worried about syphoning off from existing infrastructure

but if we can get this project done if either it's BRT plus or LRT minus. I don't care. Let's just get moving, get the project done so I will support the motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We all do respect my colleague who just spoke prior to me when I consider the idea of LRT in the context of this report. I see it more as the linear people mover type of train model than the streetcar model that was suggested by my learned friend from River Heights. I appreciate his comments but I think the report is going in a different direction than that although I completely appreciate he was talking about other modes of transportation that may or may not have merit and for me, I can tell you, the idea of moving people around has more to do with moving people from one area to the city to another area of the city in a mass transportation type of way which I think sounds a lot different than what was just being talked about. In any event, I want to begin by talking about what I see as a quiet success that we've achieved here on Council today which has gone unacknowledged to this point, Mr. Speaker. You'll note this has been a debate and discussion amongst all of us on Council today about possible ways of moving forward on the mass Rapid Transit file. That really is a success if you look at the history of this Council and Councils that have come before. I have not heard a sniff or a whippet of anyone suggesting that this city doesn't need Rapid Transit. Nobody has stood up and said the idea of Rapid Transit is not something that we should be considering. That is a lot different than even four years ago to have everybody on Council standing in unison and saying the debate is not about whether or not to, it's about how to. That's a huge step for this Council to have taken and that has to be acknowledged and I think it can be acknowledged as a huge step towards getting to where we all want to be as a city and that's having some type of mass transport mode where people can move in large numbers very, very quickly in a dedicated manner. Everybody here also agrees on another fact, given our choice, magic wand style, if we could. We would put in place a Light Rail Transit system. Everybody I think agrees on that as well. That would be all of our first choice if we could. There is debate underneath that I think that are going to become that are relevant and have to be discussed but it should be acknowledged that that is everybody's first choice and I guess we wind up after that with two groups of folks. Some of whom want to hang on to the highest possible vision, others who don't seem to think that the…I guess second choice or the first choice is necessarily achievable. That's really what this boils down to. Everybody wants ultimately the same thing. Some folks feel that the ultimate is in fact achievable. Some people don't. Right now, I don't think we actually know for sure but that's where we're at in the debate and it's a classic political conundrum. If you don't think, you can get to your ultimum, if your pinnacle, do you then scale back your wishes and I'll use the word "settle" for something that is not quite everything you'd ever wished for putting in place something else. It's a valid debate to have and while I think as politicians we struggle with constantly in a million different areas. It might make some sense in the context of today to wait. We have a new system, the first leg that is coming on line, obviously everyone here under stands it's been constructed but not yet completed. It might be worth considering how that system is going to operate, how that system is going to be received by this city. We'll have a chance to see that and we could be surprised by the results. It could be successful beyond our wildest dreams, which would be helpful to know and decide where to go for the next steps. It could fall short of our expectations which, again, would be helpful to know in terms of considering our next steps. We have Waverley West coming on line. We have the University of Manitoba which is building a new football stadium. It has been discussed and also who has acquired the Southwood Golf Club and at some stage it's going to be developing that hub. We don't exactly know when. The money makes this difficult. The money that I'll use the word exists, from the Federal and the Provincial Governments and that is what is kind of driving the urgency of this discussion today. Because it is a valid point to make that there is money available right now to do something, let's jump on it. That's worth considering and I have to admit it is tempting. I have to admit that it is tempting. As a citizen though, I'll have some faith and I'd like to think that if the money exists for a project today that is going to exist for a project that is similar, perhaps slightly different tomorrow and if that's not the case, then we run the risk of jumping at something quickly to our eventual peril which is concerning. So I hope that our partners stay in place until such time as we at least have a little bit of a chance to see how our first leg goes. That would be nice to have that information. I think it would help. It has to be acknowledged as well, my understanding is that if the Rapid Transit second leg is built, my understanding and again, I'm not a scientist or an engineer. My understanding is that approximately 25 percent of those costs are recoverable to be reinvested into a light rail system. So there would be some expense lost, a significant amount of expense Mr. Speaker that we would have to consider. And the other reality of course is that to fill out even our BRT agenda, if that was to become the will of Council, it is true that that money does not exist in our budget right now. And there are a lot of people on Council who are not comfortable going down that road and designate that money to become part of our capital budget. Those people would have to be convinced and that agreement doesn't yet exist so essentially we still have a situation which is not terrible, Mr. Speaker, a situation where everybody agrees we want to do something. We just have to again get to a point where we can agree on what exactly it is we want to do as the next step. So, the contract, unwritten though it may be Mr. Speaker, could be this. We stick with this. We all acknowledge we want to do something as a Council. We understand that. We don't know what it is yet. And folks who might be inclined to jump and say let's do whatever it takes to get the next leg of BRT done right now if they could stand back and say let's stay in this, it might be worthwhile. The other side of that coin though is, is folks who are prepared to support this motion today have to ensure

that in good faith they do stick with it. This motion is bona fide and what it says is we are going to stick with it. We believe a mass rapid transportation system is what we need and we're going to do it. That's why I'll be supporting it.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a good discussion. I listened intently to everyone before me, Councillor O'Shaughnessy, Councillor Steeves in particular and I didn't disagree with them and in fact I really would…I would totally agree with them if or maybe not totally but 90 percent, if we had not taken Rapid Transit off of our infrastructure priority list two months ago. We're getting the complete package here. We're getting A, let's vote for rail rapid transit, it's much better. B, let' take Rapid Transit off the infrastructure priority list totally. And C, let's turn down $130 million from the Provincial and Federal Government to actually finish the most obvious Rapid Transit route in the city which is the downtown to the U of M with a spanking brand new football stadium. Now I listened intently to Councillor Steeves. He said that there are some recovery costs here and he's going to vote for it because if we do transform Phase 1 to rail which is the obvious priority because that's the obvious most desirable route between the U of M with a new stadium and the downtown. We can recover up to 25 percent of those costs to put towards the actual rail project: Well Mr. Speaker, that's the same thing as saying that if we spend the $140 million for Phase 1, we're going to leave $105 million in the toilet when we transfer it to rail rapid transit. I'm not ready to waste that sort of money on Rapid Transit. Now, Mr. Speaker, everybody loves rail. I've been in Montreal in the last few months. I've been to Edmonton. I was in Toronto and Ottawa. I rode rail, I rode bus and I can tell you, if we had had this discussion four years ago my vote would've been for rail. We could have actually financed it in a sustainable way. If this motion that we're going to vote on today have come forward four years ago for discussion for ratification, as part of the Rapid Transit Task Force that the Mayor appointed with Councillor Russ Wyatt as chairperson as well as other community members who came forward and recommended that for Winnipeg we should construct Bus Rapid Transit. That was presented to this Council and was approved, the Mayor was so satisfied with the work of Councillor Wyatt. He appointed him to Executive Committee. If this motion had come up two years ago when Mayor Katz and Premier Gary Doer trotted out the Southwest Bus Rapid Transit Corridor which the Mayor and Executive Committee absolutely loved because we actually agreed to finance the Provincial portion of the Southwest Bus Rapid Transit Corridor, I would've stood up and listened if someone at that time had said let's build rail. If this motion had come out a year ago or even six months ago, before the City started pouring hundreds of tons of concrete of cement, it would've merited serious discussion but nobody said a word six months ago, three months ago or four months ago and what this motion is staying before us when you combine it with the fact that BRT is now off the infrastructure priority list. We're saying no to $140 million is that less than six weeks after pouring tons…hundreds of tons of cement, let's rip up that cement and let's install rails. Mr. Speaker, this motion and this three page report, if you can call it that represents everything which is wrong with our transportation system policy in the City of Winnipeg and that's basically we don't have one. It's non-existent and if you read Plan Winnipeg and we're going to talk about that next, they'll tell you that after four years of study of origin, destination studies, transportation authority studies, employment land studies, we don't have a master plan yet but it's coming. It's coming after the election. So right now, we're in incredible transportation vacuum and meanwhile we're caught up in a Rapid Transit quagmire where inadequate reports such as the one we're going to vote on written by political staff and not transportation experts are passed off as independent analysis and we continue to dither and delay, dither and delay, dither and delay. It's not acceptable. And the really sad part is, Mr. Speaker, six years ago we were ready to go into the ground on Rapid Transit as Reg Alcock mentioned this morning. We have signed off on a deal. It was a priority one on Plan Winnipeg which actually had a policy played on transportation. We were ready to go into the ground six years ago. Mayor Katz was elected. One of the first things he did was cancel Rapid Transit. Two years later the 300,000 dollar task force which studied it for eight months and recommended Bus Rapid Transit, the Mayor accepted the recommendations and two years after that the Mayor and the Premier stand up at the Fort Rouge Yards and proudly pronounced that we are going to build the very same BRT system that we cancelled four years earlier and the City says not only we're going to finance our part, we are going to finance the provincial portion of BRT. Two years after that, not quite two years after pouring hundreds of tons of concrete, I don't know how many kilometres of cement, we're saying that let's rip up our concrete and put in some rails so that if you're going to have an LRT or BRT, the obvious choice is the U of M to the downtown with a band new stadium at the U of M. That's where it's got to go first. We've heard about EPC refusing $130 million from other governments to finish the first leg. We've mentioned rapid transit being off the list of eligible priorities. How do you finance this? I agree with Councillor Gerbasi if we have trouble financing a cheaper system how the heck are we going to finance a more expensive system? Actually we can finance with cheaper system. We have $140 million from other provinces which leaves about 130, I believe for us to finance ourselves, we have $300 million in reserves that's easy to finance over 20 and 30 year period. We're doing it today with Chief Peguis Trail. So my final comment to the Executive Committee, to the Mayor is let's stop dithering, let's finish what we started and let's get the job done. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There's a couple bits of housekeeping. The City of Winnipeg hasn't shelled BRT. It's actually still on our priority list of infrastructure priorities, one of those priorities is a transit station at the University of Manitoban, University of Manitoba that would be somewhere valued in the millions of dollars. I'm not sure how grand and fancy it would be. It depends on what other transit oriented development you might want to do with that. You might want to also remind my colleagues that before we start planning to what we're going to put on the ground out there whether it's on top of what we're building currently which by the way is not throw away money, and I hope that nobody is foolish enough to report what Councillor Vandal just said because the concrete being poured today if you read the motion, is not thrown away money it's money that is well spent that will be utilized for the purpose and if the economics of it make sense to convert then the recommendation that's before us today would be to look at that and to do that if it made sense not to throw it away so let's get that foolishness off the table right away. I'm out at the University of Manitoba, there are a number of other things going on including the potential development of the Southwood Golf Course Lands coming forward in the next couple of years I would imagine and the stadium is also chugging along out there. Pardon the pun but chugging along. I think it would be wise that if you're looking at using the…if there is going to be some sort of redevelopment on the golf course lands, you might want to see where you would want to bring in any type of a rapid transit system into the University because that cuts probably a kilometre to two kilometres of line if you're not going all the way out to Chancellor Matheson which is what the original plan was. So you might want to consider some of those things in this sort of approach that we're taking. It's part of a larger scale transportation master plan and if you look at some of the sustainability measures that we put in front of this in a report that we're going to see today, the talk of how we're going to measure on sustainability, we might want to be including some of those things as we develop them and bring them along. I think it was one of the best speakers that I heard today was the professor from the University and the head of the Transportation Institute. He talked about time frames. He talked about sustainability which is what our thinking should be. And obviously for some of his, it's just not there. It's this Bus Rapid Transit without even understanding what Bus Rapid Transit you know is because Bus Rapid Transit is not just a strip of concrete. It's a myriad of pieces that go to work to improve a transit system. It is transit ways, but it's also on road improvements. And you know, to say that we're not doing Rapid Transit is just…it's ludicrous. We have…and the other is safety speed convenience and comfort which are for the key components of any Rapid Transit systems. Certainly our Bus Rapid Transit, we have modernized fare collection systems going on, building replacement going on, signal prioritization going on, security enhancements, on board next stop, wireless technology being put in place. We're also the testing round for some new technologies being used for buses. I don't know if you've seen the buses that have been running around. I don't know if that's what Councillor Orlikow was referring to but we are actually using that technology and again if you go back to the motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you'll see that we're not saying use only Light Rail Transit as an option for rapid transit, we are saying let's look at it in the over all contexts and we know that if makes sense for sustainability perspective. We know that it makes sense from a transit oriented development perspective and so where it makes sense, but it's not the only mode but where it makes sense let's move in that direction as it is our preference because we know the benefits are there. For people to sit in front of this suggested costs don't change, you know, somebody is throwing around the number, $50 million. We know that 50 million dollar transit system that was there at that time couldn't have been done at that time. It was basically the cancelling of an unfunded project for the funds would've sat that this Council practiced for many, many years, park it in an account. Leave it sit there, let the money rot, let it use its…lose its value, the Council of that day decided that we would put that money to work and improve in enhancing our community centres and that money went to work and at the same time, this Council went to work finding a way to actually build a bus rapid transit stretch as opposed to just sitting around talking about it so that the work got done, the money got to put to work wisely. You should also be cognizant, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the last tender that was just approved for our bus rapid transit system was over budget by about 25 percent based on the original amount. So you know, the numbers are skyrocketing out there whether it's bus rapid transit or any other type of construction in any given day. You know, don't throw around a number of $50 million for an unfunded project like that's what was going to cost and somebody walked away from it. Nothing could be further from the truth. That would've been part of the old league of putting money to rock, the way this Council used to do. And thankfully some of us got together, put our minds together and figured out a way to get that money in motion rather than suing, robbing and losing value, and losing value at a ridiculous amount when you consider the inflation that we went through in those days. You know, today we're having successes. We aren't tying up hundreds of millions dollars on an annual basis or you know for five or six years like we were before. So money is being well spent. It's been spent in an informed fashion. The work is getting done. Diamond lanes are happening. Signal light priority for trains or…for buses are happening and the bus lane is being built out to Jubilee, the station is in and the bridge is going up. There's warm comfortable stations. There's real time scheduling happening in…throughout our city where you can walk up. You can see how long your bus is going to take and ridership is going up. So we are having success in what we're doing and we can have more success and we can do a better job of it with this motion today. So let's not throw the baby out with the bath water sitting around. You're thinking this is an argument about BRT versus LRT. It's an argument about how to get a better job done, how to look further down the road for a great Winnipeg of much better Winnipeg and I think Councillor O'Shaughnessy referred to the pedestal we were on before in the years gone by and the cities like Montreal and Vancouver and Toronto and we're not that far off right now when you look at the economies of some of those cities and what's been happening and the struggles they have with infrastructure. This City is doing very well. We should stand here very proud and this is just

another step and making us a better city and putting us on top of Canadian cities as places to live and this transit system, this report today, the recommendations today move us further in that direction. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise today. The clause before us was a follow up to the clause that we debated a few months ago, I think it was April. When we requested a report in terms of LRT, I supported the clause at the time and understand that the intent of the report is to pursue the LRT technology. It's been quoted the RTTF report to recommend a BRT and that is correct. We were given a very clear guideline in terms of recommending something which is fundamentally the least cost to the rate payer and BRT is at still that actually, but in terms of what LRT can deliver versus BRT, there are a few key areas that are different. And the LRT areas have been already outlined what advantages RT so I'm not going to get into the detail of that I've got outlined that on this floor before verses BRT and what BRT can do verses LRT. The fact of that matter is Mr. Speaker today, we're really not debating LRT verses BRT. What really…we're discussing today and why we're here today debating this is because of the fact that back on April the 21st, this Council, sorry April the 28th this Council passed a motion from EPC of April the 21st, 2010, basically giving a priority list in terms of Our Building Canada Funds or monies and this is really still coming out of that, Mr. Speaker. There is a disagreement taking place between this Council, specifically the Mayor and the Premier of Manitoba. The Premier is of the view that the Building Canada Funds that are available for Winnipeg, approximately 63 million from the Federal government, 63 million from the Provincial Government and also by the way we have to come to the table, 63 million of our money so 189 million Mr. Speaker is actually the total amount we're talking here. There's a disagreement saying that these funds, the premiers believe they should go towards finishing off the BRT line, south of Jubilee and it's been rightly pointed out that the price tag for that is actually over 189 million, it was well over 200 million actually. The view of members of the majority of members of Council and the Mayor are that no, yes, we agreed to construct BRT, but at this point the priority of this Council in 2008, we made the decision to construct BRT, priority to this Council is to invest in the projects that I've…that we passed on April 28th. That's really what is at our heart here, Mr. Speaker, That's really what…and in May a month after the April 28th meeting, the Council meeting in May I asked the Mayor, have you yet to hear from the Provincial Government in terms of this motion? And at that point the Mayor indicated no we had yet to hear a formal letter from this Council goes to the Province indicating these are our priorities as a Council and at that point the Premier said no or the Mayor said no, we haven't heard from the Premier yet. So I'll be interested in hearing from the Mayor in his closing his remarks we have yet to hear from the Premier if we have not, then that's quite disappointing because Mr. Speaker, it's this Council that sets the priorities. The Premier was elected Premier back in October, but he was elected Premier. He wasn't elected Mayor. I was at that convention. I don't remember anybody cheering we just elected the Premier and the Mayor. They said they elected them the Premier, you know, the Premier of Manitoba and that's really what he was elected to be, the Premier of Manitoba. Now he has a right to express his opinion, but at the end of the day he also has to listen to the elected officials for coming for this Chamber and what the priorities are. Let me just list some of the priorities here, Mr. Speaker. They've been said how awful these priorities are, but let me…the average Winnipegger, I think a lot of priorities that they could identify with and some of them are of course, you add them up. It's well over 89 million by the way. I mean, Kenaston Boulevard widening between Taylor and Academy. It's been talked about for years. Polo Park area street and intersection improvements, we know what it's…what kind of chaos is out there. Plessis Road twinning with grade separation at the CNR rail line. That actually was a higher priority than the Kenaston underpass but because of politics it got pushed forward before this underpass was built. Street resource street major rehabilitation, I understand the plan is 10 million in one year and 10 million in another year. We know our regional streets are underfunded. Chief Peguis West Extension from Main and McPhillips, Mr. Speaker, the tie in to the Province's very CentrePort Plan that they are building. I mean I could go on. I mean and you know one of them is community centre in investment fund contribution increased it back to 10 million because we drawn upon it. We all know what we need…their community clubs need to review. These are basic infrastructure projects Mr. Speaker, that are I think are high of high importance to the citizens of Winnipeg, but the fact of the matter is Mr. Speaker, we live in the city where we underfund our infrastructure by a huge degree. This Council last year passed a motion calling on the Province to fully fund infrastructure like they do in the rural Manitoba. They fund their highways and bridges and we identify the existing regional road and bridge infrastructure deficit, 115 million a year just to maintain our existing infrastructure. New strategic roads and bridges that we know we need to build because of the growth of the economy of the City and to keep the city growing, 173 million annually. We're talking 189 million, Mr. Speaker and that's just one amount of money gone. That's it, not next year. That's just what we have this year to use. Mr. Speaker, this debate is ridiculous. This debate…the fact of the matter is Mr. Speaker, it's not LRT or BRT. It's the Premier of the Province should be listening to the elected officials that…and hearing what we're saying, the roads and the bridges of the city are crumbling. We want that to be the priority. We have set overwhelmingly back in April that this is a priority. This Premier refuses to respond to this Council and address these concerns and the situation continues to get worse and worse and worse. Mr. Speaker, this facade of the debate between LRT and BRT is just that, you know what, Mr. Speaker, I would love to afford LRT. If we do, probably and we start building LRT, the chances are we'll be definitely building no highways or freeways. I don't know why Councillor Gerbasi therefore she's not in favour of LRT because it will bankrupt our ability to build anything else because that's how we would be building the LRT. We wouldn't be able to

afford anything else but the reality is, Mr. Speaker the debate today is about $189 million, $189 million that we as a Council have requested. We lost now another construction season and let's talk about pulling rabbits out of a hat. The Premier says he is broke. Well, in 2008 he found $141 million, Mr. Speaker, I'll remind this Council, to build remember the dispute at the floodway with the Federal Government? We can't have this come together, $141 million of our infrastructure money, Mr. Speaker, that went into his floodway, the…his legacy project which we all know is important, but you would think that okay after that announcement, the next announcement would be for infrastructure the priorities to say, "No, Mr. Speaker, not even then." Two hundred twelve million to go into CentrePort, not our priority, of which 70 or $80 million was Provincial funds, Mr. Speaker that would've been earmarked to roads and bridges in this very city and we're still now waiting. So the Mayor and EPC started this discussion last fall and started in terms of the priorities and what they would be.

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

Councillor Wyatt: And the fight, the battle internally between Broadway and Main Street has been going on since well, since Mr. Salinger became Premier in October until it's surface publicly, formally in April with the motion that came to this Council. So Mr. Speaker, you know that is what this debate is about. As far as I'm concerned the concept of LRT, well, LRT has been pointed out by their Councillors as Works Across Canada and it can work here as well absolutely. We are actually believe it or not, approaching the size if you read OurWinnipeg, which we're debating next, in the next 10 years we're going to be approaching if we haven't already reaching it now Mr. Speaker and LRT sized city. We could easily handle and could not only handle but actually could use and support an LRT system because of the size and the growth of the city. So Mr. Speaker, it's not LRT or BRT I think other speakers have said that who are on the other side of the issue as well. It is Mr. Speaker, about the Council being able to make…give direction and about the challenges that we are facing as a city and that these challenges are real and for the first time, the Province is not giving us any new dollars for…they tell…give us 25 million a year and we appreciate it for roads and bridges but Mr. Speaker, we need to get these funds out into the community now to do the work for the community clubs, for the roads, for the bridges, for all the infrastructure that we know the City needs if it wants to continue to grow. Those are the projects Mr. Speaker, that this Council overwhelmingly endorsed back in April and we're still fighting about it today which is a shame. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have no further speakers listed. Mayor Katz would you like to sum up?

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, Mr. Speaker where we would be today if people didn't dare to dream. A poet, Browning, a person's reach should exceed their grasp or what's a heaven for? It appears there are many here who accept mediocrity, want to set the bar pretty low. Maybe they are afraid to fail. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with setting the bar high and not reaching it. What's really wrong is not trying to reach it. That's what this is all about, Mr. Speaker. You know, it's rather interesting and I'm saddened that there are some here who make comments about well, no other city has done this, guess what? Wouldn't it be nice to be a leader because there is always some that's going to be the first? Maybe our city should lead and not follow. When it comes to LRT light, we're obviously not leading. We're following. We're catching up but it's time we do catch up. It's time we do something that will have a positive impact on our city. Everybody here knows the benefits of LRT light. They know about the environmental impact. They know about greenhouse gas emissions. They know about how much more development will take place. They know about the fact that when it compared to buses you will increase ridership by 34 to 43 percent which truly motivates people to change their minds about driving to work. Those are all out there, there is no point beating those up. It's been said over and over again. It's disappointing to me to hear anybody on this floor of Council you know, criticize the Administration when you don't like the conclusion of the report. If you like the conclusion of the report, they did a great job. If you don't like it, they are not transparent. It's not honest, someone is beating them up. I think it's time for that nonsense to stop Mr. Speaker or show us something real and Mr. Speaker, I don't know why but for some unknown reason when I discussed what the real number is nobody, nobody said well, here is how you can solve it. You know, Mr. Speaker, I was part I was the negotiator with the Premier on Stage 1 of BRT. I did that. First time we got it to come to the table for 50/50 and I know what the Federal Government's contribution was and the realities are there is no money there. What is is Councillor Wyatt has already pointed out what Council did in April 2010, okay. It was this Council that moved that motion and the Federal Government has no problem with any of those infrastructure projects the only reason they're not moving forward is because the Province is holding it up, period. If you hear anything other than that, it's not true, we're ready to move and all these projects and I think the virtue of this projects are extremely important and everyone realizes their value and Councillor Wyatt certainly pointed that out in a much different way than I would've but God bless him for pointing it out. Mr. Speaker, I've heard so many comments today about a bird in a hand. Where is the bird? I just told you how much this project was going to cost. Can someone tell me where the bird is? Because there ain't no bird, Mr. Speaker. A lot of talk but nobody wants to say where the money is or where it's going to come from. Have you heard the Federal Government saying we'll contribute more? I can guarantee you they're not contributing a nickel more than the 63. Councillor Gerbasi talks to the Province all the time. Are they contributing any more? Haven't heard a word. It's not there Mr. Speaker, but no one wants to address that. So let's look at some of the other stuff that's been talked about. Can't help but hear some of the comments today about support our local industry. You know, Mr. Speaker, we have 545

buses in our fleet. Five hundred and twenty two of them come from New Flyer Industries, 96 percent. I call that pretty phenomenal support, so would you. And you know why they come from New Flyer? Because they've got the best. That's why they should get it. Because they are competitive and they get the best and if we protected them here in Manitoba they'd go broke because the majority of their business is outside of the country, Mr. Speaker so we won't even talk about that one anymore. Mr. Speaker, I've heard so many comments about Ottawa and how successful their BRT was and I believed it and I saw a report Mr. Speaker, from Ottawa and they talked about their BRT. From the outset the system has been beset with serious problems. Ottawa's BRT has not just brought mounting problems for Ottawa's downtown, but the transit system lost a million passenger trips per year. In contrast most new Light Rail Transit LRT systems have established a record of gaining passengers. I didn't write that, Mr. Speaker. That's just the reality. Those are the facts, for some unknown reason, and as Councillor Swandel mentioned you know, part of the infrastructure was also Active Transportation all the way down to the U of M with a terminal that's some people here seem to forget. Why can't we have it all, Mr. Speaker? Aren't we worthy? Toronto gets it, Montreal gets it. Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, they all get it. Are we second class citizens? Well, I don't believe our citizens are second class, and Mr. Speaker, we can get the infrastructure money and accomplish all we love in these projects and we can still get LRT light. That opportunity is there. The bottom line is you've got to grab the opportunity, you've got to fight for it and you can't say no. You don't accept rejection you have to be persistent but if you don't try, Mr. Speaker, what are you going to accomplish? I'm not going to settle for anything but the best for the City of Winnipeg and our citizens. I only wish Steven Juba, our former Mayor had gotten the monorail done years ago. Wouldn't be having this debate and Mr. Speaker, the one I love the most and I hear it all the time. We had $43 million and we could've built it. If you believe $43 million was going to build it, Mr. Speaker, I want to send you to see a doctor Mr. Speaker because there is no truth to that whatsoever. All that was was dividing up a pie of money and say everybody gets what they want and I'll go do what you've got. Never going to happen, Mr. Speaker. Let's be honest for once in our lives. There's an opportunity here, Mr. Speaker, and I will point out again for those who may not have heard. A. not thee, we can always do other options of Rapid Transit. There's opportunity here. Let's grasp it. Let's make Winnipeg a leader. Let's make Winnipeg a world class city. Let's make sure in 20 years from now, we grow because we did the right thing today Mr. Speaker, and we get this done and we only get it done Mr. Speaker, with all of Council working together and the Provincial Government. That's what it takes because the Federal Government is ready to move forward, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

(Unknown speaker): Recorded vote!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. All right then we're hearing a call for a recorded vote. Item 5. All in favour?

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Orlikow, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Wyatt and Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Nordman

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi Smith, Thomas and Vandal

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 4.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion passed. All right. Executive Policy Committee dated July 14th. Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 14, 2010

Mayor Katz: Since we're having so much fun Mr. Speaker, we'll try again. I'd like to introduce report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 18.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Number one, number six and number nine.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: One, six and nine. Councillor. No. 2?

Councillor Vandal: Eleven.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: And 11.

Councillor Wyatt: And 12, please, please.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Three and 12?

Mayor Katz: Do we have a big…What was the last number?

(Unknown speaker): Three and twelve.

Mayor Katz: Three, twelve, too.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right. So what's left, Mr. Clerk? (Laugher)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Four, five, seven, eight, 10 and then 13 through 18. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Item 1 – Plan Winnipeg Review – OurWinnipeg Plan By-law No. 67/2010
File PW1/2010

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I will just…I'll listen to…I'm not sure who stood it down but I'll just listen to what they have to say and I will certainly try to respond to it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Who spoke to number one?

Councillor Gerbasi: It just…it seems a little bizarre for something as important as this to go through on a Consent Agenda without making any comment. I realize people may want to go home but this is a 25 year plan for our city. It's pretty important. And I would first…I'd just like to put a few comments on the record. I'd first like to acknowledge the excellent job the Planning Department and many staff have done, there was a very extensive public consultation process and I know that the staff put their hearts and souls into this and did the very best they could within the time frame given to them. I would like to say that I am pleased with some of the planning work that has been done. In particular, it's fantastic we're going to have a heritage management plan for the first time, infill development guidelines and transit oriented development guidelines among other planning tools that are going to be very, very good. However, the process of doing this 25 year plan was flawed in a couple of important ways. First of all, the time frame was off, we didn't get started until five years late and then we are forced to meet a one year deadline. It is well understood that a plan as extensive as this takes two or three years to complete. The result is the plan is not really done yet the fact that Transportation Master Plan will not be done for another year leaves us without a complete sense of where this is all going. The public consultation was very extensive in the initially in the thirst most of the…first part of the planning process and very thorough however once the public was consulted and the administrative drafts were complete, the plan then went into the usual non-transparent black hole of the back room where the documents were politically edited, Justin Swandel's favourite words but they are true, that's why I say them. Politically edited by the Executive Policy Committee, non-EPC Councillors and the public were not part of this and furthermore, we have never been allowed to see what the changes were from the original drafts that came from the public consultation through the Administration to what happened after it went through the EPC process even after asking for that information, that information has not been provided. Then, in a rush to get the whole plan done for July Council there was a very short time frame for public meetings for the follow up meetings once the draft had been made public and many people had little notice to attend those sessions, which were compressed into a few short days. It's well understood in planning circles that for a plan to really mean something and not just be a document on a shelf or publicity mechanism the community must really feel truly part of it and the plan must belong to everyone and I know that was the intent of Planning Department and the first part of the consultation sessions really seemed to be achieving that but sadly the possibility of a plan that truly embraced by all of us has been spoiled by the non-transparent changes made to the original drafts that came from the consultation. There has to be trust and transparency for a plan to really belong to the people. Rushing it through incomplete has also reduced the faith that people have in this plan and in this process. I remain very concerned also, I'd like to raise another point that there may not be adequate staff resources in the Planning Department to complete the work that remains unfinished. There was much work to do on areas such as establish the indicators of the measuring tools. We've seen this before as the last Plan Winnipeg was never properly monitored and evaluated and followed up on and I suspect that was due to lack of staff resources. Another concern I'd like to raise is that judging by the parade of joyful faces from the development industry which paraded through the public hearing and I watched the entire public hearing process. I suspect this plan has made some people very happy in this city. It has also made others very

concerned and there was some very real concerns associated with the opening up on mass of new lands to the extent that is in this plan. The proposal for urban structure re-designates the equivalent of four more Waverley Wests. The plan is so generous with the new communities' lands and so vague that we will never need a Plan Winnipeg amendment the way it's set up and that leaves the public out of the broader shaping of the city and determining its sustainability. Pushing the built up boundaries of the city out to impasse the Perimeter is something we will regret when gas is two or three dollars a litre and the infrastructure bills come in. This is clearly a market driven plan. The plan does not make it clear that infill development in the existing neighbourhood's needs to be a higher priority and easier to do than new development. There are some very good planning tools and ideas but no mechanism to direct the development to happen in a truly sustainable way in spite of using the sustainable, the word sustainable approximately 50 million times or so in the document. The transportation plan is not complete so there's no way at this stage to be sure that priorities for transportation will in fact be sustainable choices and the verbiage around the capital region is vague and it's not clear at all how the issue of sharing services will be handled in such a way to avoid an exurban exodus. With the new water utility model coming, there could be an increased motivation to turn a providence all services to outline areas and this must not be done at the expense of our tax base. The choices this Council has made in the last few months and just now in a way or mostly in a few months ago with the priority setting, indicates that the priority is for freeway expansions and other roadway expansions as Councillor Wyatt just outlined is much more important to most of this Council than Rapid Transit investment and this clearly contradicts the 99.9 percent of the people who attended, the Mayor sustainability summit at the very beginning of the OurWinnipeg Process which I attended and many of you attended was very well attended. I did not hear anyone there suggesting new freeways should be our priority. If that's what we sent off on our list another phase of the Chief Peguis Trail I don't how we are paying for that. But that was…that's our priority right now rather than what I did here at the Mayor's sustainability summit was we should be investing in existing infrastructure and in public transit active transportation, and those things should be our first priorities but that's not what we're doing. That's not what we're doing. The hands-off ideology on issues such as poverty are overt in the document and I must assume this comes from EPC's political editing once again as I'm sure it did not come from the community in Winnipeg. I'm convinced that most Winnipeggers believe the City does have a clear leadership role to take in dealing with issues of poverty, in partnership with other levels of government yet there was minimal focus on this in the document and wording that makes it sound like this issue has…is not our problem or our responsibility. I know they tweaked something on the housing side of that but not on the other aspects of social responsibility. Dealing with struggling neighbourhoods in decline ought to be a big part of a strategy to make our city safer and it is barely a footnote in this document. This is very disappointing. It is a tough decision, you know, I mean I can support this plan or not support this plan and I've been agonizing over this right up to the last minute. What really spoiled it for me was the lack of transparency in the later stages which undermine the extensive consultation that was done and if you want a unanimous vote on this Council on something and you want everybody to be together on something you have to include people in all the information. You have to show us what you've changed and what you've taken out from what the public said to us and if you want trust, you have to earn that trust and if you want support, you have to earn that support from all of us because we don't know what's been changed and we don't have a full, transparent that transparency has been averted so and the other concern I have that I'm uncomfortable supporting this plan or I really wish I could is the market driven approach and the lack of clear guidelines.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: That would move this city it in the truly sustainable direction in transportation land use in social sustainability and I don't see that commitment. I see that vision diminished and the changes made to this plan and…and so well, I you know, we can only vote yes or no. We can't vote for part of it. We can't vote for two thirds of it. So I have to put those comments on the record and I wish I could be more supportive obviously when the plan is adopted, I'll be abiding by it and supporting it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. First of all, I do want to say it's been one of the biggest in my year and a half being here, the biggest thing that we've done that I've seen since I've been here and the thing has the most impact on our city, and future of our city. We're talking about some of the micro stuff, but this is it. This document is something that we have to have. It has to be able to be a road map to the future. It has to provide some stability in our system so we can grow because we are going to grow and that is fantastic. OurWinnipeg (inaudible) the 25-year-old blue print that will guide our physical, social environmental and economic development in our city as it grows. It is very comprehensive document however there is a glaring omission which I've…continually asked throughout the process to be addressed. The omission is what I was referred to at a recent Winnipeg Chamber Luncheon and it's reflected in a thing that's called, a tale of two cities, which I believe this document is. A tale of two cities is such things as one tale talked about new stadiums, hydro buildings, human rights museums, increasing home sales, increasing population growth. I'm representing the city that is growing, vibrant and alive, but it is silent and on the other side of our city where it's some of our re-investment communities are degrading at an incredibly rapid rate. Social decay's happening. People are trying to

stay alive but all we're doing right now is bringing in more people in without that kind of support. So right now I see the area of revitalization communities as a glaring omission. The City cannot solve this issue by itself. We need to partner with many groups including community groups, religious goups, government, whole bunch of groups start to solve this problem. However, I believe the City can be a leader in this and should be because we have the direct impact on how our City grows. OurWinnipeg could provide as it does for other areas such as mature communities, Transcona areas and other areas listed in our document and list out of vision on how we are going to address these areas. It lists what kind of policies that we can put in place which we already have some incentives to help dealing with this issue, some capital budget infrastructure and our leadership which would be specific to re-investment areas. The absence of address is a glaring omission that I believe threatens the growth of our city. The section on complete communities where re-investment areas are noted, it was referred to on page 84, under existing communities, and the characteristics are deteriorating building stock, inappropriate mix of land uses, inadequate buffering between uses, lack of services such as grocery stores, and banks and parks, lack of quality housing. Not that hard to find what those areas are in our city and how to address it. Even if you can't find a specific area, we can at least adopt a policy frame work that we can address it. The fact that made that new Winnipeggers are going to be coming without driving this growth are going to be locating in these re-investment areas. This is what has to happen. These people are coming to OurWinnipeg. Some are wealthy, many are not. So they're going to have to try to find a place to live and to be supported. And as a past experience has showed us they go to reinvestment communities because housing is cheaper so they can get in there. They can actually have four families per house. Again, that was then. This is now because we've talked about the tale of two cities, one part of our city is wonderful that our housing crises aren't growing however that person is coming as a new Canadian. They only have the same amount of money, however that $50,000 house now is $150,000. What is going to happen with all these people who are coming? I have no idea and I don't believe the City has any ideas either. Therefore because I feel that OurWinnipeg ignores one of the greatest opportunities to create a sustainable city and it is not reflected within this I cannot support the plan. They City needs to take a leadership role and securing a future for all of Winnipeggers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: The first speaker said that the review…this latest review of Plan Winnipeg started five years late. Well, I know it started at least two years ago so I want to know who was the Mayor in 2003 and who was on that EPC that should've started it then? (Inaudible) Should've started it then under law and didn't. Who were they?

Councillor Gerbasi: It's you.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: No you and Glen.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Period.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are you done, Councillor O'Shaughnessy? Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker. I want to start off by congratulating the director and everybody involved with the Plan Winnipeg Process. I believe it was an open and transparent process. I believe we have a document here now that is workable, is flexible and transparent. We know we are going forward and I think there's a lot of very positive stuff here so I congratulate so many people for spending so much time and energy on this. I do have a challenge for the people who worked on this now going forward. We've made ideals. We've talked about wanting to provide complete communities and offering full range of municipal services. The problem is the two we have to do a lot of these are allies, local improvements. A lot of us have gravel back lanes in our wards. They haven't had gravel added since 1988 and they are an ongoing problem. The problem is over time various people of various predecessors of mind approved front approaches and as a result you're never going to get a local improvement with 60 percent of support to actually get a back lane paved. It addresses things like mosquitoes. It addresses things like the continual maintenance that are required of these things but there's no tools, the current ally tool does not allow you to do it. And other areas…areas that are older existing communities where you have large lots that could be subdivided. The ally process is unreasonable in terms of getting those full range of municipal services to allow for subdivisions. It's easier to take a big stretch of greenland redevelopment, in some cases in suburban Winnipeg than in infill areas. There are good tools and good mechanisms for downtown core areas, things like TIFFs and that to do these sort of things but it doesn't exist in suburban areas, old farms sheds and stuff that are being…and homes from the 1970's. They are being redeveloped so again this is a challenge. We've gone…produced a lot of great work over the last period of time and I challenge them to find ways to develop existing neighbourhoods in this way. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you (inaudible). This day is going to be long if we keep going the way we're going. A couple of observations. I need to just…Councillor Orlikow did raise some good points but I…I think part of it is the complexity of this document, the way we've done this, you know we've got the OurWinnipeg. We've got the complete communities. We've got the other strategies and the sustainability strategies and there's a bunch of other plans and strategies being worked on that sort of link up into that so a lot of what Councillor Orlikow was referring to and talking about still connecting into this vision, you know and falling out of the plan. I want to remind everybody that it wasn't more…you know it was only a couple of years ago when we got this process started, but I remember sitting in these Chambers with questions flying. I think at the time I might've even been Chair of Property and Development. When is the Plan Winnipeg process going to start? Where is it at? When are we starting it? Can we get it going? We've got to get it done now. If I recollect, it was Councillor Gerbasi that was asking those questions. At that time there was a rush to get something done. There was cries, you know it's like why has this been waiting for so long? The Hansard will clearly reflect that those are the questions that were asked and they were answered and the answers were…some of the work has already been done because some of the work was put to us as the condition of the last Plan Winnipeg approval. That Plan Winnipeg that Councillor Gerbasi sat on the EPC for it which by the way I believe put more neighbourhood development land in play than this plan does when you look at it on a percentage basis so you obviously see the hypocrisy here and what we're hearing today and you don't see a lot of opposition here today. So the opposition that I see and hear…it is hypocrisy and it appears to be nothing more than opposition for the sake of opposition. So far as comments about political editing, you know, political editing to me means how do you say it better so that politicians can speak with it you're not tinkering with the intent. You're stating it better so that the plan can be better delivered and articulated by the body that political body of the day to ensure that the citizens are being given and we can respond and interact with the community, showing that what the citizens have asked for is actually in fact what is being delivered. It's startling that the only opposition we have here today seems to be why the rush when the request was for the rush to begin with you know, and on the other side it's BRT, let's speed up, you know, let's not slow down, let's speed up so you can see where I'm going, I mean this is obviously political games and shenanigans for the sake of games and shenanigans and politics is indeed an ugly beast, Mr. Deputy Speaker but I think at the end of the day we have a wonderful plan, wonderful supporting strategies, a great deal of other work going on that is going to align with the documents that are in front of us today so it gives me indeed a great pleasure in knowing that this…the plan and the process are celebrated by the planning community and not just Winnipeg, across the country and around North America and I think even over into other parts of the world are discussing the wonderful process. Like everybody that I heard that came here and spoke to any of the forums that I got to hear, they were blown away by the process and how engaging it was and how much input there really was. The plan you know, when you look at what we have before what we have today are the Planning Community in particular is you know, they are looking at this across North America is a document as the process to follow. So, I'm troubled that there isn't going to be unanimous support today because either the homework hasn't been done or as I stated before there is some hypocrisy and political games going on here. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No other speakers? Oh, Councillor Vandal and Councillor Smith.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the last Plan Winnipeg was approved in third reading December 1, 2001 which would bring the next Plan Winnipeg renewal to 2006. Well, you can…we can have this discussion with the City Clerk after but, what does it really matter at this point? We know it's at least four years overdue and it's going to be a long day. I want to begin by talking, thanking the Administration for their work. Glen Laubenstein, I see Deepak Joshi, I have eyes behind my head in attendance and I think that they've done a very good service to Winnipeggers and to our administration meandering this plan through the system and there has been a heck of a lot of process. I will tell you that. I have no problems with most of the plan. I think it's pretty comprehensive. It talks about all the major elements, variables of a modern, urban living, urban city. It uses the term sustainability obviously very often, almost too often, like when you use a word as often as that does, it starts to ring a little bit hollow and I think that the real measure of this Plan Winnipeg is not the words that are necessarily in the documents because let's face it frankly, 90, 95 percent of it you're going to have a hard time disagreeing with any of the statements that are there because we all want to serve our city and our citizens well. It's the implementation. That's the difficult part and there were implementation parts in the last Plan Winnipeg. I know I was the political chairperson. We had a member from each community committee and somehow, some way probably between changes of administration, political leadership, civic administration, the implementation of the measuring and it fell off the table and that's the real challenge I think is making sure that five years forward perhaps longer than that we will actually measure what we're supposed to be measuring so that we know where we're going. The only real problem and it's a very significant problem that I have with the plan is that there is no transportation plan. You can criticize the former plan Winnipeg and I will understand. I think it was very many things you could…as you can with this plan, drive a truck through it if you want. We failed to measure it but the previous Plan Winnipeg had two very detailed transportation policy place, to 2020 and beyond 2020 and Mr. Speaker, the way I look at this plan. It's incomplete. It is at least four years over due and I think that it's unacceptable that a planning, a master planning document of this statue reaches the floor of this Council this afternoon and not be complete. One of the most important aspects of Plan Winnipeg is the transportation planning document and Mr. Speaker, when you turn to page 46 of the document which is really the summarization of the entire sustainable transportation booklet, I'm going to read verbatim.

Transportation is a vital component of OurWinnipeg. It's a major part of the urban environment and a leader for achieving other objectives. In addition to this direction booklet, a comprehensive transportation master plan will be developed over the coming months. Mr. Speaker, that's not good enough. This is a document that says absolutely nothing about the very specific transportation choices that we will make as a City Council in the next five years with the very limited capital budgets that we have. And when you consider that we have spent at least $3 million on OurWinnipeg on various planning studies, transportation authority studies, I know at least 1.2 million perhaps more, destination origin study, employment land study and there is probably a few more other studies that we have approved and funded and financed for this Plan Winnipeg. I think at minimum as elected officials what we should…what we should demand is that when a plan comes to the floor of this Council that we have very specific choices on transportation options both in rapid transit and road reconstruction and that's missing. What in fact page 46 is telling us is wait after the election and we'll come back with you, to you with the details. Mr. Speaker, that's not good enough and if we connect the dots here number one, clearly we're in la la land when it comes to transportation planning. We have no plan. The other plan was approved in 2001, it's obsolete. We haven't followed it. Number two, we're doing the old flip flop on Rapid Transit again today on the floor of this Council. We don't know where we're going with Rapid Transit. The former Plan Winnipeg had a very specific policy plate A to 2020, priority number one is the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor. We're not sure what we're doing there. We've taken if off the infrastructure priority list and later this afternoon we're going to approve a freeway that's going to go up to 120 million dollars now that wasn't even in the original Plan Winnipeg, that's literally jump the queue in infrastructure priority. I think the least we need here today is a policy plate on transportation that's going to have very specific options. I don't think it's too much to ask for a document that at minimum four years overdue that we spent three to four million dollars on transportation studies. I think and we need to see that information before we vote on the plan in borrowing that Mr. Speaker, I don't know how I can support this plan without a transportation plan, a very specific one. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to leave it at that and I have pulled down the transportation discussions so I think I've just made my speech on that. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Deputy Speaker. You know, Plan Winnipeg covered a lot of things. Someone talked about this plan will be a guide. The fact is it wasn't a guide in the past because the people who elected this Council disagreed with too much of it. Council Vandal is right. It was implementation that's important. So as long as we…you know, it was good to have this in a sense that it got people talking from the communities and Councillors and so forth and studies that were useful but as far as following it as a guide. You know, you just look at who we elect you know, either we support this, it's not going to in effect mean that much in the sense of implementation and that's why I'm not very supportive of this. You know, it doesn't, I mean I can talk about it doesn't deal with poverty, it doesn't deal with a lot of issues in my neighbourhood but the fact is no matter what if we pass this you know, who knows how much it will be implemented because we saw what's happened in the past and basically it's been ignored, and you know, like I think it was worth spending the money on having neighbourhood groups and people speaking out and so forth. It was engaging but as far as it meaning something in the future I have my doubts. You know, if everything in this document was some things that I supported wholeheartedly I would still have my doubts because it's who we elect to this Council that determines what direction we go so you know, I'm not going to be supportive of it. I can't, because it leaves so much out but even as I said as before. If I agreed with everything, it still would not mean much because who we elect to this Council makes decisions and more often than not it doesn't serve as a guide to the Council members. So you know it doesn't matter if you pass this or defeat it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Okay, with that. With the highest of respect, it does matter if we pass or defeat this. In fact, it's a charter imperative, Mr. Deputy Speaker that we proceed with this. We have a charter responsibility to proceed with our plan, this one called OurWinnipeg. It's been well said already, our administration, our director Deepak Joshi who I notice is in the Gallery and Michelle Richard, his administrative team right across the entire Board, it's been a team effort and well received. Gosh, I have to ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, these wonderful ideas on the shortcomings of Plan Winnipeg of the OurWinnipeg process, were less well articulated at the public hearing process which was designed to allow City members of Executive Policy Committee to receive those comments and try to respond with a motion to meet those comments which is what we tried to do and I'd be the first to acknowledge that it's hard to meet everyone's response, but candidly to come forward at this stage without having put most of those concerns, if any of those concerns are on to the public record at the formal hearing process, I think lacks a little bit of credibility. I'm hopeful that we're not going to have people voting against the OurWinnipeg process now where we are at the stage of trying to pass it through Council. We had a specifically designated meeting, a hearing where people were invited and encouraged to come out and a lot of people from our community did come out and I would suggest spoke on balance very positively about the plan and what it represented. Yeah. To fall off the wagon now as it were, Mr. Speaker is a bit discouraging. As one of my colleagues did say it does wreak a bit of political opportunism. The time to voice one's concerns is not today. The time to voice

one's concerns was at the public hearing process when it was in front of committee and the committee had specifically set aside that time to respond the concerns based on the delegations that appeared.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Councillor Steeves caught me off guard where I was before. (Laughter) (Inaudible) time on the clock. I wasn't even getting prepared yet. So. no all joking aside, Mr. Speaker, I, you know, Mr. Speaker, I've taken the time to read the documents. I think a lot of hard work has gone into the documents. There's no doubt that there's still a lot of work still to do in terms some of the strategies but I think the overall goal is positive. I want to say that you know, my experience in the last month in terms OurWinnipeg has…I've had a number of conversations with my concerns with the Mayor who has been able to work with me in terms of seeing some changes. One of the changes is actually before you hear today that we are cleaning up if you like. We already…I want to thank the Mayor and EPC for moving the amendment. EPC, in terms of…on the transportation document…in terms of adding back in the one of the roadways that was for some reason removed from the concept plan which was in a By-law. It was in a Transcona Western Infrastructure Plan and a commitment made because when the rail yards came to our end of town to address transportation that's the Edward Sherwood Parkway in the Plessis Road, south of Regent down the Fermor. This is a long term planning but you know so I guess maybe my experience has been different. I've been able to raise my concerns and have them addressed and I appreciate that. You know, not all of them have been addressed but I don't expect all of them to be addressed. I have…I still have some reservations in term of on the overall, I'm on a land, we're putting out but at the end of the day I can only act on behalf of my constituents in my ward. I know in the case of my ward Mr. Speaker, the amendment before us today I think would address some of those concerns. Most Councillors here who know me know that while on Council I've not hesitated to support good infill development, as a matter of fact, spearheading the joint venture agreement that we have with Genstar. Right now, I can tell you Mr. Speaker of undeveloped lands in Transcona. We have the in excessive what I've been able to calculate in, not including the lands in OurWinnipeg being proposed to be put on here, we have that in excess of nearly 4,000 lots still buildable Mr. Speaker on infill lot land between Winnipeg and Transcona. That's the kind of development we need and we want and so that's why I'm moving the compromise in terms of South Transcona, I think it's premature based on all those lots plus area H which is still there in the document. I'm not suggesting we eliminate that from a new community's document. That would add about another thousand or actually more probably closer to 1500 lots so it would actually still accommodate the development in Northeast Winnipeg even though a lot of the development space in North Kildonan has now been, the North Kildonan ward has now been maximized. So this is reasonable. The fact of the matter is whether we like it or not based on legislation. We're all going to be revisiting, well probably not all of us, but if we not all of us, say 10 years from now or five years from now, this process again in terms of what we need for development and what we don't need for development. I really think, Mr. Speaker that the transportation document is crucial as we go forward here. The master plan is going to be important and involve all of Council in that because it's going to ensure how we develop as a city to a large extent and the debate we had today LRT verses BRT and also roads and bridges versus LRT. That's going to feed into that document, Mr. Speaker. You know, we don't have an infinite amount of money and we have to pick, make choices and those choices are going to be very difficult but they are going to be crucial in terms of how we spend the money and where we see our priorities in terms of transportation. At the same time I think we have to recognize that we are also a major transportation hub in terms of commercial goods and services. The Province that has made a huge investment and the Federal, with the Federal Government to develop CentrePort and those, some of us have mixed feelings about that. The fact of the matter is it's happening and therefore we should try to make it a success. The infrastructure that leads to CentrePort, to and from CentrePort is going to be crucial Mr. Speaker, and how it accesses the rest of the city and how that works so I want to thank the Mayor for his and through the Mayor to the Administration and his and the Mayor's staff today for the back and forth and suggestions and apologize to Council for the confusion but Motion number…the next Item 2 Motion forward has been withdrawn in lieu of old Motion 6 because…with the assistance of the Mayor and staff that made more sense so those are my comments but again you know, this is a process where I think…the give and take was allowed. I think that's what I want to stress. You know, I met with staff. I can be…I met with staff a couple of times during this process one on one and I was a little frustrated when the document came forward and it didn't have a lot of the concerns or some of the issues that I addressed in the document but since that time I've been able to raise those concerns through the Mayor to EPC and they…and we've been able to make progress. So I think there is a positive way to address these things, Mr. Speaker if a will is there. All right, those are my comments. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Seeing no other requests to speak, we'll ask the Mayor to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the first thing I would want to do is echo the sentiments of many here today to Deepak and all the staff. Since I've been here I don't think I've ever seen a director beaming with joy about presenting something as if his new born child had come into this world and he wants to show everybody. The enthusiasm and the excitement was phenomenal and I think the process was also phenomenal. We had more input from the public than probably any city in North America. It was very thorough and I commend him for that and I thank him for that and Mr.

Speaker, one thing I've learned to life is that you don't accomplish anything by pointing blame at anybody. The realities are we're doing what has to be done and we want to do what's best for our city and I think everybody knows you know, whether it's OurWinnipeg or the plan before that we all know there's always going to be change. You know, these are living, breathing documents. What makes sense today may not make sense five or ten years from now. There's always going to be changes and that's what this is you know really about. I very much support this document. I do want to make a comment on two specific areas. First of all, I want to thank those Councillors who came to the committee meeting and made presentations of their concerns and that would Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Orlikow. For those that are critical today and didn't even come to make a presentation I have nothing to say whatsoever but I do want to thank them. The other situation is Mr. Speaker, we are hoping to accomplish…we know there's going to be growth in our city. We also know there's challenges and in two areas that we've brought up was basically poverty and housing. Mr. Speaker, I have said on more occasions than I can count that when it comes to the issue of poverty the city has a role to play. We've also echoed the fact that we don't lead on that but we have a role to play and all three levels of government need to come to the table, along with faith-based organizations, along with the community, along with the private sector. It's a major challenge and I think we have to address that. I've said it before and I'll say it again and I do accept that and it is stated you know in OurWinnipeg as well as when it comes to our housing stock. You know, it was this man, this Council that basically made sure that there was a million dollars in Winnipeg Housing Homelessness Initiative, a million dollars a line item budget, never existed before. We continued to create programs to basically facilitate and drive investment for infill and in our downtown and I think we're having success and we will continue to find more in those categories. And I think we should, Mr. Speaker. And I know that some people may see it in a different way but that certainly is yours truly, that's my intention. I can assure you that the department wants to see more infill housing and we're seeing a lot of that and you know, I guess if some people don't see it as black and white as they had hoped. I'm sorry to hear that but I can assure you it is part of it and you know, it's in there and we intend to do the right thing and as I said, whatever you see today, seven years from today could be very different so it's always going to be changing. And I think the department did yeoman's work in trying to address so many different issues, trying to get so much input from the public and Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind everybody just because someone comes along and makes a suggestion about this or that, doesn't mean it's going to become reality. You listen to everything and decide what makes sense and that to me is a department's job and once again to Deepak, Michelle and the entire department, thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thanks, Mayor Katz. Plan Winnipeg review, OurWinnipeg Plan By-law. Recorded vote. All those in favour of Item 1?

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Orlikow, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Wyatt and Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Nordman

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas and Vandal

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 4.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion passed. Item 2, Mr. Mayor.

Item 2 – Complete Communities Direction Strategy – Secondary By-law No. 68/2010
File SP 3/2010

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I'm not sure who stood down Complete Communities, but I'd love to hear what…whoever it was and I'll listen, oh there's a motion. That's right. Thank you, Councillor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, We'll introduce the motion.

Councillor Wyatt: I'll introduce the amendment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The amendment, right. Amendment 4 was withdrawn and right now have before us Motion 6.

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

WHEREAS Our Winnipeg states that New Communities will "play an important role in accommodating projected population growth and will aim to achieve a high standard of sustainability from the onset":

AND WHEREAS our Winnipeg states that we should "only approve new development when there is a reasonable relationship between the supply of land and the projected demand";

AND WHEREAS turning our planning over to market forces will ensure further decline in older neighbourhoods which have been identified in Our Winnipeg as the Mature Communities and the Recent Communities;

AND WHEREAS, in the Transcona Ward, undeveloped areas already slated for residential development with the full range of municipal services, includes the areas identified in the Transcona West Area Structure Plan, and as of 2007, had a proposed development timeframe of 15 to 25 years based on land available for new residential/commercial development;

AND WHEREAS undeveloped land in Transcona West, in Canterbury Park, and in 'Precinct H' and 'G' (identified on Page 75) of the Complete Communities document), will easily accommodate 20 years of growth in Northeast Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS slating "Precinct I' (South Transcona) for development is both premature and unnecessary based on both existing lands already available or being made available (due to Our Winnipeg) for development;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that "Precinct I' be deleted as a New Community from the Our Winnipeg Complete Communities document.

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

WHEREAS Our Winnipeg states that New Communities will "play an important role in accommodating projected population growth and will aim to achieve a high standard of sustainability from the onset";

AND WHEREAS Our Winnipeg states that we should "only approve new development when there is a reasonable relationship between the supply of land and the projected demand';

AND WHEREAS turning our planning over to market forces will ensure further decline in older neighbourhoods which have been identified in Our Winnipeg as the Mature Communities and the Recent Communities;

AND WHEREAS, in the Transcona Ward, undeveloped areas already slated for residential development, with the full range of municipal services, includes the areas identified in the Transcona West Area Structure Plan, and as of 2007, had a proposed development timeframe of 15 to 25 years based on land available for new residential/commercial development;

AND WHEREAS undeveloped land in Transcona West, in Canterbury Park, and in 'Precinct H' and 'G' (identified on Page 75) of the Complete Communities document), will easily accommodate 20 years of growth in Northeast Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS slating "Precinct I' (South Transcona) for development is both premature and unnecessary based on both existing lands already available or being made available (due to Our Winnipeg) for development;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that 'Precinct I' be deleted as a 'New Community' from the Complete Communities document and be redesignated as a 'Rural and Agricultural Area."

Councillor Wyatt: I spoke to the…I made my comments in my previous…

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Wyatt: I mean, I'm not…right…I'm saying…yeah, Yeah, I'm not going to speak to it again. I've already spoke to it, Mr. Speaker so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any other speakers? Motion 6, all those in favour? Opposed? Amendment. Item 2 as amended, please. All in favour? Opposed? Thank you. Item 3.

Item 3 – Sustainable Transportation Direction Strategy
File PW 1/2010

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, once again I'd love to hear from members of Council and then I'll address the issue.

Councillor Vandal: I stood this down. I was unclear on how they were all tied together. I no longer wish to stand this down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. All right. Call question. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Number six.

Item 6 – Assiniboine Park Conservancy Inc. - Management Agreement
eFile – PR – 7.1

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I believe it was Councillor Gerbasi who stood it down if memory serves me well. I would love to hear from her. I think at this stage of the game, everybody knows what we're trying to accomplish in Assiniboine Park. We know that it is one of our jewels. We know that it's…has not been treated very well over the last few decades. You've heard some wonderful announcements and recent times about the new Duck Pond, a new play area and recently the old panda facility was converted for the lion display. There's lots of wonderful things going on there so I look forward to hearing what Councillor Gerbasi has to say any questions and I will gladly try to address them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, there were a few of us who did not support the creation of this as a mechanism for governance in the first place. There was a number of us who oppose that at the time and the reason for that is that it's…I don't think the case has really been made. The idea was there certainly. We all agreed the Park needs to be fixed up and there needs to be money raised but there's different models for governance and the governance model on a public park, I think could have been more public. There could've been more like the library model of raising money for the library fund, like the library foundation and other models could've been looked at. And there are some concerns before us that are not made clear by this plan. There…there's talk of user fees which isn't clear in terms of how much this is going to cost ordinary citizens to go to Assiniboine Park. Right now it's a place you go except for the Zoo, you go there for free. And I'm also disappointed that there wasn't a Council seminar, really any information shared with all members of Council. You know, there just seems to be, unfortunately, I think the way this Council's been doing things is very us and them and I guess there's…just decided that you have the right number of votes that you don't need to bring in the four or five of us who have some differences with your ideology at times so since that can just be ignored then we can just simply proceed with all kinds of stuff with no discussion with all members of Council and I think that's somewhat disappointing. My main concern is the user fees, I don't know what they are, I don't know what they're going to be and I'd really like to have some assurance on that. That was my main concern that came forward, obviously our employees are going…are negotiating a deal and I'm assuming it's going to be a good deal for them. You know, we've done that before with Winnipeg Hydro and other things we've moved to another or workers have gone to another unionized situation. So I trust that will be done but I mean, the governance model itself, it's going to separate one of our public parks from the rest of them. I like everyone else want to see that park fixed up and I also would like to see the rest of our parks fixed up but I'd like to see what this means in terms of user fees, what kind of development we're going to see in the Park beyond what is made clear here and there's not a lot of details here about that. So maybe somebody can reassure me about that. I realize this is going forward, the decisions have been made, but I'd like to know that people are going to have that our park, our signature park, our jewel of park is going to be accessible to all of our citizens and that's my concern. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I, of course am a member with the Deputy Speaker aboard from the Assiniboine Park Conservancy. So there is some over sight. There is an appointment from the City point of view from it. And just a couple of things I think you wanted addressed. First of all in terms of fundraising, I know Mike Davidson had come to Executive Policy Committee and had…he had some concerns with it but I can tell you the plan is to raise over $180 million that's from all three levels of government and some private sector money as the Mayor alluded to before, there is great progress that is being made here as you can see in terms of the development plans where you know there's the Duck Pond that's been created, the Family Centre, the playground structure. That is being worked on right now. There's a great plan to raise some private sector money and I can tell you I've been at some of these meetings with some of the private donors and there is some great excitement out there in the community and great

public support from the community to help enhance our park. I think that the process is you know, why we moved to the Conservancy Board was it allows the private sector to come in. You know, they might be a little bit more reluctant if the city is just running it but a few things that are very important to realize the city maintains 100 percent asset and control of all the assets of Assiniboine Park and in terms of the fundraising, if Mike Davidson and C.U.P.E. has some great ideas of how to raise some funding for it or any money such as that, I'll tell you what. I think our ears are wide open listening to any great ideas on how we can raise money. I'm sure there will be more than a willingness from the Board's point of view to work with C.U.P.E to address any funding issues. Second issue in terms of user fees. First of all, if you do look at the term sheet in terms of that is coming to Council, what I'd like to point you out to, actually two things. First, in terms of the community consultation, page 11 talks in a Councillor motion that we passed of course, talks about a community advisory group that will be established that the Board will have input from our citizens in terms of the direction of where Assiniboine Park can have, so I think that's, first of all, the first venue of where we can get input from them and from, the second point in terms of user fees, first of all Assiniboine Park has to follow the tendering process and the same permitting as anything else would happen in the city. But if you look at some of the report for instance on page 14, where it talks about an annual development plan, I'll just quote here, EPC is required to present to Council consideration a ten year development plan for Assiniboine Park outlining development plans and forecast cost and revenues so that includes user fees. Annual and a ten year capital forecast request at the City of Winnipeg Capital Funding shall be cored through the City development plan. EPC report annually, one of the past year's development plan progress as well as intended building and restoration plans for the upcoming year and the development plan will be completed and required for review for time for process and EPC will develop and present the amended development plan to Council for approval. Just a couple of other points here EPC shall present annual reports to Council highlighting its activities, management discussions, an analysis regarding its annual objections…objectives, reporting on performance of such annual objectives, park development fundraising and a financial statement for a reporting period. So I guess what I'm saying is and one final point sorry, on page 16, is in terms of the annual budget and its mission, every year they have to come before Council and take a look in terms of what the annual budget process is. So my point is whether it be user fee or anything else, it has to come through Council through the development plan on an annual basis so you as Councillors will have a say to say yea or nay, the public will have an opportunity to come out and have their say on Assiniboine Park, but as the Mayor had mentioned what I can say is the City has taken a very big leadership role in this and I think Council as a whole deserves a lot of credit for first establishing the Conservancy, for seeing the vision to do this and I'll tell you, you know from a budgetary process, I'm the Chair of Finance I can tell you, money talks and of that the City of Winnipeg is putting over $11 million (inaudible) into that park, we're putting over $3 million in terms of the operations and over seven, somewhere over seven almost $8 million in new capital investments and I can tell you that our investments, the City of Winnipeg's investments have taken the leadership role and right after that the CAO and the President of Assiniboine Park which we made our capital investments got calls from the Federal Government and the Provincial Government saying we want in. We want to sign up. So the City's leadership in this department and the leadership of the Board, that here I think is something second to none and I tell you this is something that we're going to create the jewel of our park system again with the help of the Board and the help of leadership of this Council. So with that I'll step aside.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Fielding, well said. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I hope I get the same comment as well from the unbiased chair. (Laughing) Right. I, too have heard the rumours of user fees and that concerns me. We have a number of free celebrations that take place in the Park, the Canada Day celebrations, the free concerts that take place in the Park and I'm concerned if that will be compromised where we have a free celebration but we have to pay to get it. That doesn't seem logical and so I'm concerned about that. I'm also concerned about the employee relationship, there's employee relationship that is being severed here and I can appreciate while we've been making negotiations with that, we'll now lose that effect of relationship. The third point I want to make is the Millennium Library fundraising shows that we don't need to do this, really. The independent board do not need to take, did not take, did not need to become an operating board in order to do this and we still have it operated as a city facility. My fourth point is we still have responsibility and people are still going to be phoning us if they find that a play structure is inappropriately placed. Now we're losing accountability. We've just put an additional step in there and now we're going to have to make contact with this citizens board and ask them for why it's taking so long for the upgrading and why certain washrooms are being blocked and when I went to the Canada Day celebrations and people saw a City Councillor in the park, you can't believe the number of concerns that were foisted upon me with regard to the slow level of upgrade and why they couldn't get certain washrooms and all the other things, and we'll be still responsible but we'll be losing that accountability mechanism and I'm concerned about that and my fifth and final point is the devil is in the details and this is just another clause we've said that about so many clauses here this afternoon where it's vote now, see it later and I'm sick and tired of that happening. This Council used to get monthly meetings where we would be updated on detailed projects that were about to proceed and get that information to us beforehand so that we would come with the knowledge of what was being voted on here and it's…well, we haven't exactly decided yet. We'll work that out after you vote on it, and that's not appropriate and I don't support that. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any further comments? Mayor Katz, oh I'm sorry, Harvey. Sorry.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Deputy Speaker. I did not support the Conservatory's creation but you know, on page 11 it says Assiniboine Park Conservancy shall be the sole authority responsible for operations, planning, management, development and restoration of Assiniboine Park. We don't have much of a role. Let me tell you that the…there's this…I'll read it again. Assuming Park Conservancy shall be the sole authority responsible for operations, planning, management, development and restoration of Assiniboine Park. Now, you know, we're not…this Council, present Council isn't responsible for the deterioration of the park. It's happened over the years and you know when it comes to budget, there is a tendency for us to follow the Mayor and, to in effect, curtail expenditures so the budget is better for he thinks, for the citizens. Why aren't we running the park? Why not, in effect, deficiencies of the park be corrected? Let me tell you this also, I'm very concerned with this on page four. Within approvals provided by the Conservatory shall be given the authority to redevelop Assiniboine Park attractions to develop new facilities and programs for public enjoyment and to pursue commercial activities appropriate to the park to support sustainability of operations. We have no idea what they are. You know, like that's incredible. If we are giving up our responsibility largely much of our responsibility for the park we should be ashamed. This is a public park. We should not let it deteriorate. We should spend money to in effect maintain it and to build it up to what its former glory. You know, past Councillors have been foolish and cutting the budget so that the taxpayer thinks that he is getting a break when he is not getting a break because deterioration is taking place of much of our facilities. I want the Park to be maintained by the City of Winnipeg, not by some outside organization that we have some input into but the sole authority happens to be the Conservatory. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I don't know if it's my age or the lateness of the day. This Council has approval over the fees, any fees they want to put in. They can't put in any fees without it coming right here. They can't build any buildings. They can't bring in any new attractions. They can't kick out the old ones without it coming here and us voting on it. Going to this method despite the fact that we're going to keep all our city workers and the fact that C.U.P.E. is paranoid about it, despite all that, I stand on one thing, our track record in that park. We have turned a jewel into some kind of plastic imitation rhinestone and we've got some people out there who are willing to give up their time and effort to restore. I thank them, I applaud them and I'm going to vote for this clause as quickly as I can.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I…when this came forward to set up the Conservancy I was…I had some concerns, Mr. Speaker. I think…I referred the Assiniboine Park and Assiniboine Forest as Mr. Hartley Richardson and his merry men or some things to this effect, but I had some concerns about it, but you know I've had a chance, Mr. Speaker, to actually read a bit, not just this document but read the work that has been done by the Board of Directors of the Conservancy and I've been impressed with the work they've done. You know, I've, I with my family enjoy the park and the zoo and we go there quite a number of times in the year and it's…it's…you know, it's something that we should be all proud of as Winnipeggers and the fact that they've now put a plan in place to reinvest into the park I think is positive. Not only are we going to have input for what I've been able to see in terms of the fees coming back but also Mr. Speaker, we do have authority on the annual budget. Budgets have to come back to this Council every year and their capital plans do. The Province did vote with their…with their wallet by making a commitment here, Mr. Speaker to the Conservancy I think it was $40 million for a bearing closure. I mean 30 million? All right, 30 or 40 million, right. I mean, you know it's a lot of money. It'd be nice to also have that for the roads and bridges but nevertheless, they made this investment so clearly they have shown confidence in what the plan is and the master plan in terms of where the Board of Directors is going. I would've preferred to see, I'll be honest, I would've preferred to see the Conservancy reporting back to the Standing Committee and not to EPC. We've seemed to have done that lately in the last little while. We did it with GCWCC reporting EPC and now we're doing it with the Conservancy reporting EPC. I think we have standing committees for reason and it would've been better to either have it reporting by our Protection and Community Services depending on how you want to look at it our Public Works. I mean set alarm, Mr. Speaker, I you know, I the over all direction I think is positive. The other challenge though we're facing is our other regional parks in the city, Mr. Speaker. We have…it was not too long ago at Harbour View and I tell you, it's looking pretty tired and run down in many cases. We put some money in there but it is looking tired and the Councillor for North Kildonan is shaking his head agreeing with me, that it is, nodding his head agreeing, and you know, we need to make an investment there, Mr. Speaker. Not just in this regional park but also in the other regional parks. We've got Kildonan Park. We have St. Vital Park. They are all important to the park system of the City and we really need to make a reinvestment in our parks. A lot of people call it soft infrastructure but the fact is the parks add directly to the quality of life as a city Mr. Speaker, and it's a way of gauging our quality of life. We need to make that investment, but when you go out to Harbour View, when you see the broken down, the terrible state of the miniature golf and the broken down crumbling sidewalks that are unsafe and it's just, it's really an embarrassment Mr. Speaker, and we have to start reinvesting in our parks. We're doing that with Assiniboine Park. I hope if the Mayor makes a commitment towards more parks that that's taken into consideration in

EPC because we really have to I think the citizens of Winnipeg would appreciate that Mr. Speaker, because though Assiniboine Park is the major regional park of our city, the largest one in at least the most high profile, the fact of the matter is the other regional parks, Mr. Speaker are in need of reinvestment as well. Thank you.

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

Councillor Steeves: The Central Parks Conservancy was found in 1980 by a group of dedicated civic and field and traffic leaders. They were determined to end Central Park's dramatic decline in the 1970s and restored it to its form of splendor as America's first and foremost major urban public space as envisioned by its 19th century designer Frederick Olmsted and Calvert Vaux. Today the Conservancy's mission is to restore, manage and enhance central park in partnership with the public for the enjoyment of the present and future generations. In 1998, the Conservancy in the city of New York signed a management agreement formalizing their then 18 year public private partnership. The relationship was reaffirmed in 2006 when the agreement was renewed for an additional eight years as the official manager of Central Park, the Conservancy is responsible for the day to day maintenance and operations of the park. Presently 80 percent of the Park's maintenance operation staff is employed by the Conservancy which provides 85 percent Central Park, $25 million annual budget through its fundraising investment revenue. The city in addition to the annual fee to the Conservancy for the service that provides funds lighting, maintenance of the park and drives enforcement. The New York City Department of Parks and Recreation retains policy control has discretion over all user permits and events in the park and provides 25 percent of the field staff. Since its founding, the Conservancy has overseen the investment of more than $530 million into Central Park of which more than $390 million was raised from private sources, individuals, corporations and foundations and more than $110 million was contributed by the City. The Conservancy has also prescribed and carried out a restoration management plan for the park and managed the capital restoration of much of the park's landscapes and facilities, created programs for volunteers and visitors and set new standards of excellence in the park. It has transformed Central Park into a model for urban parks worldwide helping other parks is a natural extension at the Conservancy's core mission as such it provides technical management and fundraising advice to park systems around the country and the world. Are we good?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think we get your point. Thank you. All right, any further questions? All those in favour? Oh…wait…let me…

Councillor Smith: I'm going to take Councillor Steeves' five minutes. (Laughing)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Sorry, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think we all know that we have challenges at Assiniboine Park and I know many of us here attend…I'm sure there aren't that many who attend more than I do with my family where there are three, four, five times a week potentially and, Mr. Speaker it was as a result of seeing what's going on there and I knew we need to do something and the fact it's been ignored for so long that actually while I was in New York on some other matters, I spent some time with the people in Central Park and found out what they did, et cetera and found out how successful it was and then brought that back here and see if we can find some way shape or form to duplicate that model. Now what I will share with you as mentioned earlier, the Assiniboine Park Conservancy's looking in investing a total of $180 million. Forty five each from the three levels of government and $45 million from the private sector. What I would ask everyone here, have you seen how much has been invested until Assiniboine Park Conservancy as a result of what Councillor Fielding said, we certainly started the ball rolling and everybody jumped on the wagon. It's just that simple. There's no way that would've ever happened, Mr. Speaker. We took the initiative and we made it happen but on top of that what I do find concerning is if there are those who have some genuine concerns or challenges or difficulties with that, you know, Mr. Speaker, I never got a phone call from anybody, okay. Whether you are on EPC or not, I get Councillors who are not on EPC calling me all the time to discuss issues. Nobody called me on this one but if they had, I would've said, slow down. You don't have to worry. The business plan is approved by Council. User fees are part of the business plan. If there are any, they are approved by Council, everything, Mr. Speaker is approved by Council. So any new creative ideas have to come here. If we approve them, they move forward. If we don't, they don't move forward, Mr. Speaker. It's really that simple. These people are volunteers giving of their time and I think we all know what makes the City work is volunteers whether it's Community Centres, United Way or whatever the case may be, we have some very giving people who want to see this park be restored and think about it, Mr. Speaker, $180 million, it's a very significant project, I think we'd all agree and you know what? I believe they're going to make it happen and we should be working with them and if they come up with something that doesn't make sense, we reject it and on top of that, I'll let Councillor Smith know if we don't like it, we can cancel this agreement any time we want. It's a great deal. We should be thanking them, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right, all those in favour rise, please.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Smith and Thomas

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 2.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Number nine.

Item 9 – Mosquito Control Program
eFile PA

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I will very briefly introduce the motion and what the issue today. What we're asking for is money to larvicide in the ten neighbouring capital regions because the experts in our Insect Control Department have told us that this will help to significantly reduce the mosquito population in Winnipeg. As well as we're requesting that the Province of Manitoba make changes to the Provincial Pesticide Use Permit to reduce the number of mosquitoes by one, reducing the size of buffer zones, amending the criteria for fogging from three days to two days, reducing the 40 hour notice for fogging to 24 hours and we're also asking for money to decrease the time it takes to fog the entire city from four to five nights which is what we have right now and reducing it to two to three nights. Review the process for registering buffer free zones as the current process does not require any proof of primary residence or I mean the bottom line is, Mr. Speaker you can rent a movie today. It's more difficult to rent a movie today than it is to register for a buffer free zone and also to move towards 100 percent biological control for larvaciding by 2012 which is two years less than we have on the table right now. That's what we're discussing today Mr. Speaker, and with that I will hear from my fellow Councillors.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is very unfortunate but the last six years of mosquito control management has been a disappointing case of dropping the ball and I'm going to tell you a little bit about why because I've looked into this in the last little while because this issue has come up again, mostly what has happened is in order to meet budget targets, programs have been cut, staff have been reduced and front line services have been affected. These programs and support if they had been in place would've gone a long way to reduce the adult mosquito population. Source reduction was supposed to be a big part of the mosquito strategy first introduced in 2003 and then again with the 2005 strategy. Reducing the standing water that breeds mosquitoes is an important preventive step. If we took these actions, we could reduce the need for fogging and then there would not be a need to be debating these buffer zones. Also, a safer environmental approach to larviciding has been delayed, shelved and put off. The use of dursban for larvaciding is bad for a couple of reasons. First of all, dursban kills off the national predators of mosquitoes and expanded larvicide program with a biological agent would not have done this. Killing off dragon flies and other predators of mosquitoes works against the goal of reducing the adult mosquito population. The other reason dursban needs to stop is that it is going to be banned by the Federal Government for environmental and public health reasons. The Federal Government doesn't go around banning things lightly. There has to be a good reason why this has been banned and it's been talked about for a long time and the ban's been delayed but it is coming and when it comes to public health, there is an ethical responsibility to take some action, not wait until we're forced to take it by some other level of government, but this Council has not acted on getting off of dursban in spite of a promise to do this by 2007.Year after year in each budget, the money was taken out and deferred to future years. The report in this agenda includes a report from 2005 which clearly shows Council's commitment in 2005 to eliminate dursban for larvaciding over the years and be eliminated by 2007, and in each year some of us raise that issue as you may recall for those of you who were here, and each year it was put off to balance our budget. The truth is that the promise now to eliminate dursban by 2012 is five years late. It is not two years early as the press releases and the report have phrased it. It is five years late from what we…this Council endorsed in 2005 and it's on your agenda if you didn't pick that up. Another source of reduction project has been cut by this Council. In 2003, Council created a program called Team under the blue print strategy for mosquito control. Targeted environmental action against mosquitoes was aimed at increasing public education and mosquito

breeding source reduction. The Team Project included a door to door home audit and backyard clean up initiative that eliminated potential mosquito breeding sources. This program was eventually killed off through budget reductions and stopped around 2007, 2008. This…these are clearly cuts to front line services for one thing which we've been told have not supposed to have been happening, but the second of all, it was part of an abandoned source reduction strategy to reduce the presence of adult mosquitoes and enhance to reduce the need to fog and have buffer zones for those who don't want to be fogged and when the strategy was brought in, it was part of the understanding that Council came to that we would try to reduce the need to fog because of the conflicts between those who don't want it and obviously for many good reasons but there was more on source reduction than this that was supposed to happen, that did not happen under this Council's watch. On page 1 of our report from March 23rd, 2005 adopted by Council, it shows the intent of promoting site reduction on public and private lands for the purpose of enhancing our measures to reduce the need for fogging with malathion. Under the heading source reduction on page 3, 112, it says, adding the staff position to the Insect Control Branch to coordinate source reduction planning would assist in identifying larva development sites that could be repaired, filled or corrected to improve drainage within the City of Winnipeg's, eradication of these larva development sources would be planned in collaboration of Public Works and other civic departments. This job is never filled and the position was laid or eliminated as part of the cuts to WAPSO staff. The irony is that having a full time person coordinating the reduction of sources for mosquito breeding would have saved this city money on larvaciding cost and that was part of the plan two because it would've had the larvacide less, that was a good idea. But now, in the 11th hour in the midst of mosquito season right before an election, we have a report in front of us which attempts to give the impression that this Council is being very proactive. It calls on the Province to pay for eliminating dursban by 2012 which again five years late, not two years early and I know why it's 2012 because there's none left. We have to stop in 2012. We can't get anymore and so we're doing this in the 11th hour with our back to the wall. We didn't do the right thing, okay. I hope we do and I do support doing this now, and I do support…we have to. But I just…I don't like the fact that the report says right in a two years early, when it's five years late and I think that's very misleading. Now, it's always better late than never, but our backs are to the wall on this. The second part of the report on the buffer zones is also an attempt to sound like something as proactive has been done, and I really hope the Province will make a reason decisions on this and not cater to the whipped up frenzy that's been created by the heat of bad mosquito season on an election. And I'm also convinced that spending one million more dollars in our operating budget to fog the city a little bit faster is not necessarily the wisest use of our money. I'd like to see that money spent on source reduction and reducing adult mosquitoes rather than fogging people more. We have more obligation and it was brought up earlier that this is an actual human rights issue, this really is not something and I think if you scope to our Administration, they would not be comfortable with eliminating buffer zones we…because there's a human rights issue to deal with the significant minority of people to protect the rights of significant minority of people who do not want chemicals put on them, their children and their pets. This push on the buffer zone is what is meant by the phrase, the tyranny of the majority. That's a real concept. I know I've said it before here and people just dismiss it, but it's actually something that happens when human rights are ignored and we're supposed to be the leaders and lead with some courage not just take a poll and figure out what would get us the…next votes…the most votes in the next three months. Many people have chemical sensitivities and other health concerns and don't forget the buffer zones only apply for nuisance mosquito spraying. They are not talking about public health threats like West Nile and such. So instead of recognizing the complexity of the issue and our obligation to consider human rights and minority rights, the banned wagon is full of elected officials by those who are encouraging nieghbours to point fingers at each other and turn on each other. You know, it's the buffer zones, it's the buffer zones. Instead of pointing blaming fingers at the minority of citizens who aren't comfortable having themselves, their children and their pets doused with chemicals, perhaps the leaders of the City should've done whatever they could've to reduce the mosquito population, a few things such as source reduction instead of cutting all of that out of our budget. In other provinces, such as Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, there are full provincial bans on the use of cosmetic pesticide…

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan moves extension. All those opposed? Favour? Thanks.

Councillor Gerbasi: By private citizens on their own property. They abandon all those promises, the majority of the population of Canada because these chemicals get into everyone else's environment and there's a violation of basic health rights and in those provinces, each citizen has a right to a safe environment. We need to wake up in the Province of Manitoba and in this city and face the environmental impacts and recognize our connection with nature and the delicate way of life, the Cancer Society has an active campaign across the country to reduce the use of non essential pesticides and Manitoba and Winnipeg are acting like ostriches, putting our heads in the sand, being addicted to chemicals as we always have been as long as I can remember and furthermore, the discard between those who fear chemical sprays and those who want to be sprayed is being whipped up and stoked in order to score political points and I think that's very wrong. The motion to reduce the notice given for fogging and to shrink the buffer zones is not based on any knowledge or science, the report in front of us does not provide research justifying that. And I hope that this thing passes which I'm sure it will, that the Province will have the courage to make sure whatever they do protects the growing minority of people who don't want to be exposed unnecessarily to chemicals. Almost 20 percent of the people in my ward and more in Councillor Smith's ward have registered for buffer zones. They've taken the time to come down and

say, I don't want this on me. That's 20 percent so you know if 20 percent of your people didn't want another project you're putting into your ward. You might be a little concerned about ignoring their rights completely. Discussions like this should occur thoughtfully not in the heat of an election campaign. We're probably not even going to be able to change anything this year anyway. So this was all unnecessary completely and in the conclusion where the rubber hits the road, is it our budget? That's where the truth comes out, cuts to source reduction community projects, cuts to source reduction staff, lack of action on eliminating risky chemicals that killed the natural predators of mosquitoes. It's a real shame that the mosquito strategy has been derailed by a lack of financial commitment or concerns for the environment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I know what you're thinking. Here's Fielding coming up and being Gerbasi's most piece on this issue. I will be speaking of the same thoughts on it.

Councillor Gerbasi: (Laughing) No. I think it's anyone else.

Councillor Fielding: Anyway, I first like to say that…listen, in my opinion I don't think our current fogging system is working for the city. We talk about buffer zones and this is the big issue for me in terms of buffer zones if you ask me I think the buffer zones are way too big. A hundred feet, a hundred metres from any size of the property in my opinion is extremely too big. I think we really need to think about not just the people that are…has some concerns in terms of the chemicals that are being used, but what about those other citizens that are within the buffer zones. I've got a number of calls from residents. There's one lady in particular, I think I mentioned last month, who called me up and said her son is allergic to mosquito bites. They're within the buffer zones. They feel hostage to their own environment that's there, so I think in…you know, I'm very hopeful that the Province is going to listen to this. We've got the 100 metres that's there. We didn't put a…you know, kind of a distance that how far that you go. If you ask my personal opinion, I think it should be a 25 feet as opposed to 50, and I think that's fair. I think that's fair for our citizens, the people that are there. There's a number of things that I do like about this. I like the reduction in the dursban that we talked about. Two years older than we need to from the Provincial or rather from the Federal Government. I think it makes sense. The fifth to 2015 moving before we need to do I think makes a lot of sense. Going back to the public opinion polls on this issue, you know…and I'm a true democrat in a lot of ways. I think that we should listen to what people have to say from our citizens. Not democrat in terms of political, you understand…we hung on this. I try and listen to our people. I apply myself in town hall meetings, everything else in terms of my ward, and I can tell you, overwhelming what I heard from people is that our system is not working that we need to make changes. You look at public opinion polls on this. You've got 90 to 95 percent that said we need to make changes, and I think we need to listen to them. Malathion. Well, you know there's been a lot of talk about this and there's always a lot of back and forth in different groups that are there. I can tell you that there's a certain thing. I'm not an expert in this field, but I can tell you. I have learned a few things by listening to some of the experts. I'm just going to rattle them off here. Number one, malathion is still considered the best and safest approach to addressing the mosquito control. Number two, when you listen to Chief Medical Officer for the Province of Manitoba, they say that there is not any direct link between malathion and any forms like that (inaudible). So they are telling us, the Chief Medical Officer is saying that there is no link. Health Canada still issues this agent to address mosquito control. The Cancer Care Manitoba from my understanding has not taken a position that says malathion is dangerous to certain extent in that dosage that we are using, and there's no other agents that are licensed by Health Canada to address this issue. Malathion has as we mentioned, no negative effects in terms of the dosage that we're using, so until I hear any different from people like the Chief Medical Officer, Cancer Care in terms of whether those things, we're going to be using, I…my position is that we maintain use of malathion until better agent is found. My understanding is there's more in the States. They're not licensed from here. I do also like some of the changes we made, the changes the notification period 24 hours, I think that makes sense, if the Province steams that it's a health risk, whether re West Nile, they give you a 24 hour notice, I think this is consistent with that, I think we should go with that. Length of time to spring, well you know, it takes anywhere between five to six days I understand to spray the whole city for this. I think if you increase the time periods, shrink the time periods to doing this. It's going to make a lot of difference because it takes that period of time. By the time you're done the spraying in heavy mosquito-driven days like years that we're in today, you probably almost need the mosquito done up after they've done one round of it. My final point is with the Province, this is really enhancing the Province, the Province issues us the license for malathion so I'm hopeful that they're going to listen to our thoughts on this if Council supports this, they should listen. There's more money that needs to be had on the table, the biological is obviously an expensive piece. The duration, I think is an expensive piece as well. So I'm very hopeful that the Province is going to listen to what our citizens are saying to what Council is saying, with that I will close. I'll keep my comments very brief because today is a long day, but I do hope that the rest of Council supports this initiative. I think what's coming before us isn't perfect, exactly what I wanted, but it's a step in the right direction, and I'm hoping the Province and the rest of Council supports this. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. The kind of sense this makes is non sense. This is a human health issue, not a matter of personal opinion and there are plenty of studies that show that these chemicals are dangerous. I do not agree with reducing the size of the buffer zone when the buffer zone was established, that was a compromise. I don't believe we should be spraying at all. I want to make that clear and the reason is not just, you know personal weegie board feeling, but based on a lot of information as a sociologist that I've managed to gather on this subject that…it's a…it's dangerous. And one of the world is talking about environmental sustainability and about doing what we can to stop the degradation of this planet to go in this direction to make it easier to spray chemicals that are…that not only dangerous carcinogens that have proven affects to breathing problems is practically stupid. So and to reduce the minimum from three days to amend the criterion for fogging from three consecutive days to greater of twenty five nuisance mosquitoes to two consecutive days, light one of the delegations said people who actually need to get out of town and there are people who do need to get out of town have that much less time to notify their employer that much less time to make plans to leave when this happens. Does someone need to die before people think about the consequences of this kind of inappropriate behaviour? The City of Winnipeg Public Service request that the Province of Manitoba reduce the initial notice time to 24 hours from 48. This is...this is absolutely goofy. Who can do anything in 24 hours? The Public Service will review the anti-pesticide registration process to make sure changes to minimize potential abuses of the registration system. Are we going to have an inspection crew to make sure that people who apply for buffer zone? Prove to us that they need a buffer zone? That's…that's absolute foolishness to prove that it's okay to trample on your rights. If someone does not want to be sprayed, they shouldn't be sprayed and for them to have to bring in their puffer and bring in their CPAP to show that they are on a machine and maybe get a certificate from a doctor. Well, you might find that there's a lot of people that are willing to come up with this information, but that's goofy to have to do that, to prove that in order to qualify for buffer zone and it doesn't say what efforts are going to be made to minimize those abuses that I'm very concerned about the type of hoops that our citizens will have to go through to prevent themselves from being abused. Would we do that with cigarettes smoke to people having to bring us a slip of paper that say I want not to have someone blow smoke in my face? It took a long time for us to get there with regards to the smoking issue and I'm really disappointed to see this step backward. Be instructed to increase the service level to adult…adulticide fogging from four to five nights per cycle from two to three nights per cycle. Are you kidding? This is the worst place. This is when they actually get to be adult. This is not what we should be doing it at the back end. Once they've…once the eggs have matured and become larvae and once the larvae become adult mosquitoes. We should be doing environmentally sustainable, chemical and biological reduction of the larvae and the eggs, right from the beginning. We should be reducing the number of swamp areas that lead to the problem. We should up our inspection teams to make sure that people go in and say this is a problem here on private property. You should eliminate that slue that's causing the problems here where if you need this slue for your kettle here's some biological chemicals that's not going to poison your kettles so that you don't end up with the mosquito…adult mosquitoes in the end. This is the wrong place and the wrong time in the wrong effort. Move to 100 percent biological control in 2012, two years ahead of schedule since we passed that in 2005 and it's now 2010, 2012, I say is going to be seven years too late from when we passed it. We passed it in 2005 saying that we should go in this direction. This reiteration that says that it's somehow two years earlier is goofy and request the problems…Province to increase the amount of incremental funding to the city for expanding larvacide, you know, that is good, but there's so much darn idiocy in the rest of that clause that for just No. 7. I can't support this whole thing. There's just too much idiocy in this clause and I refuse to be a part of that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I'm struck with the irony, Mr. Speaker. My flirted friends Councillors Gerbasi and Thomas, I don't know where this is coming from. These are two Councillors who have without fail over the course of their well, in one case two decade, Council career have voted at every turn to support the adulticiding spraying the malathion or at least Councillor Gerbasi's case. I mean I don't ever recall any impetus from Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Thomas on Executive Policy Committee to eliminate the spraying of malathion. I don't ever remember that. I stand to be corrected I suppose, but I'm sure the record will bare me out. I find it a bit hard to believe that those type of adjective is being used by a Councillor, could've at some point in their career even a couple of months ago, perhaps even today be supportive. To listen to Councillor Gerbasi's speech, you would've sworn that she was against the fogging of mosquitoes, wouldn't you, to listen to her comments? Truth is she supported a return in her entire history as a City Councillor. It's one of the very, very few things I think are around that she is unanimous as a matter of fact. It's interesting how some of us will bear this burden if I could use that term of being the spraying people when we all vote for the exact same thing it seems. I don't quite understand how somebody could on the one hand vote in favour of the application of malathion and on the other hand claim that it does the things that Councillor Gerbasi just outlined that it did. I don't know if anybody else sees that irony. I don't know if anybody else has trouble reconciling those two positions but for the purpose of the record. I think they are irreconcilable. I appreciate she is not here to hear my comments. Perhaps she doesn't care, but if what she's claiming is that we're doing irreparable harm to human beings, I guess it does vague the question, Mr. Speaker. Why do you continue to support? Is that a fair question? I'm not sure if it's a fair question, but it seems like a fair question. Tough issue. This whole fogging of mosquitoes one, on the one hand, we have people in our community who have admittedly a very, very large tolerance and appetite for spraying. We have other people in our community who

have zero tolerance for the idea of spraying malathion. We have both sides. We have people who come forward with what they feel is evidence to the idea that malathion is indeed harmful to human health. For every one of those that comes forward and says that we receive at least fifty people who will recite the statistics, deaths, injuries, may means done by West Nile Virus, two sides to each side of this argument. I don't know if it's worth stating this, but we know in our society Mr. Speaker that we use synthetic agents in all sorts of places in our society. Thousands upon, thousands upon, thousands of them and they are used everyday. There's a prescribed use and there's an abusive use, a pretty much every single one of them. Gasoline can be a really, really bad thing if use improperly, Mr. Speaker, but it has to be said in the same breath, we're going to be truly in in lexically honest about this debate that if used properly, a synthetic agent can be of assistants to the human race. Have we not seen examples of that in our history? Look at almost any medication that exists today, each one of them, a synthetic adaptation of natural product, for some of them that come forward and say the introduction of its synthetic compound into the natural environment is always bad or always good candidly is intellectually lazy. The answer lay somewhere between, the answer lay in the idea of responsible use. The question you have to ask ourselves is can the compounds that we use be used responsibly. At some stage, somebody is going to make the observation that malathion has been used in a public feeder for going on a hundred years. Is it too presumptuous to ask the question if it's been around and being used for this length of time? Would there not at this stage be? Would there not at this stage be, Mr. Speaker. Some objective criterion registration of accepted data that this compound does, in fact, not…could potentially but does in fact, based on its usage history cause human harm. If so, where is it? A sociologist friend is now vacating the Chamber but I would suggest that it doesn't exist and that's the issue. The precautionary principle in science which is a good a principle always dictate that. We never use these chemicals wantingly or without caution or improperly and we don't. Councillor Wyatt said last meeting quite correctly before we even sprayed once in the city our neighbours to the south in Grand Forks. It's sprayed 11 times. That should tell you if you are a citizen in this community, that we are considering always how to use this product responsibly. I think you have to give us that benefit of the doubt. The contract we have with our people is this. We will do everything in our power to avoid the application. We do a lot of things that are being talked about in terms of the public outreach and those types of things, but those do not work in situations of acute mosquito numbers. We all understand that. You can't ask people to go around emptying out coffee cups in their front yard if thousands of the creatures are coming up from their lawn. It doesn't deal with the issue, and the citizens who live in this city I promise you will maintain the support of progressive measures continually us doing what we can, what we can afford to do, to try to do the best we can with the best compounds we can afford. There will always be support with that provided always they appreciate and understand and believe that we are dealing with the problem when it gets to those levels. How can we on one hand avoid the use of malathion when on the other hand, we can't publicly support the application of the chemical deet to every toddler in this city in order to deal with that problem? Those two arguments are, to coin a phrase, my friend, Councillor Gerbasi, illogical. This one synthetic compound is so damaging we can't spray it on the lawn in the middle of the night. The other compound which has basically the same characteristics is so great that we can rub it into a toddler's skin all over their body. There has to be evidence, Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Steeves: There has to be…thank you, Councillor Swandel. There has to be evidence. The buffer zone, what we have asked the Province to consider this, 220 metres to me as a layperson, a non scientist seems big. We know the problems that it causes in the community. Only a Councillor would appreciate that. Only a person who receives these calls could understand the angst and anger that exists in communities. We have a duty to ask these questions of our Provincial colleagues. I'll be candid. My layperson's assessment of the size of these buffer zones, it seems too big. It does. That decision will be made by somebody else. It's not a decision we're empowered to make and if somebody wants to approach the Province and make those discussions and have those discussions, they're welcome to do so because I can tell you we do not hold the final answer on that card but you know what, you know I'd love to see, Mr. Speaker? I see my colleague has risen.

Councillor Thomas: I'm rising actually on the point personal privilege, it says that I can…I can do this immediately. I was waiting for him to finish or pause because I thought he was going to stop. The rights of privileges of Council, I'm allowed to be dealt with immediately and there were two items that you raised. One was, he suggested different than from my voting record and anybody who looks at it in a class will know that I'm a long time environmentalist, and that I've always been against the spraying. And two, suggested that I was leaving the Chamber when I went over to ask the Speaker a question and every member of the Council Chamber has the right to go over and ask you a question, not to debate amongst each other or shout comments at other Councillors when you're speaking but we do have the right to go over and ask a question of the Chair which I was doing and did not leave the Chamber. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Thomas. Councillor Steeves, continue.

Councillor Steeves: I don't know what that was about, but fair enough, Mr. Speaker. I get another 10 minutes, I think. (Laughter).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No.

Councillor Steeves: Here's the legitimate concern, Mr. Speaker. I maintain that inside of these buffer zones, when people find out they're in a buffer zone, the immediate reaction is they get together, they throw in their money and they buy their own personal fogger. That is exactly what happens. The concentration of malathion that exists in the buffer zones I guarantee it is probably 10, 20, 30, maybe even 50 times as high as places that do not have the buffer zone. That is the reality and if I'm the only person who is prepared to recognize that reality, then so be it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I think Councillor Steeves was calling you a scientist, not a lawyer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There you go.

Councillor Wyatt: It's quite impressive…

Councillor Swandel: He's a Google scientist.

Councillor Wyatt: Whatever scientist, mad scientist. I don't know, but the…Mr. speaker, I think by and large, the vast majority of Winnipeggers, if they had an opportunity to wait in on this discussion, I think they would be saying show leadership change the tide, stop the mosquito invasion of the city. I mean, the one thing that Winnipeg unfortunately gets headlines with other than our crime are mosquitoes, you know the national bird, mosquito. Everybody knows the challenge. I mean the fact of the matter is Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not our forefathers built the city in a swamp. You know, they should've really built it up in Selkirk where they originally had the rail line going to but they were able to convince the officials of the CPR through various means to move the rail line down here, and this is where they put the city and, Mr. speaker now we have the great challenge of these little mosquitoes in the summertime invading our city and I can tell you that it is an issue of a quality of life, it is an issue of health, but I look at the health and the well being of children not being able to go outside, not being able to play in the neighbourhood, being bitten by them, these mosquitoes, Mr. speaker, and I believe also that we're probably within a number of years away Mr. Speaker from being able to use another product than malathion because of the fact that it is now going through tests with Health Canada, but it hadn't been doing so before probably because the Federal Government is interested in protecting our servicemen abroad and servicewomen abroad with other products other than malathion which is fair enough in terms of mosquitoes elsewhere, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. speaker I think we're going to have other alternatives, so really the debate today I think is being…we're quite reasonable, if it was up to me, we would not be allowing these kind of buffer zone. We would be able to proceed Mr. Speaker, and be able to fog mosquitoes across the city. I think we would also, Mr. Speaker, instead of fooling around with these trucks going up and down the street, we would be able to use aerial fogging like it's used in other jurisdictions and that we are moving towards reducing the amount of fogging for four to five days down to two to three days, I think that's a positive step, Mr. Speaker, but the fact of the matter is we could go all the way, we could insist on having one day fogging of this entire city, the fact of the matter is, Mr. speaker, aerial is definitely an option and the fact of the matter, Mr. speaker, is we could do this, and we should…we should in a way challenge our citizens to show…we should show the leadership. How is this going to be paid for, the incremental increase here in the cost of three million dollars roughly, Mr. Speaker, is above what we're already spending on mosquito control which is well above six million dollars annually, I believe, Mr. Speaker. This is not pushing a $10 million item in our budget. This is above and beyond what municipalities have been asked to do in terms of municipal services. There is…I'm just waiting so I can have your attention, Mr. Speaker, this is above and beyond what municipalities have to do, Mr. Speaker, if anything, we should ensure that we are collecting this above and beyond the typical municipal tax base, I believe Winnipeggers would support a fee of some sort if they knew that the money was going directly to mosquito control, and that they knew that the service was fast, efficient, city wide, that they would not be hit with a buffer zone, but they could be done in 24 hours and they would support that fee if they were given that option because that's a service I think the majority of citizens in the city would pay for above and beyond the municipal taxes that we pay for, because this should not be coming out of the mill rate support. This should not be coming out of the taxes that we're paying today, Mr. Speaker because that's not what most of the millions of the vast majority of municipalities use our taxes for. Unfortunately, we have the special situation in Winnipeg we have to address and therefore we have to find a unique way to pay for it, so I challenge the Chair of Finance that yes, it's been directed to be looked at in the 2011 budget but do not let us look at some options here, Mr. Speaker in terms of paying for this. Let's not simply go to the general mill rate and again hit us with that cost there. Let's be transparent about it, show what the cost it, and I think, you know, we will hear from Winnipeggers who will say they are prepared, vast majority of Winnipeg, it's not everybody, but I think the majority of Winnipeggers, they are prepared to pay for good mosquito control so that we can stop being the national headline in this country that we have to read about or hear about on the television news, national news, about mosquitoes and mosquito control in Winnipeg that it would become a debate that would be over. That would be something for history to learn about, for our children to learn about, about the city and the problem we had, not

something that we have to keep reading about year after year or hearing about year after year. This can be dealt with, Mr. Speaker, and we could eliminate mosquitoes in the city, we don't have to have this problem, for the folks that have the health circumstances, health issues, as was stated earlier. There is a balance of this, Mr. Speaker. There's others on the other side who suffer just as greatly from the mosquitoes and we know that the problems that they cause. The fact of the matter is Mr. Speaker, we live in a city of nearly 700,000 people with the capital region, almost 800,000 people. We have a huge amount of population in an area concentrated in urban centre and we should not be tolerating this type of problem in today's day and age, Mr. Speaker, it's resolvable. Go to the jungles, go…expect it in the jungles, expect it in the swamps of South America, expect it in the back woods of Africa but not the in the heart of the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, not in today's day and age. This should not be tolerated any longer. This is something that can be removed from our city's landscape and we have the ability to do it. We know how it can be done, it's just a question of leadership. This report is going in the right direction but it's not going far enough, and we should be pushing harder and further and we should ensure that we can eliminate mosquitoes as we know them today in the City of Winnipeg from here on end. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm not going to take a lot of time here this afternoon. We've had a full day and we have still a fair bit to go. A month ago, I rose regarding the motion to go and study mosquito fogging and mosquito management techniques and my comments at that time were, and they are consistent today, I think buffer zones should be all but eliminated, if you do require buffer zone in your home for a medical reason, you can get a note from your medical doctor on an annual basis to do that. That said, there are with our improvements in technology, we need to adopt them. We need to push Health Canada to get the product that's used in the States which is apparently better than malathion today. We need to push the further maybe we can move up the phase out time for dursban. I understand they do kill dragon flies which are naturally of tackling mosquitoes. These are good things. That's basically I'm going to say at this point again, I think we need to find a way of tackling mosquitoes. We had a Plan Winnipeg seminar recently and I even pointed out, perhaps in our city building plans, in terms of the way we build our city, we should find ways to eliminate standing water. Maybe there are certain natural grass areas and stuff that foster mosquitoes. We need to find ways of you know, minimizing the impact of mosquitoes from those natural environments within our urban landscape, too. We have a base of ground, it's based on clay and mosquitoes really do affect the quality of life for people who live in the city. So again, Mr. Speaker, we need to tackle mosquitoes. We need to do so aggressively. We need to continue using technology to let people know when their area is being fogged, just chairing the fogging truck go by the hum of it isn't enough, doing things like we already do in terms of phone, e-mail, there's even more that we can do to continue to improve the communications, we're doing a good job and as new technologies become available, we should absolutely, positively endorse those. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Deputy Speaker, you know, we heard Councillor Steeves and Councillor Fielding both give wrong information. We're not dealing with West Nile Virus. We're dealing with nuisance mosquitoes, Councillor Steeves. (Inaudible) And also, Councillor Fielding, the Canadian Cancer Society says something different. You know, we heard Nick Turnette, his doctors told him about the problem with malathion and the Canadian Cancer Society says this, Councillor Fielding, listening? The Canadian Cancer Society says this, studies show that there may be a connection between pesticides and cancer in adults and children. The research isn't conclusive, but there is enough evidence to show a possible link. The Canadian Cancer Society advises reducing, even eliminating exposure to pesticides where possible. Now, I should point out Health Canada has a fact sheet on malathion. And one of the headings in it says, how can I minimize my exposure to malathion? Whenever possible remain indoors during and immediately after spraying. Close all windows and doors, turn off air conditioning, I mean many people don't know that and close vents to circulate indoor air before spraying begins. Bring laundry, toys and pets indoors, before spraying begins, cover swimming pools, surfaces, three, cover outdoor furniture and play equipment and rinse them off with water after spraying is finished. Now we have play structures in our parks. When we fog, we don't go ahead and wash them down. Children play there. This is advice from Health Canada and we seem to be ignoring it all these years. Wash homegrown fruit and vegetables with water before cooking and eating them, if you come in direct contact with concentrated malathion spray, protect your eyes. In other words, they're saying that malathion has an adverse health reactions. Now let me tell you this, you know, we had the building for mini program and in Vimy Ridge Park, we had all this water every year, and it was a mosquito breeding ground. We in effect to building communities program, we eliminated that by making sure that there was no standing water you know, isn't it…just think about all the money over the years we spent on fogging, millions and millions and millions. If we had used that money to go ahead and make sure that we didn't have standing water in any of the places that we have, we would be doing more to in effect combat mosquitoes than we're doing with fogging. This report should be called mosquito fogging program because that's what it is. It just relies on fogging. Now, there was an editorial in the Free Press says mosquito war needs more data and it ended with these comments. There are no easy solutions but whatever approach is adopted should be based on research and not on political expediency, and that's

what this is, political expediency. It's an election year and it's easy to get people worked up about mosquito bites, but we're not…we haven't done much over the years. We have no program to in effect inspect areas, neighbourhoods, and in effect get people to reduce the standing water. I tell you, in Wolseley, as I say we were breeding mosquitoes in large numbers until we did that. Now, the whole thing also, is about signing up for buffer zones. I have more buffer zones than anybody in the city and next to me is Jenny and I think Councillor Vandal and Councillor Orlikow, but you know, that whole thing about…(inaudible) but also, in this report says the City of Winnipeg Public Service requests the Province of Manitoba…oh no, that's not the part I mean, anti-pesticide registration process be reviewed and similar recommendations be brought forward to minimize potential abuse. The fact is, there is no any of the abuses, you know, there's no…there's not much information in this report. It's just ludicrous to go ahead and imagine things and then plan strict rules so that you can reduce the number of people registering for buffer zones. You know, I don't know if you remember by the way, I think it was the year before last, at the Folk Festival they didn't have many mosquitoes, but they had a lot of dragon flies. Maybe we should be talking about breeding dragon flies and using that as one of the things to reduce mosquito population. You know, this report just deals with…basically with fogging and you know, it doesn't make much sense because you kill the good insects like the dragon flies that feed on mosquitoes. You know, we should have a program to reduce the number of mosquitoes and we can do that by in effect getting rid of standing water, number one, getting people also educational programs. I mean, people don't know that they have to reduce the standing water in many cases. You know, we could do more. We should have people in effect trying to prevent people having standing water in their back yard. We can defeat the mosquito to a great extent. We'll never eliminate them completely, but we should have programs that reduce the possibility of them breeding in Winnipeg. So I suggest you that we should not be supporting this because it doesn't make much sense. We kill the insects that feeds on mosquitoes. We spray people. Health Canada says we have to do certain things, like why aren't we going ahead and washing down all the play structures after fogging takes place as Health Canada recommends? You know, it's…we should think of the health of all of our citizens and, not just some people who are concerned about mosquito bites. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Being no other speakers, can Mayor Katz, would you like to sum up?

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I guess I've heard at least three, maybe four times today but it appears there are some Councillors who believe, in an election year, we would just close down shop and take five months off before the election because we're not supposed to do any work. I tend to disagree with that, Mr. Speaker, but what I will say is that the Councillor Gerbasi made the comment that there are full Provincial bans in other provinces on pesticides and I'm just wondering whether Councillor Gerbasi or Councillor Smith has spoken to their friends on Broadway and if so, did they get a response or did they fall on deaf ears? It would be nice to know that and you know, when you're weighing the situation, here, Mr. Speaker, I guess on one hand, you have a report, from an entomologist, person of science, spent many years in their craft, extremely knowledgeable or I heard what the Councillor Thomas said and I guess I can take her report or Tad Stewart's report and I would support Tad Stewart's report. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We have a request for a recorded vote. All those in favour?

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas and Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 4.
Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion passes. Number 11.

Item 11 – Long Plain First Nation Economic Development Zone
Municipal Development and Services Agreement
eFile GG-1

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall who sat this down, but I'd be happy to hear what they have to say and if they have any question, I'll try to address them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: I'm supportive of the clause and I had a simple question as to when construction is actually going to get started on this project, and what exactly will it be in terms of a building?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, the way it works, is part of the process, and I think Councillor Vandal may know this, but it's obviously up to the Federal Government to approve it, all we are trying to do is create an even playing field by making sure the Service Agreement. They're paying for those services which are the equivalent with the property taxes so obviously it still has to go to the Province. There are plans and if Councillor Vandal wants to know exactly what they are planning to do, I'm sure I can get them that information, but you know, it starts here and finishes with the Federal Government and if I said Provincial Government before that and I meant Federal Government, my apologies.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No other questions for the Mayor?

Councillor Thomas: I don't have a question. I just…(inaudible) wanted to give support of it. This is the urban reserve, actually is what this is. This is a…something that I worked very hard on back in 2005 and I'm very glad to see that we are getting our first one, and, there is…the last time I looked there were 34 in Saskatchewan. There may be even more now and with the highest urban aboriginal population in the hole of Canada, it's nice to see us finally have one. I hope we get more. Thanks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Thomas. Any further discussion? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item 12.

Item 12 – Neighbourhood Multiple-Family / Mixed-Use Building Grant Program
eFile EX

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, quite simply we're adding $1.7 million dollars in here and I'll be happy to listen to any comments or questions from whomever stood it down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Who stood down No. 12?

Mayor Katz: Raise both hands.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I stood it down just simply…I had moved a motion, that didn't go anywhere, asking for this about a month or so ago. It came back. It was…

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Excuse me, Councillor Wyatt. We'll have to ask the folks in the Gallery to take their discussion outside. Thank you, go ahead.

Councillor Wyatt: Thanks, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And, it was basically asking for an extension of the program as well as to do exactly what the second clause says here which is to ask the Province to participate and to bring them on board in terms of their community revitalization tax increment financing or TIFF legislation and so, this does that, and moves in that direction so I think is a positive step and I want to thank EPC for bringing this forward and I realize that as Mayor had previously stated that I may have invented fire and penicillin but this is something that I'd like to think I had a role in participating in this, so I want to thank him. In the 10,000 years in between, I'm not too sure what I was doing but anyway the fact of the matter is...this is a positive development for our city, Mr. Speaker and you know, I just want to say that this program has had a huge impact I think it's interesting that there's certain communities where maybe…it could be argued that this is not necessary because the market forces are there and make it happen already with redevelopments in existing neighbourhoods and…but the fact is there's a lot of other neighbourhoods in areas of the city where you know, basically you have markets which cannot afford, to pay homeowners who cannot afford to pay for infill developments just simply because they can't afford to bear that cost. and this is where its credit really steps in and makes a difference and it helps facilitate development that renews older neighbourhoods which really are on the cusp of potentially going in the other direction, which is not the direction we want them going in and I can just speak from experience in the terms of my own community, I've seen this first hand where condominium developments that are reasonably priced and even rental developments have been facilitated thanks to this very program that we've initiated and unfortunately, with the cost of construction going up, and, in some ways, exceeding even the market costs, the market returns in terms of people, increase in equity in their own homes, this credit is crucial, especially combined now with provincial credit in terms of the education tax so I think it does a lot in terms of insuring that there are older neighbourhoods in our city which have been identified in OurWinnipeg that they do not slide back because what happens when you have this type of infill development and when you have multiple family mixed use development, Mr. Speaker, not only does it create renewal in that immediate area, but it actually facilitates renewal in the older

neighbourhood by having folks who live in homes and who've lived in homes for decades, being able to move out and into another development into another residential building, and allows again the type of new families and infill and change of property that we want to see happen and that renewal that comes with that quite often in an older neighbourhood so it's that transition that happens that is so positive. That's why I think this program is tremendous you know, we established it, we targeted it in certain neighbourhoods around the city and that's why I think it's absolutely crucial and I want to thank the Mayor and EPC for pursuing this because it really needs to be renewed and especially with the Province, the Province that's shown leadership recently in the downtown, with the downtown program, this is now targeted in certain neighbourhoods around the city and I think they can show the same leadership here so I want to thank this EPC for bringing this forward and that's why I wanted to speak to it to step it down off the agenda, Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Swandel: Quick comment on this that you know, it's brought forward here as additional $1.7 million to look after some projects that were sort of in the wings that hadn't yet been included because the program, the money had already been totally allocated, so this is taking care of that, I want to make it clear that I think the discussion at EPC, we did discuss that there's other issues going on, I know Councillor Gerbasi's got the ongoing issue of rentals being converted into condos and Councillor Wyatt is right in that there's some areas of town that we need to look at these incentives more than other areas, so you know, going forward, especially with the Province at the table, we'll be looking at some of those specific things where we can use this type of incentive to address those concerns. I just wanted to make sure that was on the record that this is, this $1.7 million is not the end of this. There's still a lot of work that's going on to see how we focus ourselves and hopefully bring forward another 15 and 20 million dollar program, because that multi-family housing whether it's for empty-nesters, young professionals or whoever is going to be pushing out us very hard when you look into infill and people who want to stay in their communities as the they age and just isn't room or there isn't financial wherewithal already, extremely valuable lands to do it so we need to be there somehow , but we need to do it wisely so doing this keeps us going ahead, and so we can do a little bit more work and get the right criteria in front of Council.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Nothing to be said, Mr. Speaker. (Inaudible)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. We have actually three motions that are actually automatic referrals.

(Inaudible)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Sure.

Councillor Wyatt: I'd like to on Item No. 2…(inaudible) suspension of the rules…(inaudible) deal with the matter right now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: So two third?

Councillor Wyatt: I bet Council's…

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, let's do the Motion 1, then.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No. 1, automatic referral.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Browaty,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has been encouraging homeowners to install both backwater valves and sump pumps for years;

AND WHEREAS the recent extraordinary heavy rain events overwhelmed the City of Winnipeg storm and sanitary sewer systems;

AND WHEREAS many residents in Winnipeg have yet to install either a proper backwater valve and sump pump with pit;

AND WHEREAS it is recognized that the City of Winnipeg storm and sanitary sewer system was negatively impacted with storm water from weeping tiles and/or basements being directly drained into the sanitary sewer system;

AND WHEREAS homeowners who install both a backwater valve and sump pump with pit directly minimize the risk of sewer back up, while at the same time reducing the amount of storm water flowing into the sanitary sewer lines;

AND WHEREAS the installation of a backwater valve and sump pump with pit can cost homeowners over a thousand dollars and therefore poses a financial burden to many;

THEREFORE BE IT RESLOVED that the Winnipeg Public Service work with the Province of Manitoba and the Insurance Bureau of Manitoba to establish a credit and/or grant and/or finance program to directly assist homeowners with the financial cost of installing both the backwater valve and sump pump with pit.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. Motion No. 2. I guess we need to suspend the rules. Councillor Wyatt moves. All those in favour? Opposed? Councillor Wyatt.

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

WHEREAS communities in the Red River Valley, including the City of Winnipeg, the southern Interlake and Westman suffered significant public and private sector damages due to the storm of May 28th and 29th with the Province of Manitoba declaring the event an official disaster;

AND WHEREAS the Disaster Financial Assistance Program that has now been established for this storm event exists to assist both municipalities and private property owners with damages that are uninsurable, such as overland flooding;

AND WHEREAS due to the overwhelming rain event experienced at the end of May, many homeowners in the City of Winnipeg suffered a combination of sewer back up and overland flooding;

AND WHEREAS the Premier of Manitoba has publically stated that the province will fund overland flooding claims through their Emergency Measures Organization, with 90% of the funds being derived from the federally funded DFA program;

AND WHEREAS at a recent public meeting in North Kildonan, provincial EMO staff indicated that they would deny basement damage claims of overland flooding where sewer back up was also involved;

AND WHEREAS in a provincial News Release of Tuesday, July 20, 2010, the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Emergency Measures Organization, Steve Ashton, was quoted as saying that "where there is a combination of overland flooding and sewer backup, Manitoba is prepared to pay its fair share of assistance if the federal government agrees to this change in DFA eligibility.";

AND WHEREAS the storm that hit Manitoba was the kind of extraordinary event that the DFA program was designed for and that non-insurable coverage, such as overland flooding, should not be denied due to the existence of an insurable loss, such as sewer back up;
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg call on both the Federal and Provincial governments to immediately live up to their longstanding commitment to provide disaster financial assistance for overland flooding by ending the unfair and unjust practice of denying flooded basement damage claims that were the result of both overland flooding and sewer backup.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't take long. I know it's been a long day and what do encourage us, if question, okay?

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

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion 3. Order. Order. Motion 3, automatic referral. All right. Thank you.

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

WHEREAS demolition permits are required by the City during a demolition to ensure all proper safety precautions are in place for the dangerous task of demolishing a building;

AND WHEREAS there was a failure to take proper safety steps to ensure public safety pertaining to the demolition of Transcona Meats/Transcona Locker Room on the 100 block of Regent Ave East;

AND WHEREAS the community was very fortunate that no one was insured or killed in relation to the building collapse;

AND WHEREAS some building materials may have included asbestos and other harmful substances which clearly require provincial government intervention;

AND WHEREAS this incident was the second example in three years of an unsafe demolition resulting in building collapse, with the first being the WRHA site on Main Street, where the collapse of the building precipitated lane closures on Main Street;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Auditor or another independent entity, fully review the city process for regulating demolitions, and that the WPS work with the Province of Manitoba to review their safety standards, and to report such a review with recommendations for improvements to Council.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 1ST READING ONLY

Mr. Deputy Speaker: By-laws from His Worship.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll move that By-law No. 88/2010 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 88/ 2010.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2ND READING ONLY

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following By-laws be read a second time, By-law No. 67/2010 as amended, By-law No. 68/ 2010 as amended.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 67/ 2010 as amended, By-law No. 68/ 2010 as amended.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move the following by-laws be read a first time, By-law 83/2010, 84/2010, 85/2010, 86/2010, 87/2010, and 95/2010.

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

Clerk: By-law number 83/2010, 84/2010, 85/2010, 86/2010, 87/2010, and 95/2010.

Mayor Katz: And I'll move that by-laws numbered 83/2010 to 87/2010, both inclusive and 95/2010, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 83/ 2010 to 87/2010, both inclusive and By-law No. 95, 2010.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 83/2010 to 87/2010, both inclusive and 95/2010 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have a three minute preamble (inaudible). The Winnipeg Square Parkade, which was built as an investment in the downtown, was sold last November. As a result of that sale, an ongoing revenue stream of approximately $1.9 million has been lost. Now it has been made clear in the Winnipeg Authority business plan that the strategy that the money from the sale is suppose to go to will not be ready until the fall. This means a year's worth of a revenue stream has been sacrificed without realizing any progress. It is also mentioned in a Free Press story yesterday that the value of downtown parking is going up. This shows that the premature sale of the parkade may not have been the most solid of financial decisions, however, it is too late to bring the parkade back now that it was sold. But at the time of the sale, there were concerns that some of the money from selling off this asset would be used to pay up the so called debt of the Winnipeg Parking Authority, which this debt is actually just money taken out of the Parking Authority and put to general revenue, reducing the amount of money available for the strategy. So given all of this, I would like the Mayor to confirm that the full amount of the money from the sale will go back into the parking strategy, not to pay off a debt that is a false debt, but be put back into investment in our downtown. (Inaudible) That's my question.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, that was a minute and a half preamble. I'm going to wait for the next two minutes.

Councillor Gerbasi: That's Okay.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Gerbasi for the question. I certainly do not concur with all the comments that were made. As you are well aware of Mr. Speaker and so should most of Council know, that the whole idea was to take those proceeds, and then with those proceeds accomplish the building of parkades in our downtown and our Exchange area which would motivate significant private sector development as well as, once again, there would be parking revenue coming, so Mr. Speaker that is still the intention. I said that on the record when we first discussed it. I stand by that today Mr. Speaker.

Councillor Gerbasi: I notice Councillor Swandel, when I asked the question going, "don't promise that", so obviously there was an intention that the whole 24 million is not necessarily going to go back into that, which I am very concerned about that was talked about before, and I still want to hear a clear commitment. Is all of the money from the sale of the parkade going to go into constructing those mixed-use parkades and whatever comes out in that parking strategy, when it comes out, which some of us have not yet seen.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker. It's extremely difficult for me to answer on behalf of another Councillor, so I can only answer for myself. If Councillor Gerbasi wants to poll the other Councillors, that's her prerogative. But once again, my belief is that money should be re-invested in other parkades, for example, some of the ones that have already been identified by CentreVenture to create development in our downtown where you could see basically residential, commercial, as well as parking with the type of parkades just like we've been able to do at 104 King Street except much larger. That's my intention, that's always been my intention, and I can assure Councillor Gerbasi where my vote will go.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you.

My next question is that the strategy was supposed to be ready by May. I'm sure the Administration has probably done their work and now it's the point of tweaking it or whatever goes on. Will the Mayor agree to allow all members of Council to participate in seeing this parking strategy, being briefed on it, and perhaps even having input into it?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, what basically happens, the report comes. Once the report comes, Council will have a decision to make. That's up to Council to decide. And from my point of view, I'd like to think that any information that

Councillor Gerbasi or any Councillor has, they can access. If you have difficulty accessing any information, you know where my office is, you know my number, and I will certainly help you in any way, shape or form. There is a process and we will continue to follow the process, Mr. Speaker.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In my Ward, in Windsor Park, on Saturday night, two sisters and a child were terrorized for three hours by a would-be intruder. After three calls to 9-1-1 and three hours later, Police finally arrived. The women in question has emailed both myself and yourself. I understand, and I have forwarded all information to Police Services but have yet to hear back. Can you assist in getting to the bottom of this unacceptable incident to ensure that it never occurs again to any Winnipegger?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would be more than happy to follow up with the WPS and get an answer and of course share it with the Councillor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Good. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to, through you, ask the question of the Mayor just to make sure that we're being sensible here on the floor of Council and we're not just going willy-nilly creating debt or awkwardness in our consolidated statements. I'm assuming that anything's done with any proceeds from the sale of any parkade will be rationalized firstly in the business plan of the Parking Authority and of course ultimately in the consolidated statements of the City of Winnipeg so that if there is long-term debt attached to the parkade that that would be part of the rationalization of those funds prior to making any commitment to spend them anywhere in the City, whether it be on parkades or downtown development or whatever. That's my question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, there will be report coming forward to Council. At that point in time, Council will decide what to do with the proceeds. I have said many months ago, in my opinion, I was very supportive of seeing some downtown parking and us using some of these proceeds to go towards those parking. Nothing has changed from my point of view Mr. Speaker, but obviously we're going to look at the big picture.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thanks. Back on May the 19th, Mr. Mayor, I asked you in terms of the decision back in April of Winnipeg setting its infrastructure priorities, the Building Canada Fund, and the items that we voted on, A to K, different projects, and at the time I asked you the status of that vote. What have you heard since then, and I can't recall hearing in your response earlier today. You indicated at that time, on May 19th, that anytime there is a vote on the floor of Council that impacts the Province in any shape or form, the Clerk will send a letter and they will respond. We're just waiting for the response. Have you received a response yet, a formal response by the…from the Premier in terms of these priorities that Council has voted on?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as I did state last time when asked the question, the Clerk did forward the information to the Province. Obviously the Province knows the motion that was passed and as yet, I have not gotten anything specifically in writing that I am aware of basically saying that they are supporting these issues, even though I will concur that it's the Mayor and Council who represent the City of Winnipeg, and even Minister Toews have said that the local government should be making these decisions, but I'm afraid to report I have nothing, I have nothing.

Councillor Wyatt: It's been there for 90, roughly 90 days since Council voted on this matter, and I'm assuming that letter would have went out shortly thereafter, so the Premier has not responded in 90 days. Is there any one specific project in this list that the Premier objects to? For example, the Community Club Investment Fund. Is he against re-investing in Community Clubs? Or has he indicated to you that he is against any one of these other items pertaining to this list since he hasn't given you a formal response.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I have not heard of any of these projects that they would be against. From my point of view, these are all quality projects throughout the entire City, and that's exactly what Building Canada Fund money should be used for, and I am hoping we are able to move forward as soon as possible so that we are able to get this done and as I said earlier, the only thing standing in the way of getting all of these projects done is not the City, it's not the Federal Government, it's the Provincial Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Next question.
Councillor Wyatt: In light of the fact that the Premier hasn't responded to the first letter, is there going to be another letter sent to the Premier requesting a response to the Council's request?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to send another letter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any further questions in Question Period? Being none. I guess we move on to Standing Policy Committee, Property and Development.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEEON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED JULY 6, 2010

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves. Back to your cage.

Councillor Swandel: Councillor Steeves moves…

(Laughing)

Councillor Steeves: Sorry. Geez.

Councillor Swandel: Move Consent Agenda 1 though 28.

Councillor Steeves: Yeah, I will do that, exactly that. If I stated, my apologies Mr. Speaker, I was discussing a very important matter with Councillor Gerbasi.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I'll bet. All those…anyone standing anything down? One through 28, all those in favour? Opposed?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ONPROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS - 1st READING ONLY

Councillor Steeves: No motions, Mr. Speaker? I'll move that By-law No. 89/2010, be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 89/2010.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS - 2NDAND 3RD READINGS

Councillor Steeves: I'll move the following by-laws be read a second time. By-law No. 37/2010 as amended, By-law No. 38/2010 as amended.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 37/2010 as amended, By-law No. 38/2010 as amended.

Councillor Steeves: I will move that the By-laws No. 37/2010 amended and 38/2010 amended, be read a third time and same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

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

Councillor Steeves: I will move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-laws No. 78 through 81 inclusive, 93, 96, 97, 98, all of 2010.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 78/2010, 79/2010, 80/2010, 81/2010, 93/2010, 96/2010, 97/2010, 98/2010.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that by-laws numbered 78/2010 to 81/2010, both inclusive, 93/2010, 96/2010, 98/2010 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 78/2010 to 81/2010 both inclusive, 93/2010, and 96/2010 to 98/2010 both inclusive.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that the rules be suspended and by-laws numbered 78/2010 to 81/2010 both inclusive, 93/2010 and 96/2010 to 98/2010 both inclusive be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried? Question period for the Chairman Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I have some questions for myself.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No questions? All right. Thank you very much. We'll move onto Standing Committee for Protection Community Services. Councillor Pagtakhan.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
REPORT DATED MAY 3, 2010

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the Report of dated May 3rd, 2010, we're looking for a sixty day extension.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
REPORT DATED JUNE 28, 2010

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, of the Report of June the 28th of 2010, I'd like to move Consent Agenda Items 1 through 5.

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

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED JULY 12, 2010

Councillor Pagtakhan: And on the Report of July the 12th, 2010, Mr. Speaker, move Items 1 and 2.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ONPROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move the By-law No. 90/2010 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 90/2010.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move that By-law No. 90/2010 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 90/2010.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the rule will be suspended and the By-law 90/2010 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS -1ST READING ONLY

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the rule be suspended and the By-law 99/2010 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 99/2010.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Question period for Protection and Community Services, Chair. Seeing no questions. Move to Standing Policy Committee for Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED JULY 13, 2010

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my honour to move the Report of July 13th with the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works and to move Consent Agenda Items 1 to 4, 6 and 8. One to four, six and eight.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

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

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Move Clause 5.

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

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Move Clause 7.

(Inaudible)

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Not so fast (inaudible). What? Too late. (Inaudible) Well, done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I don't mind going back.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Clause 5.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Please, thank you. All those in favour?

Councillor Vandal: Mike, I'm not against this project. I just think that it's important to note that…I would like to read the fine details of final decision of the methane, the Landfill Gas and Resource Recovery Project. I offered at Committee. I believe Councillor Gerbasi did. I'm ready to come in the month of August. I'm not going anywhere. If I go anywhere, I'm an hour away, 45 minutes if it's important and I would be willing to come in and review the clause. I understand the

Executive Committee don't feel the same way. I want to put that on the record. That's it. I'm not sure which…Councillor O'Shaughnessy, you're going to move the EPC recommendation?

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: It's not my point to move. EPC would move any amendment they have.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any further comments on No. 5? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you. Seven.

Councillor Gerbasi: Stand it down, please.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Yeah, that's why it was there?

**Item 7 – Preferred Proponent for the Design, Build, Financing and Maintenance of the Chief Peguis Trail Extension Project
eFile SB-23**

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: More than pleased to listen to the comments of any members of Council on this item.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: I guess I'll start while I can still put a few words together. Years ago, this Council approved something called the SERP Report. It wasn't that many years ago, in which…which advocated in Council endorse this that all major infrastructure project should have cost benefit analysis. That policy has been pretty much ignored with an admission recently from the Mayor that we don't do cost benefit analysis on those projects which I…I guess it's been…it's certainly being honest, but the exception though is in Rapid Transit projects which we only have one, the Southwest Transit Corridor Phase 1. We put that up to a very high level of scrutiny and repeatedly do cost benefit analysis of this pro…that kind of a project. In fact, there's been two cost benefit analysis done about that project both which raided it bare very highly, but with this particular…when it comes to a freeway expansion or road extension, no cost benefit analysis. The Chief Peguis Trail is not even in the current Plan Winnipeg. I guess we've just adopted a new one, but it still hasn't gone through the reading. Yet this freeway expansion jump the queue ahead of all sorts of other projects and I'd like to know how these priorities were decided. It certainly wasn't based on a plan because I guess as Councillor Vandal pointed out earlier we don't have one or in cost…if we do have one, we don't listen to it or on cost benefit analysis. Another concern I have and what we're dealing with today is the private partnership accepting this particular private partnership. Sixty million dollars of this project which is now 119 or 120 million dollars…109, I apologize…million dollars is being privately financed at a time when everybody knows to quote His Worship that public financing is less expensive at this time. I'm sorry but I don't know how you can make that make sense and because this is a P3, there's a lack of transparency about the true cost of this gold level Cadillac project. Documents that would be public if this was not being done with…through private financing and all that were not available for the scrutiny of the public or even to members of Council as we've seen what the Charleswood Bridge where all we can get is a backed out document from FIPPA. The cost of the project has blown to 109 million dollars and this is simply the cost of construction. Interests in other costs are above that. So this is going to cost us 8.2 million a year for the next 30 years and I question that this is the highest priority at this time for that level of infrastructure spending considering our current financial situation. It might be acceptable to spend this kind of money if something was a crucial high priority or for that significant environmental economic development or social benefits, and again there has not been a case made for any of that as there's been no cost benefit analysis done. The thinking that we must endlessly expand the regional street system and a freeway system is simply not sustainable. And here's why. The City has a cap on P3 borrowing at $30 million. We're now pretty much there so we can't do any more projects so this month…this is taking up almost a third of that cap. Furthermore, without any discussion or clear decision making point, Council has begun to overturn belong help policy of not borrowing in the tax supported budget. I hate to think what Bill Clement would say, but that policy which are many people including Bill fought for for a long time maybe it's time to change that and I realize that. But there has never been any discussion about that. There's never been an agreement among this Council that we're going to start borrowing money on the tax supported budget. We're just doing it and we've done it to a tune of $100 million now. Sixteen to 20 million of the Chief Peguis Trail, this is over an above the sixty that's privately financed. Ten for the Chief Peguis Trail, 10 million for the new fire stations and 75 million for the Disraeli and that's a $100 billion of borrowing on the tax supported budget without any policy change or discussion with anybody. I guess we can just do things, about talking about it or thinking about it. Borrowing for the utilities is all over and above that. We know there's lots of that and I'd like to know what the plan is for future investments now that we maxed out our P3 commitment. We borrowed $100 million. We borrowed a bunch from utilities, our operating budget is $80 million short projected next year. We are in a financial mess and we're billed and here's…here's the thing. Contrary to wishful thinking, we can not do it all. You know, it would be nice to have commuter traffic flow a little faster; however most major cities in Canada, they've recognized that investment needs to be priorized. Two expanding Rapid Transit infrastructure and fixing existing infrastructure, those guys, other cities are doing that and that is what a sustainable transportation plan would look like. The sustainability summit that was held at the beginning of the OurWinnipeg Process was well attended. I mentioned this earlier and the people there on mass were not supportive of this kind of direction. I did not hear anyone there promoting a new freeway system. They had a different vision, a vision that included spending our scarce dollars on truly sustainable approaches such as investing in public transit systems, active transportation and fixing existing infrastructure and as Councillor Wyatt said earlier, he was going through the list of a projects that we have…do have on our priority none of which unfortunately is Rapid Transit for our Building Canada Fund and he was saying, you know which one does the Premier support? Well, you know where's the support for sustainable projects here? This is your choice. This is your choice instead of sustainable projects and it hasn't been justified and the homework hasn't been done and we're borrowed to the hilt and our financial plan seems to have been derailed and I think the next Council is going to have a tough job to make these decisions because we haven't priorized. We've just gone with the political flow. I don't know…you know, obviously this project became more important because it was politically important to people not just at this level of

government but others for procreo political reasons not for an overall sustainable vision or plan for our city and now on our priority list, it states the next stage, the next freeway section of this freeway plus they neglected to consider the need for pedestrian fly over right on this brand new cycling path that's going…goes all the way to Birds Hill Park. You know, now we're probably going to have to have another four million or eight million to fix that problem. I mean, this thing is a money pit and it's only Phase 1. There's another Phase to come and nobody is thought about why. Nobody is justified why. It's very disappointing and you know the P Tree money, tree that was talked about a couple of years ago, originally brought forward saying it wasn't borrowing because we're just making lease payments for 30th. It's borrowing and that's what Mike Ruta tells us it is, and now people have stopped saying that, but it's just money we have. We don't have many more in hock almost $30 million out of our total capital budget from our 65 million of whatever it is, cashed to capital plus the gas tax, 30 million at it's gone for the next 30 years because we've used the P3 Money Tree to build a bunch of stuff that we haven't really priorized very well and now we're going to be…have trouble moving forward in the future. We really need that transportation plan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Councillor Swandel: (Inaudible)…this evening to finish our business that we don't have to return tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. This project is a P3 so it doesn't have my vote right off the top so it's necessary that I say that right off beginning, but it's also necessary that I talk about the cycling group that came here with regard to the Gateway Rolly portion that's going to be compromised in the Northeast Pioneer Greenway that's going to be compromised by this project. Many years ago, we moved a motion that all future of major thorough fairs would have a cycling component with them in gravel. This one does, but it's compromising in existing cycle way and I don't think that was ever in vision that while we would put a new cycle way going one way that we would compromise it in an existing one that is very well used and by the time it goes all the way out to Birds Hill Park will be extremely well used so I'm very concerned about having this compromised by an upgrade crossing and finally this project I continue to object to Molson being cut off at the end my businesses that are along Molson and Panet will now have their access to North Kildonan reduce because the streets will be synched by the northeast…by the Chief Peguis Trail Extension and they will no longer be able to access the north part of North Kildonan going there because the streets will just come to a dramatic end and we have a street that up until it reaches my ward is considered a regional street enters my road for some questionable reason becomes that collector and it's synched off near the end making all the residents who use that street to access business not being able to access it so those are the three reasons why I will not be supporting this extension how it's handled and very disappointed that these considerations were not taken in to affect in planning. The extension…some people may talk about how it wasn't priorized in Plan Winnipeg, well I agree for that. It's in its…important to the northeast quadrant of the city so I'm not objecting to the project in and of itself. I'm just objecting to how it's been handled and I can not support this clause. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have no doubt about it. We are spending like drunken sailors as Councillor Gerbasi has pointed out. This project was one of the first ones that was quite literally ramped through this Council when I first got back in 06. It's started out at $32 million within 11 months. It was up to $64 million. I called for an audit to get to the bottom of what was going on. It was voted down. We're now up to $110 million with the grade separation and we're obviously…we're likely to spend another $6 million for the active transportation improvements that are necessary and long story short. I think we're operating in a transportation policy vacuum as I stated earlier. There's nothing in Plan Winnipeg. There's no policy played as opposed to the 01 Plan Winnipeg where we knew exactly what we were going to be doing for next 20 years and to cut to the trace I think if we are going to spend that amount of money on major transportation infrastructure in the city of Winnipeg. I'm not convinced that this would be in the top three projects, top four, top five. Councillor Browaty of course would disagree with me passionately and he's done a great job in the moving this project forward for his ward, but I think when we're discussing transportation policies and we're actually funding multi-million dollar transportation projects, we should actually have a policy and a rational why some projects get funded rather than others, rather than just trying through fund transportation projects to keep politicians elected which is basically what we're doing here. Having said that, that's my comments, I've said it for four years. I want to be consistent. I know this project has merits for the northeast section of the ward, but I think we have to apply a city wide lands when we spend this sort of money on these sorts of projects because there's not a lot left, Mr. Speaker and when we look at other priorities be it CentrePort, Rapid Transit or the southwest corner of the city. We're spending like drunken sailors and we're going to hit a time where there's not a lot of money left for major transportation improvements. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker. I don't think I have heard so much malarkey to steal a term from one of my Irish colleague over here, so much malarkey in one meeting as I have today to this point time. This, Mr. Speaker, is a project

that is long overdue. Let's go back far enough in history Mr. Speaker. This was previously in Plan Winnipeg. It was yanked out of Plan Winnipeg arbitrarily by Councillor Browaty's predecessor realizing the mistake then it reversed his position and put it back in, but it was in Plan Winnipeg for years, Mr. Speaker. The land has been set aside for years. Let's talk about freeways, Mr. Speaker. Let's talk about express ways. CentrePort, the Provincial Government and Federal Government are now building an express way, Mr. Speaker, and this is a true express way, ah yes, around your community Mr. Speaker, all the way from Inkster, realigning Inkster, swinging up and then down in south across the whole northwest section of Winnipeg on an angle then south and this is I'm assuming four lanes because it's 212 million and then hard…making a hard right to the Perimeter Highway all along a way, Mr. Speaker. There's going to be a proposed grade separation alignment for Inkster Boulevard at the CPR mainline and the Prairie Dog Central. We've got to make sure we look after the Prairie Dog Central and further south, it then turns into another, it looks like they've got a circle. They don't say what that is but it's going to be some sort of grade separation. Then it's going to hit another proposed inter change, Mr.…inter change at the Perimeter Highway, a bridge to go to nowhere Mr. Speaker, sorry I know that's your neighbourhood but the reality is Mr. Speaker, I know where it's going because they're going to continue to build the Province has no doubt that that road's not just going to stop there. It's going to fly around Headingly and it's going to be a bypass around the 70 kilometre speed trap known as Headingly and oh, it doesn't end there Mr. Speaker. The CPR Glen Barrow subdivision is Saskatchewan Avenue overpass, an overpass is Saskatchewan Avenue, I mean that's amazing. I mean that's impressive. I mean this is an express way being built by the Provincial Government, Mr. Speaker part of the Provincial Government's Economic Plan for the Development Manitoba and I say this with a bit of sarcasm and the Federal Government, bit of sarcasm, but in our sincerely Mr. Speaker, this road, Chief Peguis Trail is a direct connection, the Provincial Government talks about bringing industry and building an industrial park, well guess what, an industrial park already exists. It's called northeast Winnipeg. We have huge industry…huge amounts of industry in northeast Winnipeg. The challenge is getting the vehicles miraculously somehow from the northeast to the northwest and to this, new CentrePort. Well, you're going to do it by bringing the vehicles around the city Mr. Speaker, not through the centre that we're doing today. The roll that were building today and I give Councillor Browaty a heck of a lot of credit for being persistent over the last four years and for pushing for…pushing hard for this. He…this morning there was a delegation who said some things. It was like a broad side into the…into his (inaudible) completely unfair, completely unfair the comments made. I can tell you that Mr. Speaker that both Councillor Browaty and Councillor Thomas have been more than fair and generous and supportive of the Northeast Pioneer Greenway folks over the last four years over and over and over again. This just came out of the blue or I don't know why we didn't also add like if you look at the…I think Bishop Grandin has got a greenway along as well. We should have a fly over at St. Mary's Road and we should probably also have a fly over at Dakota right, when you think about it. We should also probably have a fly over at Henderson and a fly over at Lagimodiere. I'm all in favour of building these four million dollar pedestrian bridges, Mr. Speaker, but to come at the 11th hour and all of a sudden saying, "Why aren't you building this?" We just had a $20 million announcement last fall. This was no where on the priorities I saw of the Advisory Committee even though they knew for four years now that this infrastructure project was coming forward so it was a completely unfair and I understand this volunteerism Mr. Speaker who are working on the Advisory Committee and they may not have all the time to get all the information, but I can tell you here and now what I do know and that is Councillor Browaty has been an unquestionable supporter of Rapid Transportation, Northeast Pioneers Greenway and he's worked hard to get the Chief Peguis Trail to the point that it is today and thank goodness, we're building the Rothesay grade separation Mr. Speaker because that would've been a real travesty if we weren't so you know Mr. Speaker, I think it's all relative, I guess you know, if this was being proposed that ain't by somebody else maybe wouldn't be so bad in the views…in the eyes of some of the speakers today, but the reality is Mr. Speaker, just literally down the road you've got $212 million on public money paying for an express way which by the way is going to be liking to this in the future to do exactly what we need to do, Mr. Speaker, that is to grow the City to see economic development happen to create jobs. We are a trading city. We rely on trade. We would not be here today Mr. Speaker if we did not trade. The fact of the matter is the vast majority of the product manufacturer that originate from this city one way or the other by your culture, agriculture…farm, manufacturer in produce whatever they maybe. The vast majority are exported Mr. Speaker and the key to export is to get the product quickly and efficiently on to the roads and out and right to the rail lines and on the rail…on the trains and out of the city or in this case also at the airport so Mr. Speaker. This is crucial…the Province has clearly outlined why this is crucial to economic development to the City. Chief Peguis Trail Extension whether it be here between Henderson and Lagimodiere or between McPhillips and Inkster is directly connected to the economic growth stressed by the Premiere of this province so enough of the malarkey, Mr. Speaker. We've debated this. We've discussed this. This is a positive development for the City. Yeah, absolutely if we didn't have…if we had the money in the deep pockets, we wouldn't be doing a P3 if we had Ottawa's deep pockets and Broadway's deep pockets. We wouldn't be doing a P3 today. We'd probably be trying to do it ourselves if we could find, but the reality is Mr. Speaker, we're trying to literally pin together and keep the City moving in the right direction economically with very little resources unfortunately and without…we can't go to the property tax to invest a new strategic infrastructure project, that would be just impossible, the tax payers couldn't support that. The cost would be too high. We've been asking the Provincial Government over and over and over again for more resources. We've been lobbying the Federal Government to do more and we have been making progress but the reality is Mr. Speaker, it's not enough to address the challenges that we're facing and so we have to do a P3 in a case of Chief Peguis Trail. There's no doubt about it and it makes sense. It works, and we've done

it elsewhere in the city, so Mr. Speaker, when the time comes and if the Provincial Government gives us the leadership we need and gives us the municipal sales taxes which this Council by the way on record of saying they support, we can start to invest in the kind of infrastructure we need whether be the renewal of our existing infrastructure building more new infrastructure to see the City grow Mr. Speaker, but we don't have that today unfortunately so we have to make do with what we have. Thank you.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Thinking the youngest member of Council, I'm going to give you…give everyone here a little of history lesson. The City of Winnipeg, you know along the Red River it was founded by Selkirk settlers in many cases…in most cases. They were given lots that were based off of river lots they were given to certain depth. The line between those river lots became the arterial roads we know today, streets like McPhillips, Main Street, Keewatin even. I understand today that for the most part a lot of those have become arterial roads, so we've got a great network of north-south routes as we moved between horse and buggy to vehicles and permanent river crossings east-west arterials never existed. North Winnipeg doesn't have that arterial route. In1990, the Chief Peguis Trail opened between Main Street and Henderson Highway, however they have nowhere to go once they got there. Springfield rotates 22,000 vehicles a day. Design for no more than 5,000. It's a 24 hour two truck route. It's a two way street, not all appropriate for the level of traffic that sees today. Our forefathers have the…and this is everybody here, nobody was on Council back in the 1960s, Winnipeg area transportation study reserved a land in the Winnipeg Region to hold that land for interring road. That road still exists today. There's been a lot of comments today about political editing. My understanding is Plan Winnipeg 2020 vision, I don't know who was involved at that time, but it was taken out of the short term plans at that point. Our traffic engineers from my understanding…my understanding is that the Kenaston Underpass was a lower priority than Chief Peguis Trail. We all know that that got built a lot sooner than the Chief Peguis Trail Extension. There's a comment that you know we're building roads and we're not dealing with sustainable transportation. We spent $20 million this year alone on Active Transportation. I supported Phase 1 of Rapid Transit to the cost of…to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars. We've got a good balance here, I believe of doing the traffic infrastructure we need for growing prosperous city as well as active and sustainable transportation and that's not honest, either. Chief Peguis Trail is adding the equivalent of $1.52 million worth of additional active transportationers riding six kilometres of Active Transportation and in fact, back when we did a community consultation back in 2008, there were comments that oh, we need some connectivity here, we need some connectivity over here. Those comments were heard. We've added additional ash felt paved trail, in many cases lit ash fall paved trail to what was proposed back in…what is it…when the original proposal to public open house in 2008. I do want to thank Sigrun Bailey, Louise Balaban, River East Neighbourhood Trails Committee as well Janice Lukes for their tenacity and their you know, and their vigor and support and of for active transportation. You know, when I got first elected you know, they were talking about doing a gravel trail on the Chief Peguis Trail ride away, I said hold on we're going to see if we can get Chief Peguis Trail in here. We're going to give you the trail you really want. They are not getting a gravel trail. They're getting a paved trail. This is above and beyond what they wanted and I promised them that I'm going to continue to lobby and continue to work, you know to put it on of the priority list to see if we can find the way of doing a grade separation not for the Chief Peguis Trail Extension half way, but for the Northeast Pioneers Greenway because it is part of not just a Winnipeg trail network, but of wider network. It would certainly be in the vision of John Buhler who I know is working with the Province to get a crossing perhaps even at the Perimeter Highway. Well, I do have to talk and call Janis Lukes out is notion that I don't care about neighbourhood safety. The Chief Peguis Trail is to deal with a lot of the safety issues that exist today. Springfield Road and Molson debris is MPI in the City of Winnipeg Police accident statistics, one of the worst intersections in the city. Chief Peguis Trail eliminates that. Lots of collisions, lots of injuries, lots of damage are eliminated by this extension. Twenty two thousands vehicles travel down Springfield Road today. It's a local street and it's within the catchment area of Chief Peguis School. Lots of kids have to cross this very busy street in many locations today. That's been eliminated. A lot of the cut through traffic, traffic that's…in the many cases traveling too fast on a lot of east west streets today, McLeod, McIvor, Bonner, Headmaster, these streets. A lot of the cut through traffic, now is the proper arterial road. That improves the safety of North Kildonan and the underpass at Rothesay which thanks to the funding from the Federal and Provincial Governments, it's now being done, also improves the safety of North Kildonan, so I do have to call it to task it at those comments regarding not being concerned with the safety of North Kildonan. Chief Peguis Trail does a lot of very, very good solid things in improving the safety of the community. So again, I think this is an absolutely wonderful project. I do want to again thank the Federal Government and Provincial Government for their support of this project. The P3 Canada money as well as the Province's nine million dollars, I think is a…is wonderful, and it's not just a good piece of infrastructure for Northeast Winnipeg. It's good for all of North Winnipeg. We're seeing lots of development in communities like Amber Trails and in the northwest. This provides that kind of activity that is so desperately needed in the north of our city. Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

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

Councillor Swandel: I just want to make some comments regarding the financial aspects that have been raised both by Councillor Gerbasi and I think Councillor Vandal referred to the spending like drunken sailors. I think that when we look at this type of spending that we need to look at what our bond raters say, what our Chief Financial Officer says, what our Financial Advisory Team says, our bond raters are aware of this project. They are aware that Disraeli Bridge, they are aware of the P3s that we are doing. We continue to hold our bond rating at the high level at it is. As a matter of fact, one of their best bond ratings of any municipality in the country have a large city in it in the country so I think it's important to realize that and why can they say that, because they know as they go out. They see annual payments of about $90 million starting to drop off and the year 2013 of old debt and in 2013, by 2017, 45 million of that 95 million is all external debt and it will disappear. Those are annual payments. That's not total debt. It's $45 million per year annual of old debt that goes away so you know, let's listen to the wisdom of Moody's and Standards and Poors that are Chief Financial Officer and the rest of the financial advisory team that we have around. Let's not play the boogieman here. Let's not start throwing rhetoric around like this is a P3s so I just won't support it because it's a P3. This is good spending. It's spending that's based on value too, which is something that seems to elude some of our colleagues here, value versus cost, you know, it's that boogieman stuff again, you know. It's a $30 million project…oh wait it's a $60 million dollar project…oh look at it now, it's a 100 million dollar project. Thirty million was a very old unvetted number. Sixty million is a 2008 number I believe that you know, is nowhere near the scope of the project that we're…it's being brought forward today. You tack on reasonable inflation. You see where we're at. We're where we need to be and that's what the numbers are. We also, one of the other things that people need to realize about the finances of a project like this and it's good comparison to do right now given that our tender just came in for the bridge and the station for the Rapid Transit Corridor. You know, it was the one that we did the detail design on. We went out and did the tendering on. That project came in 25 percent over the budget number. This project, the private sector did the detail design on, the numbers came out of the private sector process and it's actually within the budget that we've put forward. So I don't know what to say. I mean, you absorb that kind of inflation and if that 25 percent is indicative of what's going on in the industry for this year. That's pretty scary and if we're locked in these numbers, that's pretty good. If it's an error that was made because of our processes, it's also you can see whether the value is here. So we do have value. We have an understanding by our bond raters, we have the support of our Chief Financial Officer so that's how drunken sailors spend, well, I think we should be spending like drunken sailors but I don't think that's what Councillor Vandal referred to when he meant, when he referred to drunken sailors, he just thinks that people are going off half-cocked where money around. That's not what's going on here. There's a lot of very wise people that are involved in this process, much wiser than I or Councillor Vandal or Councillor Gerbasi or maybe not wiser than the Mayor, we're not sure the book's still out on that but, you know, they're important people to listen to. I think, you know, again, it's sort of more of this opposition for the sake of opposition and a total lack of understanding of value versus cost, I'll leave it at that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Being no further speakers, well, (inaudible) Councillor O'Shaughnessy, close.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: This walked on, hurry up project has another name. It's a piece of something called the Inner Perimeter Beltway that in the 1960s was designed and approved by something you may not remember called metro, which was the government of it predated Unicity. The Inner Perimeter Beltway has four legs, they're north, they're east, they're south and they're west. The east leg was built first, you know it as Route Lagimodiere. The south leg was built second, Bishop Grandin. A piece of the west leg was built. That's called the Bill Clement Parkway. In 1976 when I was a rookie in my first term on Council we expropriated the land on the north side of the Chief Peguis Bridge by the way which is the only piece built of the northerly east-to-west, west-to-east section which may or may not end up being the final section. We expropriated land in 1976 for this. It's not something that was hurried on to a budget. It is in the capital budget and has been for a few years now, this leg of it. And this is a project that we approved in the capital budget and unlike any other project, it's come back here because of the way we're constructing it. This were done in a normal tender process, gone, goodbye, if it was over budget by more than 10%, it would've gone to infrastructure committee, that's all, but because we're doing it in a different way it's here. So nothing is rushed, certainly, nothing is closed. This is the most open project going. Councillor Gerbasi talked what would Bill Clement have thought and that got me thinking because, you know, he wasn't the person behind this no more borrowing, it was Susan Thompson and Bill and I were proud to be her allies in that as were some other Councillors of that day. We did stop that, but, you know what, thank you Councillor Swandel, you numbered things I was going to say. We do have the highest credit rating of any municipality in Canada. As a matter of fact our credit rating, we want to keep it down because it's the same as the Province of Manitoba. We have the same credit rating as Manitoba does, they have sales tax, they have income tax, they have mining royalties, they have all these things and we have none of it and our credit rating is that high and our pension plans fully funded and we have reserves and all these things. Drunken sailors? I'll tell you, we better start spending, maybe double what we spend now minimum. Everybody else is. We're falling behind, our credit rating is in good shape, but you know how they're doing it? A friend of mine I had lunch with yesterday, a friend of yours too, Russ, this engineer just came back from Vancouver, working on a three billion dollar park and ride and interchange, three billion and I said, well, how are they paying for it? He told me and I'll let you in on it, he went and talked about the 407 that his company is working on in Toronto, the 407, more billions, and that…it's…this stuff that's going on across this country is mind-boggling. How are they doing it? They get a little bit of money from the feds and whatever, they're all toll

projects. On my way out the door let me tell you, tolls are going to be the way and they are going to come to Winnipeg. And, you know what, you don't like tollways, you don't have to take them, you can go on our old street system all you want but I think it's coming. P3, you say we're reaching our rope, what's the next phase? The next phase I think is going to be tollways. Anyway, this clause that's here is not something new, it dates back to the 60s. This is leg three finally starting, not all of it because the west side which we're going to have to get permission to go on the new CentrePort roadway, I don't know how we'll ever…they'll ever give us that but this is not new, this is a higher budget because we're doing more. This has a pedestrian cycle component that's the highest of any street transportation project so far in Winnipeg. We've decided to go with an overpass which added basically 50 percent more to the project and that is here. It's all here today and we're voting now but this is good policy in this city for over 40 years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Recorded vote, all right. We'll have a recorded vote. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Orlikow, O'Shaughnessy, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Swandel, Wyatt and Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Nordman.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Thomas and Vandal

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 4.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Motion passed. We do have a motion and it's automatic referral, from Councillor Vandal. Thank you.

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

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

WHEREAS one mandate of the City of Winnipeg Water and Waste department is to ensure proper functioning retention ponds and related drainage systems;

AND WHEREAS the Water and Waste department is responsible for the maintenance of these drainage systems to ensure the city has proper protection in the case of heavy rains, flooding, or other natural events;

AND WHEREAS the Water and Waste department of the city conducts annual maintenance of all retention ponds with regards to removing surface algae and maintaining shorelines;

AND WHEREAS the city rarely, if ever, does underwater inspections of its retention ponds outside of specific service requests;

AND WHEREAS it was determined recently that one retention pond in the city had fairly sizeable debris near the intake pipe that drains this very retention pond, possibly impacting the rate at which the pond drains and impacting the community as a whole;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Water and Waste department enact an annual underwater inspection of all retention ponds in the city to ensure that the intake pipes and drainage infrastructure is operating at its fullest capacity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: By-laws.

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

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I move that the following by-laws read a first time, By-law No. 91/2010, 92/2010 and 94/2010.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 91/2010, 92/2010 and 94/2010.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I move the by-laws numbered 91/2010, 92/2010 and 94/2010 be read a second time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. By-laws numbered 91/2010, 92/2010 and 94/2010.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I move that the rule be suspended by-laws numbered 91/2010, 92/2010, and 94/2010 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS - 2ND AND 3RD READINGS

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I move rule be suspended and By-law No. 76/2010 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 76/2010.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Now you're supposed to move according to this third reading. I think there's an error. I move the By-law No. 76/2010 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Is there a question period for…? We have a question? All right.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Thomas. Question.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. Councillor O'Shaughnessy knows about this question. At the last meeting I asked a question with regard to the litter that's being picked up in the City, and Councillor O'Shaughnessy did consider it unusual that the northeast quadrant was being dealt with differently than the other parts of the City, but this email that he received from the Administration confirms that, however, it does say that the containers are being picked up on the recycling/garbage day along with residential garbage collection, and that is my problem Councillor O'Shaughnessy, is they're not. The person from the Administration who answered it made reference to one specific location that I had mentioned that was near schools, and while that is definitely true, there is also a number of locations along Watt Street as well as a number of locations around Henderson Highway, and I would like assurances that the refuse will actually be picked up because that's the problem. It's supposed to be picked up but it's not being picked up. So if you would get those assurances for me that they will actually do this then I won't have to keep calling.

Councillor Swandel: Contract it out.

Councillor Thomas: It is. That's the problem.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I will attempt to do exactly what you ask. For other members of Council, I only got the answer this week although she had asked the question a month ago and I apologize for not following it up fast enough. But the answer I got basically was we pick it up just as poorly everywhere else. She gets the same rotten service everybody in Winnipeg gets. I don't think it's a satisfactory answer and I did have a little spin on that, but that's roughly

what they said. We'll try, Councillor, to get them to give a more satisfactory answer, one that includes some action to make sure that this litter is taken care of in a proper fashion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any other questions for the Chairman? Being none. I guess we'll move on to Standing Committee for Finance. Councillor Fielding.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
DATED JULY 8, 2010

Councillor Fielding: The hot hot sun. I will introduce, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the report and move adoption of Consent Items 1 and 2 and that's, of course, of Report of July 8th, 2010.

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

Councillor Fielding: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll move that the rules be suspended and that By-law No. 100/2010 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No.100/2010.

Councillor Fielding: Ok, I'll move that By-law No.2000, I'm sorry, 100/2010 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 100/2010.

Councillor Fielding: I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 100/2010 be read a third time and at the same time be passed and order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. No report for Downtown Committee. Question Period, I'm sorry for Finance. Any questions for Finance? Seeing none we'll move on to the Downtown Development Committee. No report, no motions. Councillor Swandel?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ONDOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Swandel: I will move that By-law 82/2010 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 82/2010.

Councillor Swandel: I'll move that By-law 82/2010 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 82/2010.

Councillor Swandel: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law 82/2010 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Any questions for the Downtown Development Committee? Seeing none, we'll move to the Alternate Service Committee. Councillor Browaty.

REPORT OF THE ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 12, 2010

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'd like to move the report of July 12, 2010, move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 5.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Ok. Other than that all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. And I guess Councillor Fielding moves that we adjourn for the day. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Roll Call. Everyone.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 6:18 p.m.