# COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
# Wednesday, December 14, 2011

**The Council met at 9:34 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 Mayes.

## ROLL CALL

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

## INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you. We are joined today by Page Madison Fedyck. Give a wave, Madison. (Applause) Madison attends Glenlawn Collegiate and resides in the ward of North Kildonan. We have today an award to be presented to one of our City of Winnipeg Core of Commissionaires who man our front desk here at City Hall. So if Terry LeBlanc and the gentlemen from the Canadian Core of Commissionaires, Perry and Bob would like to move to the desk here and make a presentation to Terry.

**Bob Chmara and Perry Ramey:** Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mayor, Councillors, ladies and gentlemen. It gives me great pleasure on behalf of the Canadian Core of Commissionaires and our chief executive officer, Mr. Tom Reimer, to make this presentation to Commissionaire Chief Warrant Officer Terry LeBlanc on recognition of his 17 years of service with the core in the City of Winnipeg. The vast majority of that service has been right here in this chamber in that all time. If I could just do one thing, this is probably not be exactly coached but I would like to quote from someone else if I may. “One thing I would say about Terry, he seems to be down-to-earth and ready to accept any challenges we throw at him. I'm positive he would be an asset to the Core and do the job right”. Twelfth of July, 1994, after his record of interview when he joined the Core obviously he has done something right 17 years later. Again, it gives me great pleasure to make this presentation to Terry on behalf of all of us. Thank you very much Sir. (Applause) We wanted to make sure we gave it to him before he heads off to Phoenix so he'll have bragging rights when he gets there.

**Terry LeBlanc:** Thank you, thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Take me, take me! No. Congratulations, Terry. Alright, we would like to move the adoption of the Minutes. Before we do that, Councillor Pagtakhan would like to rise to speak.

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say it’s part of the announcements and I want to say I have the great pleasure of going to the Dufferin School this past Monday, December 12 to talk in front of Mrs. Rodrigues' Grade 1 and 2 class and literally I was in the hot seat and these students, I got to tell you, they are really savvy about their neighbourhood. They asked me a lot of questions, and they told me, and had a lot of observations about their community and just to frame it, Dufferin School is in one of the poorest neighbourhoods in all of Canada, Mr. Speaker and for these kids to really be aware of what's going on with safety, with housing, with the roads and infrastructure, with their parks and playgrounds and requests for more libraries and safety with crosswalks really impressed me and I just wanted to thank Mrs. Rodrigues publicly for inviting me into her class and to see the wonderful work that was taking place there integrating a sort of a civic politics into their whole Grade 1 and 2 curriculum and I want to really applaud that because that’s something that I think that needs to be more emphasized in our school systems. They wrote me a letter but I also have a letter to present on behalf of the school to the Mayor and I would like to ask our Page, Madison Fedyck to present this letter from the Dufferin School students to Mayor Sam Katz. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker Pagtakhan. Seeing that we need to move the Minutes of our November 16 meeting, Councillor Pagtakhan will do so. Read as confirmed. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

All right we have a number of delegations with us today, and Councillor Gerbasi rises.

## DELEGATIONS

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of additional speakers who would like to speak and I note that the second slot for speaking in opposition to Clause 5 of the Report of November 30 was still open so I would

ask that the first person on the list be given that spot, Lynne Fernandez and then there's four or five additional speakers, James Beddome, Professor Chris Leo, Dennis Lewicky, Louise May and Leon Mandamin.

**Mr. Speaker:** That's a total of six.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** So I would ask Council to agree with two-thirds, we require two-thirds for five minutes for each speaker without questions.

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion to suspend the rules to allow additional delegations, all those in favour? Opposed? Motion passed. Alright, the delegations we do have scheduled are three at this point. First we'll invite Elizabeth Fleming on behalf of the Council of Women of Winnipeg in opposition to Item 5 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 30. Elizabeth Fleming. Ms. Fleming. You have 10 minutes.

**Elizabeth Fleming:** Good morning, Mr. Speaker, Mayor and Councillors. Thank you for this opportunity for us to speak on behalf of the Council of Women of Winnipeg. I'm really pleased to be here and speaking in opposition to Item number 5, the Shared Service Agreement from the EPC agenda of November 30. We have a long history going back both Council of Women of Winnipeg and Provincial Council of Women of Manitoba. During the 90's we got quite involved with an urban, rural issues committee which I chaired for many years. We had calls from people out in surrounding municipalities, sometimes as far away as Hanover. Mostly in the capital region we'd hear from people, women, women and men who were very concerned about development proposals in the municipality. They knew we had some background in speaking both to the municipal Councils, planning districts and before the Municipal Board and they would often ask for help and we would go and assist. We may have appeared on occasion to be antidevelopment, but in fact we weren't. We were pro-development but realized that it's all about location, location, location. Where planning is done and where it goes particularly at the development plan level is very important to watch that. Over the years, we saw that there was a lot of areas going into the development plans surround being the municipality, way more supply than there was demand. And this, I'm afraid, over the years because to hasn't been watched very carefully, it's usually done rather quietly and approved by the province. It's happened incrementally that there is a lot of land out there for residential, some of it very low density, and that has, you know, added to the planning woes over the years. We did attend the Municipal Board hearing when Headingley was annexed and I remember hearing from the Mayor Bill Norrie at the time and also the administration, they shared a lot of information at that time, about why they didn't wish to extend water to the Hamlet of Headingley at that time and we were also in opposition to the city getting involved with providing water and sewer to Headingley after that, and for good reason, the Council agreed with us and voted against it. So basically, what we have seen since then is some of the municipalities have through other means found water and sewer and particularly Headingley, MacDonald, they worked on a public/private partnership with two other municipalities, and got water and sewer, and also the RM of East St. Paul had help from the province to put in water and sewer for some of their developments in Springfield as well. In those areas, what you see over the years and nobody really tracks it as well as they should, but when there is water and sewer, I don't think its coincidence, but you do see an increase in population. And what you as Councillors have to realize is that that population increase in those outlying municipalities, comes at the expense of Winnipeg because people hear naturally enough they see that they can get a larger property for less money and they pay, generally speaking, lower taxes. And sometimes they get municipal pipe sewer and water and sometimes they don't. But it is an attraction and it does provide a draw to go out there and it's often people with a bit more money who can afford to run two cars and who do pay what taxes are asked of them and good citizens and they don't have the sort of, you know, what we are facing off in the city with the levels of poverty and the other issues that, really, a lot of us grapple with and try and help. So it's really not in our interests as Winnipeggers to provide incentives for more development, and to have people move out of the city to the surrounding areas, that's number one. The other thing is that this agreement that's in place leaves off one major issue, and it's something that the Council of Women proposed when it was first muted and that was instead of extending services, what the city should do is say to the municipality wanting sewer and water is OK, if you want that, then we need to have the option to annex your municipality and of course that really took the municipalities aback because they didn't want to do that. They wanted to keep going and be independent. But, that is what happens in some municipalities in the United States. And it really means for much more coordinated planning and service delivery and proper tax sharing, which is, you know; people are actually paying their taxes to the City of Winnipeg. That really hasn't been an option here, or at least Councillors don't seem to want it to go there. But if you're, when you are looking at this you really should be considering, well, what if we - that municipality was part of Winnipeg and we were, you know, planning properly and doing it the way we should. And all along, the province, or the city rather, has had the opportunity to go to municipal meetings and planning and have input on development plans, but in our experience it's been hit and miss and it's understandable because first of all the city doesn't want to seem like the heavy hand of big brother telling the municipalities what to do. And also, the planning department is really pretty well kept occupied with what they have to do here in the city. So they don't really get out and they haven't taken the sort of control that they could. So, that is something that could still change and you know, I would recommend it, too. The other part I want to talk about is corruption. And I was very pleased yesterday to hear when Brian Mayes was being introduced and welcomed and congratulations on your new office, very pleased to hear the oath

that was read out by the City Clerk and sworn to right here in front of everybody, and that was to do with taking money that would influence decisions. And it did remind me, a few years ago, I was doing research for an article on joint ventures for the Winnipeg Free Press, and I called up a few people, including the president of the Urban Development Institute, and somewhere along the line in the phone conversation, he said "Oh and Elizabeth, we should find you a little bit of property and have some fun with it". And I was a bit taken aback. It was a proposition I wasn't expecting but it did occur to me that if he was saying that to me he might be saying it to other journalists, to Councillors, to public officials. And it's probably not illegal to do that but it does - it did - it is maybe a temptation for some people, and not really a good idea. I just let it pass. But these are things that do happen, and I have no evidence that it happened here at City Hall. But it can happen; and the one antidote to that is sunlight: it's transparency, it's seeing exactly what is happening and it's for it to come back into a public venue like City Hall and be viewed by all of us and by the public. So, everything that may happen from this shared servicing agreement, if it goes ahead, should definitely be coming back for your review and for public review so that the citizens of Winnipeg know exactly what's happening. It should be accompanied by the planning. We've always said, have the planning on the environmental registry, everything from the development plans to the Municipal Board hearings, make it all open and accountable. It's actually quite hard to find out where these meetings are happening. You have to watch all the little local papers that are advertised otherwise you simply don't know that's something that the planning department could do and make very public. So with that, I would just urge you to decline this, and particularly, leaving it with the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, because it's something that should definitely be visible, with that, thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Ms. Fleming. Any questions? Seeing none - oh hang on. Dan Vandal.

**Councillor Vandal:** Thank you Elizabeth. I've been around for quite a while as well on this very issue, given that the Headingley experience, we know what's happened, you've described it, and we know they've gotten their water from another source, the Province of Manitoba joint private public partnership. Population has arrived in Headingley to some degree, and we as a municipality in the city are completely out of the loop in terms of joint planning, in terms of revenue. There are likely either similar situations in East St. Paul and other municipalities although Headingley is the most glaring. My question to you is, do you not see what is in front of us with the joint planning, with revenue sharing, essentially we're getting 30 per cent of revenue from any development in the West St. Paul region? Do you not see that as an improvement on a file that's been stagnant for many, many years?

**Elizabeth Fleming:** I think my point is that the city does have and has had for years, I mean even from the additional zone committee that you had, years ago; you had the opportunity to have input into planning. That was considered rather overbearing because municipalities didn't like it, they had to come here for planning permission. But, still, I think the city could have done a much better job and still could, in actually keeping the files of what's happening, planning wise, and really speaking to them in a concentrated way. On the revenue sharing, I think, it only - well some of it applies - some of the fees apply to existing pieces but mostly, it's - I mean a lot of it's mostly serviced with water and sewer in the areas that want to go, it's the incremental, it's the new that's going to, you may get some revenues from and I don't really think it's going to be that much unless things take off, and I - I think it just does apply - it's too much of an incentive for them to get going on more development and use it up. So I don't really think that it's worth the City of Winnipeg's while to promote development for what they are getting back. I think you can still do the planning piece and I think you should still be talking to the province a lot. I mean one of the areas that's really egregious is the, a lot of the trucking companies have their offices just on the other side of the road on the boundary, so maybe they're in Rosser or maybe they're in MacDonald, but they are paying taxes to those municipalities. And in this you're proposing that revenues go into regional roads to support those trucks and that doesn't make a lot of sense. I think you really have to you known, get to grips with the province on this and get more involved in the planning side.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Fielding. Oh, oh sec. Sure, sorry.

**Councillor Vandal:** Final question. Just, are you aware that there is a motion on the floor from Councillor Swandel, seconded by myself that all future negotiated service sharing agreements or amended service sharing agreements come back to the floor of this Council for approval by City Council?

**Elizabeth Fleming:** Is that for all of the municipalities in the capital region?

**Councillor Vandal:** Yes. All future municipalities.

**Elizabeth Fleming:** I think that, I didn't know about that amendment.

**Councilor Swandel:** You are out of order, Jenny. That's for debate.

**Elizabeth Fleming:** As long as it includes all municipalities, I think that that would be an improvement and would be really good to have it come back.

**Councillor Vandal:** Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Fielding.

**Councillor Fielding:** Just a question, just in terms of the environmental aspect of this and you look at the current situation that's happening right now outside of the City of Winnipeg and the septic fields and everything else that's going on, what's your opinion of that, the current situation in terms of the environmental aspect that's going on?

**Elizabeth Fleming:** It's a good point. Basically it's municipal and provincial matter and hopefully the province would hold the municipalities to the same environmental standards as they do the city and other municipalities. In many cases they have provided municipal piped sewer through Manitoba Water Services Board and the province helps a fair bit with that. But it has provided municipal pipe, sewer and there are regulations on the books about septic fields and what have you, and it's something that is monitored. A lot of people do move out to the rural municipalities for a rural lifestyle and that's what we've heard over and over again, and in particular, we've heard from farmers who really wanted to continue their operations and they really have a hard time when a subdivision comes in and then the complaints start coming in. So, I think though that the municipalities in the province are doing what they need to do to keep to provincial standards. I don't know that the city should feel responsible for extending services on that account.

**Mr. Speaker:** Second question?

**Councillor Fielding:** Knowing the fact, that there is environmental issues, I think, if you compared the City of Winnipeg's aspect in terms of how we're treating our sewage and everything else like that, verses some of the rural parts, you are talking about raw sewage that's flowing in. Who do you think is doing a better job right now?

**Elizabeth Fleming:** Well it does help to have municipal piped services. I actually have at one point; I saw a map of the Red River corridor between Selkirk and Winnipeg, with a number of red flags which is where the Department of Environment at that time had notices of septic field failures or people just dumping sewage in the drains. I don't know if there is any more vigilance on that but it was Department of Conservation that was keeping an eye on it. And in fact, I think it was students that mapped it. Obviously we've had our problems in the city with sewage disposal and our storm sewer situation is still a problem, so I don't think we are paragons. We are trying and have put a lot of money, effort and time into it. I don't, just don't think we should be taking on an area up to lake Winnipeg and down to, you know, Ritchot and these areas that are prone to flooding and there are major problems environmental wise and I don't know without having the city actually having jurisdiction, and you know, people voting for the City Councillors in those areas, that we should be taking that on. They have their own Councils and their own people that they elect and that was one of the problems with the additional zone that they felt that we are elected, why are we coming to City Council on this? So I think keeping the jurisdictions separate until there is - and there may indeed be, you know, an Unicity round 2 at some point and in which case we'll be looking at a larger piece and heaven help us then because if we think we have got problems with the capital budget, you know, doing up roads in places like Plessis and Sturgeon Creek Road, we'll be further and further out. As I say, it's a huge area. So I still think the annexation road is something the city should explore and then the jurisdictional and environmental issues would be part of City Council's agreement.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any further questions? Seeing none, thank you, Elizabeth. Oh John, no, OK. Alright. Second delegation registered in regard to the parking strategy for downtown, Barbara Judt. You have 10 minutes.

**Barbara Judt:** Alright.

**Mr. Speaker:** Followed by Marty Gold who will have five minutes, so Mr. Gold if you would like to join us.

**Barbara Judt:** OK well, good morning everybody. My name is Barbara Judt and I am the CEO of Osborne House. I'm going to speak a little briefly about Osborne House and then let you know why I'm here today to address you and the Shaw TV audience about the concerns we have about the latest parking subject. Some of you may or may not know that Osborne House is the oldest shelter in Canada and we are the largest shelter in Western Canada and we are in our 39th year of operation. And I know that everybody in this room has been touched by somebody who has experienced domestic violence in their life. And you know the Metro has done a fabulous job lately of highlighting some of the work that we do. We were, I was on the front page of the Metro on Friday, because we are experiencing extreme donor fatigue right now and we also did a big ad in the Monday edition of the Metro, talking about our needs of Osborne House and just giving an overview of the work that we've done over the past year. We do have an established history with the City of Winnipeg, and an example of this is the Mayor's Address. We've been the recipients of the proceeds from the

State of the City, twice. And that's great but City Hall's sensitivity to the concerns of our shelter cannot be measured by that gesture because it falls very, very short of what is needed. On the other hand, last year, a bike lane was imposed on our neighbourhood and that was done without any consultation with any of my neighbours and it had a profound impact on us. We've lost the good will of some of our supporters because they now are inundated with name calling by some cyclists who have a self-entitled sense of ownership on the road. Not all the cyclists and we're not saying that bike paths are a bad thing and we're not progressive because we're very progressive. Ask any of our staff at the shelter as to the changes that have gone on since I've been at the helm. But, our street was not the place for a bike path and as I said a moment ago, my donors sometimes the cyclists think they are in the way and they get called vial names and I myself have been insulted on a daily basis by the cyclists. And this is all thanks to a project that did not involve any consultation of our neighbourhood. So now, I understand there is, there is a topic going on about some changes with parking in the downtown area, and when I looked to see who had had this project run by them, I - our organization, which - whose address will remain anonymous, we weren't consulted once again and we're back where we were a year ago. Any of you can check with the good Mayor about the number of e-mails that I sent to him. I would refer to them as love letters, but they were very strongly worded. And I just fail to understand why we find ourselves back in the same spot we were a year ago. I understand that Kevin Nixon had provided to the Uniter that the bike paths were used tons this past summer so I'm going to be following up with Mr. Nixon, asking him to translate what tons means in his world. I'm pretty sure he and I have a different opinion and my Board of Directors has also interested in obtaining this data. I'm at work on a daily basis and I don't see tons of people riding up and down the bike path, so - the bike path was a fiasco in my Board's opinion and all of us at Osborne House, it was a fiasco and yet, you know, our pleas went unheard. A couple of changes got made but in the end of the day we weren't consulted. Everybody got paid for a job well done. So, one of the things I want to touch on as well, you know, it appears that nothing was learned from last, from last year's bike fiasco, and Marty Gold was here to speak on our behalf last week, I believe it was, yeah last week. And I had asked him to address our concerns of the shelter because while Marty was here, addressing City Council on our behalf and passing on my opinions I was on the phone with 911 because we had somebody trying to kick our front door in, to get into the shelter because they thought somebody was in our facility. That is not unusual to happen at our building. It is not unusual to say to people “if you don't leave, we're calling the police.” And the good police service here in Winnipeg, they take amazing, amazing care of us. They are, they are incredible. But what we're asking here is why hasn't there been any consultation done again? Why hasn't that happened? How hard is it to meet with the neighbourhood and get by, and instead of me having to take time out of my day, when I don't have enough hours in the day to do what it is I need to do, and be down here? Right now, we consider it to be our harvest time, donations are coming in on a regular basis but because of the bike lane problem, my donors who have been the recipients of this tirade of vile language, ask me to meet them outside. So, that takes time out of my day. That never ever should have happened. We lost parking; we have had to figure out a parking arrangement now with our neighbour because there was some discussion going on between the city and the province and that fell off the rails, so we feel the impact of that. And you need to understand that while you are making decisions here in Council, your decisions are having real impact on people out in the City of Winnipeg. I know Paula Havixbeck, you and I haven't yet connected via telephone but we will, because I would love for you to come down and see our shelter and see the challenges that we’ve had. We've had a few people from the city come down, Brad Sacher has been down and Mike Ruta has been down and I think them coming down to our building was quite an eye opener. You know, I know that Councillor O'Shaughnessy had admitted on Marty's show that the bike lane was not enacted legally and with this parking change that comes into play, you know, are there going to be more meters installed? Are we losing parking? Are we gaining parking? Because with the bike path, we lost some parking; and I tried to get some of that instilled back, and without any success. So, you know, I need to you act on your principles; I need you to be people of your word. I need you to be able to say with clarity and truth, yes, we did consult with them. I speak to my neighbours all the time who are also incredible supporters of the work that we do and nobody has been consulted. So now again, what’s going to happen with the South Broadway neighbourhood? Many of you know that there was a group of us last year that pooled some resources together to take legal action against the city. Well we don't have an endless pot of cash. These are small business owners and this is a not for profit shelter and I would have sooner not had to take my share of dollars and put it towards that. And in the end we had to cut our losses because nobody had the resources, financially, or the time, to come down and fight city hall on this. So, you know, if you were guided by principles, you can't pass off half-baked plans and that's not meant as an insult. That is meant that you have to plan thoroughly. You got to have appropriate terms of reference so that when I ask for them, when I ask how something was done, I can be handed a document. I asked for terms of reference and how the bike lane consultations were done and it's been a year and I've never received anything yet. So that tells me, as we know, nothing happened. Our neighbours are wonderful supporters of the work we do at Osborne house. Very often if something strange is going on they call me to make sure everything is OK. We're a tight knit group of people and we need to be included in the process and not experience another disaster in our neighbourhood. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you. Any questions? Seeing none we'll invite Marty Gold up.

**Barbara Judt:** Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** No problem. Five minutes, sir.

**Marty Gold:** Well firstly, say a greetings to our newest member here. I don't think I've ever met you. But you might become familiar with me in the future and you may be familiar with the work I've done in the past. What Barb Judt has just addressed on behalf of Osborne House is the subject of public consultation and this is the elephant in the room that is not going away. Now her references to the bike lane were significant because, as you know, a claim was made by the consultants and by your city staff that the proper public consultations had been done, that key stakeholders had been met with and clearly there is a core group in the South Broadway area that did not somehow meet the definition of key stake holders even though some of those businesses and services have been there for years. This problem must be addressed by Council. Now how it relates to the downtown parking strategy, as I explained to the Executive Policy Committee last week is simple. Here is the list of who was consulted: Parking Authority, Winnipeg Transit, Public Works, Corporate Finance, Corporate Support Services, Legal Services Department, CentreVenture Downtown Winnipeg Business in the Exchange District Biz. None of which represents social service agencies whatsoever. And in the - and by any definition that I can tell, does not represent the residents. And yet, a parking strategy has been somehow formulated without any public consultation, without any consultation to businesses or the neighbourhoods that could be affected. Now I harken back as I did at the Executive Policy Committee last week once again, to the comments made on I believe it was March 23 in this chamber by some of you. Although not Councillor Orlikow so he is free to get about. Councillor Fielding, “I think it is very important that there will be public consultations as part of the process. What's important is the public consultation, I to hear for sure what they have to say before any final decisions are made in terms of some parking fees or what goes up”. Councillor Browaty thanked me for bringing some of these issues to your attention in the past and I'll touch on those in a moment. Councillor Wyatt told the story of meters being tossed on to a street with no consultation. He liked the idea I brought forward with regards to an advocate or agent so there was an actual Complaint Department of the Parking Authority. As opposed to what happens with people like Phil Fletcher, who get a ticket, the ticket is squashed but the lien placed on his vehicle for fighting them over a single ticket was not removed and he has to take time out of his life, and his day, and his expense to go to court where the Parking Authority doesn't have any expense, or any penalty, or face any consequence because you pay for their lawyer! That hasn't been addressed in this parking strategy. And then the Mayor himself, saying that you know, he wishes the Parking Authority would be proactive because some of this stuff can be rectified with a phone call, on the phone in three or four minutes. Now, by coincidence on December 1st I happen to send an e-mail to Councillors Fielding, Browaty, Councillor Smith my good friend, Mr. Wyatt, Councillor Orlikow, without knowing that this parking strategy was coming forward here to Council. Where I took note that Stephano Grande had made a remark on Twitter about having had a great meeting with the Parking Authority and that it's wonderful has such access but the general public to this day, no matter what you promised in March, has had zero access to the Parking Authority. There are no non-big shots on the Board. Everybody that I recall being on the Parking Authority Board has some connection to something, but none with connections to human beings, the ones who pay the freight. Now a strategy comes forward as I put in the e-mail without knowing this strategy was coming forward, does the WPA intend to hold meetings with the public at the last minute to ward off opposition, cloaking themselves with the notion that quote stakeholders are all on side and present their plan as fait de complet or do they intend to thwart the will of Council, skip the directive you set out and hope you do not catch on? Do not the little people deserve a say? There are thousands of listeners of my podcast, although smaller in number than when I was on radio, who are no less concerned about the fairness and accountability in the city then they were before. I am sure as I put in the e-mail, you will respect their views and will take action that would validate the belief that when I take time out of my day to come here and represent the views of Osborne House, of other organizations, agencies, institutions and individuals, who care about public process, and I come down here and I hear assurances such as were voiced in March by Councillor Fielding, Councillor Browaty and Councillor Wyatt, and the private assurances I've heard from other members of this chamber. One way or the other, you meant what you voted for and you'll make sure that WPA engages in proper consultation and if the management can't bring themselves to meet voluntarily meet face-to-face with the people, that you order it. And therefore, with 30 seconds left, I will tell you my position is this: the Downtown Parking Strategy may look like a wonderful document, but there is a key ingredient missing that it sure sounded to me and everybody else watching on Shaw TV in March was going to be part of it: public consultation. Are you going to accept that document knowing there has been no discussion with the public and frankly, no discussion from what I can tell with the taxi companies who is supposedly are going to be integrated into this, or are you just going to once again let this, these bureaucracies do whatever they want and then try to patch it up later, because you've seen how successful, and I mean that with great sarcasm, that’s been with relation to Osborne House and any change to the downtown parking will affect the most vulnerable in society, those women and children who are victims of domestic violence as well as many others that reside in the neighbourhood. That is the message I'm bringing to you today. Public consultation should have been part of this, it was promised to the public and that should be debated here before this plan is approved. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thanks Mr. Gold. Any questions for Marty Gold? Seeing none, we’ll say thank you and continue with our delegations. Moving to the additional six individuals, we will first ask Lynne Fernandez, are you with us, Lynne? And I will give in order so that the folks are ready to move forward after five minutes. There will be no questions for these next

individuals. James Beddome, Chris Leo. Dennis Lewicky, Louise May and Councillor Leon Mandamin. So that will be the order if you would be prepared to follow quickly. Lynne Fernandez. You have five minutes.

**Lynne Fernandez:** Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Speaker, Mayor and Councillors. The Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives is concerned about the new proposal, the new policy to share water and sewer services with ex urban municipalities. We worry that this policy could have significant financial implication for Winnipeggers that it will encourage unsustainable environmentally damaging behavior and the means by which it will be implemented lacks transparency although it seems, given the comments of Councillor Vandal, that this has been addressed this morning but we didn't know that before we prepared our presentation. In order to put the proposed development into perspective we contrasted it with the recommendations by the city's own city consultations in the Call to Action Report. Report participants expressed a strong preference for commuting responsibly by expanding rapid transit and human powered traffic, enhancing urban spaces through increased urban density, preservation of agricultural land, development of pocket parks and expanding local businesses - the key being local businesses, and switching to smart infrastructure to reduce cost and stress on the environment. The policy you will be voting on today, to negotiate with ex urban municipalities for the expansion of water and sewer services represents a step away from the kind of development Winnipeggers want. First of all, deals of this sort may have significant impact on Winnipeg's revenues and development patterns, two concerns which should fall under the watchful eye of City Councillors who are elected to protect our best interests. Now, I'm glad to learn that Councillors will now have the ability to learn the details of future contracts and debate their implications. There will, and so now there will be more transparency and oversight to ensure that these deals make financial and environmental sense. Winnipeggers should be concerned on both counts. Many people move from Winnipeg to municipalities like West St. Paul so they can enjoy more luxurious homes while paying lower taxes and businesses do the same because they can pay lower taxes there. Most of these people and businesses still work in Winnipeg and do business in Winnipeg and so use our infrastructure heavily without contributing to its upkeep by paying city taxes. Although we do not yet know what sort of costing will be offered in these - to these municipalities, it is likely that they will be able to free ride on Winnipeg’s lower cost to provide water and sewer services without contributing a fair portion for its upkeep. So not only do the Winnipeg taxpayers end up subsidizing ex urbanites but our tax revenue - revenues diminish every time a Winnipegger or a business relocates. Modern cities should be increasing density and preserving surrounding farming and wild areas. This proposed policy will make it easier for bedroom communities to flourish and enlarge our environmental foot print. More cars will commute back and forth on more regional roads and fewer people will use and contribute to less polluting public transit. It’s unlikely that these contracts will have a mechanism to encourage conservation of water, thereby allowing the municipalities to drain precious resources even further. The 40,000 Winnipeggers who participated in the Call To Action and OurWinnipeg consultations were hopeful that the city would take concrete action towards a more sustainable, democratic and modern city. If this policy goes through, the city will be working against that goal. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Ms. Fernandez. James Beddome.

**James Beddome:** Mr. Speak.

**Mr. Speaker:** Five minutes.

**James Beddome:** Mr. Speaker, Your Worship, City Council. Thank you very much for having me here today. As you probably know, I am the leader of the Green Party of Manitoba and I'm here to speak against the idea of extending waste, waste water services out to neighboring municipalities. Firstly just to put on the record, I will say that when I attended some consultations on updated public land use policies in 2009, I also raised objections to this. Some of these issues obviously deal with how the province is going to deal with how we deal with our effluent. But one of the things the Green Party of Manitoba believes firmly in is that we need alternative systems to deal with, let's face it, our daily trip to the bathroom. So let's just put this into context here quickly for you guys. When we're talking about non-industrial waste water sources, offices and homes, 90 plus per cent of the nitrogen and the phosphorous comes from our daily trips to the bathroom. So the point I want to, point I want to drive home here is that if we look at what’s known as point-source diversion, meaning we try to deal with those as close to the point of source as possible, we can make great gains. Now I recognize in a large city like Winnipeg that's challenging. And I know that's not something that’s going to happen overnight, but that's something we have to work on long term planning on. But the idea of extending our sewage systems out to rural municipalities would undermine that, in my opinion because rural areas is where these systems will make the most sense. Now, I’m going to be able to spend a ton of time on that, and I would be happy to discuss further with that with any of you should you wish. But what I also can see is that if you extend the waste water and sewage systems out there and particularly if money goes to capital budget for roads, it's pretty clear it’s going to result in urban sprawl. And we're going to extend the city outward and that means we'll extend our infrastructure further outward. It's worth noting that Winnipeg is about roughly the same geographic area of Montreal and about roughly a quarter of the population. What that means is we have a quarter of the tax base to maintain our infrastructure. This is only going to continue to undermine that. I'm also really consider, I’m really concerned about this thought that we have surplus

capacity in our sewage system. Forgive me if I'm wrong but if I go on the City of Winnipeg website there's constant reminders that we at times dump raw sewage into our waterways. This was also highlighted by the Deputy Minister of Water Conservation, Dwight Williamson, in the Winnipeg Free Press. So I'm kind of wondering where this magic surplus capacity is coming from? It doesn't make any sense to me and I don't think it makes sense to other people and if we have surplus capacity we also need to keep in mind that this city has a plan to grow its population base so how long will that surplus capacity going to exist for? So, I think there is a considerable problem with that that needs to be looked at. I'm not so sure that this proposal is, in fact, going to generate revenue for the city. I think if you look at the long-term implications it will cost the city money. But even if it does raise money for the city, why would we put it towards roads? As I said I am not in favour of extending the waste water sewage facilities, but to put it towards roads seems to make no sense when, do I need to remind this Council that for years, you know, they've been haggling with the province and trying to avoid or struggling to find the money to upgrade our waste water treatment facilities. So, it seems to me if there was any revenue, which I don't necessarily believe there will, it should actually go back into the sewage infrastructure itself. I mean that would seem to be logical. So, I also am happy to hear there were some amendments to make these agreements transparent. These are government to government agreements if we do move forward with them and I see no reason why they shouldn't be a matter of public record and I'm happy to hear they will come back before City Council so I hope that that motion itself is able to pass, if City Council is going to move forward with this, what I would say is an unsustainable and nonsensical idea. I will just say, I'll summarize in short, I think I've made my points clear that I don't think extending our infrastructure outward is the plan we need. What we need to do is, we don't need to build our city outward, we need to build it upwards and we need to increase density. That is how we can drive our city forward and this policy undermines that. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Mr. Beddome. Chris Leo. You have five minutes sir.

**Christopher Leo:** Thank you. Yes, well I guess I should start by apologizing for failing to appear yesterday even though my name was on the list. It was entirely my fault and I'll do my very best to ensure nothing like that happens again. Mr. Speaker, Your Worship, members of Council, I'm going to start by directing your attention to something that I'm sure you all know very well, and that there is - namely, that there is a metropolitan wide market for land - for opportunities and development, and one of the most important factors in that is water supply. Water supply in a municipal sewage system that goes with it. So that what you are doing when you start to extend Winnipeg's excellent water supply and sewage system into adjacent municipalities is that you are drastically tilting the balance of power in that market. In just about every other respect, adjacent municipalities have everything on Winnipeg, for suburban and semi-rural types of residential development, the Winnipeg, the adjacent municipalities have got more the opportunity of living closer to nature, they have less social problems. They have good education systems. There is really nothing that Winnipeg has on them other than that water supply. Once the water supply is available on the same terms and conditions in adjacent municipalities as it is in Winnipeg, I think we can take for granted that some developers who've made land purchases throughout the metropolitan area will say, "Well I guess we don't have to bother to start this development in Winnipeg right now, we can start it in one other another municipality adjacent to Winnipeg" and unquestionably, that leads to urban sprawl. But, so I don't know if Winnipeg, I just learned today from Councillor Vandal that that apparently there is a 30 per cent revenue share from new developments that will hook into the water system. If that's true obviously there's been serious bargaining that's taken place. But, but the point that I want to stress is that that not only does this this move have the potential to undermine the viability of the city, but also, and this is particularly important, we in the academic community are often accused of being in ivory towers, but we do pay attention to other places. And so I'm going to cite to you the example of Detroit, which was arguably the liveliest city in North America and far wealthier than Winnipeg after World War II with a downtown that was a happening thing. And they decided to sell their water, start selling their water to adjacent municipalities. Well the rest is history. You go to, if you go to Detroit now its large numbers of empty buildings, empty streets, empty lots in the downtown and repeated efforts to try to revive it, well what they are down to now is urban agriculture. They think maybe they can turn Detroit into farming to farming area. This happened only within a couple of decades so I really want to stress to City Council that that once you set these forces in motion, they can escalate very fast and you can lose totally lose control of them. I think both City Council and the provincial government have an obligation to consider these matters seriously and to make sure they are not getting themselves into a situation that's going to run out of their control. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Professor Leo. Dennis Lewicky, Social Planning Council. You have five minutes.

**Dennis Lewicky:** Good morning Mr. Mayor and Councillors, my name is Dennis Lewicky as you know and I am the new Executive Director of the Social Planning Council and today I'm speaking on behalf the Board of the Directors. We would like to express our concerns with the motion that was originally on the agenda, number 5. With the amendment I think the part that's been changed, they negotiate and finalize, with that amendment I think we would like to speak in favour of that amendment. But I think that there are underlying arguments are pertinent to your to your discussion. Basically, we feel that if that original motion had been put forward and approved, you would be in effect contradicting what is in OurWinnipeg, the city plan, because instead of providing leadership on important community development issues, you

would be basically contributing to urban sprawl, and I would say eviscerating of the city's central core. While the motion before you at that time looked straightforward, I think they it was not a mere technical instruction as it has major policy implications as you've heard and could possibly affect thousands of Winnipeggers and affect the city budget. Very briefly, I would like it use the five principles for the service sharing agreements that you have in the city policy. Now, part of it, part of our discussion here is on the CAO responsibilities but the other points are relevant to the new motion. First, these agreements must be government to government and I think that the change in the policy will deal with that because we thought that that would have been a problem. Second, these agreements must be consistent with cities existing and future capacity to provide the service. Considering that there is under-utilized property and options for major core city development that will need water and service infrastructure and transportation support, I don't think this principal can be seriously met currently nor, likely in the future. Third, these agreements must be founded on strong business - on a strong business case. Who is going to provide these business cases? And how can an under staffed and under resourced city administration assure that these are appropriate, thorough and in the public interest? I suspect that it will mean more consultants working and those that who do not have the same credentials as public employees. Fourth, these agreements must incorporate a joint planning agreement to manage development and related environmental concerns. Again, how can the - this be done by a city planning department that has had its capacity slashed? While there was 27 staff in the department in 2008, there are now 14. In 2005, the planning department was able to do six secondary plans. In 2006 there were only four, and currently, the department can handle about one secondary plan a year. And finally these service sharing agreements must include a provision for revenue sharing so that both the city and the partnering municipalities share in the costs and benefits. This is where we were concerned about the CAO responsibility because without oversight opportunity we thought this would not be possible, that it was up to the Council to provide that kind of oversight and scrutiny, both in terms of seeing the agreements and having the ability to approve these agreements. In short, the potential consequences of the motion could jeopardize existing services, increase the city costs and provide for more development outside city limits. Now, in OurWinnipeg in the section on city building, it states "we need to strike a balance between growing out and growing up". Offering choices from traditional single family neighbourhoods, to more dense forms of urban housing and new neighbourhoods designed around a rapid transit system. We believe that the motion that you had before does not follow this direction and that it does not meet the standards of the five principals for service sharing agreements. We see the city is saying one thing and could be doing another. We believe in a way, that the Council was aiding and abetting urban sprawl. Instead, we would like to see Council addressing the very real issues of inner city development before expanding to the capital region. We think Council should focus on city needs and develop properties with major potential, such as capon barracks and the CP rail yards. And by the way when Council does develop or does decide to develop these properties, I would like to offer the services of the Social Planning Council. In conclusion we think Council should play a leadership role in urban development and not pass the buck. Take responsibility and address the serious issues of residents with appropriate planning, public consultation, management and oversight this can be done. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Mr. Lewicky. Louise May. Five minutes.

**Louise May:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Mayor and Councillors. Thank you for expanding the list today and allowing me to speak. My name is Louise May; I am an owner and operator of a farming business on the outskirts of the city but within the city limits. It's a 160-acre farmland, which I've been developing over the last eight years as a model of sustainable farming. I'm also have been involved and am in leadership in the community with the St. Norbert Art Centre developing that site as a historical site for the last 25 years. I've also recently, since the civic election, been on this Council of Canadians; I am their treasurer and have been actively involved there. And in the last 60 days, the last crazy 60 days, I have been actively involved in the organizing team of Occupy Winnipeg which, by the way, is a growing community and a definitely a self-organizing body looking at the very issues that we are talking about today. And a lot of very smart, disgruntled people are actively organizing as a voice, which is very exciting to me as a life-long activist in the community. I wish to address the issue of municipal services as it's something that is very near and dear to my heart and also very much a concern in our area of St. Norbert. We are still within the city limits, but we see much of the development around us and both sides, both coming from the Waverley West and from the municipalities to the south. And we are very much, those of us who are working in this area, and I include other family farming businesses and small enterprises that have taken up the task of developing green businesses that can really help us pave the way towards a vision of the future. I don't feel that developing large scale housing in areas that are prime agricultural land is a very good use of that agricultural land. We need to feed our people, and we need to develop small businesses that can use those agricultural lands to intensify and to make that food source available to the City of Winnipeg. And densifiying our city is obviously the right way to go. We've heard that from every other panelist in discussion here. We really when I was preparing last night about this, I was I was quite angry at what I thought was going to be on the plate today, which was really much an expanded power base for the Mayor and the EPC to circumvent some of the democratic processes that we at least have here, and allow these decisions to be made at a so-called administrative level which really, to me, means concentration of political power. And why is that power important? Why? Because you have this group of developers and that are very much controlling a lot of the way our development is happening in this city, and they are being facilitated and maneuvered to set up more large scale housing for whom? The wealthy people of Winnipeg. This

doesn't make any sense to me. So I very much, I appreciate that that has been struck from the proceedings today, that we will not be doing that, but it does, it does show the intent, and where you are going, and Mayor Sam, you might be in the one per cent, but the rest of us are in the 99 per cent and we don't want to have, you know, look at the big picture. If the economic global bubble bursts and we have a housing bubble that's going to burst at some time, where are we going to be? How are going to we feed our people? How are we going to provide the necessary aspects of life that we need? We need a vision and people like myself are providing you with vision, with our blood, sweat and tears by creating models that you can look at and see, that are tangibly working and we would like you to pay attention. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Ms May. And our last speaker, Councillor Leon Mandamin, from Shoal Lake. You have five minutes, sir.

**Councillor Leon Mandamin:** Bonjour. (English not spoken here, First Nations spoken here) … Good morning, Mayor, City Council. I am from the Iskatewizaagegan First Nation also known as Shoal Lake 39, in Ontario, where Winnipeg gets their water from. I am opposed, just like my people back home, with expansion of water and sewer services to RMs around Winnipeg. The taking of water from my lake has created poverty for my people. We are still waiting to be properly consulted and accommodated for the poverty that Manitoba and Winnipeg has inflicted on my people. We will not allow this theft to continue. The governments of Manitoba and Winnipeg cannot ignore us anymore. We will not go away. We hope, on behalf of my Nation, we hope that you guys can pave the way through good negotiation. Ironically, I'm drinking the water from Shoal Lake this morning.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor. Alright and that concludes our delegations for this morning. We will now move to the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 30. Mayor Katz.

## REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED NOVEMBER 30, 2011

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the Report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 5, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Item 2. And we have Motions on 5 and 1. Alright so that tells me we're OK with 3 and 4? No, Brian just did 1. Alright. So seeing no requests for debate on 3 and 4, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

**Clerk:** Item number 2?

**Mr. Speaker:** No, Item 1.

**Clerk:** 1?

**Mr. Speaker:** Yeah.

### Item 1 - City of Winnipeg's Compliance with French Language Services Obligations - 2009 and 2010 Report

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. Very briefly I just want to commend the efforts of the French Language Services staff here, I haven't read their report, it did strike me but there is a provision there about City of Winnipeg staff and eligibility for French Language training and I was listening to Councillor Vandal on French CBC as I drove in this morning and his eloquently bilingual address there made me think I do want to ask if Councillors including myself would be eligible for that program as we all know, the St. Vital is 20 per cent bilingual, much higher than the city average and certainly something during the campaign I made some undertakings on to improve my own level of French. So I just wanted to confirm this can now be responded to some later date that Councillors have similar eligibility for the French language training.

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, I really don't know for sure if the answer is yes or no, but I would be happy it look into that, and Councillor Vandal may know that I will follow up and get the answer for Councillor Mayes. I would be happy to do that and I'm sure we can do that very quickly Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you no further comments or discussion on number 1? Seeing none. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item number 2.

**Item 2 - Request for Loan Guarantee - Assiniboine Park Conservancy Inc. – Journey to Churchill Project**

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Havixbeck.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Thank you. I just wanted to speak to my support and encourage everyone to support this project and just to reiterate that with this loan guarantee, the City of Winnipeg is ensuring that a project that has been announced and funded by the Province of Manitoba is going to go ahead, and were it not for this loan guarantee, this project could be delayed seriously or could not actually go ahead. And so, I just wanted to reiterate that it is the city who is stepping up to the plate to provide this, and this is an amount that is consolidated in our financial statements and does show as a debt item on our books. So those were my only comments.

**Mr. Speaker:** Seeing no further comments regarding Item 2 of the Report of November 30. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Alright Item 5 has been set aside and we have a number of Motions and we will ask the Mayor to proceed. Yes, Councillor Pagtakhan.

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** We have three Motions Mr. Speaker on Item number 5. Will you be allowing all three Motions to be heard?

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Gerbasi is our...

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Maybe I could, just before.

**Mr. Speaker:** Yeah.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** And give him another 10 minutes.

**Mr. Speaker:** Speak to that.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** I, originally, was advised that the motion was the same as my motion. But I hadn't seen the Motion Number 1, but having seen Motion Number 1, I see that yes, it has all future agreements finalized by Council except West St. Paul. So they are asking us to approve a deal that's already been made in Motion number 1 whereas, excuse me I have the floor, Councillor Swandel. Excuse me, I would just like to finish thank you, Councillor Swandel. I'm pointing out the motions are not the same motions, but yet at the same time, I don't want the third motion, they are similar, I don't want the third motion which is about the motion from Councillor Pagtakhan to be lost. And I notice that the procedure by-law says. Excuse me, the procedure by-law was sent to me by the clerk says that you can't have three amendments, you can only have two, and I guess if we had two-thirds of Council to suspend rules, we can then hear all three. On a matter as important as this it's two motions or three motions amendments. I don't really see why we couldn't do that, Mr. Speaker. If two-thirds of Council is willing to support all three motions, I would like to ask them to do that before I withdrawing one of the other two motions.

**Mr. Speaker:** Fair enough. We'll make an attempt here to suspend the rules so we can receive all three motions regarding Item 5. So, we need a two-thirds majority here. So all those in favour? Opposed? The yeas have it. Mayor Katz.

**Item 5 - Water and Sewer Service Sharing with Neighbouring Municipalities**

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's a, first of all I think as most people would know this has been a discussion that's been going on for a long, long time. Well over a decade. The other realities are we know most of us know the facts on this matter and I was quite surprised that some of the delegations weren't totally aware of the details, but I'm glad they were here today to get them clarified. Number 1, let's all accept what reality is today, factual reality. The City of Winnipeg is growing and the capital region is growing. They are both growing and the projections are for them to continue to grow. Let's look at what happened with the great debate on the floor of Council in Headingley. When the city refused the service on a tie vote, the province came up with the money and now they have the services that are required and there is growth in Headingley. Let's look at the other RMs right now. Right now the province has given them carte blanche to do the development. We have zero input whatsoever on a regular basis, I've heard of this floor of Council, urban sprawl, urban sprawl, urban sprawl. Well the province gave them that ability, gave them that opportunity, without any input from the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker. So what is really happening here? Several things: number 1, I think it's important that the city have a say in the development. I think that's extremely important. And with this motion, Mr.

Speaker around this proposal, there is say. Our people are sit down with theirs and there will be orderly development. That's number 1. Number 2, Mr. Speaker, revenue sharing. It's been mentioned already, 30 per cent. There is the one time fees of $3,000.00 and up. There is the annual of $200,000.00 plus inflation. So, Mr. Speaker, this is a situation where we can have orderly growth and also get some revenue. Neither of which we have today. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I found it interesting that some of the delegations kept bringing up amalgamation; well Mr. Speaker I can tell you with the great CentrePort debate amalgamation came up there. The province was nowhere to be found, has no interest. So it's nice to talk about it, but everybody should know that in order to even discuss that, the province has to give its blessings and those blessings are not there. In addition to that, yesterday on the floor of Council, I heard some Councillors talk about having a co-operative working relationship with the Province of Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is something that the Province of Manitoba very much wants to see happen. So now I'll hear from everybody else and we'll have a very good discussion. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you. So as we go forward in this discussion we will be, Mr. Clerk are we going to be dealing with all 3? OK. So Councillor Swandel we are going to ask you to introduce your motion. Thank you.

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. The motion is pretty straightforward. It just talks about because much has been made of the fact that this is delegating the authority to the CAO. Just that any future service agreements come back to Council. We currently have the West St. Paul service sharing agreement I think pretty well ready to go. We've been in that negotiation for quite a long time now so the parameters that are set out here exactly what that contract reflects. So just to get the boogieman politics out of the road of every contract at the end of the world there is something corrupt going on. This sort of clears that up and gets that off the table. So, it's very straightforward and very simple. The reason we left West St. Paul in there is because it's basically the agreement that's attached, the terms that are right here, and that's the one we're using as the template. So it gets that done and gets Lake Winnipeg looked after, you know, I guess I have to talk about both right now I don't get a chance to come back and talk about - what's that? I can talk to the greater clause after? OK. So yeah, that's all this is just taking the politics out of it and getting down to saving the lake and river as the province has asked us to do as the capital region people have asked us to do and get these principles moving forward as FCM and other organizations have asked us to do.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. I am pleased that in introducing my motion that it's similar to the motion moved by Councillor Swandel. I recognize it's similar. I recognize and appreciate that obviously the Mayor and Councillors on EPC have heard from the public and from some of us on Council that these agreements are government to government. They are public documents. There is no reason that they should not come forward to Council. In fact, any such agreement from another Council, if it was going into a service sharing agreement even in Manitoba or one of the other municipalities, it would automatically come to their Council for full and rigorous discussion. Like our processes are pretty bad. I mean, this particular whole policy hasn't really had a lot of rigorous discussion I would point out. I mean it appeared on an agenda, November 20 or 30. I was out of town. There was a seminar the day following that, so you know, there hasn't really been a lot of good process. So, this is to ensure that things come back to Council which is good. I'm not sure, and it does include the, my motion includes all agreements so how it differs from the other amendment, is that it includes West St. Paul and I'm not sure why we would exclude West St. Paul. I understand it might be similar to the terms in there but the devil is in the details of the terms. And there are a lot of unanswered questions. For example, the policy framework doesn't actually clarify all the extent of the development that's going to happen; how many hookups we're talking about and such things like that, specific land uses, what type of development and all those things aren't really that clear to us and we haven't really had a rigorous Council discussion about that, so I don't know why we wouldn't allow the West St. Paul one to come forward and even have a proper seminar on it before we come for a vote and actually really look at what that means. I know there was a quick seminar after it was already voted on in EPC when you can't make any changes to the policy. I don't believe we've had a discussion, a really thorough discussion about this policy now that we've had a couple of weeks to be aware of it. It's a pretty significant decision to have a policy like that, like this that opens up this door. There is a lot more to be said about the door we're opening up later. I mean it's just simply introducing the amendment which is saying why Council needs to discuss the whole overall policy at this point. We know that we're opening up service land that's attractive to businesses and residents to relocate outside of Winnipeg. I didn't note in the policy an explanation or a thorough analysis of the business case of how much of our tax base is going to be lost when people move to these more attractive areas with water and sewer, large lots, lower taxes, et cetera. So, you know, I don't think the policy itself is it's a good guideline for the administration to go out and to negotiate. But I still believe that all of these agreements, even the West St. Paul one, should come back to Council. I mean, I am really pleased that you actually listened. But one of the delegations pointed out that it's kind of concerning that you would even consider accepting a policy like this and not have it come back to Council to debate at all in the first place and I think that kind of shows kind of, you don't really see Council as having a significant role in these issues or you don't maybe grasp the importance of these issues and the implications. Like there is a policy here and there are general principles here but there are many questions that are unanswered. And, of course, my speech that I

had all prepared yesterday is - I'm having to sort of wing this because it's a different situation now that you've listened to us. So very well done. I guess it's my day to be rattled and yesterday was your day. But I am really pleased that these other things will come back to Council. I would also like to add that when they do come back to Council, there should be a better process than winging something on an EPC agenda, having a Council seminar after EPC's already decided on the matter, having it when Councillors are out of town on city business with little notice and things like that and where is the public input into it? You know if we're going to decide to expand services outside of the city even if we have a policy in place, there should be a public process, I don't think the public was very engaged in this and many of the delegations have reflected the OurWinnipeg process and how there was a vision for a city that came from that but doesn't seem to be reflected in this direction. We're making this a priority to help the province out on their capital region problems; we're making it a priority to help our capital region friends with their problems. In the meantime, our own problems are not dealt and I know Councillor Pagtakhan will be introducing another motion about putting all the money from this into regional roads, so I'll leave that to him at this point. I understand I do have a chance to speak to the overall issue after. So I'm asking rather than support the first motion, which has all the agreements come back to Council except West St. Paul, because I know the delegations were a little confused about what was really happening because it wasn't made that clear. I would suggest you support the second motion which has even the West St. Paul agreement come back for further scrutiny which would give opportunity for the public to ask questions. But honestly I think the whole policy hasn't had enough questioning and enough debate but I'll get into that afterwards. So thank you, Mr. Speaker; I hope that explains the amendment.

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

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** Thank you Mr. Speaker and I want to thank this Council for suspending the rules and allowing the third motion to be heard and I want to thank Councillor Gerbasi for seconding the motion. This motion really takes aim at the implications of the recommendation in the report, Mr. Speaker contained on page 3 and the implications of the recommendations of this report it says the revenue sharing would be allocated to the City of Winnipeg regional roads capital budget. This motion here I believe, Mr. Speaker is a very friendly agreement it's in keeping with the whole notion that the service sharing agreement has a benefit to the City of Winnipeg and what it's asking for, Mr. Speaker is that in the "therefore be it resolved" that the revenue sharing from service sharing agreements be dedicated to the public transit improvements and fixing existing local streets and sidewalks. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at our capital budget we heard from almost every single Councillor, the need for more sidewalks, more local road improvements and the need for public transit. This motion, Mr. Speaker would harness the power of the service sharing agreements and do just that, it would do exactly what we were wishing here. Yesterday in talking about the capital budget and I think it's a very friendly motion and it's something that I think all Councillors can get behind. I mean the flip side argument is in and the implications here, we would get money, we would put money into the capital budget for regional roads and from that saving we would put that into our local roads. But I think that, Mr. Speaker, we have to sort of have a stronger vision for returning the glory of the inner city and the mature neighbourhoods of the City of Winnipeg. I think this will really, you know, give it a head start and providing our older parts of the city, the more mature neighbourhoods, Mr. Speaker, with a dedicated revenue source coming from service sharing agreements really demonstrates leadership at this City Council. So I'll leave it at that and I hopefully we can get all Council to support Motion Number 3. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** OK now that all 3 motions have been put on the floor, we're open to individual comment from Councillors. So I'm waiting for someone to comment. Councillor Mayes first.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the work that has been put in on this. I am in a unique position or perhaps seemingly incongruous position of saying that I would favour all three amendments and I'll come back to the reasons for that. But I think in general terms, a lot of people talked this morning about sprawl. I don't think this does encourage sprawl and I think it's also not true to say if you're inside the city that that doesn't equal sprawl and if you're outside that is sprawl. My Ward contains quite a bit of territory south of the perimeter and I had the opportunity to go door to door in the Ramblewood area which is east of the Seine River, south of the perimeter. You knock on someone's door and you're looking back in toward the 'Welcome to Winnipeg' sign. So you're out there and they are not on city water. People were talking about how they wanted to defect from the city and join the neighboring RM and it wasn't because the neighbouring RM has water and sewer. I mean these folks are not on city water. They were other issues other than simply water and sewer that made people want to live there and made people decide, you know, where they wanted to, whether they wanted to belong to the City of Winnipeg or a different RM. So I think the issue of sprawl is a little more complex than just the issue of water. We'll say as well, I campaigned a fair bit back in the 90s out in the suburbs outside of Detroit and largely it was said that Detroit, the City of Detroit has problems that is clearly true, I think it's rather more complex than just water and sewer. They are race issues; there are certainly mass transit issues, where we're miles ahead of Detroit here. So I think one can point to other cities that have had problems with sprawl but the causation is a little more complex than water and sewer. So, if we put aside the issue of sprawl, I think there is also competing arguments here on environmental benefit. I think it's good to have people getting off septic fields and septic tanks. Conversely, some people have said we don't, this will encourage people to live further out from the city and have

more greenhouse gases as they drive into work. I'm not sure it's as simple as that. I think there are some environmental benefits to be had here. That said I think all of Councillor Pagtakhan's motion makes sense in terms of trying to put some of the resources towards sidewalks and uses other than regional roads. I want to commend Councillor Gerbasi because she says all the agreements should come back here and that was I think my main concern coming here today was the idea we would be delegating out the authority. However, Councillor Swandel and Vandal's motion, I think also, if that's all that we're going to pass here today I still think that's a vast improvement over the original motion. I would also, in that it does, save for West St. Paul require all further agreements to come back here. The issue has also arisen in terms of privatization. I've asked the Chief Operating Officer and others about that, I see no indication here there's any change in service delivery. I see no indication here of any privatization, that also was an issue throughout my campaign. So I've been reassured we are not looking at any manner of privatization. I think ultimately, what Councillor Vandal said earlier today is kind of what guides me here. This is an improvement on a long stagnant file. I think that's true and I would favour the Motions introduced, the number 2 and number 3. If number 1 is all we get through today to bring matters back here then I guess that's the improvement we'll see but I do think overall what Councillor Vandal said about making improvements is the view that I tend to share. I do want to, before I conclude, Mr. Speaker I still have four minutes left so your comments yesterday about being paid by the word, I'll have to stretch this out. I want to thank the Chief Operating Officer, who I had a good talk with yesterday. I was saying show me where the pipe is on the map, we were literally pounding away on the map trying to get a better sense of where the various pipes were in the city, both south end and north end. And I'll be speaking later today some more about that Ramblewood area and some of my area that's south of the perimeter. So I do want to thank him for his assistance and I do want to say I think this product, the amendments here do move this further forward and I do think we'll have a better model to go to the public with. I appreciate the delegations and the concerns there about making sure things return to Council and as a former School Trustee I was always conscious of that, but I don't think that the delegation on the West St. Paul issue is enough to make me vote against this. I do think there is progress on a stagnant file and therefore I support all of the motions. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Councillor Mayes. Who's next? Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the clause and also the amendment brought forward, moved by Councillor Swandel. Mr. Speaker, the bigger issue here is the entire issue of the capital region. And this has been going on for some time in terms of a need for direction that can't really come from the city; it has to come from the province. This is their file. They have the City of Winnipeg Charter. It's their Charter, their Act. And they also have the Municipal Act, which governs all the other municipalities in Manitoba; and the capital region falls within that, Mr. Speaker. And we know that this has been going on for some time. When this government was first elected back in 99, one of the first things they did was create the, for lack of a better term, the Paul Thomas Commission, to look at the capital region and to study the capital region and to bring back recommendations about the capital region and how the capital region interacts with the City of Winnipeg. These aren't easy issues, Mr. Speaker, to deal with because to depend how you want to approach it. You can approach it from kind of a laissez-faire attitude that let the market decide let the services go where they may and let that go forward. Historically that's not been the case in Manitoba and in Winnipeg and in the capital region and it goes back even further when we had the urban limit line where we prevented development; and we actually had at one time as a Council had control of development outside of the city. So we have a long history of dealing with this issue. But, in the last ten or 12 years we haven't really had any clear direction. We've had decisions being made, driven by development, where developers in the capital region have come forward requesting development, and the province has either ruled yea or nay that it's in favour of their plan of municipal plan for that municipality or not in favour and by and large they've ruled in favour, saying yes. And even going to the municipal board in favour, yes, when it was challenged. And so we've seen developments that have taken place in East St. Paul and developments like Pritchard Farm Road, in the RM of Springfield we've seen the growth of their industrial park that's taken place and in West St. Paul we've seen the growth in terms of development in that municipality. And it's all been happening, Mr. Speaker, by informal policies like the challenge of the capital region being allowed to grow just on its own and the province allowing that. We as a city really don't have the tools to say no. We're almost faced with the prospect, Mr. Speaker, where we're dammed if we do and we're dammed if we don't, in terms of dealing with this issue to be quite blunt. Because of the fact that we know, that if the West St. Paul wants to grow, this government will let them grow and we've seen that with East St. Paul. East St. Paul recently filed for an application to build over 300 homes, right on the edge of our city. And they don't need our sewer and water service and why Mr. Speaker? Because they have their own sewer and water services because the province helped them build it, and pay for it. They have their own treatment facility for waste water, Mr. Speaker and they have their own water. And so they can come forward and actually do their own development. And development, which by the way, Mr. Speaker, we will not receive one nickel from, and by the way, Mr. Speaker, development which will have a direct impact on our regional streets and our local streets in North Kildonan. Just ask Councillor Browaty who is very familiar with the issue. So, Mr. Speaker, this has been going on and we are faced with this, you could call it a poison because we're trying to deal with as best we can. Mr. Speaker, we're trying to deal with this best we can. With the RM of Rosser was mentioned, we were basically told this is happening whether you like it or not. CentrePort is happening, Councillors, whether you like it or not. Deal with it. Deal with it. This

is happening. Going all the way from the Premier to the Prime Minister. We want those services extended, period. Mr. Speaker, this chamber knows my view. I have authored a motion that's been referred, that's still alive and maybe some of the delegations weren't aware of this, to extend I call it boundary amendments, some call it annexation to amend our boundaries up to the Perimeter Highway; and you know Mr. Speaker, I think that makes sense because if you ask most Winnipeggers they don't really know where our boundaries are. They think well the perimeter is the natural boundary of the city, so why shouldn't the boundaries of the city be up to the perimeter. But as the Mayor points out, that, again, resides with the Premier and the Legislature. They control us through the Charter and the other municipalities through the Municipal Act. So, we're left with this challenge Mr. Speaker, and I think we're trying to deal with it the best we can; and the amendment coming forward, this should be unanimous now, based on the amendment coming forward by Councillor Swandel and Vandal. This should be a unanimous. We are addressing the very concern which is, was that this Council should be in control. That's what happening. In terms of West St. Paul the agreement is here, Councillors. The report is here and it's very clear. It goes into the details of actually what we're going to be receiving in terms of sewer and water services. What we're going to be receiving as a one-time charge, what we're going to be receiving as an (inaudible) the agreement is right here. And it even says in the motion, "the agreement with the rural municipality of West St. Paul per the basic terms of the service sharing agreements as contained herein". We're approving West St. Paul today, ladies and gentlemen, and we're saying in clause 3 that all future negotiated service sharing agreements or amended service sharing agreements, amended, so if this is ever amended, be approved by City Council. So it has to come back here. I think this is, what surprises me is that EPC is listening. EPC is listening. And yet it shouldn't, and it's not going to be unanimous. Yesterday, the Mayor spoke about some members of Council said yesterday's budget was a conservative one and the Mayor rightly pointed out he said the makeup of EPC is actually reflective of Council today if you look at it. You have three Conservative members which we, I think we know who we are or who they are. We have two. Thank you. I know. Two, and that brings me to my point, we have one Liberal who I think we know who he is. Two New Democrats, and then we have one person the Mayor referred to as I think Independent or not affiliated with one party. What I didn't know is, Mr. Speaker, is when did the Mayor become a New Democrat? (Inaudible). But anyways, so the, you know, Mr. Speaker, all joking aside, you know I think EPC has listened and it's heard from the public and we're making this amendment, and we treat it very seriously, Mr. Speaker, because we also see it - I think we should see this as our opportunity when it comes to dealing with the provincial government, because let's be very clear, they've allowed for these developments that are having these headaches in West St. Paul. They've allowed and approved and are part of the problem. The sewage we hear about in the ditches and what not, this was approved by this government and previous governments of the Province of Manitoba. They are pushing and want us to assist. Well you know, we have issues too and challenges too. So we have, we are working and it was rightly pointed out, co-operating now with the provincial government on this matter and we certainly hope that it's a two-way street. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Thank you Councillor Wyatt. Next up is Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman.

**Councillor Nordman:** Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise today in support of the amendments and I will just give you a bit of a history lesson as to the reason why we're here today. And Councillor Swandel I think really put it into perspective at the end of his comments in introducing his amendment. It's about the lake and one of the things I've been lucky enough to do over the last three or four years is participate as one of the City of Winnipeg's representatives on what, once upon a time was called the Mayors and Reeves of the capital region, today it's known as the partnership of the Manitoba capital region. And Councillor Vandal and I are the two representatives from the City of Winnipeg, and I am lucky enough currently to chair that board. Now, the partnership of the capital region are 16 elected entities. There are a couple of cities, there's the town of Stonewall and then several rural municipalities all surrounding the City of Winnipeg. And in particular, there is five entities that relate directly to Lake Winnipeg who are most closely, physically associated with it, and that's the RM's of West St. Paul, East St. Paul, St. Clements, St. Andrews and the City of Selkirk. So, knowing what we know and a few months ago with my help we put through an initiative here on the floor of Council and approved the concept of the City of Winnipeg being lake friendly and that means in all of our purchases and procurement practices that we should be looking particularly about what we are putting in the lake that the city purchases so in the way of cleaning products and those types of things. You know, Mr. Beddome spoke specifically and I've got to say in the five years here that I've been on City Council, I know way more about human waste than I ever wanted to know and I'm sure we've all had that same emotion. But nonetheless it's a function of what we do here. You know, when people say what's the city responsible for and we give them the five P's: pipes, pavement, parks, police and paramedics. So it's the pipes part is a fundamental thing; and what we're proposing to do today is to run our pipe to the edge of the city and one thing I have learned within my relationship with our partners in the capital region is that they have been waiting for this concept to evolve for a very long time. When the news release went out regarding EPC'S decision back on November 30th, I sent the same news release to my counter parts of the 16, the other 15 organizations, municipalities and what not; about 10 minutes after our press release went back out. And I had an interesting comment from the Reeve of Headingley, Reeve Wilf Taillieu said back to me, "great news it's just 15 years too late for Headingley." So you know, this has been an activity as Councillor Vandal suggested, that's been under way for way too long. It's an idea whose time has come, like it or not, we're accused way too often I think of suffering from perimeter-itus

and to be honest there are lots of portions of the City of Winnipeg that's extend way beyond the perimeter. Councillor Mayes, you're very correct, you have a huge track of land there south of the perimeter on the east side of the Red River. In my case, most people don't know St. Charles Ward does not end at the Perimeter Highway. All of those properties west of the Perimeter Highway on Portage Avenue, Point West Auto Park, Assiniboia Downs, the Red River Exhibition, the MTS Iceplex and Chapel Lawn, which we all one way or another have to attend, those are all in the City of Winnipeg and they all pay taxes to the City of Winnipeg. They do not belong to Headingley. But for some reason that concept exists. Yes, within the North Kildonan area particularly and west, on the west side of the river, Councillor Sharma's area, yes, there's a sliver of municipalities inside the Perimeter Highway but by and large, I think we have to start working in more harmony and I think after experiencing the last, Mayor Katz I don't know if it's four or five years that I've been doing this but the reality is, I've seen a real change in attitude within our partners and they are excited that the Winnipeg Council is finally coming to the party. And the provincial government, as Councillor Wyatt suggested, have been driving this initiative for a long time and I think we finally have some folks within the local government ministry over there that are recognizing this is an effective partnership whose time has come and they are quite prepared to fund the operation from the standpoint of a transportation study that's going to be coming forward in partnership with Brad Sacher's Public Works and Transportation, marrying the master transportation plan that we've just done; and also an overall planning scenario that we will be taking the best of what we've found from OurWinnipeg and allowing urban planning students from the University of Manitoba to start in January to present an outstanding presentation to us, we hope, by May and have a better understanding so we harmonize many of the terms and the working ideas that we have within the 16 organizations. So I just want you to know that in some respects we are our brother's keeper. We're looked upon as leaders and the partners of the Manitoba capital region are quite excited about this new initiative and we're happy to move forward with it, so I would encourage all of you to support this as we move forward. Thank you.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Thank you Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman. Next up is Councillor Havixbeck.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. I just have a little news flash though you know, people in Headingley drive on our roads. People in Portage already drive on our roads. They are already using our roads to get into the city. I rise in support of Councillor Vandal and Swandel's motion. I think it's a good, really strong, good effort towards improving the wording to make sure that this Council can debate and can discuss any future agreement and any amendment to existing agreements. I want to put a little bit of a different slant on it because I did some of my own research over the weekend. I talked with Brent Olynyck, who is the CAO in West St. Paul, and I wanted to know how he feels about this agreement because we're here deciding on an agreement that the administration puts forward and I really don't know what the RM is thinking except what I'm told, so I like to do my own research. And he said that they are pleased, cautiously pleased, but pleased because it is long overdue as many Councillors have said. He said this is a good opportunity for West St. Paul and the City of Winnipeg. And from where he stood, it was, it really was a good thing. Now, people opposing that would say well, if it's a good thing for them, how can it be a good thing for the City of Winnipeg? But how can it not be a win/win if both sides are really saying that it is? What this does do is it presents the beginning of better relationships with the RM, not that they are bad, but it just sets an example so we can move it out to surrounding communities. I speak with the elected officials in the RM of MacDonald and Headingley, I speak with the Reeve there and they all have growing needs, and we are embarking on Centre Port, which is really driving that need and that was pretty much implemented and done without a similar kind of a partnership. If we look to Headingley their needs, I have now the Charleswood Rotary Club has moved their meetings to be in Headingley. We have two people that ride on handy transit and are wheelchair accessible only; it costs the Rotary Club $180.00/week to send two people because we don't have handy transit going out there. I see this service sharing agreement as the beginning for other kinds of services that we could be offering and going back to partnering with because we used to partner up until about the mid-90s, with these communities. As well, if you go to, or if you live on McCreary Road, you'll know that the last hundred feet that fall in MacDonald because they are so bumpy, they belong to the RM of MacDonald. And we have to do something to maintain and co-ordinate our effort. McCreary Road was extensively re-done two years ago and yet the last 100 feet that fall within the RM of MacDonald were not and so how do we explain to the citizens of Winnipeg who use those roads fully that you don't get your road complete? And I know that other Councillors who have wards that are on those edges of the city experience the same thing. I want to turn us to a report done in 2006 by the Lake Winnipeg Stewardship Board. And this to me is the most compelling reason that we need to do this and that we need to move forward with it. In the report in sections 8, 24.4, 25.2, there is a need to implement regional sewage treatment plants with nutrient removal capabilities prioritizing in areas with high residential density and those in close proximity to other regions. Efforts to prevent illegal disposal of septic, indigenous or other inappropriate locations must be strengthened. So this is our role too, this is mandated by the province. We are in the Province of Manitoba so to me the logic is right there in a report that the government has gone off and implemented in terms of a committee. To say that there has been no discussion or no details is really absurd. We had a Council seminar. We had the opportunity to hear the information. We have access to the administration to have even more explanation. Even our newest Councillor took it upon himself to meet with the COO to talk about what this exactly means. So, to claim there was a lack of information is absurd in my view. And some may argue well we voted at EPC, there are many opportunities to move motions at Council to make changes as we're seeing here today. And you know, I believe that with the number of e-mails that were received, there

was a drive to change and have the motion that we have on the table today. Some may have argued in the past that there are intergovernmental relationships that is are often strained and you know what, if anybody would say that this is not an opportunity to strengthen a relationship between the rural municipality, the City of Winnipeg, the Province of Manitoba, and academia, I would have to argue you are voting down those principles if you vote that down. Thank you.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Thank you Councillor Havixbeck. Next up is Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Conference Board of Canada says there are going to be 180,000 new people in the capital region over the next 20 years by 2031. 83,000 new households. The City of Winnipeg is going to have to grow out and grow up, physically in terms of you know multi-family projects. And you know what? It's going to be hard to believe but in terms of city infrastructure, it's probably and this is my empirical opinion now, it's easier to add 500 new homes in West St. Paul on city roads, than 500 new homes in Sage Creek or Waverley West. The infrastructure is there and capacity is there. Let's look at the two alternatives: new service sharing, not do service sharing. If we do nothing, they can continue to grow but with RMs. Eventually at some point maybe they start coming up with better environmental standards and maybe they will do their part to save Lake Winnipeg. If we do service sharing we have planning input. When you're talking about development beside the Perimeter Highway, perhaps we can look at you know instead of having country-sized yards, we can actually impose something that's smaller. We get a $3,000 hook up royalty per property, and that's up next to inflation that goes up every year. We get a $200 annual participation fee per household on this. That also goes up with inflation. And it's not like we'll be selling something that's going to cause stress to our existing infrastructure. This is excess capacity. This only happens when we have the excess capacity. How is this bad deal for the City of Winnipeg? Again, I think the amendment that Councillors Swandel and Vandal are proposing here make sense. The current proposal, the framework for West St. Paul is good in most cases because the money goes toward regional streets, which is again the piece of infrastructure that will have additional use or additional stress because of new ex urban development. There may be exceptions, in my case in East St. Paul, Councillor Wyatt was mentioning the proposed development of the 450 homes in the new subdivision, they would be accessing local streets so that development of East St. Paul might need a little bit of tweaking and a little bit of changing. But again, I think this is a fair deal for the city; it's a fair deal for the RMs and perhaps as Councillor Havixbeck was talking about I think this is a win for everybody, so I'll be supporting the motion from Councillors Swandel and Vandal, I'll be supporting the main motion here. Thank you.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Thank you Councillor Browaty. Councillor Scott Fielding.

**Councillor Fielding:** Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker and I'd first like to say I definitely will be supporting this proposal before us. You know, I think this is really a fantastic agreement not just for the City of Winnipeg, but it's been mentioned by other speakers, there have been numerous attempts to do this over the years to do service sharing that's a part of it. I think that there's are two main facets that make this such a great deal and number 1 is the economic side of the equation and the other is the environmental side of the equation. It's been talked a little bit about in terms of the revenue sharing side and we talked about the $3,000.00 that - a number of other things that are part of the 30 per cent, you've got $200.00 in terms of revenue sharing, you have as I mentioned, $3,000.00 revenue that's part of it and there is also the element that the RM is responsible for all the hookups that is part of that that makes a lot of sense. So I think on a financial base this is something that very much makes sense for taxpayers. The environmental side, I don't think there is any argument to the world, I mean quite honestly I was surprised by some of the groups that came here and talked in terms of the environmental aspects of this. I mean, we know what's going on in some of these rural municipalities where they talk about sewage, raw sewage in the ditches and we talk about septic fields, these are things that are currently happening that are there. What we are offering, obviously is a reform in terms of an environmental stewardship piece of the equation is coming much better and so I don't think how there's any argument at all in terms of the environmental aspect of why this agreement wouldn't make sense and why we shouldn't enter into it and why does it makes sense on a global basis. You look at our needs you know, in terms of the environmental aspect of it, I'll tell you the environmental aspects of it don't just stop at the end of the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg. So it makes a lot of sense on an environmental basis as well as an economic basis. There has been a lot of talk in terms of the management, the growth patterns and what's been going on in rural municipalities in terms of growth patterns. I personally don't have a problem with people expanding you know, if they want to live in a rural setting that's fantastic. In fact my in-laws live in the RM of Springfield and they are always encouraging us to move out there. But you know what? The reality is I like living in the City of Winnipeg. I like the urban aspect. I think so, the City of Winnipeg's on a roll. I'm not going to look to move to the Rural Municipality of Springfield or any others just because I like living in the City of Winnipeg. I think there is a great advantage, there's great services that is a part of it and I don't think that hooking up the sewer system or sewer and water lines to any municipality is going have a massive outflow of people living within the City of Winnipeg moving to the rural parts because people like living in an urban environment. If you do want to live in a rural environment, than you can choose that to move out yourself. So I don't think there's any elements of that, there is talk of joint planning and people are concerned about how the planning works out. Councillor Wyatt quite clearly indicated what's been going on in these areas and what's happened before. We know the experience of Headingley, we know the experience of other areas;

what this agreement does it allows the joint planning that's a part of it. So what happens if people say well you can go out to the Municipal Board and part of that, well you can cancel the group. So I think there are enough assurances there; this is a much better planning process that we have in place as opposed to what is currently there, so it makes a lot of sense for this as well. Some talk in terms of road networks, fixing the road networks, how would the revenues, how would all the money that we're going to gain from this, how would it go? Well to be fair I spent most of yesterday morning listening to the vast majority of Councillors here talking about the capital budget. And you know, there are some good points and there's some deficiencies. Even the people who supported it, including myself, said the one element of this budget, the capital budget that we like to do most, do you remember what it was? Well it was the regional local streets budget that's a part of it. This, Councillors is your opportunity to make those investments in these regional streets. If you truly believe that we're not spending enough money on regional and local streets, this is your opportunity to do it. So I think the revenue that's a part of this makes a lot of sense. This is something that people have been very passionate about, it's talked about it in the media, a lot of Councillors have talked about that and we put a bit of seed money in the budget to address the regional and local streets. This is something that can address it, so if you're very much concerned about that and I know there was concerns, you should be thinking about supporting this document because it is going to help our system that's there. Another aspect of things that we talked a little bit about this, in terms of one taxpayer. Well there is one taxpayer and what this does, we know that we got the capacity to provide the servicing to go these municipality areas. One taxpayer, the fact of the matter is going to save multimillions of dollars if we're able to use the City of Winnipeg's capacity to work on the whole network, if you will, because at the end of the day, in the provincial government, the dollars you put into the provincial government in terms of your taxes will go to pay for some of the servicing, some of the waste water, some of the water treatment plants that would have to be built. But this is going to save taxpayer's money. So I'm encouraged by this agreement, I think it's been a long time coming, I think that the COO and CAO of the City of Winnipeg deserve a lot of credit for bringing this forward. I'm very excited about this, I think this is in fact one of the best agreements and items that have come through City Council since I've been here five years and I think it's bravo to everyone who has been involved in this. It's a monstrous step forward for the City of Winnipeg and for the capital region, and for environment and the economy. Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Thank you Councillor Fielding. Next up is Councillor Orlikow.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm not going to sit here today and talk about how much we should be doing for the rural municipalities outside of Winnipeg. I'm going to be talking about what we should be doing for Winnipeggers. It's all nice and happy that we are willing to, and I know 100 per cent that the rural municipalities are very happy with this deal. Again, the question though, it's not about the rural municipalities. I wasn't elected for them, I was elected for Winnipeg. So is this a good deal for Winnipeg? That's the question here. So the question, we know that this deal plans to open up, will open up new developable lands on the outside of the city. We know that will that happen with or without us. We'll get into that later. We know that we are selling water that is true, people missed that a little bit sometimes, but we are selling water and waste water treatment. We know that for sure. So and that the new money will go into our regional roads, likely to help people commute into the city a little bit faster. I have to stress that I do find it incredibly unfortunate and almost unbelievable to me, that there is no business plan. There are some principles and general ideas, even those some of them I question. But there is nothing that outlines the projected changes in the population, how many people will this affect, will move in or out of the city there, is no projections on of the number of hookups that we're looking at either in West St. Paul or throughout the whole region. There is no estimate of the amount of water, the volume of water and the volume of water treatment that we are going to be providing, no nothing like that. There's no outcomes, there is no benchmark so that we can evaluate that this is actually in the best interest of Winnipeggers. None of that. I couldn't even get a proper answer if we're even allowed to sell water. I know the City of Winnipeg is saying we have the opinion that we can, and we've heard from other groups who say they have an opinion that we can't. Well we haven't really clarified that at all yet, however we're going to be moving forward. So, there are many, and many of these questions that I have, could have been answered. I didn't have to spend incredible amounts of time trying to go through Stats Can and trying to get these numbers together on my own, because they weren't available anywhere else for me. So again, if my numbers are a little bit off I do apologize, I am a staff of one. So, let's talk about Winnipeg for example, I'm going to actually take it back to step 2, to even my own local neighbourhood of three families. Three families that live on a nice, Centennial Street in a bungalow. Three families: Peter, Paul and Mary. Three families are now looking at growing. They have now, they have starter homes, they lived in Winnipeg. They enjoy themselves quite a bit, but now they need to look, now their families are growing, they want to buy a bigger home, whatever the case may be. We have Peter, strict urbanist. Peter loves the vibrancy of cities, he loves the noise, he loves the restaurants, he loves all those great things. Peter, we don't have to worry about too much. Paul is looking at some other variables. Paul is looking at taxes, how much will he save in taxes by moving out to a rural municipality. How much will the commute time be? How much will the house be? How much land do I get? Do I have to be five feet away from someone or do I get acreage? These are the considerations that Paul is looking at. He hasn't decided yet. He would like to stay in the city, but he hasn't decided. Mary, she is gone. Mary is sick and tired of decaying mature neighbourhoods where the streets are falling apart, her sewer keeps breaking, backing up, she has trees are disappearing around the neighbourhood, Mary is done. Why am I paying all these taxes? I am going to move. Mary is gone. OK, so those are the

three scenario people we're talking about today. You know, these are Winnipeggers. These Winnipeggers represent our value, our revenue, let's not forget that we talk about municipalities and we're going to get a few dollars here and there and a one-time fee of $3,000. Remember every Mary and possibly Paul, the middle guy who's deciding, who leaves, we lose property tax, which is our main revenue. So let's say Mary does go, Mary takes off. That one household represents a loss, in twenty years, because that's a contract, of $60,000.00. One. Just one person lost. How much revenue? If I'm incredibly optimistic with that new development that Mary lived in, we may over 20 years, get about and I'm really pushing it saying ten million dollars from this new development, that's including sewer fees, that's including a onetime development fee. That so, we're going to lose sixty grand and we may get about sixty million and we may get ten million. I don't see that being really in the best interest, but it does identify for people how important it is for us to keep people wanting to live in Winnipeg. I'm not trying to say why is it a good idea and facilitating growth in rural municipalities because it's good for them. It isn't good for us if people move out of Winnipeg; and that is inevitability going to happen. So what are some of those factors that we're looking at? OK some of those factors that, you know Peter who we're looking at, he's an urbanist so we're pretty good to go. The city can probably decay to completely nothing and Peter will still love to stay here because he loves the vibrancy. However, we have to realize and especially with the capital budget yesterday, the continuing infrastructure decay, increasing frontage levies and the increasing taxes that we are becoming less competitive against our neighbours in retaining people here. If you don't think that's so, I would love to hear the argument why and maybe someone will do that after. However, the reality is we are facilitating growth by the service agreement. The one argument that I did, and again I was trying to figure out the way to make this work. So the one argument I have heard which turned me for a little loop for a bit until I actually started to think about revenue again, was the fact that it's going to happen anyway people. So don't you want to get a piece of the pie? Well, that sounds nice but let's talk about that in more detail. What does our participation as the City of Winnipeg result? It results in two things: we increase in the supply of a service, therefore more opportunity; we also by increasing the supplies in the service we make it cheaper for rural municipalities to do this, again so they have to lower their taxes. The other thing is some areas can't develop, they just don't have the capacity at all to do it. So again, by us being involved we're actually helping them develop faster. So remember Mary, who waiting to take off? She previously couldn't find a place to live or something that would have worked for her. So Mary stayed here, let's just say 10 years longer than she expected to, that again represents $30,000 to our pocket. Now that we've done this, Mary is gone. So again what I'm trying to stress here as much as I can is stop worrying about the rural municipalities, stop worrying about even the environment. I say there is a very strong case East St. Paul and West St. Paul have their own treatment plants. Let them take care of their own waste. To say that Winnipeg is already on board, we just had a huge spill in the south end plant and we have huge volumes now going into the north end plant, we have new technologies going and new regulations, we should not be trying to increase the volume that we have to deal with at this time. We haven't proven ourselves good stewards yet, so again I would dispute the fact we should, this is our cause for the environment. So again, I can just quickly go, because am I out of time, to the issue regarding the CAO selling the CAO delegation authority.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Councillor Mayes moves extension of time. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Sure the principles are nice. But again, I want to know how much volume of water will be sold? I want to know what type of waste treatment is going to be brought into the city. Is it going to be from a slaughter house that's laid out right side of Transcona? Is that the kind of sewage that we're going to be taking, some king of, what kind of industries are going to be dumping sewage into our new north end plant? And the number of connections, how many connections will we see out there? OK, land deals. What is the land deal that we are looking at? I want to know that before we approve it, not after. Those are the details, not the principles, those are the details we need to be looking at today. So at the end of the day, you know have Peter, Paul and Mary is gone. We've lost Mary's revenue. We have Peter and Paul. Peter is sitting here, he's good to go, we'll keep his $60,000.00 revenue. However now, Paul has looked out, he's found a nice place on Oxford but has no trees left due to Dutch Elm, and his back lane is a sewer, because it's just there is no drainage, it actually drains into his house. He is going to have to actually upgrade his house to be up to nob and tube wiring, he will have to invest huge amounts of money and he's going to pay more taxes. You know what, I hate to say it, Paul and many Pauls are now going to choose to live outside of Winnipeg, rather than if the city invested in our old, mature neighbourhoods, made them vibrant, made them exciting places, people will stay there; and that is our goal here Winnipeg, not helping out the RMs. Our goal here is to find ways to keep Winnipeggers in Winnipeg because that is sustainable revenue over long time. One time development cost, $3,000.00 over 20 years, you do the math how much that actually works out for. Nominal. If we raise the fees that is are appropriate, if we actually said you have to actually pay your real fair share, then maybe we can enter into these agreements. But as it stands now, Winnipeg is going to take it on the nose in this one. We are going to lose mass amounts of revenue and we will become even more unsustainable than we are today. So I will be voting against the whole motion.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Thank you Councillor Orlikow. We have Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you Deputy Speaker Pagtakhan. Where to start? Actually I didn't get, I didn't acknowledge Councillor Mayes inauguration yesterday and I'm glad he is on here because he started his speech off with talking about

how complex this situation was in Detroit. And the complexity about what we're talking about today in terms of an agreement, what we are looking at is a simple, on the surface, a simple look at merely providing water and waste services to the rural municipalities or municipalities that surround the City of Winnipeg. Well, it isn't that basic. The basic thing though that it does do, is it allows the competition, that does exist, there is a competition for residents in all of these municipalities, including in the City of Winnipeg. And what you're doing is, you're allowing the rural municipalities to be able to offer the most basic reason why somebody might not want to move out to West St. Paul or to Rosser or wherever, and that is, and I talk to people all the time. People are not willing to move out there if they can't have good water and good waste services. That is a basic that I hear. I have friends who moved into Riverdale. Great people, they love living where they do, one of the biggest struggles that I hear them complain about though all the time is their sewage septic system and the water. That's what I hear. And that's what their friends hear who live in Winnipeg. If they start to hear that in the municipalities outside of Winnipeg that there is now that basic need that needs to be taken care of, a source of water and a good source of water and good sewage system that basically takes it away from your house and you don't have to pay attention to it any more, it's gone. So that's what we're doing. And I also heard competition. What we are doing is, we are allowing the municipalities around us to compete with us again when it comes to businesses moving out there. And I heard this over the last decade, I heard about us talking about having agreements and I've heard the Reeves of certain municipalities talk about their real want to compete with Winnipeg and take away from there so they can make lives better for the citizens that live and residents that live in their municipalities. And thank you, Councillor Orlikow for reminding us who we are supposed to be concerned about and that is the residents and citizens of Winnipeg that we all represent. And yes, don't get me wrong, I have lots of friends in rural municipalities and some of them operate their businesses in Winnipeg and live in other places, that’s great. But really, they want to make sure that their needs are met and frankly, they don't necessarily see that they need the same needs that we in Winnipeg, we decide we want. We decided that we want library services. We want good transportation, good transit, we want, there is a whole host of services that you can't necessarily get in say, West St. Paul. I have great respect for the head administrator of West St. Paul, very intelligent fellow. He knows a good deal when he sees it, and that's good because he knows what might work for the people. So I see a whole host of problems here. Now we're talking about bringing in revenue and I heard somebody mention the, what was it, one-third or 30 per cent of any revenue that might come from businesses moving in to another neighbourhood and we share in that growth to some extent. But, and there is the $3,000.00. And you know, let’s not mix things up here, you know. Last year we had two separate items. We had in this city, capital budget, we had regional street budgets and we had a street renewal budget. Separate lines, OK. Let's be clear about that. I wanted everybody to be clear about that. This agreement is dealing with, unless the amendment passes, this agreement is dealing, the motion to amend unless it passes, this is only dealing with regional streets. Is it dealing with the feeder streets that everybody uses to get out to West St. Paul or East St. Paul? They use Jefferson, they use Leila, they use Partridge, they use all these streets. Are they all regional streets? I don't think so. So let's talk about what are we doing? We talked yesterday in the capital budget, again, and my basic argument again is, one day I will vote for the capital budget that comes from the particular people on EPC when they draw a balance between providing capital money for growth as well as balancing out, and increasing the amount to fix and renew our existing streets that, frankly, I know people who move to West St. Paul because they were sick and tired, as an example of John, sick and tired of not getting the proper service and you know what, they wanted more land anyways so they made the decision to move. Now we're making it easier for people to move, way easier and I'm really concerned about this agreement. I really want to work with all the municipalities. You know it would be great if we could have an agreement. What I want to point out, what's not in these principles and what will not be indicated here, are we going to expect if West St. Paul grows, are they going to build the appropriate fire stations to deal with the fire hazards that they are dealing with? Are we still going to have to do the same thing we do with Springfield? Yes Springfield had to pay us, our firefighters, our fire fighter system, pay us to fight that fire. But let me point something out to you. That if we stretch those firefighting capabilities beyond their capabilities, we're in trouble within the City of Winnipeg. So what in this agreement ensures that when that industrial development does comes in Centreport, when it does come in West St. Paul because West St. Paul does have a plan for a small strip of industrial within their boundaries, I know they do, that's part of their plans. So are we going to be assured that they will make a decision? Because they have their own ability to make their own decisions and their residents will vote appropriately. That’s right, they will vote appropriately and will they vote to increase their fire capability? I don't know. I'm not sure. I know that West St. Paul halls a volunteer firefighting crew and they do a great job but will they be able to meet the demand, meet the need? I don't think so. As well as, what about the existing households that exist in West St. Paul, we had a seminar I did ask this question, I said and this is up to them to decide, West St. Paul, I asked will all the existing homes and businesses have to hook up to the water and sewage system that we have here? This goes to the environment argument OK. So whatever spilling that you talk about in the ditches right now out in West St. Paul is because that system is there. Those people, those properties exist today. I see nowhere in this agreement where we can expect them to force everybody to hook into our system. So how is that actually serving the environment? There are already a lot of homes. Riverdale is, you know what, it's a wonderful community, it's quite sizeable it is; it’s quite sizeable. I also wanted to mention, we always measure things and we want to talk about OurWinnipeg and I really appreciate Councillor Nordman's presentation about bringing together the same dialogue and the same overall sort of growth principles with the University of Winnipeg bringing in their urban people to talk about these issues and figure out a plan and then present that in May. I really appreciate that and I hope that they

all agree that we should be going with OurWinnipeg, if that's the perspective. But here is what is going to happen, in Winnipeg we are trying to, as much as we can because we will see a huge growth of people who do want to live in the urban setting. We know that, we've also heard that from the same source that Councillor Browaty referred to. And so let's think about that. We are creating density in the City of Winnipeg and then what we're doing is, people who want that option for the bigger piece of property, there are bigger pieces of property in West St. Paul, East St. Paul, like they are bigger pieces of property, and Headingley, bigger pieces of property. So where are those people going to go? Their option is to go where? To West St. Paul. They, even based on our own planning documents, can we not, I know it's difficult, can we not bring together all these principles about what living around a capital region means and how can we develop that as a whole package, not as a separate selling water. I want to conclude actually on another point, and I heard from the Treaty 39 Councillor, and I really respect what he has to say because why shouldn't they have an opportunity to sell what was basically was originally their resources. Are we going to fit that in to the price we're charging for water? Because maybe we should. If we're going to selling, now we're selling water. We're not just bringing in water for ourselves; we're selling water outside, that's what we're doing. So if we think about that, why don't we just add whatever per liter or per whatever thousand litres, whatever the heck it is, let's try that. But the price increase is the only way of water, is the only way that if we make a mistake in these agreements, is the only way we'll recapture any kind of revenue to take care of our bouncing growth and taking care of what we already have in the inner city. And I'll be supporting the motions from, on changing where the money goes to try to amend this agreement because I know it is going to pass. I'm also going to vote for the Gerbasi, Councillor Pagtakhan's amendment, which allows us to actually see the West St. Paul agreement. Because there is a whole bunch of details that actually are not in these lists of (inaudible) that will be in an agreement. So thank you very much, I will be voting against the main motion no matter how it gets amended.

**Reconvened meeting of**
**Winnipeg City Council of**
**December 14, 2011, at 1:34 p.m.**

**Mr. Speaker:** Continue discussion regarding Item 5 of the EPC report for November 30, and next to speak is Councillor Vandal.

**Councillor Vandal:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That Christmas supper kind of took the wind out of my sails but I'll try to remember what my thoughts were. Mr. Speaker, I've been around since 95 and I did take 3 years off though, but since 95 we've been talking about capital region. I've sat in meetings with intergovernmental ministers, MaryAnn Mihychuk and Glen Murray, former Mayor, with other ministers to talk about the capital region, to talk about what we needed to do to move, to advance the file forward. Quite literally, nothing has happened since 1995. It's been, and I think I called it a stale file, that actually wasn't my word but since 95. Mr. Speaker, we talked about with the Minister with the Province of Manitoba, annexation boundary redistribution. The province simply is not there and we know what happened with the Headingley debate, we know we turned it down on this floor of Council and it was a close vote, 8 all. And we know that literally a year later, Headingley had water and sewer services provided by the private sector and provided by the Province of Manitoba through a triple P. The City of Winnipeg had absolutely no input in joint planning, had absolutely no input in revenue sharing, and the development occurred anyways. Councillor Browaty has the situation just outside of his border where there is, I believe there are a hundred homes if not more waiting to be, to move forward. They have the zoning. The province is on board, Mr. Speaker. Whether or not we decide to move forward on this today, I don't think it's going to have a whole heck of a lot of influence over what happens in the capital region. So, having said all that, there are some really positive initiatives here, I think, that advance the file forward in a progressive, positive way. Number one, we are going to solve some really undesirable environmental issues in West St. Paul and we know where a lot of that sludge and sewage goes, right into the Red River and it's everybody's Red River Mr. Speaker and it's everybody's Lake Winnipeg and we know how important that is to our region. Probably most importantly, there is joint planning. We're going to be at the table with other capital regions, other municipalities, to talk about where we go in terms of residential development for the area. And number three, Mr. Speaker, there is revenue sharing. We're going to get approximately 30 per cent of all revenue accruing to the municipality through the development coming back to the City of Winnipeg Mr. Speaker, and that's 30 per cent more than we've received in past developments that have moved forward. I think that is there a lot that's positive here. I'm not as in love with it as Councillor Fielding is, but nevertheless, there are some really good things here and it's moving the ball forward. And I don't share the dramatic interpretations of some of my colleagues where everything is going, the sky is going to fall and thousands of people are going to move to the capital region and it's going to depopulate the city. That's simply not the case. Our growth projections for the City of Winnipeg and for the capital region are very similar. The Winnipeg population is not going to decline in the next 20 years, Mr. Speaker. I don't think this is going to have a very dramatic effect in terms of development and if it does, our people are going to be at the table, administratively, and we're going to get a share of the revenue going forward. And with the amendment, Councillor Swandel moved, which I was glad to second, every other negotiation with other regional municipalities are coming back to the floor of this Council for discussion, and for analysis and then discussion, Mr. Speaker. So, it's been a long road to get to this point. This is not a panacea of a policy for the entire region. There is

going to be other opportunities to further discuss this with other municipalities, if indeed those developments bear fruit. And this is a positive step forward in the entire capital region discussion, which has been going on for many, many years, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

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

**Councillor Gerbasi:** You know, I can accept the fact that many people here on Council do not believe in Santa Claus, but I hope you all do believe in urban sprawl and I hope you all do believe in climate change, because this is something that does have an impact, it is real and we're not the only city that talks about these issues and has to deal with the regional issues. And I appreciate what Councillor Vandal said, we're advancing the file forward, we certainly are. I certainly agree. I've been around a little while, too, and I know, we haven't got very far in solving the capital region area's problems, and we haven't gotten very far in solving the Province of Manitoba's problems. I recognize we're all one big family and one big taxpayer. But I don't know that it's, in most issues this Council doesn't want to take on other people's responsibilities. Why? Because we have a whole bunch of our own. And now, we are advancing this file forward because of the province isn't helping us and the province is on board and everyone else is on board, so we're helping them solve their problems and that's very good of us. But my question is, and I think Councillor Orlikow said it very well, who are we here to represent? We have to look at that bottom line and the best interest of that first and I just want to make sure that that's what we're doing here today. Now it's been talked about what we are doing today is opening up the sale of water and sewer to the other areas. Now, you can say well that's just going, you know this stuff is going to happen anyway. That's what we've heard it, this stuff is just going to happen anyway. It's not just what was going to happen anyway and what was projected in OurWinnipeg. This will go further than that. This will, this could, depending on how many agreements go out there and how many are negotiated, I don't know how many are in mind, I don't know how many hookups are in mind and I don't know what kinds of businesses, and residents, and commercial, and industrial, and other things would all move outside of the city once they have water and sewer. None of that is clear in this policy. And we are expected to just go this is a great day because we're helping to solve a few problems of our friends, which is always a nice feeling inside to do, you know especially at Christmas. But you know, we really have to look at the implications of this and I'm concerned that the policy doesn't cover that off. We heard from a number of delegations today who made some good points. I know some people are rolling their eyes and dismissing them but these are actually, I think there is a place for academics in our society. Some people were grumbling about ivory towers and such, but there is a place for research and study, and those people are saying that when water and sewer is the key tipping point to allow development, so we're not just allowing what was going to happen anyway, we're accelerating that rate and every time we do that and those things move out there, we're losing our own, what would have been our tax base, our basic property tax base to pay for inner city libraries, to pay for streets and sidewalks and services. So we're sort of losing sight of all of that and going, you know we're getting caught up in solving all these big problems. I agree it's disappointing we haven't solved those problems. But that should not be our first priority to solve another municipality's problems. If we can do it and it works for everyone, fine but that's what we need to be assured of. I would point out that Calgary has a service sharing policy, which somebody sent me today and I took a look at it and their policy is only, it does not support service extensions to non-residential uses, except in exceptional circumstances. So generally, like they are very clear that they are not extending services so that their businesses can move outside. That's what Calgary, other places have service sharing policies and they've had to because they actually have cities around them, big cities around them and their municipalities are at a larger stage of growth than ours. And that's another point that hasn't been made that much, is that our municipalities are smaller around our city. We're not where Calgary is and Edmonton is, that has other large cities around it and that's what they are dealing with. But we're jumping ahead and being proactive and you know, acting as if we are in that position. It's been said that the province won't let us annex these places, so we're going to have to deal with more services for these areas, far beyond what is covered in this policy that we are asked to say yes to today. Far beyond, there is fire, there is the impact of traffic, roads, more trucks, more widening of roads, you know, and we already have a massive infrastructure deficit that we can't cover as we talked about at our discussion yesterday. And, I harken to this issue in my speech yesterday that this is basically, we need money for regional roads, badly. I know how much Councillor Wyatt wanted it, I think a few months ago he was talking about our capital region's friends in the newspaper he called them free-loaders and I was quite shocked. But now, you know, we have found a way to build regional roads so we have found a quick fix, we have found revenue, hurray, hurray! But we have to know that that revenue is going to balance on the other side when that revenue enables more businesses, residents, industrial, whatever, to pick up stakes and move out of existing neighbourhoods and move outside of the City of Winnipeg and pay them taxes instead of us. And if you don't, that's called, and then that means more driving because they don't have the transit systems out there. It means more greenhouse gas emissions, that's called sprawl, that's called low density development and if people don't think that's a real issue, then they need to take their head out of the sand. There is another concern that has been mentioned about water conservation. We don't, we are basically, our services are going to be under the control and assents of other municipalities. You know, it's not clear, there's questions about that that I hope are going to be looked at in case we want to change things in the future to do more environmental measures. We're going to be tied into other systems. Christopher Leo talked about water supply as being the tilting point, the tipping point, to the market so that development becomes possible. It will become possible if these agreements occur, in

all sorts of places that is not possible now. How can that be good for our tax base? How can that be good for our bottom line? And how can we not calculate that into these equations we're looking at? We're looking at quick cash, $3,000.00, this and that, oh great it's a money tree. But you got to look closer at these money trees that we are told about. In times of desperation we always seem to look for them. I think it's a very compelling story about what happened in Detroit. They sold their water and lost the heart of their city. It became a doughnut. Has anyone forgotten that cities have become donuts because of urban sprawl? We've been trying to counteract that with incredible efforts to revitalize our downtown. But we're setting the forces in motion, not just to go well, there is nothing we can do about it, it's happening anyway. We're accelerating it, we're putting on the gas to make it go faster. I don't know why everybody can't see this, you know. And I don't think I'm the crazy one here, some people might disagree, I don't think so. I don't think so. And who is going to win from this? I think we have to look at that, who is the winners in this? Yes, we're really being good Samaritans here. We're our brother's keeper. We're helping our regional municipalities and I love those guys. I'm on FCM, I go to AMM stuff. They're wonderful people, but we were elected by the people in our Wards and in our City and I'm not saying that we should do something to harm them out there.

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

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you Councillor Swandel. But we have to consider first what our priorities should be. And so the winners are going to be the developers who are going to make a lot of money off of this, don't think they won't for a moment. And the losers, as I said yesterday in our budgets, and this is just going to accelerate this process, is going to be the existing residents of Winnipeg who are not, who are going to continue to have a loss of our tax base which is going to affect every budget discussion we have going forward. And I am not convinced that this policy protects us from that. Mike's motion, I know there is not enough time to talk about, on the issue of this magnitude, in our structure and there hasn't been enough proper consultation in terms of really looking at the policy and going over it line by line and making sure everything is in it. I just wish we had had that opportunity, unfortunately we didn't. Mike's motion talks about if we're going to do this, let's put the money into transit and let's put the money into local and existing streets, not widening regional roads so people who choose to leave our city and not pay us taxes can have a smoother ride as they cut through our city. That's what we're doing with this policy and that's what that motion is talking about. It's a desperate measure to get quick money for regional streets. And again, I get back to what I started with here; do you think climate change isn't an issue? Do you say the words, when you say the word sustainability, and our whole city plan is about that, there is nothing in here about sustainability. This is all about building more roads. It's all about, it's not about finding, I realize it's trying to find a solution so we can live in brotherhood, as a whole province and everything. But we have to figure out our own problems to make our own answers, to make our city sustainable. This quick cash in selling services is going to make our problems much, much worse. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me start by answering the question earlier, who are we here to represent. Certainly we're here to represent our constituents and the citizens of Winnipeg. But we're also here to represent all humanity on the planet. I believe there is something happening to the climate today, within the climate, with climate change. And I'm not prepared to sit idly by and let it continue to happen and let the impacts of it continue to happen on our city. Somebody has an issue whether to live in this Winnipeg, this city or outside the city, I'm going to stop and I'm going to help them. Some of you among us may choose not to. We have an opportunity here to do some great good for our planet. I want to talk to you about three things: sustainability, planning, and process. You look at this through the sustainability lens, environmentally, economically and socially, this is bringing huge improvements. When you look at people who are experts in the field of sustainability, they talk about accessing existing services where they exist rather than creating new. When you look at the deplorable conditions that exist right outside our boundaries, failing micro plants, failing septic fields, and in one of the documents, I think Councillor Havixbeck referred to it, it actually talks about the issues in the corridor between Selkirk and Winnipeg. That was the Lake Winnipeg Stewardship Group and we need to find some form of service sharing to start dealing with the sewage treatment issues that exist there. So here we are today trying to do something. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities talks about service sharing as a best practice and funding infrastructure and sustainable infrastructure. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities, in their green programs, they promote it you know, and there is all kinds of research done by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. The Province of Manitoba, you know, strengthening Manitoba's capital region, talks about it. The Province of Manitoba paid for something called the R-Pact: Regional Planning something, something Committee. Strong arguments from R-Pact about service sharing. This process is one that is sustainable; it's democratic and it's responsible. We have so much to say that we are doing here in the field of sustainability. You move from that to the planning piece. Planning is one of the areas that we can greatly, perhaps most greatly impact sustainability. The fact that we're able to do joint planning with these people as a result of this, is a huge step forward, and you have development going on now without services being provided, without the type of planning detail that we're able to provide, and the expertise that we're able to provide and bring to the table, that scares me, Mr. Speaker. Through this process and through the planning that's been done to get to this point, the planning we will do going forward, we are well

on the right track to doing something great for our environment. The other piece of the planning side, if you look at it, why do people choose to live outside of the city? If you're going to beat this drum of ex urban sprawl and before you start beating drums of urban sprawl or ex urban sprawl, you better define what you mean. What are your suitable densities? You know, when you now provide services that drive the costs of the land up, then make it so that people may not make that choice, that when they do their math, they may say "Oh, you know what, I'm better off to push density inside the city than I am to step outside of the boundaries." This could actually be beneficial. You might actually be moving people into the city by doing this. I don't know the answer to that question, but little bit of math tells me you know, the cost of having a service lot, a properly serviced lot, as opposed to having a hillbilly serviced lot, is going to have a huge impact on your cost of housing. Mr. Speaker, OurWinnipeg, the OurWinnipeg process, has pushed us towards this in our planning. A sustainable Winnipeg talks about our commitment to working with the capital region. It just goes on and on and on. Representations were made here today from the Shoal Lake Band, I don't believe that's the band that we have a signed agreement with, I just want everybody to be cognizant of that. I just made a note of it. I want to talk to you a bit about process and the delegation is the thing that I put this motion forward, you know, to delegate around what's delegated authority to the CAO. We've done this since the beginning of time, delegated authority to the CAO. In 2004, Council unanimously dedicated the authority to the CAO for the CentreVenture tax credit program or the heritage tax credit program with CentreVenture. I don't know how many millions it was, but we authorized the CAO to develop procedures to administer the CentreVenture Heritage Tax Credit Program and approve the final terms and conditions for the program required to reflect the intent of Council. This is not an unusual policy. We've done it with the Gail Parvin Hammerquist program, the stadium, that we just approved a huge contract with the stadium that had a clause that said we authorized to finalize and approve the terms and conditions of all documents and agreements required to implement the intent of Council. Finalize the terms and agreements of all documents, Mr. Speaker. That was passed unanimously, Mr. Speaker. Oh and by the way, in December 2005, I wasn't on Council yet, but the Report on Inter-municipal Shared Servicing was passed unanimously as well. Mr. Speaker, I think we can all see what's going on here. We've got something that's extremely important to the well-being of our city, our province, our planet. Somehow we're trying to force politics into it. Let politics get in the road. Politics have gotten into the road of us working with the capital region since the beginning of time maybe but certainly since Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Vandal were here they've both made representations to the fact that this conversation has been, you know-on going. You know, we have this opportunity in front of us. The motion that I put forward, that Councillor Vandal seconded, you know it just cleans up that little bit of political, I don't know what the right term for it is, but that type of authority is delegated all the time and been supported by every member of this chamber in the past. You know the truth to do this boogieman politics, I see there's a motion coming up you know, down the road as well, somebody's going "Oh look, we have to adjust the conflict of interest guidelines" or one of the delegations even made some inference this morning that somehow there was some kind of corruption. This trying to paint an entity as if they are always on the side of evil, you know, let's get away from that stupidity. Let's you know, have a little decorum in this place, Mr. Speaker. Let's remind ourselves that we need to respect each and every one, all of us need to respect each other, to start showing these innuendos around, and these snide attempts to paint somebody under this ugly veil, we got to stop it, Mr. Speaker. Because if you do stop it, it gives you a lot more time to get things done, like these service sharing agreements where we can improve this province, improve this planet and I believe, improve this city. In other words, just one more quick point, there's talk about whether or not the proceeds from the extra funds should go to regional streets. I remind everybody that this is a two-way agreement. There are two parties involved. When you sit down with that other party and you want to talk, it's easy to have the other party sign up for regional streets. If you get them to sign up for buses that they're never going to use or libraries that they might no use…

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

**Councillor Swandel:** it's a little more difficult. It's a place to get some funding from other municipalities that use our infrastructure. Yes, some of them might use libraries but we know all of them use our regional streets. It's not about where I think the money should go or any of you think the money should go, it's getting some sort of revenue sharing from them to get money coming into the city from people just outside of the city that have an impact. I'll leave it at that Mr. Speaker. I'm going to support Motion number 1, I'm going to support the Clause; the rest you know, I'm going to treat it for what it is and not support them. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Smith.

**Councillor Smith:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to advance the file. I don't want us to be negotiating with the surrounding municipalities. Pure and simple.

**Councillor Swandel:** You voted for it.

**Councillor Smith:** Implications of the recommendations providing water and sewer services to neighbourhood municipalities would provide additional revenue to the city in the form of increased water and sewer revenues. Sure

we're going to get more money. This does not make the surrounding communities; this does make these surrounding communities more viable and attractive for many more Winnipeggers to leave Winnipeg. I don't agree with the comments of Councillor Vandal, where he suggested all those who were opposing this clause, that or suggesting that the sky was going to fall out and everything was going to go wrong because of this. They will have the same water and sewer services as Winnipeggers now have and with the lower property tax rates, this will be a further incentive to move out of Winnipeg. I'm not saying it's the only incentive. It's additional incentive to move out of Winnipeg. We were told these communities would have an expansion of population anyway, but mark my words, these municipalities will explode as many more Winnipeg residents leave, no longer paying taxes to the city. In the short-term, we will have more money, that's indisputable, to spend on regional roads. But in the long run, we will be selling our city short; creating urban sprawl is no answer for the development of Winnipeg.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any further speakers on this subject? Seeing none, we will close in reverse order. Councillor Pagtakhan if you will.

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** OK, thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this Council, whenever we deliberate something we must precede on balance. Councillor DeSmedt said that before, former Councillor DeSmedt, and that's something I hold true and close to my heart. Whenever we make decisions we've got to come across on balance. And I think, Mr. Speaker, on the Motion number 3 that's presented here, we're talking about, we're not just talking about one or the other, Mr. Speaker, we know full well that a service sharing agreement it's going to increase the population of the capital region. That's without a doubt going to happen. And what this motion is proposing, Mr. Speaker, in the actual, sorry let me just back up for a second. In the original implications, it's talking about reinvesting within our regional roads. Nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. But what this motion is saying, is that let's invest in that spirit, but instead with transit improvements and that is regional, Mr. Speaker, with existing local streets. We've heard that time and time again, Councillor Fielding mentioned it just now in his discussion and we talked about it yesterday in our capital budget. Local streets, Mr. Speaker, we need more funds for that. This motion tries to ensure that we have funds from the service sharing agreement to be reinvested into our local streets. And Mr. Speaker, sustainability, we've heard it over and over again in this debate. Sidewalks is another form of active transportation and that's a step in the right direction to creating a sustainable city. So this motion, I think, Mr. Speaker is very friendly and is within the spirit of infrastructure and it's talking about investing within our transit system, which is a regional system, in our local streets and we know full well that we need more funds to make that happen as well as sustainable development with our active transportation routes and sidewalks is a perfect example of that. We also heard today, Mr. Speaker, that this is a two-way agreement. Councillor Swandel had indicated in his debate that this is two-way agreement between the City of Winnipeg and the RM that we're going to be signing on with. This is exactly why Councillor Gerbasi's motion is very important. As the elected officials, we need to make sure that the spirit and intent of these negotiations is consistent with the thinking of this Council. I would have loved to have created terms of reference for the sale, to go out and discuss with the municipality, if it was to support sustainable infrastructure, Mr. Speaker and not just regional roads. That's what I would have wanted to see and I think some of my colleagues on Council would have wanted to see that as well. But, and that's why I think it's very important that we have that type of authority. We don't want to water down our authority, Mr. Speaker and it's important that we are at the front of that in terms of creating the terms of reference for our administration to go out and actually negotiate with various municipalities, including the one we have here today. If number 3 was supported, Mr. Speaker and support for existing, for transit, for local roads and for sidewalks that means that we can actually now lever monies from the provincial government. We're always talking about, you know leveraging money from both the provincial government and the federal government if we were to support number 3, Mr. Speaker, and invest in our local roads. That means we have more power, I believe, politically to negotiate with the provincial government and the federal government to enhance our regional streets. So that's a positive point of supporting Motion number 3. And Mr. Speaker, this City of Winnipeg was founded and incorporated in 1873, and you know, some wonderful neighbourhoods grew around it: South Point Douglas, North Point Douglas, River Heights, the North end, West Kildonan, Elmwood and others and these parts of the city are great neighbourhoods, Mr. Speaker, and they are aging. They are in need of much investments, love, and attention, and I think that what we are doing here with this particular motion, Mr. Speaker, is to make sure that we have a mechanism to reinvest back within to the neighbourhoods of our city. Those are the founding neighbourhoods of our city and we must not forget that. They're not going to go away, they're going to be here and this is one way we can transform them Mr. Speaker, and invest in them, and have a vision to do that, Mr. Speaker. So you know, when you read this motion it's not standing in the way of service sharing agreements Mr. Speaker, it's talking about simply using the revenue from the service sharing to enhance our city, our older neighbourhoods that need the investment badly, and all parts of the city for that matter, Mr. Speaker. So I'm hoping that we can get full support for Motion number 3. I'll be supporting Motion number 2, and you know Motion number 1, I think is part way there, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, but I think you know my previous comments are - speak for themselves. I would like to have had more of an opportunity to set the terms of reference for our administration to go out and negotiate and I believe that we ought to be doing that and so I can't support Item number 1. And I appreciate the opportunity to speak. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The amendments that I put forward says that each and every agreement comes forward to Council for debate, and one of the reasons that's so important is that what we've done today here is set a policy, which some of us have severe misgivings about the very nature of the policy and the guidance; but we've given our CAO guidance to go out and this will probably pass, so he will have that guidance, but when he comes back with an a agreement it should come back here because many of these agreements will have larger implications, that are not covered in the policy alone. As I've mentioned, other policies are more rigorous like in Calgary where they don't even allow to share water and services for businesses to move outside of the city at all. They only allow it for residential because they don't want to lose their tax base. There's other bigger policy implications and I would like to actually acknowledge, since nobody really has, that Councillor Mandamin who's here from Shoal Lake, I realize there's legal issues around this, which we aren't allowed to know the detail legal assessment agreements we've been given. But there are implications because we are selling water to other municipalities and that might be legal and we may be able to do that, but I think we also have to look at all the implications of that and that's all I'll say on that. I'm curious about Motion 1, and why West St. Paul agreement can't come back here, why you know Councillor Swandel sounded like he didn't really think it was, the motion says that the other agreements in the future can come back to Council but West St. Paul we are approving right now according to motion 1 that's my problem with it. Is the agreement that just goes with our policy that's in front of us today, does not tell us a number of things. It doesn't tell us exactly where the growth is going, how much, what kind of, all sorts of other issues, you know aren't that clear. So why can't Council have an open debate? Again, I point out the reason why this came the initial proposal was that none of the agreements would come back at all and we would give these guidelines and there could be an endless number of agreements with every and any municipality, to any extent, for any type of services or whatever, or water and waste services. But any type of development basically, could be gone out and negotiated, if it's long as it meets these guidelines, we're for sale, our water is for sale. And the impact on that would not have been clear to us and we would have been giving away that authority. That's why I moved the motion in the first place and I honestly don't understand why they had to leave West St. Paul out of that. Why is it any different than any other agreement? These are government to government agreements. You will not find a single city Council, probably in the country, and not in Manitoba that is not going to vote line by line, go over an agreement and have it in front of them. They don't approve agreements based on a general policy of how to go and negotiate an agreement. They look at the agreement in front of them. I'm sure the other Councillors in West St. Paul will be looking at their agreements line by line and having that discussion while our administration is across the table from them. And I would imagine that all the Councillors on that Council will be in the room too, at the same time. So like I think we do have some issues with our process here, and you know, in my earlier arguments, I've said that there are more implications to this than just simply it's going to happen anyway. We as a Council have to be accountable for what we're allowing to the way we're allowing our land use and these things to happen that you can say we can have a framework to negotiate things but as Councillor Swandel just said, you know we have to consider what the other side wants. They want regional roads because they want to cut through the city because they are driving through. Well you know, of course they do. Again, we are, we have to bend to the interests of outside our city to go down this road. And I kind of agree that we really, there is a reason we didn't go down this road for many, many years to this extent. I mean, this is going, opening the door to a huge extent that we've never gone down. That's not an accident that we didn't go down this road. And if we're at the point like some other cities that are larger than what is around and we could consider annexation and all, I guess it might make a little more sense. Maybe it will make sense in 20 years or 30 years, but right now, we're putting the cart before the horse and we're allowing, we're actually accelerating our own problems. We're actually putting more pressure on our existing roads, we're going to be losing our tax base and all of this was going to be put forward without it even coming to Council even for discussion. I mean, I still think the policy we're adopting is not rigorous enough. I think there's a lot of flaws in it. I mean it was really a finger in the dike effort to at least have it come back here and not just automatically just happen without even a discussion of where this development is going to happen and what. But, so I guess, in a way, I guess we can argue it's a bit of a, it is appreciated that that was listened to, I do appreciate that it was listened to, that the concern that it wouldn't even come back to Council. But I still think our policy itself needs a lot of work and I would actually like to ask the Mayor, you know that after this if there is any other opportunity for us to revamp that policy and look at some of these other issues that have come up in this debate today and have public consultation about that policy on a broader level, I really think that's what should be done because we just had an OurWinnipeg process with all those people participating in it and all of that, all those people who were at that, I remember the very first sustainability summit, they were not talking about doing this. They were talking about building rapid transit, infill development, density, densifying our city, fixing existing infrastructure. 99 per cent of the people in the room were talking about that. They weren't talking about giving water and sewer services so people could sprawl out their developments outside the city and we'd have to widen and expand our regional roads at an even greater rate. That's not what they were saying. So we've lost touch with what direction the people spoke in the OurWinnipeg process, I believe we have. And I believe it's the responsibility of the leadership of this Council through you to the Mayor, Mr. Speaker, to give people a voice back in this and look at this policy again in the future. I mean it's going to pass today but I think it's a grave, grave mistake and I am relieved that at least it will come back here so we can continue to have this debate and maybe people will have time to reconsider the direction we're going in the future. Thank you. Mr. Speaker.

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

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well this is pretty straightforward. I can answer the questions. Most of it is just if my colleagues would be so kind as to read the report. You know, the report basically outlines what the parameters are for the deal with West St. Paul, in case there are any variances from that coming forward with new ones, this motion just allows us to have, take a look and to consider to make sure that everything is consistent going forward. This is basically the deal with West St. Paul, that's been negotiated to this point as per our EOI process, I believe you voted for it Councillor, or through you Mr. Speaker to the Councillor. I just encourage everybody to sort of get over this political histrionics and you know, stop doing the boogieman politics. Development is occurring outside of our city, the development that is occurring outside of our city is not sustainable. We're taking action now to help make it sustainable. You know, so that's where this motion sort of gets it into the right place. Earlier on I heard reference to Calgary. Calgary's policy deals with - they have a long history with the capital region and absorbed a lot of what we're absorbing now and that's why they're saying just residential going forward but in the beginning they serviced industrial and commercial and all kinds of services, all kinds of properties were serviced when the initial service sharing agreements were done. And you know, I just - I want to read this one clause here that will help maybe. This is in the report, this is troubling that I actually have to read this, but "no development plan amendments, rezoning, subdivision, building permits, topsoil removal or development of any kind shall take place within these designated areas without a formal inter-municipal agreement in place guiding the future development of the lands in question." That's the policy we're voting for. People complain about ex urban sprawl, Mr. Speaker. They recognize that there is harm out there, but we're actually able to stop that harm. We're actually able to control, and we can get one done right away, we can get it done right away Mr. Speaker. We can make this plan a little bit better today and a lot better in the future, albeit, you know, in the past where some of our colleagues were in a position to control things like this, they had no problem delegating the authority to the CAO. You know, I've crafted a motion here that sort of just takes the political histrionics off the table; there is no boogieman here, nobody is doing anything evil. This is saving the planet Mr. Speaker, this is sustainability; this is good planning; this is a great opportunity for Winnipeg, for our neighbours and guess what Mr. Speaker, we also get a little bit of extra infrastructure money out of it. If you want to nickel and dime about where it goes, you know. It should go to transit, it should go to libraries, it should go to regional streets, it should go to local streets; we actually got some revenue sharing coming to us from the capital region. We've got revenue sharing coming from the capital region. We can do that tomorrow. We can send the CAO out to get the first one done with West St. Paul, Mr. Speaker. Of course the other ones will have to keep coming back here, and back here and back here and back here, so we can go through this sort of theatrics in the future but some of us here today are going to fight for this planet, we're going to fight for a great city, we're going to fight for a great capital region, we're going to fight for a clean Lake Winnipeg. You know, we're living in a place that is prospering, we're doing great. You know, environmentally we're moving ahead, and we have opportunities to move even faster, Mr. Speaker. And fortunately, I hope we have got the votes to carry to at least get West St. Paul done today and I guess we'll have to go through the political histrionics in the future, you know for the other ones. I would like to see us be able to negotiate as many as we can right now because I truly believe this is a great tool for in the realm of sustainability. It will help the environment, it will help our infrastructure, it cleans up so much bad planning that's happened in the past outside of our borders, you know, and you know when people start talking about ex urban sprawl, they should also start promoting density as well. If they really want to be champions in that regard, let's promote density. I think there will be some opportunities to do that here today, so let's seize those opportunities, Mr. Speaker because you can't have one without the other, Mr. Speaker. We get something done today for West St. Paul and we could do something great going forward for Winnipeg. And you know we also, what we get done for West St. Paul today is good for the City of Winnipeg. But there are other opportunities. If you truly believe that density and growing up is more important than growing out, even though our policy is to grow up and out, because we know that not everybody wants to live in a 500 square foot apartment on Corydon Avenue. Some people like new communities and new schools and new community centres and those amenities that come with new communities to raise their children with a bit of space to play in their backyard. Because when we listen to people in OurWinnipeg, Mr. Speaker some of us listen to all of the people, not the people that just serve our political arguments, that we want it make for the sake of power. Some of us listen to them because we want to make this place great for everybody, not just the select few that come forward with these arguments that are more in the world of idealism. Today we can do something for West St. Paul and for the City of Winnipeg. Hopefully, tomorrow these future agreements come forward we'll be doing it for a great deal more partners in the capital region and that lake will be getting cleaner and cleaner every chance we get. And who knows, the province, when they talk about these service sharing agreements in the R-Pact program, in the R-Pact committee report and some of the other places where they are talking about service sharing and even in the Lake Winnipeg stewardship report, it suggests that where service sharing exists that should be where the province should be pointing its water stewardship should be helping to dedicate provincial dollars towards those kinds of agreements because these ideas are about sustainability and they should be one of the things that help identify where you should prioritize your dollars to. So by getting this deal done with West St. Paul and the others that will have to go through this extraneous process for, because lord knows we all want to sit and do the minutiae of every deal. Although we've never done it before, Mr. Speaker, never done it before. We have lawyers, we have CAOs, we have department heads that do

that minutiae. But I guess for the sake of politics we should ask for it. Mr. Speaker, this is a great opportunity and I'm just so proud to be a part of getting this lake cleaned up and hopefully getting some more provincial dollars for this infrastructure now that we are using it for shared service. As the province and you know, all those commissions and committees that they bring forward and that they help, they champion this. They say that this type of behaviour should be rewarded. Not scolded like it's something to be put down for the sake of politics. It's about our planet, it's not about your politics. It's about OurWinnipeg; it's about our capital region neighbours. Let's grow up, let's do it right, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Swandel. Mr. Mayor to close.

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I tend to think, Mr. Speaker, there has been some very good dialogue and I think everybody should have their opinion, have the opportunity to express it. It's unfortunate that, or it's reality I guess, that we're not always going to agree, but I do want to make a few comments. I won't speak for any previous Mayors or any previous EPC, but I will say this, that there obviously has been rigorous discussion on this, there was a Council seminar. The COO was there to answer all questions. The majority of Councillors were there. It's unfortunate some may have been away for valid reasons but that's reality. That happens at Council seminars all the time. And when EPC makes a decision and believes they can improve that decision, I believe it is incumbent upon the Mayor and members of EPC to listen and make changes and that's what you saw today and I think that's a very good thing, Mr. Speaker. I was very intent on listening to the Peter, Paul and Mary story, one of my favourite groups from days gone bym but today I noted it was all about Mary today, Mr. Speaker. And you know, with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Orlikow, I don't know about anybody else in this chamber, but I can assure you that if anybody were to sell their home and move to the capital region, they are not doing that before they sell their home, get the money and guess what? There is no loss of revenue because you're collecting the exact same money. And Mr. Speaker, I challenge you. Go try to find a home today for sale that you can buy in River Heights. Good luck to you, Mr. Speaker. I hope you're ready to get involved in a bidding war because that's what's happening in the market today. It's a very good thing for those who are selling, it's a very good thing for agents but the reality is it's tough to find a home there for people wanting to start a family and have a home there. So, I don't know where those numbers came from, I don't get the analogy but it makes absolutely no sense. And I want to address a comment that was made, actually it was a question, ok, that was made by Councillor Eadie. He talked about what was potentially happening and I think he made reference to Springfield and the fire, which is a very good point because under the existing scenario, they can build anything they want, Mr. Speaker. And guess what? Was there a fire hydrant near this manufacturing company? Absolutely not. If we had input, do you think there would have been? I guarantee you there would have been. That's the difference, Mr. Speaker. So let me give you a lay of the land here. OK we have our services and they end right here. In order to move it forward, the RM of West St. Paul will basically pay and maintain everything. We're going to be getting our 30 per cent. Could it be 50 per cent? It's more than 30. Is that what the debate is about? 50 verses 30? 30 is a lot better than zero and no input. Just a fact Mr. Speaker, that's just a reality. And let's look at what's happening in our city, OK. Because you know what, I do agree that we want to see development in our city. We want to see higher density. So look what's going on right now. Take a look at our downtown. The heart of their city, the heart of the city. Record development in homes in our downtown. More than ever before, Mr. Speaker, ever before. High rise. High rise, Mr. Speaker, two and a half decades there has been no high rise investments to be worked on Assiniboine. Fort Rouge Yards, a great development, Mr. Speaker. The potential for more residential in Polo Park. I just left a press conference with the Premier on the naming rights for the new football stadium. I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, can you not look around our city and see all these great things that are happening? No matter where you look, Main Street, Portage Avenue, Polo Park, U of M, Fort Rouge Yards, airport, Museum for Human Rights, name it, it's happening Mr. Speaker. If this is approved today, there are 16 of us here today, right now. I would love to see, through you, to all the Councillors if this happens today and West St. Paul has these services, who is moving out there? I'm not. Is anybody else moving? I like it the city, Mr. Speaker and that's where I will be. And let me tell you something that's wonderful about Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, it's why my parents came here ok, with nothing but two little kids on their backs, because it's a democracy. It's where everyone is treated equal. If you want to live in Transcona, God bless you, if you want to be in Corydon, Little Italy where the action is, God bless you. You want to live in the capital region, God bless you. You are entitled to that, that is your right Mr. Speaker. Everyone's right. So you know what, just once, and you know sometimes I feel like I'm talking to the wall, we're going to be getting revenue. Yesterday, Councillor Mayes, knocking on doors and we don't have to knock on doors to know that the residents feel our sidewalks are falling apart. Our roads, local streets and regional are falling apart. Our back lanes, our curbs, our community centres, our pipes, OK our hockey rinks, it's all falling apart. So Mr. Speaker, we're going to get some money and we're going to direct it to regional roads, OK. Which are falling apart, which is our responsibility. Has anybody ever thought if you found that revenue to put to regional roads, maybe it will give us some other revenues that we won't have to use for regional roads; we can put it to the sidewalks, back lanes, curbs, et cetera? Is that a bad thing, Mr. Speaker? And let's just talk about the environment. We've been mandated to spend $1.2 billion by the Clean Environment Commission, OK. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? Because of all the phosphorous and nitrogen going into Lake Winnipeg, We're 5 per cent of it. Five. The other 95 per cent comes from outside the City of Winnipeg. That's the big picture. If we don't address some of those issues what are we doing with our $1.2 billion investment? Flushing it right down the toilet, you will accomplish nothing. Because right now as we speak, in some of these areas in the capital

region, not only are the septic fields failing, there is raw sewage floating in those ditches, into the rivers, right into Lake Winnipeg. I know you all care about that. I know you all care about that. So Mr. Speaker, let's realize the city is growing, the sky is not falling. Winnipeg will not become a ghost town, I guarantee you, Winnipeg will not become a ghost town. This city will continue to flourish and grow because this Council cares and we're going to move it forward in the same direction as we're going now towards prosperity, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Mayor Katz. Now, we will vote in reverse order. Correct? Alright. This is on Motion 3. All those in favour please rise.

A recorded vote was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas:** Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Mayes, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Smith.

**Nays:** His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck, Sharma, Steen, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman.

**City Clerk:** The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 6, Nays 10.

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion is defeated. Now Motion 2. All those in favour please rise.

A recorded vote was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

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

**Nays**

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

**City Clerk:** The vote, Mr. Speaker, Yeas 6, Nays 10.

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion is defeated. And our Motion 1, all those in favour please rise.

A recorded vote was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

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

**Nays**

Councillor Eadie, Gerbasi, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Smith.

**City Clerk:** Mr. Speaker, Yeas 11, Nays 5.

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion passed on the clause as amended. OK, we'll vote. All those in favour of the clause as amended please rise.

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

**Yeas**

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

**Nays**

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Orlikow. Pagtakhan, Smith.

**Mr. Speaker:** The amended motion.

**Clerk:** The vote, Mr. Speaker, Yeas 11 Nays 5.

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion passes. Alright, we will move on to the Report of December 7. Mayor Katz.

**REPORT "A" OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 7, 2011**

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the Report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items number 1 to 24.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Stand down 20 and 23.

**Mr. Speaker:** No further? Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** 12, please.

**Mr. Speaker:** So 12 and Councillor Eadie's. So that will be 1 through 11 and 13 through 19, 21, and 22 and 24. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item number 12.

**Item 12 - Winnipeg Convention Centre Corporation - Citizen Member Appointments**

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, obviously we know what this is, we are doing it every year, it's appointing citizens to the Convention Centre. I would love to hear what Councillor Mayes has to say and then if I can respond, I obviously would be glad to.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Very briefly I just wanted to commend the appointment of my predecessor Mr. Steeves to the Board. I don't see any controversy, in fact I'm pleased to see it. It's always good to see younger people, younger than me, getting involved in the governance of the city, so I didn't want to delay things I just wanted to commend the appointment of Mr. Steeves.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you any further comments? Seeing none all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Number 20.

**Item 20 - General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres - Review of Community Centres – Review of Community Centre Universal Funding Formula - City of Winnipeg and Community Centre Responsibilities Document**

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, under the funding formula what we've done here is given an increase of 8.1 per cent. It's a five year deal. We've also addressed inflation, which has annual increases of 2 per cent. I will listen very carefully and closely to what Councillor Eadie has to say and then if I have to respond, I certainly shall do so.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you Speaker Nordman. I just asked this be stood down. I only wanted to, and I think this is a great thing because the community centres have been needing a better way of bringing in their revenue through this report. I think it's fair to smaller community centres to make them more viable and it's a really good thing. But I just wanted to bring, it came to my attention, I was reading Clause 8 or point number 8 under the new agreement for the next five years and what was really good is it talks about coming up with what are the financial analysis and what the expectations are of adding new community centre space, activity recreation space, that will be needed and it does says the city will appropriate enough money in the budget to cover the new space. Now, my only concern here is, what's not in here, it doesn't reflect. This particular clause does not reflect, what I think is another policy that exists in some other

report that was, that comes before I became a City Councillor in which it says, when you, there is a report that says when you expand or actually, it's a policy, I guess, that was set. It's set with the, what is it? Thank you.

**Unknown Speaker:** GCWCC.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you. Anyways, it charges them and it's kind of like having a health authority or some other authority governing and taking care of our community centres. Although we do acknowledge that community centres are part of the city's responsibility. But in there, there is a report that says that if they add any new extra recreational space that needs to be heated, not a new hockey rink but an indoor soccer. But, which is I think is to be paid for through user fees. But, if you do create extra recreational space, you need to actually remove some, in one place to create new in another place and another; a great example would be I think it's great that there will be a new Elmwood Community Centre. It's excellent and sounds like it might even be bigger and better. But I'm wondering, what is the implication of number 8, which would mean if it's expanded it will be heated and all the money will go forward and that makes it viable. But, if we're taking away space elsewhere, is there a recoup of the heated space money that the city provides? How is that money redirected because it says we appropriate money for the new space but it doesn't deal with this other report where we supposedly have to remove recreational space when we create extra new space in certain regions, I guess it is. So I'm not sure about that. I will be actually voting for this report today but this report doesn't reflect some of the complexities of our agreements that we have with the community centres of Winnipeg.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** I just have one quick question that perhaps the Mayor can answer when he sums up. Obviously I'm going to be supporting this. We desperately need more operating funding for our community centres. I do recall a motion awhile back and I may have missed, I was looking through the report trying to find it in here. But it is my understanding that the funding for this initiative, which is something that obviously should happen. But I'm a bit concerned that I understand, and if I'm wrong great, but I think the money is coming from the land operating reserve, I believe and I just have a concern about selling land that's one time land sales and using it you know as a financial approach, using it to fund the operating, ongoing operating of something like community centres. Obviously we need to find this money and I'm certainly going to support it, but I was trying to the last few days, trying to find it in the documents and I do remember that and I did ask Mr. Wightman about it and he said that he confirmed that it was money for this was coming from the land operating reserve. So I just wonder if the Mayor could comment on that. I realize we're in a financially difficult situation and we desperately need to find this money I understand that and I'm prepared to support it but I just want to put my concern on the record about using land sale, one time money, to fund a yearly operating cost of something as important as our community centres.

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz, would you like to reply.

**Mayor Katz:** First of all Mr. Speaker, my understanding is what Councillor Gerbasi said is accurate, and keep something in mind, and Councillor Gerbasi and I have had these discussions before. What I believe Council has to do in the future is try to identify revenue sources that are specifically dedicated for specific projects such as this but in the meantime it is coming from the LOR, that is absolutely correct.

**Mr. Speaker:** Were you going to respond to Councillor Eadie?

**Mayor Katz:** OK, just kidding, Councillor Eadie. I was so focused on Councillor Gerbasi I forgot about the previous. Now what were you asking about Councillor?

**Councillor Eadie:** I was asking about the repercussions.

**Mayor Katz:** Oh the square footage.

**Councillor Eadie:** Is the square footage supposed to take away (inaudible).

**Mayor Katz:** Yes, that is the policy. It's basically based on you know, the population of the area, the basin per say, that's a policy that exists. If that is something we want to discuss in the future that certainly is something we can look into but we are always looking on population verses facilities and it's based on square footage equating to the population. When there is population growth you need more square footage, if the population dwindling you need less square footage. So that is the way the policy and if Councillor Eadie wants to discuss that and has ideas or thoughts I would be happy to meet with him.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you. Seeing no further comments or questions all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. And Number 22? 23 sorry.

**Item 23 - Development Procedures By-law**

**Mayor Katz:** I'll just let Councillor Eadie make some comments and then we'll try and address them.

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

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you Speaker Nordman and thanks for the Mayor. This is the Development Procedures By-law. I think there is a number of changes that are being presented in this By-law to meet our new planning documents, our new guide for the City of Winnipeg, the OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities. It talks about all the different processes that we do have in terms of dealing with things like zoning, which talk about density and it's kind of ironic that when we talk about political historics and histrionics and that sort of stuff, it's kind of interesting that these are the processes that are set aside to do things here, and there is a number of histrionics that go along with some of these. For example, there is only - for the rezoning of property, we hear it at community committee and after a decision is made there is no opportunity for appeal, no opportunity for more delegates to come and speak to it, to appeal that decision. There is no new information allowed to be put on the table, it goes to the Standing Committee and this is what is still going to be in this document when it passes and I don't think and there is probably some other things in this Development Procedures By-law that probably need amendment. But, when it comes to this kind of thing, as a City Councillor I take my job seriously and I look at these planning documents and when I hear at a hearing, I hear the presentations and I've heard a couple now, and I hear some unreasonable arguments when it comes to rezoning, but then I hear some good arguments. And notably what's coming up further on in the agenda has two issues, actually, one where a decision was made to make lots of density at 530 Polson and one where there was chosen to be a little less density but more density created even though through the decision. But in this process, in this by-law process, what's in here is if a Standing Committee has the opportunity to turn over a decision, as well as EPC, to turn it over and do what it wants when it goes to there and then it comes to Council for a vote, what my concern is, is that if you're going to overturn a decision of a hearing, it should be a lot more exact as to how that decision violates OurWinnipeg or our Complete Community, in order to overturn that decision. It's very important that that happens because political histrionics does happen. People do have connections to other people, and it's very hard to stay unbiased. And you know, Standing Committee decisions can be biased as well towards one side or the other. So, if there is no opportunity for more delegates, and no opportunity for no more information to be supplied, shouldn't we actually expect an actual demonstration before something is overturned, exactly how OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities is violated in order to do that and these amendments that are coming to these procedures, Development Procedures By-law does not address that and I really think it does. You know, I don't go around the political spectrum can be ugly at times without using words like I heard, today I heard "crazy" although I heard the person say "I'm not crazy" but I did hear words like "crazy" and other, I heard other innuendo and I think that I have actually respect for everybody in this chamber, I have respect for everybody in this chamber, and so it can be very frustrating though when I have to say, when decisions are made to overturn decisions, and there is no strong grounds to actually overturn it. Demonstrate to me where these things are violated. So I really - I'm going to vote for the changes to this procedures, Development Procedures By-law but I just wanted people to understand that there is a flaw here in terms of only having one hearing. In a sense, it's almost taken democracy out of it. So and if the intention was to have some sort of democratic process at the start, why not finish it up that way then? So anyway I'll leave it at that. Thank you Speaker Nordman for allowing me to speak to this and thanks to the Mayor.

**Mr. Speaker:** Mayor Katz.

**Mayor Katz:** I'm not sure I heard what the question was. I certainly heard some comments. I guess you know when the comments are made about bias, Mr. Speaker, let's just call it the way it is. Whether it's Community Committee or Standing Policy Committee, there is always a possibility for bias one way or the other. And I would say to you that one of the few areas that would be totally objective, 100 per cent is when a department puts forward their recommendations and their opinion that's probably the most unbiased of all, Mr. Speaker. End of story. I don't know what else I can say other than the fact that Ross I love you, OK, and I respect you.

**Councillor Eadie:** There's lots of time when the administration stuff is overturned.

**Mr. Speaker:** Too much information. In any event, seeing no other comments all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE - MOTIONS**

**Mr. Speaker:** OK, Motion number 4, we have motion, and I think as the Chair I'm going to refer this automatically to the Governance Committee to look at further. Point of order on that?

**Councillor Orlikow:** (Inaudible)… because it's asking the province to do something, that it's required to go to EPC because it's a provincial thing. I mean I'm good either way, just that I was told that earlier on. I don't care either way.

**Mr. Speaker:** OK we'll go to Governance and it may flow to EPC from Governance. Alright so that's Item Number 4. By-laws, Mayor Katz, we have a truck load here.

## EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE – CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

**Mayor Katz:** Thank you Mr. Speaker, I move the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law number 126/2011, 146/2011, 147/2011, 151/2011, 152/2011, 153/2011, 157/2011, 159/2011, and 160/2011.

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

**Clerk:** By-laws numbered 126/2011, 146/2011, 147/2011, 151/2011, 152/2011, 153/2011, 157/2011, 159/2011, and 160/2011.

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker I will move that By-laws numbered 126/2011, 146/2011, 147/2011, 151/2011 to 153/2011 both inclusive, and By-laws number 157/2011, 159/2011 and 160/2011 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-laws numbered 126/2011, 146/2011, 147/2011, 151 to 153/2011 both inclusive and By-laws numbered 157/2011, 159/2011, and 160/2011.

**Mayor Katz:** And Mr. Speaker I will move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 126/2011, 146/2011, 147/2011, 151/2011 to 153/2011 both inclusive, and By-laws numbered 157/2011, 159/2011 and 160/2011 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

## EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
## QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Speaker:** Question period Mayor Katz. Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. I had the very enlightening experience this week…was it this week? No, it must have been last week…of attending EPC and listening to the discussion there, and there were a few things said that prompted my questions today. The first one was, when there was discussion in response to the delegations that came regarding the transit fare increase, because people came I guess on the Capital Budget to talk about that. I was wondering if you could clarify, Mr. Mayor, what Councillor Swandel, if there was truth to what Councillor Swandel said at that meeting when he said that the money coming from the 20-cent increase in transit fares was not necessarily going to Rapid Transit. That the wording of the motion was "Transit Improvements", and because I really believe it was said in the media and the impression was given that that 20-cent transit increase was going to go to Phase 2 of the Southwest Corridor or to Rapid Transit, and that's how it was talked about by everyone. But then I'm quite certain I heard Councillor Swandel sort of reassure the delegation, "don't worry, they're not paying for the Southwest Corridor, it's just going to transit improvements. It's not going to any particular…it could just go into a general pot for Transit Improvement." So I'm wondering if you could give some clarity as to what that means.

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi, I thank her for the question. I certainly will try and give clarity as to what I believe is taking place. I know that Councillor Gerbasi could have the opportunity later on to ask Councillor Swandel to clarify anything that she wants him to clarify. My understanding quite simple, Mr. Speaker, as a result of moving up Rapid Transit from the year 2031 to 2016, there was a motion put forward on the floor and it is my understanding that all those monies are going to pay for the completion of the Southwest Corridor. Where I think the disconnect may have taken place, because I've heard other Councillors ask this as well, is that not the entire burden of completing the Southwest Transit Corridor is not falling on the transit user, and that was done, I know, both Councillor Swandel and Councillor Wyatt, basically made reference to that. When you take the total cost, a small percentage of it is going for that plus as we already know, and you can debate it, but, if you take 150,000…$150 million budget today, for a transit, half of that, approximately, including revenue, from both fares and advertising is about 75 million which means the rest is already being subsidized and we were raising money for one-third of it, which means the other two-thirds is

coming from somewhere else, so to say that the entire burden was being placed on the transit user, I think that's what the comment that they were making, but I can assure Councillor Gerbasi that my understanding is that's exactly where the money is going.

**Mr. Speaker:** Second question?

**Councillor Gerbasi:** You answered the first…I never…that whole second part I wasn't getting at that but that's OK. That answers the question. It's for the Southwest Transit Corridor which I believe is in Councillor Swandel's Ward. But, what I was going to follow up on that and ask, since Council approved the transit fare increase, there was word said through you Mr. Speaker to the Mayor, that there was going to be discussions with the Province, and if the Province sort of comes through with some other way to fund this project, that we won't have to put the burden on the transit user and that the money could come from some other source. I'm wondering if you could update us as to how those meetings are going, what kind of discussions have there been and what kind of efforts are you making to divert this transit fare increase to coming on to our citizens and transit users?

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, as you know, this is something that's been put off for six months. It takes place in June, and that gave the Province the opportunity, and they still have that opportunity, to see if there are other ways. I can tell you that I had a very short discussion with the Premier today, as I mentioned I was at a…unfortunately I could not attend your luncheon because of an announcement for the naming rights for the new football stadium at the University of Manitoba, and it appears right now that the Premier is very much focused on the issue of flooding and whether they are going to be recouping the monies that are required right now. But I can tell you that probably about two weeks ago, the media claimed they heard some rumblings and asked me if I heard anything and I told them no, I haven't. A few days ago I was asked the same question and I said no, but this is the time of year where things do start slowing down and I'm sure in the new year we'll start these dialogues again, but at this particular point in time, I have not had any suggestions come forward from the Province. That doesn't mean it may not happen. In the beginning of the New Year, it could be March, it could be April, I have no idea, but I can assure Councillor Gerbasi that I will bring it up with the Premier.

**Mr. Speaker:** Last question.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you. My last question also at that EPC meeting that day, I heard some discussion about closed door meetings that were happening…that had happened between the Premier and I don't know who was there, whatever, but if it's a closed door meeting, it should be a closed door meeting. It shouldn't be talked about at an EPC meeting, and I was concerned. Another thing that was raised also was a 2 per cent sales tax discussion that had apparently happened between the Mayor and the Premier. So I guess I'm kind of asking if there's any problem with talking about closed door meetings. I know would I have gotten my hand slapped if I said that, but the other thing is did the Mayor in fact go to the Premier and propose a 2 per cent sales tax? Because that was said…excuse me…that was what was said at EPC, that the Mayor and Councillor Wyatt perhaps went to the Premier and talked about a 2 per cent City sales tax. I guess I just wanted to verify whether that was true.

**Mr. Speaker:** OK, we've got a question.

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker to the best of my knowledge, and I was chairing that meeting, I never made any comment whatsoever about closed door meetings of any kind. That's number one. Number two, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that there have been ongoing discussions with the AMM and the provincial government regarding getting a share of existing sales tax, of looking at new ways, whether there'd be new point, whatever the case may be, we are a member of the AMM and it's gone through the AMM and unfortunately, I can only answer for myself, Mr. Speaker, that I wasn't at any meeting specifically requesting such a thing from the Province or the Premier. Could that have come from the AMM? That's possible, Mr. Speaker. I was not there.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** I have I think only one question which pertains fittingly to the new stadium for the Mayor, and this arose out of something that came up when I was out door knocking, which I may have mentioned previously there, but out doing some door knocking. My sister was a great help on the campaign and I was on a street called Minnetonka Street which is quite close to the river, and you could hear the final Bison's game being played at the old stadium, and I commented and the people at the door commented that if you could hear those 500 people roughly in attendance at that game, you're going to hear the 30 odd thousand for a Bombers' game, and if you get the jet engine volume of an AC/DC concert going on there, you're certainly going to hear that, so my question is two-fold about the new stadium. Number one, when I was up in the gallery last for a Riel Community Committee, there was a Stadium Advisory Committee created through the work of Councillor Swandel. No one from St. Vital was actually on that committee and the traffic and the parking and certainly the noise issues are going to come across the river so I'd like to see some St. Vital

representation there. In addition a number of people in my Ward have talked to me about their concerns about a foot bridge. People seem to have this idea that this is going to be decided on by Council in March, that we're going to be putting a foot bridge across to the U of M to help with pedestrian traffic. I have had no indication from Mr. Pittet or anyone else at the Clerk's office that there is any imminent plan for a foot bridge, but I wonder if you can just speak to those issues. Obviously I personally think the stadium is a good thing. It's going to be good for the City and I think it'll be good for the south end, but I do want St. Vital residents to be part of that ongoing Stadium Advisory Committee, and just if you have any information on…we've heard everything from the gondola to the foot bridge to everything else. If there's any further developments on that or any specific time frame on that. Thank you.

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Mayes, I'm glad you did mention the gondola, I recall vividly. I think that was a time we were looking at creative thoughts and Councillor Swandel did raise that issue. I can tell you that I have not had, personally, any dialogue regarding either a foot bridge or a gondola. I don't believe I've heard from any other Councillor or any department that's been discussing this. That was, I don't know, maybe two years ago. As far as the noise situation, let's all be very realistic, is that during the 10 football games and the hopeful playoffs and maybe a Grey Cup and maybe a few concerts, there is absolutely no doubt in my mind that there is going to be sound, noise, that people in certain areas are going to hear. I think part of the design of the Investors Group Field will address some of it, but don't for a moment think that there won't be any noise. The good news is the vast majority of these games are played either on the weekend or in the afternoon on a weekend which I think is very positive, and if anybody, I'm sure Scott Fielding, Councillor Fielding, can let you know that residents in St. James have been dealing with this issue and quite often for a concert they'll just pull up a lawn chair and have a BBQ and enjoy a free show. They don't get to see it but they get to hear it. But that is a reality. I can also tell you that the University, I have spoken to Dr. David Barnard of the University of Manitoba. They are very cognizant of the noise and want to make sure they can do everything they can to minimize any inconvenience to residents, but I think we all have to be realistic that for those, you know, dozen dates, yes, there will be noise and hopefully it will not inconvenience people because of the time parameter it takes place, the weekend or an afternoon. But I don't think you're going to get away from that. The only way to do that would be, I guess, an indoor, enclosed facility and that is not the case here.

**Mr. Speaker:** Second question?

**Councillor Mayes:** Just to follow up that. I'm reassured by that because some of the people in St. Vital have indicated to me they thought this was merely a…people saw this merely as a west side of the river issue, obviously the noise is going to come across, we'll have to deal with that and sounds like the city is taking steps to deal with that, so thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Let's hope it's the sound of victory. Councillor Orlikow.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Mayor, can you just give us an update on how negotiations are going regarding the new Building Canada Fund?

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Orlikow, as you are aware, one announcement has been done and obviously approved, and that was Plessis Road, which takes a significant amount of money from the Building Canada funds. We have until 2014, because that's what this tranche is for and there is still dialogue going on, on what other projects. I will share with Councillor Orlikow. I'm sure he recalls that the City did send a list of projects to both the Federal and Provincial Government, and this is a situation where you have to get all three to agree because it is in this one-third, one-third, one-third and quite often it ends up being a little bit more of the City of Winnipeg. In other words they're a little bit lower than one-third because certain costs are not allowed but that's the update right now. I doubt that I'll be hearing anything further until the New Year.

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

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you Speaker Nordman. Through you to the Mayor. There was, I think we made a quick decision about a 20-cent increase for bus fare last Council meeting and I know we do have to find money to build the rest of the Southwest Rapid Transit corridor. I think a lot of people from the north might want to find a transit way to get to a football game and there's a lot of people up in my Ward that will be going, but my question is really, when we make these decisions, I'm wondering if anywhere there is any discussion about…or does anybody on City Council know how many people use the bus because they're working for a living, they're not on social assistance, but they're working for a living, they can't afford a car because they choose to channel that money into having a bit better place to live. They channel that money into making sure that the kids have better clothes, because you know they're having trouble making ends meet, so they take the bus…

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there a question?

**Councillor Eadie:** …so I'm asking if the Mayor or anybody on his committee called the Executive Policy Committee, knows how many people ride transit who are basically what we call working poor, who have nowhere, no social safety net to fall back on?

**Mr. Speaker:** OK we have the question. Your Worship?

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker, when that decision was made, we, this Council, made that decision. Councillor Eadie was on the Chamber floor just like everybody else, that's number one. I can tell you that if you're asking me, do I, can I identify that number? No. But I can tell you this that's pointed out. The City is very cognizant that there are people that fall into that category which is why, I believe, we provide $33.5 million to the Province of Manitoba to help address those issues, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Second question?

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes. $33.5 million from what?

**Mayor Katz:** The City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, gives the Provincial Government $33.5 million to deal with basically social assistance. I mean, that's something we've been doing for quite a long time. It's unfortunate that the vast majority of the population including Council hasn't been aware of that even though it's been going on for a very long time. So I guess the reason I'm pointing that out is just to let Councillor Eadie know, Mr. Speaker, that we are cognizant of that and I think you would agree that 33.5…could be 33, I'm not sure Mr. Speaker, so I will clarify and say approximately $33 million, that we certainly are doing our share.

**Mr. Speaker:** Last question.

**Councillor Eadie:** Final question is, this then would be the money that was negotiated when Mayor Murray at the time I think negotiated social services to go…all Winnipeg social services to go to the Province, and if that is so, that does not, and would you agree with me, that does not cover people who are working poor because they're not on social assistance?

**Mayor Katz:** Mr. Speaker that's exactly what I'm clarifying and number one, I'm just stating a statement. Number two is that I don't know whether Councillor Eadie has the answer to his question, maybe he has that statistic and if he does I would be pleased if he would share it with the rest of us. I don't have access to that information Mr. Speaker, but the realities are, you know, there's been a lot of uploading and down loading between different governments, and when you define core services, Mr. Speaker, you can have a wonderful debate on what the core services are of the City. I think you very eloquently described it earlier. It might have been yesterday or today, they are kind of blending into each other where you gave us the five Ps Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you Mayor Katz. No further questions. That will conclude Question Period for His Worship Mayor Katz and the Executive Policy Committee. We'll move on to the Standing Committee for Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. I will just comment on Question Period for the Standing Committees. Given the hour that we're in and if there are questions, I would appreciate that we limit the preambles and get right to the question.

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

**Councillor Vandal:** Mr. Speaker, there is one Item of which I have an amendment to that one Item, which was seconded by Councillor Sharma. The amendment is a simple change of date on recommendation 2b. Rather than have the 7.5 a kiloliter as of July 1, 2014, it should read July 1, 2013. So I will move the Item 1 as amended.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question? You want to speak to it?

**Councillor Mayes:** Oh no, it's not a question. I want to speak to it.

**Mr. Speaker:** You want to speak to it?

**Councillor Mayes:** As mentioned by way of brief preamble, my question pertains to this...

**Mr. Speaker:** OK.

**Councillor Mayes:** My comment is as I mentioned I have a lot of people outside of the perimeter, a lot of people who aren't on city water, to the Chair of the Committee do you have any sense - if the average family burns off 1 kilolitre a year, this is a $2.00 increase, I don't much care but I don't want people coming to me after this meeting and saying at the first meeting you were at you stood by while Council made a 500 per cent increase in the amount I have to pay. I appreciate this is not a household chart but the report says we anticipate this will be passed on to household users. I have no idea how many kilolitres the average house would use and I'll be dazzled if you know that Mr. Chair. But as somebody who has a lot of people on city water I've got some concerned about what kind of cost this would mean to the average household.

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

**Councillor Vandal:** Actually, this is part of the administration's quest, a full cost recovery on hauled waste water, and it is - I don't have really, a good reading on what the total bill is. I actually don't have anyone who hauls waste water in my ward, but I can endeavor to get that information from the Public Works Director and circulate it through yourself and anyone else who is interested. And certainly you are on the right committee to ask those sorts of questions into the future. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour of the amendment? Opposed? The Clause is amended, right. And now we just move the amended clause. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question Period. Seeing none, that's pretty brief. We'll move on to Finance Committee. Councillor Fielding.

**Councillor Fielding:** Sure, Mr. Speaker I'd like to introduce the Report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 and 2.

**Mr. Speaker:** Seeing no issues, oh, Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Not unlike the previous comment, there is an increase here on number 1 on new fee well water discharge fee that pertains to cooling systems.

**Mr. Speaker:** OK, we're going to pull number 1. So thanks Councillor Mayes. Sorry, I should have slowed you down there before you got into it. You'll ask your question in a moment. Consent agenda on Item 2. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

**Item 1 - 2012 - Miscellaneous Fees and Charges Increases**

**Mr. Speaker:** Scott, (inaudible).

**Councillor Fielding:** Sure, I'd like to introduce Item 1 fees and charges. You know, I'd love to hear what Councillor Mayes is, hopefully I have an answer for him, otherwise I'll refer it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Given that the increase doesn't kick in until 2014 deferral might be the play. Actually, this again is a question about people not on city water, well water, discharge fee and I'm just pertaining to cooling systems so I'm not exactly sure if this would affect the average homeowner. I appreciate that it's not coming until 2014 so, deferral - I'm confident you'll get me whatever information I require before that.

**Councillor Fielding:** That would be much appreciated. I will get the answer back. I don't believe it does have an impact, but like I say I want to make sure from the administration so I'll get that answer and respond back to Council.

**Mr. Speaker:** OK all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. By-laws, Councillor Fielding.

**Councillor Fielding:** I would like to move that By-laws numbered 156/2011 be taken and read a first time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law no. 156/2011.

**Councillor Fielding:** OK I'd like to move the By-law no. 156/2011 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law no. 156/2011.

**Councillor Fielding:** I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law no. 156/2011 be read a third time and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Motion passed. Question Period for Chairman of Finance. Seeing none we will move on to Downtown Development and Riverbank Management. Councillor Swandel.

**REPORT OF THE**
**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT DATED NOVEMBER 28, 2011**

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'll introduce the Report of November 28 and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 and 2.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Smith, 2. OK all in favour consent agenda Item 1? Opposed? Carried.

**Item 2 - Downtown Parking Strategy**

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Swandel.

**Councillor Swandel:** I'll wait until I hear what Councillor Smith has to say and respond.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Smith.

**Councillor Smith:** You know, in my Ward I've heard from many businesses, consultation has not always taken place and I read that report and it doesn't refer to anything to do with consultation and so I'm quite concerned that we have some sort of procedure for consultation. That's my concern. I cannot support it unless we know something about that.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Swandel.

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you. There has been onerous consultation. Oh sorry.

**Mr. Speaker:** Sorry I missed you Ross. Go ahead.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you Mr. Speaker, I appreciate it. I just - this strategic plan, my concern is that there are a lot of people that go downtown. The strategic plan here probably agrees with the recent, I think it was doubling of the parking fees in the downtown. I have concerns with the strategic plan that does that and doesn't - I don't think I heard anybody speak to this issue, but if you push up the prices at the street and double it, you're actually increasing the price that you have to pay for the indoor parking because it is a market and the market likes to charge as much, it likes to make a profit. And my concern is that the strategic plan and maybe through really in-depth consultations, these kinds of matters might have come up. And so I'm not - I don't think I can actually support this strategy, although I will have open ears for the Chairperson of the Downtown Heritage Committee, downtown. I just have that concern that what we've now done is driven up the indoor or surface lot parking fees, we basically driven up that price because they do provide more convenience, actually, and they always - they usually charge more than the street parking fee and so you basically pushed up the market. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thanks Councillor Eadie. No further comments. To close, Councillor Swandel.

**Councillor Swandel:** Yeah, you know, I guess the problem people are grasping is how exactly the consultation occurred. So many different levels from OurWinnipeg through sustainable Winnipeg through transportation plan down to the transportation master plan, and a lot of engagement with the business. As you know, the downtown parking not only affects people who come into downtown but it affects the BIZs. The cost that Councillor Eadie is referring to of increasing the cost of parking, it's in some parking meters in high demand areas where you try to get the turn over and keep those parking spaces rolling over, so the businesses or we use it already I think at the Health Sciences Centre to get some turn over and get the people out of the short term on street parking and into the longer term off street parking. So there's a number of strategies that have been developed here, a plethora of consultations with the general public, with all the stakeholders. There are advisory groups that work with the Parking Authority on a regular basis, they have an advisory group. The Downtown Biz in particular and this is bigger than just the Downtown Biz, but the Downtown Biz in particular has been very involved in this process and you know, so it's been out there. It's been pushed through all of

our processes for consultation when we are doing OurWinnipeg and the sustainable transportation plan and our transportation master plan and it's not just about parking. You will see some of the language is about getting a shift from cars to buses or cars to bicycles. The mode to shift as well as increased parking or better parking management. The idea of car sharing is even talked about in there. I believe, I don't know if it's in the report but at one point there was a conversation about the pricing parking stalls to better suit really small cars like smart cars and make it more affordable or price it better so that people with smart cars or more sustainable forms or sustainable forms of transportation would benefit from it. So it's a very comprehensive strategy. It's not one single thing like parking meters or like off street parking it's all in it together to try and is an overall parking strategy and you'll see that some action plans that come with it as well. So I don't think there is anything that's going to have a negative impact on our city, and as a matter of fact, it's a positive impact on downtown and just keeping that downtown drive going. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Seeing no further comments, all those in favour of consent agenda Item 1? Opposed? Carried. Standing Policy… I'm sorry oh? December 5 correct.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT DATED DECEMBER 5, 2011**

**Councillor Swandel:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'll introduce the Report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 and 2 from the Report of December 5.

**Mr. Speaker:** Item 1? Stand down Item 1. Item 2 by consent, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

**Item 1 - Street Name Change - Mostyn Place to Granite Way**

**Mr. Speaker:** Go ahead.

**Councillor Swandel:** You want me to introduce this? Oh I can't wait to hear what somebody said on the doorstep about this.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you to the Duke of Decorum for that interjection. Actually I favour the name change. My only question was in accessibility when we talked about no implications for cost but as someone who rides the bus that goes by there, the bus keep saying Mostyn as it always does. Do we have some procedure by which we change the recorded voice to indicate a new place name? It still says St. Vital Road on one of the other buses that I take, so does this come up and people complain about it, so I don't know if there is a procedure in place to get those names changed. And I don't - it's more a Transit issue than Downtown Development issue but I wanted to flag that.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** I just wanted to rise since this was pulled off the agenda; I just wanted to say that this is actually really quite exciting. The Granite Curling Club has been there for a hundred years and they are having - this is sort of marking a big event they are having for that and I don't know if many of you know the film "Men With Brooms" was filmed there and you know, it's just got a great history and there is no other - that wasn't that great of a movie but it was cool that it happen there. But anyway, I won't take too much time, I just think it's something to note. It won't affect any other businesses, as no other addresses on that street at all. So - and I'm sure just to reassure, I'm sure that could easily be brought to Transit's attention and they could correct that issue.

**Mr. Speaker:** That's it.

**Councillor Swandel:** I'm glad we stood that one down, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I'm pretty sure someone could push a button in Transit and change whatever has to happen there. You know, I think Councillor Gerbasi, you know, spoke to the quality of the location here. I think it also has some heritage and historic value in the city. So just to help them celebrate their 100 years and so it's a good thing.

**Mr. Speaker:** 50 years ago, as a 10 year old, that's where I learned to curl so. Yes, I curled last night. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Alright, Standing Policy Committee Property and Development. Councillor. Question Period. Do we have any questions for Councillor Swandel? Sorry I got into the rhythm. Councillor Browaty.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 29, 2011**

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the Report of November 29 and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 11.

**Councillor Eadie:** Item 5.

**Mr. Speaker:** Item 5. Stand down Item 5. Any further Items? Seeing none, we'll do consent on 1 through 4, and 6 through 11. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item 5.

**Item 5 - Subdivision and Rezoning - 108 Scotia Street - DASZ 32/2011**

**Councillor Browaty:** I say this somewhat cautiously, but I'd love to hear the Councillor's comments. I got my earmuffs ready.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Eadie. This is your chance.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you Speaker Nordman and I think you all know I don't use that kind of profanity in public meetings. My name is not Pat Martin, thank you very much. I, in terms of, I don't want to speak to the issue of what went down because I think a respectful work place is something we all need to work towards because I listened to the Standing Committee meeting in which these decisions were made and frankly, I was kind of - I didn't think that it was respectful of people, no matter what your political stripe is or who you are. If you live in a neighbourhood you should be able to speak your piece without being snickered at. And I don't do that to anybody in this Council chamber. I have used some, I would say publicly inappropriate words, but anyway the issue at hand. Now I want to point out that there is also a by-law down here, where it's at 530 Polson at the corner of McGregor and Polson. I heard hearing and I had input in it and you know what, this four dwelling condo unit made total sense. There was opposition to it and I heard a lot of arguments about it, but the arguments that I heard didn't really make sense and it's in a perfect spot to create more density. It was a perfect project and so, also when I was looking at 108, you know, I hadn't made a decision coming into the hearing on this particular Item here. Then I discovered you know it's actually two lots on one address, 108 Scotia, and it's on the side of the street where there is it five smaller houses with 33 foot frontages on it; and yes there say old apartment block across the street on Scotia, that is very true and as a kid I remember distinctly people from that apartment block looking at me playing in my backyard at 7 Luxton. Distinctly recall that, I don't know if we build those kind of apartment blocks nowadays but it is a condo now, it does offer an option for condos in that community but really, it's not really effectively a part of the block we are talking about. Anybody who drives down Scotia from Cathedral heading north, knows that you don't even see that apartment block at all, but you will see 108 Scotia quite clearly. And it is going to sit, the immensity of this particular building, the sound decisions that went behind this, Ok, number 1 is density so you can divide this and double the density on one lot because there has only been one house there since anybody can remember around there. There used to be a barn on one of the lots but that's gone a long time ago. You have the opportunity to build another house in there. It is infill housing. There is infill housing happening all over along, not on Scotia necessarily but just off. There is subdivision of lots on Perth and all kinds of streets. People have no problems with building this infill housing. It's increasing the density of this particular neighbourhood area, that's good. But Scotia is an R1 and when you actually think about the 5,000 square foot building that's going to be placed in the middle of this smaller lot there's a, I don't know if people know the Black family, I know that you've all heard of Harry Black who is with the Pan Am Boxing Club. Well, that's his parents' home. It's a home that is slightly over 3,000 square feet I believe and set back 150 feet. It's very close to where this is, oh no sorry, it's set back a hundred feet, and the width of this lot is 150 feet and the full depth of the lot is 400 and whatever, it might even be 500 feet. It's a huge lot with a big house and actually, that apartment block across the street in terms of size, there are 10 - 600 square foot condos in there with a common area. The maximum that thing will be is about 7,500 square feet. Like what they're building here in the middle of 108, what's being proposed, this will go ahead if we rezone it to, although there still needs to be an appeal on the conditional use hearing. I would point out though that building two smaller houses, two single family homes on two lots here where one used to exist, is meeting OurWinnipeg requirements. It really isn't a place where we should have single family homes. Most of Scotia, there is a two apartment blocks at Smithfield and Scotia. For those of you who don't know this particular area, Smithfield and Scotia actually, although it's only a number of blocks, it's kind of in a slightly different neighbourhood because you are entering West Kildonan when you hit Smith. And those two apartment blocks are at the bottom of a feeder street. Smithfield is a feeder street with a traffic light up at the top on Main Street. Those two apartment blocks are set way back, many, many feet. Although there's no trees and stuff in front of them. But they also have huge back yards and a lot of parking space. The proposed home here just does not fit on this side of Scotia between Luxton and Inkster and that's the basis of the decision. And I would also point out that if you go back in the record on many decisions at Community Committee, at Standing Committees, administrative reports are

always amended, changed, or are sometimes declined, and it happens all the time. So you know, if you want to say that the administration's report is perfect, well obviously over a long period of time, it's been proven that people disagree with that and we amend those changes, or we decline them, or accept them as a whole. I asked my particular planner if you know, doesn't this create double density with two houses on one lot? Does that complement OurWinnipeg? Yes. That's what he said, yes. So it doesn't take away from there. So I don't understand why we can't let this particular Item stand, really. And frankly, I just hope that people will see it that way. I think that this is an issue that shouldn't have been treated as it was at Standing Committee and I urge you to vote no on Item No. 5. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Smith.

**Councillor Smith:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to vote no, because at the public meeting there was no support except from the developer himself. You know, there was no real consultation with the community, and you know, I want density, too. But the fact is, you can't go ahead and do something like this and annoy the whole neighbourhood. You know, it seems to me that it wasn't dealt with wisely. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Smith. Councillor Vandal.

**Councillor Vandal:** Mr. Speaker, I was supporting the area Councillor on the Executive Committee and I just want to say that I will do so on the floor of this Council. As far as I'm concerned this is an area issue. Councillor Eadie has explained that he'd prefer two single family lots on a 66-foot parcel of land, rather than four town homes; and the Community Committee was there they heard the delegations, they - both pro and con, and I understand they unanimously made a decision so I'm going to be supporting the area Councillor.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any further comments? Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yes Mr. Speaker, I'm going to rise. I was at the Committee, moved the motion that is before us today, on the Standing Committee of Property and Development. And that motion was passed unanimously by the entire committee, all 4 members agreed. As a matter of fact, there were some suggestions to the motion, which we amended. One thing to point out, one of the things, changes that we made was to give the Community Committee the power to actually have full control over the elevation of the building. The elevation is the facade of the building for those of you who don't know, and landscaping in terms of the site itself. I want to remind or just point out, Mr. Speaker that we as a Community Committee make recommendations. We don't make decisions. This body makes decisions. We make recommendations to each committee and the committees make a recommendation forward. Council actually makes the decision. We aren't neighbourhood bosses, though we think we are sometimes. We have to do things, Mr. Speaker. Pot calling the kettle black, it's very true but we have to understand we are part of a larger picture. In July of this year, this Council passed unanimously OurWinnipeg, unanimously, the Clause and the By-laws. And OurWinnipeg is rightly pointing out and I'll read from the report itself from the documents quite nicely Mr. Speaker, OurWinnipeg Development Plan, Council's guide for the next 25 years. Projecting we'll have 10,000 people a year. It goes on to say, Mr. Speaker that "to provide options to accommodate growth, we need to strike a balance between growing out and growing up. Offering choices from traditional single family neighbourhoods to more dense forms of urban housing." It goes on to say Mr. Speaker, that "in order to meet the full life cycle of housing needs within the community, promote a mix of housing type and tenure such as duplexes, low rise apartments, secondary suites, semi-detached homes, town houses." I'll add Mr. Speaker it even talks about mature communities such as this one. Mature communities represent some of the most complete existing communities in Winnipeg. They present some of the best opportunities to accommodate infill develop. To increase housing choice and then maximize the use of the existing infrastructure. Let me tell you something Mr. Speaker, one of the toughest things as a City Councillor that I've seen, is these public hearings we deal with. Because we're before residents, some of them we've known for years, people who we've had as neighbour maybe in the past. It's not easy slugging, Mr. Speaker. It's tough and we're being asked to make decisions for the good of the community, for the good of the neighbourhood, but also for the good of the city and we have to strike a balance and Mr. Speaker, in terms of the decision made of the committee, I'll just point out it's not the first. It's happened before and it's happened a number of times before and will happen again where we see a lopsided decision coming out of Community Committee. Typically in the past, community committees at least when we try to do, our Community Committee is try to strike a balance, if we can, to allow development to occur, maybe not to the same extent or density but some sort of development to occur. I'll point out Edgewood Estates, which came forward, was rejected at first, they pulled the application and came back with a new scenario and it worked and it got passed. That was a long one, we sat there until 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning hearing residents opposing, and that was put through Mr. Speaker. That was a decision that made sense, I support it, and it was supported by this Council. Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you of another one that I can recall very easily tell, where on a lot of 100 by 100 surrounded by single family homes, OK slightly larger than this. A developer coming forward to put up a two story, 10 unit building. 10 units, not four, 10, slightly larger one and residents showing up packed the community committee saying you better not allow this to happen to our neighbourhood, Councillor Wyatt. And one lady standing up in the meeting and reminding me that she babysat me and changed my

diapers. I had to kindly and disrespectfully, I had to, don't think of that image. Anyway, I had to respectfully disagree and the developer walked out with approval of a condo development, two stories tall, not ten units but eight Mr. Speaker. We had a development where we were approving a second phase, 20 years after the fact because of the economy in Winnipeg, a second phase of what's called Harbourview South Phase 2. Everybody who was living in the first phase of Harbourview South Phase 1, came out and opposed Phase 2. It would have been very easy, and very popular I might add Mr. Speaker, if you want to be popular start rejecting. You'll be a hero and shut down development in your neighbourhood and in your Ward, but very popular Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we are called upon to make decisions and the planning decisions, which we as a Community Committee and, which Councillors have protected in terms of land use, struggle to ensure that they have control over, it's crucial that we have a balance. And it's not easy and I know, Councillor Eadie that it was probably a very tough meeting and it was a difficult meeting for him to go through. But there has to be some room, because I can assure you Councillors that the development community, small and large, and there is a lot of small developers out there because of the economy the way it is right now and believe me you, Mr. Speaker, it's not always going to remain this way where we're going to have people who will be interested in developing an older, mature neighbourhoods. The real estate market is not going to remain this way forever. You can believe me, they are watching. They are watching very closely, they are watching which areas of the city would they want to do business in or not do business in. Mynarski, Mr. Speaker, is an area which is an older part of the city, which needs private sector investment, not just government investment, but private sector investment to actually renew those older neighbourhoods. They're watching carefully, is Mynarski a Ward we want to do business in? Because it could be just as easy and less headaches to go elsewhere. I think it's crucial Mr. Speaker, that the decision of the Standing Committee made unanimous by the Standing Committee be supported because this development makes sense. We're giving local control to the Councillor and to the Councillors on the Community Committee in terms of the façade. At the end of the day, they can make this look like the White House, OK. And the trees and landscaping on it look mint. We're talking about, Mr. Speaker, a four-plex let's keep that in perspective. Across the street is an apartment block which has been turned to condos. Mr. Speaker, we're talking about a building which is sitting on a 66 by 100 foot lot. The side yards, Mr. Speaker, 6.2 feet. More than 2 feet on either side of the required side yards. No variance needed on the side yards. With front yards, Mr. Speaker that go beyond what's required - 22 feet front yard and 29 foot rear yard. Yes, 5,000 square feet what the Councillor didn't say is that is 5,000 total, 2,500 and 2,500. You know Mr. Speaker, the reality is, this is a project that fits this site. If anything it should be greater density here, not less, because of the fact that you have density across the street and there is an opportunity to increase the density in this area. That's not happening, but what we have before us is a very reasonable application supported and argued extensively throughout the report, Mr. Speaker by our planners who are quoting the very document that we voted on unanimously just in July. So, Mr. Speaker, I think this say reasonable decision.

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

**Councillor Wyatt:** I would like you know, I've had some experience now and you know we always say you know never admit you're wrong in politics, never admit you're wrong, right? Well you know, there are times when you are wrong and I admit it. You know, I was a new Councillor and I was on the Standing Committee of Property and Development and an application for 20-acres in my Ward, infill housing that the developer wanted to build on and we said OK you know what maybe build on 18, leave two acres of park, showed up at the hearing, the room was packed against the development. So I said OK, we're going to have 12 and a half acres, 7 and a half acre park, so increase the size of the park. Came forward, Council approved it. But a message went to the development community, go and file on the rest on the application, it was our land that actually we were selling. File on the other 4 acres, I believe 3 and a half acre part. It was a message from that time the Chair your predecessor, Councillor De Smedt who said that's not reasonable. It went forward, actually to put a mobile family site up to 24 condominiums on the site in a residential single family area, I opposed it, no different from Ross Eadie, Councilor Eadie is doing today. But today, when I look at it and it went through, because the votes were there. It went through Standing Committee; it went through Council, it got approved over my objections but when I look at it today Mr. Speaker it's a beautiful development and the neighbourhood loves it and the people who are living in these condos love it. So, Mr. Speaker, sometimes with the fullness of time and the ability to stand back and look forward, you can see that in terms of decisions we make there is a rationale and why we have not just the Standing but the Community Committee, there's a reason why the Community Committee is not the only committee to make this decision. This is a reason why there is a recommendation to the Standing Committee of Property and Development, and onwards to Council, to have that sober second thought Mr. Speaker, which is so important. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Speaker:** Well timed Councillor Wyatt. Seeing no further comments, I'll ask Councillor Browaty to close.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. The sad reality of our jobs is it's probably easiest to do nothing, to allow nothing and to change nothing. But why do we do that? Why do we get into elected office in the first place? To improve our neighbourhoods, to make things better. I mean, Chief Peguis Trail was held up politically by my predecessor because of the threats of the people backing on to the roadway. I've approved an apartment complex in

Whellams Lane that hasn't been built yet. It was the right thing to do, but in the 2010 election the only poll in the entire (inaudible) that I lost was the one that included Whellams Lane. It's by seven votes, but I still lost it. Again, it's easiest to do nothing. This is small. This fits in the context of what's around there. Councillor Wyatt properly read from our Winnipeg Complete Communities the section about mature communities that's to fit the neighbourhood. As Chair of the Committee, I made the recommendation - hey, let's you know, even though it will probably be rejected let's at least send it back to the Community Cmmittee for plan approval, so that they, the people that know the area can do and design something and ensure that the look fits the immediate neighbourhood and that's exactly what we did. So again, I encourage the Councillor for the area to work with the developer, to work with the residents in the area, to come up with a plan and a building design that's appropriate and fits the area. Assuming that the appeal on the conditional use proceeds or whatever has to happen there. So again, infill isn't a four-letter word. It's really appropriate and I drove around this neighbourhood earlier this week and again across the street there is a ten-unit apartment complex. It fits. Municipal services are there. There's a route 88 bus goes right down Scotia Street, A lot of the immediate surrounding streets have others – actually it's down Scotia Street there is a duplex it, along the other immediate side streets, there's small apartment blocks, duplexes and whatever else. Again, you know I love my Councillor and I, my ears are ok from the swear words. That was fine. I mean he was hot in the hallway there, the doors were open and people heard about it. That was more offensive than the e-mail, but he apologized and I accept his apology for that. But again, this is small. It's compatible with OurWinnipeg, the recommendation from our planners, who are professionals and don't take these decisions lightly was to accept it, so in this case you know I will certainly be moving this forward. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** OK time for the motion. Recorded vote, all right. All those in favour of Item 5 as presented please rise.

A recorded vote was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

His worship mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck, Pagtakhan, Steen, Swandel, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman.

**Nays**

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Mayes, Orlikow, Sharma, Smith, Vandal.

**City Clerk:** The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 7.

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion is passed. We will move to actual motions. Motion number 6, which you will have received. Councillor Browaty, maybe you would like to. Sure.

**Councillor Vandal:** Sleeping on the job. Mr. Speaker, there is an amendment to a by-law, which you have in front of you, which is essentially a spelling error. Seaside is one word, which is the proper way as opposed to Sea Side - two words. An astute constituent, actually through Councillor Wyatt, got a hold of me and mentioned the spelling error, and I checked it out and yeah, it's a spelling error. So this takes care of that.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** I'd like to move that we change it to Seasick. That's the way I feel right now. I withdraw my amendment.

**Councillor Vandal:** I believe we need two-thirds suspension to do it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Can we have two-thirds majority please to suspend the rules, all those in favour? Opposed? Alright, we have our two-thirds. Motion, all in favour of the motion to change the spelling of Seaside all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. By-laws, Councillor Browaty.

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

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move the following by-laws be read a first time, By-laws 148/2011, 150/2011, 155/2011, 149/2011, 154/2011. Sorry, I was reading down and not across, oh and 154/2011 as amended. Thank you.

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

**Clerk:** By-laws numbered 148/2011, 149/2011, 150/2011, 154 as amended of/2011 and By-law No. 155/2011.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** I move that the by-laws numbered 148/2011 to 150/2011 both inclusive, and 154 as amended and 155/2011 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-laws numbered 148 to 150 both inclusive, of/2011 and 154 as amended of/2011 and 155/2011.

**Councillor Browaty:** I move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 148/2011 to 150/2011 both inclusive, 154/2011 as amended and 155/2011 be read a third time and the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Question Period for Property and Development. Councillor Smith.

**Councillor Smith:** Yes Mr. Speaker. You know, I'd like to ask the Chair of the Committee why the serious delays in building permit issues? What's the problem? For nine years we've been trying to resolve this issue. Why is it not resolved?

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I get constantly asked that exact same question. There's a new person that's been brought in to oversee the permit and application process, Property and Development. Some of the issues, in fact, are incomplete documents that are being submitted, especially on the commercial side of things. We're working at making sure that those don't even get accepted so that they're starting…you know the clock. Definitely problems in the system and in terms of reporting as to when we're going to actually get some meaningful improvement, I hope to report back in the New Year.

**Councillor Smith:** In the letter from the Winnipeg Construction Association, it says "In our opinion, permit approval delays are largely related to a lack of adequate administrative staff." How do you respond to that?

**Councillor Browaty:** I guess there's some question at least from our Administration as to what should be done with an application that is incorrect. Should they be hand holding the applicant and architects and all these professionals out there and say "hey, you know, you can't do this and you know start again." Or as soon as they see a problem with it they start again or do they go through the whole thing, do all their work with a red pen, go through pages and pages of documents of inadequacies and do the work for them? I'm not saying we don't have enough people on it. Perhaps we do need additional resources on it at certain times of the year, but at the same time the department has raised concerns about the quality of the submissions that are being made.

**Mr. Speaker:** I saw a hand over here. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you Speaker Nordman. Question through you to the Chairperson of Property and Development. At the end of Kildonan Drive, there's going to be three huge apartment blocks, and there's also what used to be the Bergen Cut-off, there's some open space there that the City happens to own I believe, and I know that we're re-looking at all of our open space in terms of what we might do with it. I'm wondering if the Chairperson could let me know when we're going to declare some of that excess space, which used to be the Bergen Cut-off as declared as surplus and build a 17-storey apartment block on Kildonan Drive.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, and through you to the member from Mynarski, again, I believe currently that land is zoned as park land. Any type of rezoning and sale application I think would probably require two-thirds vote of Council and go through the similar process. Is it going to stay park land in that particular piece there forever? Not necessarily. I mean, down Whellams Lane you've got three apartment towers but that's along Whellams

Lane which is built to a commercial standard only a handful of homes that actually front onto Whellams Lane. Essar Avenue and Kildonan Drive over there, a little bit different. You're not going to put 17 storeys there, but can you put some two, three or four storey multi-family in there? Possibly.

**Mr. Speaker:** Second question?

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes, thank you. Kildonan Drive does end at the back of the Whellams Lane properties that he speaks of and so I think that why wouldn't you build a 17-storey apartment block and have that land declared surplus, rezoned and so on at the end of Kildonan Drive.

**Mr. Speaker:** Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** The only access to the Whellams Lane apartments, the multi-storey apartments he is talking about, is from Whellams Lane. There is a service access in the back that apparently services the property for garbage and with the new plan that was approved by this Council for additional towers, even the garbage access was moved to Whellams Lane, not Kildonan Drive.

**Mr. Speaker:** No further questions? Seeing none we will move on to Standing Policy Committee of Protection and Community Services. Councillor Havixbeck.

**Councillor Havixbeck:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services from December 2 and move adoption of the consent agenda Item 1.

**REPORT OF THE**
**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES**
**DATED DECEMBER 2, 2011**

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. No motions. Do we have any questions for Standing Policy Committee Protection Community Services? Seeing none. Governance Committee Report, Councillor Vandal would you like to speak to that please.

**GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL – CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

**Councillor Vandal:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will move that By-law no. 158/2011 is read a first time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law number 158/2011.

**Councillor Vandal:** I will move By-law number 158/2011 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law number 158/2011.

**Councillor Vandal:** I will move the rules be suspended and by-law number 158/2011 be read a third time and the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Well thank you very much everyone. That concludes our agenda and we will move that Council adjourn. Having said that we wish you all a very happy holiday. Merry Christmas to our viewers at home on Shaw. Best of the season and we'll see you back here in January. Roll call.

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

**Council adjourned at 3:55 p.m.**