COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, January 25, 2012

The Council met at 9:32 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 Orlikow.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Visa. And we'd like to welcome our guests in the seats this morning. I guess we're here with Mrs. Lesley Sisco, Miss Janet Gibb and the students of the grade 12 Consumer Mathematics Class of J. H. Bruns. Are you here? Give us a wave. You should've been here for the budget meeting. Thanks for joining us today. We have a condolence motion, Visa.

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Orlikow,
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of Robert Eadie, father of Councillor Ross Eadie, which occurred on December 18, 2011;

This Council extends to Councillor Eadie, his wife Patty and their family, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. We also have a leave of absence motion.

Moved by Councillor Sharma,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

THAT Councillor Pagtakhan be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to his absence from the City on City Business.

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

We have a couple of comments that would like to be made before we get into the meeting in earnest and we'd invite Mayor Katz to rise, put his thoughts on this

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take a moment, Mr. Speaker to offer condolences to the family and the friends of the two women and children who lost their lives in the devastating fire that occurred last night in West Kildonan, Mr. Speaker. Our thoughts and our prayers are with them at this time. I would also like to offer my sincerest gratitude to the brave men and women of our city's Fire and Paramedic Service who worked tirelessly at the scene Mr. Speaker, as well as our gratitude goes out to all our departments who came together through our Emergency Measures Services to provide assistance to the families and individuals who lost their homes in the Sherbrook Street apartment fire on January the 14th. To all the men and women at the City who provide front line emergency service for our citizens every single day, on behalf of myself and all members of Council and all Winnipeggers, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank them. They are true heroes. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mayor Katz. And on a happier note, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise just to let members of Council and the public know that this year is the anniversary, hundredth anniversary of Transcona's Centennial. The community became a community on April the 12th, 1912 through an Act of the…incorporated through an Act of the Legislature and the community has been organizing for the last, over a year, year and a half, nearly two years, towards the Centennial to mark the importance of community, the importance of the fact that there's still strong community pride in our community and that there will be

celebrations; there will be events taking place; the opening of the Transcona Centennial Square, and left on everyone's desk is just a complimentary coffee mug for this marking of the Centennial, which you can buy if you need more. If you come by, the Transcona Legion has them on sale as well as the baseball caps, golf shirts and pens and also this can be followed on www.transcona100.ca and so I want to just congratulate, Mr. Speaker, the chairpersons, the co-chairs of the Centennial Committee, Murray Rougeau, Peter Martin and Barb Culbertson and all the members of the Centennial Committee for all their hard work and efforts. It's much appreciated, their dedication, as well as Dianne Truderung who's writing a Transcona historical book, hundredth anniversary book and her committee for all their great work that they're doing and I want to thank the Mayor in advance for his financial commitment that will be forthcoming for the Centennial Committee as well. (Laughter) So, thank you in advance of that. And so it's going to be a great celebration and we encourage all members not just in Transcona but from other parts of the city to come and join in the festivities and Mr. Speaker just on a more somber note if I may, the other day we lost a great public servant from our community, Mary Andree. She never served in this chamber but she served and dedicated her 43 years of her life to public service as a School Trustee which in and of its fact is truly amazing. There is not one member of previous members of this Council Chamber those that she did not have contact with and had an impact on, myself included. She was an amazing person who cared for our children and cared for our schools and did a lot for our community through her dedication and hard work and it is a true loss to all of us not just in Transcona but I believe our entire province for somebody as great as this. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Mr. Speaker. The happier task of noting that if you go downstairs here there is a picture of the first meeting of the Unicity Council, January 5, 1972 and I wanted to rise to note that we are now at the 40th anniversary of that Council meeting. So 40 years since the 12 suburban municipalities in the City of Winnipeg came together. I'm hopeful that we can keep the progress going. It's amazing to some extent that we still haven't gone out to the Perimeter and Councillor Wyatt says, "I've got some motion on today I think…to kind of keep furthering that initiative to keep the City building. I would hope and thank you, Mr. Speaker for your discussions with me on this, I would like to do something to celebrate the remaining surviving members of that Council. I will leave it to the discretion of the Governance Committee to see if there is something we can do. There may be people who say, "Well, is anybody still going from that group, it was 40 years ago. Well, a number of us were at the Chinese dinner last night. Pearl McGonigal was there, she was at the head table with the Mayor, Pearl McGonigal is definitely still going, I would say that and a number of these other Councillors are, too. So I would hope we can do something to honour them. And I found in my materials, Steven Juba's speech on that occasion which I will not read from at length to the relief of everyone, but he did end by saying if we have a successful beginning who knows but that a spokesman for the next generation may well be able to proclaim of Winnipeg as did St. Paul in his reference to Rome, "I am a citizen of no mean city" which translates to "I'm a city of some consequence." So I think based on the work that's been done over the 40 years, we are a city of some consequence and hopefully the work we do today will keep building the city so, I would hope we can do something to honour those Councillors and I did want to celebrate that moment of 40 year anniversary. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Forty years.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: I just want to acknowledge this wonderful gift of the cup. I will treasure this cup for years and years.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sure Councillor Smith has some ties that are 40 years old so.. Councillor Orlikow, do you want to jump in with Kelvin High School at this point or is that a later meeting? Okay, all right having said that, thank you everyone for your comments today. We do have a motion to suspend the rules before we hear the delegations. Councillor Fielding.

DELEGATIONS

Councillor Fielding: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'll move the motion that we suspend the rules to hear two more delegations I believe on the Assiniboine bike pathway. The speakers are, I believe, Mr. Marty Gold, Martin Boroditsky I believe. I'm not sure which the alias is, but one or the other and Mr. Colin Craig.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I need a two-thirds majority. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion passed. So gentlemen you are on the slate. We will start with our first delegation and we'll ask Barbara Judt to join us. The Executive Policy Committee Report regarding the Assiniboine Active Transportation Bikeway. I'm just going to give some other names here so people know where they are in the queue. Following Barbara will be Graham Hnatiuk, Bob Axford, Doug

Mackenzie, Harold Taylor, Jackie Avent and Marty or Colin, whichever one of you wants to go first, you figure it out. The floor is yours, ten minutes.

Barbara Judt: I like being first, that's for sure. All right. I wasn't able to make it last week so I'm just going to work off the notes that have been circulated to everybody. And what I want to talk about here is the impact that the bike path has had on Osborne House. I'll step back for a minute. My name is Barbara Judt; I'm the CEO of Osborne House, Manitoba and Canada's oldest and largest women's shelter. You know, despite our repeated attempts along with our neighbours and the neighbourhood to actively communicate with various areas of the city, the majority of our requests fell upon deaf ears. Now there are some good people in the city that did listen to us and I have to acknowledge that but at the same time, the majority of our communications weren't listened to. We tried and tried and tried and things like our food delivery not being able to be delivered one day happened as a result of the construction that was going on. And what I had to do that day was go out, stop what I'm doing and kind of get the construction rearranged, get the crew rearranged. Get the food company to come back and get our food delivery so that I could feed our clients lunch that day. There's no need for that to have to happen. I don't have an administration of five or ten people or even three to help me out. I am the Administrator, I am the Finance person, I am the Complaint Department, I am the cleaner upper of many substances in the shelter that shall remain nameless, but that's life in our not for profit world. Despite our repeated attempts, we felt that Osborne House was being put in the position of having to publicly announce where our location was just so that we could be heard. But we didn't do that at the time. Since that time, we have come out a little bit more about our agency and talked about the work we're doing. But we couldn't risk our clients. We couldn't risk our staff and when we raised the subject with the city we were lied to, we were patronized and we really feel and our Board feels, that we were taken advantage of because we were in such a Catch 22. We can't go out there and say this is where we're located. People aren't always a fan of Osborne House. That's why it's a lock down facility. The downtown delegation committee claimed that there was consultation done. Our shelter was not looked out for, Deputy Mayor Swandel. That didn't happen, despite our repeated attempts. Nobody was looking out for the most vulnerable segment of our society. Why did that have to happen? I know I'll never get the answers that I'm looking for, but we do expect answers and we do expect this to never repeat itself again. But, we certainly do feel that the concerns and care, the caring that goes on at Osborne House and the daily challenges that we have in our building, that nobody can possibly experience and understand unless they are there, are understood. I was a board member at Osborne House initially when I got involved and I thought I was well versed in the organization. Then I took over the role of CEO and as a board member, I knew nothing. The project was very, very slanted towards the lobby groups and this is evidenced by information that's in your audit report. Again, the neighbourhood was not consulted with. So, at the last meeting, I believe, the December, December sometime, yes, ya. Deputy Mayor Swandel, you alluded to the fact that perhaps we were confused about the consultation process. But your audit report states that that did not occur. You need to apologize to me and you need to apologize to Marty Gold. We weren't confused. We're not confused about something that didn't happen. So I need to, you know, I need you to explain to me why…why that had to happen? As mentioned last week in my report and was made public in the Winnipeg Sun article, the City used our own tax dollars against us, and even when our neighbourhood rallied together and enlisted the support of a lawyer, we had to stop because we are small businesses. Osborne House is a not for profit. There was no endless pot of cash to fight a bureaucracy. And that's not how taxpayers' dollars should be used anyway. And the answers that we were given by some of the people and Councillor Gerbasi you mentioned this to me, well if it doesn't work we can just redo it, we can take it out. That's an unacceptable use of taxpayer's dollars. Now, you don't need to roll your eyes. That's what happens. Ya, you did. So well, I'm just stating what happened. It's…

Mr. Speaker: You know what…

Barbara Judt: It's a movement of disrespect though.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Ma'am stay on…okay

(Inaudible)

Barbara Judt: No. No. I'm stating the truth.

Mr. Speaker: Ma'am stay on your subject, please.

Barbara Judt: I am.

Mr. Speaker: There are no personal accusations to be made in this chamber or I'll suspend you, okay?

Barbara Judt: No, that's fine but when I'm speaking and somebody rolls their eyes.

Mr. Speaker: You know what.

Barbara Judt: That's unacceptable then and I'm making…I'm simply stating my opinion, okay.

Mr. Speaker: You are in no position to argue. Make your point. You are here to make an address. Make your address.

Barbara Judt: Well, treat me respectfully. Anyhow…I'll get back to this. And we're still awaiting to know what's happening with the Winnipeg Parking Authority and the changes that you want to make to the area. Consultation needs to occur. It shouldn't have to wait for an audit to be requested by a citizen which costs more money to be used. That should not have to happen. I, when I look through these reports, they are very well done, they are written, you know, the latest language is used and you know, it looks fabulous on paper. But these things did not occur and that's why we are here today. We cannot continue to carry on and have projects like this where service delivery models and consulting with the community and having these fabulous looking charts and all the latest terminology that goes into the projects, that's great but at the end result you have to think about the impact of what you're doing and we can't have a repeat of this again and we also need to have Assiniboine Avenue fixed. It cannot stay the way it currently is. It is not working for our neighbourhood. And that's what we want to have happen. We want to engage with the City and work towards a meaningful solution for our neighbourhood. That's what we've wanted all along. That's what we were saying all along. We want to engage in a meaningful consultation and that did not happen and that was not fair to the citizens of Assiniboine Avenue, the businesses and most of all, the women and children who come to our facility, not on a bike but more often in a police car, in a taxi or in an ambulance after they've been released from the hospital. So that's what we are looking for. We want the matter resolved. We can't wait until the next time; we have to fix what has happened here. And I know that that can happen. And I'm finished.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Barbara Judt: Is that where I ask about any questions?

Mr. Speaker: We'll hear from Mr. Hnatiuk and then we'll have questions for the two of you.

Barbara Judt: Okay, good.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Hnatiuk. You have five minutes.

Graham Hnatiuk: I'm here today in support of the motion but to insist an amendment be added to further investigate the conduct of city employees in dealing with the public. What I went through is why people are not involved in civics; do not participate as active citizens and refrain from participating in any city process. I should note that I do not oppose active transportation. I commute via cycling myself. I'm an environmentalist and I have concerns about these issues. Those concerns were not listened to and it resulted in this audit report after lengthy saga with city employees who went out of their way to ensure my concerns as well as those raised by the Great Canadian Talk Show were stopped. A number of events happened to me as an active citizen that you need to be aware of. These results and the repetition of severity of implications leave no possible explanation other than it was purposely done. The actions of city employees against me were nothing less than deplorable and nobody in this chamber should consider them to be acceptable. The why it was done is the question that needs to be asked by Council and the core of the purpose of the amendment I ask for. I have seven points in my farcical saga in my attempts to be an active citizen and participate in the bike path process. Number one, my letter intended for the city auditor was rerouted by 311 staff and sent to Active Transportation Coordinator, Kevin Nixon who is a person whose department would have been investigated. Number two, Acting 311 Manager, Joel Knockaert defended this action by telling me I could not contact the auditor as a citizen and it was not the auditor's role to deal with the public. I stand before you now because the auditor acted on my complaint and published this report. Number three, when I pointed out that the City of Winnipeg web site says otherwise, Mr. Knockaert defended his decision by quoting FIPPA regulations. Number four, 311 Acting Deputy Manager, Brian Rosenberg agreed with the action of the 311 staff in my case and what they had told me about the role of the City Auditor. Does this mean that 311 can judge what gets sent to whom and who as a citizen I get to talk to? Number five, Brian Rosenberg informed me that my complaint had been received by Kevin Nixon and that he had already investigated it. Number six, Kevin Nixon's supposed investigation into this is only one of two outcomes. Either he investigated my concerns and did nothing about them as the audit report surely would have mentioned his changes or he lied to me. I can tell you that I have filed many freedom of information requests. This has never come to my hands. I have also been trying to get the findings from Mr. Nixon's office as of EPC last week and I have yet to receive any answer. And number seven, Brian Rosenberg alleged that I made threats on my web site which is not true and my content remains published to this day so that anybody can see it. Such a comment can only be taken as an attempt to smear me as a Whistle-blower and prevent me from

contacting the auditor or to have any of my concerns taken in a serious manner. If this is what happens when someone tries to get involved with a city process of…or blow a whistle, in the legacy of the act of transportation context as well as this council and administration would be to discourage involvement and encourage apathy. This is not how a citizen who wants to take part in a process in any process should be treated. Mr. Wyatt commented prior to voting on EPC that this audit and information was very revealing. I assure you Mr. Wyatt, as well as the rest of Council, that you are lucky I am not to be bullied or intimidated. That I do not back down from this sort of thing and I do not give up. Think of all the people that would and all the people that do. The Berry Street Project created uproar in St. James. It also…

Mr. Speaker: Sir, that's not germane to the active transportation on Assiniboia.

Graham Hnatiuk: Fair enough. What did I get for questioning this process? I got turned away, I got told lies. I got told lies by the auditor, lies by 311. I heard repeated phrases like consultation was done or we're on a tight time frame. As if the tight time frame was a reasonable excuse. The consultant has time enough to create a list of stakeholders and consult with them. Therefore, it's not...therefore it is reasonable to assume that a proper reflective accurate stakeholder list could have been made and real consultation could have happened. And now I am here because I am undertaken by the city auditor on behalf of a complaint from a citizen, me. I am not the only person who's had such a difficult time. You cannot say I fell through the cracks. And I insist that the conduct of the employees that I mentioned be investigated. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: All right. We have question period for Barbara and Graham. Any questions? Seeing none, thank you for your presentation. We'll now call Bob Axford in opposition. He has ten minutes.

Bob Axford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm standing here today because I oppose the Council simply receiving that report as information. The Active Transportation Audit is more important than just treating it as information. Each person that's speaking with you today has some particular perspective on that audit, but from my case, I think it's more…less about bikes and more about governance. The public consultation process is completely broken. This Council and the Mayor have extoled the virtues of consultation but your own auditor tells you in this case, it's just a bunch of malarkey. There were at the presentation in front of the EPC, there were some questions regarding the outcome and generally those questions were geared to say you know, the end kind of justifies the means we went through. And there is no real evidence that the end justifies the means, just in the change of the usage. But, secondly you could try and balance what the result is verses the punishment inflicted on other people to get that result. In that case, there's no justification either. But in the third possible way of weighing it, there's a question about that damage to the City's credibility, damage to the democratic process verses the outcome. If you're weighing it that way, there's absolutely no contest. That audit was important because when audit people actually report on something other than bean counting, like the theft of democracy, what has happened here, they are in unchartered water and have to be very, very sure of themselves. That's why it's so unusual to have them work outside of their field of expertise and say that something is wrong, and if they've said that something is wrong, you can be absolutely sure that's an understatement. Somebody is cheating when they've gone out and stuck their neck out that far. To have faith in a system or a natural law or an institution, the body has to start off in neutral position. People get their input, then people accept the outcome. Because they felt that the body they are appealing to started off as neutral. Well, forget the concerns about the consultants. Your own people were not neutral. This was not the only case and has more often than not, been a problem with consulting. But it's always the same flaw. The City is not accidentally, but deliberately trying to stifle public input. I thought your own people didn't understand it but I was wrong. They do understand it and they have been plain and simply malicious. And I want to give you…I want to get on the record here, the report from your own people to a conference that was held outside of the city and that says exactly what they did. The Mayor publicly stated that there's been problems. Your people were out bragging how good they did. This is incredible. Not only that they're out bragging about how successful they've been in muzzling legitimate consultation so if anybody wants a copy of that, Mr. Speaker, you are welcome to it. Let me be blunt. You can't let these people loose. They are an embarrassment to the City. What happened here is they're deliberately promoting the systemic extinction of democratic principles. You are sworn to protect the public interests not the bureaucrats' interest and you can't accept this as information. You need to revisit the Council's consultation guidelines for future projects and you need to get control of your own employees. Now for people that weren't at the EPC meeting the other…last week, I offered Council members a copy of Shelley Arnsteen's ladder of citizenship participation and I'll leave a full copy of that with the Speaker for any of those who want to see it. This is the gold standard of consultation and it would be well worthwhile for you to have a good look at it and see what other jurisdictions are doing about consultation and how they view it. There is consultation and consultations and some are appropriately most, just information. But when a benefit for one group means a loss of rights for another group, you need much more serious consultation and you need to get much more serious about training your own folks in terms of their responsibilities to the public. Councillor Harvey Smith was right almost two years ago, when he publicly identified somebody in Public Works that should be fired. The only thing wrong, Harvey, you should have gone a little further up the food chain. There needs to be a few more of them. So, I hope you folks will read the report of your own department. What they said about

themselves, how they were bragging. And I hope you see what I'm trying to describe to you is a serious, serious problem with democracy. I implore you to do more than just receive this report as information.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Mr. Axford. Doug Mackenzie, we'll have questions for both of you if you stay tuned here. Five minutes.

Doug Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, Councillors, I have brought some material that I believe was left with the Clerk to be circulated to you. It's my speaking notes with attachments. I'm Douglas Mackenzie. I represent 10 Donald Street Ltd. and our building overlooks the Assiniboine bikeway. I'm speaking here with the support of several local businesses. The audit is clear that the materials distributed by the City's consultants excluded the full impact of the bikeway on traffic, businesses, residents with the end result and it was a one-sided and therefore flawed consultation. It's not sufficient for Council to receive the report as information and resolve to do better next time. Next time won't address the issues remaining on Assiniboine and they only remain because of a flawed consultation. The consequence of inadequate consultation was materials on safety and on traffic, that should have been considered, were not. The bikeway is unsafe. It's a serious personal injury waiting to happen, when, not if. Council owes a duty to examine now these issues. I'm going to speak first on safety and if I have time briefly on traffic. Safety standards used around the world were ignored on the bikeway. Three clear examples. Dr. Pasanen of the Helsinki's Traffic Planning Division offered this advice, quotes, "In those countries and cities just beginning to build facilities two way cycle paths in particular should be avoided in an urban street network." It's the first attachment in my material. Dr. Pasanen says half of Helsinki's more than 800 kilometres two way cycle paths are quotes, "dangerous ones located along the streets." That's just like the Assiniboine bikeway that was constructed. The risk of accidents shown to be three times higher particularly where there are junctions that are crossed. Pedestrian injuries are higher. Second example, ASSHTO is the Association of American State Highway and Transportation Officials. It's developed guidelines for all 50 continental United States and recommends against bike paths for safety reasons when crossings are greater than 4 per mile. Assiniboine in less than half a mile has 15 private driveways servicing a steady stream of businesses, apartment traffic, residents, guest deliveries, garbage trucks, taxis and sometimes crossing and backing in and out across that bike path. It has 14 street corner pedestrian crossings. It's crossed by pedestrians who just simply jaywalk all down Assiniboine Avenue. The rate of crossings is at least 15 times greater than ASSHTO's recommendation. I'm going to skip right to the third example. We have a unique curb that separates bicycles from motorized traffic on Assiniboine Avenue. "It's a made in Winnipeg solution" so said your consultants. It's dangerous; it's contrary to any guidelines. A Wisconsin Design Handbook that follows ASSHTO says a cycle path adjacent to a road should be separated from traffic either by a 5-foot separation which doesn't exist in Assiniboine or a three and a half foot high vertical barrier. Instead what we have is a curb several inches wide, a few inches high with a flat top on which bicyclists and skateboarders have been seen driving. A sad irony given that the curb is apparently intended to protect them from vehicle traffic. Wisconsin advises against the use of that kind of curb. The inadequacy and danger of the curb as illustrated in a photo attached. It shows a car that slid across the ice over the curb, which is purposely mountable because they wanted to accommodate emergency traffic. It's slidded and through the bicycle path up on to a snow bank. Fortunately no one was killed or injured. The curb was also within what is called a pedal strike zone where a cyclist could strike the curb on the down stroke of his pedal, lift the bike, lose control, fall possibly into traffic. The curb is snow covered and it's a danger most of the winter. Last winter I observed the City's crews hand shoveling the walk over a two day period on a weekend and then they placed saw-horses in the middle to try to make it visible but they were tipped over. They crushed under vehicle tires, sharp objects protruding up. There's a variety of photographs that show this eyesore. On traffic concerns I'll only briefly say that now surpasses confusion corner in its ability to confound motorists. In many spots, you can't get from there, to there from here. Back lanes are being used as alternate street routes. In summary, Council owes a duty to the citizens of Winnipeg and to the residents and businesses in this area to now properly examine the compelling issues of safety in traffic relating to the Assiniboine bikeway that were not examined in the flawed consultation. As found by your auditor. Every Councillor should want to ensure safety issues are addressed as soon as possible before a serious personal injury takes place. Thank you for consideration of this submission.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Mr. Mackenzie. Do we have any questions for Mr. Axford or Mr. Mackenzie? Seeing none, we'll thank the gentlemen for their presentations today. Harold Taylor in opposition to the Property Development and marketing of sale land off the North Perimeter Park.

Harold Taylor: Good morning.

Mr. Speaker: Former Councillor, welcome

Harold Taylor: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Mayor Katz. Councillors, it's been a long time since I've come down to Council and addressed the Council. For one to start off by saying there's quite a few new faces here and I haven't seen hardly any of you since the election. It was very late congratulations on your election; you've laid yourself out for four years of very hard work, having been there a little before you. I'm here today on what is that sometimes a little bit of

a confusing issue: green space on along the river, outside of the city. It's a little akin to some earlier parks that we had in the city that were La Barrier, Little Mountain, our own Assiniboine Park was not in Winnipeg and we've had parks like that in the past. We received this land from the City, or from the Province of Manitoba at the time of the very early development of the Perimeter Highway circling the city. The land was then developed. It was developed with monies from Canada, Manitoba and I believe the City of Winnipeg as well. It was called the ARC agreement and I went and looked up some old City of Winnipeg Parks officials in the last couple of days and I also have to say I had a rather enlightening discussion with Councillor Browaty last night. We were at the Red River Basin Commission annual conference, the summit conference there. We did have a little quiet time ourselves and of course what's it dealing with? Land and water. Very appropriate. The ARC agreement was developed some years back; it was put in place in this province in 81, it was supposed to be a five year and ended up being a seven year agreement. It ended in the end of 88. Each province had one, and there were very significant monies coming in for the agreement on recreation and conservation. ARC was a watch word. It's how many of your parks got, our parks got started. So for example, Steven Juba Park named after one of our very well-known Mayors was just a chunk of land and nothing was there. It got its development started through that same agreement so was the walkway that goes around not the pump buildings but the intake for the old pump buildings for the high pressure hydrant system that was in downtown Winnipeg. That walkway was ARC. The redo of the Alexander docks in its first go…that came from there and interestingly enough, one that wasn't on the water but they sort of stretched the rules a little bit, the wing walls that are on the gate of which to become I believe a national historic site, Upper Fort Garry. Those wing walls were built at the time I was first on Council and it was with money that came from ARC. So there's just an example of the history. We have this land north and south of the perimeter highway Councillors, and it…it speaks some forward thinking of the time. We developed, we, community our province and our federal government, developed a boat launch on the south edge. There is quite a large parking lot there. There were no boat launches almost at all in Winnipeg at the time. And interestingly there was an educational component that was also put in. All the fish in our waters are edible. Most city dwellers don't know this or most city dwellers weren't taking advantage of it, so guess what they did? They built a platform over the banks so people, one, wouldn't get stuck in the mud and two, wouldn't fall in the river and have their life in danger. So what did they do? They taught them about the fish. They taught them how to fish and there were fishing programs jointly by Winnipeg and Manitoba at that site. The land to the north was the quiet space, it was the passive part of the park and you could access, you didn't go over the highway, you went under and after the spring flood and you could use that space and that's what it was for. Now of course the wisdom of an earlier Council circa about 1920 was the buy a big chunk of land; a big chunk of land in the village of Tuxedo. That's Assiniboine Park. I don't know what all the thinking was on this because I just came on to Council when the work started being implemented, but in any case, there was a forward thinking thing and there was a very major push by Winnipeg to actually turn back towards the rivers. We had turned away from the rivers essentially because the rivers were access for marine shipping and for rail roads and for industrial development and it wasn't, there wasn't a lot of residential and there sure as heck wasn't much in the way of river parks. That was the time of change, was the 80s and so we developed a whole series of river parks and we started connecting them with foot and bike paths, a real step forward. This was part of that same thing. So when I see this thing of this move afoot to sell the land and there may be a justification for selling it but I think it needs some rethinking. I don't think you have the full report with you here. The one that I've got, the eight page report that I've had shared with me, speaks nothing about the development, nothing about the relationship with the senior levels of government nor any commitment of city funds. There is a piece missing here. There is element missing in the report. That would be the first thing that I would say to you. And secondly, just to add a litle to the confusion here and I'm well aware of the negotiations under way by the administration for the provision of water and sewer servicing and an agreement will come out of that with the city , with RM of West St. Paul. But there is also another report out there and it's in draft, prepared by the Planning Department and it's called Boundary Realignment. And every so often, with this city that we've inherited that was put together in 1971 and putting 13 other communities together with what was then a much smaller Winnipeg because there had been the allowing of this huge development circling the city, so the old thing about you know, there was the doughnut, you know, the doughnut being problems with downtown inner city and then the nice suburbs around it. Well, there was a second doughnut and the doughnut was Winnipeg and the outer doughnut in that case was the suburbs going nuts without any planning controls. Well we ended up having something which I sat on for quite some years called the additional zone. Very, very different from ARM, Association of Rural Municipalities, which host meetings for the ten municipalities around Winnipeg and invites Councillors and staff from the City of Winnipeg to get together. That has no basis in law. It is not a construct. It is, in effect a way of communicating yes, but I think it might be better defined as social than governance. And we had something called the additional zone which meant that the municipalities around us must meet with this Council and its representatives and its staff and it was very, very useful. Not that we didn't have some terrible arguments. I mean things got very bitter at times because of how people felt strongly about the issues. I remember getting in real trouble from a, with a member from East St. Paul and they wanted to put a gravel quarry right against some residences and I said this is just not right. Well, it ended up getting stopped and the Councillor that I locked horns with ended up becoming the Reeve and we were known to share a glass of water purification some evenings and we would, we laughed about some of the things later but you know, it was a means and you don't have that means, so now we have this thing going on with West St. Paul for a servicing agreement, in effect, they're going to compete with us Councillors for development, for residents, people, growth, that sort of thing and other development as

well. We don't have a formal relationship that is as developed as it needs to be and we're in a situation where because of this other report I just mentioned to you, is that we're going to be in a situation that Winnipeg needs to really say what do we want to do? One of the things might be as we have that perimeter highway now fully encircling, thank you. What we need to know is, what do you want to do about that land? Rosser RM, West St. Paul, East St. Paul, there's some shallow pieces between Winnipeg's north boundary and the Perimeter, what do you want to do about that? This piece of land, quite frankly Council, is leverage. Use it. Hold off for the moment. There's no big need. Yes, you'll you know, Councillor Browaty correctly points out that we'll get a little money but maybe the strategy is more important than the money and so I would very respectfully suggest that this issue here should be laid over until that other report comes out. You can get your heads into that, think about where you want to go and look out for us and the City of Winnipeg. Not for the next couple of years and not for a small amount of revenue but for the next hundred years going forward so we know where we're going. We're getting constrained in a way we've never been constrained before. Let's see if we can look that way and I would say this would be nice leverage with West St. Paul.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. Do we have any questions for Mr. Taylor? Seeing none sir, we'll thank you for your comments.

Harold Taylor: Thank you very much. Nice seeing you all.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Thank you for your service to the City. Jackie Avent, Green Action Centre.

Jackie Avent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Your Worship, members of Council, for providing the opportunity to speak with you today about concerns I have regarding the widening of Route 90 between Taylor Avenue and Ness Avenue and there will be some materials distributed to you shortly. My name is Jackie Avent and I am the Coordinator of the Active and Safe Routes to School Program with Green Action Centre. As you may know from previous presentations to Council and various committees, Green Action Centre believes in creating an equitable situation for all road users both ensuring safe, easy and priority access for vulnerable road users and making sure that new infrastructure projects are paid for by the appropriate users in a fair way. That's why I'm here. Upon review of the preliminary documents for the widening of Route 90, there appears to be inadequate accommodation of the needs of children and youth in terms of prioritizing their unique transportation requirements; inadequate facilities to make active transportation a realistic option for significant number of users and sorely inappropriate consideration of the opportunities for any type of rapid transit in the corridor. I am here today to ask you, Your Worship Mayor Katz, you distinguished members of Council, to reconsider this preliminary plan for Route 90 and to not let it pass without the following key issues addressed. The first is a request to change the proposed pedestrian overpass currently on the plans at Lockstone Avenue to mandatory. To add an additional corridor for non-motorized transportation along the east side of Route 90 to complement the one that's planned on the west side of Route 90. To make provisions for rapid transit or priority transit corridor like diamond lanes et cetera, a part of the plans and to consider adding a toll system at one or both of the St. James Bridge and or the Taylor underpass to generate revenue for road use similar to the way transit users pay for bus fare. So in…speaking to the first point, as coordinator of the Safe Route to School Program, I've worked on the development of the school travel plan with the staff and parents at Carpathia School as well as members of the community and members of the City administration and Councillor Orlikow. In the take home parent surveys from the parents that I received and discussions that follow at meetings, crossings along the Route 90 area are identified by the families living on the west side of Kenaston as a serious safety hazard and they impact parents' decisions on whether to allow their children to walk or cycle to school. The crossings at Lockstone Avenue and Tuxedo Avenue that are the primary access points to Carpathia School need to be constructed to the highest level of safety possible. At Lockstone Avenue, this type of crossing is a grade separated crossing, a pedestrian overpass. Currently it is listed as recommended in the plans but my request here today is that it be made mandatory in the plans before they are passed by Council. I also ask that all grade level crossings that are included as part of the plan are accommodated to allow for the optimal level of safety for vulnerable road users and to equip each crossing with pedestrian priority crossings that would allow pedestrians to move independently of vehicles early in the light sequence in either direction and to accommodate a minimum crossing time or maximum crossing time that will maximize accessibility for children and seniors. The first guideline in the child and youth friendly land use in transport planning guidelines developed by the centre for sustainable transportation and the public agency of Canada requests that transport and land use planning, the needs of children and youth should receive as much priority as the needs of people of other ages and the requirement of business. The expansion of Kenaston already contradicts this guideline. If the needs of children and youth were given the same priority as business and vehicle traffic, this freeway would never be built along a main corridor inside the city. Heavy truck and transportation traffic would've been routed outside of the city or an alternative route sparing this community which will become less vibrant, more car dependent and sicker because of the expansion. Cities all over the world are putting roads on diets, narrowing streets and making them more complete to accommodate a wider range of users, more pedestrians, cyclists and transit users and they're lowering speed limits. I feel this expansion in Winnipeg is going backwards; widening roadways to allow transport trucks to pass through a community corridor is like widening your belt to try to cure obesity. Recognizing that this widening of Route 90 is not going to be completely reversed however, the second thing that I would like to request is

to add an additional corridor for non-motorized transportation along the east side of Route 90. I find it difficult to believe that in a scale of a project like this with the scope that CentrePort has become a multi-mortal transportation hub in the City of Winnipeg, that there's not enough money to put another corridor for non-motorized transportation on the east side. Currently there is only one shown on the preliminary drawings. In Our Winnipeg Sustainable Transportation Strategy, one of the key strategic goals is to create a transportation system that supports active and accessible and healthy life style option. Having infrastructure for non-motorized transportation done each side of the roadway will meet this strategic goal. The other way that this can be met is by making provisions for a rapid transit corridor or another transit priority route as part of this expansion. There currently not even diamond lanes suggested as part of this or that I could see on the plans and if Winnipeg is going to become a multi-modal transportation hub, it has the opportunity to show its commitment by investing in rapid transit along this corridor. It's actually an amazing opportunity if you think about it, to link the University of Manitoba, Waverley West and the Kenaston-Lindenwoods communities to the airport. It's a key link and an element that is missing in the plans for the expansion. Finally, Green Action Centre believes that it's time to get our cars off of welfare. This project is huge, the Route 90 Expansion and the bill for it is going to be huge. If we follow Council's logic of having the user pay for improvements to rapid transit, we should do the same with vehicles. Get Winnipeg's cars and trucks off of welfare and have people that are using the roadway pay for it by implementing a toll system at the Taylor underpass and/or the St. James Bridge. The widening of Route 90 is undoubtedly one of the largest infrastructure projects the City will face in the next century and will impact the health, well-being and vibrancy of that community and the City as a whole for generations to come. We owe it to the children of today and tomorrow to make the right planning and land use decisions with the opportunity this widening presents. Consider the huge investment being made in this project. There should be more attention being paid to the needs of rapid transit, non-motorized transportation and children and youth. Your grandchildren's grandchildren's grandchildren's grandchildren and mine will thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Ms Avent. Any questions? Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Jackie. It's good to see you again. Are you aware that we are adopting a preliminary design for the actual roadway which will allow our property department to go out and negotiate with home owners and that there will in fact be ample time for detail design for alternative transportation, for transit considerations as we, the project progresses. There's going to be lots of time, the entire budget's not before us today. It's just allowing the alignment to move forward so that the property department can negotiate with home owners.

Jackie Avent: Yes I understand that.

Councillor Vandal: There will be time to actually get into the detail of alternative transportation, of transit improvements as part of the more detailed design.

Jackie Avent: Thank you.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further questions, thank you very much for your presentation today. All right Colin Fast…Craig. Why did I…Fast…Freudian slip.

Colin Craig: I don't look like a policy frog do I? (Laughter) Thank you for the opportunity to speak here today on the City Auditor's Report on Assiniboine. I will keep my comments brief and I want to say at the outset that I do recognize that we're not talking about a lot of money between the cost of construction along Assiniboine;, the cost of consultations for that one component alone as well as the auditor's time, the cost to fix up the mistakes. We're certainly talking about in the neighbourhood of a couple hundred thousand dollars. It's a drop in the bucket when you look at the entire city budget but like they say all those drops start to add up and what I think is really important here is that there's a lot of really good lessons to be learned and we definitely support the auditor's recommendations. First, in terms of the need to consult, I think it has to be recognized that there is no City Council, no City Hall, no City Government, no Provincial Government, no Federal Government, without businesses and entrepreneurs. They create the wealth and pay taxes themselves, hire individuals who pay taxes, which in turn fund government. So there needs to be a great respect for that relationship, and certainly for projects moving forward we support the auditor's recommendation to ensure that businesses are in fact consulted with. Another component I think that was missed as that project proceeded were in fact motorists. Certainly something could've been done to engage the motorists that use that route each and every day to get their take on what the different recommendations would mean to them. Second, we support the auditor's recommendation on the need to communicate the cost of different alternatives when the City proposes different options to Winnipeg citizens. As we all know that Winnipeg can be a frugal city and I think this might actually help the city going forward, if you communicate the costs of different options because then it will allow taxpayers to choose if they want an option that includes all the bells and whistles or not. Third, we also support the auditor's recommendations to ensure that

different projects moving forward are communicated in a clear and concise manner. The terms traffic calming and active transportation are becoming more and more known as we move forward, but certainly a few years ago I think many would have no idea what the term, traffic calming would mean. Finally, I want to conclude my comments today by just noting about the accountability of what happened. There were some serious mistakes and problems with that process, I think everyone recognizes that, but our question is what has happened as a result? Has anyone received so much as a pay cut, a demotion, any other form of reprimand? That's something that we're hoping to hear more about going forward. Thank you for listening to our comments today.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Craig. There are no questions, thanks. Marty Gold.

Marty Gold: Good morning, Mr. Speaker. Good morning Councillors, Mr. Mayor.

Mr. Speaker: Five minutes.

Marty Gold: Thank you, sir. I'm here to speak in opposition to the motion with regards to the audit. I realized that at Executive Policy Committee I struck the position that it should be accepted with amendments, however once I became aware of the City Report that was distributed with a city insignia on it, along with some of these vaunted consultants at a national conference in Halifax in September of 2010 when the ink was barely dry on the lawsuit filed by the aggrieved parties, and clearly their concerns have been validated by this audit, I am inclined to agree with Bob Axford and Doug Mackenzie that to go along with the mild and limited recommendations of the auditor whereas they are good…well intentioned is not sufficient. All public consultation must be reformed. This is your opportunity. And in fact a directive must be given to the administration to begin that process and as well a copy of this audit by rights should be distributed in a public meeting held with the people in the Assiniboine neighbourhood who were essentially screwed over by what the Mayor referred to last week as a poor job done by everybody including members of this chamber. The exceptions of course, are the members who I suppose weren't here back when this was transpiring in 2010. This was, in fact, cheating. What Doug Mackenzie referenced about the kind of information the City has not been infused with, this process has not infused with, you can extract from the presentation of your own staff of what they say would've been helpful data. Helpful data would've included traffic volumes and speeds, cross streets and residential and business uses in parking and the impact of universal design considerations. In other words, and everything that has come up on Assiniboine that your own people said, "Well, we really should have had this stuff before we proceeded." But the insult to the community where they went to a national conference and said things like, "Through the public consultation process the project team was able to begin building public support through a meaningful engagement with local residents and shareholders." That stands as an outright lie. So if you vote for the audit you have to repudiate this paper that was circulated that has the City's insignia on it. Now how did this happen? Very simple. Look at their conclusion, first sentence. Looking back receiving 20 million in funding for these projects was like winning the lottery; you want to spend it all. As Mayor Katz indicated and I think I'm the only media outlet that played his comments in full on my web site, sometimes not such a smart idea just because somebody is dangling money. Now, there was certainly a lot of controversy surrounding this. Threats to Red River College the day after Councillor Browaty on the air said he'd get to the bottom of what 311 had done to Graham Hnatiuk. The treatment of Graham Hnatiuk. I myself have filed a Freedom of Information request on Kevin Nixon to try to get to the bottom of what was going on behind the scenes and I was told it would cost me $6,000. I know Sam, to search his e-mail. Can you believe it? So obviously, somebody has something to hide. Now there's also this myth about public consultation and in that regard, in December what Barb Judt was referencing, as where the Deputy Mayor made a statement there had been a plethora of public consultations. Clearly whatever plethora there was did not suffice based on this audit and there was no confusion by people because genuine consultation didn't take place because of the language that was used, designed to exclude people who would not row the boat in the same direction. How can the concerns of the people of Assiniboine be redressed? I would refer you all to a blog post on our web site, tgcts.com dated October 7th at which Kim, the traffic reporter, attended a meeting at 33 Edmonton that Councillor Gerbasi had with the people there. In which Councillor Gerbasi made the statement, "There was no point in pointing fingers with regards to the shortcomings in consultation". And in addition, after talking about how fire trucks are having difficulty and buses couldn't make the turns she did admit if it's a failure they could take it out. So Doug McKenzie's proposal and Barb Judt's proposal is in fact accurate. The last thing I want to leave you with because this is rather rushed is how the City defended the lawsuit. The need to consult curbs when the street is closed but the City is not closing the street. How deceptive could your lawyer said been in fighting the lawsuit than to make a statement like that on consultation by the auditor's own finding was required regardless of whether the street was being closed or not. The idea of the lawsuit had no basis because the City wasn't required to speak with anybody before and it was also one of the premises put forward by your lawyers. The bottom line is as James Hope Howard wrote on his blog today. Nobody involved in the whole mess would admit any wrong doing or impropriety until relevant documents were forcefully wrangled out of the system through Freedom of Information action. You can take action today. If you're all going to do is approve it as information and not act on this, don't try to fool the people again. Don't humour yourselves but if you understand and you believe that public consultation for everything, zoning, bike lanes, all of it, can start changing today as I've been advocating in these chambers for over a year on the air for five years, here is your chance to hold the

administration accountable, to do a better yourselves as the Mayor recommended, and to redress the failure to treat people in the Assiniboine-South Broadway neighbourhood properly. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Marty. No questions? And we will carry on with our agenda. That completes our delegations today, ladies and gentlemen. We'd just like to go back and move the Minutes of the Meeting of December 13th.
.,

MINUTES

Councillor Mayes moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on December 13, 2011 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Mr. Speaker: Executive Policy Committee, meeting of January the 11th, Mayor Katz

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 11, 2012

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

Mr. Speaker: See no stand down. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. January 18th, Mayor Katz.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 18, 2012

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce the Report and move adoption of Consent Agenda, Items 1 to 12.

Mr. Speaker: Eleven? Councillor Eadie? Ten, five. Okay, we'll move Consent then on 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 12.

Item 5 – Municipal Boundary Realignment: Considerations for Winnipeg

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Yeah, we just want to pose the question on the numbers I read out, okay. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. He is the guy ahead of you. Item 5, Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I guess I missed when someone stood that down, but if they did, I very much like to hear what they have to say and I'd be happy to respond to it.

Mr. Speaker: You were five? Okay, are you standing it down? Go ahead.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stood it down. I know the recommendation is to ask for another layover for 30 days and I support that, to come back here. I stand it down though I…to have an opportunity to speak to this again, Mr. Speaker because I think it's a crucial issue facing our city. We have a unique challenge in Winnipeg and it's a good challenge to have and that is …we are a growing city and right now growing at a tremendous rate. It's having a major transformation on our city and we can see it happening virtually on a daily basis. All the growth projections Mr. Speaker that have been made in the past…recent past have been corrected in the more distant past. They were incorrect actually. They were off by at least half. We are now growing on average, Mr. Speaker, of about 10,000 people a year and that's, for Winnipeg that's unprecedented. We've never had that kind of growth in recent memory. You have to really go back to the turn of the last century with the boom that took place with immigration and the growth of the city where Winnipeg was going to be widely known as the Chicago of the north to see those types of growth rates, 10,000 people a year. And we know, Mr. Speaker, from the Our Winnipeg process and those by the way Mr. Speaker, those projections have been accurate and the numbers have been accurate in terms of the actual numbers that we've been going by. We know also from Our Winnipeg process, Mr. Speaker, that we must accommodate this growth both in terms of densification, through infill development and through densifying existing neighbourhoods, but we know Mr. Speaker also from the OurWinnipeg process that that will not be enough to be able to accommodate this growth as a city. We know that we are going to have to accommodate the growth through development of lands that are not developed yet on the periphery of the existing developed lands within our city, Mr. Speaker. And we also know, Mr. Speaker, that there is a growing pressure in terms of the capital region. Even though our growth rates are impressive, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the growth outside of Winnipeg is happening actually at rate double our growth. So the capital region even though the numbers are smaller over all, Mr. Speaker because their numbers are quite a bit smaller than us, they

are actually growing faster in proportion to their size. And I think this is a trend that's going to continue. It's been there for some time and it's growing and it's…I think it's happening for various reasons. You know, consumers are able to have different options in the capital region, larger lots. I think it's happening for the very fact that you can have lower costs, land costs are lower, land costs are lower Mr. Speaker, why? Because they have lower requirements in terms of service requirements, in terms of servicing requirements, in terms of development standards and so what does it mean, Mr. Speaker? It means somebody can actually buy a home in the capital region and they can have the same kind of home that they dreamed of having in the city but they can actually afford it in the Capital region because the land is indirectly subsidizing the cost of that person being able to buy that type of house because the cost is cheaper. So Mr. Speaker, we're faced with this challenge in terms of the residential zone, we're also faced in terms of the challenge Mr. Speaker, in terms of industrial development., an industrial growth that's happening on the periphery of the city. The industrial development again, same thing Mr. Speaker, I can tell you we have an industrial development on the edge of our city in the RM of Springfield Industrial Park that they charge half the industrial property, the mill rate that we have in the City of Winnipeg. These businesses, and it's growing, Mr. Speaker. It's growing tremendously well. And yet, de facto Mr. Speaker is relying on our municipal services. We have yet to see, Mr. Speaker, commercial development happening though I think that is going to be happening soon. It's around the corner, because if you look at the way the city is developed we developed kind of in this, kind of circular fashion and we created these major centres. Well, the next layer if you like, Mr. Speaker is going to be believe it or not, not inside the City of Winnipeg as it stands right now. The next large commercial development and we hear that the Perimeter Highway actually may be kind of the next major transportation corridor that actually would accommodate that. Will be taking that into consideration and will be the challenge of the future. So Mr. Speaker when this motion was made, it was made full well that we as a city are literally running out of land. We are growing at a rate where we're running out of land and it was made full well knowing Mr. Speaker, that on the edge of our city, our municipalities who with the resources they have are doing the best they can but the fact of the matter is Mr. Speaker, is they're allowing development to go forward with both substandard service requirements and substandard development requirements and when I say substandard, I mean compared to the standard that we require inside the City of Winnipeg and we see that over and over again. We've heard municipal officials here Mr. Speaker in this very chamber speak about how sewage as they're in the ditches at homes and we know Mr. Speaker that we have municipalities that de facto rely on our firefighting protection for their industrial developments and yet when they come to us and ask for the price to actually buy that service formally from us their Council baulks at paying that price even though that's the goose that lays the golden egg for them. So Mr. Speaker we have this huge divide. I argue, Mr. Speaker and believe it's far better for us to be able to have our service standards, our development standards in place if this development is going to happen and it's going to happen, Mr. Speaker because now, under this government provincially and under the previous government provincially Mr. Speaker, there has been a laissez faire attitude to development in the capital region. They can basically develop as they wish and wish as they develop and that's what it comes down to, Mr. Speaker. So knowing this full well and knowing that this policy is not going to change Mr. Speaker with the election of the government, re-election of the government again last fall, we Mr. Speaker, should be in control of our own destiny and we can do that by controlling the land. We know that, Mr. Speaker. We know that, and think about it. The majority of citizens, many citizens think our boundaries already start at the Perimeter. It's just a physical…we don't have mountains, we don't…we have rivers but we don't have valleys. We have the Perimeter Highway and that Mr. Speaker, when they cross the Perimeter, wow now I'm inside the city, but in most of the cases, in many cases you are not. So Mr. Speaker to bring the boundaries up to the Perimeter where it does not already go beyond the Perimeter, I think makes sense. It secures, it keeps our future secure. It ensures orderly development, the development at a standard which we expect Mr. Speaker, which the Provincial Government expects us to do which we have been ensuring as a city and Mr. Speaker, ensures that the City as a whole can plan properly. It actually ensures, Mr. Speaker, that those who stand for density, those who believe in infill should be made a priority it can actually be made a priority because no matter what we do we can't control and encourage infill development if this kind of development is being allowed to happen outside of our city which is exactly what's happening. So Mr. Speaker, I leave those thoughts with you, I know this is coming back again, I stood it down just to speak to it to communicate my concerns and the whole gist of this motion. I don't think I've had that opportunity to do this yet and that's why I appreciate this opportunity. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel, are you raising your hand?

Councillor Swandel: I don't know why we're allowing speakers on this. This is something that's asked for 30 day extension and this will come back. The issues were, that we had at EPC needs further information so I'm supportive of what EPC has done and we'll get that information and come back and we'll have those types of conversations at a later date. I'm surprised that went on because that's not what this is about today.

Mr. Speaker: Fair enough. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me thank Councillor Wyatt through you for his comments. I appreciate comments from all Councillors on whatever the topic may be and there are many things that were stated that I certainly

do agree with but I think what Councillor Wyatt, I'm going to try and see if I can paraphrase it. We need to be in charge of our own destiny. Well, Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg is not in charge of its own destiny. I think every Councillor sitting here knows that. We are a creature of the Province. They are the parent, we are the child. Do we like that? No. Does it make sense? Absolutely not but that's the way it is and the facts are, Mr. Speaker there's two things that I think everyone has to be cognizant of, actually believe it or not one of the previous delegations although they didn't say it, okay, I believe this former Councillor Harold Taylor, they were also talking about the A word, annexation, and I believe Councillor Wyatt is also going there and it's been discussed many times before but I think everybody on the floor of Council knows only the province can make that happen. We talked about that when CentrePort started to become a reality about annexation. It fell on deaf ears Mr. Speaker, so that's just the reality of the situation. We talk about being in charge of our own destiny, Mr. Speaker. What about our infrastructure? We know the problems we face. We only get 8 cents of every dollar. So let's not for a moment think we're in charge of our own destiny. Should we be? Absolutely but we're not. But the one comment I do want to make and I certainly understand the motivation of the motion, I think it makes sense to be laid over. When people talk about the Perimeter there are many parts of the city that stop before the Perimeter there were some that go beyond the Perimeter. The Perimeter exists because the province wanted to build the Perimeter on provincially owned land so they built it on provincially owned land and that's how that was determined. I think in order to consider any movement from that I think takes a little bit more due diligence and I think that's what this motion is all about. And it makes sense. And I am supportive of the layover Mr. Speaker, but I thank Councillor Wyatt for his comments.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Laid over for 30 days. Item 11.

Item 10 – Review of Winnipeg Public Library Services

Mayor Katz: Item 10, Mr. Speaker, I think it was laid over by Councillor Eadie and I would love to hear what Councillor Eadie has to say.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. Thank you, Mayor. I just…there wasn't much conversation with this report coming to EPC when I attended last meeting on the 18th. I just would like to point out something in this report that I find very interesting and I think that those of us on City Council who have long supported the vibrant, well-serving libraries that I should at least raise one particular point at least and…but I do, and I should start off by making my comments that I've been involved with library boards and advisory boards and so on, regarding libraries in this province for quite a few years because as a stakeholder who needs accessible information, accessible books, accessible reading material, I've tried to inject that importance in the libraries including the Winnipeg Public Library and many other libraries across the Province and the Provincial department that provides us with their electronic library management system that allows electric books that are quite accessible for people to download and listen to. I think it's great. So it's very important that we do acknowledge any audit of a library system in Winnipeg or anywhere else has found and will find that libraries manage with the least amount of money that they can. They are very successful at it. They do very well in terms of innovation and ways of finding ways to deliver their services in a very, very cost efficient manner. Now, given that context, the reality is, of course, that there is a cost associated with providing library materials and in this particular report I noted that…now these are 2009 numbers. I note that they mention that the City of Winnipeg's per capita expenditure on materials, $4.25 in 2009 where the average across the country, $6.39. That's quite a discrepancy and last year, it was…well, I'll say it: I was proud along with Councillor Browaty we were quite proud that we were able to convince City Council through its operating budget to increase the materials budget by a substantial amount of money and I think that that was great because the library does need to provide the newest material as well as material that people are looking for in terms of the expanding electronic library, that's like the exponential growth of that service is huge and it is probably the least expensive one way to deliver books. Now that's not to say that all programming in libraries isn't important because you do need facilities to do that but I would point out that the increase that we provided to the materials budget and in the operating budget last year probably only represented an increase of 7 cents. So I'm thinking that in 2011, there might have been something before but adding 7 cents to $4.25, that takes us to $4.32 approximately. I think there was a materials budget increase of about anywhere from 10 to 25,000 in 2010. I wasn't part of that operating budget decision-making process but I just wanted to point that out that we need to find a way and I'm hoping that in the 2012 budget we can find a way to bring more money to the materials purchasing for our Winnipeg Public Library which again, I will say, is managed and run very cost effectively, very efficiently and we just need to put some more money on the table for materials so I just want to mention that. The Auditor's report is there. There's number of other details and I'm sure that other City Councillors around the table here may want to make comments. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I attended the Executive Policy Committee last week to hear the reaction of the Mayor and his fellow members of that committee to the Auditor's report regarding our library services. Councillor Swandel moved it to be received as information. Not a word was uttered. Not a single word. They were silent as the

auditor's report stated that Winnipeg had the lowest total library expenditure per capita of $38. Calgary, Edmonton, Halifax, Vancouver, Regina, Ottawa, Saskatoon, Toronto and Montreal gave greater support to their libraries than did Winnipeg. But we do have magnificent facilities, some magnificent facilities. The Millennium Library, the West End Library, the Henderson Library and the McPhillips Library are fine modern facilities, but we do not support them and the 16 other libraries with books et cetera, the way other major Canadian cities do. Our city spent $2,870,535.00 on library materials but, for example, Ottawa spent $4,705,108 on books and audio vision materials. Why, Mr. Mayor do we spend so little compared to other Canadian cities on this core service? We spent 4.25 per capita compared to Regina expenditure of 8.15 per capita. Regina spent twice as much as we do and look at what Vancouver spends on library material, in 2009 Vancouver spent $9.31 per capita on library materials compared to our $4.25. And Mr. Mayor, the auditor came to the conclusion that what was at risk was our library service's inability to maintain a collection with current and up to date materials. And Mr. Mayor, have you lobbied the Provincial Government for an increase in the of Provincial Library Grant from 2006 to 2010, the grant has only increased by 100,000. You only have to look at book expenditures to realize that the grant is not sufficient. Books for example have doubled in price, but I guess from your actions, Mr. Mayor that libraries are not as important to you as they are to the 460,456 registered borrowers who made 2,771,358 visits to our libraries in 2009. We should really have more from the Mayor and Executive Policy Committee than receiving this just as information.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank the Auditor for the time and energy put into this audit and there are a lot of very good solid recommendations here. A as you know we've been operating in a very tight financial environment here at the City in my opinion, but I think we've made libraries a priority as Councillor Smith correctly pointed out. We have a lot of new modern facilities and there's more in the works as well so again I think we're doing the right thing when it comes to our libraries making sure that they are adapting to the new modern circumstances that are out there. It's not now just about books, books are still important but other materials that you know, fall into the material budget whether they be E-books or other electronic resources, electronic content, I mean, so again a lot of good things going on. What I just want to say is or I think the real problem lies is throughout the Province of Manitoba the provincial policy has a formula for applying grants and support to library branches throughout the Province. We have a different system and we get far less money. In fact back in the 1990s, a formula was put in place with a cap for funding the City of Winnipeg library system. That cap was reached in around 2003, 2004 and since then the Province's support has only increased by $100,000 which went up in 2008. So it's been $1.9 million out of a 2.3…verses $2.3 million coming from the City in terms of tax supported funding. In other cities it's matching up to I think around $6 per population, maybe a little more. So again we need to do a little work lobbying our friends over on Broadway to make sure that the Winnipeg Public Library branch gets its fair shake.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.
.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to take this opportunity to remind our colleagues here that we always receive these reports as information. With regard to the library, nobody disagreed with what the auditor said. I think Councillor Smith makes fair comment, I think Councillor Browaty makes fair comment. The important piece is to make sure that we follow through with our tracking process that we know that the recommendations are being implemented or if they're not that there is a good reason why they are being implemented. That's our process. We do annual reports and tracking of those recommendations and the implementation of the recommendations, so I think a little bit of much ado about nothing is being made here. This is what we do. We do track those recommendations. We do try to get them recommend…the recommendations implemented. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz would you like to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the comments from both Councillor Eadie as well as Councillor Smith. Unfortunately, I'm not convinced that I agree with some of the comments of Councillor Smith and I guess it comes back to what was said earlier, "In charge of your own destiny". Mr. Speaker, every year that I can recall as was reiterated by Councillor Eadie, we've done what we can to enhance library services; extending hours, more books, more electronic books. We do everything we can and also keeping in mind, Mr. Speaker that there is a Board and in addition there is a group of Library Advisory Committee which every Community Committee appoints a member. So why don't we discuss what the real problem is? And I'm thankful to Councillor Browaty for basically starting to address it, Mr. Speaker. The Provincial Government capped their contribution at $1.9 million. If we were treated equally to the rest of the province, Mr. Speaker, and got the exact same formula, we'd be receiving an additional 5-point…no I'm sorry, the additional $4 million. Take that $4 million, divide it by approximately 684,000 people, that would raise the per cap by 5.84. We would be the highest in the country. Wouldn't that be nice? So what I would like to encourage Councillor Smith for you to do is make that speech on Broadway because that's where that speech needs to be made. How many times,

Mr. Speaker, have I said to you, out of every tax dollar, 8 cents to the City of Winnipeg, 65 cents to the Province of Manitoba, and 27 cents to the Federal Government. That's after transfers, grants, the whole kit and caboodle. If you talk, if you talk to any member of the Board or any member of the Advisory Committee, they keep on saying to us, can't you get the Province to change it so we'll be treating fairly. Well, Mr. Speaker, a little while ago we talked about certain changes we've asked from the Province. I hate to say it, we haven't had a lot of success. But I'll tell you what, I'm ready to go back to Broadway with Councillor Smith at my side and do it one more time, Mr. Speaker. It would be an honour and privilege to be accompanied by the Councillor, a former MLA I might add.

Mr. Speaker: Move the motion. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. It has been received as information. Item 11, Councillor Gerbasi.

Item 11 – Review of the Assiniboine Active Transportation Bikeway

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the number of people that did come out and speak today and I think they were heard. They were heard at EPC. They've been heard many times but I also want to put this in perspective that there's very much a different point of view on this as well and I also want to mention that the Assiniboine Bikeway now that it's here and it's in practice and it exists, it's a very, very positive thing for a lot of people and I fully support it, its continuance. I wasn't able to attend the EPC meeting but I appreciate a chance now to speak to some of the issues that are raised by the audit. I would like to say that the Audit Department's recommendations make a lot of sense and it's excellent that the public service has already agreed to carry out the improvements to the consultation process and that's what we expect. The public consultation process had shortfalls which were outlined in the audit however, I think that some of the opponents of the active transportation and in particular, opponents to the changes on Assiniboine Avenue have exaggerated and extrapolated a little too much out of the implications of that. To say, for example it's been stated over, there's been no public consultation done. Well, it wasn't a perfect process. There were flaws in it. That doesn't mean that nothing was done and as issues arose, everyone did their best to address those issues wherever possible. For example, there were many one on one meetings, responses, phone calls, discussions with residents, for example I was at 33 Edmonton, the one that he mentioned there and met with those people. There was a lot of further discussions that went on and many of those concerns and issues that were raised were dealt with and things were changed, loading zones for the accessibility and in different issues. I recall very clearly the group of people that took legal action against the City. Their concerns were very much heard. They weren't necessarily agreed with in full but they were listened to. And when the City, when they took the City to court, I mean I think what they wanted was for this thing not to happen at all but one of the main things they wanted was to have the two way restored up to the Donald Bridge and that was restored and that was the major issue and that was actually changed to what they wanted so I think that's called listening. And it would have been undemocratic to let a project like this be hijacked by a small group who oppose it and just stop doing it. However, the concerns they were raised were listened to, I just mentioned that that was implemented so I agree that there were, and we all agree that there need to be changes and improvements for the consultation process but people were listened to and consulted with as follow, you know as our process would follow through. I would also like to remind everyone that the active transportation funding came from a federal stimulus program which was enthusiastically sought after by this Council. This was something we asked for and at the time a lot of Council including the Mayor, were really excited about the idea of providing alternative transportation options, never before had the City of Winnipeg had the chance to invest $20 million in over 35 active transportation projects and everyone was pumped about this, I remember this. However, the Federal stimulus program came with some very tight time lines which meant the projects had to be done in a single construction season. ????one coming up. And the other challenge was that many of the projects including the Assiniboine bikeway which was one of the most…involved the most change to how the current streets work, was constructed in the fall right before the winter and right in the middle of a civic election. It was unfortunate to see many candidates and city leaders taking advantage of the situation by trying to inflame residents' fears and concerns in the hopes of influencing voters. The Assiniboine bikeway was a major change to how the neighbourhood streets work and involved a lot of adjustment and the construction caused disruption and confusion as any construction does; however, when the going gets tough that's when we as city leaders ought to show some guts and courage and face the challenge and ensure that the job gets done. Instead, we saw finger pointing, scapegoating and blaming of local Councillors and City staff at the most difficult part of the implementation. What happened to the enthusiastic commitment to AT infrastructure? It seemed to have faded with a cynical effort to discredit local Councillors however if anybody isn't aware the election results show that the Councillor who never wavered in supporting the Assiniboine bikeway won a big majority including winning handily in the downtown poll where the bikeway is located. This was right in the middle of the construction season with all the confusion and challenges and imperfections that all of us have taken some responsibility for. I'm also pleased to say that in spite of what you heard last week, I'm hearing a lot of positive response and I have been from the Broadway Assiniboine neighbourhood, the residents and I'd like to share a few examples with you. "I'm an affected resident. As an affected resident, it is my opinion that the end result the bikeway and vehicular traffic changes have improved the life in the neighbourhood significantly. As a property owner in the area, I certainly like the fact Assiniboine is no longer used as a main thoroughfare. It feels like the nice residential neighbourhood that it is. As a resident of the neighbourhood, I enjoy

the reduced car traffic on Assiniboine during rush hours" and this is a little bit more of a lengthy one, this person wanted…wasn't able to be here in delegation. She says "I've lived at 15 Kennedy for 15 years now. During this entire time, we've been plagued by heavy traffic at all hours of the day and night, people racing to take a shortcut at Kennedy all the way down to Assiniboine to Main. Now what, now what you would call a normal residential neighbourhood. Our residents also gives home to focus to a population of 15 disabled individuals all of whom are in wheelchairs, almost all whom are in wheelchairs, some are on ventilators and most of them go out and need to cross the street. A wonderful transformation occurred in our area last year: the bicycle pathway. There will always be someone who will not agree with the new project. They should be heard but the whole wonderful idea should not be scrapped or changed because of one small group or person. The one person who complained came to our block last fall and tried to convince us to be unhappy with the change but we are happy. Everyone is safer now. Our street has room for parking on both sides", she's talking about Kennedy where some parking was at it and believe me, parking is a large issue for people who live downtown. We are promoting healthy, unrestricted mobility by bike for those who wish it so I hope that now we have had this audit and we are moving forward with its recommendations we can get back to an approach of enthusiastic support for active transportation infrastructure projects. This particular route is one of the key active transportation routes connecting the downtown, the Forks and many, many Winnipeg neighbourhoods. It's working well and it's highly used. It's a fantastic experience to use, I actually myself use it almost every day as soon as the snow goes away. It wasn't too long ago that virtually all of Council was enthusiastic about this and was keen to see more integrated transportation being put in place. Sometimes there were growing pains and challenges when we tried to bring it forward and I think that's what we have to recognize this as. Sure there's growing pains, believe me it was painful for many of us, for all of us perhaps. But, you know, you have to look at the big picture and you have to look at what's there now and it's an improvement to our city. This is a residential street and it's in downtown and it's part of what makes it beautiful and I also wanted to add there is a new high rise going in there and there's another one in the works. People want to live there. They are not stopping…

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

Councillor Gerbasi: They are not moving away in droves because of this bikeway, it's making their lives better. The seniors who live at Fort Garry Place and some of the apartments, you know their street is now quiet and it's working for a lot of people and I just…I'm emphasizing that because that's not the message that all of you were hearing and I think it's a more balanced message. I acknowledge that some people don't like it, but it's very rare that we are able to please everybody. And so, thank you very much for listening and I hope you'll continue to be enthusiastic about showing innovation, being progressive, making our city better, making it the kind of city people want to live in because I think that's what this project is actually helped to do if we can step back from the pain we all went through to get there. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a few brief comments on this. First, I want to go into a little bit what Councillor Gerbasi did. The whole program of the active transportation, I tell you, I was very excited about it. There was a whole bunch of projects, 20 million, I forget the grand total amount of projects but, there are some of the projects were fantastic, there's one that's in the Speaker's ward and mine, Yellow Ribbon Greenway Trail. I can tell you, people love this trail. There's no controversy at all and I think the vast majority of these projects were active transportation. We're as such. You know, there was some consultation, could've been done better absolutely but the vast majority of these projects that we did, haven't enhanced the quality of life for our citizens in our area. So I just want to address that. There are…each ward Councillor did have an opportunity to take a look at the plans that were there. They came and approached me in terms of a number of projects, and the Councillor had to make decisions on whether it made sense for the community, once the consultations that were there. There were some in my ward that were part of a you know, in my comfort zone if you will, there is one that I know some of the presenters earlier, you know, took issues with some of the ones that were in my area as well. But, there's also an opportunity for each Councillor to say yeah or nay to them. For example, I'll give you an example, that active transportation folks had a proposal to do some bikeways, the thing that Councillor Orlikow has kind of navigated through, through the election process. They wanted to do bikeways or the roundabouts if you will in the Brooklands area and I didn't have any consultation. They had made representation that they consulted the public on that and I wasn't sure that they did so I killed it and I stopped it at the Community Committee process. So there is and there is an ability for Councillors to make some changes at the Community Committee level so I just want to put that on the record and as I mentioned you know, I took some heat on one of mine, the Berry Street location and wasn't my favourite active transportation trail, no but I tried to listen to the public I tried to go on and the media was…had some concern about it, go on some media shows, express my interest on it and sometimes they were good but I can tell you one thing which is funny, it's 18 months later, there's a number of people that actually live on that one street that was controversial in my ward that actually have come up to me and said they actually like the trails that are there now too. But you get in the heat of the moment, especially the election campaign and all you hear is you know, kind of the negative sayers for it, but there has been some people that have come back.

Now in terms of the auditor's report. You know, I do agree with what the auditor said, you know I think that there could've been better consultations specifically in the Assiniboine location for it. I think that there were some changes made during the election campaign at that point to address some of the areas that are better. I know some of the communications folks that were there you know aren't part of our team I guess, communicating the aspects of it so there have been some changes made for it and I think we do need to embrace kind of what the Councillors, what the Councillors and what the Auditor is saying in regards to this. Once again, you know the vast majority of these active transportation have been fantastic for community, have been great. I wish the Assiniboine process could've gone a little bit better. I think that there was some changes made, probably not everything that the community wanted but to some extent it does make some sense. There has been a lot of talk about this, I mean anyone that was involved with the last election campaign, that had voted on these active transportation trails, heard about it. You heard about the doors, you were talked about in the media even if you were a part of some of the controversial ones, you really heard about it. But at the end of the day, the process is there, this is something that happened pretty close to 18 months ago, I think we need to listen to what the Auditor said, embrace it and let's just move forward and make sure that the consultation for something like this you know can be approved in the future but once again, this is something that that happened 18 months ago and I think we need to move forward with it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Fielding. We have Councillor Havixbeck, Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Eadie to speak on this.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make a few comments. I mean, you know we're here today and this Auditor's report is before us and our process is to receive it as information but you know, when we have these audits it's my observation that a lot of time has passed from the point where the audit was done and management has seen the recommendations and actually has had an opportunity to make some improvements. And maybe it's altruistic but I believe that we generally try to move forward and take the Auditor's recommendations and learn and grow from them. But, I do feel the need to speak out on this topic only because there are some constituents of mine who operate businesses along this route and there is a lawsuit before us and when I look at some of these things, I think more and more consultation needs to be an important part of what we do. When we decide to accept a project or approve a site plan or make a zoning change or whatever we're doing at the Community Committee level yet, I think it's a balance between helping our city progress and move forward towards the future but also, balancing the people who live there and who are directly impacted and we saw just last month how a lineup, a gallery full of people in opposition can shut down a project. People who are directly impacted who might come out, who might sign a petition and you can have upward of a thousand people opposing what would seem to be a really good project. So…but sometimes we need to balance the negotiables and non-negotiables, and I wasn't on Council at the time but looking back I can see you know, a bundle of money coming forward and a project that needs to happen and sometimes I wonder if maybe it went a little quicker than the general public would like. Ideally you'd like to bring forward a plan and recommendation No. 1 is that the Department of Public Works work more collaboratively and that there be more consultation when there is an active transportation project ahead. I just want to make some reference though to some of the pieces of information that I'm gathering. The lawsuit that's registered in the court system, if you cross-reference the nine people or the nine groups that are on there, I don't see them in anything. I go back to September '09 to the Community Committee and I look at the list of all the people who should have been consulted and I see many bike groups, many private bike companies. I see lots of government departments. I see the Hotel Fort Garry but I don't see those nine that are listed in the lawsuit as having been consulted and I think that's an important piece here because we've said we've done the consultation and we need to improve it but we need to make a really deliberate effort to include those that operate a business and may not live in that area, but operate their business there because as Mr. Craig said earlier, business helps our city. It helps create jobs. It helps keep people here and if those businesses up and leave then we have a beautiful bike path with nothing along it. So, you know I just wanted to point that out. The other thing that I wanted to point out is in reference to some of Councillor Gerbasi's comments that a small group who oppose. Well, nine businesses on a street or on a portion of a street where there may be 30 or so to me is a fairly substantial group who oppose and again, some of those things were not embraced in that. I do want to comment on some of the information that was brought forward by one of the people in delegation. I think that maybe there is an opportunity here to take this back to Public Works and to look at it outside of the Auditor's report and see whether safety has been achieved and whether some of the things that were identified by the members of delegation were actually achieved. And I think as Councillors and representatives for our city, that the onus is on us to do that. So, I think that that would be something we will raise in the future. So with that, I will close but just reinforce that going forward, I think most of us as Councillors in approving things, move them forward as…with consultation in mind and we need that kind of input and balance throughout the organization. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First just in quick response to a comment that Councillor Fielding made regarding the ability to make changes in the design of the active transportation. That may be accurate in his case; it definitely wasn't accurate in my case and many of the people in City Centre Committee. We received the information as

information and then changes that were requested if whoever did make changes were usually felt by the sting of it's all or nothing. You take it or you get nothing and that's pretty all we ended up with so that's kind of what we're left at with that the…and again it was a time frame in many options. I personally didn't appreciate that but again as a brand new Councillor, just got elected at that point, I had to say, "Okay how do I go forward on this?" So what we're talking about today is the consultation part but I think we need to qualify that because there may be, there's still some people in my neighbourhood that may've picked up and come back at me was that I just want to clarify that it wasn't the same in my case but on the issue of the Assiniboine… not on the Assiniboine bike path but about the consultation. I know that the City of Winnipeg can consult very well. I had a very good experience recently. Took two years but it was a very good experience regarding Academy Rezoning PDO, it's called. It was a very positive experience. It brought groups together, different stakeholders from the Biz group, from the local residents in the neighbourhood and they've come together to come to some consensus and now they have a working model together and actually develop further relationships where they are looking at dealing with parking together and we're not involved in that. So again, that the City can do a very good job and it isn't an easy task as we know. Residents are growing, the wards are growing and we are responsible for communicating even more information to a world that is getting busier and busier and busier with about a thousand e-mail bombs a day, and all the other staff, the junk mail package about yoh big. So how do you engage the public when you have more residents every day growing into your wards and it is not an easy task, you know. Our office that continues to try to look at ways in doing that either through social media and making sure that information connects with them, and the way you make information connect with them, which I think the Auditor's report is very clear on it. You have to connect with each stakeholder differently. The bike person is different than the car person which is different than the kid who's trying to cross the street to go to school. These are all different stakeholders that need to be consulted and not in the same format so again I think that's why we definitely came into some problems and definitely and that's why again this was felt during that, during my, during the time that we were doing this in River Heights where we had to send out a post card after being refused by the administration that said car people, business is coming. Again, it went through the ad mail system. A lot of people couldn't see it. We only had two weeks but we had to say because the administration would not budge on it but we knew that the car people were not engaging in this process. We knew it. I went to the open houses. They are just wasn't enough people there that who are going to affect a historical neighbourhood that's permanent street that they've all grown up with, and only six people show up? Okay that means we haven't engaged and that is a fundamental problem just because the City of Winnipeg has information to spew out, who cares? Unless they engage with that information. Unless they actually wanted to do it so going through the process of communication is one thing but you have to make sure that it engages and that's why you need to break it down into different stakeholder groups and make sure that message is, if it's working. So again, we know how we do it. We do it by making sure that the issues that we're identifying are with the people who are interested in. The person who never rides a bike does not care about a bike boulevard. They don't, they don't care about it at all. They are not going to take their time to read it. The person who rides a bike will care about a bike boulevard especially when you're doing this in the middle of winter. Okay, let's remember when it is to do consultations were happening in the middle of winter but you tell someone, I'm going to be removing this or putting this here and it's going to affect your traffic and how you drive, then the people who drive who are the majority, are going to get engaged and that's what we want to be engaged so they at least know what's going on. No one likes to be surprised. No one, especially when they wake up in the morning and they see a big truck ripping a hole out of their street. They don't know what's going on and again, how do we get better? That is a question we're here for today and that's what this audit does is how do we get better? Again, but we shouldn't be sitting here and saying, oh the audit is done, Assiniboine is done. It's okay. People, it still continues on today. We still have it in City Hall today. On September 12, after about two years of trying to get some more education on traffic circles and a few other good things. I sent a letter to the Mayor stating, and the Mayor who was responsive to it. It is my opinion that the present Join the Movement campaign which is a web education campaign that the City has, fails with a broader community and this is why past members have failed to connect therefore I recommend focusing on local drivers and the kids attending schools. Again, Join the Movement campaign, what driver is going to go to the Join the Movement campaign? What do I care? I want to know what…how do I manage these traffic circles or how do I get through Assiniboine bike…that's, as a car person I need to know that. I'm not going to go to Join the Movement campaign, no matter how many bill boards that we put up in the City of Winnipeg. So again, it's unfortunate that's still there so I use that as an example that we haven't learned yet and I'm hoping that we will. We will see this and say okay we need to address it to specific stakeholders. So Mr. Speaker, it's easy to blame the consultant, administration, other Councillors, special interest groups but the reality is that poor communication does continue at City Hall and we must do better. The one area that we have right now is a great opportunity and I'll throw it out there, is the whole idea of the possibility of selling some golf courses. Again, I have got a motion today that quite clearly says that I believe the process that we've undertaken so far is completely wrong and we need to be looking at a way that's much more involving of all the stakeholders. Developing community isn't the only stakeholder about our green space. There's many other stakeholders and we need to be reaching out and talking to them. Again, at this part we aren't. So I raised the red flag on that as well. And I hope and all I can do is hope, and I'll continue to send different ideas about budget consultations, consultations at…you know they've done in Calgary and I'll send that information to the Mayor and the Executive Policy Committee for their considerations, but as my role I can only hope that we will get better and my office will continue to strive to do what we can at our local level.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman and I think I thank Councillor Orlikow actually for expressing what my biggest concerns are in terms of consultation because this is where I think the Auditor has indicated there was some failure. Consultation is so important and all stakeholders are different. That is definitely for sure, and while I was not elected to City Council at the time of the active transportation trails coming into being, I…being an involved person, activist with the Manitoba League of Persons with Disabilities, Chairperson of the Transportation Committee, I was involved in the consultations related to the active transportation trails. And actually it all started and I think it was an interesting way that these active transportation started in that I was actually at Executive Policy Committee when Anders, I can't remember his last name at the moment, was really the only positive presentation on a day of much debate and I recall the Mayor recognizing the need for active transportation trails which we all do believe needs to exist. Active transportation trails are very essential to getting us away from that car society from making our way of getting around through our neighbourhoods safer, just so people can be totally involved in that active way. And active transportation is not just cycling of course, it is people who walk, people who use wheelchairs, people who use scooters and so on. So we always have to be cognizant of that. And I think that essentially, my analysis of this whole thing is that while…so we had buy in from the City for active transportation trails, the speed at which they had to move was ridiculous and that was one of the problems that I had when I was involved on the other side, not as a City Councillor, but as a stakeholder, trying to give input into all these trails that were being built and as a person who's totally blind, utilizing traffic circles was a huge concern. And I must say I was at the CNIB doing a consultation, they were talking about putting in a traffic circle at St. Matthews and…I can't think of the name…Dominion, and…which is an intersection where a lot of people who are blind use to get to the CNIB and just live in the neighbourhood because there's a number of people who are blind who live in the West End, and so in that conversation, I asked what is the consultation that's being done? Who's talking to the drivers? Because you know, it's been my experience, my experience and this is where this stakeholder consultations I think really failed in a big way is nobody really talked to the drivers to say, "Do you know how to use a traffic circle?" Now again, this was part of the fundings coming from the Feds. The Feds say if you don't spend the money, you can't do it. Well you know what, I think in the context of that, that we have to step back and say, "Well, come on Federal Government, we're going to spend the money, we're going to get this done but we don't want to put people's lives in jeopardy, we don't want to cause dangerous situations where people are walking, cycling, using wheelchairs, are interacting with traffic so we can be careful. We use transit moving around the City in that manner, and I must say that part of the process which was not consulting is going back and saying if we built some facility or control within one of the trails, how do we go back and remove it and fix it if it's broken?" I did hear something very concerning here today, very concerning to me and this was the way that they separated the cyclist path from the motor vehicles at Assiniboine. I'm really concerned about that, very, very concerned about that and as well, I know in my…there's an active transportation corridor done on Powers and I know that a raised intersection has caused a problem for residents in the immediate area around it and really to get that fixed, it's going nowhere. It needs to be removed. It is not working. It is not slowing down traffic. No, it is slowing down traffic by about 5 km/h. Big deal. Big deal. That's not calming traffic enough given what the problems are that that particular facility is causing. We need to figure out a way to fix those things. So, I think that that part, set aside the consultations, we need to be able to fix real problems if they are dangerous. Now, I don't think that saying traffic circles are dangerous because people know how to use them that we should remove traffic circles. I think that it's good, we need to all, as all users of the streets, understand how to use a traffic circle and I would say to the people who live in Southdale, please in the morning when you are upset and you're running late, please remember there's pedestrians trying to cross at the traffic circle there. I tell you, it's very dangerous. People are little too aggressive. We need to slow down some times and yeah, if you're little bit late, at least somebody didn't get hurt, or isn't almost having a heart attack because they almost got hit by a car. So that's my comments on this. The consultations again, I expect the City to do consultations on many things that affect them. I heard from Colin Craig today who talked about, well, actually I want to say this. Meaningful consultation, meaningful consultation because you can consult and a bunch of people will present a bunch of information, but if that's not what the project wants to hear, sometimes what happens is what moves ahead is the opposite of what the majority or many people were saying is an issue that we need to deal with and so when we're doing consulting we need to understand how do we give meaningful consultation to that and I think that Councillor Orlikow pointed out that stakeholder identification and when you're advertising that there's going to be a consultation, you need to use different words like you better come to this consultation as a driver, if you don't know how to use a traffic circle. Come on out so that you can take care of that. So that's my comments on this particular Auditor's report and it's too bad there was a bit of a failure or now I should actually point out that I was directly involved in a consultation on Assiniboine. There was a person with a disability who didn't…doesn't live at 15 Kennedy but lived at another building and I must say that through the consultation and through a big effort actually we're kind of being ignored but the staff did pay attention. The City workers did pay attention. We needed have an appropriate loading zone, a perfect, an appropriate traffic direction, in order to serve some people with disabilities in that area and that was done. It was done. There was consultation. There was discussion. There's a lot of…it wasn't an easy consultation but it was done and that person's needs and other people in that block's needs were taken care of. So I wanted to just point that out. Thank you.

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

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. (Inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: I apologize. I didn't give Councillor Mayes.

Mayor Katz: Then I'm glad to sit down and hear Councillor Mayes

Councillor Mayes: And hopefully you can rise again in about one minute. I'll try to be brief. Three things, I think Councillor Gerbasi quite eloquently described the historical process here in the effort that she put in. I think Councillor Fielding spoke well saying, "Look, we are not ignoring this report, this audit; we are looking at it; we're learning from it; we're going to move forward; we're not going however go back and revisit history. I didn't have personal history with this project. I was…have had some history as an elected official, as a School Trustee and I'll say two things about that we engaged in what was described as the longest, largest public consultation in the history of Brandon when I was there and there was still people who came to me afterwards and said, "Well, you didn't consult." And to which I would say, no we didn't do what you wanted but that doesn't mean we didn't consult." So there's always going to be somebody upset with consultation. I asked my oldest son who's eight, you know, "What do you think I should do? What would you like me to do as a City Councillor?" And he said. "I think you should change the name of Bannatyne to Bananatyne." So everyone has ideas. Everyone likes to be consulted. They are not always good ideas so we don't always do them but that there is a process, there is consultation that if your idea isn't adopted, it doesn't mean we're not consulting and finally there may have been some tight time limits on this but I spent about seven years in my life on a project in Brandon to get a new gym there and the shovel just would not…people just couldn't make up their minds, the shovel didn't go in the ground year after year after year. The project kept running away from the proponents and here it wasn't perfect but to the credit of Councillor Gerbasi and some of the other people who were here at the time, there is a project, active transportation project that got done in St. Vital by my predecessor, Mr. Steeves. I think I give them some credit. The shovel got in the ground. Was it perfect? No. Could we probably, could we make some changes later on? Quite possibly. I used to run along Assiniboine when I was a lawyer downtown before the project. I kept running there after the project got done. I don't feel any more unsafe. I don't live there, I don't work there, I don't own a business there so my concerns are not immediate but I would say the shovel got in the ground here, I think it got done. I think that's a good thing. We'll learn from the mistakes in the process. But if there's specific design flaws, we can come back and look at that, but let's not go backwards and see who can chastise in the City's staff or around the Council table. I think it's, by on measure it sounds like…it was a good move for the City and I'm pleased to see that it went through. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Seeing none, Mayor Katz to close.

Mayor Katz: Are you sure, Mr. Speaker? Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was about to say earlier, I think that there was some very good comments made but I just want to look at the big picture, Mr. Speaker. I believe the vast majority of Council is supportive of active transportation you know, biking, running, walking, in a wheelchair, with a baby stroller, on roller blades, skate boards, whatever the case me be, we've seen some phenomenal movement and you have to understand, Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg was far behind, far behind other cities. I mean, you know before this project started you know we were at about 274 kilometers and we're going to increase it by about 375 km and what you have to understand, this entailed 35 different projects. Assiniboine which was just one of those 35 projects Mr. Speaker, that's what the big picture is all about with approximately $21 million being spent, and here is the scenario, quite often you know, everybody's been talking about consultation and I've been happy to say that I think we all could've done a better job but it wasn't just on the consultation where my mind was focused. Consultation doesn't really mean much, Mr. Speaker, if the public isn't aware. The first thing you have, you can have an open house Mr. Speaker, but if no one is aware of anything, who's going to show up? From my point of view, when you're hearing residents who wake up in the morning and all of a sudden see something and wonder what's this or businesses, et cetera, there's no question in my mind, as good a job as we may do, the onus on us is to do better, okay. We need to do better. We need to ensure that the public is aware. Then they can attend all these consultation processes and basically share their opinion. And, I think as Councillor Mayes so eloquently said, you may not agree with something, that doesn't mean there wasn't consultation and we all know that to be the case. Mr. Speaker, I can tell ya first of all, I attended many locations where there were upset businesses or upset citizens, whether it was Assiniboine, in areas where the West End Biz has some concerns in St. James, in River Heights where Councillor Orlikow and I talked to probably the same people over and over again about calming-circles, and Mr. Speaker, where I feel and I must put this on the record, Mr. Speaker, I know of many instances where both the Acting CAO at the time, along with the Director of Public Works personally visited and tried to find solutions to our problems existing. That's a fact Mr. Speaker, so obviously is everybody satisfied from some of the delegations you heard today? That's not the case, but in the vast majority of those 35 projects, they basically been embraced but I do believe Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon us in the future to make sure that citizens are aware. You have to make sure they are aware, and you can't assume, because you put a flyer, and this is the one I had difficulty with. You put a flyer in someone's mailbox that means they are aware of it. I disagree because I know what happens to

all the flyers I get Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure many people on the floor of Council are the same. So we need to go above and beyond and make sure we've done everything to make sure that people are aware and then have consultation. But in the big picture of active transportation, I was supportive then, I'm supportive today, obviously we can do a better job and that's what comes out of it and that's what we must do. Council, the administration, whatever the case may be, we all know we can do a better job. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing that we've concluded our comments on that, on Item 11, the Review of the Assiniboine Active Transportation Bikeway, to receive it as information, all those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Thank you. We have some By-laws, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE - CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS
SECOND AND THIRD READING

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll move that By-law No. 144/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 144/2011.

Mayor Katz: I'll move that By-law No. 144/2011 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed, Mr. Speaker.

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

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'll move the following by-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 6/2012, By-law No. 7/2012 and By-law No. 8/2012.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 6/2012, By-law No. 7/2012, By-law No. 8/2012.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that By-laws numbered 6/2012 to 8/2012, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 6/2012 to 8/2012 both inclusive.

Mayor Katz: And I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 6/2012 to 8/2012 both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed. All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Question Period. Councillor Gerbasi for Mayor Katz.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In November, this Council voted to bring a 20 cent transit fare increase over and above the five cent inflationary increase to transit fares, and that fare increase, as we know, is set to start in June and the funding supposed to go to Rapid Transit infrastructure. There has been a growing public outcry about the inequity of charging transit riders for their infrastructure while there is no additional fees being put in place for automobile users for their infrastructure such as tolls, congestion fees or anything else being considered. Considering the fact that those who choose public transit are opting for an action that benefits everyone by reducing congestion and greenhouse gas emissions, given this, will the Mayor advise whether there is any hope of reconsidering the 20 cent fare increase proposed for June or preferably cancelling it altogether.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi I thank her for the question, and I think Mr. Speaker the best way to address it would be quite simple. Council moved a motion. It was approved. As you know, the Provincial Government made the comment that they would like to see some alternatives. I can tell you that we have until March 31st to see if there are new ideas coming forward from the Provincial Government. I have actually spoken to the Premier. We hope to get together and meet on this and hopefully some new idea will arise that might be different than the one that's already been approved by Council. If there is no movement on that, then I think what is, is what is, but hopefully, as I've said in the past, something will come forward before June 1, but in order for us to deal with it, in my mind, I think we have a deadline of March 31st or April, so I will gladly inform Council once I have a meeting with the Premier specifically to get on this topic and share exactly what has come up, and hopefully it will be embraced.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Gerbasi: So I appreciate that you will be talking to the Premier about this. Are you going to be pushing hard to find an alternative form of funding from the City's end, because obviously we're going to have to put in some funding to it. We can't expect the Province to cover one hundred percent of the project, so rather than using the transit fare as our source of funding, are you talking about some other sources of funding that you're expecting. Like I'm just trying to understand what option could come up that would result in a roll back of the transit fare that you're bringing to the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, actually I think Councillor Gerbasi has it reversed. When this took place it was the Province who stated they'd like to see those monies come from other sources. I'm hoping they will identify them. I can tell you on a monthly basis, we identify all sorts of potential opportunities for new revenue streams, but as everybody knows, the only one that we really have control of is property taxes. Everything else we need to work with the Province, and quite often need the blessings of the Province, so from my point of view, since the Province has already said they would like to see something other than that, I'm hoping that they will be doing their due diligence and if any member of Council has a thought or an idea, please come to my office and share that idea. I'd be happy to bring it up in the meeting as well.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Would you consider and are you considering and looking at other potential revenue sources such as tolls, congestion tax, parking fees, transit taxes that other cities across Canada have that all citizens pay, not just those who choose public transit, to pay towards transit infrastructure. Is anybody looking at any alternative to simply jacking up the cost to the transit user?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, this is not an "I" Council, this is a "we" Council. Many ideas that Councillor Gerbasi just put forward, we could certainly discuss that. There's a process, we could bring it forward and maybe it will be embraced by Council, all of Council, but the other side of the coin that you have to appreciate is that all citizens pay towards transit; those who use it and those who do not. Transit has approximately $150 million in expenses and about $75 million in revenue, so the taxpayers are subsidizing transit, everybody. So we're all at the table, but any ideas that have some merit to any Councillor, bring forward, bring it to the process, bring it to the Committee. We're all open to listen. That's what it's all about…listening Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Mayor Katz. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. Quick questions. Mr. Mayor, do you support the Golf Convergence Assessment in the Winnipeg 2010 Golf Audit that Winnipeg has too much green space?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: What I believe Mr. Speaker is that right now, we have too many golf courses per capita of our population and they're not being used. That's something I totally believe in, no doubt about it, as does almost every other city in North America because golf, unfortunately, is not a growing sport.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Orlikow: Okay, so I'll just repeat the question because I understand golf courses, but that's not my question, because the Golf Convergence report was very clear that it says Winnipeg has an abundance, almost double the

amount of green space, that other cities have. No evidence of that. It's a statement. They spent two pages on that, talking about why we should develop the land because we have so much green space already. So again, Golf Convergence Assessment in the Winnipeg 2010 Golf Audit is not about golf courses. It is, but it also says Winnipeg has too much green space. Do you agree with that statement or not?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, once again, this is my opinion, okay. And my opinion was not to look at green space. The motion that came forward was about golf courses and do we have sufficient number or do we have too many. That to me is the issue. As far as green space per se, there are many people who never have the opportunity to get on a golf course between the months of May and October because they're not allowed on these golf courses, so if the Councillor is asking me are they parks or something but they're golf courses Mr. Speaker, so I refer to them as golf courses because that's exactly what they are.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Orlikow: Okay, so I'm going to try it one more time. Actually these golf courses are referred to in OurWinnipeg as "major green spaces", "major open spaces", so you can call them "golf courses", I can call them "green spaces", but now that we have OurWinnipeg guide, we can call them "major open spaces". So if that's fair. So again I'll rephrase it then. Do you support the Golf Convergence Assessment in the 2010 Golf Audit that Winnipeg has too much open spaces?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would probably say that when it comes to open space, I'm not sure there's such a thing as too much open space. I mean, that is something that's very subjective for every individual as far as open spaces. I think we want to make sure is we have a sufficient amount of open space so that our public can enjoy the open space. That's what it's really all about. A better quality of life.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman, to the Mayor. I just learned of something that troubles me. The new Chief Peguis Trail, of course, was finished and we're paying lease payments to the private owner of the facility that was built, and again the facility is well used and many people are enjoying using it, being able to drive 80 kilometers to be able to get to, like my son, to a soccer game quicker, or to go to a breakfast fundraiser out that way. People get to benefit from that better way of getting through North Kildonan. There's also great use of the Active Transportation Trail, and I heard about that recently and I think that's great. But what really troubles me…

Mr. Speaker: Question Councillor.

Councillor Eadie: This is my question. What troubles me is that there is no…park and ride was not built. It was in the original design and was not built and I'm disappointed and I'd like to ask the Mayor if he is going to try to find a way to get a park and ride built at Chief Peguis Trail near Henderson Highway so we can get more cars off of the road.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the question from Councillor Eadie. I know we had a meeting yesterday. If he had brought that up yesterday I could have tried to get him the answer. Unfortunately now I'll just have to take it under advisement and I will get back to Councillor Eadie. I don't have all the details on that so rather than try and guess, I will try and get him some specific information.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Do you have a second question?

Councillor Eadie: Yes thank you. In a short meeting it's hard to cover a lot of items and business was the topic of yesterday. Today's topic, the question just simply about it, it's my understanding that it was removed so that there could be more money for other aspects to the trail, but again, I want to know what is the commitment? I know you have an environmental committee. What is the commitment on behalf of the Mayor's Office to ensure that we are doing things to make our transit system to take more cars off the road so that we can find money to deal with actually fixing our inner city infrastructure which seems to be continually failing, so what is the commitment through the Environment Committee to take care of this car society and implementing different ideas to make sure it's done, and is there follow-up to make sure that when construction projects are done, that the proper facilities are in place.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier I'm not convinced that what Councillor Eadie is referring to is accurate. That's number one. Number two, I don't think there's anybody who has put in more effort and energy into addressing our infrastructure deficit than yours truly. How many times do I talk to you about 8 cents, 65 cents, and 27 cents? How many times do we talk about, you know, going to Ottawa and fighting for the gas tax so we can use for our infrastructure? Every Councillor on this floor should be fighting for more revenue streams to address our infrastructure. I'm not going to get into a debate whether you need to have less cars or whatever the case may be. We just spent how much money on active transportation which, I think, is what it's all about. We're doing it all Mr. Speaker and that's what we should do. Make it a quality, affordable, vibrant city, and make it a healthy city for everybody, and that's what Councillors should be doing and that's what I will continue to do.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Eadie: As the leader of this City, the Mayor, what steps are you taking to take leadership? You just cited 8 cents, 27 cents and whatever the other cents were. What steps, as the leader, are you taking to get the public of the City to petition the Province to make sure that they listen to some of the ideas that City Council has in terms of raising more dollars to pay for our infrastructure? What is the Mayor doing in the advocacy effort to get the populace of this City, to let the Province know that we need a better way of funding our infrastructure?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate but obviously Councillor Eadie is not aware of the fact that we work with the A.M.M., Association of Manitoba Municipalities, represents the entire Province. We have lobbied the public through press conferences, through advertising about the need, the dire straits we're in; the fact that this is emergency time. The ship is sinking and we have to find more resources to basically make sure that we can maintain our infrastructure. We've been doing that for a few years now Mr. Speaker. We also come up with new ideas, whether it comes from the Administration, the C.F.O., whatever the case may be, of areas where we believe we're entitled to more and new revenue streams, and we will continue to do that, but I think the reality is that it's not just one individual that does this. You're much stronger when you're united doing this. So I would ask Councillor Eadie and beg him to join us in this crusade to get a bigger share of the revenue streams and make sure that we can be in charge of our own destiny.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Mayor Katz. I'm going to make a ruling that we'll just complete the Question Period with the Mayor before we adjourn for lunch okay? Next up, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I think just one question and that is, we've touched on golf courses once already and I see there's a motion coming later so I won't say a whole lot at this point but a third or a half of the communications I get from the public right now are about the golf course issue and I won't get into the merits, but there seemed to be two issues. The Council motion put forward two options: privatization or possible disposal of some of the lands. Those are two very different issues. I just really want to get a question about the process. I had a very good meeting with Mr. Davey from the City staff who gave me all the information he could and talked to me about the process, but I just would like the Mayor to reassure the public that no decisions have been made, at least none that I'm aware of that there will be a public consultation process, and once this body decides based on the Expressions of Interest where things are, do we want go down either of those pathways. It's not every golf course, of course, that's the subject of the Expressions of Interest, and of the seven not every one has public staff, but there are issues about privatization, issues about land disposal, so if you could just flesh out where things are going from here in your view so we can reassure the public that decisions have not yet been made and there will be a consultation process. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Mayes, I am happy to do that. As I believe everybody is aware of, we have put out an Expression of Interest, E.O.I.'s. What will happen right now is that departments will assess all those ideas that came in, see if any of them have any merit, then once they decide that, they will have a report which will come forward, go through the normal process and I can assure Councillor Mayes of two things. One, nothing has happened to date, and number two, there will be public input. Whether it's through open houses or whatever our process is, there definitely will be public input once they come up with the recommendation. At this particular point in time they're still doing their due diligence and assessing all the ideas that came in and seeing if any of them do have merit. I hope that addresses the question.

Mr. Speaker: Good. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I was just wondering if the Mayor was aware that originally part of the reason for a transit park and ride at the Chief Peguis Trail property by Douglas and Henderson Highway was to provide alternatives during what was originally going to be a sixteen month closure of the Disraeli, which again, this

Council and the foresight of the Mayor and Premier Doer was able to avoid and certainly save the residents of North Kildonan what I would have described as “traffic-geddon”.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, no I was not but I thank Councillor Browaty because maybe he has now addressed the question that Councillor Eadie had of me and I appreciate that very much.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Browaty: It’s just a matter of (inaudible). I was wondering if the Mayor was aware that the opinion at least of a lot of residents in North Kildonan was that transit service is actually quite thorough throughout the community due to the way it’s built and that in fact they felt that the biggest users of a transit park and ride at that location would in fact be residents of East St. Paul, not Winnipeg taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: No Mr. Speaker I was not, but I am now and once again I thank Councillor Browaty.

Mr. Speaker: No more questions from Councillor Browaty. Anybody else? We have nobody on the list. Alright, we will adjourn and resume at 1:30. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
January 25, 2012, at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker We'll call the meeting back to order, please and we have the report from Standing Committee Protection Community Services, Councillor Havixbeck.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED JANUARY 5, 2012

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, thank you. I would like to introduce Items 1 and 3 and in terms of Item 2, in showing an abundance of caution and you know what may be perceived to be a conflict of interest because the University of Manitoba is my employer as well, I am recusing myself from No. 2, so I don’t know how you handle that.

Mr. Speaker: Well, we’ll thank you for one and three and we'll call the motion on…(Inaudible) stand both of them down? Okay and then when it comes…is anybody standing down 2? Harvey is. Okay so when it comes time to do two, we'll ask you to leave the chamber and that will be how we solve it.

Item 1 – Community Incentive Grant – Bord-Aire Community Centre Inc.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I just want to stand up and state clearly that I will be supporting this…oh, sorry…

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck has to open. You got ahead of me there, Justin. Councillor Havixbeck, No. 1.

Councillor Havixbeck: Well, I’d be interested to hear what the Councillor has to say.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Okay, I'll start. I just want to stand up and support clearly that I will be supporting the Committee's recommendation that the criteria be waived in this case. I think it's important when these things come forward that you look at them in their entire context and when you consider that the City's vision statement, the vision statement for the City of Winnipeg is to be a vibrant and healthy city which places its highest priority on quality of life for all citizens, when you look at this project, it certainly does add to that. I mean, considering that it falls into the realm of sports and recreation, I think it's important in OurWinnipeg, we have a section of OurWinnipeg, that’s called the city that works, and it says the following. It says “recreation, active living and leisure programs and services, strengthen families, build healthy communities, improve quality of life, support the healthy development of children and provide an opportunity to develop leadership skills. Opportunity to participate in recreation activities enhance life skills, community leadership

development and an overall quality of life for citizens particularly among youth in our neighbourhoods. Opportunities to volunteer with community-based recreation programs; offer valuable and meaningful experiences in the volunteer contribution is essential to their success". It goes on to say in a second direction that work with…that we should work with community partners to provide services that are responsive to the community recreation and leisure needs. Direction three within that strategy says that we should directly provide and facilitate through partnerships, equitable access to a base level of recreation, culture and leisure services for all Winnipegers including identify and address barriers to participation and recreation, cultural leisure services and in partnership with the community develop and promote a program to help low income families participate in recreation, cultural and physical activity opportunities. Mr. Speaker, it goes on to say in direction four with community partners participate as a leader in planning and delivering recreation and leisure services in Winnipeg and that we should provide leadership and collaborate with other service providers to meet their community needs, avoid duplication, identify gaps and leverage resources. You know, pretty good stuff. This is OurWinnipeg that we just completed and in direction five, we should provide and facilitate community development and recreational opportunities for vulnerable youth and it goes on to say partnership with the community provide opportunities to build community capacity and youth by developing resiliency through participation in recreation and leadership opportunities. I wanted to make sure that we got this on the record, Mr. Speaker because these things are often difficult to deal with and assess. But, if you get back to that vision statement, you get back to what we're trying to do here, from time to time we do have to bend the criteria. And from time to time we have reports come forward that are erroneous and we need to, in spite of some of the noises made out there, by some folks in the media, we need to be able to say, here's the errors in these reports. Stand up, show some leadership and fight for what we believe in and we certainly believe, you know, that community incentive grants like opportunities for the Bord-Aire Community Centre in the St. James and Brooklands Ward are important to the overall well-being of our city, and that we should be able to waive criteria and make sure that this type of work gets done. I don't know if anybody else will speak to this but I hope you all see the importance of this and you'll all be able to recognize it as we move forward through the agenda.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Seeing none, I'll call the question on Item 1 for Protection Community Services, all those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Item 2 has been stood down so.

Item 2 – Community Incentive Grant – University of Manitoba

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel, I'm going to ask you if you could put…no, I know you didn't but the Chair has left and this motion came forward from EPC basically through EPC and it's in your ward so I'll ask you to bring it forward.

Councillor Swandel: I look forward to hearing what the good Councillor has to say.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker, I agreed with the Mayor, Councillor Havixbeck, Councillor Fielding, Councillor Steen for their original position on this issue. Those of you who desire to waive the requirement for the Community Grant Program to assist with the costs of Winnipeg Airport Authority's Art Piece Relocation Project are saying that you allow the Councillor from St. Norbert to spend his community incentive grant allocation any way he wants. Never mind the purpose of the community incentive grant is to help provide facilities for recreational purposes for the residents of our wards. How does giving a grant to the University of Manitoba for relocating a mural help the residents of St. Norbert Ward? I will not support this clause as I do not want to cheat the residents who reside in the St. Norbert Ward. Now, I can understand the desire to save this work of art but surely the university can raise some money to do that. And I hope that they do so. We should not be giving them 10,000 tax dollars meant for the development of sports and recreational facilities in the St. Norbert Ward. So I'm not going to be supportive of this.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie then Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. I wanted to speak to this issue as I did at Standing Committee when it came through. First of all, there is a semantic here that I think should be considered. One of the rules that they said is in place that it didn't fit in was that it was a not-for-profit organization, so to speak in those terms. University of Manitoba, of course, raises money but it's an education post-secondary facility. To me, it's not a far jump to say that it's not…it is a publicly accessible organization, it's facilities are publicly accessible just like a community centre, anybody who travels to that particular facility, wherever the art work will be displayed, I'm sure it will be displayed in a public place where the people of St. Norbert can actually…who live closer to it will be able to take in that art and enjoy a legacy and understanding of art work that's been at the old airport for a substantial amount of time. It's important that it saves it and underlying it really, too, again is it looks to me as though the university is looking for other funding sources as well. The project is more than just the, I believe it's 10,000 that they are asking for. I see no problem with them doing that and they're trying to leverage money. They have to still meet the rules, as I understand it, that in order to receive the community incentive grant they still have to have that money matched by other organizations and they're going to have

to do that. So you know, I really don't understand why anybody would have a problem with this. Yes, the university is a big place and raises lots of money, it actually is a facility, the University of Manitoba is also a place that also has the…they're studying air ships and all that kind of stuff. They are into the whole airport, the transportation logistics faculty, and you know, I just…it's a public place, it's a great place to move this art to, and a great kudos to the University of Manitoba for bringing that art away from a place that as I understand, is going to be destroyed. So let's get that art there, let's…I don't know why we have to, let's go based on the recommendation of the Community Committee and the EPC here. To me it's a project that deserves to have rules waived and to move ahead. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, many of you know I'm often reluctant to waive the rules for CIG grants that fall outside of the policy especially if I'm concerned about setting a precedent that will lead to future requests outside of our policy. However, there are some cases where it is a one-time unusual request that is never likely to happen again. This is certainly one of those. We don't demolish an airport every day, and I don't think we have to worry about a slew of requests to save modern art from airports that are going to the wrecking ball. Some have argued,… there's been a number of arguments I've heard about why people think we should turn this down. Some heard told me they personally don't like the art. Please, let us not…let's not have Councillors deciding what makes good public art or any other kind of art. We have an Arts Council for that. Modern architecture and…modern architecture and this art we're talking about, represent a certain era that reflects part of our history and part of our story as a city. It is certainly a worthy cause to preserve that. And the fact is there really is no other source of funds that the St. Norbert Councillor could access for this. So in summary, it's a one off project that sets no precedent. It saves part of our history and the story, a part of our story as the City of Winnipeg. It benefits our community, perhaps in a less tangible way than some other projects but not necessarily less valuable. And finally, it's interesting how some have argued that supporting public art should not be a core service of the City. Here is a news flash. Every modern city supports art as part of its core function. We have done it for decades and will continue to do so. Why do we do this? Because it makes our city special, unlike every other place, art and culture make our city stand out as unique and vibrant. Art makes our city a place people care about and want to stay here to live and invest and work and play. Vocal lobby groups such as the Taxpayers Association and their favourite newspaper have been working hard to create fear among elected officials by calling for us to cut funding and investment in the arts and I think that might be what Councillor Swandel was alluding to when he talked about leadership. Let them have their say, and then let us continue to work hard to make our city great. No great city is without art and the greatest cities invest the most in art. Enough said. It is also reasonable to support the decisions whenever possible of the local Councillor. In this case I have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting this grant. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I rise and am in favour of the Councillor from St. Norbert's proposal here. I think he deserves some credit for taking some leadership on this in the face of some heat in the media. I think he said to me that maybe the art work isn't to his taste. I said I happen to like it. Art is in the eye of the beholder. I don't like Mr. Sheegl's statue, he does and he probably doesn't like the stuff I have in my office. This is the great thing about art, about public art. You can debate it You can discuss it and not everyone is going to agree with it but as Councillor Gerbasi said we don't vote on it. It's not…we're not the ones who are deciding the art. That's why we have an Arts Council. I do think it's a worthwhile proposal. I'm not concerned it may violate the criteria. I think we should as Councillor Gerbasi said, we have to make some investments in art and I think this is an exception that we should go with and support the Councillor from St. Norbert.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker. I supported us at Community Committee and I'm going to support it on the floor of this Council. I just want to say that there is ample precedent for this sort of thing. I mean, if you look at my ward only, if I had the time I would've went and looked back over the years and I know we funded all sorts of dollars for the Cercle Moliere Theatre, for lights on the Boulevard, for some sheds to actually help the Festival du Voyageur and a few years ago, in fact I remember being the entire Community Committee threw some money to the Art Space Building for some structural work that was being done there. We did so because there is a benefit to the whole idea of investing in public art if you go to great cities throughout the world, Mr. Speaker, you'll see great public art in every great city. And Councillor Gerbasi raises a good point, a very good point, that this is part of the airport heritage and as far as I know, I believe that the decision's been made that the airport's going to be decommissioned and so with a relatively reasonable amount of money that's already budgeted, that's in the ward of Councillor Swandel, we can help to keep alive a part of the old Winnipeg Airport at the University of Manitoba. And when I read the actual evaluation, I read that the organization is not a non-profit organization. Seems to me the University of Manitoba is not a non-profit organization. It's certainly not for a profit organization. It does not offer sport or recreational services. I understand this is going on the Max Bell Centre. If

there is…if that's not a sport and recreational organization that benefits thousands year in and year out, I'm not sure what the definition of a sport and recreational service organization is. So, I want to put my record…my comments on the record. I will be supporting this and I hope you all do as well. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I supported this at EPC because again I thought it was a small deviation from the policies that were there, but at the end of the day this is in fact public money. I have in the past raised concern about funding public art. Back in 2008 of our half million dollar public art allocation that is in our budget every year, we're proposing a $208,000 piece here in the courtyard at City Hall. To me that seemed a complete ridiculous waste of money and the $600,000 deficit coming into that year. This is really no different at the end of the day. I have to admit I have a soft spot for this particular piece of art and for public art in general. I think we need to have policies where public art is part of any new development application. If you're building a project, a quarter of a percent or tenth of a percent of the value of the building permit needs to be done, needs to be contributed towards public art. I'm okay with that for towards new development but not off the backs of property taxpayers. That's not a core service. Again I do have a soft spot for the old terminal building but again it's an era gone by and it's something that to me we have to move on from. So what I'm fledging here today is if in fact there is an opportunity to raise this $10,000 whether it's people in the private sector or whatever, I'll contribute a hundred dollars of my own public, my own private money, my own check account, towards this project if that would make a difference if there's a community-driven process to start with this. So again, I don't like changing my mind but enough people have brought this to my attention. It's the right thing to do, it's consistent with my beliefs in the past and I will not be supporting this. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Seeing none I'll call the question. We have a request…oh I'm sorry.

Councillor Swandel: Let me start just by asking you to take the time, not to stand up on some soap box and make this about a piece of art. Read the bloody report. Read it. You know, the organization is not a non-profit organization offering sport or recreation services. It is. The report is wrong. You have a number of reasons why you should do this today. This report is wrong. The months before we did a contemplative garden at the Victoria General Hospital with a request for over a hundred thousand dollars, numerous members of this Committee or this Council supporting that project. We've had through our history, you know, murals, gardens, the Aviation Museum; the Canadian…the Western Canadian Museum for Aviation, the criteria was not met because it was not a sports and recreation. This meets the criteria. This is erroneous. It's wrong. The project does not make a significant contribution to the long term benefit of the community at large in terms of improved facilities. OurWinnipeg says it's wrong. Heritage conservation, quality of life, so that's the first reason that you should support having this over turning what is before us but we…this, this meets criteria. Just take the time, flip through and read those reasons why they're saying it doesn't meet criteria. It is wrong. I'll guarantee you everybody at home is watching this, nobody will flip to those pages and read that. But it is wrong. It is 100% wrong, Mr. Speaker. You know, it's so many other levels. Let's start with heritage, heritage conservation. There is a place…a First Nation Settlement the Historic Gate Way to Western Canada and Transportation Hub located at the centre of the Nation Winnipeg has inherited a unique multilayer diverse sense of place that fills its past and promises an exciting future. How many people have passed through that airport? From a heritage perspective, what does hanging on to a piece of that airport mean to this city? Characterization of Heritage Conservation management, preserve, protect and commemorate significant heritage legacy resources and illustrate the broad range of Winnipeg's historical development. You don't think that airport was a historical piece of our development, historical piece of happenings in this city? The City in conjunction with senior governments and community partners as developed a heritage management framework that has recognized many historic sites, structures, buildings, people and events at municipal, provincial, national levels. Heritage conservation is also recognized as an important part of sustainability, sustainability and important part of sustainability. I don't know…how far you gotta look back to see what we did in OurWinnipeg and it's crucial in the long term development of a complete community. Conserve, protect and celebrate the significant heritage resources that illustrate the broad range of Winnipeg's heritage values; recognize the importance of a broad range of tangible and intangible heritage resources throughout the city that illustrate Winnipeg's unique sense of place and community pride. You know, there's so much we've done where we've bent criteria and I hundred percent believe we're not bending criteria here. The criteria has already been met. There is a new person in this position. They describe the University of Manitoba as not being a non-profit organization. The report is wrong. Please read it. Please understand that. Please look at other reports that have gone through that have met criteria. Similar nature to this. There are many of them. And then there were some we waived criteria like the Western Canadian Aviation Museum, the Good Neighbour Centre along the Henderson Highway, the Burton Cummings Community Centre for cupboards and pieces for kitchen. Kings Park Daycare Centre. You know, at the time that was done, it didn't meet criteria. Councillor Steeves, Gerbasi and Nordman and Pagtakhan you know, wanted to support the expansion of that daycare centre. We found a way to get it done. We found a way to improve our city. We found a way to be a part of this vision statement that we made to be a vibrant and healthy city which places its highest priority on quality of life for all citizens, Mr. Speaker. The Discovery Children Centre in the St. James Brooklands Ward. CIG did not meet criteria. This one does. The report is wrong. But yet, what are we going to

do, we're going to kowtow to the shock journalists and the info-tainers of the world? People believe, we believe, you know, as part of a healthy city, part of a great city that arts, culture and entertainment are all part of that. The Northwood Community Centre for tables, chairs and caddies. You know, it didn't meet criteria but it was done. There is so much more. We've done grants for murals, grants for gardens, grants for professional sports franchises. Grants for professional sports franchises we do. You know. When it talks…you know, a city that works…a quality of life you know, quality of life, is a big part of OurWinnipeg. There is a whole section on quality of life; continue to develop Winnipeg's unique artistic identity and diversity of expression. Champion and support public art is a tool for place making a community identity including, encouraging the integration of art into the new public spaces and Public Works projects and promoting and facilitating the incorporation of permanent and temporary art into existing public spaces in city owned facilities, developments and major Public Works projects. The University of Manitoba is a public space by definition. You know we should be doing this. Support and enable meaningful community expression, work in partnership with art stakeholders to integrate art and cultural activities and recreational programs and facilities. Foster lifelong arts learning opportunities. This is what we are supposed to be doing. We're you know, this…it meets criteria. It hits OurWinnipeg on so many different levels. Let's not be this place that is known for being cheap and a wholesale price point community. We're better than that, Mr. Speaker. We want to be this vibrant city that our vision statement talks about. We want to be. But we're sitting here. It's a $10,000 grant and you know what, I will leverage that grant at the University of Manitoba for. Look where we leveraged, you could be…our relationship with the University of Manitoba before. A stadium, a soccer facility, we've got a wellness facility coming down the pipe right away. You know, a high level sports training facility. These are all things that we, because of our partnership, because of our relationship that we are able to further a great city. Not the city of mediocrity, not the city where because somebody doesn't like the fact that there is a contribution to art although we all say we do think that arts and culture are an important part of a vibrant city, and I think we do. I think that's what we all agreed to when we did OurWinnipeg. You know, let's get this done. You know, work with me to build this vibrant city or at least let me add to the quality of life of the St. Norbert residents because arts and culture are significantly lacking when you drive out this sort of barren stretch of Pembina Highway. One of the things we're trying to partner with the University and get them to sponsor and this is part of the snow sculpture and winter lights sculpture program that we're trying to get going out there. We will leverage this. We will bring more to the table as a result of this and at the same time, not only benefit the residents of the St. Norbert Ward.

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

Councillor Swandel: We will benefit the City of Winnipeg. We will hit on so many different levels in OurWinnipeg. We'll do it for all citizens, not just for the residents. And all you have to do is take a deep breath and a sober second thought and say, "You know, now that I read this, the person that wrote this report is wrong. It does meet criteria. They are wrong. This is not about art. You've all…arts grants meet criteria, this meets criteria. If you can't do it for that reason, do it because it's part of the vision of our city and it's part of what OurWinnipeg, Complete Communities and Sustainable Communities directs us to do. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Swandel. I apologize for overlooking you earlier. We'll move to the question. Recorded vote. All those in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Mayes, Orlikow, Sharma, Steen, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillor Browaty, Fielding, Smith.

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

Mr. Speaker: Motion carried. Thank you. Okay we can invite Councillor Havixbeck back and she will…Paula…can you get Paula? Oh, here she comes. And she will introduce No. 3.

Item 3 – Community Incentive Grant – Tyndall Park Community Centre Inc.

Mr. Speaker: You can introduce that please.

Councillor Havixbeck: Sure. Sorry. I would be happy to hear. I can't recall who stood this down. Oh, I thought somebody stood it down.

Councillor Gerbasi: Councillor Swandel did.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel stood it down so. Were you combining 1 and 3 when you were…because…

(Inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: Do you want to close Councillor Havixbeck?

Councillor Gerbasi: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Call the question.

Councillor Havixbeck: Sure.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of Item 3? Those opposed? Motion carried. Tyndall Park Incentive Grant. All right, Councillor Vandal we have Infrastructure Renewal…

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Question Period. Do we have a Question Period for Protection and Community Services? Certainly we do it looks like, so Councillor Mayes you are the first one who I see your hand.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, and I had meant to mention that I don't think Councillor Havixbeck had a conflict. That's obviously her decision but I hope she doesn't recuse herself on all U of M matters. That would be unfortunate.
My question is, doesn't need a response today, I've got a constituent…(inaudible speaking in the background)…I'm not billing for this so it's not legal advice. The question that doesn't need an answer today…a constituent of mine had identified a concern that I know former Councillor Steeves had raised, a fellow whose name may have created a hit on the criminal record registry. He was saying, "look I had to go and get fingerprinted. It cost me $55 at the City of Winnipeg. What's being done?" As I understand it from the Chief of Police things are much quicker now getting the criminal record checks processed but if we could just get a report back perhaps or from the Councillor at some future meeting about the…there is a $55 charge. I think there's a good reason for it. If we can get that explained so we can relate that to the public why we're having to do this in the face of a Federal requirement.

Councillor Havixbeck. Okay I think there's two questions in that, so I'm just going to clarify. One was about the delay in processing criminal record checks and the other was about the charge and actually having to pay for that, so I can first speak to the delay in that there were delays in around the June/July mark, and we had a number of not-for-profit firms come forward who hire for the summer and who experienced a delay so far that students, university students, could not be hired into those positions until August or September at which point the summer was well over and any employment opportunities were sort of gone, so I understand from discussing that matter with the Police Chief at the time, that that issue was addressed and that it was expedited and whatever was needed, I'm not sure if it was additional staff or people to process the claims, but the backlog was addressed. As for the charge, I would have to come back and report to the Councillor on that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Mr. Speaker. There was recently…the Winnipeg Police Report had some, I guess some questions regarding some of the numbers that were presented and they're going to re-do the report. That's my understanding. When would we see that…do you have any idea when we'll see the revised report?

Councillor Havixbeck: Could I just ask the Councillor to clarify whether he means the Crime Reduction Strategy, whether he means the Annual Report which is the statistics? There's a number of reports that have come out.

Councillor Orlikow: Sorry. Sorry. To clarify…annual

Mr. Speaker: The Annual Report.

Councillor Havixbeck: Okay, I'm sorry I'm not aware of any revisions to that report that were being planned. The statistics as I understood it were what they were but I will definitely go back and check with the Police Chief on that matter.
Mr. Speaker: Fair enough. Any further questions for Councillor…Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes. Councillor Havixbeck, why are we hiding on the Winnipeg website, the names of restaurants that have been convicted of food violations? You have to click on "Departments" and then you have to click on "Community Services Department" to find restaurants convicted of unhealthy restaurant conditions. How many Winnipeggers know that the names of restaurants convicted of bad food practices will be found under the Community Services Department and what about the restaurants in the suburbs that have such convictions? Should we not be listing them on our website? Are we not concerned with the health of our citizens and visitors who eat at Winnipeg restaurants?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes thank you Mr. Chair, and through you to Councillor Smith, that's a very good question. I'm not a web master. I don't know whether they're hidden or not hidden. I really hadn't taken the time to look. That's definitely something if we want to maybe address with the I.T. Department we can. As for the ones in the suburbs, should we be reporting them? Well I believe we have an obligation to the health of our citizens, however, I believe as the Councillor knows, much of the inspection will be transferred to the Province. I'm not suggesting for a second that we off-load any kind of problems or divert the attention; however, we will not be in that business come this Spring, so, you know I can do what I can for the next few months on this matter and I'll address that with the Councillor.

Mr. Speaker: Second question Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: The thing is, these restaurants are in the City of Winnipeg and regardless even after April, if it's all in the Province doing the inspection, we should still negotiate with them to list the restaurants that are convicted of improper food practices on our website. My question is why are we not thinking that way?

Mr. Speaker: Response?

Councillor Havixbeck: I don't know how to answer that. I'm not sure how I'm thinking on the matter. I mean, I believe the Province, last I checked, they have a fully integrated website. They will have a Health Department. They will be listed somewhere in that inspections process. Why would we duplicate the efforts of the Province, I'm not sure. So…

Mr. Speaker: Possibly a link? Third question? No? Any further questions for Protection and Community Services? Seeing none, we'll move onto Councillor Vandal and Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED JANUARY 16, 2012

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will move Items 1 to 5. I think it's 5.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Vandal: As Consent items.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi. Number 4. Anything else? Seeing none we will vote on 1, 2, 3 and 5. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item 4.

Item 4 – Preliminary Design – Widening of Route 90 between Taylor Avenue and Ness Avenue

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We had actually quite a lively discussion at Standing Committee on this. Just as by way of introduction I just want to clarify what exactly we're voting on today. Recommendation 1 is that the preliminary design for improving Route 90 including widening Kenaston Boulevard on alternating sides be approved as the adopted alignment. The concept proposes widening Kenaston to six lanes by widening on the west side south of Tuxedo Boulevard and widening on the east side north of Tuxedo Boulevard, and widening both of the St. James

Bridges in both directions. Recommendation 2, that the Planning Property and Development Department be authorized to negotiate for the acquisition of the properties required for the adopted alignment. We are not, Mr. Speaker, we are not approving the entire budget of this project this afternoon. We are approving the alignment and we're giving authority for the administration to go out and negotiate. And negotiate with those property owners that are willing to sell their property for the eventual Kenaston Bridge project. So that's all we are voting for today. There's not any funds for this in the Capital Budget at this point. And when the project does come forward in the Capital Budget, it will be on the floor of this Council for thorough discussion on the entire project. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a number of concerns about the current preliminary design for the widening of Route 90 between Taylor and Ness including the St. James Bridge. Part of my concern is the inconsistency and the double standard in which a road widening project such as this is being handled as opposed to transit projects. The Kenaston widening along with the next phase of rapid transit are scheduled in the Transportation Master Plan to be complete by 2016 while the majority of EPC and Council agreed to put a 2016 time line on Phase 2 of rapid transit, they also swiftly slapped a transit tax on transit users to pay for a large part of the cost of the project. Where is the money coming from for widening Kenaston and expanding the St. James Bridge? Why from every citizen of Winnipeg even those who don't own a car? Yet those who take transit are helping citizens by reducing congestion and reducing greenhouse gas emissions and there is a double standard here and that in fairness is glare…the unfairness is glaring and will continue until this ill-conceived and unfair transit tax is removed. When the Transportation Master Plan was approved in November, an additional strategic goal was added to the plan. It reads "a transportation system that reduces its greenhouse gas emissions footprint and meets or surpasses climate change and emission reduction goals set by the City and the Province". Transportation is one of our largest sources of greenhouse gas emissions. Recent land use planning decisions and designs like this provide little alternative to the car and undermine the City's commitment to sustainability. Commitments made in the Transportation Master Plan and OurWinnipeg to deal with climate change. While the Transportation Master Plan has some good transit plans and other measures that could take us in a more sustainable direction, it also contains a significant number of projects that fly in the face of sustainability goals and it also recommends building pretty much everything that everyone wants but the problem is while all these projects may have merit how do we make the decision about which ones to proceed with first? Those decisions should be based on a proper, thorough and transparent cost benefit analysis. The land use decisions this Council has made in the south of the City including Waverley West and the massive retail complex associated with the IKEA, it is no surprise the City plan now projects a 40% increase in vehicle traffic on Kenaston in the next 20 years. If this is the case, we need aggressive and proactive plans to implement rapid transit much faster. Yet the preliminary design before us is a weak and minimalistic approach towards encouraging public transit use. A few queue jump lanes and priority signals and we will see a 40% increase in car traffic in the next 20 years. I call that transit plan somewhat of a failed attempt. In spite of the lofty vision adopted in OurWinnipeg which was supposed to take us in a more sustainable direction, this design is not much different than the same thinking from the 1970s. Trying to build your way out of congestion has been tried and it doesn't work. It cost too much, reduces the quality of life in the neighbourhoods that these freeways blast through and our greenhouse gas levels continues to skyrocket. I question whether or not other ways to deal with the congestion on Kenaston have been thoroughly considered. The few minor transit measures suggested in the plan are not much more than green washing. The land use this Council has permitted along Kenaston is designed to increase automobile dependency and I see little if any change to that. At Public Works Committee I did ask a lot of questions. First, I was told that Kenaston traffic has been over a certain traffic level for decades, probably according to the Highway Capacity Manual and therefore it must be widened. It's interesting because if I'm correct the Disraeli Freeway traffic numbers are also high and above those standards yet that project which we are constructing right now remains at four lanes. According to the Disraeli Project Freeway newsletters, in spite of this traffic counts other issues such as the cost of the project and the need to acquire much more land and the impact on the neighbourhood has resulted in the decision to keep the Disraeli at four lanes for now so obviously traffic counts are not the only deciding factor. The other question I'd asked at Public Works was whether or not a cost benefit analysis was done. Eventually came out that there was one but it hadn't been made public. I also got a sense that it was not going to be made public anytime soon. Cost benefit analysis should be done in a transparent manner for any project as important and costly as this. Council approved a capital audit and SERP Report and confirmed in OurWinnipeg that we should be basing our decisions on this analysis. We are the decision makers here. We should have all the facts in front of us and so before I support a project of this magnitude, I want to see that analysis. The City can't afford to do every project, so we should be looking at the cost benefits so these decisions can be properly made. Which project has the most merit? Is it the Plessis underpass? Is it the Waverley underpass or neither? Capital projects are being politically driven and that is not the way to build a city. The…I'd also like to comment that the projected cost of the project is being said to be 130 million as if that's a factual number. Yet, it seems remarkably low but even if it is accurate there are a large number of variables that are likely to drive up the cost in the future. First of all, the $130 million figure is a year too old already and it doesn't take inflation into account. Widening this road from four to six lanes, up to nine lanes at many intersections if you count turning lanes and upping the speed limit significantly which has also been talked about will result in a much greater need for noise

attenuation. There will also be a need for pedestrian flyovers as well for this thing to be livable for the people there. Furthermore, issues of the potential cost of expropriation and delays coming from the Kapyong barracks issue could lead to further cost escalation, so while I agree that we need better transportation options in the area, in this area of the city, I don't believe this preliminary design does the job. The unfairness of the transit tax has made to me pretty much every project seem tainted with this glaring inequity and favouring of infrastructure projects for the single occupant automobile. This needs to be pointed out whether you are tired of hearing about it or not. That transit tax should be removed or else a toll or some fee for motorists implemented. There is little commitment in this design to future rapid transit development and transit measures here are minimal and ineffective. The projected increases in traffic counts going forward are discouraging and seem to reflect a "head in the sand" approach to the environmental challenges we face. A thorough and accurate cost benefit analysis should be made public and scrutinized before any decision is made to lock into any certain design. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, please.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. Well, I stand here today unfortunately to support the Kenaston. Not that we don't need to have the Kenaston Road widening but I regret that I could not move after much lobbying because many sound engineering advice from our administration that we should widen more on the other side, i.e. the Tuxedo and leave my side alone. However…however that didn't work out so well because you do have that corner. You have that corner and you have that Juvenile Detention Centre there. So as much as I would love to retain my complete ward because it really is a hard thing that these people are going to be facing especially those people that will…some people will lose a little bit, some are losing a whole pieces of home. Some are losing their complete home and that is inevitable. And for many people I've talked to in the neighbourhood, I've actually been to three to four living-room meetings with six or seven people who not only live on Kenaston but also on the street behind it on Centennial, they are talking about some of their issues. We…and we all…we don't want it to happen but then when I have to ask the question what do we want to have happen? Do we want to have all this traffic hitting that block at Taylor and they say, hey I'm just going to whip down Taylor and then I'll go down Borebank for a while and then whip down Grosvenor for a while and then hopefully the bike boulevard will stop that and then I go down here and go down here and I'll whip through the neighbourhood. Okay, do you want that? Because that's what's happening with Kenaston right now. It bottles up right there at Taylor and cars scurry through and try to make a beeline to Academy to go over the bridge that way. If they stayed on Taylor, you just would've gone down to Pembina, be great and the number shows that some of them do, however the flow is running through our community. So it is a huge safety issue for the neighbourhood. It's number one issue in the neighbourhood is through traffic. There's an enormous amount. So the inevitable reality is is the inner belt way is happening. This is a link for that middle corridor. Do I like separating neighbourhoods? Absolutely not. This is going to put a line between Tuxedo and River Heights and neighbours will be separated. Do I like that? Absolutely not. It's tough. Do I like the fact that some people who really love their homes and don't want to move, will have to move. No. Of course, none of us like that, but again we have to get traffic to move down these…I guess we'll call them regional roads, in a way that prevents the negative impact happening on our local communities. I just want to take a moment to dispel a couple of that people said "Why didn't we do this and this option, this option?" Well, this really is only option. There was a couple of other options they put on the table, some were horrific and just got the neighbourhood very mad. Other ones…, but again once you boil it down to this really is the only option that we have available at this present time. Even in the report it says that if negotiations that are kind of going on with the Province and they do want to move that youth detention centre out, well then things may change but at this point, I…in my conversations I had, very unlikely. It's a very expensive endeavor. So again what are we going to do? Not do anything or do something, okay? So I said to the people we have to do something. So they all have concerns. What about we're closing off streets? Willow does not, no longer go into Kenaston. So what are those people going to do? Okay, and that's all…so they have to go into a cul-de-sac. How does that affect their back lane? These are the details that we're working on and the neighbourhood has brought it to my attention and the administration has been nothing but very accommodating trying to answer this. The idea of having a fly over bridge but that one I think as some of you may have read that one, we're going to have a two tier bridge. Well, that's just is ridiculous and I'm going to state that for the record. This is a ridiculous idea to have a fly over. It's incredibly expensive, the land that you have to expropriate just to have these on and off ramps, ridiculous. So I just wanted to spell that because people are still talking about that. It's ridiculous. There's no other way around it it's very expensive, dangerous. Neighbourhood right now is concerned about the pedestrian bridge going over. Well, can you imagine if you had a freeway going above your house? I think they're getting a little more upset so again that is off the table. So, I believe that this is the best option that we have available at this time to protect the facts from the neighbourhood for having that through traffic; to making people who are on that belt way be able to cut through. The other issue of whether we have talked about is rapid transit. Well, at this stage they do have easements that we can build into that at this point there really just isn't the transit ridership there and that's just a sad reality, but it's true. It's supposed to be moving there…we're looking at a rapid transit corridor there, maybe I mean, Bill Clement Way later on. These are some of the other areas that we'll be looking at more of the transfer house but this one they will have some diamond lanes. They are looking at those. Again we haven't decided exactly how yet. We have to deal with the berms, we haven't actually…they haven't decided exactly where. I do a hundred percent support the pedestrian overpass. There is a school there. Lots of

kids come over across, it is six lanes, will be very difficult. Remember people, that we should also be worried about and I'll be keeping close eye on it but one of the most dangerous intersections in our city is Kenaston and Grant, okay so we've got this, I've been told with better egresses on and off, this will actually improve safety with no over ramps, no over ramps, no, just to have a little bit more cut in and cut out will actually improve safety on both that corner and the other one on Taylor which is also building up. So again, I understand some concerns about…and I share them but the reality is people are driving cars. The reality is that the capital region is growing and though 90 percent of people work within Winnipeg, they're going to be driving into Winnipeg. I like to fight that a little bit more. However, this is the reality of our situation. So, I hear you say we don't do anything and I'll let that traffic keep running through the ward and then I can share…therefore I step down as a City Councillor because that is not our job. Our job…my job is to find a way to deal with the number one issue for the River Heights area and that is through traffic and this in my opinion and from the administration's opinions will help alleviate that so again I will be supporting this alignment and just on one last note, the reason why this came forward and I'm very happy it is coming forward, I have six people that call me every month and say, "I need to move but no one will buy my house. I've been trying to do this for four years but who's going to buy a house that may just be ripped down. No one's going to do that. So they're very irate. How long is this going to take before I can actually do something? And I agree with them. It's unfair that you've had to wait four years to sell your house and no buyers because who's going to buy a house that's going to be ripped…unless you don't tell the person and that actually has happened in the neighbourhood. People sold the house and not told that person that their home was probably going to be "click click" in 10 whatever years. Again, these are honest people that tell the buyer that we're not sure what's going to happen to your house. No kidding they're not getting offers on their homes. So now at least the City can get in there. Those homes will be rented out again. When the City buys these homes, we're not sure when this project will start. One concern previously is what about these good homes that people have sold to the City. Well, I've been assured that we will be using them for rental until such time. Again that's a good use right now but we have to allow these people who've been waiting for so long, the opportunity to move and so that's why this motion today is so important and why I will be supporting it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just want to remind everyone of something that Councillor Vandal alluded to at the beginning when he spoke and that is that this report is about the alignment of the expansion, not the final design. So a lot of the comments made…Councillor Gerbasi made are certainly going to be appropriate and pertinent as we go forward. This is about alignment and how do you deal with that alignment and acquiring our properties. I should also mention that Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Orlikow that perhaps a motion should come forward at some point to fund the acquisition. We have several properties that are sort of they aren't for sale and we are funding a few of them right now that we could acquire but we do need more funding and we should look at getting that funding in place right away. There's a number in the report. I don't recall it off the top of my head, but to deal with all of the properties so that we have the access to funding quickly if people decided that they wanted to get fair market value for their properties right now and you know we can negotiate something and we certainly look at that so it's something that we as a Councillor and perhaps Councillor Orlikow can leave the…bring that motion forward so that goes conversations can be ongoing. I just want to let you know, Councillor Gerbasi and I know that she is a strong advocate for rapid transit. But it doesn't do any good when we stand up here and throw around terms like ill-conceived fare increases. And I have to say that I don't like getting into the back and forth on stuff like this but ill-conceived fare increase, if you want to quote…what stated is that then my response to that would be it was out of an ill-conceived decision to put a $300 million project in that we had budgeted to get done by 2031 or could be done sooner than that to say that it has to be completed by 2016. You heard the estimates put on this project of $130 million so you'd be doing this more than twice. The numbers for that project, the second phase are very old. I think they were 250 million as at 2004, 2005 number. We've upped that to 300 million. We don't know that that number is even in the ballpark. We're talking about crossing Bishop Grandin, we're talking about maybe crossing railroad tracks, we don't know the final alignment. It should also be recognized that there is a second phase rapid transit implementation process that has been started already that involves the Province and the City. So that's not their…you know, it's not fair to make comments like that. I understand how strongly people feel about bus fares and about rapid transit but we want to build rapid transit for everyone in the city and to say that all it is is sticker shock to the poor and the down trodden in the city is wrong. We've got the second lowest transit fares in this country. Even if you were to follow through entirely and implementing all of that 20 cents at that time and I think the Mayor this morning was suggesting that there is some conversations going on that may see only a portion of that or maybe none of it implemented or phased over a period of time because we have other opportunities. We would still have the second lowest transit fares in the country. What we don't want to have is the second lowest quality of transit in the country. We want to strive to have the highest quality of transit in the country that meets the needs of all people not the lowest economic sector. We need to respect them; we need to do our part where we can. We also need to recognize that the idea of a social safety network comes to those pieces belongs more in the hands of the Provincial and Federal Government. We help where we can. We do it in partnership, but that's not how we should be making our decisions. With regards to cost benefit analysis…well before we go to cost benefit analysis, there was a comment made of who is paying for this when rapid transit fare increases, they've got to pay for rapid transit. I just

want to remind everybody around the table that the gas tax will probably be one of the funding sources for this project. The Provincial Government might be another funding source; the Federal Government might be a funding source. That's cash to capital borrowing but the gas tax, I think that's kind of coming from automobile users you know and considering that the use…the automobile user already brings the vehicle to the road, the maintenance of that vehicle and insurance of that vehicle. It all related cost of that vehicle, there is a substantial inequity. If you want to use that argument, I don't want to use that argument because I think it takes away from getting this rapid transit. If you want to have equity, I think they're going to be waiting a long time for rapid transit. I think we have to recognize that if we're going to do rapid transit because it's going to add to our sustainability. It's going to add to our quality of life. It's going to help us build a much better city where people can move around more freely and hopefully make choices that are good for our environment. Cost benefit was also brought up. I would suggest you know, if you want to get into throwing the cost benefit stuff around with moving that the rapid transit forward to 2016, you better go back and do another cost benefit. You better go back once you get the alignment sorted out and do a cost benefit on the rapid transit as well. Again, because one of our huge overruns areas in the first phase of rapid transit was land acquisition and we had to tinker somewhat with land…with route alignment to deal with some of those land acquisition issues but, you know, we need to do that in both areas if you think that that's really fit, but I don't think you'll like the answer to the question. You know, I'm just a layman in these things but I look at the numbers where we're looking at and depending on what you're using as your…on the benefit side of the column and if the elimination of greenhouse gas is one of them, the faster moving of all traffic without having to lay down kilometres and kilometres and kilometres of concrete that's only going to be used by a few vehicles, the cost benefit may not bear out what you think it will bear out and as a matter fact we've actually had that stated to it by our administration at times when it comes to the greenhouse gas piece. I think as this goes forward, we're going to see and this through you Mr. Speaker, I say to Councillor Orlikow and to Councillor Havixbeck who represents the other side of this road, that this project is going to a great opportunity to improve the quality of lives of people in both sides of this major artery. The idea of linking the two communities…that road's always been a barrier. I went to school at St. John Brebeuf when I was a kid. The military kids would come across to J. B. Mitchell and St. John Brebeuf in the elementary school, Carpathia School, I think it was. It was just…that's why that speed limit was down there because there were so many kids there and that was all when the barracks was really populated back then and this constant complaining of about the speed limit being as low as it is by the traffic users you know, it could easily be argued that you want the traffic to move, it will flow through faster, raise speed limit… we've seen some of the arguments we get on speed limits and this time and we know some of them are made about protecting and preserving communities and the safety of their citizens and. So they are going to see some improvements in that area and the connecting of those communities where it's much easier to skip over to go to play a little bit of ice hockey at Sir John Franklin Community Centre and vice verso over to Tuxedo Community Centre and tying those two communities are going to be a great improvement. So I guess just in conclusion I remind everybody again that this is the alignment of the roadway not the detail design and there's a lot more work to be done here.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. Recognizing that it is about alignment but I just felt as the City Councillor for Mynarski, inner-city, I know it doesn't seem like I should have an opinion or anything on this but I would like to first reflect Councillor Orlikow's reflection about all these people taking Taylor, Grosvenor or whatever streets they are taking to avoid the traffic glut or whatever you want to call it. Traffic is like water as I've said many times. We have similar problems in my ward where people are trying to get out to West and East St. Paul and different places and even as far as St. Andrews. People who live in Petersfield are cutting through the Mynarski Ward, puts a heavy traffic load on places where it shouldn't be, lowers the quality of life I think in our neighbourhoods. So number one is we do have this legacy that we have with the City. Nobody knew 50, 60 years ago or more, where this city was going to be and I guess Kenaston was treated in a certain way but I have to say, as an advocate and as a person who is political and a person who loves the City of Winnipeg and travels. I have to say Kenaston right now is not the easiest street to cross. I've tried it and I would concur that Grant and Kenaston is one of the most wickedest intersections in the city to navigate and try it blind. I've done it but I tell you, it's like run like hell and hope you're safe. The…so but in terms of Kenaston I'm going to be supporting this alignment which sounds like it's probably the best. You could just ask the people who live in North Point Douglas what it's like to have a bridge go over top of some of their houses or very near to their homes. It's not the greatest thing in the world to have but what I wanted to say is though is that this plan for Kenaston is part of a bigger vision that I think this city should really be looking at and that's why I voted against the transportation plan because the reality is, is that I don't think we can afford an inner ring road as the concept of some people around this table believe the inner ring road should be. I believe it should be an inner rectangle road that's pretty well almost built and Kenaston is one of the bottlenecks, but Kenaston really goes all the way it's Route 90 and goes all the way to, what King Edward and then it becomes Oak Point Highway. I think that we should be connecting Chief Peguis Trail to it and we would have this inner ring road that would work great for trade and so the plan and the design plan…well, I don't know what bus fares has anything to do with the issue as well, thank you very much Councillor Swandel. And I'm not going to talk about the bus fare in context of this but I will say that the alignment, allowing for diamond lanes will be great because you know what, diamond lanes and transit is rapid transit. We can have a better transit system because the Winnipeg Transit is a

very good system right now. It does need improvements going into the future. This particular alignment, if it allows diamond lanes we can run buses and if they are looking at upping the speed limit because we'll have a pedestrian bridge over it which I recommend, but right now it's very dangerous for pedestrians to get across Kenaston anyway. So let's provide a better means to do it and I would say that we could improve Winnipeg's transit system immensely by using an inner rectangle road that would be much more affordable and so I will be supporting this particular plan to align it the way it is. It makes sense. Let's move forward. I would concur with the Councillor Swandel that now that you know the alignment, set aside the money, buy those houses please. I mean, help those people out and I'll point out that if you have to buy them 20 or 30 years down the road at the current increase in the market rate you know what, if we can do it as soon as possible I think we should. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Eadie. Seeing no further comments we'll call the question. All those in favour? Oh, I'm sorry, Councillor Vandal is going to close.

Councillor Vandal: I have a 15 minute speech ready to go.

Mr. Speaker: I'm just trying to move this baby along.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, it's been a good discussion and I especially like the area Councillor, Councillor Orlikow, he sounds like, his…I especially liked his words because he sounds like a person who's actually been to the public consultation and three years ago there were five options brought forward to the community. There were hundreds of people at the meetings I understand, there were some phone surveys. This project just didn't show up at Public Works last month for the first time. There's been a lot of thought put into this and Mr. Speaker, this is a roadway that connects Waverley West which I understand is about ten, fifteen percent built out and the airport where there's CentrePort being developed as we speak. Polo Park is going to be redeveloped and there's an argument to be made that once Polo Park is redeveloped there is going to be more traffic there on a more consistent basis than in when there was a stadium and arena. We have the new IKEA there and this is a major roadway that we're going to have to improve at one point. And this is the alignment only, the alignment only. The report is very thorough. There's a couple of paragraphs on active transportation facilities; there's transit improvements as a paragraph on that and all of those details are going to come out in the detail design so I encourage everyone to vote for this. It's going to be a very good project and it's much needed.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Vandal, my apologies. Seeing no further comments, questions, all those in favour? Motion carried. Those opposed? Nay, one. Okay, Harvey too. All right. I'm going to offer my apologies to Councillor Smith when we were doing the original standing down of issues, the only one that I saw was four. He's asked that we look at standing down number one: the car exchange for a lifetime now I'm going to have to go back to the will of the Council to do that. It's with regard to reporting back in 90 days on that lifetime transit pass. What's the will of Council? Are you in favour of letting it stand down right now and addressing it? All those in favour? Okay, recorded vote. I need two-thirds so. All those in favour of standing…allowing us to open up number one.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Mayes, Orlikow, Sharma, Smith, Steen, Wyatt and Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman.

Nays

Councillors Havixbeck and Swandel.

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

Mr. Speaker: The yeas have it. Councillor Vandal, would you like to open this on No. 1 and Councillor Smith…

Item 1 - Car Exchange for Lifetime Transit Pass

Councillor Vandal: You know, Mr. Speaker. It's a 90 day layover and I think even at that there were some raised eyebrows so I'll wait to hear what the Councillor has to say.

Mr. Speaker: Hey, we're speaking to the layover, Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yeah, I support the layover. You know, I found on the internet, the City of Murcia in Spain had a program where they offered a free transit pass to any resident who gave their car to the City. The part of the campaign ended and they'd given their cars to the Government and the next phase involved the City displaying all the cars and having City personnel take them apart so as to make the cars disappear. And Murcia mechanics taken the cars apart were broadcasting the effort by web com for all to see, I'm sure our television stations in Winnipeg will corporate in broadcasting such an event here and Mayor Katz could show leadership by offering his car in the exchange for lifetime transit pass. (Laughter) Getting many cars off the road would end many traffic jams for those who are still driving their cars. It would allow us to have less wear and tear on our roads and it would certainly reduce the stress of driving during rush hours and most important if the Mayor gave up his car, he'd be showing leadership and encouraging our citizens to use transit. As well the Mayor could avoid car accidents by taking transit. (Laughter)

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Councillor Vandal to close.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move layover for 90 days.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question Period for Public Works Infrastructure Renewal, oh we do have a by-law. I'm sorry.

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

Councillor Vandal: I will move that By-law No. 10/2012 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 10/2012.

Councillor Vandal: I will move By-law No. 10/2012 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 10/2012.

Councillor Vandal: I will move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 10/2012 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. Now we have question period. Any questions for Infrastructure Renewal Public Works? Seeing none, we'll thank Councillor Vandal and we'll move on to report from the Downtown Policy Committee. Councillor Swandel.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
DATED JANUARY 9, 2012

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I'll move…I'll introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Item No.1.

Mr. Speaker: No one wishing to speak to it? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have a By-law, Councillor Swandel.

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

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll move that By-law No. 9/2012 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 9/2012.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that By-law No. 9/2012 be read a second time. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 9/2012.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 9/2012 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. Question Period for the Downtown Committee.

Councillor Swandel: Heritage and Riverbanks too.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. Question.

Councillor Vandal: I'm…it's actually germane to today's meeting. I'm wondering if the Councillor can tell us what the status is, the official status of the old airport that's being de-commissioned. Is there…has a decision been made that it's going to actually be taken down and if so, when?

Councillor Swandel: I saw something in the newspaper or on one of the websites this morning that the Aviation Museum had abandoned its plans for looking at it. I don't know that there's actually something formal, but I could take that under advisement and get back to you.

Mr. Speaker: No other questions for Downtown, Heritage and Riverbank Management? Seeing none. We have no Finance Report, but I can offer Question Period for Finance if we have any questions for the Chair of Finance Councillor Fielding. Okay one question? Councillor Gerbasi.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gerbasi: Is it possible or the Chair to advise members of Council as to what the time lines are for the Operating Budget so that we can plan our schedules and travels and various things. We really often get told kind of late in the process and if there's going to be any change to the process from last year. I notice there's one meeting at the Convention Centre for the public next week that we just heard about today. Is there going to be any information for Councillors or is it ahead of that, the tabling of it to the media that day and our seminar, or is it going to be the usual process?

Councillor Fielding: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yeah there is a public consultation session. I think you probably got a message from our C.F.O., Councillor Mike Ruta. I think I'm giving you a pay-degrade, actually, Mike. But anyways, so there will be a public consultation session on Tuesday. Generally we table the budget somewhere around the third week of February, third or fourth week of February. We haven't nailed down a date but it probably will be in around that week and then general standard practice is that you have a Tuesday before the March meeting, so probably you'd have the Operating Budget happening on March 20th. That's generally the days we aim for, but there's been no final dates that have been established but the consultation session will happen on Tuesday so I encourage you all to come out. From my office we're going to try and do a bit more of outreach for people making some phone calls to groups and agencies to come out to make presentations for it. So that's the plan that's in place for the consultation as well as the budget.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Fielding. Any further questions? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: So the draft is not being released before the 31st. The draft will be tabled roughly the third week of February and the Councillors have been encouraging me to provide input. I appreciate that but I just want to be sure that the draft is coming roughly third week of Feb.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Yeah that's…just for Councillor Mayes, I know is newer to the Council process. So generally we table the budget. Executive Policy Committee tables it somewhere around the 27th, 28th, somewhere around there. The date hasn't been finalized. Then it goes to the Committee process. We hear delegations from people that will come out and make presentations to the Committee stage and then we'll hear delegations and decisions are made if there should be amendments if we missed something or made some changes to it, and then it is debated. Usually it's the Tuesday

before the last Council Meeting of March. I wouldn't anticipate there'd be any change to that. We don't like to go past the Wednesday of the March Council Meeting because it does start to cut into the Spring Break that people have.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions for Finance, then we'll move to Property and Development. Councillor Browaty.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED JANUARY 10, 2012

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of January 10th and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 to 5.

Mr. Speaker: Number five? Two people for five. Got it. Four? No others? So we stand down 4 and 5 so call question on 1, 2 and 3 by Consent. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 4 – Review of Existing Secondary Suite Zoning Regulations

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd love to hear the Councillor's issue.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Fine, it is where it is, okay. Thank you very much. I just…I know this is referral and it is timely. So I just want to put on the record though that I do have some concerns and I'd expressed it to the administration already. My concerns are about using the secondary suite to get around rezoning to start taking some single R1 homes and using this to have secondary suites would make it theoretically an R2. That's a large concern. They also the other concern I have is that I'm not sure how we are balancing it but for every secondary suite you add into a block you add in a car so again there's traffic issues that are associated with that. So those are my two concerns about the secondary suite. I think it can work in some spots but I look forward to seeing the report.

Mr. Speaker: Anyone else on 4? No, seeing none. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, we're referring this for a discussion piece going forward with the administration. Concerns that the Councillor brought up certainly are well recognized and certainly do need to be properly analyzed.

Mr. Speaker: Call the question, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Browaty for No. 5.

Item 5 – Marketing of Land for Sale – North Perimeter Park

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd love to hear the Councillor's concerns or comments.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not supportive of selling off this chunk of law land to facilitate more exurban development outside of the City of Winnipeg. The new residents on this land will pay their taxes to West St. Paul, not to Winnipeg and furthermore this is river bank land and has a history of being park land. Whatever the current zoning is in West St. Paul and I guess I ask should we not be keeping these sorts of lands for green space purposes? I'm thinking more long term. I'd like to know there is also some information in the report in front of us that we have that's…that's just not there. For example, I'd like to know why we own this land in the first place. We did hear this morning from a delegation who gave us some of the history but I imagine that we would've purchased it with some larger plan for river bank park uses. The report in front of us contains nothing about the history of the land, the context and the story of how it came to be owned by the City and there must be someone on staff who knows some of this history and if not, someone should go talk to them and provide that as part of this report. And I'm very disappointed that it's not included. It's just not thoroughly informing Council. We're supposed to make a decision without that information and I think that's unfortunate. And I mean, the reason I…we've been told we're selling it is to make some money quickly. I'm not sure what that money is going to go towards. I assume perhaps balancing the operating budget, I don't know. I'm concerned about one time land sales being used to cover operating costs and I don't know what…we also haven't been told what the end use of the funds are other than to come, to make some quick money. Another factor in this decision is

the recent decision on the service sharing agreement with water and sewer services to be finalized by the C.A.O. with West St. Paul. Council insisted for some reason that the final agreement not be brought forward to Council on this particular West St. Paul's agreement. I'm not sure why there would be a desire to have that lack of transparency and I'm not sure why such an agreement needs to bypass Council's scrutiny but the ultimate sale of this land will depends on finalizing that service sharing agreement. And a final thing I'm going to mention very carefully is that there are legal issues out there with an aboriginal band that have been spoken of and the Mayor has stated the City has a very strong case and perhaps we do but that doesn't mean there might not be years of delay. The courts take aboriginal land claims a lot more seriously than some people around here, seem to.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi that's got little or nothing to do with the land that we're talking about.

Councillor Gerbasi: Well, it has to do with the…the marketing of this is contingent on the service sharing agreement going ahead which is being challenged in court so I think it is relevant. None of these issues should be taken lightly is all I'm saying and I'm not going to go into it any more except to say that I really believe that all members of Council should be given a briefing, a private confidential briefing, we can sign a confidentiality agreement. We can do things like that we can keep our Councillors informed about what the legal position is on it because I think we are being asked to…just to have faith, trust us without any information and I think that's difficult and not really fair. So I would put that on the table as something to request that the Mayor would do for us. So frankly, I think there's issues that aren't resolved yet. The history and the longer term vision of this land has not really been properly explained, maybe somebody can do that.

Mr. Speaker: I'll just share with you from the Chair, sitting right beside the gentleman this morning that he said it was gifted to the City of Winnipeg from the Province of Manitoba at the time the Perimeter Highway was put through. Those are his exact words.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, all right, well, it's nice to hear that from a delegation, a citizen delegation. But I mean, I think that should be, well my point was that it should be included and there's more to it than just that but that's information that the department should be providing us when they ask us to market a property. We should know what the uses of it were intended and more about it. There is more to the story than we were told in that report and I think that's disappointing. And I guess I just don't…I remain concerned about ex-urban development and fostering that whether we really…how much you benefit when you look at the whole picture of that you know, in order to make some short-term cash which again it hasn't been explained where that short-term cash will be directed so I do have some concerns. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. I'll try to stay on point to the issue. The marketing of the land for sale is an issue in which the way it's being proposed, I don't think that I…I will not be supporting this recommendation moving ahead to mark the land in. It was great to hear from the former Councillor Taylor some more history about how we obtained the land but also why. And in the circumstances that it did because he referred to pre-Unicity and he talked about making sure that there was green space for citizens to utilize along the riverways. This current plan looks to me like they will sell to a developer which will build housing on it which will, as its been pointed out, that's housing that will get built in West St. Paul; that won't be built in Winnipeg necessarily and people will make various choices as the Peter, Paul and Mary report came out last City Council meeting I think it was. But -- and the service agreement, this is bound to the signing of the service agreement with West St. Paul so it could take a long time if the aboriginal people do file a formal legal challenge to selling water and that will stall the whole plan and the marketing. But what I want to point out here is maybe I could support this. If West St. Paul, Councillor Wyatt referred to the growth of municipalities outside of the city and East St. Paul is a great example of huge growth happening outside of the city. Well, those actual municipalities, those soon to be cities, will have a need for green space. Maybe we should be selling it to West St. Paul proper so they can decide whether or not they want to keep some of this for park land they might need. I don't know. They might. That might be something that's important. That's when we heard from Councillor Taylor as to why that land was there in the first place. So, I just wanted to point that out. Now we also had a number of debates today about issues, I asked the question of the Mayor, about park and ride. Well -- and I do understand there is some sort of service agreement between East St. Paul and Winnipeg that went to the public utilities board not long ago. East St. Paul is built up and if the city somehow helped them build up shouldn't we be trying to make sure they get out of their cars? It seems that we're creating this problem and we do need a park and ride if all that housing goes into West St. Paul I want to know where they are getting the money to build a park and ride because you know what, it will be our responsibility to build a park and ride so that those people are not cruising our roads and causing the problems they do. And I know in the service agreement that whatever they negotiated it's not going to be enough money to cover off our infrastructure needs and what we're going to need in the future. Because I know that park and rides were not even considered I'm sure, in this particular service agreement. We do need the money. If that's part of expanding and taking care of the original roads I don't think so. The real reason the park and ride, I believe, was taken out of the Chief Peguis Trail is they

had to save some money somewhere, because they had to build a proper facility and they had to find it somewhere and that's the real reason. So, I just want to point these things out, that when we talk about moving ahead and selling this land to developers to build housing so that more people can live outside of Winnipeg, that is causing us problems on the inside of the City of Winnipeg that we talked about that people seem to be dismissing So let's take some responsibility when we're making some decisions. That's all I ask of City Council. Take some responsibility and think through what's really going to happen if we do these things. When we take these initiatives. Maybe we're going to be selling land that the citizens of West St. Paul might want to use for green space sometime in the future. That might be a better way to look at it as well. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Eadie. Just so we know who is on deck here, Councillor Fielding, Councillor Orlikow, Councillor Swandel, Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Fielding:

Councillor Fielding: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I've got probably two words to my good friend Councillor Browaty. Thank you. Thank you for finally looking at this land. I know your Committee did some due diligence before the servicing agreement that came in place. You know, for the life of me since I've been on Council, 5, 5 and ½ years, I've often wondered why the City of Winnipeg owns land outside of our boundaries and I got some explanation today by the presenter today, who I believe is a former Councillor from River Heights, if I'm not mistaken. River Heights / Fort Rouge or somewhere in that area. What I hear from all Councillors is that we should be providing more services, you know we should be putting more services on, get people like myself arguing to you know keep your taxes low and a whole host of things that are city-related issues. This is a piece of land that is not in the City of Winnipeg. Why are we spending time, money and energy on lands that the City has no purpose being in? Why don't we just focus on the lands that we can. You know when I hear things that we have 300-acres in the RM of Springfield that could be a developed when you have the old ash dump site, I think 140 acres, you've got lands in the Stonewall Quarry. It just makes me wonder why we're making decisions like this. So any time we can move to liberate some land if you will in my respect I think is a very good thing for the City of Winnipeg and I want to thank Property and Development for your due diligence. I know you held off. Councillor Wyatt I think was the one moved the motion originally to hold off for a little while until the whole piece was servicing through water and sewer services were run, but I think this makes a lot of sense for the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg if we gain a million or two million or whatever we're going to get from the land I think it makes sense. You know that one or two million dollars can do? It can put more services in the City of Winnipeg. It can build a new rec centre, put more police officers on the street, it can maintain a competitive tax environment. So any time we can look to liberate lands that are not in the City of Winnipeg I think it's a good day here for the City of Winnipeg and some great decisions will be made. So thank you very much, Councillor Browaty and your committee.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I guess the question really does boil down to is why do we care? Right, it's not in Winnipeg. It's outside of Winnipeg. Sell it. It doesn't matter if it has incredible heritage value, doesn't matter if it is important for our park system that interlocks on the river bank. It doesn't really matter, we don't care, pave it over, put up whatever you want. We don't care; it's outside of the city. Well, I have a little different view on that. I believe that the City was given that land under a public trust and we were entrusted to make sure that if we decided to dispose of it, it's done in the way that's in the public interest. So does that mean we can't sell it? Absolutely not. But does that mean we just say, "Hey, it's outside of the city, we sell it all, we just need to cash and run." Absolutely not. We are entrusted to go through the process. Have we gone through our, you know ecologically significant natural land strategy? Not all. Have we identified parcels of the land only to be sold? Not at all. We just said, "Go ahead and do it." So again, I believe that we do have a role and a responsibility to any lands entrusted to us. Now that said, even if you take the completely fiscal position there is no rush. We're not going to get the money now. There is a caveat on the land sale that says it has to wait till the agreement is signed and that's not going to happen any time soon. It may be happening next week. I don't see that. The clean is in. There is going to be some tussle going on. So again what's the rush? Wouldn't it be better if we are going to sell land without a caveat on it? Don't we make more money doing that? So even if you believe that we don't have any kind of responsibility to this land at all and you just want to make the most amount of cash, we can from selling this land. To me as a buyer, I believe once we get that caveat off i.e. the agreement is signed, that land, correct me I'm not a real estate agent, would appreciate in value we make more money. So I don't see that urgent need to rush into this right now, if there is it wasn't in the report. I've never been told why we have to do this today. So again, the land is there. It's only going to appreciate in value. Let's wait until the deal is signed with West St. Paul and then you can go forward and hopefully by that time we'll look at some riverbank stuff and say maybe new developer can't have right on the riverbank, you have an egress back, with that we can do that but at this point I just don't see why we have to rush into it today. If it is about the operating budget this year, we're not getting any money for that this year. You know, we're not. So again it's not going to affect our operating budget this year so claims about it's just there to back-end our operating budget. I don't believe that because we're just not going to have the money in our hand. So really I don't see a pressing need to rush into this at this point so I'll be not supporting it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker. Let me just answer the question why do we care? By saying we do care. We know that we do a lot of work with the capital region. We're trying to put in place joint planning provisions when we're doing service sharing agreements. We work closely with the Provincial Government, Intergovernmental Affairs folks and planners to try to ensure that there's some consistency in planning not just in Winnipeg but throughout the capital region. But I think…what you really have to ask yourself is what is our role here, what's our responsibility? I find our whole approach so far in this conversation to be somewhat big brotherish. And we're making the assumption that if another municipality were charged with the control over planning and development of this land that they would somehow abuse that authority. And I think that's the wrong foot to start on. You can argue we should have lands outside, we should have lands inside. I personally think this land should've been marketed a long time ago back in 1993 when it was declared surplus it should've been sold then. In 1994 because of some changes that were made. That's actually in the report, wherever we got the land from and when it was going to be sold before…actually when I was Chair of Property and Development I brought it forward and said, "You know, let's just, what are we doing here?" And people are making the same arguments, "Well, it might create exurban sprawl." You know, not our decision. You know the Province controls the planning in those jurisdictions, density, density restrictions in those plans. They're…they're supposed to be participating in an orderly development the same way as we are. You know, so I think we should start from the premise that we are all responsible people and that those people that function in the same roles as we do just outside of our borders should be considered responsible people as well. So we do know that there are some environmental issues that we're trying to help clean up out there and I think that's the motive for putting the caveat in there about service sharing so that there is a proper set of services available so that any development that does occur could be considered sustainable. And you know, pieces of OurWinnipeg out here and the capital region stuff in OurWinnipeg, it talks about the principle of sustainability and working to push them outside of our borders as well. With regard to one time money and selling, we do this every year. We bring into the budget for as long as I've been around this building, there's been one time money in the budget. It comes because we overfund reserves or we have land end up in our laps or you know last year there was a thing with hydro tax. There's always one time money, some of it by design, some of it just comes to us and we're always taking properties and tax sales and we've got some serious lands outside of the City that we acquired lord knows how from some of it's like from almost a hundred years ago. Some of it has to do with when we created the aqueduct. We've got, in some areas we've got huge pieces of land that we could be argued that we don't necessarily need the whole piece of land. So you know, at the end of the day this is a piece of land, it's controlled by planning in another jurisdiction and if that…I mean, that jurisdiction can actually make an offer on the land if they so desired, they may see you not wanting ten or fifteen acres of it as a riverside park and then putting the other pieces of the land for land out for development. Who knows? It's right adjacent to the Perimeter Highway. I don't know how attractive it is as development lands. Also included in that negotiation when we acquire that land from the Province. They also gave us a large track of land off of McPhillips according to this report. I think we used it as a land fill or it's currently a snow dump upon that one's taken. I think that's the piece that they're referring to. I could be wrong, I stand to be corrected. So you know, it's outside the city. We don't have a need for it. To try and use it, you know for a political argument or just be big brotherish suggesting that these people outside the city can't go through a well thought out planning process and act responsibly when it comes to development and applications I think is just not right. So I'll be supporting the sale of the land and the proceeds going into the land operating reserve which I believe 10 percent of that or 5 percent goes into Gail Parvin Hammerquist and some of it's going into community centres so there is all kinds of places where this money will benefit the citizens of the City of Winnipeg, not to mention that having and sitting there in a land operating reserve to use if we've got a glut of money in there rather than just it sitting there that we can use it to keep Winnipeg affordable for all citizens to offset a tax increase so you know in years, whether it's next year or the year after or the year after that by the time anything happens on this piece of land. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As it was noted by previous speaker, I think it was Councillor Fielding, I was in the committee. I moved that this matter be laid over at the committee and it was until we finalized what we were doing with the service agreements with municipalities and we've done that, Mr. Speaker. And I thought that transparency was important and that's why it was premature to deal with the sale of this property, And I want to thank Councillor Browaty for supporting that. Mr. Speaker, if you read the history of this property, it's fairly clear that this was in the land exchange that took place back in the early 1970s and that this actually, it actually predates Unicity, Mr. Speaker, and that the more recent history Mr. Speaker, I'll point out that this decision is not to declare surplus today. We've already declared it surplus Mr. Speaker. We declared it surplus on October the 24th, 2007, this Council and this Council declared it surplus unanimously by consent, move…the report was moved by Councillor Swandel. And it was adopted by consent, which means everyone in the Chamber who was here at that time actually supported declaring this land surplus. Usually you don't declare land surplus unless you really intend to sell it. That's the purpose of declaring the land surplus typically, surplus to the needs of the City, all the departments of the City are canvassed. Is there a need, do you see a need. If there's an issue that comes up, the Department Heads will indicate that and bring that forward and we would make a

decision yea or nay at that time and clearly that happened and the decision was made and it was adopted unanimously by Council. So I think we're really debating something that happened…we already made a decision on or previous Council you can argue, made the decision but the decision was made to go down this road for whatever reason we did not choose at that point to actually market the land. So, Mr. Speaker, the…and if you read the minutes actually from them, it states the fact that in the absence of a capital region plan or alternatively a change in policy, the Planning Property Development is of the opinion that the City's current position should be consistent with the June 7th, 2001 decision which was just to wait and see. Now we waited, Mr. Speaker for the Provincial Government to have a policy with regards to the capital region now for over 12 years. And this government refuses to have a policy with regards to capital region. The report states clearly there is currently no capital region policy plan to guide inter-municipal land use and development issues. This was in 2007, October of 07. So Mr. Speaker, we've moved on since then. We still have no capital region policy plan. We didn't have one before that, we don't have one now, and to the credit of this Council, we at least are filling that vacuum with the fact that we've come forward with a service agreement, a service joint, service policy with municipalities and with the first one being West St. Paul in this vacuum of lack of leadership from the Provincial Government. Absolute lack of leadership. I mean, I think when the…when Doer first got elected he was a hundred percent committed to doing something about the capital region. Had Paul Thomas doing the big study and I think what happened was the Mandarins over there, the senior civil service beat them up for an Election; said no everything is fine. Why take it with anything that's not broken in their opinion. And they didn't do anything. So we have a situation where land use plans no different than our land use plan. OurWinnipeg has to be submitted to the Provincial Government every five years is what they like. They have land use plans; they don't submit them that often. They have land use plans. They have to submit to the Provincial Government, the Provincial Government signs off on their land use plans and then they proceed and it's no different than whether it would be the RM of Albert way out in Western Manitoba or the RM of West St. Paul or East St. Paul. Now the Provincial Government, if it's truly, sincere and serious about doing something about the capital region maybe this land shouldn't be developed but it's not the City of Winnipeg's role to say this land should be developed or not developed. The Provincial Government is the lead government in terms of dealing with municipalities outside of the City of Winnipeg and they've chosen not to have any policy, Mr. Speaker. So I don't know how members who support the Provincial Government could be here standing up and making a case on this when the Provincial Government of this province has refused to deal with us. I just don't know. And this is a major policy void in this province when the City of Winnipeg is the economic engine of growth of Manitoba and the capital region's part of that not to have a capital region policy is ludicrous but they do. They don't have a policy because it's too hard to do, I guess you know. But that's leadership, Mr. Speaker. So Mr. Speaker, the report is very clear. It's reasonable., I laid it over because I was concerned about the service agreement. We have sorted that out. And now that it's pursued and sell this land and hopefully get the best price we can. The Chair of Finance mentioned a few numbers. I certainly…whatever it is Mr. Speaker. We should market it and get the best price we can for the citizens of Winnipeg. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Wyatt. Just so you know from the partnership of the capital region, we're closer to that plan than you'll ever know so. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I would…I'm going to oppose the marketing at this time. I think Councillor Gerbasi's reasons don't need to be restated. I would agree with most of those. My question though I have a question in terms of process perhaps you can deal with, Mr. Speaker. This looks like to me like a straight majority vote. I think Councillor Wyatt as resident historian has clarified some of this that this was originally passed by the two-thirds threshold so that this does not require at two thirds vote. This is a simple majority vote because I'm sure I will be getting e-mails from people concerning about the golf courses saying, "Well, look you went ahead and sold some land and I was agreed to market it that was on a straight majority and we sought that the golf courses were subject to parkland or subject to a two-thirds vote. So I just…I think Councillor Wyatt has clarified that issue but the two-thirds vote did occur back in 07. And now this is a step in the procedure, shall we say.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead. We're going to ask for the Clerk to speak.

City Clerk: For reasons other than that cited, it doesn't require a two-thirds vote. The charter specifically says that if the lands were used for parkland or cemetery purposes when the charter comes into effect in 2003, or whether the land was acquired after for park or cemetery purposes and the answer is no to both of those so it doesn't require a two-thirds vote.

Councillor Mayes: Park purposes as per the definition of park? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Councillor Browaty to close.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to answer a bunch of the various comments that have been put forward thus far. Again this was previously declared surplus by this Council. That's said and done. I thank Councillor Wyatt in fact for suggesting that we wait until what you know, the service sharing agreement was complete. We're going to get a better value for the land now and it makes good sense to do it at this juncture. My understanding is

that both the Councils of Winnipeg which we did in December and the Council of West St. Paul have finalized and given instructions to their administrators to complete the deal with based on the terms that were established here. The lawyers I understand are basically done. We're…that deal will be inked and sealed imminently. I understand it's really right there. Mr. Taylor this morning brought up the issue of the boat launch. A swap that was done back in the early 1970s that Councillor Wyatt was mentioning. There were two portions of what we traded land over by McPhillips for this land in by Main Street in West St. Paul. There's a portion of land on the south side of the Perimeter Highway that is not part of this transaction. The City of Winnipeg, I have no idea about this until I started reading up on this. The City of Winnipeg operates a boat launch to serve north Winnipeg in the RM of West St. Paul. Who knew? That's not being affected by this in any way shape or form. The discussions we've been having about boundary alignment they have not had any discussions, like the motion that came out of…came from Councillor Wyatt in 2011 had nothing to do with anything outside of the Perimeter Highway. These lands are outside the Perimeter. Some people talk about exurban sprawl not having any planning control. We do have planning control as part of the service sharing agreement that we agreed to by this Council in December. What about the question people ask me is what about extensive, more uses in City services. In they built their own micro treatment plant or their own water supplies, we get nothing towards our regional infrastructure. As part of the servicing agreement that we…that this Council wisely adopted in December we get $3,000 one-time connection fee and $200 a lot, those both indexed inflation go to go towards our regional street infrastructure. So we do get a benefit back from the development in this area so again, I think the timing is right. We're in a good spot right now. In terms of whether or not…who's going to purchase it if West St. Paul wanted to purchase it to make a jumbo park, they could. But on the other hand if they want to as part of the development process, their rezoning application, they can do it as part of it if they build a residential subdivision. There's land dedication, they can build a park as part of it. That would be very consistent and appropriate. If I was the Councillor or the Municipality in the area, I would suggest keeping part of the riverbank area as open public space but that's not our decision to make. This is not our jurisdiction, so I, you know, leave it at that and again I will be supporting this.

Mr. Speaker: Recorded vote. All right. All those in favour of Item 5, the Marketing of Land for Sale in North Perimeter Park, 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, Sharma, Steen, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt and Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman.

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Mayes, Orlikow and Smith.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 5.

Mr. Speaker: Motion has passed. We have one motion in front of us here from Councillor Orlikow seconded by Councillor Gerbasi. It's an automatic referral. Okay I need a two-thirds (inaudible).

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS the public service has not produced evidence that Winnipeg has an abundance of public green space available for development;

AND WHEREAS the City Winnipeg's OurWinnipeg identifies golf courses as major green spaces;

AND WHEREAS OurWinnipeg states that "public spaces are valued as essential to the urban fabric, encouraging and promoting healthy lifestyles, cleaner environments, connectivity, recreation, community pride and urban beautification..";

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has an Ecologically Significant Natural Lands (ESNL) Strategy that identifies ecological or heritage lands within the major green spaces, including golf courses, which has not been implemented;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has not properly consulted the public or community groups regarding re-purposing of major green spaces including golf course lands;

AND WHEREAS public green spaces are entrusted to Council for future generations;

AND WHEREAS any sale of public green space should be done in an open tendering process once Council has determined if, and what green space, can be developed and the appropriate development for that particular land is determined;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT negotiations with developers regarding the potential development of golf courses be suspended;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Council direct the administration to outline a process that follows The City of Winnipeg's Ecologically Significant Natural Lands (ESNL) Process and report back to Council.

Councillor Gerbasi: For or against referral or it is just…?

(Inaudible)

Councillor Gerbasi: It was supposed to be automatically referred and someone is wanting to kill it right now by having it voted on before. (Inaudible) Immediately, yes. So they want to kill it right now. Anyway what I'm asking procedurally, is there any…

Mr. Speaker: Okay, We'll have a recorded vote, please. It will be two thirds.

Councillor Gerbasi: To deal with it now rather than have it referred.

(Inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: Deal with it now as opposed to automatic referral. (Inaudible) Everybody has a chance to speak once.

Councillor Orlikow: On the motion to…

Mr. Speaker: Not on the motion…not on the motion to extend the rules. We're voting to suspend the rules and I need a two-thirds majority.

Councillor Orlikow: We don't speak to it.

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote, please.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of suspending the rules and dealing with the motion now?

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Mayes, Orlikow and Smith.

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

Mr. Speaker: Motion has two-thirds. And introduce your motion please, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: It's introduced. Now just for clarification, introduce the motion and then I get a chance to speak to it at the end. Is that correct?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, you will. You'll get to close.

Councillor Orlikow: Okay, I'll wait to hear what everyone has to say.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Who is first to speak? Councillor Eadie, you had your hand up?

Councillor Eadie: Does he get to introduce the motion?

Mr. Speaker: He did.

Councillor Eadie: Well, I would just like to stand up and speak to this you know, I just barely read it over. I thought it was going to be an automatic referral so I hardly have any of the idea what I'm debating so if you want to reread the motion but I just wanted to make a point here. And I think that the public needs to understand something about the process that just happened. Yes, we want to debate this, yes that's great but you know, where is the opportunity for the public to get involved and discuss this motion that brings up some very important points. The Councillors that moved this motion are not just being…not doing this for nilly willy reasons. They're actually bringing a motion that they would like to see debated and discussed through City Hall process. They would like to see it go to a standing committee so at least we can have public representations to speak to this. By suspending the rules, what we've done is we have said what I heard other Councillors including the Mayor around here talking about consulting with the people. Consulting with the people! Well, how are we going to consult with the people when delegates can't even register to discuss or debate this particular motion because it was on the floor as an automatic referral? Now, I just want the public to understand that. What they have done is yes, they want to debate it right now but what they don't want is they don't want public consultation on this. They don't want this to appear at standing committee so that we can discuss this in full and talk about the aspects of it so I just want people to be clear about that. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I just...I don't know if it's appropriate but through you to Councillor Eadie, I'd like to say that everything that he's just said is a little bit off the mark. The reason that I want to debate this right now is because everything that's in here actually happens through this process. There's no decision to sell any golf courses in the City of Winnipeg, some folks in our community for whatever reason are out there spreading this great deal of misinformation. We're out there looking for expression of interest to see what kind of ideas are out there. Whether that results in anything at the end of the day, we have no idea. If it does, whether certainly there would be a great deal of public consultation and engagement, there would certainly be you know, the involvement of the ecologically significant natural land strategy, conservation inventories…there's a whole bunch of stuff that has to be done. If we were ever to try, make any changes there. And those changes, if we were to make any changes could range anything from disposition of some land to just changes in operation, try to find ways to make this viable or perhaps just a shift that uses of this. So that it serves a greater piece of the public. But there has been sort of a political game afoot for lack of a better term out there where people have been led to believe that somebody is selling off City golf course. That's…there's an expression of interest out there and there was anything that resulted in moving forward in any of those expressions of interest. This would've already be done. So I would suggest that you know, I don't know and I don't want to talk too intent but I hope this wasn't done for political purposes just to try and bring a thousand people forward to sort of paint the picture that there was some evil doing that there was some collaboration or consortion? Consorting going on with developers trying to take these valuable pieces of green space and had them over the developers, certainly not the intent. The Intent of an expression of interest process like this is to bring the best value for all of our citizens and you know, I was a little angered earlier on when I spoke, but I strongly believe in bringing quality of life to our citizens. I strongly believe that all green spaces in our city add to that quality of life. You know, I get sick and tired of people talking about this city as a bitterly cold place that's riddled with mosquitoes and that we are cheap and we're the wholesale town. But I can quickly offset that by saying that we've got wonderful open spaces. We've got some of the highest ratio for our green space per capita. I think is the measurement that they use and so we cherish that. We cherish the fact that we have these huge elm trees and other forest throughout our city and green space…golf courses make up some of those green spaces or public spaces as some people refer to them as. So you know, it's good to make the public aware that there's ecologically significant land strategy out there because we don't talk about it very much. It's a valuable tool not only in our working with our land but also working with developers in bringing the lands forward, I don't know perhaps in Councillor Sharma's ward, I think maybe Councillor O'Shaughnessy out at the end of the Main Street years ago, there was a piece of land going down to the Red River whether it was really ecologically significant lands and we did a lot of wheeling and dealing with the developer involved there to make sure that we got a lot of that land protected for the City and the developer actually came to the table there. So not just on our land. So this is already happening so that's the reason that I want to deal with it today. We don't need to go through all of the histrionics that when you've got a public that's been misinformed by somebody and I hope it's nobody from this chamber, but the suggestion that these lands are being sold off is just wrong but to have an expression of interest to look at options and opportunities some of

them might get thrown out as soon as they come forward. Others, we might take a serious look at and go through some of these processes. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What really angers me right now is some of the language that's in this particular motion and some of the things that suggests. Negotiations with developers. Did you read the expression of interest document? There were a whole menu of scenarios that we were looking at for our golf courses, those options included having private companies come and manage them, having partnerships like we saw at Spa Le Nordic at Crescent Drive. There's a million one scenarios we left it wide open for a whole plethora of reasons. This is just ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I think… I have great concerns about this issue as I think I may clear when I ask the question earlier today and I'm trying to keep this process as clear and clean for the public as possible. So that people aren't down here making deputations on one issue and saying well, I think you already voted against it or for it so I appreciate what Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Gerbasi are saying here and their concerns over the green spaces, but we heard earlier today from the Mayor that there would be full public consultation on this. We don't yet know what the response has been to the expression of interest. We know there were a bunch of respondents. We don't know what they say. I've had a number of conversations on this with the cross-country ski folks with people who live in my war, with people who live outside the ward. There's a lot of public concern about this. There will be public consultations. I think we have to be clear on where we're going with this and let and continue on with the process. There hasn't been…there isn't a negotiation that's about to conclude or that has concluded. We need to see what's in the expression of interest. I also want to emphasize that what Council voted on back in 09 I think it was or I may be incorrect on the date but prior to my coming here with looking at either disposing lands or privatizations, some alternative way of operating these, that isn't dealt with in this motion and I want to make sure both of those options City, some aren't. It's a sort of confusing collection of seven different courses that are in play here being discussed. I don't want to see Crescent Drive, which is in Councillor Gerbasi's ward, privatized. I don't want to see Windsor Park privatized. That's one that's in Councillor Vandal's has had a number of discussions with me about that to his credit and certainly, aware that we both have a chunk of Windsor Park. So I'm not in favour of this motion. What I would like to see though and I think the Mayor's emphasized is that there's going to be public consultation about this that there are at least two options, Councillor Swandel's touched on it. Do we want to run what we've got differently and my position is clear on that. Secondly do we want to dispose of some of them? Which ones? How are we going to do that? I think the public will be very interested in that and I want to keep the process moving clear for the public and I don't think we're there yet to have that, what I hope to be a large public consultation. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I'm really disappointed that this was treated in this manner because I think this is a reasonable, responsible, appropriate motion to put forward to be referred. So that there can be some proper public process as the motion goes through and clearly, there was a little con fab that got together and suggested we find a way to kill this because I've been around here long enough to see…have seen this done many times before.

(Inaudible)

Councillor Gerbasi: Can you stop? Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I continue?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, ma'am.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. The reason this motion is coming forward is because we do have this Ecologically Significant Natural Lands Process and Policy which a lot of us might not have really looked at that carefully. It…Councillor Orlikow has done quite a bit of work in this largely because he is trying to keep his community and all of our communities, he's been doing all of us a service in terms of informing the public about what's going on here so frankly instead of criticizing Councillors that are communicating with the public about issues such as green space issues in our city, I think we should all be thanking Councillors like Councillor Orlikow, at least I do. There is a lot of concern about the decision to go out for requests for proposals on the golf courses and perhaps there isn't an overwhelming amount of confidence in the consultation process and you know, I think what this motion does is it strengthens that process by saying, we go but we ask the staff to do some more work and insures that this process is run. What do we…how do we know? I mean, Councillor Mayes asked the question this morning and he was told, yes there would be public consultation, but what does that mean? Does that mean you know, two hours at the Convention Centre one

night? Does that mean we go through the committee process? I don't know what that means. And we haven't been told that and this is an issue that has a lot of citizens concerned and rightly so. It's not just the citizens that are concerned. It's a lot of members Council are concerned. You know, I supported in Crescent Drive Park, this partnership, this business venture to make that golf course viable and I said on the record at that time to make that up, keep that…help to keep that public…to keep that a public course. Next thing I know it's out for expressions of interest. I don't know where that's going to lead and I think people do want some reassurance and rightly so because we've all seen how sometimes things go. I appreciate and understand the process. There's going to be a report that's going to come forward from the administration. It's going to come up, but how much time is there going to be for people to truly understand it? I don't know. If it's a rigorous, fantastic public process, we'll all be happy and we'll all be relieved. But I think this motion was necessary to give people an opportunity to come down here and ask these questions. To put in place a more rigorous public consultation process that looks at the sensitive lands and it's not politics. We're in politics and part of our job as politicians is to advocate for the issues that concern us and green spaces is one of those issues and preserving our green spaces. So I think people should be thanking Councillor Orlikow for and myself and anyone else who's been proactive on this issue and I hope you'll support having this motion referred back to the administration and have its proper debate instead of trying to just put it into the garbage bin marked, you know, well in your opinion it's garbage. You know I think there's a lot of citizens and many of them in your area who probably won't agree with you that it's garbage. And I think Mr. Speaker, well you're talking to me, I was just talking back. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Oh, well it won't be the first time I'm out of order. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just urge people to…I know people quickly this was sort of sprung on people to refer this quickly. I think there might be some Councillors who may regret that decision to have done that when they think about this whole issue, but in any case it's done. There's obviously a strong intent to just kill this matter but it's not going to go away. I can assure you of that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's too important of an issue to our citizens.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just like to comment that I too, along with Councillor Browaty and a few others, think that this motion is quite absurd. I think it puts the cart before the horse in many ways. Not a week goes by just to clarify that I don't get a call from someone either within my ward or throughout the…all areas of the city with some comments either by e-mail or telephone. And there's a process and there's a process under way and I am certain that the CAO who is always present in the room, who has read all the reports about accountability and transparency and consultation will make sure that happens in this process. So why bring something now before we even know what we have? We are in a bit of a Catch 22 in that. How do you know what you have to consider before you get some interest and then how do you know what you're considering? You can't do one without the other. But I'm certain that there will be public consultation. People who are directly affected, people who are indirectly affected will have the opportunity. I can tell you that as also as a member of EPC; I have not heard any information on any of the applicants or any of the evaluation of the applicants. So there is no conspiracy as someone used I believe was the word to hide anything. There's no time lines either provided on this and so we're left to respond in that nature to constituents and so that may be something that we may need to look at in the next few months and look at city wide. The other thing I can tell you though that we're responsible for the public purse and I don't think and I'm sure many of these people…the Councillors in this room as well as the taxpayers think that taxpayers should fund municipal golf. That's the issue that would be debated and would need the consultation. The golf courses show a shortfall every single year and coming up with a better way of doing business either with existing people, working through them or changing the way the business is done. But looking at things as a business unit might be the way we need to do and whether that involves changing them into spas, into something residential and into something else while preserving nature, I think is what we need to look at. When we divest ourselves completely of things, many times they can be turned around, sometimes they can't. So I am also quite familiar with the ESNL Strategy, having just gone through the consultation process in the Ridgewood Project Development. And I can tell you that that would be a definite piece to any of this consultation that the administration would be undertaking on our behalf. So again it's a tricky balance in finding out whether there's any interest and you can't go out and do anything until you know whether there's somebody interested and at the table. So to me this motion is frivolous. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to repeat what Councillor Havixbeck has just stated but I agree with everything that she said. We started a process months ago and I'm more than just a neutral stakeholder. Here I have the Windsor Park Golf Course and constituents are calling me and I'm actually meeting with the residents group in a few weeks as I always do. But I just want to make one point very clear, it hasn't been mentioned yet on this issue. That we need a two-thirds vote if there's going to be any material change to our golf courses. If that's…if we're going to turn the golf course into a housing project or any other amalgamation of land use, it's gotta come back to this…the floor of this Council. There's got to be 11 of us out of 16 who agree to move forward on that so there's going to be ample community consultation before we even get to that point, I hope and we're all watching this very closely because there's…our

citizens that are calling us and there is somebody. Councillor Swandel is right; there is some information that's flowing out there that's not entirely accurate. People are concerned, but there has to be 11 of the 16 politicians on the floor of this Council who agree to move forward with any initiative. So there's a process in place, we're almost there, which is why I think I'm going to be supporting the ability to kill this this afternoon, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I do have comments similar to what some other Councillors have said. I mean, this is…let's face facts, this is a political document that is here and it's put here for a reason. There's a process which we laid out earlier on the year that looked at the expression of interests. For my personal opinion, I'm there. You know, I want to take a look at how we're operating, the golf course is losing a million dollars a year in my opinion this is not a viable option when you have the crime problems that we have in the City of Winnipeg. You've got recreational centres that are there spending a million dollars; you know if you're in the glue, a million dollars a year, I don't think is a viable option. I don't think the idea of having some development on golf courses, because you're not going to take every proposal that's there. But it's an opportunity for people to come in, give some proposals, we're going to evaluate them as Councillor Vandal clearly said two-thirds of Council needs to support it. Do I think that everything that's on the list in terms of an expression of interest is going to be developed in some respect? No. But I think we need to take a look at some options and but I can tell you as a fact that I am there. I think we need to make some changes and I would like to see some development on some of these courses and I would like to see you know if the units have an opportunity to bid on it. They can cut their costs in terms of what they're delivering, that's fine through a managed competition process, but I think we need to change up or look at how we're delivering that service. And I'm interested to see them as they come into proposal. So I am not going to support this motion that's brought forward today. I think also too in the process, if you did want to delay for a month you could've put in a Notice of Motion, which would be a proper procedure, a motion for here does call for two-thirds of Council. So there isn't political game being had. I think that if there was any political game being had, it's putting forth motions like this that says nothing when we actually have a process that's well documented, that's supported by Council coming forward over the next numbers of months, so thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further speakers, I'll allow Councillor Orlikow to close on his motion.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunate, but surprised, I'm not surprised. I actually am prepared for something I said, "Boy I hope they don't do this. I hope they don't try to do that because this is just going to muddy the waters." I am not trying to kill anything. I'm not trying to kill…I think if you've seen everything I wrote and what…I'll be very clear and Councillor Havixbeck said it quite clear. The cart is in front of the horse. We have gone backwards on this. That's all I'm saying the process, I don't agree with the process. That's all I'm saying. We should be consulting with the public first about what they may see as an opportunity for these lands. Again, so that is what we're talking about today. I am not talking…and yes, I will use any political means I can to try to get Council, all of you to agree that we should be meeting with the public first before we meet with the developers. That's what I'm doing and that's what I'll continue to try to do. And in the most honest way possible, so I'll just quickly go through it. So what are we talking about today? The process is we're looking at selling over not saying we're going to, I always say possible, 650 acres of land with over $50 million. That's what we're looking at right now. That's possible. I don't know if it's all part, some of it. No one supposedly knows. But again, what I do know is there has been an EOI sent out that was specific and it was very specific. It didn't say alternative uses it says quote, "It's inviting interested parties to submit an expression of interest, proposals, blah, blah, blah, blah and again for commercial, residential development or long term lease. It doesn't say repurposing. Doesn't tell Wildewood Cross Country Club to come. So what I'm trying to really try to say here is we're going about it the wrong way. Why should we say, hey developers what pieces of land do you like the most? What do you like the most and then we're going to bring that forward? If we decide we like your idea, the administration. Well, can we ask the public what lands do you like the most? What? Do you want to keep those riverbanks? What ideas do you have? This is what I'm talking about here today, people. I'm not talking…I think the process is backwards. So why am I concerned? Well, I talked to the Mayor on November 16th during Question Period. We talked about are we open to all ideas because I expressed concern about the fact that we have only developers and private golf operators in the expression of interest. The answer was quite clear. Yes, we are open to all and then I find out we're all into wall but you only be considered if we decide it's okay, which again I've no idea the criteria I've been using if you have a $50,000 deposit. What? Okay, so unless you're how failed that is again for the little guy. You have to put in a $50,000 deposit if you want your proposal to go forward. Again, that's a process I've been hearing so far, so I'm not sure how open that process could be to the Wildewood Ski Club. They don't have $50,000 to put down on a process, okay. The selection process I hear that it is coming forward. I have no idea where the parameters are. I just know it's being done by some of the administrators, committee and they'll come forward with some developer ideas who pay the $50,000 and then we can look at it. Again, that again should happen after the community had a chance. The result of an open transparent process is positive for both the community and developers alike instead of this oppositional approach, which we're heading towards. The existing process does not follow the City of Winnipeg Ecological Sensitive Natural Land Policy

because how you're letting the developers bid on lands that we're not going to let them bid on because it's environmentally sensible land that has huge heritage value so there is wait…the developers are wasting their time by bidding on lands we're not even going to give them. They go, oh don't worry it'll be taking care of in the next process. Well, I send you back to the Parker Land Swap. Remember that land swap? Well, that was to the land that we swapped over, okay. In that land you may not know is the highest grade heritage lands that we have, 1A. The Aspen forest. That was given to the private developers, no report. Nothing. I found this out months after. Again, so excuse me if I'm a little concerned about the process. I've already experienced it once, I won't experience it twice. The position taken by some people is that the public will get input, maybe in the rezoning process or maybe the two-thirds which may not happen if we decide to lease the land which I fear heard about as well which doesn't require two-thirds, but if we do need two-thirds. Again, okay so I'll just…so again that probably…the people should be brought in forward before that process happens. Again I'm not sure about how will the process unravel? Let's write it down. People are asking what's going to happen? Is this going to change OurWinnipeg? Yes, it will require a change if we do anything, it will require a change in OurWinnipeg, yeah so what is the process for that? People just want to know. People are scared about all their land which I don't think Council will do and I still don't feel that. I don't…Council is not going to just pave over all the golf courses, that's just ridiculous, again, but people are worried about certain aspects of these lands that they want to make sure that they have a voice in preserving not after the developer had, which had a joyous moment at Wildewood Club. That is the path we're heading down. Developer says I want to put the condo here. Now community has to come and fight it. That is…this is the people's lands. These aren't the developers' lands. The people need to go first so that is what this motion is trying to state. I want to put…I'm not saying kill it you see, it says suspend it. Not kill development, throw them all in the garbage; to suspend it until we've had the proper up front process so I agree with Councillor Havixbeck just backwards. I believe the cart is in front of the horse but the wrong way.

Mayor Katz: Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I did not want to interrupt Councillor Orlikow. But I did want to clarify something on his comment about $50,000. There is no $50,000 requirement in the EOI whatsoever. If an idea came forward and if there was two-thirds support and if it was proposed, then in the next phase there is a $50,000 requirement and that came as a result of something our experience, we learned from that but there is no $50,000 deposit required in the EOI, Mr. Speaker. I just want that on the record.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks for the clarification, Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote, please.

Mr. Speaker: All right, we're at the end of this so all of those in favour of Motion 1 as it stands, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Orlikow and Smith.

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: Motion is defeated. With…still with Property Development. Councillor Browaty, we have some by-laws.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that the following By-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 1/2012, By-law No. 2/2012, By-law No. 3/2012, By-law No. 4/2012, By-law No. 5/2012, By-law No. 11/2012

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

Clerk: By-law No. 1/2012, By-law No. 2/2012, By-law No. 3/2012, By-law No. 4/2012, By-law No. 5/2012, By-law No. 11/2012.

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

Councilor Browaty: I move that By-laws numbered 1/2012 to 5/2012, both inclusive, and 11/2012 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 1/2012 to 5/2012 both inclusive and 11/2012.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rules be suspended and By-laws numbered 1/2012 to 5/2012 both inclusive and 11/2012 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. Question period for Property and Development. No questions?

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL DATED JANUARY 12, 2012

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none, we'll move on to the final committee which is government, Governance. I can't excuse myself from the Chair and invite the Deputy Speaker to come because he is not here so I will just introduce Items 1, 2 and 3 as Consent.

Councillor Vandal: You're moving the…

Mr. Speaker: I'm moving the Governance Committee Report.

Councillor Vandal: With the EPC Recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: With the EPC recommendation which is in the report.

All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Harvey's opposed? Okay. Which one? No. 1? (Inaudible) He hasn't read it, I guess. All right, that's it for today, sports fans. I think we've put in a full day here. All those in favour of adjournment?

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 3:52 p.m.