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

The Council met at 9:35 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Steen.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We're joined today by Madison Fedyck who is our Page and she hails from Glenlawn Collegiate and resides in North Kildonan Ward. Thanks for being here today, Madison. We would like to welcome any guests in the audience and we do have some business to take care of: it's our family photo, so, we're going to ask Mr. Walter Janzen who's in the gallery here, if all of the Councillors and people in the Chamber here would turn towards the West Gallery…right, so we're getting two shots as everybody heard. Thank you, Mr. Janzen.
(No audio while pictures being taken)

MINUTES

Councillor Fielding moved that the Minutes of the meetings held on March 20 and 21, 2012 be taken as read and confirmed.

All those in Favour? Contrary? Carried.

And Mayor Katz has an announcement. Thank you. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the daffodil is the Canadian Cancer Society's symbol of hope and represents the fight against all cancers, of which there are more than 200 kinds. April is daffodil month when Manitobans can unite by showing cancer that we're not afraid to standup and fight back. I and many Councillors here today are wearing the pin in hopes that we can find a cure soon. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we wear it to recognize the courage of the 20,000 Winnipeggers who have beat this disease and to remember the estimated 10,000 Winnipeggers who have been lost to the disease in the time that I've been Mayor, and that includes our former City Councillors, Bill Clement and Brenda Leipsic. Daffodil pins are available for a small donation throughout Manitoba and I encourage Winnipeggers to pick up them up and wear them as a symbol of hope, determination and remembrance. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Katz. We have several delegations....

Councillor Swandel: I'm going to ask for the rules to be suspended, so we can deal with a bit of this water park thing because I've got a letter from the proponent asking for a bit of time. So, maybe we could ask the Mayor to leave?

Mr. Speaker: Ah, well, not often……

Councillor Swandel: And I guess that would make me the Mayor (laughter).

Mr. Speaker: Time out for just two seconds, we do have two delegations that are not about the water park.

Councillor Swandel: Ok, we can do it that way…

Mr. Speaker: So when the delegations come forward that are regarding the issue at hand, we will excuse the Mayor, so...

Councillor Swandel: I understand one of the delegations is here on both items. You would have to separate, this won't take very long.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker, Point of Order.

Mr. Speaker: Sure Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Can I just suggest, we don't actually have that many delegations on the water park and I was going to ask to waive the rules to hear one additional speaker. We have only three. Can we just not follow the normal process here today? Nobody's going to have to wait that long and anyways, I was just going to advise Council, excuse me, I have the floor, Councillor Vandal, please! I'll just be a moment. I only have one extra delegation today.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, understood.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: I have that, Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: This is very simple and maybe just in the interests let's deal with it right now; so we don't get into this type of back and forth. The proponent and maybe we can ask the Mayor to leave before I get into this because I've asked to suspend the rules to do that, so we can have a vote on that.

Mr. Speaker: Is Mr. Klassen here? I'm going to rule…

Councillor Swandel: Grant, like, the Mayor's just left, there are delegations, you've got to let me make my statement here, my point here, before we do that. I want to ask to suspend the rules to do this so we that we can technically do things properly here. So, rather than getting into the delegations, I'd like to deal with this matter first, so that we don't have any confusion as it what delegations we should be hearing, or shouldn't be hearing. The matters not going to be on the Agenda, then there's no…we don't hear delegations of it. So, I would ask for your consideration again on this matter.

Mr. Speaker: All right, Mr. Klassen if you can step back for two moments and we'll let Councillor Swandel move his motion.

Councillor Swandel: My request, Mr. Speaker is that we suspend the rules to deal with this Item right now because I have a request from the proponent to lay this matter over for a period of time and in their words to allow this time to meet with Council and provide additional information to assist the Councillors before voting on our Expression of Interest for the Hotel, Parkade and Water park Proposal, which I think is something that we would all welcome and so rather than us getting into a debate and talking about the information or lack of information, this would make great sense and it would enable Councillors to get more up to speed on who these people are, what it is that they are proposing, because it seems the process with the protections that we're trying to put in place, isn't satisfying many members of Council. So I would just ask that we bring the matter forward right now and move that the matter be laid over for up to 70 days which would get us through the next, up to the June Council Meeting, if we need to go that far and then we can get a lot more information here and perhaps be making a more informed decision, which many of our colleagues have asked for.

Mr. Speaker: We'll deal with the suspension of the rules first. Do we want to suspend the rules to deal with the subject? All those in favour? Opposed? That's too close to call, I think. I'll think I'll call for a recorded vote. All those in favour please rise. Suspending the rules?

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Clerk: Councillors Fielding, Havixbeck, Swandel, Wyatt.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed please rise.

Nays

Clerk: Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Gerbasi, Mayes, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Sharma, Smith, Steen, Vandal, Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman.

City Clerk: The vote yeas 4, nays 11.

Mr. Speaker: All right. So we decided not to suspend the rules and although the Mayor has left the building we will move forward with our delegations in the order they are presented. Okay.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order. First of all, I do need to officially move a motion to additional delegation, Dave Sauer for 5 minutes in opposition to the Water park and also, I believe the Mayor could be in the room to hear the delegations on the first item and I think he should be. So I assume he can come back until we hear delegations.

Mr. Speaker: Yes he can return for Mr. Klassen.

Councillor Gerbasi: Unless you want to do the Water….yeah, just Scott suggested we can hear the Water park people first and then the Mayor could return but whatever it's your judgment call.

Mr. Speaker: Well, it will take longer then. I'm just going to rule that Mr. Klassen. Are we in favour of adding an additional delegation? All those in favour? Opposed. Carried. Mr. Klassen, please proceed.

Ken Klassen: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking today in opposition to your notice of motion to advance the three major transportation-related projects and the Transportation Master Plan. I guess my opposition is based on a couple of reasons and I'll be outlining them as follows. I think the first thing in terms of the motion is that we have to recognize that altering the Transportation Master Plan so soon after it's been adopted by Council really raises some questions for me. The ink is barely dry on the document. You adopted that Plan only five months ago, November of 2011. My first question is what has changed so radically since then, that you now want to add almost $300 million worth of new road projects? I simply just don't understand that. You currently have $293 million in Transportation Master Plan for expansion of the capacity regional streets system before 2016. What you're being asked to do today is effectively double that budget. I noticed that in the motion before you, that there is a statement "will create new property tax revenue for the City of Winnipeg" so there's an implication in this motion that the property tax revenue that will be generated, as a result of the Ridgewood Development, will pay for the new roads. I strongly object or question that, that assumption. I think that every Councillor should read the research highlight from CMHC. They looked at Government post charges of new housing in Canada, came out November of 2010. They looked at the Municipal and other government charges by Provincial and Federal Governments on new housing in Canada. They looked at 21 Municipalities across Canada including Winnipeg. The charges on a, the municipal charges on a new single family home in Winnipeg were, for the example they've chosen, were just over $6,000. The Canadian average is over $21,000. So I really question that underlining assumption, that the new development will pay for these new roads. I think what really perhaps bothers me more is the whole decision-making process. The City of Winnipeg undertook a Capital Project Management Audit, the report came out November of 2008, the Administration accepted every single recommendation. The Report was endorsed unanimously by Council and by the Mayor. That Audit said that you would do certain things when it came to Capital Projects. Now, one of the things it did is it said that you would do a better job of consulting the public. There's been no consultation to my knowledge; I think I'm the only speaker this morning on this issue. There's been no consultation with the public about spending $300 million more advanced; anywhere from 5 to 15 years. The other thing is that it says, second recommendation, objective criteria be developed to determine which projects have the greatest need and benefit; they have the greatest benefit. So looking at the motion, I don't see any evidence -- I don't see any cost benefit analysis that would justify that these projects be advanced. And again that's contrary to the Transportation Master plan itself. The Transportation Master Plan endorses the SIRP Report, the strategic investment and renewal report in policy. The policy says that we'll continue to implement the recommendations of the SIRP Report until a new report can be issued. The number one thing, the first thing it lists that we're going to do, "subject new or rehabilitation projects to life cycle costing analysis". Where's the benefit or where is the cost benefit analysis to show this project is or three projects are worth advancing from 5 to 15 years? If the City of Winnipeg is going to be advancing anything in terms of its infrastructure, I think the two highest priorities for Winnipeg should be, number 1, fix what we've already got, and number 2, invest in Rapid Transit. I've asked that two handouts be distributed to you. The first one is a summary I've done on Rapid Transit in Canada. I've looked at all the current and recent projects, major projects in the four Western Provinces and Ontario. It's really an eye-opener. There's been $21 billion worth of projects, that have been approved, or are either in design, construction or have been recently completed. Less than -- or $130 million for the first phase of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor is less than 1% of that total. What I've done on the second page there, is I've tried to look at the per

capita funding. What are other cities investing in? What are their priorities? Is it roads or is it Transit? Well, look at that on the second page on a per capita basis. Winnipeg for every dollar we're investing in Rapid Transit in the last few years, we're getting outspent by over 9-1. So Toronto, the ratio is 12-1. Ottawa Gatineau 12.3 to 1. Kitchener, Cambridge, Waterloo, a City that has slightly more than half our population, is spending $818 million or about 5 times what we're spending. Vancouver, Edmonton, Calgary, the list goes on. So again, if we're going to advance the construction, the transportation-related infrastructure, why are we advancing roads and not other Rapid Transit projects? So I guess the other question I have is where is the money going to come from? The City cannot fix our existing infrastructure. We haven't even identified sources it seems to me for the $293 million of infrastructure or road infrastructure, that you want to build in the next few years. So where are you getting 300 million extra dollars from? So -- and why can't we afford better roads and why can't we afford better Transit? So the next thing I did is I've done a gasoline tax comparison, and it's being distributed to you. What I've done is I've taken the largest City in each Province with the exception of P.E.I., because it's kind of too small, and I've done a population-weighted average of gasoline taxes. Even with the recent gasoline tax increase here in Manitoba, an extra 2.5 cents per litre, we have one of the lowest gasoline taxes in Canada, we're almost 11 cents per litre. Eleven cents per litre, below the national average of what other Canadians pay. If we merely paid the average, not more, the average, there would be plenty of money to fix our roads and to do Rapid Transit and Councillors Havixbeck and Sharma; to maybe advance some of these other projects. So, I think that's really something that this Council needs to debate long and hard. I don't think that there's enough money in the pot, certainly at a Provincial level, simply ask for a share of the gasoline tax; I think we need to look, if we want to be competitive with other cities, you want to support CentrePort, you want to build Rapid Transit, you want to fix the existing roads, we're going to have to pay. And I think this Council needs to debate this and send a motion to the Province indicating support, that you support higher gasoline taxes. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: We'll have the two delegations, what the heck, we'll ask Mr. Klassen, any questions? Yes. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes. Thank you for coming today and I would just like to know, under what basis do you make the assumptions that no consultation has occurred and that rapid transit is not being considered to be augmented, particularly in the southwest corner towards the IKEA Development Project: Seasons of Tuxedo and into the potential Ridgewood South corridor?

Ken Klassen: I was only notified , or I only became aware of this Motion, I am perhaps one of the most active citizens I think you have to agree, one of the most knowledgeable citizens in Winnipeg about what's going on at City Hall. If it weren't for a newsletter from Councillor Gerbasi I would not know. So I think that if you polled most people, stopped people on the street here, 99% of the people wouldn't have a clue that you want to double the budget for new roads in Winnipeg in the next few years, number 1. Number 2, when you talk about the consultations I guess you are talking about the Seasons of Tuxedo. There was a public consultation about the transportation issues related to that. The developer submitted a 64 page plan about transportation-related impacts, and the entire discussion on Transit consisted of two sentences, in a 64 page report. Everything else was about cars. There was a consultation with people in the active transportation community. The Bike to the Future Group received a call from the consultant the day before the public meeting to discuss the consultants plan for transportation related Seasons of Tuxedo. So there was public consultation but it was pretty poor.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Havixbeck: What if I told you that when it comes to the Ridgewood Residential Development, that every household in Charleswood had received notice and somewhere in the neighbourhood of 3 to 4,000 people had actually come to a consultation over the last year? Would you be convinced that there was satisfactory consultation?

Ken Klassen: No, because that may be satisfactory consultation for Charleswood. This has city-wide implications. Every dollar that's spent in Charleswood you spend $300,000 million on Chief Peguis and the extension of the Bill Clement Parkway, that affects other people in Winnipeg, other projects. You know there's only a fixed amount of money; you're moving those in advance of other projects. So congratulations you did consult within Charleswood; I didn't realize that but what about all the other people in Winnipeg. Do they not have a say? This affects…this is being sold on a benefit to Winnipeg overall, CentrePort and things like that has city-wide implications, the consultation should be city-wide in addition to Charleswood. Charleswood a good start, I congratulate you for that Councillor, but city-wide implications should be a city-wide consultation.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi, did you have a question?

Councillor Gerbasi: I think I'll just leave it.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none, thank you Mr. Klassen.

Ken Klassen: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: We'll invite Mr. Ken Guilford. Sir, you have 5 minutes and we would like you to restrict your comments particularly to the Winnipeg Transportation Master Plan.

Ken Guilford: Okay.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Ken Guilford: Councillors, people in the audience, I've come to talk against the Transportation Plan. In speaking to the Transportation Plan, I'm shocked by how much it cost for roads, streets, avenues and more. I wonder if this money is used for streets, how much money do we get for roads in the Daniel McIntyre Ward? This is Harvey Smith's and my ward and I would like to welcome Mr. Smith, Councillor Smith today. It's been a long time since I've seen you. And there are many people, poor people living here and there are many seniors and people living on fixed income and many people who are mentally and physically disabled. We need help as well. Will you please help as well as building the new roads. And I would like to know when -- if you guys drive down Furby Street and I'm sure there's others that but that one is full of potholes. I've talked to the City; I've emailed the City and nothing is happening. I would like to know more what I can do and also, there's a lot of things going around that are not true. I'm stumped because I did not know this, I'm not used to speaking here, so I included other things in my speech, so I can't -- the speaker says I can't use it right now. So thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, sir. All right that concludes the issues with – that are involved in the indoor water facilities, so at this point Mayor Katz, I'll ask you to excuse yourself. And the first speaker on Item 2 is Mr. Ty Tran. Ty, you have 10 minutes.

Ty Tran: Thank you. Good morning, Councillors. It has been a long time I stand before you debating over the hottest topic in the last 8 years. There is no doubt Winnipeggers want an indoor world-class water park. I'm not here today to address my concern about the $7 million public funds attached to the proposal. For almost a decade, 17,000 supporters have been waiting for a winter haven. I enjoy going to theme parks, water parks and anything that offers, thrills, chills and spills. It makes me feel like a kid again going to these places. And it's a great way to relieve stress. The current proposal on parcel 4 is conveniently located to the public. It will generate a lot of businesses to the area. Families won't have to waste gas and money to travel outside of the province to have fun. I have read Councillor Vandal's letter to the editor in the Winnipeg Free Press dated April 21; quote "there will be an opportunity to analyze, critique and improve the development through the Urban Design Review Committee. Consisting of architects, planners and design professionals, as well as the Downtown Standing Policy Committee responsible and final design and plan approval at the political level before construction can begin." I would like to make a few recommendations of products for all ages will satisfy many Winnipeggers. Here are some of the examples that the proposed water park must have. Number 1: wave pool. Two: lazy river. Three: pro slide ride house, play centres for the kids. Four: rocket, also known as zip coaster, is an inline water coaster. And five: jet stream, which is my favourite, it's a free fall, so a free-falling rush but is rocket from a horizontal lying position down a vertical flume reaching maximum body speed. I know everyone here today have been waiting anxiously for years to see Councillor Smith in his speedo going down this slide but you may have to call 911. On July 9, 2004, I was upset of the decision made on the original water park proposal at the old Winnipeg Arena site. I want to make this clear on record to Kevin Engstrom, from the Winnipeg Sun. Whatever the outcome of today's decision, I won't get upset and I will be a stronger man. I can wait for another ten years. Before I go, I would like Councillors to consider this statement. This can relate to your personal love life when you are concerting for that special person that I'm referring to, the water park. When you have an opportunity to meet someone special, never look over his or her shoulders if there is anything better. That special person is right before your eyes and you know it. Give him or her a chance and you never know what may turn out. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any questions? Councillor Smith?

Councillor Smith: Yes. TY as you know, I've encouraged you to fight for a water park, but I'm concerned about this water park. Is it really going to be world class? How do you know it's world class?

Ty Tran: I am concerned too about the site itself. I'm always looking for the bigger and the better picture. Like, I was hoping for at least 80,000 square feet minimum. But because right now, the moment, this is the only offer we have, and I can't really see in the future, if there will be another developer. So, you can see I'm getting short in my stick, being very impatient and to me right now, I just -- even if you can sell for almost anything at the moment but like I said, if there's another proposal that's on the table that is officially confirmed, I welcome two water parks.

Mr. Speaker: Anything further? Comments? Questions? Thank you, Ty.

Ty Tran: You're welcome, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Ken Guilford in opposition.

Ken Guilford: Councillors, Speaker, my name is Ken Guilford as most of you probably know. I'm speaking against the budget and spending $7 million for a water park. This is crazy. We don't need it. I'm sure the other seniors and I will not be using it. You have not told me how much it will cost people to use it. You talk about other things but not how much do I have to spend to go to this park? People should know. People should also be in the know when something like this magnitude comes -- is presented to the people that they will have a chance to see. I do a lot of talking in my ward, Harvey Smith's ward or Councillor Smith's ward, and the money used for the project may easily be used for other purposes. A few weeks ago I spoke three different times against the motion to raise the price of the bus fare 20 cents. We won a portion of the city budget. The city budget was passed. I enjoy making speeches and speaking. This was the first for me at City Hall and it's great. I spoke for -- I spoke last Wednesday April 13th at Executive Policy Committee in City Hall against the $7 million water park at the Forks and my question there is, is this water park across the street from Mayor Sam Katz's baseball team? And I would like to…where are we going to park the cars? Where they park across the fields there now? Across the water, there's not room there now. So, if you -- close off all that, then how on earth are you going to manage? And it doesn't make sense to me. Where I would like to see this park -- or a water park here is at the Old Exhibition Grounds, north of Polo Park. Polo Park is full of people all the time and it's right beside the Bomber's stadium. I like, really like the way it is now and I'm hoping that things are going to change. Prior to the election of 2010, Mayor Sam Katz made us a promise he would sell off his baseball team because of a conflict of interest but he has never done that. Shame. Prior to the last election he promised he wouldn't raise the…

Mr. Speaker: Sir that's got nothing to do with the issue with the water park, so I'll ask you to make your comments in that regard.

Ken Guilford: Okay. There are many reasons not to spend $10 million on a park. We need more grass space. I am for green grass, space. Let's do it. The space should be market gardens, for fairs, aboriginal activities like Pow Wows, etcetera. There are a lot of hotels in downtown Winnipeg and that maybe rejuvenated more and made in good condition. We need another Art Space like the one on Broadway and Young or larger. I watched a film last Sunday, April 15 about the Art Space on Broadway and Young. It was a good film; one may do things in a small space. We need another one, why not build it at the Forks. I'd like to see one with more space. I'd like to see the water park built, I said that already. It should be a recreation centre built along similar land like the one by McGregor Street and it should be more a place in the Forks where people may hire bicycles for a reasonable rate and even people on fixed income may rent a bicycle. And what we need is to renovate existing hotels so anyone can rent rooms from them.

In conclusion, it's my firm belief that we do not need a $7 million water park at the Forks. Too many people listen to others and do what they say, when I speak, I put a lot of thought into what I say and do. And for the most part, I respect what others are saying and enjoy speaking and hope others will do what I do. It's not easy, I get nervous sometimes when I'm speaking and I understand people if they do not wish to speak, they can also hand in a submission or a report to City Hall. Thank you, Ken Guilford.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Mr. Guilford. We will have questions for all the folks against at the same time. So if you would like to remain in the holding area. Colin Craig, the Canadian Taxpayers Federation. Mr. Craig, You have 5 minutes.

Colin Craig: Well, thank you for the opportunity to speak here today. It looks like the water park proposal's going to be shelved at least for at least a little while, but hopefully I can provide you with some food for thought as you consider this Item going forward. And I would like to begin with a quote from the Mayor's Office from a news release from June 3, 2009. In it the Mayor notes and I quote "Winnipeggers have made it very clear what their priorities are. Fix our neglected roads and bridges and improve public safety. Another gem comes from a July 23rd, 2010 news release from the Mayor's Office, "Winnipeg's infrastructure is in need of much improvement. We all hear about it and notice more each day. It's time we get to work on these projects and give Winnipeggers the peace of mind that their streets and bridges will not fall further into decay." Now I'm not just trying to pick on the Mayor here today. It's probably fair to say that at one point or another just about everyone around the Council table has suggested that the City does not have enough money to pay for its existing infrastructure deficit. To ask for more money from another level of government, while giving private company money to build a water park, well that's irresponsible. To give private business money to build a water park while our roads and bridges are falling apart, that's like buying a big screen TV and putting it in a living-room that has a leaky roof. As the Mayor said, it's time for the City to focus on its priorities. Not to mention the fact that governments shouldn't subsidies businesses. Business should be able to stand on their own two feet and if there is a demand for a certain type of service, eventually the market will respond.

That's exactly what we're seeing happen. In fact this week, in the Winnipeg Sun it was noted that a second water park proposal is looking to move forward without any government money. The bottom line is that if the city eventually proceeds with the $7 million subsidy, it's going to dramatically reduce its credibility when it comes to claiming that it does not have money to meet its funding challenges. Now, it's no secret that many of our roads out there are absolutely embarrassing. Everyone can agree with that, and I understand that the $7 million in question is earmarked for recreation purposes but I'm also a believer in the saying, if there's a will, there's a way. Certainly the city could find a way to shuffle the money around so that it could increase it's road repair budget by $7 million. Some will suggest that $7 million won't do anything but that type of thinking is small minded and with that type of thinking, the city's never going to get anywhere. I asked the City of Winnipeg's Public Works Department, last year for the cost of fixing the average residential street in Winnipeg. And they directed me to Atwood Street in Transcona. 500-meters on that street had just received an asphalt overlay for $350,000. Divide $350,000 into $7 million and 20 residential streets around town could receive some much needed tender loving care with the $7 million that you are contemplating today. Put a few other luxury project on ice and you can do even more to fix our crumbling infrastructure. Now, if you have the option that the funds can't be shuffled, well consider July 2009 Report to Council, that claims the City has a $277 million infrastructure deficit for recreation facilities alone. No doubt many of you know firsthand of a city library, arena, park or community club in your ward that could use some tender loving care. Of course there's also the matter of public access to the facility in question. How do you ensure that the public actually has access to the facility or what its rates will be? Media reports have indicated that passes will be provided to low income children but who decides what the threshold is for low income? And what about other families? After all, property taxes are going up, school taxes are going up, gas taxes are going up, sales taxes are going up, Hydro bills are going up. We just saw garbage collection fees go up. Frontage levies went up. Birth Certificates went up, Death Certificates went up and a whole bunch of other taxes and fees, they're all going up. Taxpayers out there are really feeling the pinch. And another important question, how many around the Council table picked up the phone to call Fun Mountain? After all that's an existing water park within the perimeter here in Winnipeg. And I know the answer to that question because I called Fun Mountain. Credibly they told me they haven't received a single phone call or email from anyone on Council and not a single bureaucrat. Now, some of you around the Council table have businesses on the side. What would you think if you woke up one day and read in the newspaper that tax dollars were going to be used to fund a new competitor for your business? I suspect many of you would not be pleased to learn such news. Finally there's the little matter of the parcel of land in question and how it's being sold off without being going to the open market to determine its actual value. That one is a no brainer. If you want to know the true value of it, you let everyone know it's for sale and accept bids for it and I'll conclude my comments given that the clock has ran out. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Mr. Craig. Dave Sauer. Are you with us Dave? There he is.

Dave Sauer: Good afternoon City Councillors.

Mr. Speaker: 5 minutes sir.

Dave Sauer: Colin and I were just talking about how it's interesting how the Winnipeg Labour Council and the Canadian Taxpayer Federation are agreeing on something. So, like, good on you Colin. Yeah. Absolutely yes, absolutely. So, I just want to thank the Councillors and the Mayor, well, not here today, but in general, for allowing the Winnipeg Labour Council to come out and address Council. We have 72 affiliated unions here in the City and we're the political and the social voice of workers here in the City. That's what our by-laws state. So, I'm going to be coming at both angles on this issue. First and foremost, we are here to speak out against the water park and the use of $7 million in public funds for a private institution down at the Forks. At the Forks Historic Site. So let's just think really clearly where this money originally came out of, it was for Rapid Transit. That's an essential service that we need to have here in this City. We're one of the only cities of our size that does not have a functioning Rapid Transit system or at least a very efficient one. We need a Rapid Transit System. Now I want to just touch on this quite heavily because we need investment in greener technologies and sustainability. We need to be a more sustainable City. I'm going to reference a March 5 Committee Meeting of the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Committee and I know Councillor Sharma and Gerbasi and Mayes and Vandal were there and they saw this young gentleman. I can only call him Mr. T, Tea, because that's the only T-shirt that he was wearing, I didn't get a chance to speak to him but he spoke very passionately about why we needed to have a Rapid Transit System and the necessity of making sure that we have a greener future for our children and he was talking in reference to his nieces. Now this is important for me because today happens to be my 2-year-old niece Ella's birthday. Now, she actually had her birthday actually on Earth Day, three days ago, her party. She'll be 30 years old in 2040 and she'll be 40 in 2050 that's when the worst effects of climate change are going to start to manifest themselves. We need to move on this issue. You all have children, at least most of you do. You all know what they're going to be going through in the future. I think if you look at climate change, the defeat of the Wild Rose recently in Alberta and its climate change policies, it's done. The climate change denial is done; we need to get moving on this issue. Please stop hitting the snooze button on green issues. We can't do it any longer; second, the infrastructure deficit that was cited by the

Canadian Taxpayers Federation. $3.8 billion infrastructure deficit and we want to go and put 7 million into a hotel and water park down at the forks. Again, that's irresponsible. Infrastructure, roads, sidewalks, community centres, arenas and I know Councillor Orlikow was bringing forward a proposal on this when he was at EPC last week to talk about maybe dividing up the 7 million to existing community centres. That's not a bad idea, but anything but putting it into a water park. Third, recent budget fee increases that we saw in the Operating Budget and the $13 million in Vacancy Management; 7 million could half that. When we have a $13 million Vacancy Management issue, we are not getting services to the citizens of Winnipeg, so we need to make sure that, if we're going to use 7 million, maybe that's another option that we use. The current economic crisis is calling for lean times all over the place. It's a continuous drum beat in the media. Why are we doing this then? Why would $7 million go to a private Water park and hotel? We have issues that we need to deal with in here. Some of our other existing -- or sorry, some of our other concerns we have with this. One, the timing, we haven't had a significant review of all the plans that are before City Council. I know Councillor Gerbasi yesterday outlined a lot of that in her Free Press article and I know that, last week at EPC, Councillor Mayes called for maybe an additional 60 days to review all of this, so we need timing on our side and it is not on our side. The location, this is the Forks Historic Site. It is the landmark of Winnipeg. Proponents argue, that you know a water park might compliment the area because is there's a baseball park there already and a skateboard park. I see those as different. A baseball diamond is part of our culture here; it sustains the Goldeyes, which is part of the sports culture we have in the City, along with the Jets and the Bombers. So that's an important institution in that right and should be treated differently. The skateboard park, this is interesting thing because I believe it's a training ground. Some people think that it's just thugs going to skate board, but I don't, I think this is a training ground for the future Tony Hawkes we might be having out there. Tony Hawke even visited that site. That's important. I also see it as a… 15 seconds, okay, I've got to wrap this up. Going on and on and on. In short, please, do not support this water park. I could go on for quite at length and I am being cut off so I appreciate the timing on this but please don't support this. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Dave. Do we have any questions? Okay, Paula Havixbeck, Councillor Havixbeck, Councillor Swandel?

Councillor Swandel: For Mr. Craig and maybe to Mr. Sauer, I think you made reference to the financial aspects of this, just wondering if you've done any research on how many millions of dollars are currently leaving our city to places like Steinbach, Portage la Prairie, Grand Forks, I think there's one Maple Grove in Minnesota for these types of activities and what the measure of that spending might be?

David Sauer: You know, I'm not sure what the figure is. I don't know what the figure is for the number of people that go down to Minneapolis to see a Major League Baseball game or see a Vikings game or see all kinds of other amenities and attractions that Winnipeg doesn't have, but certainly we can lure people to Winnipeg based on other things that we have going for us here.

Councillor Swandel: I was trying to get a sense of whether or not you considered the total financial implication and the other piece is, the value of what amenities like this, what they leverage as an attraction overall, as part of of the bigger picture of attractions to our City to getting people to come here. Never mind the loss but the attractions, what value that might be in the economy and maybe also on the tax side, how much taxes would be gained over the life of something like this.

David Sauer: There is certainly also an economic benefit of leaving money in people's pockets and letting them drive economic growth and in fact, we're seeing, as I mentioned earlier in the Winnipeg Sun, it's talking about a private sector water park coming to Winnipeg without any subsidies. Why on earth would Council say one day, that it has no money to pay for existing priorities and not wait to find out what's happening with that other proposal. You could get a water park here for nothing and that's what we think is important as let the private sector handle private sector responsibilities and let the public sector handle core responsibilities. There's also a, I see where you're going with the economic arguments. I think what's also important is how many people come to Winnipeg and leave shocked and embarrassed at the road conditions that we have here? Or walk into a community club and see a bucket on the ground collecting water from the roof/ That has an implication as well. And what we're saying is that at the very least, take a time out for a short period and focus in on the basics. Fix the leaky roof first, before you even talk about putting in a big screen TV underneath it.

Mr. Speaker: Your third question?

Councillor Swandel: Colin, I was really just asking you, but you come forward here, you make these representations and I just want to make sure that you've considered these important financial pieces before you just come forward and put forward the rhetoric that your organization is so known for. The 9 second sound bite kind of stuff and political slogans stuff . These are important components when you are looking at the finances of something like this. I just wanted to know if you'd actually considered them and I'm getting the sense you haven't.

David Sauer: We have considered them but one thing that I didn't notice in the city's proposal were the same numbers that you're asking for.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, any other questions? Councillor Havixbeck?

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, stay there Colin, these ones are for you and just further to that, are you aware that all of Grand Forks, Steinbach, Portage, West Edmonton Mall water parks, all have public funding and needed public funding to get going?

Colin Craig: No I am not aware of that, but again, you know the city has a whole bunch of basic facilities that it should be funding and the city continuously goes out into the media and claims it does not have enough money to pay for those facilities. It's a very, very hard argument to raise property taxes this year on the people of Winnipeg and then say that you're going to give $7 million to a private business to build a water park, it's a very tough pill to swallow, and just on that note, just because one jurisdiction proceeds with bad public policy, it doesn't mean Winnipeg should follow suit.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Havixbeck: Okay, I'm just trying to get a sense of what level of research, same as Councillor Swandel and I'm not getting a strong sense of research about what other water parks do. I mean, Grand Forks, for example, is subsidized to the same amount of money that we're looking at here. Grand Forks is a much smaller city. Are you aware that this may generate somewhere in the neighbourhood of one and a half to $2 million of municipal tax revenue on an annual basis and that going forward 25 years looking out with the voucher system, over whatever the access agreement will look like, that's over $2 million per year, in direct benefits to the City. Would you not be in agreement with something that put that money into infrastructure?

Colin Craig: I guess I would say two things. Again, first of all, again this week, we saw reports that a water park could proceed in this city without any money. Why on earth would Council consider spending $7 million of scarce resources towards funding a water park if you can get one for free.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Havixbeck: Further to that, where is that plan exactly? Because I've heard it's going to be in the Seasons of Tuxedos. I'm the area Councillor. I've talked to the administration. No one in the City of Winnipeg is working with any developer as of yesterday evening. So where is that plan?

Colin Craig: I don't know where the plan is. That's not my responsibility to know where it is, but at the same time, it's not up to the City of Winnipeg to be going out and subsidizing private businesses. That's not the role. There are plenty of different amenities, in others jurisdictions, that we don't have here. We don't have a Major League Baseball team, we don't, we don't have an NFL team, we don't have an NBA team, we don't have all kinds of other things that people like about other jurisdictions but we have plenty other good things going on here. And when you leave more money in the taxpayers' pockets, that can drive economic growth as well and that type of argument never seems to come forward in city reports either. What is the benefit of fixing up the embarrassing conditions of our roads, so that Winnipeg isn't known as being a pothole city? What is the economic benefit of addressing the crime problem, something that plagues this city and that's something that Winnipeg is developing a terrible reputation for. There's a huge economic benefit of Winnipeg having, making these positive stories rather than these other issues and that's the type of thing that we should see in Council reports too, instead of simply coming up with the numbers to support spending public funds on private businesses.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. The City of Winnipeg in its Adopted 2012 Operating Budget is budgeted $8.813 million in 2012 for aquatic programming. Should we be in the business at all?

Colin Craig: Sorry for which program?

Councillor Browaty: Aquatics, swimming pools, wading pools, spray pads and outdoor pools.

Colin Craig: Sorry, I didn't hear what you said there. If you go back to the 06 or 2007 Economic Opportunity Commission Report that noted that if the city looks at partnerships with the private sector; specifically groups like the Y.M.C.A. you can save millions and millions of dollars. I think there's a huge opportunity there for the city to look at partnerships in that area and save a substantial amount of money. We haven't really seen any movement in that

direction, so, that would be something that's worth looking at. Beyond aquatic facilities, as I have mentioned there are some basic recreation facilities that I think everyone would agree that the city has a role in funding, things like community clubs and it's my understanding that there's a sizeable hole there in terms of the money that community clubs need, to be brought up to more appropriate conditions.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Browaty: So, would your organization think it would be more appropriate to take one of our 13 existing in-door pools and upgrade it to the modern standards of aquatic leisure centres that you see in other cities like Calgary even Steinbach or Portage la Prairie?

Colin Craig: No. I think the…what's more appropriate is to focus in on the absolute priorities. As I mentioned our roads out there are falling apart. Everyone would agree with that. Everyone says that roads need to become a priority in terms of how public funds are being spent. That's not happening. So many different projects keep getting bumped ahead of repairing our roads and then everyone stands around and says well my goodness, look at the conditions of our roads, they're terrible. Well at some point if you want the roads to become more drivable, you have to put money into them and you have to fix them up. When it comes to recreation facilities, it's the same thing. We can sit around and complain about community clubs having leaky roofs and needing other necessary upgrades or we can actually put city funds into it. So it's a hard pill to swallow for people to see their property taxes rises, rising to pay for something that is a luxury good. We haven't had a water park in Winnipeg for -- well, never. I think a number of Winnipeggers have turned out okay without having a water park. As I mentioned too, it looks like eventually a water park will come here without public funds because there is a demand for it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel. You have 45 seconds.

Councillor Swandel: Just a few seconds here, are you aware Colin, that in the last five or six years, the city has spent over 75 million on other aquatics and recreation-related capital projects and hundreds of millions of dollars on roads and bridges?

Colin Craig: Yes. I mean the city routinely spends money on infrastructure. The city also routinely goes out into the media and suggests it does not have enough money to pay for its existing infrastructure deficit. As I mentioned, the city report in 2009 says that there's $277 million worth of recreation facilities that are going to need money and the city takes numbers like that and then goes to the Province and the Feds, and says, hey, we need more money but at the same time, you're raising taxes and you're trying to spend money on a water park. It's a luxury that we can't afford and that's my point. And we might be able to sit down and look at that $277 million figure that represents the recreation component alone and say, well this part really isn't part of it and this one isn't necessary. I think we could probably reduce that figure but I don't doubt there are facilities around town that actually do need resources and those would be a legitimate expenditure on behalf of Council.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Colin Craig. And thank you other members of the delegates. Is Mr. Guilford going to -- Councillors it has been suggested to me that in the interest…Yes? No, there were no questions for you, sir. Thank you. So, are you going to take the elevator?

Alright, it's been suggested to me that in the situation that the Mayor is not in the Chamber, that we should move the Downtown Development Heritage and River Bank Management Committee forward and deal with the issue at this point so.

Councillor Gerbasi: Councillor Pagtakhan just left the room and probably not knowing you were going to change the order, so before we do anything, can we just make sure all Councillors are aware if you are changing anything. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Should we ask one of the Commissionaires to go find Councillor Pagtakhan? Mr. Guilford still has to leave the chambers, so, here he comes. All right, is that the will of the chamber? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. So we will ask Councillor Swandel to bring the Report on Downtown Development.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE
AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT DATED APRIL 13, 2012**

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I'll introduce the Report and move Item 2; I believe it is; is the Item that we'll probably have concurrence on. I understand there is a motion on Item 2? Well if then it's going to get stood down as well, then…Item 1 which is easement, I'll move Item 1 Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Swandel: On Item 2, Mr. Speaker, once again, we didn't get to suspend the rules. The proponent has made a request here, of us here, so they can get more information to us. Which is a respectful thing to do I believe, to have that conversation before we start doing anything else with this. That's our standard practice when a proponent makes a request like this, that we do give them time to put forward more information and allow them the opportunity to put forward more information. So out of respect for the people that we do business with and these developers who are trying to come into our town to do business, I'm just asking like in so many cases, we allow them the opportunity to meet with Councillors and provide more information before we do anything either killing it or putting restrictions on it. Not referral just a layover for 30 to 60 days, which is their letter. They made a request to get more information to us which is what I wanted to do in the beginning before we got into all of us, which is why I was trying to suspend the rules. It's their request and I believe out of respect for them and just proper business decorum, we should honour that request. So, I'm asking for you to do that and to deal with it respectfully. That's the motion that I have.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Being that it's a verbal motion, there's no debate on it, so I'll call the question. Recorded vote. All those in favour please rise, referring this for -- for laying it over, 60 days. Thank you. All those in favour?

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas:

Councillors Fielding, Havixbeck, Swandel, Wyatt.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed please rise.

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Gerbasi, Mayes, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Sharma, Smith, Steen, Vandal, Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman.

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

Mr. Speaker: The motion to layover is denied. Can you please introduce the clause, Councillor Swandel.

Item 2 – Results of Expression of Interest and Qualifications for an Indoor Water Park Facility

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the clause. I don't know where we're going. I see we have a motion on the clause as well. I thought -- I'm not really that prepared to speak on this because I thought that this Council would have conducted itself a little more respectfully than what we just did. I encourage you all to go to the Forks website maybe before you speak, take a look at its vision and mandate so you understand that the purpose of that site is. There are a number of things we want to put forward here and we need to talk about. There are some very basic issues like the financial piece, which we certainly can, you've got a sense from the questions that went back and forth here; that there is a financial argument that can be made here of a benefit to the City. Not just the property tax, business tax and accommodation tax perspective, but also an amenity like this can add for our City and what it can leverage. We know that design is probably the biggest challenge that we have. I thought we had put in place, a pretty good condition, as far as how we deal with that design. We know that even before we get the design, there's going to be some archaeological digging that has to happen. You can't really ask people to put something in a certain place before you know what the archeological impacts of that might be. We know that we're already in conversations with both the Forks and the Human Rights Museum, to get them involved in the design process. The significance of the site, the iconic architecture of the Human Rights Museum and just tying into the site and making this work from a visual perspective and continuity with what's existing. We know we need to engage those stakeholders and that will be done. In addition, the Urban Design Advisory Committee will be involved. And that Urban Design Advisory Committee is made up of 3 prominent architects in the City of Winnipeg, 3 prominent

landscape architects in the City of Winnipeg and an individual from our Planning Department and I believe also the head of CentreVenture. I like this idea of the proponent getting a chance to speak with us before we start putting any further restrictions on this. We certainly can put these restrictions on going forward if you so desire. But to do it without talking to the proponent and understanding whether they might have any deal-breaking impacts, I think is… when you have the opportunity to have a conversation before you do that, you should do that. And one of the conditions I was going to talk about today adding even just having them here for a Council seminar but they are actually asking to go further than that and provide hopefully what sounds like a lot more information as far as what they plan exactly to do. And not just in how they're going to take on the design challenges but also with the Public Access Agreement. I think there has been a lot of misinformation out there and a lot of politicizing. We've seen this thing characterized as a road side motel and we've seen it characterized as an outdoor water park, we've seen it characterized as being at the Forks proper site where the existing buildings are. None of that is true. We know that we can put the protections in place to ensure that we do this properly. And we can even strengthen that before we deal with this by allowing these proponents to come forward and meet with us. I don't know what signal this says to the rest of the world; when we're not even decent enough to say yes, we want to allow you the opportunity to come and provide more information before we start assuming that things are wrong. And I think it's a challenge that we're going to have to deal with going forward. You know, the Forks site itself has got development plans on its website, development plans that include on the lands that are actually right across from the Human Museum, Human Rights Museum. This is actually kiddy-corner to the Human Rights Museum and if you look at this site, buildings would probably be situated as far as 7 or 800 feet away from the Museum. But in close proximity, and if you look at your design plans, actually right up on the road, are some development plans at the Forks that include mixed use residential. There're some very early concept drawings there, which I think even if you get someone to come forward in a plan right now is what you would get as early concept drawings which -- and you know, until you have a plan or until you've got some detailed discussion and figure out some of the site challenges, including archeological and maybe even the environmental and the soil conditions, you're not even going to be able to say where that building might go and that's why you need to have those conversations before you have any kind of detailed plan. And I would hope that all of you are listening to what I'm saying, rather than just waiting to stand up and make your political arguments. But listen to what I'm saying. Understand there are ways to do this. There are ways to be at the table, treat these people respectfully. They're not bad people, for some reason we were trying to demonize them out there. I don't know why. We're not saying anybody in particular here but there has been this demonization. You know you see the Taxpayers Federation coming forward with their rhetoric; totally superficial, unprepared. We know that we do things with ballots that we're constantly doing this juggling act. You could say on any day you want, why did we put money into roads when we need more money in crime. Why would we put money into community centres when we need more money in roads? And that's the balancing act that Council does. That's what we get elected to do. Council made a decision and I think it might have been unanimous a number of years ago, to spend $7 million to attract a water park. And that decision's been made. So let's not fall into the rhetoric of the Taxpayers Federation. We know what Colin's role is and he does a good job of it, but take it for what it is, it is superficial rhetoric. It has no depth and there isn't a lot of detail there, as you could, what you get is, is that sort of sound bite rhetoric back that doesn't really do anything. And on the financial side, seriously consider what it means. I listened to someone this morning on the radio talk, they are worried about the size because when they go down to Grand Forks on a long weekend, the place is so packed they consider it as having too many people in it and those too many people are Winnipeggers. And I don't know what it is, whether it's a hundred, five hundred but if each one of those families spends a thousand dollars when they go down there, on any long weekend or maybe even it's on any given weekend, that's a lot of money leaving our City. And that money could stay here and be part of our economy and be a part of creating jobs and be a part of creating taxes. And I think you've got to consider this. You've got to consider the financial implications as well. You know, I think I've touched on most of the points and I'll probably in closing get into it. I don't know, I guess I could speak to the motion when it gets put on the table and we'll go from there. But, I mean there are so many reasons why this site is appropriate, just from the mandate of the Human Rights Museum on down to the fact that is it actually at the Forks or on green space of the Forks, so people really need to realize this is on the gravel parking lot up against the high line railroad track. This is not a Super 8 Motel, this is not an outdoor water park, it is not a building with tubes coming out of it. At the end of the day, what it will be is a building. This will take place inside a building, and we will have architectural control over that. So we have the ability to deal with all of these issues of design, financial, the Public Access Agreement which will be tens of thousands of people on an annual basis having access to a site like this, that they might not ever have had access to in their lives. So, these things are all positives. We can certainly handle this. And if we just -- you know, I can very easily deal with the issues of design on the site, as long as people get away from this rhetoric of Super 8 Motel or roadside motel. This is not what we're talking about here. And if you look at the pictures that are on the Forks site of what some of their early concept pictures are of what they would like to do in this location it's more adjacent to the Human Rights Museum, that's the type of architect people are looking for, then let's say that through our design process. We don't need to get into making this such a complicated process -- I read somewhere early on when I was looking back at some of the other designs or some of the other deals that were done by the City involving the private sector and one of the things that people said was, the reason why investors from outside of the City didn't like to come here at that time is, and it was a number of years ago was that they had to jump through so many approval processes that it frustrated them

and so money stopped coming to our town. Development stopped coming to our town, opportunity stopped coming to our town. This represents development, this represents opportunity. It's a big feather in our cap as far as adding to the overall package of downtown and driving people to our downtown and I think we've got to do a little better job of getting the message out there and get the proponent in here, talk with them.

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

Councillor Swandel: And figure out how we do a better job of communicating to the public, that we have the ability to control this properly. I encourage that hopefully at the end of this, we'll find a way to lay this over for the 60 days that have been requested. You guys got to seriously treat these people with respect and I don't know why you all sit there in the way you did. I'm a little taken aback by it. It's the respect that we should show anybody that asks for that type of consideration in this Chamber. So, let's listen to the debate and I'll have some further comments at the end.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Moved by Councillor Vandal,
Seconded by Councillor Sharma,

WHEREAS any development at or near the Forks must meet extraordinary design standards;

AND WHEREAS there has been tremendous public interest and concern over the proposed water park at the Parcel 4 location;

AND WHEREAS there is a substantial financial public investment in the proposed water park;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg currently does not have a preliminary design, site plan, or an architectural rendering of the proposed water park / hotel / parkade on Parcel 4 by Canalta hotels;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 2 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management be referred to the administration with instruction for the City of Winnipeg to engage the proponent for:

1) Substantial design plans for the Water park, hotels, and Parkade at said location before any Council decision on the $ 7 million public investment is voted on.

2) Site plans on the proposed location of all buildings on parcel 4 including access and egress for the site.

3) Finalized Public access agreement between the City of Winnipeg and Canalta Hotels.

4) Consultation with the Forks / North Portage Corporation and the Human Rights Museum and public consultation on the design and site plans.

Councillor Vandal: I don't actually disagree with a lot of what Councillor Swandel says except for the part that this is somehow treating the developer disrespectfully. In fact the motion to layover in my motion to refer it all back are very similar, except I don't want to lay it over and have the developer come in and have a Council seminar and blue sky on what could be. I want to refer it back and I want to bring back very specific information about what we're talking about, Mr. Speaker, because our Achilles' heel in this whole development is that we don't have any information. And I don't have to be sold on the potential benefits of this. I think young families at the Forks is an excellent thing. Going to the MTYP, the Children's Museum, old St. Boniface, having lunch at the Forks. But when I talk to my constituents and I've talked to hundreds of constituents in a very concentrated consultation, let me call it that, concentrated consultation, there's an extra ordinary level of concern with what we're doing. People want to know, do you have a sketch? Well we don't have a sketch. Do you know what the agreements going to look like with the access? Well we know that the overriding guarantee is but we don't know how it's going to be administered. So I think that the time is right, to let the proponent make the case, to actually spend a few dollars, and the motion is clear, it's very succinct, it's direct, it's unambiguous, That "Therefore let it be Resolved " is our number one. Substantial design plans for the water park, hotels, parkade at parcel 4, said location, before any decision on the $7 million public investment is voted on. Number 2, site plans for the proposed location of all buildings. We should know where the hotels will be sited, where the water park be sited, where the parkade will be sited on Parcel 4. Where the access and egress will be. Finalize Public Access Agreement between the City and Canalta. There's clearly Mr. Speaker, a concern about how this is going to be managed. And number 4, consultations with the Forks North Portage, consultations with the Human Rights Museum, and consultations with the general public on where we're going with this site, Mr. Speaker. I

think back to some pretty heavy issues in the past 10 years and we've been burnt because we have not consulted the public to the degree that we should on a development that's this major. So I don't think it's unreasonable, I certainly don't think it's disrespectful for our administration to go back to the developer and say, can you get all of this back to Council? Do some homework. Show us where the buildings are going to be; show us what they're going to look like, show us what the Access Agreement is going to be and I'm not touching the archeological issue because I'm not quite sure on the process with that and I believe that's a Federal requirement and consult with your neighbours on where this could be. That's certainly not disrespectful, I think that's just due diligence on our part. I think the public have sent us a clear message; that we need to be careful here. We need to do our homework and that is all that the motion to refer back with very specific instructions to come back is doing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Vandal. So what we will do is discuss both the original clause and the motion that we've just been presented, Motion 3 as we go forward. And we will then close in a reverse order. So Councillor Vandal will close, followed by Councillor Swandel. So the first speaker, I will invite Councillor Gerbasi to present for ten minutes.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Most people agree that having a water park in Winnipeg would be a positive thing. However, what we as a Council are deciding this week, is what we were deciding, now we're considering giving it more time, to get more information. But what Council must decide is whether this is the right proposal in the right location and under the right terms. And my position has been clear. The proposal as it stands with the information that we have now is unacceptable, inadequate and it begs answers to a whole lot of unanswered questions. Councillor Vandal's motion is positive as it asks for some of the answers to some very significant questions. And I think Council must have that information before any decision is made. It's definitely a step in the right direction. However, I do want to put some comments on the record about some questions as well that it doesn't answer -- doesn't ask for. And I hope that those questions will be taken under advisement if this motion does pass and that is the administration and whoever is working with the developer can try to get all of our questions answered.

The land in question across from the Human Rights Museum is likely the most valuable piece of land the City owns and a decision on such a crucial piece of land, that impacts the heart of our City, should have had a rigorous planning process which should have included the downtown stakeholders such as the Forks, the Human Rights Museum and others and by consultation I don't mean a phone call at eleven o'clock at night, I mean a consultation. Downtown stakeholders are not in a position to speak their true thoughts on this kind of proposal the way it's been presented in the media as a political issue. They rely on the City's favour and it's pretty clear no one really asked them to date to be part of this process. People want to see something world class at a site of this stature. The Esplanade Riel is world class. The Human Rights Museum is world class; the skateboard park is world class. We have little reason at this stage to be satisfied, that this small town motel company which is what their record is; if you look at their website of what their other developments are like, that's all we have to go on. There's questions; whether they can produce a product which with architectural standards or quality that is up to par with what should be expected at this location. Now some people are against all future development at this site. I would -- I am not one of those people. I would like to see this piece of land put to a higher use than a gravel parking lot. But whatever development is going to happen there; should be up to the level of quality and stature that of a world class city. And I also want to see a well-planned project that is a complement to the heart of our city, our Forks and our downtown and addresses issues such as that will be raised if there actually is consultation. Council is being asked to approve this without even seeing a basic conceptual sketch, as Councillor Vandal just said; which is surprising for a project of this magnitude. There were fewer details required for this proposal, than if you wanted to get an approval for a driveway and there is $7 million of public money on the line. There is something wrong with that picture. Design review and the plan approval process are not tools that can answer the larger fundamental land use questions; neither can these tools ensure a level of esthetics that is required for a location across from a world class piece of architecture. Once this is approved there is only so much design review you can do to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. Especially if the developer pleads as they often do that the requirements are cost prohibitive. And another issue is the details of the Public Access Agreement. They are not clear. We have been told that the deal, a deal, has not yet been negotiated. We've also been told; it's confidential; this is absurd. The agreement should be final and scrutinized before Council gives the go ahead which, Councillor Vandal's motion does ask for. The CanadInn proposal that was previous, was 66,000 square feet at Polo Park and that fell through because I don't know why, some have said it's because they couldn't sort out the Public Access Agreement. If that was the reason, we have reason to be concerned and we need those questions answered about why it's so difficult to conclude such an agreement. Is the process of access for all citizens going to be fair and inclusive? Will the working poor have access if they don't utilized social agencies? Will they have to come crawling to Community Services for a fee waiver and plead poverty to get a voucher? Many folks will never do that. In any case, members of Council should be able to see the final Public Access Agreement before anyone votes for or against a $7 million subsidy for a project like this. The idea of having a world class water park is something a lot of people like. But it's… again I just get back to the point that it has to be the right deal, the right plan, the right way and if there's going to be a public subsidy involved there has to be information that that money is being well spent. Now, according to a letter…there's some other questions; that have not yet been answered which I have

referred to earlier; which I would like to have answered from the administration. According to a letter from Canalta Hotels published on the City website; there's an undisclosed group of local investors involved. When questioned at the Downtown Committee; I asked these questions and I was told; they didn't know who they were, that wasn't going to be provided, I'm not sure. I have not been able to get that answer and I think that's more information that we should be able to have as Council. We should know who the investors are. The land being sold for this project never went out to public offer. I think that's disappointing. It's possible that the land could be sold for more money or for a more suitable project. If this project proceeds that is something we will never know. There is a question about the size of the water park, whether it's large enough to be a world class park at 50,000 square feet, when the Expression of Interest that went out, the minimum requirements were 55 to 70, so it doesn't even meet the minimum requirements of the Expression of Interest and this is an unsolicited offer. You know, so, even Ty Tran is settling for this water park as he said earlier in his presentation. Expectations were raised when the water park was first talked about that this would be world class not mediocre. We're told the $7 million grant will be in exchange for public access vouchers to kids in need, but vouchers don't cost anything if they are given out when the water park has excess capacity. So really it's a grant; is more of a subsidy, to make the project feasible, then, we need to know if that subsidy is really needed. And there has been no business case or analysis to show that this subsidy is needed. Maybe it is but that should have been part of any administration report, so I would like that information as well. Before -- that should have been part of this…before we even had a vote on this. And we've heard rumours that Seasons of Tuxedo near IKEA might be planning to build a water park. We don't know if that's true, but it would be nice to know. It would be nice to have that investigated and have those discussions if a private sector water park is being built, perhaps we can find a better way to subsidize access to recreation in our city. I'm missing a page of my speech, do I have time to get it, I'm sorry. I had computer problems this morning. Just give me one more minute, on my clock, honestly it will take 2 seconds because I had an important thing I wanted to say in the end here. There we go. Sorry. Thank you for your indulgence. Just a moment, just when I'm getting momentum too, that always happens. Thank you very much. Right there. Just one second, oh, okay, I think I found it. Okay so thank you very much for your indulgence. I can't argue with Councillor Vandal's notion of sending this back to get further information. I'm certainly not committing that I'll be satisfied with that information but I'm certainly open to getting that information. I don't think anyone can criticize that because that's really something the public has been saying; is we need to know more and I do applaud Councillor Vandal and the other Councillors who…those of you who choose to open your mind and take the time to get more information when you've already put yourself out there and taken a position and I really admire and respect that. That's not an easy to do. You're showing that you're listening to your constituents and referring it back and asking for these questions is better than the risk of having it go forward as it is. But, I do want to say one final comment that I really believe that this water park proposal as it's been presented, is a file that's been seriously mishandled. And I think our CAO must be held accountable for that. The Mayor who has recused himself in the last part of this discussion, should also reconsider a leadership approach that has led to this public relations and public policy disaster which I really think this is, indeed.

Mr. Speaker: I just caution you, Councillor Gerbasi, that singling out individuals of the administration is not appropriate.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, well, I guess when I speak to that, the administration, I'm speaking to the…you know, you speak to the one in charge but that's all I was intending. I'm not intending to single out individual people but I'm not trying to single out any person, but I'm talking about accountability for a process. There has to be political and administrative accountability when things are mishandled and I think what I would suggest Council consider and EPC consider; which is the Audit Committee; that the Audit Committee consider asking for an audit of all major property and development transactions. It's been a long time since we've had one of those and I think it might clear up some of the concerns that this proposal has raised in the minds of many citizens and I just wanted to put those comments on the record as something for the Audit Committee to consider, but having said that, I will support Councillor Vandal's motion because it asks a number of the questions that I and many citizens and many Councillors have been asking. I thank him for having the courage to have a sober second thought here and even when he's put himself out there to support something, to listen to the people he represents and I think his constituents will thank him and admire him for having that courage. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Gerbasi. Who's next? Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: I just want to touch on a few points because I think there is a lot of misinformation. I find it incredibly disrespectful to somebody from outside of Winnipeg who has come forward to want to do business here. Part of our strategic objectives that we're working on is saying we are going to be open for business but we just shut the door on somebody who potentially wants to do business with us. The cost to come back with what we're asking is in the neighbourhood of a quarter of a million dollars. I am doubtful that this will go anywhere further. So instead of thanking Councillor Vandal who put forward this motion as Councillor Gerbasi just has done, I would say we should be thanking him for impeding another project in our city and it has incredibly frustrated-- I am incredibly frustrated with trying to move forward on getting major attractions to our city. There is a number of things though that I would like to

clarify that have not been reported properly in the media or have not been spelled out in the reports. But I have continually contacted our COO since Friday. Day and evening he has been available to all of us and he has been available to answer more questions. This option is open to everybody. So I particularly would like to thank him for the time he dedicated. At first blush my reaction was similar. It's little information, seems vague. Dig a little deeper. We're not doing our jobs if we're not digging deeper for some information and looking at what is going to make this something that can be a major attraction for our city. I quickly learned that this is a very sophisticated and I would argue it's an incredible opportunity for our city, about to walk away. I think there is a need for a reality check and actually what this water park, hotel and parking structure will contribute to the City of Winnipeg; such a tremendous attraction for downtown. It is outside of the Forks and the Forks and what they are working on in their plan; its downtown. I remember as a kid getting on the bus going downtown. We all did that. We went shopping there, went to our dentist appointments there or doctor appointments. It was a place to go. It was a hub and it was safer because of that, because of the people around there. Even went to movies, went to The Bay and Eaton's. We don't have that any more. We go to our suburb malls now essentially. It felt safe again, and this will contribute to more people being there. More people feeling safe. It will add to pedestrian, vehicular and transit traffic, yes, but it continues to make our city be more vibrant. The arguments that I don't like being around so many people at the Forks, that just -- the Forks is too busy, we want it to be busy. We want people to be shopping there and active and at a meeting place. I have heard concerns that the designs will be tacky. In fact, comments like unacceptable, begs questions, ask the questions. I think almost everybody was at the Council Seminar when we saw the designs in Las Vegas and Singapore. These were fantastic. Yes, albeit, many of the Canadian-based ones look much more like highway hotels but as a member of the Downtown Committee, I can assure you that if this architecture were not in keeping with what the Museum has already established there, I would reject it. To say that we have no control over this process is really absurd. We have the UDAK process which is very stringent and we have the Downtown Committee looking at it. That being said, any development close to the Forks needs to be undertaken carefully. This plan will be scrutinized and I understand that going forward, should we have had approval today, a consultation process was going to be starting with Jim August from the Forks, as well as representatives from the Museum. They would have input from the start. So, I think that's an important piece of information and everybody would have had access to that information if they would have asked the question. There is more development to come at the Forks; residential, another parkade. And I've heard issues around parking, yes, we're taking away a hundred stall unit gravel surface parking lot and Phase 2 of this project would be a 450 spot parkade. I don't see the loss here except for an eyesore. There have been comments about public money and about the Public Access Agreement and those pieces haven't quite been worked out but to not support a project from going forward because something has public money or an agreement hasn't worked out, I don't feel is a satisfactory reason. If you look at the future value of this money that we would be putting in and the returns, you are looking at somewhere in the $50 million mark. 50-60 million mark over the 25 year agreement. To further the argument we're spending our money elsewhere. I hadn't been to Grand Forks, I was in Grand Forks during spring break. I haven't been there since before the flood in 1997 because philosophically I believe we have everything here that we could possibly need to spend our money on and I know numerous parents who take their kids out of our city and spend that money, a thousand dollars Councillor Swandel said I would say, is probably in the ballpark. Why would we not want that money here in our city and spent here in businesses? And you know, public money was used in the Grand Forks CanadInns. They received a 5 year property tax exemption from municipal taxes, approximate value 3.5 million. A marketing agreement at about a million to be used for advertising and a gift of the land at about 1.4 million; no Public Access Agreement. If we don't have a Public Access Agreement, people will argue, people from whatever ward or whatever part of the city won't be allowed in because it's an exclusive club out of reach for many working people. Steinbach, 6.2 million project in 2000, 24,000 square feet, 100% publicly funded, no Public Access Agreement but kids under 5 years old are free. Other publicly funded ones include West Edmonton Mall, Mall of America, West Edmonton Mall told me that their funding structure was much more complex but it was in the neighbourhood of 70 million. So the people who say bigger need to recognize that bigger costs more; so all of these questions were answered by our administration. I don't know why people didn't feel -- I understand 6 Councillors contacted the COO and mine were in depth. Councillor Sharma's questions were in depth. I understand two Councillors asked whether the Mayor had a lease on the land. So the questions that are here are available for everyone to have answered. For people to say they didn't have the answers to their questions, I think is irrelevant. I think a decision was before us for here, for today, and it's our responsibility as representatives of the people to gather the information and not dismiss it because of a lack of information. And you know, certain other things have been taken out of context. For example, on page 10 of the EOI, I believe Councillor Gerbasi said minimum 70,000 square feet. The wording is a footprint of 55,000 to 70,000 square feet; I believe the wording was minimum. Investigation of the Seasons of Tuxedo, this issue keeps coming up. And I can't tell you the frustration I am having with this as the area Councillor. There is no plan. I am assured by the city that no one from the city is working on this. And I would hold the CAO accountable if that were not true. I have asked that as recently as this morning and nobody is working on another water park. So, to provide all this innuendo that something must be cooking, it strengthens the business case that there is a high demand for it, if it were true. But show me the plan. So in conclusion, I don't support Councillor Vandal's motion today. I think delay after delay, stalls our city from moving forward. We're being disrespectful to this person -- to this group; who has

come forward and all they've asked for is 60 days and to come back to us and I think that's an open and fair enough process. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of Councillor Vandal's motion. I would prefer to simply have this project voted down today but it appears the will of most of the Councillors I've talked to is to support that motion and I appreciate Councillor Vandal making that motion. What is this about specifically? Well, firstly, I'm glad to hear people saying today, the land is at the Forks. People talking about respect, I believe I was rebuked last week when I presented at EPC for saying it was at the Forks; I was told, no it's adjacent to the Forks, the developer and the documents we have before us says, they're going to purchase the property known as Lot 4 at the Forks. We've heard nothing but discussion today about of this being at the Forks. So it's Lot 4 at the Forks. What it isn't about today I think is this is not to me about the Mayor. The Mayor has recused himself, I think that's proper. I don't think there is any vote here as a referendum on the Mayor or some consideration of the Mayor's involvement. It's not about Shindico, to me it's not about whether it's Canalta or another hotel chain. This is about the proposal specifically at the Forks for this specific use. I am continually to be opposed to a water park at the Forks. I know we're sending this back for more information. When I spoke at EPC I favoured a delay so we could get more information and I think this is the best approach to trying to get some more information on this project. If as Councillor Havixbeck suggests that that's going to kill it, well frankly, I think given what I've seen of this project, that certainly is not proper for the Forks. It's been said that we should have asked for more information or you have enough information. Let's take a look at exactly what's being proposed here. We have got…we're going to be paid 6 million for the piece of land; we're going to give the land and 7 million back. So essentially we're giving the land and a million bucks to the proponent and what are we saying, you've got to have public access and what are details of that? We have none. We have absolutely no details on the public access even today and I don't want to misquote Councillor Havixbeck but I think she accurately said the vouchers are whatever it's going to be, we don't know. I called the public access a cockamamie scheme when I presented at EPC. I continue to stand by that comment. The main reason to look at this being downtown, the main reason was for it to have public access for lower income residents; yet we have no detail whatsoever on what that would be. We don't know if it's vouchers. We're told at EPC by administration; you won't know until we finalize the agreement and I think that's just unacceptable. If that's the main reason to have it at this location, is it's got to be downtown because we got to have public access but we have no details on whatsoever on what that access is going to be, I think that alone is reason to defeat the proposal. A lot of debate here; a lot of public presentation about water parks; again, this isn't a vote on are water parks good or bad. This isn't a vote on; it's putting $7 million towards a water park good or bad? This is a vote about the Forks' site specifically. If Canalta and water front products and water front products does seem to be a major league player in the water park business, if they came forward for a proposal in Elmwood or in Point Douglas that was workable, I think I would seriously consider that; seriously consider looking at the $7 million which we still have and see if that's a workable plan. But the idea of doing this at the Forks next to what is called the iconic Human Rights Museum at presentations of economic development in Winnipeg yesterday, the iconic Human Rights Museum and this is the amount of detail we have for something that's going in there, I think that's unacceptable. It's been said by Councillor Wyatt and I don't want to pick on Councillor Wyatt but he was in the papers today, well I think the opponents are sort of from the artsy fartsy crowd and I have to admit when I started on this side, I had some concerns, I had heard from retired judges, I heard from lawyer, I ran into some lawyers at the St. Vital Y who said, you've got to vote no on this, that you're doing the right thing. So I thought is it? Are these the opponents? No, I find this interesting this past week I was at the Glenwood Community Centre and the people on the executive said, you should oppose this, I was dropping off my sons at school the other day, the secretaries there said we are not opposed to a water park don't put it at the Forks. You're cramming that in. That's not the right place for it. And I was listening to the radio myself on the way in and there was concern on rock radio about the proposal not being big enough. As I'm sitting here I get an email from Forbes Road which is well south of the perimeter and not artsy fartsy territory; snowmobiling territory and the person saying; don't build it at the Forks. So, I'm not saying let's kill -- there is nothing wrong with the artsy fartsy community that Councillor Gerbasi's reminding me, but my larger point here is, I think there is a fairly broad section of the public opposed to this proposal and people have said, well you are opposing it for political reasons, we've got people who are Conservatives, N.D.P.ers, Liberals all opposing this. People who worked for me, people worked against me in my campaign are opposing this, so I think it's pretty broad sector of the public that's opposed to this and a pretty broad group in Council that's opposed to this. It isn't political, it isn't ideological. People may get there for different reasons but I certainly still think this is the wrong spot for that proposal. The idea that we should be spending the money on other uses, that maybe. Certainly, the Taxpayers Federation have said that. I was at an event at the St. Vital Curling Club the other night, the bartender said I'll pay for your drink and in return you try and fix the lanes and the roads in the ward and we'll be coming to that later, Councillor Fielding has an initiative on laneways but I was struck by that. This wasn't someone saying, I'll buy you a drink if get through that proposal at the Forks. I think that people who are from a broad section of my ward and across the city are opposed to this proposal. Sometimes we make mistakes here. Sometimes people back projects that don't work out. The Mayor at the State of the City talked about his financial backing of the pro basketball in Winnipeg and I remember being one of the 8 or 10 people in the

stands to see the Winnipeg Thunder play and it didn't work but it really didn't have any lasting negative impacts. When I was a School Trustee I probably should have voted for more “smart boards” in the classroom. I didn't but my mistake there didn't have any lasting impacts. I think if we make the mistake here and vote for this proposal we're going to have to live with it for 40, 50 years. We don't have a lot of information you would expect from any other developer or for any other proposal; so this is certainly not a correct use for this site. If we make a mistake here, it’s going to be there for decades. I think Councillor Steen, Councillor Sharma, others have really agonized over this and sought more information and I think the motion hopefully will go some way toward getting more information out, getting the public a chance to say this isn't the right place for this proposal. Maybe we will have a proposal from Canalta and water front products that’s in a different part of the city. Maybe we won't, but regardless I don’t think we are not under any obligation to vote for this. I do think we, it's proper for us to send this back and I appreciate the motion from Councillor Vandal, it doesn't force us to go up or down on this today. I think if this were, if were to have a proposal pass 8-7 for such an important site, I think that really would be regrettable. I think as a Council we can hopefully work together some more, see if there’s another proposal that might benefit. Maybe we want to put $7 million into it, maybe we don’t. I think that's a whole debate the unified Taxpayer Federation - Labour Council position is unusual to see those two groups speaking on the same issue. But that's a separate debate for a separate location. What we have before us today is the specifics of is the Forks the right place? I don't think it is. I think getting more information will buttress that position and I encourage other members of Council to vote in favour of the motion and make sure we don't walk out of here today having somehow approved a building that’s going to be there 30 or 40 years which certainly I don’t think is appropriate for the site. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. I rise – I’m not going to support Councillor Vandal's motion to refer it back. And I would challenge anyone -- and I've listened to a few of the speakers now and I have the hunch, Mr. Speaker, that this is simply a delay tactic to the inevitable. If there are those who have said point blank, Councillor Mayes is one of them, who said, I don't want it at the Forks, how does this address that concern? It doesn't. I've heard Councillor Gerbasi say we should not be spending this kind of money on a private sector partnership. This does not change that at all. I think folks should be sincere and they should say what they mean and mean what they say. If they have no intention of supporting this proposed project, they should be not supporting the amendment to refer back, Mr. Speaker, because when it comes back, ultimately to this Chamber, I challenge and watch to see how they will vote and I would argue they will still vote, no matter how beautiful this building is looking, they'll still vote against it. In 2008, I supported the proposal before us the CanadInn’s proposal at Polo Park and then when that failed, we had the motion before this Council to reissue the EOI. I moved a motion or actually Councillor Smith moved a motion and I seconded it; to amend the clause to have the funds go to existing pools in the community to fix them up. That clause died on a tied vote of 7-7. It was a close vote. And then, I voted against the EOI but I respected the decision by Council, the majority of Council voted to go forward with the EOI. The Expression of Interest went forward and now we have a proponent coming back. For those who feel that the Forks is not the right location, no matter what you do with this facility, it will satisfy those folks who feel the Forks is not the right location. I've heard from residents as well, both from my constituency and outside of my constituency and this are many reasons why they don't think it should be at the Forks. There are some who think it shouldn't be across from the Museum. How dare you put a water park across from the Museum. There’s those who feel that, those there’s those who believe we're cluttering the Forks, you know that this expanse of land that we're used to seeing on the bald prairie that we're making it too cluttered and you won't be able to find parking. That's being taken away. There’s those who just feel that we shouldn't be giving, entering into a private sponsorship Mr. Speaker, and there are those Mr. Speaker, who basically imply that somehow the Mayor is going to benefit. And I would argue, Mr. Speaker, as someone who has stood on this floor of Council and spoken before with regards to Riverside Park Management and that entire issue and parcel 4, that if anything was happening here in terms of the Goldeyes Park, from what I can see Mr. Speaker, is a negative effect, in terms of the fact that they’re losing parking but I understand that the provincial legislation says whether it's a positive effect or negative effect you have to declare conflict in which he’s done. But let's not kid ourselves Mr. Speaker, that's part of this debate below the surface and that's absolutely abhorrent and wrong that that is part of it but it’s there. There are those also, Mr. Speaker, who maybe feel that there should be a Hyatt or Wyatt hotel, I don't know, something fancy or you know, something big at the site. And so, you know, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Forks, I'll just respond to these if I can recall all their arguments. The Forks is, as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker is an entertainment leisure district. It is a place where people go for various, for shopping, to see a ball game, future to see a museum, there’s a Children's Museum there already, it's becoming that and that's great. I think that's terrific. That's great for our downtown. So I think this is very appropriate for the Forks. In terms of the hotel and affordability, Mr. Speaker, I think it's great that we will have a hotel that the majority of folks can stay in, versus 250 or $350 a night and guess what Mr. Speaker, people who are going to be staying at this hotel are going to be walking across the street and going to the Museum. When it comes to parking, Mr. Speaker, we have to be aware that the entire downtown…we're trying to move away from open parking stalls, surface parking lots, never mind a gravel one, Mr. Speaker, we have paved ones, this is gravel. We’re trying to get away from and I realize that one of the reasons the Forks is a success is because you have this open parking. It's kind of like the equivalent of our suburban shopping

mall but in the downtown and a lot of folks in the city think that's a God given right, that they should be able to drive up to a mall and have free parking. But in reality, that's subsidized Mr. Speaker in many ways by the fact that the shopping malls have to pay for that and this is the same thing here. If you go to the Forks and I recall going to many open houses at the Forks before I was on Council Mr. Speaker, because I was interested in what was happing there, that the Forks had completely planned for this to be developed. This was not going to be empty space folks for parking. This was going to be fully developed for housing or whatever and in terms of that, Mr. Speaker, this parcel, this is city land. This was never handed over to the Forks Renewal, the Forks North Portage Corporation for their use. This was always retained by the city for the city's purposes whatever the City Council should see fit. So, now I know that perception is that is part of it. Mr. Speaker, I would argue that this is a positive development for our city. That the reality is, you look across the country, and you see community after community and in Manitoba, building indoor water parks you could call it, indoor pools and or slides for the residents. For those who say that it's too small, Mr. Speaker, you know unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, these projects cost not millions but tens of millions of dollars, it literally to build an indoor pool, the size bigger than 50,000 square feet, if we as a city were to do it, you'd probably be looking $30, $40 million range maybe more. We as a city having to do this Mr. Speaker. So here we are Mr. Speaker, able to invest $7 million with a private sector partner and actually get an amenity for our city. I think that's positive. That's leveraging, it's trying to make it happen and that's why I supported the CanadInn proposal in 2008. Folks say, we want this, well, to raise that kind of money Mr. Speaker, we know how much we would have to raise property taxes for it and then see the level of debate and who really wants to pay for this. It's easy to snap our fingers and say you know we want this, we want this. But let's see, what is going to be the actual cost for paying for a 50,000 or 60,000 or 80,000 square foot facility that people are saying, that's what we should be having as a city. I think the support would dry up fairly quickly, Mr. Speaker. You know, the reality is Mr. Speaker, we have a company that in good faith has come to the city as part of their Expression of Interest process and has made a proposal. I supported Councillor Swandel's request to lay this matter over to allow the proponent. I was quite surprised, too, that Council chose not to do that. Reality is, I don't know what's going to happen after today. Whether the proponent -- the proponent may just walk. That's a real possibility and or the scenario too, Mr. Speaker, is the proponent is now being asked by us to spend tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars to detail design and to do elevations, architectural renderings, everything of the site, we want detail, this is what the motion says, there's a chance, Mr. Speaker that when it comes back and they've spent that money, that we still won't approve what's before us and then we're left with the scenario where…I'm not saying the proponent will do this but to recover that cost would have no choice but to file a Statement of Claim unless we as a Council voluntarily agree to cover those costs for them. So, Statement of Claim means a lawsuit Mr. Speaker, against the city. So, you know, it's not really the right way of going about it. You know, we as Council, we know we do this all the time at our Community Committees we have hearings; we approve developments and we make it subject to site plan approval and we make it subject to it coming back to the Community Committee to be signed off and we have often said, we want to see more than just site plan, we want to see elevations, we want to see the look of the buildings and that works, Mr. Speaker. That actually…that pro stress does by and large, there have been hiccups in the past but by and large it works and that is what's been requested here. I don't think…if you don't believe that this is the right location for the…for this. If you don't believe in 7 million going into a private sector partnership, if you don't believe that it's the right size of a building, then you should not be supporting Councillor Vandal's motion. If you don't believe that this is the right hotel then you shouldn't be supporting it because that's not going to change it folks when it comes back here. But if you do believe that this is the right project and you want to see what it's going to look like and you genuinely do, and you see, and hopefully, you know, beauty is in the eye of the beholder, right folks, you know. So when it comes back we're going to have -- well you know, I don't like this window there or I don't like that brick there. Well let's not get into that, right. You know, let's be realistic, beauty is in the eye of the beholder. We will…

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

Councillor Wyatt: We're going to have a discussion, should be having when it comes back here, a discussion of what this site plan and the building looks like. Not once again, you know, well I don't want it because it's not big enough or I don't want it because it's not the right hotel or I'm against it because it's at the Forks because that's what I've been hearing so far Mr. Speaker, and if that's the case, you shouldn't be supporting this because you really are not being sincere with this Council or your constituents out there. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I would like to start by thanking Councillor Vandal for his motion here today. I want a modern water park in our city. Our Expression of Interest had some very clear specific specifications that the… our minimum components that the facility must have. An entrance lobby, reception and change rooms; consisting of male and female and family change rooms. One wave pool up to 5,000 square feet; one lazy river with a minimum 100 foot run, and symbiotic relationship with other components. One swirl pool with an approximate 30 person capacity; or two swirl pools. One adult focused and one child focused, each with approximately 15 person capacity. One children's activity pool, water plays of approximately 2,000 square feet.

Three to five water slides with a minimum of one tube slide and 2 to 4 body slides, viewing towers, master blaster water coaster or equivalent. Cork screw vortex slider equivalent. A surf rider deep water sheet wave attraction. I've been trying, I've been asking lots of questions, lots and lots of questions; I don't have answers. The original proposal was 55,000 to 70,000 square foot facility, that's the floor plate. When you talk about water parks, one of the key components is cubic square footage of heated indoor space. How tall will this going to be? When you talk about water slides you can do a lot of stuff without having a bigger foot print, because we're talking about a 50,000 square foot capacity, I've asked, are these still minimum requirements? The public service has clearly told me, we don't know yet, there's, it still up in the air. We're contributing $7 million, we need that answered. Also, what is the building itself going to look like? I've asked the question, we have nothing before us here today. We've got nothing. What will the Public Access Agreement, how will that work? We simply don't know. What other amenities are going to be part of this hotel? Will there be conference facilities? Is it tied in with the Canadian Museum for Human Rights, that sort of thing, not a clue. What brand is the hotel going to be? You talk to people in the event management, the association management business in the city, one of the biggest complaints is we don't have a lot of branded hotels; one of the big things that draw people into a city for a conference is having a branded hotel. You're organizing a conference; you want to have a Starwood Hotel, a Hilton Hotel, a Marriott Hotel, all brands that we don't have in our downtown core right now. You have those brands, you organize a conference in Winnipeg, the organizers can use points later, to go to Hawaii with their points. Significant but again we don't know what brand this is going to be, is it going to be a Canalta? Is it going to be a higher end Wyndham Grand? Looks like Canalta deals with the Ramada franchising group, that might be acceptable but we don't know. In fact, yesterday morning, I picked up the phone trying to get you know, build a very quick relationship to understand where these good folks were coming from. I called Canalta; didn't get a call back. I wanted to do it. So again I think giving 60 days but having firm details out here. The motion by Councillor Vandal and seconded by Councillor Sharma, the public needs to have some comfort and I need to have some comfort, before we put $7 million of public money into it. I to Councillor Wyatt, I'm very sincere in wanting to see this succeed, I'm very sincere wanting to support this at the Forks with a big indoor water park, but at this point we don't have the details to do it, so I will definitely not be supporting Councillor Vandal's motion and I truly, genuinely hope that this does not kill the deal and that we have an opportunity to see a water park at the Forks. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and I think we're having a good fulsome debate here today, so congratulations all around. I, on the motion to amend, the amendment Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Councillor Vandal and Sharma, I think they're coming from a good place. You know, wanting to get more information, consulting with the public. Asking the developer to prepare substantial plans and designs, I think those are all really good things, however Mr. Speaker, over the last 7 days we've heard stories here from other Councillors. I too have some stories to tell, with respect to being engaged with the public, whether it was grocery shopping, filling up gas, going out for dinner with my kids and family or just even at family gatherings. People have said to me, we don't have a problem with the water park in the city just not at the Forks and that rang true and clear over and over and over again, Mr. Speaker. So, I don't profess to know more than the public and I've listened to them. My residents from all over the city and Mr. Speaker, that plaque that says the city's Motto, "Unum Cum Virtute Multorum" one City with the strength of many, I've received calls from St. Vital, from Old Kildonan, from Mynarski, from people out of town even, we don't represent them but they want to weigh in on this as well and from people all over Point Douglas. I think people want to be engaged in this and they are engaged Mr. Speaker. And I think that what we did successfully with in terms of public engagement is Plan Winnipeg. We had over 40,000; 50,000 people were engaged across the City and that plan, Mr. Speaker is hailed as an internationally acclaimed plan and I understand Europe and Paris are actually looking to do something like that in their cities. This is the kind of exercise that we need to do here at the Forks. The Forks is a very near and dear to people's heart. It's got; it's prime real estate for the entire city; it's prime real estate for the entire province of Manitoba. It's what has created part of western Canadian history for millennia. People have been meeting there for 3,000 years, Mr. Speaker and since the 1700s, that place has been a huge inter-continental trade for the fur trade. So, there say lot of history here Mr. Speaker, and we cannot fault people for really being emotional and being really engaged in this. And we do, Councillor Mayes talked about an iconic architectural structure in the Canadian Museum of Human Rights. That will be a huge thing, that's going to put us on the world map, Mr. Speaker, and you know like I said, this motion is coming from a good place, however, I fundamentally don't agree with the fact that the water park ought to be at the Forks and so I'm finding it really difficult to, you know, that we asked the developer to provide substantial design plans. A friend of mine who's in the Exchange said it's a two star attraction in a five-star location. It's not a world class facility, Mr. Speaker. We're looking for a world class facility. If we're going to do this right, we have to put out a public call for tender and do it that way. So we can do better Mr. Speaker. We only get one chance, one chance. This is a life time opportunity for all of us here at Council to get it right at the Forks and to do that properly, Mr. Speaker, I believe we need to engage our public, engage the Museum, engage the Forks, engage the historical community and engage all of us along with our Planning Department to do it right. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well this is obviously a topic that's been very hot in the public, there's no doubt about it. I just want to say, I absolutely loved the idea of a water park and we all know the kind of history that it's been, we've tried to attract private sector developer to do a water park over the last number of years, initially even before I was on Council, there's a number of proposals that kind of fell through for one reason or the other. At that point, we had a number of dollars that come from the Federal Government for recreation, a lot of we stuck into existing recreation type programs; one community club in my ward, we just opened up last week was a part of that, part of that we also stuck $2 million in the Kildonan Park Pool which is a fantastic and everyone goes there, it's a fantastic new facility which we used, but at that point, we also decided that the water park was a great concept, we wanted to attract private sector person and so that point we put an Expression of Interest out. We know that there was a developer that had stepped up to the table but through the financial crisis at the end of the day, it didn't work out so we reissued that contract and this is one of the ones that have come forward with it. There has been some notions, why don't you build it yourself? And I guess my concerns and I know one of the lads, the young lad at the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, I think his name is Colin Craig, had you know, talked about the Economic Opportunity Commission and I can tell you that I think it was a darn good report that brought up at that point and part of that report was exactly that about the aquatic centre and that's why I like the private sector notion happening with this because any time we get involved in the private sector, first of all, it will probably cost us $25 million to build a water park; second of all, any time you have recreation it's a lost litre, we ended up losing money just because our labour costs are higher, historically that's an issue that's been there. I truly believe this still could be a great development that's out there. You know, I do like the concept that's been brought forward that's there. You know, I am interested and there's some talk of a private sector developer, whether it's the Seasons at Tuxedo or whomever else, that could happen that's going there, caught me a little bit off guard because I didn't hear of this until there's a media report on it, so, I'm interested to see kind of where that's going. There's a lot of questions I've been answering a lot of comments on this; probably of all the issues that I've been here for five and half years, probably got the most amount of calls and emails because of this, that have been generated and the issues that I'm hearing a lot from residents, number 1, as been mentioned is the Forks, the site of the Forks doesn't make sense. I'm not sure I necessary buy into the whole argument of the whole area is historic place you can't do anything because there's a skateboard park that's about half a block down, there's bars, there's restaurants, there's a skating rink that's there. I think it is all in the same element but people do have some concerns in terms of that site. Also there's a lot of concerns I hear residents of what the hotel would look like, esthetically pleasing. I'm fairly convinced that the process that we had in place would be able to identify that and people would be able to see what the end product would take a like at before that would go there, but there most definitely is a lot of concerns that there is nothing hard, fast that's there. There is some talk about the public subsidy or incentive that's there. You know, that's kind of a debate that we have, whether it makes sense to do this, do we put a little bit of seed money there to create a $75 million development? I tend to be more on that side of the equation. I do see what, you know other people have some concerns in it, I can't tell you what Councillor Havixbeck said about the amount of revenue that will be generated, whether it be 1.5 to $2 million a year that money would be paid back in about a four year period. At that point you have another 1.5 to $2 million to put into things like community clubs, you know policing, you name it, but it's a debate that's on going. Parking issues is something that I've also heard of, quite extensively, people are concerned about the Forks in terms of the parking, trying to get parking. I can of see it as…you almost have to split the property in two because I think if you're going to the Forks or if you're going to the Spaghetti Factory or you're going to Johnson Terminal, you're not going to park down, way down at the Goldeyes Park, you're going to park, you're going to try to get something where, closer to it, so I think the other half of the equation is there. I think that the parkade that's in the Phase 2 actually could be a benefit to it. With that, I would like to see some sort of a parking analysis, we did that with some developments that are there, just to see exactly would this be a benefit to parking or not. A lot of debate from constituents that I hear of is, whether this is a world class destination; the responsive that I have been giving all week to people, you know, is basically, well at the end of the day, you know, we put out an Expression of Interest; this is one that came forward even with the $7 million if you call it an incentive or subsidy, whatever you're going to call it. This is the proposal that came forward. I'm not sure if the mathematics works out for this or not but this is the proposal that has come forward; you know I think at the end of the day, it would be nice to see what the developer has to say about it. I think what's important is some sort of schematic drawings, so people know exactly what is going to go there in the Forks. Also, to know exactly what the water park is there, so with that, I do agree with Councillor Vandal's amendment and I will be supporting that. I think that…I'm not saying I'm opposed to it, but at the end of the day, I'm hearing from a lot of my constituents on this and at the end of the day, I like this proposal, I'm in love with my constituents and I'm hearing quite a bit, you know concerns on it and I think, if we get some more details, get some more drawings, what it's going to look like, people's concerns and fears may be alleviated. They might not be, I don't know, but it's within us to get more details for it. It is a big development and with that, I will be supporting Councillor Vandal's amendment to the motion. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Fielding; and next up is Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. It my pleasure to rise today, as many of you know, that my politics aren't exactly anti-development. You know for 40 years our family has been very pro-business in our community and it's with no great excitement that I have to rise today and say I won't be supporting Councillor Vandal's amendment, nor the clause; regarding the development at the Forks, Lot 4. All politics are local; nobody knows that more than Councillor Wyatt and the people of St. Charles Ward have spoken loud and clear; that they are not in any way, shape or form against the water park. They're against a water park at the Forks. It was curious, you're probably familiar, I put a message out on my Facebook page late Friday afternoon and that really opened up people's opportunities to tell me how they really felt. I've asked for their opinion prior to sort of declaring my own intentions; which at that time I said I wouldn't be supporting the project; but the landslide of comments from friends and certainly even folks in the media that came forward and said well thank God somebody stepped up and put it out there. And for a long time I felt I was kind of out there on the ledge by myself but as the weekend continued and Monday morning broke, the reality was that we were on the brink of a virtual tie vote. Which has not often happened in this Chamber while I've been here; over the last five years. You know, the Forks is 20 years old, 21 years old I think, and what they envisioned in the early 90s and what's evolved to today, may be somewhat within their plan, but the fact that we have, if you will, our Sidney Opera House, the Canadian Museum for Human Rights, being suggested to have a not a first class facility across the street from it, for me just flies in the face of what we're trying to develop here. Like it or not, if you're not in love with the Museum that's okay but you have to give credit to that organization that they have done and created a first class facility. You may not like the design but no expense has been spared to make sure that that is an iconic facility.

I would like to suggest, too, our new Winnipeg International James Armstrong Airport is a world class and has already been given awards and recognized in the top dozen airports in the world for its design and its concept. It's first class. So I think at this point, you know, Councillor Swandel was worrying about hurting the feelings of the people at Canalta. Look, I was in business for 17 years, was in the Chamber of Commerce movement for ten years. They're big boys, they'll get over it. Well, you know, sometimes you have to draw a line in the sand. And as far as I'm concerned, the line in the sand is the Forks property. If Canalta or anyone else wants to come forward with a proposal, we'd be most open to it, almost anywhere else in the City and that's what the people of St. Charles Ward have told me and likewise many of your residents have come to me too. It really has been a somewhat of a staggering experience as far as our email is concerned when we're replying to all of these folks. It comes down to two things, three things. Wrong site, wrong size, and wrong hotel brand. And it's already been mentioned here that my feelings are, I'm quite okay with development of that property. It's going to get developed at one time or another over the next probably ten years and I really feel that as our Convention Centre is going to be expanded, we're going to need more bedrooms in the downtown to accommodate conventions and people coming to events at the Convention Centre and that we need, as Councillor Browaty suggested, a world-class brand at that facility. Whether it's Hyatt or Weston or Sheraton, Marriott, you know, these are all recognized hoteliers that have a reservation system that can, you know, bring people from right across the world: I spent 17 years in the travel industry and tourism industry and believe me, those brands mean something when you're traveling to another destination and you know, with greatest respect for the Delta and the Fairmont and the Radisson, you know within Winnipeg, we sort of come up short on those hotel brands. So I would like it see that along with a substantial parkade put on that property at Lot 4. So, I will say we should stop this process right now and start a new one and encourage the private sector to come forward and fund a water park without any civic subsidy in it. $7 million I would suggest; if we were going to spend the $7 million, we either do it by adding on to the Pan Am Pool, right now, the youth end for the little guys at the south end of the Pan Am Pool; would be a perfect destination for that $7 million. I also agreed with Councillor Orlikow when he suggested that we divide the 7 million by 15 and do one project in each of the 15 wards, so however that's spent. So I really do feel that this should be private sector driven, it shouldn't be at the Forks and that I'm representing the citizens of St. Charles as I make my vote on both; no to the amendment and no to the clause. Thanks a lot.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Speaker, next up we have Councillor Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. Firstly, I would like to thank all of the people that have shared their concerns and opinions about this project with me over the past few weeks. I have considered each message and point of view carefully and all of them have been helpful during my decision-making process. With all of the calls, emails, faxes, letters and constituents stopping by my community office, there are many questions and I absolutely did not have all the answers. Is the water park big enough? What does it look like? What are the admission charges? How will the Public Access Agreement work? And most importantly, is this the highest and best use for the property? The past few weeks have made it very clear to me, the easiest thing to do with this lack of information, is to simply vote the project down. But I didn't run for City Council to do the easy thing or increase my probability of being re-elected. I ran, to try to shape the decisions that are made at City Council, to improve the lives of Winnipeggers and to ensure that our city is best positioned to prosper. Councillor Vandal and I are bringing forward this motion so we can all get the answers that we need. Although the city is open for business, asking us to vote for something before proper due diligence is done is no way to do business. Referring this motion back to the administration will allow City Council and the citizens of Winnipeg the opportunity to see the full potential or pit falls of

this project. If the proposal stands up to the standards of City Council and the community, then I will be more happy to support this development at that time. However, if the proposal that comes back to us is less than our expectations, of how we in Winnipeg feel about the Forks development, then I will vote accordingly. Any time I am asked to commit significant taxpayer dollars to a project, I take that very seriously. In the same way that I take seriously any group that wants to invest $75 million in our city. For those two reasons, I feel we still have to do our homework. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Sharma, next up is Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Mr. Speaker. On April 18, 2012 I've asked Executive Policy Committee to rescind the $7 million to the water park proposal. That proposal was rejected by EPC so we're here today. So for some EPC members have heard this before, I have added some new pieces at the bottom, so allow me to first to go through what I said at the EPC meeting for those who weren't there. The rational on the regarding the $7 million is really twofold. One is priorities. These public funds should be spent on, I believe, on existing infrastructure. While this money will not completely address, as we noted today, our infrastructure deficit, I can guarantee you a piece of bread to a starving man is much appreciated. Is providing $7 million access to a water park considered a core service? Again, we're in that process now, of looking what our some City of Winnipeg's core services and we're going to have some really tough decisions to make down the line. Again, we're saying today that we think access to a water park is a core service; however, are we going to say libraries are a core service? These are the choices we have to be making. Public safety we do know that's one of our main priorities and I believe, no I don't believe, I know, that all the evidence has proven that if you increase local programming, in local areas, that is the best crime diversion plan you can have. That gets those kids locally engaged; to believe that children from some areas of town, where they never even leave their neighbourhood, they won't even cross a street because it's another neighbourhood and to think that they're all going to come to the Forks water park? I believe sure, some will, but where is the best impact of the value of our dollars going to, so again, if we improve local community centres, local recreational opportunities, partnering with the Y, all those kind of things that provide that local programming, we're going to have a much more positive impact on public safety. The value, the value of the Access Agreement, again, you have to weigh that value versus what I just mentioned in regarding crime diversion, infrastructure, local programming but again, so what are some of the other ideas? Why do we want create value in our local communities like this? Well, again we talked about, we talked about, we want to make sure we have this water park so we have visitors coming to Winnipeg and this is going to be a big destination attraction spot. I'll get to that in a moment. However the real value for Winnipeggers is making sure that people who live in Winnipeg or stay in Winnipeg, people that want to move to Winnipeg. That's where our real value goes to. Will someone who's living in an area that is falling apart completely, go, oh, I don't mind all this and pay more property tax because I have an Access Agreement to the water park? If you really believe that's going to change their mind about deciding to move to an area where lower taxes are right outside the border of Winnipeg. I have to say, you know, then there really not really on the ball with us anyways, they looking at for some reason to move, because a water park is not going to make the value, as you're going to get by improving local communities. That's where we create the value because that's property tax and that's what we want. Again we'll do in-fill, we'll do density, we'll get all that going. But then we also have to look at a little bit of what are some of the alternatives? Again, we talked about it. I know Councillor Fielding's to his credit, mentioning you know, Councillor Orlikow and then we talk about it, this is just a minor amount, will it really have an affect my ward? Again, I pull that back. I pull that back, you're right; we can discuss openly where we believe that public money is best spent. It could be something regional, I prefer something locally but again, we have projects all on the plate. We got community centre, cultural centres, capital supports, we've got Inner-city access programs, and we've got community centres that need to maybe take over some iceplex. They're going to need some capital support to help them get moving. Again, we have water parks existing; some that aren't existing yet, that need some upgrading or new ones; these all things that enhance the local community, so Mr. Speaker though, the second issue I have is regarding the steering of the land. I think it's very important to recognize today, that Parcel 4 has never been tendered. Okay, it's not tendered. We are giving this proposal to a water park company and a hotel and the land has never been tendered officially. It was a ROI, where the last developer through it on and said I want to go there but again, we never gave the community or the broad community a chance to tender this land to see what other options are. The land is not Council's to do what we will but it is the public's land and this type of use and possible development for the land requires prior input from all stakeholders. This lack of process is a problem and I believe completely disrespectful to our local developers who never even had a chance to say, I've got a great idea for that spot. Let me tell you what it is. We never even gave our local developers the opportunity. So again, why no, the developers coming from Alberta maybe a little miffed however, I have talked to many local developers who are miffed. That they never even got a chance to do it, and they could come up with some really great ideas again, that process should take part. So either, the Parcel 4, golf courses or greens fields, we as a Council have an obligation to engage the public and all stakeholders prior to us deciding to dispose of land. Mr. Speaker, the third issue is the actual proposal. This proposal does not create a destination place that our ROI definitely said that we wanted. We want it to be a destination place. Again, I look at this proposal, it's very small, I don't believe it's a destination spot. So, people who are saying that this is going to be attracting all these new tourists that come into Winnipeg, common on, this is not a destination spot. It's a nice little

water park. Okay, so again, I don't believe that the justification that we need to do this, so we can attract all these visitors to come flowing into Winnipeg to go on this great water park, that's not true. And are a number of other issues with this recommendation, however, it must be pointed out. that 130 residents and these are my residents who have told me where they live, I've got much more, but 130 residents have contacted my office either through twitter, email, whatever, phone calls, there has not been one supporter. I've gone through; we've all gone through, huge development issues of infill development. There's always a little support, maybe it's very small sometimes, maybe it's very large. But there's always some balance, in this case, there's been zero. It's all opposed. Again that is quite concerning. So while many Councillors may have different reasons and different barriers to support this program, Councillor Vandal's motion will allow some of those issues to be potentially addressed and to allow us to be able to communicate that to our constituents; so we need to work together on this issue and we aren't there yet. Will we ever be there? I don't know but I do believe it's worth the effort.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much Councillor Orlikow. Okay Councillors, the time is 11:59, we have one person on list, out of 3 possible potential speakers, All in favour of continuing past twelve o'clock? Against? All right it's, we're moving ahead. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I'm in favour of continuing but I'm hungry! No, okay I just want to start off by -- I had a different speech but I want to start off with the consideration of the word "respect". And I just wanted to say that one of the problems with this particular proposal has to do with the way the process went to try to establish a water park in the city. As Councillor Orlikow referred to, there was never a consultation and a look at tendering out this particular parcel of land to a bigger consideration. So, I do have respect for the business that wants to try to follow through and build a water park. They are in business as Councillor Nordman has pointed out, and there are issues and to this point they haven't, I don't know that they've spent a lot of money to come up with this plan or proposal but I have some respect for it but ultimately they're caught in a process that was set a whole number of years ago, before I was here, but that process has moved around, around the city and now it has to be downtown and the city happens to own a Parcel 4. So, you know, I don't think it's fair to say that we're not showing respect to this business when Dan moves a motion to get more information and details with some more consultation because you know, this is a critical piece of land as people have mentioned. But so, given that, I wanted to -- and I also want to mention that I'm okay with providing social good, social services. I'm into that. I think that swimming pools that we have, I think that the parks and all the recreation services that we offer, as a public good is in the public interest it's part of the vision of this great City of Winnipeg and is an excellent city. I've been listening to the debate on the radio a bit and stuff, this isn't a bunch of like nay-saying stuff here. You know, Winnipeg is moving forward. Winnipeg is actually looking at in the next year, growing by 2.4% is what I'm hearing from the economics people. That means the city is growing. The private sector is investing in this city. This city as, I heard a comment this morning from a former City Councillor, he said "One Great City". This city is on the move. It's doing really well and the private sector wants to invest and be a part of our city. So let's not turn it into a negative here. I think that there's a huge market, as I was considering this whole proposal, I wasn't against it originally. I know back 25 years ago, people said they wanted a water park out in the Forks area. I know that never came to fruition and now it seems like the city's, a lot of people's perspective has changed, but you know, that was a long time ago but I just wanted to…so there is definitely a market for a water park here. The private sector, I think has a possibility of opening up a water park in this city without even needing any public money. There is a huge market. I'm listening to it. It's there. I never seen one person against the water park. I see a person against things for different reasons, like it's at the Forks or whatever, I particularly, you know, I think there has to be some kind of development at the Forks. Bringing more people to the Forks area for the businesses who are right at the Forks but just for that general area is important; because, you know, I was wandering around there after a meeting at the Forks, the River City Connections they're calling it, I think it's called, where they're consulting with what should we do with our river banks and that sort of stuff. I stepped out of there and you know what, the place was deserted at 9:00 clock. There's nothing happening around there. So we do need to look at, how we can make the Forks area and that area more important and I think you have to go with what Councillor Orlikow's talked about. So, to say that this is the one attraction or the only attraction that could necessarily bring people to this area is wrong. But technically, you know, there's rumours; about a private, another private water park effort. I don't know if it exists. We've heard from Councillor Havixbeck that she could not find out any information but you know, it just makes total sense. water parks are great. They attract people to stay at hotels; they attract people to come to malls, that's why you find them in malls and attached to hotels. These are features that make their market better; makes them more able to make money and survive in a competitive industry. So for me, again, the private sector I think can fund this, make it happen. I heard comments about Grand Forks and you know, my family made a decision to go to Falcon Lake one year and we were going out there because it was out at a Provincial Park. There's lots of different outdoor things to do and also, we decided to stay in a hotel because they had a salt water pool with at the time, you know for our kids at their age, they had a water slide, it's nothing like what we're talking about but the point is; simply that, you know that feature just happened to be there, but we were actually going to the Falcon Lake area for the wilderness thing and it just happened to be antidotal. People are going to Grand Forks mostly to shop. You know, the reality is, the Federal Government has now given you even more incentive to go down to Grand Forks right, so, you know, people go down there to shop and when there, yeah they take the opportunity to go to a water

park but I don't know that that's lost money. I think it was lost money when they went to shop down in Grand Forks. That's where the lost money is. You know, we could do a big evaluation and I know that I don't think anybody has done a study about, you know, how much money are we losing as a City because of Water parks in Steinbach. Again, I've been to Brandon staying at a Super 8 and a pool. Those conditions exist – so, for me, I don't understand any of those kinds of arguments. I do know we need to have a competitive process. So anyway, on the economic stuff, why not get the most money we can for this piece of property that the City owns. You know, I heard, you know, this proposal of $6 million. I know when we tender stuff out, mostly, you know lots of properties in this city because business and private sector is coming here, the land gets bid up. Just because you have an appraisal for $5.9 million dollars, that's not the sale price. That is not the sale price. It could be way more. We know that. Every one of us in this Chamber knows what's been happening in the land and home market and I believe the commercial market in certain areas of the city are up. This particular area of the city has a high value. Yeah, I hate to say it, in my area, some of it, some of the commercial stuff is having difficulty but you know, it's on its way back up too. So, I just wanted to talk about the 50,000 square foot water park. I know it's vertical but you know, we have facilities in this city, the Pan Am Pool is over 30,000 square feet as a pool area. That's the pool area footprint close to that, it's not exact. Couldn't get the exact number right away, but definitely it's in the order of that. Kildonan Park is the new pool. Thank you for putting the $2 million in there. People really appreciate it but as I understand it, there's a lot of young kids and families who aren't attending it now because they have to pay to use the splash pad, so but, that 30, that footprint with the splash pad and the pool, just the footprint, it's 38,000 square feet, it does have some slight vertical features but nothing in the order of what Councillor Browaty's mentioned.

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

Councillor Eadie: I want to give that size perspective because I really think if you're talking about a real serious attraction, I think that it's really important that you consider making it a real attraction not something that's small. Somebody might experience, I heard from one person who told me they went to Grand Forks, they'd been to West Edmonton Mall. West Edmonton Mall is a place they will go back to; Grand Forks that not a place they're necessarily interested in any more. Now, it's been said that low income families will get free access but you know, when I did hear in the seminar, was I heard that there would be possible blackout days and there were 77 free passes a day for less than 365 days a year. But I want to point out something, low income families are no different than other families really, in the sense, when did they have time to go participate in a water park. So, if you're talking about an Access Agreement that's going to limit the days when they can go and when they can go; right there you're providing a block. It's not going to happen. I just did a quick calculation yeah, we're putting in….

Mr. Speaker: One minute.

Councillor Eadie: $7 million dollars in; sorry one minute, okay, we're putting $7 million in, we could let, we could have, free access to all our water facilities, 274 kids, twelve and under could attend for free a day for 365 days a year, for twenty-five years, that's $7 million. 63 families a day, 365, 25 years, could visit and that's a family with two adults and as many kids, or on your health card living at the address where you are; so, there's so much we can do with the $7 million. I tend to agree with Councillor Orlikow in his presentation on that, people will participate more at the local area. I just want to conclude then, by just saying, I respect that Councillors need to be able to make a decision. And so, I'm going to be supporting Councillor Vandal's motion here; to allow the people who really do need time, to make a decision. I respect that they really need to look at this and the people are concerned about it, so, I'm going to be voting yes for that, but I just want people to know, I'm not in support of this whole plan whether or not people get more information; I will be voting against if it comes back to City Council. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Speaker. I'm amazed, utterly amazed of the Councillors that got up and say, we don't want more information. I mean, you want to buy something without enough facts? For example, the access section, I have no idea how it's going to work. I have no idea if this is going to be a world class water park. Councillor Vandal's motion will supply us with a little bit more information, a lot more debate and we should have it. We shouldn't act like a church and have just on faith, with this administration doing this. We need information. I haven't heard anybody speak against getting information that makes any sense. I mean, Councillor Wyatt says it's a delay tactic. Well, how much of a delay is it? It's not really a great delay. This is an important thing for us to decide. I want a world class water park. I don't know if I want it at the Forks or not. I don't know if can be provided there. So, let's have this motion, let's be unanimous and support Vandal's motion. It's worth it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steen.

Councillor Steen: Mr. Speaker, I'll be brief. I'm going to support the motion because, I strongly believe that consultation with area stakeholders is key in this and its holds, it in here, and that's all I want to say, add to what's been said here. A lot of good things have been said so. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Steen. Well that concludes all the comments. We will in reverse order, then close with the amendment. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's been a good discussion. A lot of points of view, lots of information shared. In 1997, I sat in one of the basement rooms with a fellow by the name of Sam Katz who wanted to talk to me about the Goldeyes Stadium. Mr. Katz had a business plan about two inches thick and renderings from every possible angle. Couple years later, I moved up in the world, I was up in the Mayor's Office; with the Mayor talking with some of the proponents for what is now the MTS Centre. They had world class renderings from every angle in the world; every perspective in the world, excuse me. What my motion -- my referral motion is basically directing, is to get that same sort of information, Mr. Speaker. Whether we choose to recognize it or not, our citizens have let us know what they think about this. Some of them are irrational, some of them don't have enough information and some of the citizens basically are, are independent thinking, free thinking citizens, who don't belong to any special interest groups. I think it's incumbent on us to listen to what they're saying, Mr. Speaker. I don't think it's disrespectful to ask the proponent, at this stage, Canalta, to go out and make the case. Give us some renderings. If you have to spend $20,000 - $30,000; I don't think it's disrespectful to do that if you're trying to get a $7 million subsidy from the City of Winnipeg. I know our administration will act in good faith, and work with the proponents, to give us the information we propose. Mr. Speaker, just to summarize on my motion, we're looking for substantial design plans for the water park, hotels and parkade at said location before any Council decision on the $7 million public investment is voted on. We're looking for site plans on propose location of site 4, where the buildings will be sited. We're looking for a finalized Public Access Agreement between the City of Winnipeg and Canalta and we want to do consultations with the Forks North Portage Corporation and of course the Human Rights Museum on what is being proposed. There is nothing Mr. Speaker that says we have to make this decision here today. We need more information. I think the majority of Council have spoken; and I hope there is unanimous consent for my motion.

Mr. Speaker: Question? All those in favour? Recorded Vote? I'm sorry? No the amendment first and then the clause. All those in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Mayes, Orlikow, Sharma, Smith, Steen, Vandal.

Nays

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed please rise.

Councillors Havixbeck, Pagtakhan, Swandel, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman.

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

Mr. Speaker: All right, speaking to the amended clause. No, that's it? Okay, so Councillor…

Councillor Swandel: I don't understand. How can you…

Councillor Vandal: The motion's referred.

Councillor Swandel: So, why did we have the debate on the clause? But you know you can't do it in that order, you have to do motion to refer; if it's a motion to refer you have to do that first.

Mr. Speaker: All right folks we've made our decision on this. The amendment stands and we will adjourn until 1:40.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
April 25, 2012, at 1:42 p.m.**

Mr. Speaker: Executive Policy Committee Report for April 4th, Mayor Katz.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITEE
DATED APRIL 4, 2012**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the Report and move adoption of consent agenda Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. The other that would be the 11th of April.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED APRIL 11, 2012**

Mayor Katz: I would like to Introduce the Report Mr. Speaker, and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1, 2 and 3.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no hands, All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. And the most recent April 18th. Yes.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED APRIL 18, 2012**

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to Introduce the Report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 4.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. And we have a Notice of Motion; which one is that?

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE – NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Mayor Katz: Councillor Eadie.

Mr. Speaker: Eadie and Gerbasi, okay. I will move by Councillor Eadie, seconded by Councillor Gerbasi -- sorry? Yeah. Councillor Eadie would you like to introduce it please.

Councillor Eadie: Yes thank you Speaker Nordman. I'm rising today to speak to this from last months' Notice of Motion; to allow us to ratify the selection of the Chief of Police. Right now, that is not the situation as with all our departmental senior managers, it's by appointment from the CAO, I believe. But in my whereas, I talk about the Winnipeg Police Service is our largest department. It's a huge expenditure, and it's also a service that's critical to all City Councillors here in the city; not just inner-city; City Councillors but for all City Councillors; the Chief of Police is an essential position. It's very difficult for the process as it is, to have a large committee to make a section process. What I'm proposing to do is not uncommon from what my experience was as a School Board Trustee, in the Seven Oaks School Division, where when we hired Superintendent's and Administrators of schools, what we would do is there'd be a committee and we would do the interviews with a short list and then once we determined who we wanted to recommend, we would then come to an informal committee meeting where we would explain why we chose one particular Superintendent from the short list and explained the reasoning behind it and then what would happen is at a School Board meeting, at the formal meeting, there would be basically a ratification of the decision that came from the committee. And again, I'm saying that this is a very essential position here to the city as we all know, it's been on the city's -- near the top agenda of the City of Winnipeg for over a decade, is the issue of crime. And again, depending on who our Chief of Police is and what skills they have, could have a huge effect on the ability of our Winnipeg Police Service to achieve its goals. We -- you know, we could have a meeting once the committee has made a decision without ratifying, but I think that it's really essential though, that we as City Councillors do have a role

in deciding this particular -- this particular thing to ratify the Chief of Police. So, that's basically an introduction and I assume I get to close?

Mr. Speaker: Correct.

Councillor Eadie: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Speaking to the notice of motion. Seeing none. All those in favour? Opposed? Okay let's have a recorded vote. Okay, you get to close Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Forgot, yeah, there's nobody else. Anyway, like -- I just feel that the process is already in place in terms of selecting our next Chief of Police. The next Chief after that will more than likely be subject to a Police Board who will then be making decisions about which Police Chief in this city gets hired and I know that the process that they will use will be very similar to the one that I've just mentioned here. It's -- I don't see why we wouldn't go with this. This is a department that's unlike the other departments. This is really essential to all City Councillors. So, that's my position on it and that's it for my closing.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Recorded vote. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed; please rise.

Nays

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

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

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Mr. Speaker: Motion is defeated. We have motions from Councillor Swandel and Wyatt and Mayor Katz and Councillor Wyatt and I guess we refer those? Yes, okay. So, we will deal with those next time. Consideration of By-laws, Mayor Katz.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move that the following By-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 60/2012, By-law No. 61/2012 and By-law No. 62/2012.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 60/2012, 61/2012 and 62/2012.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker, I move that By-laws numbered 60/2012 to 62/2012 both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 60/2012 to 62/2012 both inclusive.

Mayor Katz: And I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 60/2012 to 62/2012 both inclusive, 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. We have question period. First question for Mayor? Councillor Mayes go ahead.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Mr. Speaker, one question for the Mayor. A number of the Councillors including myself will on the weekend be going to the fundraiser put on by the Rainbow Resource Centre and that's a group very active in gay, lesbian, bi-issues throughout the City and I understand that traditionally there's been a flag raising ceremony here and it's I think, scheduled to take place before our next council meeting. So, I just wondered if the Mayor could highlight for the public what's coming up in terms of the flag-raising ceremony here for not the Pride Day activities but in late May I understand there's to be a flag raising. No less authority than Councillor Gerbasi has said that the Mayor spoke eloquently at last year's flag raising on this so I wonder if he could just highlight for the public what the city's plans are in terms of raising a flag for the gay and lesbian community.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Mayes, I thank him for the question. I will try and share as much information as I can. May the 25th to June the 3rd, Mr. Speaker, is Pride Festival in Winnipeg. It does start at City Hall as has been mentioned, with the raising of the Pride Flag, which we also did last year and I should also tell you, Mr. Speaker, for those who are not aware, that the Pride Festival turns 25, and approximately 30,000 people joined in the celebration. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I don't have all the details of all the events that go on during that period of time; but I would ask Councillor Mayes or any other Councillor that does want more information to please contact Mr. Kenny Boyce, who's the Manager of Special Events, who would know the entire program and would be more than happy to share any information, and answer any further questions and I do thank the Councillor for the question.

Mr. Speaker: Second question? Any further questions for the Mayor? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Given our past vote that just occurred in terms of ratification for Councillor; Mayor I'm wondering, through the Speaker, I'm wondering if I could, well actually, there is an organization – there's a National Organization that has indicated good criteria to follow when looking to select a Police Chief to run a Police Service for a big city and I would just like to ask the Mayor if he could please get me the criteria that the committee that's already been struck, the criteria they will be using to figure out who will be the next Police Chief of the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, first of all, it would be my pleasure through you, to Councillor Eadie, to get him the information as far as the criteria. It's my understanding that the criteria has not been set at this stage of the game. I would certainly encourage all Councillors to have suggestions or comments, to definitely share them or make them aware of it and when I know what that criteria is, it would be my pleasure to make Councillor Eadie and any other Councillor aware of that.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. I have a second question on this topic. I'm wondering if, like, I don't know all the criteria I would expect it see to represent my population. Would the Mayor be in favour of me doing some consultations in my ward and then coming back with some criteria ideas to forward on to the Chief Administrative Officer?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think for anyone, any Councillor who represents their ward, to communicate with your ward and find out some of the things that the citizens may be looking for, I would define as very positive and then sharing that with Council and the CAO, I think that is a very good idea, absolutely, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, if the good Councillor wants me to join him, I might walk through his ward with him and be there by his side.

Mr. Speaker: Third question, last question.

Councillor Eadie: Who should I book that through? (Laughing)

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think I can take the initiative and have my office contact Councillor Eadie and make it real easy for him, okay, be my pleasure.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Mayor? Seeing none, we'll move on to the Standing Policy Committee for Finance. There's no report. No motions. No by-laws, do we have questions for Councillor Fielding? Councillor Mayes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker, one question for Councillor Fielding. First perhaps by way of introduction, it was overlooked in all of the excitement last week with the water park was an important announcement from Councillor Fielding, saying he would be staying with us, so I just wanted to say this was a win/win. I think, I often vote against Councillor Fielding but he has been very gentlemanly in his dealings with me and I think works very hard here and the second half of the win is it probably enhances the Selinger Government's chances of being re-elected and I'm sure we're all pleased to see that, perhaps not Councillor Fielding. My question has to do with initiative Councillor Fielding has coming out of Community Committee that I spotted pertaining to granular roadways improvement; granular gravel roadways always a big issue; laneways in St. Vital, St. Boniface and so I just wanted to ask Councillor Fielding for some more information, this is coming back to Infrastructure Committee, so certainly be pleased to see some initiatives on the 2013 Capital Budget in terms of enhancement for laneways but if Councillor Fielding could perhaps elaborate on his proposal that would be appreciated.

Councillor Fielding: Sure. It's the gravel lanes, actually something that a number of Councillors face… the gravel lanes, the back lanes and a couple of years ago in our Budget 2010 we passed some money through; there's a fund, I forget the fund right off the top of my head… anyways, a number of dollars were set aside to improve the gravel back lanes. There's a Local Improvement process to get paid; the problem is been, if you can't get 60% support of it, then there's an issue and so there's large issues. I know Councillor Vandal's ward, it's a big issue; Councillor Nordman and myself; so we were able to put some money into the budget to get these, the gravel back lanes done and they do it, they take a look at which ones are in the worst shape and they allocate money for it. They put out a tender last year, late in the year, so they weren't able to get; and the tenders I guess were a little bit small; so they weren't able to get a lot of people to bid on the tender, I guess, if you will or to answer the tender. So they did it through Internal Services; this year we allocated same thing about a million dollars. So I think at that point, Councillor or myself spoke a little about it and I know from my own ward, I'm doing two back lanes. I did one last year. Councillor Nordman I think had zero and then one; Councillor Vandal had some as well. So the thought was to take a look at the budget. I consulted public works and through the director and Ken Boyd in charge of that area, they said well let's wait and see what the tenders are. If we get some good pricing and we might be might be able to do some additional work. So I said, okay how much additional work could you do, we're going to move up a million dollars; we're proposal to move up a million dollars to do more work sooner from the 2013 Budget; they thought $500,000 might make sense, so that was the motion for first call on the money; it's contingent upon how the tenders come back in. If we get good pricing for the tenders then we can do a maybe second round of tenders in fall and then we can make adjustments in the budget next year. So, whether there'll be more money; the department probably have a better sense on what capacity there would be to do it, so whether we increase that or keep it the same, we just kind of allocate some money. It just allows us to pull some money from next year into this budget year to get the jobs done a lot sooner. So that's essentially the process and like I say, it only hinges upon what comes back in terms of the tenders.

Mr. Speaker: Satisfied? Okay. Any other questions for Finance? Seeing none. We did do the Standing Policy Committee for Downtown Development, Heritage and River Bank Management this morning dealing just with the clauses. There were no motions. There were no consideration for by-laws but we should have a question period if anybody would like to ask the Chair, Councillor Swandel anything about Downtown? Seeing none, we will carry on, Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Councillor Browaty.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED MARCH 6, 2012**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to reintroduce the report of March 6, 2012 and move Item 5 of the report as consent.

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

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report of April 10 and move Items 1 through 11 as consent.

Mr. Speaker: Stand Down Number 7, Councillor Eadie. Anybody else? So voting on 1 through 6 and 8 through 11. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Browaty.

Item 7 - Funding for the Transcona Water Park

Councillor Browaty: I would be absolutely thrilled to answer the Councillor's questions.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you. Actually, I'm going to be voting for this particular motion but I just wanted to point out some things that I don't think I read in the report, and I understand this is $800,000 coming from the Land Operating Reserve not the Land Dedication Reserve, and that there is a pending land sale that will be sold, and which will replenish the money back into the Land Operating Reserve; but, given some of our past votes lately on City Council, Speaker Nordman there's been an issue where we're utilizing the accumulation of money in the Land Operating Reserve to pay for things like renovations to community centres, which is a great idea, as well as utilizing some of the money from this particular Land Operating Reserve for some programming for community centres. So what I didn't read was, was there any financial impact? Like so, if there's -- I don't know what the value of the land is, but if this is a pure $800,000 sale of property it goes through, or is the property worth 2 million? I'm not sure. But this Land Operating Reserve has a lot of draw on it for many different things and so I was just concerned about that and didn't really read anything as a Financial Impact Statement in here, although I guess you could say none if it washed through but there is no detailed description. So I just wanted to point that out but I am in favour of this motion. I just wish that in the Mynarski Ward, I had the ability that there was some land that isn't already being used for a park or anything, that we could sell and then further enhance some of our parks. So thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt was first, then Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Yeah, I thank you Mr. Speaker, I can shed some light on Councillor Eadie's question or concern. The land in question that this funding is coming from, he's correct, it does come from Land Dedication. The public service came forward…just let me finish, please. I'll get to that. The monies are coming from Land Dedication towards this. Now the issue, the public service was the one who came forward and said, we need to write a report. They are not far away from concluding the transaction. We sold in a subdivision that has not been built, we have a lot of park space. Our parks, I sent it to the Parks and Open Space Division of the city, do we need this much parks space; they came back and said no, this was devised back in the 1980s, we don't need this much park space, so the park space was able to be reduced by 10 acres. The land was sold for $80,000 an acre, at that time to Qualico. Qualico bought it, that's $800,000, all the proceeds go when we're selling park land in to Land Dedication and we've already actually rezoned the land, so not only have we sold it Mr. Speaker, we have actually gone through the Public Hearing and Rezoning which everyone in this room voted for and supported and the rezoning was the guarantee in terms of that transaction being able to happen. Qualico is in the process of doing what they call the mylars. The mylars, once they have the mylars, there very close to that, once they have the mylars they can then register the plan of subdivision with Land Titles and when Land Titles happens the transfer can actually take place. So basically there's a gap here Mr. Speaker, of a few months, where the monies from the sale of the transaction will actually flow into the LOR; and then the LOR that replenishing the money taken out. So the reality is this is the Public Service who came forward; they said we just want to make sure there is no hiccup in terms of flowing the money but it's literally a matter of; it's a cash flow issue and that's why they requested this. So believe it or not, you might have a hard time believing this, this is not my request that this came forward it's the Public Service because the monies are

not in Land Dedication at this point but they will be very soon; which they would debit back from the LOR because of this, if they need to actually. So it's there if they have to and they are required to do it. In terms of the fact that it's Parks and Open Space, the Public Service was the one who came back and said and we went through it at a Public Hearing, it was well advertised so the community was aware of it and there was no opposition at the community committee in terms of doing this.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I was out in Transcona the other day and my thanks to Councillor Wyatt for showing me the site. It looks like a little, it needs some work, where the water park's going to go, so I'll be in favour of this. I also, when we got to the site, I wasn't sure if number 8 had been pulled as well, there was some noise behind me, so I'm not sure if number 8.

Mr. Speaker: No, we pulled 8.

Councillor Mayes: If we could pull 8.

Mr. Speaker: We already passed it. Sorry. Next? Anybody else? Seeing none, All those in favour? -- Oh Councillor Browaty you want to close.

Councillor Browaty: Yes, as Councillor Wyatt explained it, in summary, this is basically just a timing issue. The money's there, it's all good.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Okay, no motions and do we have a question, any questions -- oh by-laws sorry. Turn the page here. You have lots of by-laws.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law Nos. 63/2012, 64/2012, 65/2012, 66/2012, 67/2012, 68/2012, 69/2012, 70/2012.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 63/2012, 64/2012, 65/2012, 66/2012, 67/2012, 68/2012, 69/2012 and 70/2012.

Councillor Browaty: Mr. Speaker I move that the by-laws numbered 63/2012 to 70/2012 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 63/2012 to 70/2012 both inclusive.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 63/2012 to 70/2012 both inclusive, be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Now we have question period for Property and Development. Councillor Smith followed by Councillor Mayes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Browaty, we were expecting a report on the financial electronic billboards and it's way past the time that you said it was going to be presented to us. What's the delay? When are we going to get it?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Councillor Smith. As you are very aware, this is a touchy subject. There's certainly a lot of consultation going on as we speak. I would like to think that it's going to be coming out in the fairly new future.

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

Councillor Mayes: Yes if Councillor Browaty could just flesh out for us. Number 8, which I had wanted to pull. I wasn't sure if when talking with Councillor Wyatt what sort of; are we expecting a full-on report back from city administration and before we finalize that agreement. I don't necessarily have a problem with the agreement. It's quite lengthy, a lot of work put in by Councillor Wyatt, but just where are we going from here on number 8?

Councillor Browaty: Yes, I mean there was a draft in terms of reference that I believe were agreed to between the City of Winnipeg and the various parties that are involved in this. There's…it's the whole development scheme for Transcona West that we're basically talking about here. People involved include the Kildonan Place Shopping Centre and their parent company. Shindico has a very small piece in it. The City of Winnipeg's joint venture with Genstar is a big piece of it. Global Homes, and a couple of others as well. There are all sorts of servicing issues in this particular parcel of land and this is just to send the public service now to go and get the lawyers out and basically lawyer it all up. You know, I don't know anything about lawyering up documents.

Mr. Speaker: Follow up? Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: I've got a follow up question. Do we know how much it's going to cost to service this land and do we have a ballpark figure and do we know where the money's going to come from? The reason I ask is, I was on Appeal Committee. There was an appeal on the variance I think, whereas the rezoning has already gone through to this land. The appeal was, you know, it's gone through the variance and I realize that's after the fact, so we basically rezoned this land, it's ready to be developed, and now we're looking at a servicing agreement under the terms and I guess I'm just wondering, it's just a little…I'm a little concerned about how much this is going to cost and how it's going to be paid for, and that isn't clear to me from the reports.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. I don't have the specifics in front of me right now how the numbers break down per acre or per buildable lot or such. It is my understanding that I think, compared to even other developments in the past, there's a greater onus on the developers in play here to cover some of the costs. I would certainly be willing to set up a meeting with the folks in Property and Development to give you some additional detail even before the final report comes forward if that would make the Councillor feel better.

Councillor Gerbasi: And I guess I was just wondering about the…it just seems unusual to me that we would approve a rezoning and everything and then not know the price at the time of the rezoning, and I guess I wonder from a policy point of view, as a Standing Policy Committee, if you have any comments on that. Is that a way to go, to do things, and it concerns me?

Councillor Browaty: The particular subdivision and rezoning that the Councillor is speaking of was proposed before even some of the area improvements were being considered. The problem was we were going to create some poorly designed urban neighbourhoods if we approved as is, as applied for. We would have created what I call a McIvor scenario whereby Almey Road, which is an unpaved roadway with open ditches, would become a primary transportation route into a new subdivision, which wasn't acceptable on a whole multitude of levels. This will actually call for the paving of Reenders through to Peguis at the very beginning before this development goes forward and would allow orderly development to happen in this area, so you're right. In terms of knowing the cost that would be helpful. I noticed Councillor Wyatt is asking a question. I have a sneaking suspicion he has some information he's going to share in the form of a question momentarily.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, well, I appreciate the answer and I think it's sort of obvious that we are doing something without knowing the price ahead of time, and I guess I just wonder, if you would actually think there is anything wrong with that kind of approach or if we should be taking a different approach in future developments? There's a reason it took a long time to develop this land. Is it going to cost us a lot? I mean, we need to know.

Councillor Browaty: I mean just to be fair, I don't have the hard costs in front of me, but I do know that this is consistent with the Transcona West Area Structure Plan that was approved by this Council, so it is part of the orderly development that was proposed, so again, I think Councillor Wyatt may have some information to share here.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: …in the form of a question, are you aware Mr. Chairman that historically in this city, collector roads, developers have four-lane roadways been required to put up one lane only for their side of the road and the developer on the other side if it's the same or different, one lane only with the City of Winnipeg having to pay for the other two lanes and that this proposal that is now before us today, would actually set a positive precedent where developers will be paying for now a lane and a half on either side of the roadway, therefore contributing to a total of three lanes instead of only two with the city holding the liability of only one instead of two. Are you aware of that?

Councillor Browaty: I'd like to thank my learned colleague from Transcona for the very good question. I was aware that this was more generous than typical developments but I wasn't quite sure what the exact ramification was there, so one and a half verses one, that's one and a half times better. Thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: (inaudible) the City, and are you aware that the joint venture that we have entered into with Genstar voted on by this Council unanimously in 2004, was actually held back by the fact that the servicing in this area was not resolved, and that the revenues from the joint venture will more than make up and actually beyond make up and add to the bottom line of the city in terms of being able to develop now that we thankfully that we've been able to find a resolution.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I wasn't aware that there were servicing issues holding back our joint venture lands, but I was aware that there have already been significant contributions to the L.O.R. from the development of those lands in the joint venture lands with Genstar; as again, Councillor Wyatt and myself are both members of the board of that joint venture.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Wyatt: And are you aware that since the joint venture was struck, that the joint venture between the City of Winnipeg and Genstar has contributed nearly $10 million to the land operating reserve, the bottom line of this city, which we would not have achieved had we'd sold it simply as raw land and not developed land.

Councillor Browaty: I was not aware that the number was $10 million but I am quite impressed to hear that that's the fact.

(inaudible speaking in the background)

Mr. Speaker: Sure, absolutely. Go ahead.

Councillor Gerbasi: Are you aware that Members of Council still don't know the cost of these improvements, as wonderful as they are being presented to be, and we have already approved a rezoning without knowing the cost of the charges to our capital costs and other things? I wonder if you're aware of that.

Mr. Speaker Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm aware that the hard numbers are not here, but I am quite comfortable at this point in that the new revenues that are being brought on-stream by both the joint venture as well as the tax roll are not insignificant. That said, I will endeavor to get more hard costs for the Councillor.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for Property and Development? Seeing none. We'll move onto the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. Councillor Havixbeck.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED APRIL 2, 2012

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 through 4.

Mr. Speaker: Okay we're standing down 3. So, all those in favour of 1, 2 and 4? Opposed? Motion passed. Councillor Havixbeck.

Item 3 – Community Incentive Grant - The Underground Gym

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, I would be interested to hear the thoughts; this Item was an Item that came to the Community Incentive Grant Program, it did not meet the criteria but was adopted at the Standing Policy Committee so I would be interested to hear the questions.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Steen.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. The reason I had this stood down is I -- the cause of the Underground Gym which is a boxing studio and athletic, physical kind of exercise place, and it's not that it isn't a great effort. It's something that the community more than likely wants, but I at Standing Committee, I didn't have it recorded but I didn't vote for this particular initiative because it doesn't meet any criteria that I could tell under the Community Incentive Grant, other than, I guess it's a not-for-profit. But anyway, the problem here is this money is all going to operating and I understand that you know, it's difficult for these kinds of facilities and good efforts in the community to keep young people engaged. There is a whole bunch of organizations that need more money to deliver the programs and services that we have here in Winnipeg and it's quite clear to me that in the budget process that there was a huge demand for this; so simply I'm not against the Underground Gym; I think they're providing a good service, providing things for youth to do in the Elmwood area. I think that's great but I can't really vote for this. I know we're reviewing the Community Incentive Grant, I believe, and I, but I don't see how any review would start to say that there was ever any idea that a CIG grant would be related to providing operating dollars to organizations. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steen.

Councillor Steen: The Underground Gym is from Thunder Bay. They moved into our area. This is the first year they're there. They have 200 kids between 13 and 19 going there. Crime is down 35% in our area. We don't have many programs in our area that does something for kids 13 to 19; so I'm sure this is part of helping, keeping crime down. And I just; this is a onetime only. They have a business model from Thunder Bay which will is going to take them a little bit of time to get it in place, so we're trying to help them with that, so I am hoping we can waive the criteria for this one time only so we can keep the gym in our area, or else they're going to move out. That's why I did this. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: No further comments? Call the vote then? All those in favour? Opposed?

Councillor Havixbeck: I believe -- do I not close on this?

Mr. Speaker: Yeah, you should close here.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, I would like to. So -- sounds like it's a resoundingly successful. I just want to point out a couple of things though about this. That yes, this is going to operating however, this is a not-for-profit organization and you know, I wanted to add something to this that I went out with Councillor Steen in his Ward on a Sunday afternoon and you know, I hadn't really spent any time in East Kildonan and Elmwood area, since I was a kid and we had family living there, in the 70's, so it was a very nice place and he showed me around and it's got some challenges. And a lot of people don't know this but Councillor Steen actually works with a lot of faith-based groups in his area and he goes out once a week and gets kids these ages out of the 7-11 and into these kinds of programs. So I think it's really important for his area of the city.

Mr. Speaker: My apologies, Councillor Havixbeck. Now, all those in favour? Opposed? Motion passed. We have no motions but we do have some by-laws, Councillor Havixbeck.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Havixbeck: I move that By-law 71/2012 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 71/2012.

Councillor Havixbeck: I move that By-law No. 71/2012 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 71/2012.

Councillor Havixbeck: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 71/2012 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 Protection and Community Services. Councillor Swandel.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker, Councillor Havixbeck is the person who is going to be most involved in the hiring of the Police Chief as the Chair of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. Can you confirm for us that there will, in fact, be or we will be able to and there will be properly received and given due consideration provided to the hiring committee or the people making up the criteria for hiring the new Chief, any of our individual thoughts on what we believe should be there for a Chief. Some people might lean more towards community based policing and some to more traditional forms of policing, but it's going to be difficult to shape that but I'm sure that everybody here has an opinion. Can you give us some sense of how you feel that process is going to work?

Councillor Havixbeck: I can tell you where the process is at maybe at this point. I understand that People First h r services has been contracted, and I am a part. I was appointed by the Mayor of the search committee, so we will begin a detailed recruitment strategy and with that will be the development of the criteria that we would expect, so I would be welcome and open and probably going around to each and every Councillor to hear what kinds of expectations they have, what kinds of qualifications perhaps even they hope that the next Chief has.

Mr. Speaker: Second question? No? Any further questions for Protection and Community Services? Seeing none we'll move onto the Standing Committee for Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Vandal.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED APRIL 12, 2012

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to move Items 1 and 2 of the report dated -- I don't have a date.

Mr. Speaker: April 12.

Councillor Vandal: April 12th.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have a notice of motion. Councillor Sharma and Councillor Havixbeck. Councillor Sharma if you would open.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Sharma,
Seconded by Councillor Havixbeck,

WHEREAS the Centre Port development could ensure the future success of Winnipeg as a major trading and commercial centre for Canada and North America;

AND WHEREAS a major component of Centre Port's development has been focused on improving road access in and around the Centre Port Lands, specifically with upgrades to the Perimeter Highway, Inkster Boulevard and the construction of the new Centre Port Canada Way;

AND WHEREAS based on the fact that the Provincial Government has spent over $200 million of federal infrastructure dollars on road access improvements for Centre Port, Centre Port represents a high public policy priority for the Government of Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS a completed inner ring road system, as documented in the recent Transportation Master Plan and previously documented in the Mayor's Trade Council Report, is crucial to both the development of Centre Port and securing Winnipeg's future status as an ongoing centre for trade and commerce in North America;

AND WHEREAS the completion of the inner ring road will divert truck traffic that presently rely on existing regional roads which pass through Winnipeg's centre and impact older neighbourhoods such as Elmwood, St. Boniface, the West End, West Kildonan, the North End, and Downtown Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS for the Chief Peguis Trail to be fully effective as one of the main transportation routes for Centre Port, the Trail's transportation infrastructure must first be built so as to connect into the Route 90 transportation system;

AND WHEREAS the Chief Peguis Trail, from Main to McPhillips, is in the Transportation Master Plan under the Medium-term timeframe (by 2021) at an estimated cost of $110 million and the Chief Peguis Trail, from McPhillips to Route 90, is in the same Plan under the Long-term timeframe (by 2031), with an estimated cost of construction of $130 million;

AND WHEREAS plans are now underway for 'Ridgewood' in Charleswood, a new housing development on an estimated 900 acres of land that will create new property tax revenues for the City of Winnipeg, enhance an existing older neighbourhood (Charleswood), and provide housing to a growing city by building infill development rather than suburban sprawl;

AND WHEREAS that a prerequisite to facilitate the Ridgewood development reduce existing traffic issues will be the construction of the William R. Clement Parkway, from Grant to Wilkes, providing this development with its main source of ingress and egress to Winnipeg's regional street network and helping to fulfill the goal of completing Winnipeg's inner ring road system with its strategic importance to the Centre Port Project and other will support the retail and commercial development in the area;

AND WHEREAS the William R. Clement Parkway, from Grant to Wilkes, is in the Transportation Master Plan under the Medium-term time frame (by 2021) and at an estimated construction cost of $60 million;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Winnipeg City Council amend the Winnipeg Transportation Master Plan by moving up to the Short-term timeframe schedule (by 2016) the following projects:

i) Chief Peguis Trail - from Main to McPhillips - a total estimated construction cost of $110 million

ii) Chief Peguis Trail – from McPhillips to Route 90 – a total estimated construction cost of $130 million

iii) William R. Clement Parkway – from Grant to Wilkes – at total estimated construction cost of $60 million.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to ask support for this motion, seconded by Councillor Havixbeck to accelerate the completion of two planned projects, namely the extension of the Chief Peguis Trail to Route 90 and the construction of the William R. Clement Parkway from Grant to Wilkes. Mr. Speaker, these two transportation investments are already in the city's master transportation plan. However, given the strong economic growth, community needs, demands for enhanced transportation by business and general communities, this motion asks for Council to support and accelerate the completion of these two projects to 2016. Each of these transportation assets are important to the overall economic growth of our city. And in particular, to the northwest corner of Winnipeg. The extension of Chief Peguis from Main to McPhillips and from McPhillips to Route 90 is a key part of our goal of creating an inner road ring in Winnipeg. One that would simultaneously improve traffic flows and support the development of CentrePort by allowing truck cargo traffic to move efficiently to and from market into and out of Winnipeg. It will help people travel to jobs in the area which is important to Winnipeg's business attraction efforts. The Chief Peguis extension would also have the benefit of helping residents with improved, more timely and efficient transportation systems. Development is rapidly occurring in both the residential and industrial sectors within Winnipeg's northwest. Sectors that would be directly serviced by the Chief Peguis extension. It makes so much sense for us to support this development by planning for the completion of the extension sooner than originally planned. I know this is a priority for businesses and investment decisions in the area, as well as for people and families working and living nearby in neighbouring communities. The construction of the William R. Clement Parkway from Grant to Wilkes is part of the inner ring road network and is also critically important to our city's development. I believe this proposal is win/win for our city. It will help improve traffic flows in both the northwest, northeast, west and south sections of our city. It will support new business development and residential housing growth. And it will benefit Winnipeggers, Mr. Speaker and their families, as they travel from one community to another. Obviously the

extension of Chief Peguis is important to people in my ward where residential housing continues to expand and traffic concerns are real. This proposal helps address those local issues but as a by-product of a much broader vision, which supports the overall growth of our city and economy. Whether it's the travelling to and from work, driving the kids to hockey or dance lessons or moving kids to and from market, roads are what connect us to one another. Roads connect us to family, to friends, to other neighbourhoods, to jobs and to new market opportunities. Roads are an investment in our economic growth and our quality of life. Making these changes to our Transportation Master Plan is a positive move forward. I urge you to be visionary, to support the connections these investments support, and the economic growth they enable. I ask you to support the motion here today and I've circulated a letter of support from CentrePort, I believe you all have a copy. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie -- sorry. Oh I'm sorry, Councillor Vandal was first; I apologize.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I will move that this be referred to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure and Public works.

Councillor Swandel: Call a recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker: Recorded vote? All those in favour of referring this to Infrastructure Renewal?

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Gerbasi, Mayes, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Smith, Swandel, Vandal.

Mr. Speaker: Those opposed please rise.

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: Well we have a tie vote and in that case unfortunately it is defeated. All right so we debate it today, and would you like to now go, Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Yes very briefly.

Mr. Speaker: Followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, I think that there's never been greater evidence that we need a transportation authority at the City of Winnipeg; who can look at all these issues and in a long term visionary way, that can have industry expertise other government's expertise and actually look at our budgets, look at our funding sources and look at what exactly is doable. I know Councillor Sharma; this is coming from a very good place. Obviously it's her ward and she's abdicating for her ward but the realities are that we spend at least $2 million on a Transportation Master Plan. There have been origin destination studies completed; there's been industrial land studies completed; there probably been other studies completed which were; I understand were cost shared between the Province of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg. And we adopted a Transportation Master Plan four months ago, with the priorities both in roadway implementation and construction and transit. Four months ago there is not a heck of a lot that's changed in the last four months, Mr. Speaker. And I dare say this was not a recommendation from the administration when they did their analysis; brought forward their recommendations. I don't think this was ever brought up at the Public Works Committee, at Executive Committee or on the floor of the Council. When this Master Plan was approved, and the reality of nothing has changed since that time; my suggestion, if we want to keep the integrity and the validity of the Master Plan intact is to review the Master Plan in one year, after we've had a little bit of breath to see where we're at. We will hopefully by that time be in the process of adopting a transportation authority. And at that one year period we perhaps have a Council Seminar and look at amendments to the Plan. I think that's the intelligent way to move forward. We could certainly use our transportation experts to do that analysis. We could look at our budgeting and our financing going forward in a realistic way. I know there are a couple of motions coming forward next month on gas tax and on the motor vehicle tax for specific projects. It just seems to me that on the whim of a motion and again, I know it's coming from a good place, on the whim of a motion, to make $300 million of changes in the Master Plan, invalidates our Master Plan, if indeed that is what we're going to do today.

Mr. Speaker: Ross Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. I would like to speak to this motion but I'm not sure at what point to do this but I would like to be able to vote on this clause by clause for this particular motion if that's possible.

Mr. Speaker: No I don't think that's possible.

Councillor Eadie: Pardon me? One, two, three, there are 3 clauses in here? Separate and vote on each one? I think that's a motion that's in order, it's just a matter of how do I do that?

Mr. Speaker: Well, we'll -- you're making…

Councillor Eadie: I'm just moving that we vote on each clause but still speak to the whole motion.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, all right, I'll ask if that's the will of the Council that each of the 3 designated routes are voted on independently? Nay okay. All those in favour? Those opposed? I think we have the answer. Sorry Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: So I can speak to the motion though, is that correct Speaker Nordman?

\Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: Okay, that's fine. I wanted to speak to the motion. I actually, Chief Peguis Trail, none of this is actually in my ward called the Mynarski Ward; we only go as far north actually as the Chief Peguis Trail; as it exists right now; but I would point out that in particular, I did not vote for the transportation plan that everybody else voted. I keep getting reminded that there was only one person that voted against it; that was I, and, sorry. But anyway, this would be amending the transportation plan as I understand it. So, the reason I bring this up is that the Chief Peguis Trail is a lot related to a trade route. It is directly associated with getting from the east side of the city over to the new CentrePort area, as well as into our existing trucking situation that exists along Inkster. It's been there for a lot of years, ever since I was a kid. We have the Inkster Industrial over there as well and what's happening right now in my ward is Leila where there's houses on, is taking the load of that kind of trade route through my ward, as well as through Councillor Sharma's ward and so it's my concern that we do build the Chief Peguis Trail as soon as possible. And I would also point out that right now, this city, people don't think about this, but there is no big huge like Sage Creek plan or Waverley West plan. But what's happening in Old Kildonan, is it is growing very fast, and we ended up having to spend a lot of extra money to bring the existing extension that went through, by putting in an underpass so that didn't wreck neighbourhoods that already grew up and developed over time. And so one of the reasons that I am supporting this particular motion is to allow us to build this before it's going to cost even more money, than it would otherwise if we hadn't moved fast enough before development happens. So like I would invite any Councillor, Councillor Sharma should invite people up to see how fast Amber Trails really is growing and I understand in Councillor Pagtakhan's ward there is a new move to move further north as well. So -- but really, I think that the trade and that kind of traffic that's going down Leila in my ward is untenable. I'm actually not in support of the William Clement Parkway Extension or whatever it's called, because that's part of an inner ring road. I think that this city and it is too bad, I don't know if a transportation authority would ever come up with this idea, but there is actually a way of inspiring trade without building an inner ring road. There are cheaper ways, if you build, what I call, a kind of a weird shape but I call it the inner rectangle with spokes off it and you could do it that way and you could also run buses quickly down those roads as well. And so, this is why I'm moving this forward, the Chief Peguis Trail, both extensions I think should be in the 2016 and just to be clear again, I don't support the extension into Charleswood at this point. I don't see how trade is necessarily related to that. The industrial area in St. James, Inkster Industrial, the airport, all of that is really not that connected and you can get to the airport quite easily if you use Route 90 that's Kenaston and it's already on our books to widen Kenaston. I think that those things are there so, that's why I stand today to support the motion for the Chief Peguis Trail. I don't know how you're going to get the funding done. Yes it's true all the money isn't necessarily there to dedicate it but I think that we need to actually modify our Financial Management Plan which is maybe that's the one I was the only person who voted against. But that Financial Management Plan does not allow us -- what happens is we have new construction. If we have to borrow for this new roads and new construction it takes away from our ability to borrow money and fix our inner city streets. We should be using this so-called frontage levy. We should be borrowing money to move along the faster renewal of our streets so I don't see any controversy between the two. I think we need to modify our Financial Management Plan and we will not lose our credit rating; if we can demonstrate to any of these bond rating agencies that this is our plan; this is how we proceed and this is how we can do it. So I am in support the Chief Peguis Trail, thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Just want to say that the, you know, the inner ring road is something that's been talked about since the 60s and I think there was an opportunity back then to create an inner ring road system. I'm not sure why those decisions were made or weren't made at that point ,but if you look at the City of Winnipeg the closest we have to an inner city road – I mean, every major city has one really except for the City of Winnipeg, would be the Bishop Grandin and we know there's lights that kind of go on; I always use this as the context for the evening and weekend construction and how you are moving back and forth but Winnipeg is constantly …you're in the stop/start mentality that that's there and I think the inner road beltway or the inner road, roadway system is something that really needs to be looked at. You know, I think that a part of this – actually I don't think it's in Councillor Wyatt's, in terms of the Edward Schreyer Parkway is something that can be built into that, it's well in terms of this process, but I think it makes….

(inaudible talking)

Councillor Fielding: But my point with this – you know my point….

Councillor Gerbasi: Existing new roads…

Councillor Fielding: Hang on, to be fair, this isn't the first time that we've made amendments on the floor of Council to the Transportation Master Plan. This has happened numerous times so this isn't anything out of the ordinary which we haven't done in the past. We can get into those debates or not; one way or another. One thing that I'm very, very supportive of is CentrePort. I'm a very big supporter of CentrePort. I think the concept is fantastic and I think if it's done right, it can be very effective tool. We got a letter, looks like from the CentrePort, I'm not sure it's from the board, I know it's from Diane Gray. Very supportive of this process and thinks it will help. I truly believe that CentrePort can create thousands of jobs, if done right. There is trade delegations that are going through China; there's a whole bunch of people, the federal government, the provincial government, the city governments, the media, the business community, they are all very much supportive of this and I think anything we can do to make Centre Port a reality makes a lot of sense. There's something in a road belt-way obviously is something I think that our citizens can most definitely get behind. There's always debate at how we spend our infrastructure dollars that's there. I can tell you that's something that I get talked to all the time. People always bring that, why doesn't the city have it. It's tough to implement once we are where we are. But I think it's a good investment of public sector dollars that are there. You know, I've been pretty vocal in terms of our infrastructure plans. I was the only member of Council not to support the Bus Rapid Transit System, when it did come through. I'm hoping I'm wrong with that, I know it's been introduced. I haven't had a chance to go in it but I will; I will be in the next few weeks to try it out and see the numbers I guess in terms of what you would save, I don't know if it's 2 minutes or what but in any event, I believe that's what is was, at least that's what it reports in the paper. But anyways, I want to see that succeed. I know they said that its -- it would increase ridership by 30%, so hopefully that will succeed. My point is, I think this project takes priority over that in my opinion. I think not only will this be good for our citizens to get people back and forth more than there going to go; it makes sense on an economic basis, to drive jobs; drive the economy. I know one of the speakers came up earlier on today, and was talking about why we should invest in master transportation. I think that makes sense too, but at the end of the day master transportation goes on the roads; you need a road to drive some of these buses that we're talking about. So I very much think that it makes a lot of sense. You know, I'm a; I wasn't at -- when we debated I was supportive of the Transportation Master Plan. I was away, my wife was having a baby, so I didn't, I wasn't at EPC and I wasn't, that's not an excuse but I was also at the Council session that's here. But when this idea came forward, I thought this was just a fantastic idea and we should be taking a look at it. The question that Councillor Eadie brought up is a valid point, okay, so how will we pay for this? Now, I think there's a whole bunch of funding sources and I think we make this a priority. You can take a look at, you know, you've got Building Canada funds that are coming available; looks like in 2014. There's other funding source, people have talked about tolls; people have talked about a whole host of things that are there. So, in my opinion, you know, I think that this is a priority, I think it should be priority above and beyond the second phase of Rapid Transit and the Financial Management Plan, there is some talk of the debt capacity and that's debatable. We can't talk about it. You know, I can tell you that we are kind of at the peak of our borrowing capacity that's there and we will be visiting the bond raters and I think we've got some meetings set up in September. So it's interesting to have these things come forward and we'll be reviewing that plan on a yearly basis in terms of what our capacity. We all know we need to do a whole host more work that's there and if there's a way to somehow take a look at that Financial Management Plan and have some more flexibility in it by revenues and everything else that's there, then I'm sure we can take a look at it. I'm not willing -- personally I'm not willing to jeopardize our credit rating if you have people like the bond raters suggesting that it could impact our credit rating by in terms of our borrowing capacity. That's something I personally not willing to do. I know some people might want to push the envelope here and that's fine; that's a debate we can have but I'm personally not there yet with it; but it's something I guess we can talk about when we do visit the bond raters in September . Thank you very supported, thank you for bringing this forward, I think it makes a lot of sense

and very happy to support this and hope it does become get incorporated in the Transportation Master Plan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I won't be supporting this and I wanted to clarify, there seems to be a misconception that the Master Plan was amended on the fly on the floor of Council to include Rapid Transit and I would like to clarify what actually happened. The draft master plan, which went through significant public consultation and then went to the Public Works Committee; at the Public Works Committee which this motion has not gone to, there was -- it was noted that the road projects all identified in the Master Plan up to 2031 all had time lines on them. They were either short, medium or long term. Whereas all the Transit projects had no time lines, so they listed a number of projects and you know, without putting them -- saying we will do them by 2016 or 2021 or 2031. So the Public Works Committee, everyone agreed, this topic never came up there and everyone agreed that we should put time lines on and so the firnot to supportst -- the second phase of the southwest corridor was put to 2016 and the eastern corridor in that part of the city, was put into the medium term. The projects talked about in this motion are in the Master Plan. I think two of them are in the medium term and one in the longer term. So, it's not that they are not in the Master Plan but at the time it was realized that if there was any intention to ever build any further Rapid Transit then what we built now, they had to be considered in our Transportation Master Plan and put a timeline on them. Public Works agreed to that, all of Council agreed to that, it was passed and then that kind of triggered things like the Transit Fare increase and other discussions and people have been sort of implying that somehow we've just added something in. Really what we did was, we said, we are a city that's going to build roads and going to build some Transit and that's what every other city is doing. In fact, the delegation, Ken Klassen earlier pointed out today, most other cities are building much more Transit in ratio to the amount of roads that we are going; we're doing very little, and we're very much behind in that regard, so, and I just heard Councillor Fielding state that you know, he doesn't really think we should be building any more Rapid Transit; we should do this, this is a much better idea. So I'm very concerned to hear this coming forward like this. The cost of these roadways are $300 million. We're talking about having them completed by 2016. I guess is it's a matter of priorities. If we think we should build twice as many new roads and not build Transit, obviously that's already been expressed by one member of Council. You know, that's what could happen here, if we support this. So the reason I brought up the earlier decisions, I know it already has been brought up by others and I want to clarify what actually happened. It was not done "On the Fly". It was done with the proper discussion at the Policy Committee which is how things should be done which is why I supported referring this back for further discussion but unfortunately that didn't pass. I think it should be obvious to all of us here that there needs to be a balanced investment in Rapid Transit and roads. We also can't forget the deficit of existing infrastructure and to simply add $300 million more dollars of projects to be done in the next 2 or 3 years; I'm really concerned. We are miles behind most Canadian cities in our investment in Rapid Transit and the Master Plan that we approved in November, I supported it. I didn't think it was perfect. I mean, you know there's projects in there I didn't like to see go forward. I agreed to support -- though there is a lot of road extensions in there over the course of the Master Plan and I thought well at least there's some balance here. And if this motion happens I think it's Councillor Vandal indicated, it kind of makes the whole plan, kind of a bit of a meaningless document. And I guess I wonder if part of the problem we're having here today is the climate of how decision making has been made around here. We know that the Plessis Underpass project came about as a high priority; it was moved up as our biggest priority for Building Canada funds and everything. We know, yeah, Councillor Wyatt did his job by, in an intensely politically driven campaign during two elections, at two different levels of government, and as a result, you know, that project is now our top priority, $75 million. Most people believe -- well they might like that project and think it's great; you know, may not of been the highest priority thing but it happened because of what Councillor Wyatt did. And his tactics of fighting politically and aggressively to get a major road expansion in his ward not only worked but they were encouraged and lauded by the Mayor at the time. I remember this and the message at that point to each Councillor is to essentially go ahead and lobby and fight politically to get what you want for your ward and for your corner of the city. That is the message, that's how this Council is now operating. The squeakiest wheel will get the grease and so we better each of us get out there and start making deals, and trading horses and making some noise. Well, and that message has been received. I mean, I don't blame people. Councillors, it's understandable, you're fighting for your ward, you made promises in your election, you want to get what you think is best for your ward, your neighbourhood but transportation planning should not be done that way and I object to that style of politics being brought into transportation planning. I object -- I think that Council should be driven -- and I mean this from my heart I'm talking here because I don't have a project in my ward, my Rapid Transit piece is done already. I mean, I've been fighting for Rapid Transit on the national level. I've been involved with the Canadian Urban Transit Association; I'm lobbying the federal government -- through that, though FCM, I'm lobbying on behalf of the City of Winnipeg to build a Transit System and to build a corridor in the eastern part of the city. This isn't about Fort Rouge, this is about what kind of Transportation Plan is good for our city and I think most of us; in our heart of hearts are here for that reason to build a better city not necessarily just to get ourselves reelected. I certainly hope not but I think we have to – you know, Council should be driven by good public policy not by horse trading and lobbying for our own things in our wards. And – you know, there might be some arguments for the Chief Peguis Trail because of CentrePort I hear that, I see

that. And I'm not saying, it shouldn't be built, I'm just saying to move it up to the next 2 to 3 years when we just finished building a very expensive extension on it, you know, I guess I just question; whether we should do that without even having the Administration comment on it or we don't know if there's land acquisition; there's other issues and as for the Charleswood thing there, I hear -- read in the paper, that there's a big subdivision coming eventually. Is that a reason to spend this kind of money in the next two or three years when that subdivision hasn't even been approved yet? You know, I can understand why individual Councillors would want these projects, but I think we have to step back and look at the big picture. Let's see. Supporting this motion concerns me for the message it sends not only to all Councillors, that's already been sent is, the squeakiest wheel rather than working as a team. I think it says to our funders and our infrastructure partners, you know, everyone go out and lobby for your thing. It's sort of, if we have a plan that really isn't credible that we're changing like this, I think it's -- it makes the other funders wonder, you know, do we really have a plan? If we have a list that's so long; that's so expensive; which thing do we want? And what it does is it puts things lower down the list that were already approved as priorities for 2016 and I already heard one Councillor say, you know, he didn't think Rapid Transit is that important and it should probably come off the list and move further down, so I mean, I guess I'm really concerned about that for our whole city.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Not speaking just for Fort Rouge but I think there's a lot of the citizens of Winnipeg, we've got 3.7 kilometers of BRT, I was just in London and Paris where they have a subway system in London for 150 years. A hundred years they've had it in Paris and here we are, we've got 3.7 kilometers and hear people saying let's not finish it to the new stadium and the University; let's put that off because we want to build $300 million dollars more with the new roads. And I know everyone may not be saying that, they're saying let's build it all, but I don't think we can build it all. We have to make choices; we have to build priorities and that's what a Transportation Master Plan is about. I know we not all going to agree on everything. I didn't agree with everything in that Plan either but I supported it because there was at least some balance and there was Transit projects and road projects; spread out over the course of the plan; and we're not all going to get everything we want whenever; so I guess I urge you, not to support this because I believe that it will make our Master Plan a meaningless and ineffective document and I think it will hurt our credibility as a Council. I wish we could have just referred this discussion back and at least had a discussion at Public Works and got some information from our administration but I really urge you that this is a time where we need to face our infrastructure challenges together. I notice there're motions coming forward on this form of funding or that form of funding, let's try that. I don't really feel like we're working together. We should be coming together with a plan and saying, here's the different – here's our priorities and I thought that's what we did in November. I honestly thought, I supported it, in spite of my reservations because I honestly thought that was going to be our plan now. Now the next step would be to go get the money for it. I was on board with that and I'm just really shocked to see this now because especially to hear some Councillor saying you know, we should ditch the transit aspect of it and just build even more roads. I mean, you know, we heard this morning how far behind we are of other cities. There's some excitement in this city about the transit we have started. If we only build 3.7 kilometers, I mean, yeah, it probably not going to succeed in the long term. So I urge you to reconsider this. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Mr. Speaker. There is a certain unreality to the whole debate of course, because we are not saying we've got 200 million and it should go here or there, we're debating where to move things on a conceptual schedule. Councillor Sharma's doing a good job for her constituents. Councillor Havixbeck is doing a good job for her constituents. I think the problem here is, if we pass this, I'll be coming in next time, seconded by Councillor Vandal or others, saying, well I want that St. Mary's road widening that was set for 2016. I'd like to move that up or move it from 2031 to 2016. I think we're going to be spending an hour at each and every meeting debating this all. I'll come in and say well, I want to move up the Vandal/Wyatt eastern leg of the Transport Corridor, make that; that should be moved up so that it's ahead of the Southwest Transit Corridor. We're going to be in here, I think, spending a lot of time doing this; what I would rather do is under the Mayor's leadership let's sit down as a Council, say okay what A: do we want to; what do we want to look at in terms of taxation if anything, to get infrastructure doughed together. B; Let's go to the Province with a list and we can thrash that out. If the Province comes back and says actually we want to do the William R. Clement Parkway because we're targeting the Charleswood and Tuxedo ridings, for the next provincial election, so want to do that. Then we can consider that, we can say well no or yes, but right now, and I don't fault Councillor Havixbeck or Councillor Sharma for moving this. I guess we have this Master Plan and we should be sticking to it. There's obviously each year there's a Capital Budget. Councillor Fielding says he's not going to do it again, but I suspect we'll have Councillor Fielding doing it again in the fall, which I'm fine with, and things like the Plessis Underpass move up for whatever reasons. If that the decision that comes out of the budget this year so be it but I just think if we're in here each month debating individual projects and in some ways it almost forces us to bring them up for our own wards because we'll have constituents saying, "well why aren't you going to bat for St. Mary's Road or why aren't you going to bat for Bishop Grandin; getting that kicked over from Lag. up to Fermor because that's on the list". So, while I'm sure this is a good proposal, we've heard it would be good for

CentrePort, quite possibly is. I don't know, we don't have anything from the administration saying "due to new developments we may have miscalibrated here and the Chief Peguis one should have been higher up". We don't have that report. If we want that, we should get it, as I say, I would rather spend my time sitting down as a group with the Mayor and saying; here's what we want to do on infrastructure; here's the list we want to go to the Province with and make them come to the table with some kind of list of their own. So, I'll be voting against the proposal, but it's not that I want to see this die; I would like to see this as part of a larger process. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I'll be fairly brief in my comments, but I just want to say, I'll be in support of today's motion. Sixteen of us here in this Chamber are the ones who set the priorities. Are we open for business? Are we open for trade? There's two things that you know we have to realize. Sure, we are behind some other jurisdictions when is it comes to Rapid Transit; but we're also behind other jurisdictions when it comes to high speed arterial routes. Instead we're putting semi-trailers, we're trying to be a global transportation hub; a global commerce hub and we're putting semi-trailers at all hours of the day down residential streets. Phase 2 of Chief Peguis Trail that opened in December, has been a phenomenal success in northeast Winnipeg. Trade goes down roads that are designed for and we're not destroying our local streets any more. We're saving ourselves operating dollars and having to maintain streets that are being torn up by semi-trailers going over them, that aren't designed for it. I think this is a good motion in front of us here today. I have a feeling that our department inflated the numbers in planning them out for 2021; based on the length and land we have, I can't believe Item number 1 here would cost $110 million that seems really high; so I think there is an opportunity to take advantage of getting ahead of construction inflation and getting some of the stuff in the ground. So I will be supportive of the motion here today.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was kind of ready just to let this go through today because we're making so many changes here we're just really making our Transportation Master Plan obsolete. But I heard Councillor Vandal's motion and the fact we're sitting here as divided as we are tells you that you've got to put some kind of review process in here. We spend millions of dollars doing these things; whether it's that plan or Our Winnipeg, Transportation Authority is going to be another; several more, over a million dollars to complete that, and we seem to do it for not because we get in here and for whatever reasons, we bring these projects forward. Yes, they may have merit but I would suggest that you need to tie them a little tighter to the merit. If you look at the two projects that are being proposed today, very easy I can say yes they make wonderful sense. The one in Charleswood will certainly make sense if and when there is a development proposal that's ready to move forward and we should seriously look at moving that forward in the Transportation Master Plan at that time. There's still significant challenges to deal with from land drainage; to the supply of sewer and infrastructure with developing those lands. The other thing is that development is going to take place over a long period of time. The need for a full expressway and I don't know that you would go all the way through to Wilkes Street there because once you do that it also opens up the community to all the traffic coming down Wilkes. You're putting that road, that road network out then to Wilkes, which if it going outside the city going out towards the Perimeter is a two lane, rural in nature…I don't know if it's asphalt even, it's sort of a paved old gravel road, is what it is for the most part, it's in pretty rough shape. I don't know if that road is designed to handle the kind of traffic that if you were to punch this through there. That's the type of thing that a Transportation Master Plan contemplates. So, I see the intent of it and I agree with the intent. I think we need to bring it forward at the right time; and that particular one, we need to at whether or not it can be phased and if it's only two lanes in the first place, to get access to the development; then perhaps for a funding source we could even talk about the developer front-ending those two lanes because if it was to become a, what do we call an expressway for development agreement purposes where the city pays for everything then we need to negotiate that. Just a point of negotiation and we can be fair in that process. The other one is Chief Peguis Trail extension, yes, we want to continue to connect the inner ring road. Is it there? Is it an extension of Bishop Grandin? This one though is being relative to CentrePort and I see CentrePort has sent the letter of support here today. That's very troubling. When we talked about CenterPort and went to CenterPort; one of the principles that they put forward initially; was that they were going to take this traffic out to the perimeter. That's why they're building those Canada, CenterPort Way, it's to get the traffic out to the perimeter so it can go around and then have access into which should be our more industrial lands on the edges of the City because this -- the priority for this place at the beginning are one of the highest priorities was to help relieve poor congestion; that's why it's called CenterPort; an inland port; it's supposed to be an inland port; it's a place where things come to be redistributed outside of the City or come for assembly to be distributed outside the city; so, I'm a little confused by CentrePort forthcoming forward here and they mention, you know, all the projects that are going on there. Those projects were all under way before CenterPort was even developed. Paterson Grains Project was underway, the Brookside Industrial was under way and there may be some businesses coming there now into those industrial developments and maybe CenterPort's helped a bit there but that was already under way. Another thing to consider in this, when you look at it from the port congestion perspective is; that the economy's done a pretty good job of slowing down port congestion; which has really sort of slowed down

CenterPort, and you know, we need to consider that in our planning. What is the timing for that money? When would you actually have something there that would have -- would create a substantial amount of traffic? Because what was developed there was being developed and proposed even before any of the new roadways went in; and you know, so I don't know why CenterPort did this and why it's here. Why they wouldn't have come forward during the Transportation Master Plan debate if this was their priority. So I don't know what the motivation is here. But I'll certainly do a little bit more digging on it to try to understand that perspective or maybe it's just because there's opportunity there and their belief is that any improvement in roadways is good for CenterPort but that's not the perspective that we have to take on our overall Transportation Master Plan. We need to be targeted and we need to look at it relative to the entire city. A comment was made I forget by who, good for their constituents, certainly good for all our constituents in many cases, but the Transportation Master Plan is about being good for the entire city. It's about looking at the priorities of the entire city. I guess, in closing, I would like to say that Councillor Vandal put a reasonable motion forward here. If -- only a few months ago we passed this Transportation Master Plan and we're here doing this, then there's something wrong with our Transportation Master Plan. It's time for a review. So I'm not going to support today. The concepts I support, I think you need to look at how you align these things and bring them into context of the overall plan. We don't have any context to the overall plan here. We have two individual projects and we certainly don't have any financing here before us; I know there's a couple of notices of motion today; one was to help fund Rapid Transit; there would be enough money there to actually fund that, and yes maybe now we can do that. And perhaps there might be enough with the Mayor's notice of motion on using the gas tax to get some of these other projects done but we can't look at them just in isolation. So let's be sensible and let's make sure that the money that we spend doing this planning is being spent wisely and it's not just political parochialization and it's not just us sitting in a room, blind to the plan, making these arbitrary decisions. So those are my comments, Mr. Speaker and I hope that wisdom will prevail.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Swandel. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I will be definitely supportive of the motion and let me tell you why. To start off with, Mr. Speaker, we have our experts who spend a lot of time and energy developing a Transportation Master Plan. So for the record, let's all admit to reality. Before the ink was dry on that Transportation Master Plan, changes were already made and in the end it came to Council and they approved it. That's just the fact, Mr. Speaker. We have short-term, midterm, long term changes were made. That's number 1. Number 2, Mr. Speaker, is that, you have to really come to grips with the facts that, every Councillor in this Chamber fights hard for their ward, for their community, for the people who elect them. Let's not be so naive to think that's not the case. That's a fact and anybody wants to debate that with me, I'd be happy to, okay. As the Mayor who does represent the entire city, I try to look at the big picture but don't think there is not pulling in different directions on a regular basis. I can also assure you, Mr. Speaker, for the record, there is not one Councillor in this chamber, who doesn't lobby other levels of government on whatever project they have in mind. I've heard Councillors on this floor tell me they spoke to this rep or that rep; whether it's on Broadway or whether it's in Ottawa. That happens all the time too. Those are facts Mr. Speaker, that are absolutely indisputable, okay, and I would just through you, Mr. Speaker to Councillor Gerbasi, just to reminder her that I have seen what has happened in the past on Building Canada funds before I was elected. It was all horse trading, Mr. Speaker, and we are trying to get away from that; but the facts of life are, when Federal or Provincial politicians want you to do something with their money, it's a tough battle but you fight the best you can. So let's all get that straight. Now let's look at the Transportation Master Plan. Mr. Speaker, the facts are, even the Transportation Master Plan changes as the city changes. I've heard several Councillors here today say, that well, if there's going to be development and it's going to stimulate taxes and growth maybe we should be looking at it. Nothing is black and white. There's always changes that are going to take place Mr. Speaker; and then when CenterPort writes a letter like this which I read from top to bottom, I have yet to be at a function Mr. Speaker, where the Premier doesn't get up and extol the virtues of CenterPort or the Minister, just yesterday, the Minister of Finance extol the virtues of CenterPort. As a matter of fact Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of this great country, put $212 million into CenterPort and again, the taxpayers as a result of the city initiative put some more money in. There's a lot of money being invested in CenterPort. That's just a fact of life and don't get away from there. And I can assure you, when the Prime Minister and the Premier put that kind of money in, they're going to do everything they can to make sure it's a success Mr. Speaker. So it's interesting because you know, I heard the comments about Rapid Transit; well you know what, I thank Councillor Swandel and Councillor Wyatt. They put a motion - a notice of motion which will be discussed next month Mr. Speaker that can address Phase 2, it's done. If the Province agrees with that, it's done. We here at City Hall are coming up with real ideas to get things done and Mr. Speaker, do you know how many projects there are in any of those categories, short-term, midterm, long-term that do not have the money identified? I know that Councillor Eadie a little while ago said in a humorous way; we don't have enough money to do 20% of the stuff we want to do. But to identify a project which is all we're doing, we're identifying a project as a priority. We all know we need to find the money. If you don't find the money it doesn't happen. We've seen Items in our capital budgets that were there and they were moved down the road, Mr. Speaker. We're identifying priorities and the facts of life are, Mr. Speaker, these are both good projects and if we can't find the money there not going to happen. But the facts of life are, before the ink was dry from our expertise on that

Transportation Master Plan, changes were made. Changes were made, they came to Council. So for these suggestions to be treated any differently, I don't think that makes any sense. Good projects. We're going to have to work hard to find the money. I put forward a notice of motion and I think it's up to all of us, to keep on lobbying to find the money for infrastructure and just as a reminder, I think, City Council has shown that Rapid Transit is a priority. We keep on coming up with new ideas on a regular basis, over and over again, and one day, God willing, something will be embraced and we'll get that project complete. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Mr. Mayor. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just a few points to clarify some of what I've heard but you know, before you leave the room Councillor Wyatt, I'd like to commend you on spending $18,000 on your advertising budget and achieving capital expenditures, or capital funding of 75 million, I think that's great rate of return. You know my understanding of this document and when I first learned about it; I was told that it's a fluid, living document, one that wasn't going to sit on a shelf; one that could be modified as changes in economics, socioeconomic conditions change. I see this as, I see that something has changed and I will speak in a little more detail to the whole Ridgewood Project but this is a city-wide decision should this motion be agreed to today. What we are doing is a city-wide decision and I want to explain a few things about that. I think that with the whole CenterPort initiative, the movement of goods and just these last two weeks we saw the first shipments in and out of China and that's significantly going to impact our growth of both residential because workers will need to live closer, and truck traffic and the movement of goods. In terms of the William R. Clement Parkway, and that is its name, in case some people don't know, it was named after former Councillor Bill Clement, it was -- I've heard it referred to by residents of Charleswood as almost a bridge to nowhere because it ends. And it ends and people in the community have truck traffic, have speeding issues and this traffic has moved from the north side of the Assiniboine River, from the Moray Industrial Park to the perimeter, into neighbourhoods. Neighbourhoods. I have initiated a traffic analysis. The terms are just out. We'll have a draft report on that in June. And since the completion of that Parkway much has changed for a lot of Charleswood residents and much more will change come November when Ikea opens, come the months after that when Lowe's opens and when everybody from every end of the city is coming to it. Currently under the Ridgewood, the Ridgewood Project is undergoing public consultation. They've gone through the third round of that which was yesterday and Monday and some, at least, 6,000 people have come in and out of these consultations since last November. Nearly every person has looked at this map and said that Clement Parkway has to go right through. Every traffic engineer, every person has told me this is essential because of what is happening now and what will happen with the growth in this area and this growth is important. It's 800-acres of agriculturally zoned land. It could result in net revenue, municipal tax revenue, for a city of, somewhere in the neighbourhood of $50 million; so elevating the priority of something so significant creates the opportunity for more infrastructures to be developed. The developers and there are some 100 land owners which has made this very complex, they have done a cost benefit analysis. Somebody mentioned earlier that perhaps there was no cost benefit analysis. This will come forward with the Secondary Plan and it's anticipated that this will come forward in June or July which is very soon, so there's a significant importance for this portion of the motion to actually be adopted. It's sad that so many see this as one or the other; that Rapid Transit cannot happen concurrent to roads being developed and bridges being built. I for one have insisted with the developer that Rapid Transit be augmented and considered as in some form to service this southwestern piece of the city. At some point, which has fallen off the priority list, a loop that would have gone through Ikea and of the Rapid Transit Corridor piece would flow through Fort Whyte. I would still like to see that and again, that's not just a benefit for people in my ward; that has a benefit for everybody in the city. For those who don't know Ikea will be the largest in North America in Winnipeg and it's rapidly going up and traffic… traffic now is gridlocked at rush hours which appear to be 3:00 to 6:00 p.m.; bumper to bumper most times of day. If anybody has tried to go on Kenaston… the challenges with Kenaston prevent us from moving forward any quicker on that, having the Kapyong Barracks, the issue's in the Courts, this would alleviate and I have had an opinion from Public Works, that this would alleviate much of the residential traffic that goes on to Kenaston and directs it in a different route through to Wilkes. So in closing, I hope that many will see that, although this motion is being perceived to impact only a couple of wards in the city, it will have a city-wide effect and completion of the inner road -- inner ring road system is essential and it has always been talked about. It was talked about in the 60s and 70s and here we are today still talking about it and I think it's time that we elevate this in priority and get it done. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is a, I actually didn't vote for the Transportation Master Plan, and I see that my vote was actually even more reasoned now because this plan right now is useless. If this is where we're going to head to, this is an useless plan because we're just going to shift things all around. We have no analysis from our administration, this Chief Peguis is a good idea or not. We heard some good points today that it's actually supposed to go out to the perimeter. We've heard today that we're going to have some traffic analysis in Charleswood later, but we need it now. We're not actually sure, but we need the analysis later and that's what I heard. We've talked about things that we all want, been given guidance by the Mayor today that we're supposed to

go out there and be parochial; be as hard core parochial as you can be for your ward, that's what I'm hearing. That's what this is saying to me today. That's how we want to run the city, if that's how we want to run the city; this is forcing me to go that route as well. Because why would I sit here today and say yes, I would like some more projects, one in the north part of town that's $300 million and another project that's really going really nowhere yet, to come in and crowd the space for example on Kenaston widening. I don't think anyone here will say the Kenaston widening isn't a priority especially because it is the inner beltway; it is the central corridor that goes through, however, River Heights residents have been feeling the brunt of this congestion for the last X amount of years with things that Councillor Havixbeck has talked about; speeding traffic through the neighbourhood, cars trying to get through our grid pattern roads. That's what would be happening. Now I'm supposed to say, you know what, I guess Kenaston isn't as important as Chief Peguis Trail or I guess Kenaston really isn't as important as the road to nowhere. So, if that's what you're asking me to do today? Absolutely not. There's no way and that's not even talking about the Waverley by-pass or whatever we're going to call it now. You go talk to those 300 people who were lined up there; as the trains keep coming and going. Yeah I was bitter but that wasn't addressed as a priority last time, but again, we can't get everything we want; but we should everything we want. Why shouldn't we all get what we want? Why should we move everything up to the same date; just get rid of dates and say, everybody it's a free for all? And then I would say let's stop wasting money on plans. We're not going to follow a plan, stop wasting the money. Why are we doing this? I have a motion here today that wasn't going to get seconded by the… to move the Waverley by-pass up the list. Let's move it to a priority. If you do it for your wards, why can't you do that for my ward? I can give you the same ballot arguments why that Waverley is so important. Again, it wasn't seconded, it won't go forward. So again, why would I vote for something for you when you're not going to help me? That's call parochialization of a system. I don't agree with it but again with the leadership we've been provided, that is a route that we're going down so again, I won't be supporting this.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Orlikow, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. You know, I think it's crucial that we remember a few things, Mr. Speaker and that is the Transportation Master Plan was not written by saints it was written by engineers and elected officials. The proposal that actually came forward Mr. Speaker and voted on by members of this Council, did have a political ends and I'm not going to go any further but to say that. But, so let's not hold this thing up as this is some sort of saintly document that we must climb to the altar and worship in front of. This is a human written document which we have the ability to amend. And you know Mr. Speaker, let's look at this, not from a parochial point of view but from the big city point of view; from the whole picture of where we're going as a city. Can you imagine what our city would be like today if the members of Council at the time, way back when, who knows which Council it wa,s said you know what, it's not in our plan we better not punch and build Bishop Grandin? How dare we build Bishop Grandin. It's not in our plan. Could you imagine what the city would look like in the south end of St. Vital in this area, if we said you know what, we better not do that grade separation at Pembina and Bishop Grandin. Millions of dollars then Mr. Speaker, at Pembina and Bishop Grandin and then could you imagine another vote, and it was a separate vote; these are all separate votes, where Council of the day says you know we better not make it a priority to extend Bishop Grandin to Route 90. Now, we just can't do that. That's not in our plan. We got to stick to the plan. Mr. Speaker, we, previous Councils recognized the city was growing and they addressed it one way or the other. You know, I was at a function on the weekend recently and had a chance to talk to Pearl McGonigal, who was a former Lieutenant Governor and member of this Council; and she was here in the 70s, early 80s, and she said "it was far more fun when I was on Council because we had money". And that's true, when you look back. Right, they had resources okay. And that's the challenge we're living with today. But at the same time, we know -- we know this City is growing. We know that. I just returned from Calgary not long ago and that city is not only building roads; they're building Rapid Transit and they are extending their rail lines; they just opened up the whole Stony Trail system, an inner ring road system in the north; going over the top part of the city. It takes 40 minutes to drive that and uninterrupted, Mr. Speaker, an express way. Forty minutes, no tolls from end to end. All grade separations. Brandon, that city is growing and they're stepping across it now and building. We're competing with that city, Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not. This city is competing with Calgary just like we're competing with other cities in Western Canada. We as a city are growing. So far the Conference Board of Canada's projections have been correct and if we want to continue to grow we know from experience, Mr. Speaker, that the investment in public infrastructure; facilitates growth and develop. Right now I can tell you the other day, I don't know why anybody would be opposing this especially through the centre -- east Winnipeg; I saw trucks coming from the CNR Intermodal yards going through the centre of the city and there's not hundreds, but thousands on a weekly basis Mr. Speaker, right through down Provencher Boulevard through the heart of the city through downtown Winnipeg which clearly could have been going around if we had built the road network for them, that this is going to start to provide. We have to start thinking in these terms, Mr. Speaker. We have to think beyond where we are today. The world, the known, and navigable mapped world does not start at Corydon Avenue and end at Westminster, it's bigger than that Mr. Speaker and we as a city are bigger than that. We have to be able to see and go forward as a City that is growing and a City that wants to continue to grow, if we want to say we're going to self enclose and stop growth and everything else and dream maybe someday we're going to be a London or a Paris; that's just unrealistic Mr. Speaker. We have to ensure

that we as a City are competitive with those other cities. We have to ensure that we as a city can continue to grow and whether you like it not Mr. Speaker, not everybody is going to be able to live in Wolseley. Not everybody is going to be able to have property or live in an apartment downtown or want to do that. There's going to be many who will want a piece of grass and live in a suburban community; we know that Mr. Speaker. And we know that from experience and I see it in my community which is growing. We see it all over the city and yet at the same time, our constituents are asking us to address the transportation needs of this city. Recently the opening of the Chief Peguis Trail,which was adamantly opposed by some members of this Council because they don't see it as being necessary. Has been crucial in improving the quality of life in older neighbourhoods, believe it or not, there are older neighbourhoods out of Wolseley and Crescentwood, there are older neighbourhoods elsewhere in the city, Mr. Speaker. Older neighbourhoods are benefiting by the fact that they don't have trucks rumbling across the front of their homes. They're on a semi-expressway, it's not an expressway because there's traffic lights, instead of going down the front street, which they have no business, two lane streets, and we have that going on all the time. Councillor Eadie spoke about Leila Avenue, where you have apartments and kids playing in parks literally on that street. You know, we have to start to envision the city of the future, Mr. Speaker. And will it have Rapid Transit? Absolutely. Is that absolutely crucial to the future of the city? Absolutely. Will it have an inner ring road system that's functional? Absolutely. Will we be expanding our boundaries? I certainly hope so. Because to be ruled by West St. Paul or the R. M. of Springfield, God help us, okay, that Mr. Speaker, is a vision for where we can go as a city. The challenge we have, Mr. Speaker, is what Pearl talked about, money, you know, the money's not there, the resource is there. Does that mean we don't -- we say oh well we can't have a vision, we can't think boldly, we can't dream? Absolutely not. If anything, the money should follow our dreams; we should be able to take this city where we need to take it and offer a vision of where we have to go. So Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Councillor Sharma and Councillor Havixbeck for this motion. I think it's appropriate. I would have liked to see it may be gone further to include the rest of the ring road and further south and connect up, unfortunately we do have to go through the RM of McDonald which is a bit of a problem, but anyway, and connect up with Bishop Grandin on the south side. But, you know, has been mentioned, the Edward Schreyer Parkway, to make that connection because then you will make it far easier for the truck traffic and linking east Winnipeg which has very, has lots of industry, directly to CenterPort because you can build all the industries you want at CenterPort and that's great but the reality is a lot of the industries in the city already exist and they exist on the east side and they exist on the northwest side of our city and we have to make a better transportation connection rather than having them go. And I challenge anybody just go down to the corner of Portage and Main or Portage and Notre Dame at noon hour and watch the amount of container trucks going through that intersection and it's literally one every other minute. In either direction. So that's -- and that's hammering the heck out of our existing infrastructure today. This is the right thing Mr. Speaker to do and I encourage all members to support this motion. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Wyatt. Any further conversation? Seeing none, we'll call the question with a recorded vote – I'm sorry. You're going to close, Councillor Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: Mr. Speaker, I sincerely appreciate the debate here today, both the critical and supportive comments. That is the purpose of these debates on the floor of this Chamber and I welcome and support that. Let's now travel down the road of vision that Councillor Wyatt alluded to. I support, Mr. Speaker, making decisions. Sometimes difficult ones and the well-founded belief that the legacy we should leave; is a stronger opportunity for our community and its residents than the one we inherited when we were first elected. That spirit and objective is, at the end of the day, what under pins this motion supported by Councillor Havixbeck for which support I am grateful. It is our vision to make a visible and meaningful contribution to the growth opportunity for our kids and schools now and the thousands more to join them in the coming years. It's our vision to say loudly that we believe in the city's future and are prepared to make investments, which platform growth in its positive respects. We have an opportunity today, Mr. Speaker, to help set that stage for positive growth. To platform the expansion of our national, continental and globe trade profile. All to help our city grow. That is what is at stake here. And that is what we're supporting here. We must believe in our city's future. We signify belief in our city's future by decisions which push the envelope of opportunity. This motion is one of those decisions. We have both an opportunity and a privilege to make. I ask you to make it. I ask you to support this motion. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Sharma. It's been requested for a recorded vote so, all those in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Fielding, Havixbeck, Pagtakhan, Sharma, Smith, Steen, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker, Councillor Nordman.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed please rise.

Nays: Councillors Gerbasi, Mayes, Orlikow, Vandal and Swandel.

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

Mr. Speaker: Motion is passed. We have no motions for the Infrastructure Renewal Committee, we have no by-laws, do we have a question period for Councillor Vandal? One question from Councillor Havixbeck.

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

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes thank you Mr. Speaker. One question. Some time back, perhaps in November, Father Allan Fogarty, the President of St. Paul's High School wrote, requesting two areas for signage along Grant Avenue and the purpose of these was to improve traffic flow. Now, Father Fogarty expressed to me verbally and having been the Past President in Montreal's St. Ignatius of Loyola, where a student was killed by a vehicle because of the congestion he was very concerned about the added traffic and the added potential for an accident. Why has the Public Works Committee denied even the referral of this Item on to the administration for a review?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I clearly -- I don't recall the request that was made, it's important to know we get; you know dozens and dozens of requests for traffic signalization. I find it unusual that, what we usually do is refer them to the administration for analysis. So, I find it unusual that it wouldn't be referred to the administration because we take the requests seriously. I will follow up with the Director of Public Works and our Clerk and get back to Councillor Havixbeck.

**REPORT OF THE
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED APRIL 12, 2012**

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? Seeing none. There is just one issue left and that's the Governance Committee and I just will advise that the report of the Chief Electoral Officer of the City of Winnipeg's report for the 2010 election has been referred back to Governance and we will -- if you would like to speak to us on that report; by all means be in touch with your community committee representative and we'll take it from there. Seeing no further business, Councillor Orlikow moves that we adjourn. All those in favour? Thank you. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 3:31 p.m.