COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, July 18, 2012

The Council met at 9:34 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Wyatt.

ROLL CALL

Mr. 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, Jo-Ann. We are joined today by our page, Madison Fedyck who attends Glenlawn Collegiate and resides in North Kildonan. So welcome, Madison. (Applause) We are unfortunately in a position where we have to offer condolences today and I will ask Jo-Ann Park to read the condolence motion.

MOTIONS

Moved by His Worship Mayor Katz,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of former Mayor William (Bill) Norrie, which occurred on July 6, 2012.

Bill Norrie served the citizens of Winnipeg as Councillor for the Kelvin Ward, in the Fort Rouge Community from 1971 to 79 and as Mayor from 1979 to 1992.

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

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: As it was mentioned earlier this month, the City of Winnipeg lost the devoted friend, former Mayor Bill Norrie died at the age of 83, after dedicating much of his life to public service. Bill served as Mayor of Winnipeg from 1979 to 1992. He will be remembered as a man of great intellect with the calm, soft spoken manner. Bill's leadership style was to seek consensus and listen to different points of view. Perhaps his greatest legacy as Mayor is the redevelopment of the Forks site, which has become one of Winnipeg's premier all season tourist destinations. Next year will mark the 30th anniversary of the Mayor's Volunteer Service Awards. Bill Norrie along with Helen Hayles, then Executive Director of Volunteer Manitoba, was instrumental in creating this award. He believed in recognizing people for the good work, and until his death, he served as honorary chair of the Volunteer Manitoba Community Service Awards. On behalf of the City of Winnipeg and City Council, I extend our deepest sympathies to Bill's wife Helen and his family. I invite everyone here today to sign the book of condolence in the Mayor's Foyer in memory of one of Winnipeg's longest-serving Mayors. Rest in peace, Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Out of respect, we would then rise for a moment of silence for Mayor Norrie.

(Moment of silence)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We have a second motion of condolence.

Moved by Councillor Sharma,
Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan,
THAT Council place record its profound sorrow at the death of Margaret Merle Greenway, the mother of former Councillor Mike O'Shaughnessy, which occurred on July 14, 2012.

This Council extends to Michael O'Shaughnessy and his family its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker: Again, we'd like to rise and have a moment of silence for the O'Shaughnessy family.

(Moment of silence)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We're here today to do some legislative business, but we're also here to recognize some folks that are with us in the galleries. We'd like to welcome all of our guests. I see many of my friends from the St. Andrew's Society here, which we'll have a moment to speak with you in a few minutes but before we do that, Mayor Katz, we have a recognition from you.

Mayor Katz: Yes, Mr. Speaker, actually have several today. And I'd like to start with a very special event that took place Mr. Speaker, one of our local football clubs, the Transcona Nationals are celebrating their 100th anniversary this year and during the weekend of July 27, 28 and 29, the Terminator home field of the Transcona Nationals Football Club will be renamed in honour of one of our City Councillors. The Terminator home field located Optimist Park in Transcona will be renamed Russ Wyatt Field. The sign will be officially unveiled on July the 27th at the Transcona Nationals pre-season tournament. Definitely a great honour for Councillor Wyatt and certainly reflects upon his commitment to supporting community clubs and sports teams in Transcona. On behalf of the City Council and all citizens, congratulations, Councillor Wyatt. (applause) Mr. Speaker, 2012 is the International Year of Cooperatives as declared by the United Nations General Assembly. Here in Winnipeg and all over Manitoba, our citizens have embraced co-ops. The Manitoba Cooperative Association represents approximately 150 individual co-ops. Manitobans hold more than 800,000 co-op memberships. Cooperator's' principles such as voluntary and open membership, democratic member control and concern for community help to make our community stronger. I thank Councillor Mayes for bringing the International Year of Cooperatives to my attention and I'm pleased to acknowledge the economic and social value of co-ops in the city. (applause). Mr. Speaker, 2012 also marks the 200th anniversary of the arrival of the Lord Selkirk settlers at the Forks of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. These Selkirk settlers were the first to establish permanent residents along the Red River in what is now the City of Winnipeg. Lord Selkirk offered disadvantaged people from Ireland, Scotland and other countries the opportunity to own their own lands and make their way in a new country. With help from Chief Peguis and other first nation peoples, the settlers were able to build a life here. I stand today in this anniversary year to recognize the role of the lord Selkirk settlers in the creation of the first city we now call home.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mayor Katz. And we have with us today the Co-chairs of the celebration of the 200th anniversary for the Lord Selkirk settlers, Phyllis Fraser and Lawrence Prout. We offer you a few moments to give us your take on the celebrations.

Phyllis Fraser: Well, Your Worship and Councillors, ladies and gentlemen, we appreciate so very much the opportunity to tell you a little bit about the plans that our committee has to mark this very special milestone. I would like to begin by recognizing the members of our committee who are present in the gallery today. They are a team of volunteers who have been working on this commemoration for about two years now. We are called the bicentenary of the Red River Selkirk Settlement Committee and we are made up of Scottish organizations, history organizations, various levels of government, so I would just ask them to stand up and be recognized, please. (applause) The arrival of the Selkirk settlers in 1812 was a very pivotal event for the settlement of western Canada, the Province of Manitoba, what was to become the Province of Manitoba, and of course, the City of Winnipeg. The significance of this milestone is the start of the family farming system and, indeed, agriculture in western Canada. The settlers are also credited with starting the waves of immigration that followed and continues today to populate the west. Many of the settlers' descendants still farm in the area around Winnipeg. They homesteaded land in this area. The Lord Selkirk Association of Rupertsland is made up of direct descendants of the original settlers and over the years has compiled a genealogy of the 45 settlers who remained in the colony after 1820. Many left because of the hardships they had in those early years but a number remained and their names, of course, are commemorated on the bridge of the settlers in Winnipeg. And I just wanted to mention that as of 1997 their descendants numbered in the neighbourhood of 20,000 in Manitoba so I think that is quite significant. We had prepared a longer presentation. I know that your time is short today. I read that in the Free Press this morning that you have a busy day, so we'll try and keep it brief. I was going to give you a little more history but it is available on our website at www.redriver200.ca and I would encourage you to go there for more detailed information. We've prepared a package for each of you. You'll soon start to see a number of ads appearing around the city billboards and ads on TV and we, we hope that it will get people's attention. We have a week of events planned beginning August

31st until September 9. Lord and Lady Selkirk have agreed to join us for this commemoration and we're thrilled with that. We will be…we're working with the Barge Fest people at the Forks and on Friday night we will have the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra kicking off the week of events with music with John McDermott and at the Forks and then the Saturday will be the largely First Nations, Metis, French events at the Forks, the settlers would not have survived without as Mayor Katz said without Chief Peguis and his people who saved them from starvation and from numerous hardships that they incurred. There will be events going on throughout the week. There will be a reenactment ceremony at…in LaVerendrye Park. Some of the events involve Lord Selkirk are more private events but we would really appreciate your participation in the gala dinner which will take place on Saturday, September 8, at the Winnipeg Convention Centre. We have a notice about that in your folder there. We are hoping to have a lot of people traveling from outside of the province attending all of these events. We'll finalize the week with the service of thanksgiving at St. John's Cathedral. That's where many of the early settlers are buried in the cemetery there and we would, we think that's a fitting end for this week of commemoration. Sorry, I'm scanning this pretty quickly but I just want to say once again thanks so very much for allowing us to speak to you this morning and we would welcome any questions or comments that you might like to make and we would encourage you to be a part of this special milestone event. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Lawrence, thank you Phyllis. We appreciate you coming by. We look forward to the first week of September. Mayor Katz, we have another special recognition.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And this is an absolute privilege for me to rise to honour a long-time civil servant on the eve of her retirement. Jo-Ann Park, that beautiful smiling face that we get to see at every Council meeting, began her career in public service, the City of Winnipeg in 1980, working as a clerk with the Department of Environmental Planning. After a very long and productive career, she's retiring from her position as Manager of the Decision Making Process within the City Clerk's Office. Mr. Speaker, for everybody who was on EPC and yours truly, it was an honour and a privilege to work with Jo-Ann and I can tell you an absolute fountain of knowledge who made sure that we stayed out of trouble and helped direct us on proper procedure and an absolute treasure. It's an absolute shame to see her go but the realities are she's going to have nothing but enjoyment and that's all on behalf of all Council we wish for you, Jo-Ann, and just want to thank you for the years of dedication and years of passion and always making sure you got into EPC before I did. We love you very much. Thank you very much. (applause)

MINUTES

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on June 27, 2012, be taken as read and confirmed.

All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

We'll just wait for a moment while some of our colleagues leave the gallery.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: We're good? All right, we'll start with our delegations and we actually have quite a few today so the first one up and registered is Chuck Davidson, Vice-President of Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, in support of Item 1 of the Report of EPC from July the 11th, Sunday shopping. Chuck?

Chuck Davidson: Thank you, Your Worship Mayor Katz and members of Council. On behalf of Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce as well, we would like to congratulate Jo-Ann Park. We worked with her a number of years as we've been a regular contributor of the goings on at City Hall and what a pleasure it's been to work with you and we wish you all the best in your retirement as well. Founded in 1873, the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce is Winnipeg's largest business organization dedicated to fostering an environment in which business and all Manitobans can prosper. The Chamber's vision for Winnipeg is to be a cost competitive technological innovative city with the skilled labour force, modern infrastructure to support existing and emerging industries, a city with the bright economic future. The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce has twice been recognized by the American Chamber of Commerce executives as one of the top 10 fastest growing Chambers in all of North America. In addition, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce has acknowledged Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce as an accredited Chamber of Commerce with distinction for high standards of excellence in service. The Chamber firmly believes that a positive and competitive business climate brings with it wealth, prosperity and high quality of life for its citizens. Winnipeg chamber of commerce is pleased to provide comment today on the amendment to the Sunday and holiday shopping by-law on behalf of our 2025 member companies that employ

approximately 90,000 workers in the City of Winnipeg. Manitoba retailers support promoting greater hospitality opportunities for visitors to our province and Manitobans alike. Retailers have indicated the position of provincial government in the past by continually asking for the provincial government to lift restrictions regarding Sunday shopping to ensure people visiting our province have a full range of hospitality and retail opportunities seven days a week. Increasingly, Sunday is becoming the busiest and most important day of the week in terms of the sales for retailers in Manitoba. And Manitobans have indicated in public polling that they would like to see the restrictions lifted on the hours a retailer can operate, be open on Sundays so the retailers can provide greater access to their products and services on Sunday. Retailers have indicated that the economic benefit of removing restrictions on Sunday shopping in Manitoba for both for employers and employees in retail would be significant. While not all retailers support expanding Sunday shopping hours, there was clear industry consensus that retailers should be allowed to make the decision for themselves and not have government dictate to them as to what their hours of operation can be. Having the ability to choose is a key component that retailers of all sizes and formats agree on and clearly retailers operating in Manitoba and Winnipeg want the ability to determine their own hours of operation. Currently Manitoba has the most restrictive Sunday shopping legislation in North America and is the only remaining province to regulate retails of our operation on Sundays. With more and more national and international retailers viewing Manitoba and Winnipeg as a top market to expand their operations in, these antiquated restrictions are a competitive disadvantage for the province. The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce strongly believes that retailers should have the ability to choose when they can be open on Sundays to satisfy the demands of their customers. And while the provincial government has not chosen to go as far as we would like when it comes to expanding Sunday shopping hours in Manitoba, we do view the recent changes as an improvement over what currently exists and would ask City of Winnipeg Councillors to amend the Sunday and Holiday Shopping By-law to reflect those changes that have been made provincially. The argument for allowing retails to set their own hours of operation we look at in three areas. One, freedom of choice for retailers and customers. The Chamber views Sunday shopping largely as a rights issue. Consumers and retailers, not government, should decide who shops and who does not on Sunday just as they do every other day of the week. We note every industry in Manitoba has the right to be open on Sunday except the retail sector. We look at employment opportunities. The Chamber believes that Sunday shopping generates job opportunities and given the status of our economy, this is a factor that cannot be overlooked. And finally consumer support for Sunday shopping. In October 2010, the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce commissioned Prairie Research Associates in an omnibus survey. In the poll, we asked Manitobans whether they support or oppose allowing retailers to set their own hours of operation including on Sundays to accommodate consumer demand. Among all Manitobans almost two years ago, almost two in three Manitobans, 62% say they at least somewhat support allowing retailers to set their own hours including 35% who say they strongly support the idea. There are no statistically significant differences in whether participants supported or opposed retailers settling their own hours of operation by gender, age, annual household income or region. When you look at the age breakdown in terms of the support between the age of 18 to 24, 64% support, between the ages of 25 and 39, 70% support for allowing retailers to set their own hours, between 40 and 64, 60% and over 65, 59% support for allowing retailers to set their own hours. In conclusion we applaud the provincial government for its willingness to address the issue of Sunday shopping. This is something the Chamber has been lobbying in favour of for the past 20 years. However, by continuing to insist on restrictions we do believe they have missed an opportunity to deal with the issue once and for all and I can assure you the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce will continue to lobby all political parties until they treat the retail sector the same way to do any other sector and remove the restrictions on when they're able to operate. This is something that is in best interest for business, employees and consumers and for that reason we would ask City Council to pass this by-law today. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any questions for Mr. Davidson. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Mr. Davidson. And I would agree that the retailer should figure out when they should be open on Sundays as it...they should know their markets the best and given that the way today's society works, you need to do that but my question is just…I think that through the whole dialogue and discussion about Sunday hours, there's a lot of people who actually work as you mention, work in the employment and employment in the retail sector. Has the Chamber done any consideration, I guess the employers would try to balance shift work so that some families are not having to work on certain times or they can trade off with who's working and so on? Has that been a part of the discussions when the Chamber is moving forward with recommending open Sunday shopping hours?

Chuck Davidson: Councillor Eadie, absolutely. This is something that continues in the legislation that would continue that workers would have the right to refuse to work on Sundays. We have talked to many retailers about this and whether or not they would have challenges in terms of finding enough workers and employees that would want to work on Sundays. What retailers are telling us is this is not going to be an issue at all.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Eadie: In your surveying and stuff, I'm not sure if you talk to retailers' employees but the issue about transportation getting to work on Sundays become an issue. I know that a lot of people who work in retail utilize the transit service?

Chuck Davidson: This is not an issue that has been raised with us as a major concern at this point.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Thank you, Chuck. Good to see you. All right, our second delegation, we have two delegations actually on the issue of Item 3, the Report of Executive Policy Committee dated July the 4th and we'll invite Mr. Kael McKenzie for a 10 minute presentation, after the 10 minute presentation followed by Jim Hutchinson with a follow up five minute presentation. So if each gentleman could come forward, Kael McKenzie.

Kael McKenzie: Good morning your Worship, Council members, it's actually Kael McKenzie, it's spelt wrong on the agenda. However, I'm here today as legal counsel for the Historical Museum of the St. James-Assiniboia and I've also been asked to speak briefly as a friend of Grant's Old Mill Museum. They're here today asking Council in opposition of Item No. 3. What they're asking the Council to do at this time is defer this matter for a period of time. They're asking until the new year but certainly until summer break is done and the purpose of asking Council to defer this matter is the two museums have just learned about this proposal early or late last week. I believe it was Thursday last week. They had less than a week to respond to this and in fact they're posing their opposition today, but they're actually not really even sure if they're in opposition or not. They haven't had a chance to meet with their City Council member. They had hoped to meet this morning but wasn't a possibility. So surely they should be given an opportunity to at least put together their board of directors. It's summer time. They have not had an opportunity to have a board meeting. One of St. James is just…Assiniboia has just had their annual general meeting in June. Their next annual general meeting is not until the following June. So I am going to suggest the Council today that you do defer this matter on their behalf and I can also say that I don't think that it's in any way prejudice the City of Winnipeg by deferring it just a short period of times to give the respective museums an opportunity to at least formulate their position on this matter. And that's my presentation.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, we'll ask Mr. Hutchinson to come forward and then we'll have questions for both of you together if that's fair enough. You have five minutes, sir.

Jim Hutchinson: I just want to say that I'm with Grant's Old Mill and we're also looking for time to discuss this amongst our board because we just got this information last week and actually I'm the only board member in town right now so I just agree with Mr. McKenzie.

Mr. Speaker: Any questions of the gentlemen regarding item 3? Seeing none we'll deal with it in the EPC motions so thank you for your presentation today. On the next issue, Marty Gold on Item 2, the Report of the Alternate Service Committee regarding implementation of demand-based pricing on street meters. Marty Gold.

Marty Gold: Good morning Mr. Speaker, thank you. Yellow folder day here for the delegations. I'm appearing today once again with regards to matters pertaining to the Winnipeg Parking Authority. Certainly no surprise I think to those of you gathered here that I would have done so or that I am doing so rather. I have a number of, I have a number of observations I'd like to make in relation to the matters before you and I'd like to clarify that I was told I could actually speak on both matters relating to the Parking Authority, but in the interest of brevity I'm only speaking on one so instead of taking 20 minutes and taking 10 so I ask you to listen twice as good to the one time I speak. I want to remind you all, you like that one, I want to remind you all, the comments that some of you made last, I guess it was March of 2011, when the business plan concept of the Parking Authority first came before this chamber. For instance, Councillor Browaty congratulated me for bringing forward various issues that have come forward from the public dissatisfaction with the operation of the Parking Authority; problems with regards to the operation of pay stations and other systems that were less than adequate in terms of community service and express the concern about whether $2 increase across the board with adequate and perhaps we should look at the Minneapolis model for staggering how much should be paid on different streets depending on the actual demand, which I thought was a very clever idea. Councillor Smith, you opposed the motion at that time saying there was very little opportunity for consultation with parking matters, with the parking authority and you didn't see any basis in the… from the business plan to support it because there was no appeal being contemplated. I know that it appears that has been, I don't want to say rectified but the Parking Authority seems to be willing to address it through the hiring of another administrative position that apparently will apparently be a clearing house for concerns of the public. Councillor Fielding, you said I want, with regards to the aspect of public consultation which was mandated before this matter could come back to Council, you said, I for sure want to hear what they, meaning the public, have to say before any final decisions are made in terms of some parking fees, or what goes up, what stays the same or what levels are part of it. Councillor Gerbasi, you said there could be problems if it's implemented wrong. I think those are valid concerns and it's good that the concerns have been raised by the delegation because I think it's important that we're very vigilant and that we do a very thorough consultation before we bring in any new measures. Councillor Wyatt, you made a remark that you thought if they were committing to do the public

consultation I think that's good, I think that's positive, and you then said I'm hoping this report marks a signal and a change and lastly Councillor Eadie, you made a remark that you're not sure the public consultations necessarily work all that well in terms of getting the full input of all stakeholders because the consultations stay places, you put it when people are driving their kids to soccer, coming downtown work or are at work. And you weren't overly convinced that these consultations won't work so now we juxtapose to the comments that were made in this Chamber. Those comments, those sentiments with what really happened to the public consultation which was held by the Winnipeg Parking Authority on March the 5th of 2012, now I have not seen any indication, and granted I've not been at the committee meetings thus far. But I haven't seen any indications that there's anything from the Parking Authority that tells you what happened at that meeting. Now I was there and I've already told all of you in two e-mails, one sent four hours before the session where it was easy to predict it was going to be a laughable failure and another one afterwards where I detailed not only the failures but the evasive behaviour of the Parking Authority when faced with questions from the public. Had the Parking Authority and the City of Winnipeg used plain language such as "get ready to pay more for downtown parking"; flyers distributed throughout downtown in the Exchange District would've surely resulted in a crowd greater than 10 at that meeting at the Convention Centre, however that would have firstly required that the Parking Authority could've been bothered to write, print and distribute flyers in the first place. They did none of that. There was no lessons learned from the report of the City Auditor into the Assiniboine bike lane embarrassment. In essence what happened was with one day's notice, a tweet put out on Friday at noon for a meeting that was being held Monday at 5 o'clock, weekend display ads in the weekend newspapers; no advertising in the Metro which at least is free and you see people read on the bus. The ad itself made no mention of the term "parking authority." That in itself is something that should be a concern. If you people see an ad that says, "Tell us what you think about parking", well you're going to get certain kind of reaction. If you see an ad, people see an ad that says: "Tell us what you think about the Parking Authority", people will take notice. There was no mention or campaign on Facebook, no Twitter campaign, no mention on the City's website that could be found by normal humans. Not one person blogged or tweeted anything about this so the minimal efforts that were put forward by the Parking Authority to attract the public to this public consultation that you yourselves were so invested in, was a failure. Bloggers have outworked the main stream media by a rate of four or five to one when it comes to writing stories about the Parking Authority over the past three to four years and yet they were completely ignored in terms of reaching out to the public to engage them in getting feedback about their issues, concerns and thoughts about the proposed business plan. There was no flyer distribution whatsoever. Now you would think since there is going to be differential parking rates between certain streets of downtown that especially people who have businesses and live on, and I'm picking two examples here because I'm not as expert in the map as I would like to be, Smith and Garry I think are an example of two streets where there are stretches where the parking will still be a dollar. Well, logically shouldn't the people on those streets, the businesses, the residents, have been the target of these specific blitz because those streets will now be gridlocked by the creeping cars looking for the cheaper parking spaces. It's obvious that they should've been notified that their streets were going to be treated differently than other streets and there could be an effect on their ability to transact business. Because of this poor communication, once again, Osborne House and Barb Judt, the CO was here to speak about the Parking Authority in the past. They were left out of this process, Unicity taxi was again left out, Fleet Galleries on Albert Street, Jeff Gasenzer had no idea this was going on and in fact Kelly Hughes of Aqua Books went through his e-mail folders for me in the course of an interview on the Great Canadian Talk Show Podcast found no mention of that public consultation meeting taking place in any correspondence from either the Downtown Biz or the Exchange District Biz and it was not in the mingle newsletter either. Why is it that nobody actually wanted the public to come out and give their opinion, give their concerns about the Parking Authority? Businesses were not invited, supposedly because they were involved as stakeholders in the preparation meetings. Oh that was ridiculous because they never saw the actual display boards with the various details of the plans and the members of the public that attended not one, not one voiced any support for the plan of the Parking Authority moving forward. And that is very important. Richard Edwards pointed out that the Parking Authority is putting out false information. When they put out a graph that says, well there's X number of city spots in the Exchange District or downtown and Y number, a much larger number of available off site spots, those spots were not available. There may be 20,000 parking lot spaces available but a number of them are rented out and in the Exchange District if this plan goes forward there's going to be a lot of problems because the Parking Authority has overestimated the amount of off street parking that is available during the hours seven, eight, nine o'clock when people otherwise would be attending the theatre. Richard Edwards pointed that out and I'm not seen one change to the business plan from the feedback of the ten people that attended the public consultation. Richard Edwards, Bob Axford, a number of other individuals who are very smart, very wise to business and made some good points. Isn't that the point of public consultation to draw ten people not even listen to what the people have to say, come back and rubber stamp what the parking authority wants? David Jacks, University of Winnipeg activist, he put out a message. Public consultation of parking in my neighbour taking place tonight and nobody in the neighbourhood knows about it. The parking authority stood in the front of the room of the Convention Centre and had the nerve to tell those of us in attendance. Their excuse was you can't make people come. Well the City Auditor told you otherwise when it came to Assiniboine. If people don't come it's because of your failure to engage the citizens, your failure to use plain language, your failure to explain how propose changes will affect people's businesses, homes, their parking rights, et cetera. The Parking Authority also refused to reveal any details or answer any questions at that meeting about their debt load and admitted their business plan had no financial

projections. I see today you have an audited statement in front of you. Don't you think the public should've had the right to review that, as well as an adequate opportunity to be attracted to make comments? Avoiding direct invitations to residents and area businesses means one thing: the public was not wanted. That is not the way the City professes it wants to go, not everybody can drop their jobs, their businesses, running the kids to soccer and hockey practice in the beginning of March to run to a meeting on a day and a half's notice at 5 a.m. Kelly Hughes said that the City's methodology to attract community participation was 1974 methodology. So the question is, are you going to rubber stamp this or are you going to hold true to your word that it was important to hear from the public that it was important to have an adequate opportunity to be able…just wrapping up, Mr. Speaker… an adequate opportunity to be able to provide feedback about their concerns, their issues, their observations. They have some helpful suggestions that could've improved things including approving communication between the Parking Authority and the general public. I made a proposal that at that time when this first came out that the Parking Authority should be directed to hold another proper public consultation. I did not hear back from any members of Council directly with regards to this. This was a dismal performance with pathetic excuses, did the bare minimum to meet the parameters of Councils edicts. The residents of downtown were cheated. Not a single resident of downtown attended and it is not because they don't care. It's because the notifications for this meeting, this public consultation was slid through with the barest minimum requirement on your part. A more poorly thought out, less transparent process could not have been invented by somebody deliberately. There was no support for this plan that night and this is what breeds voter cynicism. When they're avoided, when they're tricked, when they show up and they're ignored and you wonder why people don't vote. You wonder why you have to reach out, you wonder why people don't trust what comes out of City Council, et cetera.

Mr. Speaker: All right, Mr. Gold. To the issue of parking

Marty Gold: This is one of the reasons why… so I would ask you to, sure, I would ask you to revisit this matter, it's not that urgent. Direct the Parking Authority to hold a second well-advertised properly conducted public consultation, listen to the public and the businesses and revise the plan accordingly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, sir. Questions for Mr. Gold? Seeing none, sir.

Marty Gold: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Council.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Cindy Tugwell from Heritage Winnipeg regarding Report or Item 5, the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, July 3rd regarding the Shanghai Restaurant, Cindy Tugwell.

Cindy Tugwell: Good morning, Your Worship, good morning, Councillors. I'm here this morning to peak in opposition to the recommendation from the committees to grant a demolition permit for the former Shanghai Restaurant building subject to an urban design and approved urban design submission and I appeal to you today from a decision that was made two years ago and we took our lumps. We lost, the building was not designated. Although we find it is extremely historic. It is one of the oldest buildings in the downtown. It's on a footprint of a whole city block and we believe that the Vacant and Derelict Buildings By-law, that was introduced in 2004, is sufficient for these vacant heritage buildings that are not being reused and not to allow this building to be demolished for the lot which I believe and others is one step up from surface parking is just going to be sodded green space and to allow that building to be secured under the Vacant and Derelict Buildings By-law, to allow the process to be followed properly so if in fact a business plan is approved and it goes forward, we applaud the Chinatown Development Corporation for the Senior Housing. We don't want built heritage to be pitted against new development. So we're looking at saying that we think it's a great idea to have seniors housing but if in fact, you do not have a business plan at this time approved, do not grant the demolition permit; allow the Vacant Derelict Buildings By-law to be put in place for the building to be put it there so that if in fact a redevelopment proposal is not put forward in the future, that there's a possibility that that building could be re-developed and I bring to you the examples of many buildings in the Exchange that we've talked about over many years that I've spoken to you that if in fact, the Council did not have the vision to see that those buildings would be redeveloped. We would've lost buildings like the Kelly House, the former Union Bank Building, the King Building on King and Bannatyne. Avenue and Hample Building, the most recent success sat to vacant and derelict for almost 30 years. So what I'm saying to you is there's prime examples, buildings, the pumping house, James Avenue pumping house that's in the news right now, there's dozens of buildings in the downtown that are sitting, that do not have business plans in place to be redeveloped so we're asking you to not unlike those buildings to say if in fact you do not have a business proposal approved which was the recommendation from Council in December of 2010, to allow this process to unfold properly, to be fair to all the building owners, we're fighting right now with buildings like the St. Charles Hotel, like the Royal Albert Building where we want to say if in fact you do not have a redevelopment proposal for that building, you secure it under that by-law. You allow the process to unfold. If you do not have the financial wherewithal to redevelop the building, someone else possibly could have the vision to do it and we all well know that it's the right building owner. And I've seen it time to time again, people say, no it's just about redeveloping, it's just about the economic, it's not. The Exchange in the downtown for decades, it's been about the right building owner and about the timing and what was a little disconcerting initially from the decision

from December 2010 was there was no engineers report, and to my knowledge, and the unfortunate thing with that is that we're understanding today the urgency to demolish the building it's because it's a public safety issue. We're not convinced that it's a public safety issue if in fact no engineers report has been produced to substantiate that and I know that one of the Councillors two years had asked for a report to be produced, to date, to the best of my knowledge, no report has been produced so again I'm here today for you to step back and say once we lose these buildings, they're never coming back. This is a significant cultural district. The Chinese community is an immense character district although not in the national historic site. We recognize that. It's still a very important heritage building, again, it's a…the floor plate is a whole city block to raze that building to have that just sodded over, it raises other concerns and also I think you have to be the most salient point I can say today is the precedent you're setting to other building owners who own heritage buildings, who are waiting to see if in fact you're not a good steward of a building. You do not maintain that building for 20 or 30 years and do not invest in your property, you're going to be rewarded by City Council as soon as that building is deemed in disrepair and derelict that you're going to have it razed. So I strongly suggest today, don't send that message to developers. This is an amazing downtown, a lot of the appeal to the downtown in the Exchange is obviously our belt heritage so let's take our time, let the process work properly. If in fact the Senior Housings Development is going to go forward, that's wonderful. If in fact, the process is followed properly. Wait for that to happen before the demolition permit is to be granted. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any questions for Cindy? Seeing none, thanks Cindy. All right, that concludes our delegations for today so we'll move into the committee reports starting with the Executive Policy Committee Report for July the 4th. Mayor Katz.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED JULY 4, 2012

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda, items 1 to 6.

Mr. Speaker: There's an amendment for six. So we're looking at one through, you're standing down six?

Mayor Katz: Oh one, oh yeah we'll do one through five.

Mr. Speaker: One through five. Any comments, questions? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 6 – Establishing Reduced Speeds in School Zones in Winnipeg

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think as everyone here is aware we've been working for a few years now to basically reduce the speed limits in schools. Our department has provided us with the report on how it can be done. This is something we're hoping to move as quickly as we can. We have the opportunity now. There was a situation where in the first report that came out, Mr. Speaker, it was going to take; it could be done over a five year period of time and approximately $200,000 per annum. I think we now through the department, working with the Chair, Councillor Vandal, we've identified the money so we can actually get this done within the year. To be very frank with you, Mr. Speaker, I think this Council should move as quickly as possible. I don't think anyone here wants to wait for an accident to take place. There was a thought process that everybody who drives a vehicle would always be prudent and always obey the traffic laws that exist in our city. We know that's not the case and I think this is something that we should be moving forward. I certainly hope the Council supports this unanimously, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: we have a motion from Councillor Vandal.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Vandal,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Katz,

WHEREAS on July 4, 2012, as part of its recommendation to Council on Establishing Reduced Speeds in School Zones in Winnipeg, the Executive Policy Committee recommended:

> *"3. That the estimated five year annual $200,000 capital budget required for the associated signing of speed limits in school zones be referred to the 2013 capital budget process."*

AND WHEREAS on July 17, 2012, the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works approved the transfer of $1,000,000.00 from surpluses in the completion of five separate regional street projects included in the 2009 and 2010 Regional and Local Street Renewal Programs, to the Traffic Engineering Improvements – Various Locations Program, to allow the Public Works Department to expedite the establishment of reduced speed limits in school zones;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 6 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated July 4, 2012 be amended by deleting Recommendation 3 and renumbering the remaining recommendation accordingly.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker. My motion is to amend Item 6 and let me explain why. Yesterday we had a special Public Works and Infrastructure Renewal Committee whereby we approved the second whereas. Our Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Committee approved the transfer of one million dollars from surpluses in the completion of five separate regional street projects in the '09 and '10 regional and local street renewal programs through the traffic engineering improvements at various locations program which is essentially the reduction of the speed in school zones to allow for the Public Works Department to expedite the establishment of reduced speed limits in school zones. Essentially that's the financing piece of the initiative, Mr. Speaker. That was approved yesterday unanimously at Public Works, we have the delegated authority to make that transfer of funds so that initiative ended at Public Works. So given that we're going on an expedited process with the monies have been found from surplus accounts, therefore be it resolved that Item 6 of the report of EPC dated July 4 be amended by deleting Recommendation 3, Recommendation 3 is the five years, the five year annual 200,000 capital budget required for the associated cost of doing the signs. We no longer need that since we financed it a different way, so the financing has been approved at the Standing Policy Committee. It ends there. Nevertheless the initiative, the report that is before us under EPC is still valid and is moving forward. I think this is initiative that has dragged on far too long. It's…I don't know anybody who does not support this and I think it's time that we move this forward, Mr. Speaker. If there's any questions, I'll gladly try to clarify them in closing.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I rise actually in support of this overall report to reduce school speed limits but I have to say in going through this report, I have what I think is a very important concern and that is that I don't agree with Principle 3 in the report that talks about setting the…talks about setting criteria for where these zones will be established and specifically my concern is considering two elements, one is how far set back the school is from the street and the other is fencing. I don't…the reason that we're moving forward on reducing the speed limit around school zones mostly has to do with kids having to cross the street to get to their school and be in class and, yes, sometimes soccer balls and other kinds of sports stuff fly outside of the yard but I don't, if they are using this as a criteria, it has to be very minimum. I will give you an example of where we need a reduced school zone and I think that the amount of traffic flow is a real important thing. The Norquay School, a grade one to six school, on actually… it's address is on Lusted, but in order to get to that school, it's on Euclid, and Euclid has quite a high traffic flow at rush hours, the time that kids are going to and from school and, but it has a good fence and the school is set way back from Euclid but, so in setting this criteria, and I understand that there is an appeal process and so on, but if we're going to put weight on criteria here, I think it's very important that it's measured… the biggest one is traffic flow around these schools and Euclid is not a regional road so I have to say that I wouldn't agree with this and I hope that when the administration really applies the criteria that at the very…well, I would like it just not consider fencing and how far back the school is but if it is, it would be a very small weighted decision in deciding whether or not to establish the speed zone because frankly around Norquay School, you need to reduce the speed limit.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: Mr. Speaker, I applaud Mayor Katz for his leadership on this issue and there is much support in this chamber I believe as well as from school divisions. We heard from many school divisions across the city. The allocation of these new resources will allow the public service to implement the reduced speed in school zones much

more quickly than if we're doing it with existing resources. This is a good thing. I think we all agree safety is paramount, especially when children are involved. As Councillor Vandal stated, it was discussed yesterday Mr. Speaker, at the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee that the public service is doing some work such as engineering analysis production of signage et cetera on this and anticipation of the regulations being approved by the province at the end of the year. All of this with the goal in mind of creating a safer environment for our children. Thank you again, Mayor Katz, for bringing this to the forefront.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just very briefly, I'm in favour of the amendment, I'm in favour of the motion. I had resident ask how come it cost a million dollars, how, for 250 schools. I e-mailed that to Brad Sacher, our head of public works. Again, I think of very thorough and very detailed answer which you repeated yesterday at the committee, which is in essence. This is an estimate we don't know exactly how many schools we're going to have so we're making what maybe a high end estimate. Number two, it's not one sign, one school that could be as many as eight signs for a school depending on the deployment. And thirdly, the wonderful phrase that we're going to be using, high grade retro reflective materials on aluminum plate. In other words, very high quality signs trying to be as reflective, as visible, as possible so these are not, this isn't as simple as going out and buying a whole a lot of aluminum and slapping it up. These are…the most reflective signs we can, given the stakes that are involved with reducing the speed limits around school zones, so thank you to the Mayor and to Councillor Vandal for their work on this initiative. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. I rise to support both the amendment and the actual motion and it's a first step. It's a first step in addressing an issue that is incredibly important. We have schools scattered all over the City of Winnipeg and these are actually community schools so they're usually located within our communities but we have to be cognizant of the fact that this is not a silver bullet. Councillor Vandal asked about why wouldn't some people support this? Well, if you do your research throughout Canada, look at Calgary, look at Edmonton who have gone through this motion, there is a very large debate, will this actually translate into actually improving safety? Again, we have to do something and so I do praise the Mayor and Councillor Vandal for taking this first step and try to make our communities safer but this can't be our last step. There are many more initiatives out there. We just have to go follow Edmonton, Ottawa, Vancouver, who are trying to create safer communities, a place our kids will begin to walk to school again. How do we deal with community traffic? That is really where the focus of this debate needs to get moving toward. So again as a first step, I thank you, but this is only a first step, it cannot be the last step. Thank you.

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

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These are all good commends relative to Councillor Eadie's comments about Recommendation 3. I'll read the first paragraph; the signs will be consistent with the existing approved signs as much as possible with the national guidelines established by the Transportation Association of Canada. We're not the first city in Canada to do this. It's not…it need not be overly complicated but there's models out there and I think that's where we're going to base it on. Having said that I anticipate the Standing Policy Committee is going to be reviewing the criteria and the policy as it comes forward and if there are things that need tweaking, if there are things that aren't working, then committee will be looking at that. I know that each councillor for sure will be getting feedback from their parent councils or school principals and their school so it's, I agree with Councillor Orlikow. It's an excellent first step. It's taken too long but it can't be, it can't be the last step. We have to remain vigilant…school…the safety of the kids is paramount so I want to thank leadership of Mayor Katz for bringing this forward as well and we're going to undoubtedly be reviewing this at Policy Committee. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: And Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I very much appreciate the comments that were made today. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, I've had communication from principals, from people sitting on school boards, from parents. I think everybody agrees that one of the biggest steps that you can take for safety of children in the school areas is to get people to slow down, just slow down. There's no question that would be the biggest step of any. Are there more that we take them down the road? Of course, there's always more. But this would be the biggest step that we can take and I certainly hope that all Council approves this unanimously.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, sir. First the vote on the amendment. All those in favour. Opposed? Carried. Now on the amended motion. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. The report of the Executive Policy Committee July the 11th. Mayor Katz.

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

Mayor Katz: I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 13.

Mr. Speaker: Stand down No. 9? All right, 1 through 8 and 10 through 13. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, No. 9, oh I'm sorry.

Item 9 – Approval of Funding Participation – Winnipeg Convention Centre Expansion Project

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker. I think everyone here knows the three levels of government are joining in to basically expand our convention centre long overdue. This work, a lot of this work, will be done over what you and I would call a very large surface parking lot which I think is a very good step. There's also other amenities that could be in addition to this down the road with a hotel et cetera. We know that we basically built our convention centre all on our own with no support at that particular point in time, we were the first convention centre to be built Mr. Speaker. We now have the three levels of government join together to make sure that we don't fall out of the Tier 2 scenario and I would love to hear the comments on No. 9 and then I'll address them.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The question comes to mind, why are we willing to put 51 million into an expansion of the Convention Centre? Do they have a business plan? Do we need a bigger convention centre? Across Canada, there is a mad desire to build and expand convention centres. Expansions in new convention centres have taken place in Ottawa, Niagara Falls, Victoria, Vancouver and I understand Halifax is also constructing a new convention centre. All of those centres will be competing with ours for conventions and what about all those shows now held at our convention centre that could be lured into the new event centre at the Red River Ex? But I'm still voting for this expansion and I urge all of you to do likewise. Why? Because when the new Human Rights Museum is open, Winnipeg will attract many more conventions. We will beat all those cities that have new and expanding convention centres and we will try thousands visitors from a multitude of new conventions. Winnipeg will become a destination spot for many organizations. Let's do it. Let me tell you this. I really think the Mayor and the Executive Policy Committee should be congratulated. I think this is a very important step and it will mean a lot for Winnipeg's future. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments or questions for the Mayor regarding Item No. 9? Seeing none, Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Councillor Smith for his very interesting support on this but I do want to remind everyone that this is something that Council decided many years ago to support; the expansion of the Convention Centre that was done through the accommodation tax. It was a very astute move. The money is set aside, it's coming from that specific fund. It will make this project a reality. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker. There's been a lot of work done by so many people to make this happen. And I want to commend them. I want to thank them. We also have two members of Council who's served on the Convention Centre. Mr. Speaker, you, yourself do and Councillor Swandel and you've both done yeoman's work, I certainly hope that everyone supports this and the one comment I do want to make about the comments from Councillor Smith. When it comes to competition, competition Mr. Speaker, is the best thing in the world. It keeps you on your toes. It keeps you motivated. It keeps you creative and there's very little doubt that this new convention centre will have a very positive impact on our city. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No further comments? All those in favour of Item 9? Opposed? Motion carried. We have a notice of motion. Councillor Gerbasi, please.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this motion was brought forward as a…I had originally intended it to be referred back to the capital budget process so I've decided to, because notice was called and that's another issue of discussing why that happened and it doesn't really matter at this point but what I'm proposing is the amendment which is seconded by Councillor Eadie is basically just making the…what I'm suggesting a little less prescriptive in terms of and I'll explain what this is about. It's about the fact that there was, is now because the water park project is not proceeding, there's seven million dollars available. It isn't all that clear. It was clear that it's going to go back into recreation of some sort and so I just wanted to put forward a suggestion for consideration that among the other ideas that other people are putting forward that a regional parks be considered as a source of some of that money. So and I'm going to combine introducing the amendment with introducing the motion if that's appropriate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Fair enough.

Councillor Gerbasi: I think that makes sense just to explain the situation. So the motion is basically if you look at the whereases which is in you agenda there aside from the amendment, which the whereases speak to some of the issues that we have a number of regional parks such as you know, Crescent Drive, Kildonan, Harbour View, King, St. Vital and others that their infrastructure is you know, in sense,40 year old washrooms, inaccessible in some cases. Costs that are pretty significant that really have to come from our capital budget in some form or another and there's a big deficit there among other areas and these are parks that are used by the general public throughout the city. They're not necessarily each one a ward issue. Like people from all over the city go to Kildonan. They go to Crescent Drive, et cetera, so it's sort of to say it's not…and the amounts of money required are larger than you know a little pot of money for a pocket park or other sources of funding that we have. So we sort of need to come up with capital budget projects in these parks from a city wide level as opposed to some of the other smaller park issues. So that's sort of why I'm raising this. Also the reason I thought of the seven million dollars is that it is money that was originally targeted to a regional park, Kildonan Park, and some of that money did go, some money did go to the Kildonan Park and then seven was taken and went to the other thing which didn't happen and now it's available again, so it is some kind of logic to it going back into parks. It's just all I'm suggesting there. And I realize other people might have other ideas. I just think it's something we need to deal with in our capital budget. I was just going to speak briefly about Crescent Park in my ward. I know there's some people here who care very much about that park so I just wanted to add that that park is a gorgeous asset, those… I know Councillor Fielding was telling me he was there recently and people, so people from all over the city use it and I talk to the staff about that park in particular because it's in my ward so I know what it needs. I don't know the specifics of all the others. This park needs about a million dollars to deal with the play equipment, the washroom, accessibility, the picnic shelter, the signage, the barbecue stations, the paths, the benches, the asphalt, and so on. So I…what this motion will do is refer all of these issues back to the administration, back to the budget process to be considered and the new wording in the amendment doesn't say that all seven million has to go into this priority. It just basically says that, you know, please consider this as you're considering all the other ideas and as a councillor who's not, who's on EPC, who's not on EPC, it's one way to sort of get the thing in the mix. You know, and so it's not just about my ward I'm talking in this particular motion. You know this is about all of our, we all have a stewardship in our city, the… all of these regional parks we all go to them and we spent a lot of money lately on Assiniboia Park. It's pretty amazing what's happening there and I think we all support that, but these other parks kind of get forgotten and I think it's our duty in the capital budget to consider that so the amendment is really a friendly way of saying can we just have this supported and then it won't prescribe that anything happens. It will just be part of the discussion as we're dealing with our capital budget process, so I urge everyone to support it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. I'm standing to second this particular amendment as well as the motion and it's simply for the reason, this is the reason. The seven million dollars seems to have been a special amount of money set aside for potentially building a water park and I'm not sure where the money originally came from. There's a lot of discussion about that. But the reason that I believe that this should go back for a specific discussion rather than just as a total overall capital budget consideration is that this was designated as a certain pot of money to deal with a particular item and I believe that it should be treated in a separate discussion as to where the seven million dollars go so that is why I stand in support of this motion and I know that due diligence will be taken as to how best to spend that money and its impact but, again, I just wanted to say I think that it's important that this is dealt with a, as kind of a separate item just based on how the money is flowed and what is surrounded in the past. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm taking that silence as hopefully understanding and support and so I'll just maybe leave it there and hope that people are in a jolly mood today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All right, we will vote on the amendment for the Notice of Motion, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Closing, Councillor Gerbasi, any further clause on the amended motion or vote on the amended motion, Notice of motion? All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried.

Mr. Speaker: All right, Mayor Katz. We have some by-laws.

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

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that By-law 100/2012, a by-law of the City of Winnipeg to authorize the borrowing of money in the amount of up to 51 million dollars be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 100/2012.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 94/2012, 95/2012, 96/2012, 97/2012 and 98/2012.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 94/2012, 95/2012, 96/2012, 97/2012 and 98/2012.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker, I move that the by-laws numbered 94/2012 to 98/2012 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 94/2012 to 98/2012 both inclusive.

Mayor Katz: And I move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 94/2012 to 98/2012 both inclusive to 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. That completes the by-laws.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: We have question period. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'm in front of the queue here.

One question, that is, we seem to be nearing the end today of the Expression of Interest on the golf courses, which by way of preamble, which brings to mind another Expression of Interest that has been out there which pertains to city

arenas. That's been out for quite a while. If we thought the different types of golf courses were complex, I was just looking at some of the stats on the sheets of ice in the City of Winnipeg. Some are owned by the City. Some are owned by…some are operated by different arenas…West Kildonan, St. Vital, quite a hodgepodge. I know this process has been going on for some time. I would like to ask where we are on that process. Certainly this past winter, as I sat there at my son's skating lessons at St. Vital Arena, while I was frantically trying to get some work done, people would come up and say "we want to talk to you about this arena. What's happening with the arena?" And generally I would say they certainly didn't want to see it privatized. So we've gone through the golf course exercise. I'm hoping we've learned from that to try and get some public input. I'm hoping we can move forward with that with the arenas. I don't want to volunteer the Service Delivery Committee for any more work than it already has since you'll probably rule me out of order as a member of that committee Mr. Speaker, but in general, I'd like to get some clarification if possible at today's meeting or in the future as to where we are on the whole arena Expression of Interest. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you I thank Councillor Mayes for the question. The Expression of Interest has gone out Mr. Speaker as we all know. There have been responses to it. I'm more than happy to share that I have heard that there's communication going on between the department and some of the respondents. I was hoping that we would have actually had a report for this Council meeting but it hasn't quite materialized yet. I expect it to be coming forthwith so we can deal with this issue as quickly as possible, so obviously I think we should be able to deal with at our next meeting Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We have more questions? Going once. Enjoy the summer Mr. Mayor. Alright we'll move onto the Standing Policy Committee of Property and Development, Councillor Browaty.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED JULY 3, 2012

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of July 3rd and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 7.

Councillor Eadie: Stand down five.

Mr. Speaker: Stand down five?

Councillor Browaty: I thought we were being jolly today.

Mr. Speaker: All right, we've stood down five. That means one through four and six and seven. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 5 – Demolition – Shanghai Restaurant – 228 King Street

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd love to hear the questions and comments from the members who stood this down.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, did you want to go ahead?

Mr. Speaker: Eadie. I'm sorry.

Councillor Gerbasi: Whichever you prefer, okay. Mr. Speaker, I… first I want to thank Cindy Tugwell for her excellent delegation today. She did actually make a lot of the points that I would be making today, that's why the reason I didn't ask questions was I think she made it very clear. But I just wanted to put it in a little bit of context. You know, as you know, we had a decision in 2010 which did take away the heritage designation which is why this matter was before the Property Committee and not the Heritage Committee or whatever so the heritage decision was a decision that's already made but I think the concern here is that even with that, I guess there's still a thread of hope without a heritage

designation. If a building is still standing and there isn't a plan yet for a project that's going forward for sure and finalized that there's still a hope that if for some reason that project, that doesn't succeed it, then there's a hope in it from the heritage point of view and that perhaps something, someone else could…ownership could change or ideas could change and something could be preserved. So obviously that's a long shot but those who care about heritage which I think we all care about heritage that it…we're pitted against, in this case, two different good things. Obviously housing in Chinatown is a really good thing and everybody supports that. It's just this particular location an 1873 building of an entire city block that's an integral part of our Chinatown, is also an important thing and it's really awful that people have to choose between the two. I'm not totally convinced there couldn't be a…couldn't have been in 2010, an opener, an open mind about looking at and saying maybe we just can't lose this heritage and we have to look at another site for the housing or something, but that didn't happen. So I don't want to go back to those decisions. The decision we're making today is to say instead of waiting till that final plan comes forward, you're going to allow the building to be gone prior to having that final plan and it's going to be sodded and I have some concerns, a couple of reasons I'm concerned about this. One is that it's kind of precedent setting as Cindy Tugwell alluded to that if, many times projects are proposed. They come, they go, they disappear and if people know… it does cost money to keep it there to even under a vacant by-law to keep a building on hold until you're ready to develop it. So if we start opening the door, not even just for heritage buildings but other buildings that you know it's sometimes better to have the building in place than a sodded lot in some cases and or where there's any question. I still think that the heritage question isn't completely closed in a lot of people's minds even though the decision was made. But the decision, because the decision was made as housing or heritage, if you took away the housing, is that the project didn't happen, people might reconsider the heritage. So that's the concern with allowing a demolition ahead of having a confirmed funded whatever they would require a development plan that's been approved and something that can really happen because things change; the economy could change, things could change, the federal funding might not be there et cetera for this project and then we would've already, the building would already be gone and there's no way to revisit the decision. I'm also concerned like I'm pleased that people are saying no parking lot. I respect that. I thank you for that because that would be even worse, because once you put in a parking lot, it makes it harder to do anything and even discourages anyone for even building a project because they've got a parking lot so that's a good part of this but sodding a lot is not always, it's just one step above and it's still a problem. It's still an empty space in the downtown which could create problems. I know on Assiniboine and Kennedy in 2005 with the Chelsea Courts decision, some of you may remember, but that was, the decision was not to designate these old apartments. They were pretty amazing. Fred Penner lived there and all kinds of famous people in Winnipeg lived there and they were one of a kind apartments and the Council decided not to designate them and they allowed them to be demolished without a plan in that case and that was 2005, I believe, we still have a sodded empty lot right near the Legislature in the beautiful Assiniboine area sitting there and I do get complaints from constituents about garbage and other things. I mean I know they say they're going to fence it and stuff like that, but you know it's just, it's not, I just don't see why we can't stick to at least and this I think what Cindy was saying, at least stick to the 2010 decision to require a plan before. It might cost a little bit to maintain the thing and I guess the final point that needs to be made is there's no engineering report that's been available. I don't think there is an engineering report. There wasn't one in 2010. I did move a motion asking for one in 2010 and that was defeated. There still isn't one saying that someone is in danger like people expressed opinions I don't want a brick falling on their head or whatever it was at the time. They worry it's not structurally sound and I mean that's all fine but we should be doing things based on evidence and an engineering report would be due diligence and proper process and as I said in it, the same thing I'm saying now is that hasn't been done so we really shouldn't be taking out of building unless, I mean sometimes you have to demo something if someone is going to get hurt by it, you know if you can prove that. But we haven't even proved that. So we have lots of buildings that stay boarded up safely under our Vacant and Derelict Buildings By-law, Cindy allude to a number of them. I mean, at one point the Fort Garry Hotel was boarded up for goodness sake. I mean the Princess Block was boarded up for like 30 years and now we have the Red River Campus Project so there's a reason we don't take out buildings unless we have a development project that's totally ready to go, not just the idea of one and so that's my point today. So I think we should defeat this today. We just should not do this. We should stick with our original decision and require the owners to maintain the building until their plan comes forward and that will put some pressure on them to bring a plan forward as well and encourage development rather than discouraging it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. I can't vote for this motion today. It does appear on the Property, Planning and Development's agenda but Chinatown is a part of downtown and downtown has been decided by this Council over the last 20 or more years that it is an important place to keep friendly to the people who visit our city as well as for those to live in our city and I've read many articles about how other cities seem to be able to maintain their heritage buildings while still having a vibrant place to do business and to enjoy a part of the heritage while still moving forward with and making sure that the buildings are in good shape and so I don't understand why we in this city didn't take a bigger look at this. This is Chinatown, I just recently was at Kelekis and there was a couple who grew up in Winnipeg. They're well into their 70s and it was their last visit to Winnipeg and they were talking to me at Kelekis and they said, "Well for supper we like to go off, is the Shanghai still open?" and I said, "Well, no it's not". And I let him know

that the building is actually going to be torn down and they were quite disappointed that the heritage place like that was going to be lost so I stand involved in this even though it does fall in Councillor Pagtakhan's ward. The point is that this is downtown and there should be a development plan as it was mentioned. The building that just recently got done at William and Main Street by the Red River Community College, I mean it could've just simply been ripped down you know, like given that it didn't have a good heating source because the coal plant shut down, given all these different issues with that building. So I don't really understand why there's a move here to quickly rip down this building. There never was an engineering report and I know it's not part of the heritage process anymore, but you know frankly, this is downtown, Chinatown is downtown. It has a historical significance and we're just proceeding here in what I think is a frivolous way to do it. I understand that a not-for-profit organization is handling this and there's a cost associated with maintaining a building but you know this has real significance for this city and I don't understand why we're just proceeding to let it be torn down and we're going to cover it over with sod and whatever we're going to do. For me that…it just doesn't make sense so I'll be voting against it today.

Mr. Speaker: Council Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was not here in 2010, 2011 when this was first dealt with, so I wanted to rise and speak, I am the Councillor who sits on the Heritage Winnipeg Board but in this instance. I don't agree with the position of Heritage Winnipeg. I think very highly of Cindy and the work she's doing but I wanted to speak briefly about the reasons why I will support the motion for the demolition permit. City planning and heritage planning as we know from the last couple of weeks, these are not exact sciences and different people can view priorities differently. Certainly, I think the work we've been doing around protecting Riel House, Councillor Vandal's ward was trying to protect the Gaboury Police Station in St. Boniface, it may not yet succeed but from the Councillors around the table work to preserve heritage buildings. In this case, there is a lot of heritage in Chinatown that exists beyond this particular building. I was at an event on January 1st of 2011 at the KMT Building and that's a building I certainly hope we preserve up on Pacific at the intersection where there's the flag celebrating the, it's a 100th anniversary of Dr. sun yat sen's speech across the street, not at the Shanghai but across the street and I believe Councillor Smith was at that speech in 1911, Dr. Smith from Dr. sun yat sen but there's a great long Chinatown history in Winnipeg that doesn't depend entirely on that location and it's worth noting that one of the buildings that now I think is the focal point of Chinatown Winnipeg is the Dynasty Building and that came about at least partly through the efforts of former Mayor Bill Norrie and I want to note Kevin Fan from the Chinese Cultural Centre is here, Terry Prychitko is here who wrote a very good piece Free Press commending former Mayor Norrie for his involvement with the Chinese community and for getting that structure up. So neighborhoods involved that building is now becoming some ways that the focal point of Chinatown. We do have a vibrant Chinatown still would be annual festival, that I would certainly enjoy going to. My point here is that I don't think we're demolishing the history of Chinatown by granting this permit. I think something will rise in its place under the leadership of that the Chinese Cultural Centre, the Province's actually been pretty good. I think it's getting money towards Chinese community housing projects and I would certainly hope to see something going up in the near future at that location. Obviously as it's been said previously, we're not looking at a parking lot there, we're looking at a sodded structure so that's certainly a positive. I don't think anyone particularly likes to see buildings with some history to them torn down but in this case I think it's part of the evolution of that neighbourhood of the Chinatown is still strong, it's still evolving, there will still be buildings like the KMT Building of historical significance there so in this case I think we can look forward to working with the WCCC and the Chinese community and hopefully see something rise on that site that's going to be a benefit to the community and benefit to the city as a whole. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make a few quick points here. I think it's important to note in spite of some of the characterizations here today that this Council in particular has consistently shown our commitment to heritage and ensuring that where it makes sense that we can protect and preserve buildings and that we will. We've gone above and beyond when it comes to heritage. I don't like it when I stand in, or sit in this chamber and listen to people characterize it like this somehow that we're not doing our job on heritage. When you look what we did with the Ryan Building you know the King Street Parkade, when you look what we did with Kelly House, when you look over what we've done with the Canada Building. On and on and on, the list goes on. We've been able to protect buildings that normally wouldn't…in a great many of the cases, in a great many cities, wouldn't receive the amount of support that they receive from this Council so we should all be proud of that and we shouldn't let ourselves be characterized in a light that we're not doing our jobs when it comes to heritage. We're doing a damn good job when it comes to heritage and we're doing it responsibly. Reality is this building is too far gone. Wise people whether we've had a formal report or not, wise people acting in good faith have gone in there and they have told us that it is too far gone. You know the cost of hanging on to that building and maintaining it right now is over 35 or 40,000 dollars a year for this community organization, just to hang on to the building. This is a strong community group that does so much for the area. You know the group is responsible for bringing some wonderful housing projects into the area, for bringing some commercial development into the area for keeping that area alive because if you look at why those buildings are

deteriorating, some of them, it's because there wasn't a vibrancy there. That vibrancy is there again. There's a population when we talk about bringing residential to downtown, Chinatown, the folks in Chinatown have got down a good job of bringing residential into that area, a really good job and if you would've taken that small in compared to the rest of the downtown, I would say that they're far exceeding what we're doing in the rest of downtown and they'll continue to do so. You know, a passive park as a development plan, you know that is the plan. It's subject to the design review board…the Downtown Design Review Committee. It's not just sodding it over; there are other elements involved with this as I understand: proper fencing and pieces that will make it look much more attractive than just a piece of flat sodded ground and you know, to have a bit of green space in Chinatown right now, it's not a bad thing and perhaps you know, in future development they can incorporate a bit of green space and maybe some commentary on the history in the heritage that have gone on our downtown and some of the people that have helped to build it and I think this is really a step that we must take to ensure that these groups that are working so hard and are bringing so much to our downtown can continue to do so and that we're enabling them the fiscal ability to do it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No further comments? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Just, you know I need to say a few words because of some of the comments also made on the floor. You know, I think we have to first of all recognize who is coming forward today as the Winnipeg Chinatown and Cultural Centre Association. The leadership of the Dr. Du and the Lieutenant Governor Philip Lee, have for the last 30 or 40 years been tremendous. If you look at Chinatown today basically a lot of it is the culmination of their hard work to actually build Chinatown as we know it along with previous Mayors and previous Councils. You know, if it wasn't for their dedication, hard work, you would not see the development that you see in Chinatown and so to compare them to other projects where demolition is occurred and nothing has happened, these folks have a track record. They don't roll up their tents and leave. They're here for the long run. They're dedicated to the City. They've shown that dedication over and over again. From what I understand they've already had meetings with the Minister in terms of a project to take place here; the province is apparently looking positive though it's not official. The concept is to have assisted living. There's nowhere inside the City of Winnipeg today for people of Asian descent to live in assisted living and to have meals which they're accustomed to. They would, if they lived in assisted living, they have to eat well North American meals, call what you like, I mean the reality is they don't have anything that's available so that in the last, the golden years of their life they can enjoy the assisted living in the environment that they're used to and you know, so I think the challenge that they see in the challenge that the leadership of Chinatown sees, is real and they have managed to work together to secure not just the Shanghai property but the development plan called for Mr. Speaker, we're also working with the church behind and going all the way over actually to Princess so this would be actually a large project, development project with housing on that entire square block almost except you have a tower there, would be a long side that existing tower and so you have the precedent of the housing, you have that newer tower right beside it and so I think it's very positive. They've made the commitment. They're going to have to spend well up to $40, $50,000 which would be really throw away but they're doing it because we've asked them to so that it's not a parking lot that this is going to be fenced nicely. It will be park-like and not be used as parking. They've agreed to this. They're going to go to that expense. It is a throw away cost to them that they all you know, once the building goes up it would be removed but they're prepared to do that in good faith, Mr. Speaker, that we've asked them to do in terms of addressing that concern that we have about parking lots. And you know, I guess in the ideal world yeah, it would be great if we could've restored the building, Mr. Speaker, but it would've been great as well, Mr. Speaker, if we were able to save the Grain Exchange Annex which was in far better condition Mr. Speaker, than this building, yet Heritage Winnipeg did not hesitate to come to this Council and speak in favour of that demolition and that Mr. Speaker, was within the Historic Designated Site by Parks Canada. This as rightly pointed out this building as outside the National Historic Site, the Grain Exchange was within and it was in a far better condition yet Heritage Winnipeg chose to strongly supported that demolition of that heritage building Mr. Speaker, and yet this one I'll side heritage building in the kind of condition with the group and organization that's committed to the downtown like no other group and organization is and Heritage Winnipeg is again it. It makes no sense whatsoever. So this is a positive project Mr. Speaker, I complement, I know Councillor Pagtakhan has worked extremely hard on it, it's his ward. He's dedicated to seeing this through working with it, he's been the driving force in making this happen, Mr. Speaker, so he deserves a lot of credit and I hope this Council adopts this unanimously, Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Again, today's debate is not whether or not, it's not what, is whether, today's discussion is not about the building being historic. That has already been decided by this Council. The issue before us today is in regards the demolition of the building prior to their being a new proposal before us. Assisted living housing is a challenging task, various levels of government funding come together to make this project happen. The Chinatown Development Corporation has a tremendous track record in our Chinatown, over the years providing services to people of Chinese descent. Right now they're in fact producing a housing project at the corner of Logan and Princess. I commend them for that work. As of today they don't have all the funding lined up for this new project on the former Shanghai site. I understand that. But this is the next step that they need to do to make sure that it makes sense

for them to acquire the property. As it is the liability to maintain this property is expected to cost tens of thousands of dollars a year in this current state. For a non-profit group that's trying…provided much needed service, that's really not tenable so basically the biggest concern that we've had and Mayor Katz has stated over and over again is a creation of new service part in our downtown is what we need to absolutely avoid at this, almost all costs. This will not be surface parking. This will be green space until such time is ready for it, for this type of development. As Councillor Wyatt alluded to, I mean my oma, people like to have the food they're used to growing up even when they're in their later phases of life and you know circumstances of assisted living. My oma likes where she lives because they still have food that she recognizes you know, in her older years. There really isn't that opportunity right now for the Chinese community. That's what this will provide and I think that's what we need to keep our focus on. This is a very important piece for the Chinese community in Winnipeg and that's why I'm supporting it.

Mr. Speaker: Call the question? All those in favour? Recorded vote. All right, all those in favour of motion or item 5, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi and Smith.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 13, Nays 3.

Mr. Speaker: Motion carried. We have some by-laws, Councillor Browaty.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2ND AND 3RD READING

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that By-law No. 138/2011 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 138/2011.

Councillor Browaty: Mr. Speaker, I move that By-law No. 138/2011 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

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

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-law No. 101/2012, 102/2012, 103/2012 and 104/2012.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 101/2012, 102/2012, 103/2012 and 104/2012. Mr. Speaker, I move that By-laws numbered 101/2012 to 104/2012 both inclusive be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.
Clerk: By-laws numbered 101/2012 to 104/2012 both inclusive.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 101/2012 to 104/2012 both inclusive be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Question Period for Property and Development. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Chair, given some of the concerns that have arisen in the last little while about a Neighbourhood Livability Plan, about some of the Planning Department issues, can the Chair tell me what the status of the hiring of the Senior Planner for the Planning Department is at?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I know that a search is currently under way. I don't have any current status on it but I could certainly get back to the Councillor.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes. I've had a number of complaints in the last two or three weeks about permits being issued and I'm wondering since the decision a few months ago of a new permit process, what improvements have we seen in the process in terms of turnaround or have there been any?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I thank the member for the question. I haven't seen any particular metrics as to the performance of the system. Again, this is a very busy time of year and it's not unusual to have permits and inspections delayed at this time of year. That said, I do understand that the new process that allows for standard type stuff and the inspections…sorry the seals of professionals, architects and engineers to be recognized certainly helps. Again, that's a new process so there is actually opportunities in many cases if certain types of plans are pre-sealed and pre-approved that they can actually get through the process a lot faster, in fact, the industry certainly has to look at taking advantage of those options perhaps more than they already are. My understanding as well is we do ramp up with temporary plan inspectors and during the summer months, and my understanding is they actually bring them in earlier now, so students and that, they bring them in part time during the school year at the end to get them up to speed so that they can hit the road running…they can hit the road running in the summer months when they're at their peak times.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Any further questions for Councillor Browaty? Seeing none, we'll move to the Standing Policy Committee for Protection and Community Services. Councillor Havixbeck.

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

Councillor Havixbeck: I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 3.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have no motions. We have no by-laws.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Do we have question period for Protection and Community Services? Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Three to the Chair.

We've been experiencing some wonderful warm weather, and over the last number of years, thanks to a number of projects, whether it's land dedication funds, park amenity money or in fact in some cases, the charitable funding, we've produced up to, I think is it 9 spray pads opened in the City of Winnipeg. These spray pads are wonderful in that they don't require any staffing at them and in fact they don't cost us anything if nobody is pressing the button to actually have the water run. So in my mind, I don't understand why we have such restricted hours and even season, for these particular spray pads. Would the member be amenable to looking at if there would be any cost to extending the season of the spray pads from Victoria Day weekend in May through to the end of September and operating them from hours 9 a.m. to 9 p.m.?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, and thank you Councillor Browaty for your question. I believe in addition to the 9 spray pads we also extended hours to some of our pools and libraries and other facilities during the extensive heat so that people can keep cool. We could definitely look at in future years and outgoing years to extending the hours during the said period on a more permanent basis.

Mr. Speaker: Any more questions for the Chair of Protection and Community Services? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question pertains to commendable initiative that my predecessor, Councillor Steeves, actually left in place which was some funding for capital improvements in St. Vital Park, specifically the duck pond pavilion. The monies there, we had a very successful open house in the spring, we had people from planning there, we had people from parks there, we had community services folks there, we had all sorts of members of the public come by. A report has been completed and now we're not too sure where that is, and the community people are asking me when we're going to get this built. Certainly the architects who worked on the study are keen to get it going, did a very fine job creating some models, so I don't need an answer today but I'm wondering if the Chair can advise when the report on St. Vital Park is going to be moving forward. I'd like to break the…wherever it is on someone's desk if we can get it moving again and get that approved, get an R.F.P. and get the building built. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, and thank you for your email yesterday as well on this item Councillor Mayes. I guess just in reference to that, I'm informed that there is money in the capital budget for the duck pond. There is no "bureaucratic log jam" that was cited, and the project is moving forward, however this is not the Protection and Community Services area of responsibility. This is actually a public works area of responsibility. And so I will ask that Councillor Mayes defer his question to Councillor Vandal when it's his question period.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further questions, we'll close the Protection and Community Services report and move to the Committee of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Vandal.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED JULY 3, 2012

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I heard my name there somewhere, so I perked up. I'd like to move Items 1 through to 15 as consent items.

Mr. Speaker: Nothing to be stood down, 1 to 15? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We…yes, sir.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker. May I be recorded in opposition to Item 6, please.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie recorded in opposition to Item 6. (Inaudible)

Councillor Vandal: Which item is it?

Mr. Speaker: Motions. We have a motion from Councillor Smith and Councillor Eadie which is an automatic referral so we will take that as an automatic referral.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Smith,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS in the interest of improving road safety for children, City Council is considering reducing speeds to 30 km/h in some school zones in Winnipeg to be in force Monday to Friday, 07:00 – 17:30, during the months of September to June;

AND WHEREAS road safety for children is a concern also outside of school zone boundaries and at all times, particularly at neighbourhood parks and playgrounds and around homes;

AND WHEREAS according to experts, a pedestrian or a cyclist hit at 50 km/h is two to three times more likely to die as one hit at 40km/h and injuries and property damage are also greatly reduced at a lower speed;

AND WHEREAS the City of Edmonton recently reduced speed limits to 40km/h in several residential neighbourhoods with a 25% drop in severe collisions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council ask the Winnipeg Public Service to consider lowering the residential speed limit in Winnipeg to 40km/h.

Mr. Speaker: By-laws to consider, Councillor Vandal.

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

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 105, 106, 107, 108, 110/2012.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 105/2012, 106/2012, 107/2012, 108/2012, 110/2012.

Councillor Vandal: I will move that the by-laws numbered 105/2012 to 108/2012 both inclusive, and By-law No. 110/2012 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 105/2012 to 108/2012 both inclusive and By-law No. 110/2012.

Councillor Vandal: I will move that the rules be suspended and by-laws numbered 105/2012 to 108/2012 both inclusive and By-law No. 110/2012 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. I do believe Councillor Mayes has a question for Councillor Vandal?

Councillor Vandal: Oh, okay.

Councillor Mayes: No thank you.

Mr. Speaker: No? No referral there. Any other questions for the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Committee? Seeing none, we will move right along to the Standing Committee of Finance. Oh, I'm sorry. Councillor Smith.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker, Councillor Vandal, there are many problems with the Disraeli Project for businesses on Higgins due to lack of communicating with them. They would like notice of street closings as it affects their business. It is especially a problem when the street is closed for a few days like it was from June 29 to July the 2nd. Can you see that the Public Works Department give adequate notice so that they can alert customers in future?

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to Councillor Smith. Absolutely, I will. I know in the past when I received some e-mails on interruption and access to businesses along Higgins. I have talked to Director Sacher and we have resolved them so if there's any specific concerns that Councillor Smith knows of, I encourage him to e-mail my office and we'll try to resolve them.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? Thank you. We now will move on to Standing Policy Committee for Finance. Report of July 10th. Councillor Fielding.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE DATED JULY 10, 2012

Councillor Fielding: Sure, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of the consent item No. 1.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no comments. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. We have no motions, there's no by-laws. We now have question period for Finance. Seeing none, we will move to the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management. Councillor Swandel?

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

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pleased to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda, Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no comments. All those in favour 1 and 2? Opposed? Motion carried. Bylaws. Councillor Swandel.

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

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll move that the by-law numbered 99/2012 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 99/2012.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, I move that By-law No. 99/2012 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 99/2012.

Councillor Swandel: It's got a nice ring to it, By-law 99/2012. Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 99/2012 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. That concludes by-laws. Question period for Downtown Committee. Seeing none, thank you. Alternate Services Delivery Committee, Councillor Fielding.

REPORT OF THE ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE DATED JULY 6, 2012

Councillor Fielding: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce report and move adoption, Items 1 through 4.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, I see Councillor Pagtakhan for 2. Councillor Mayes for 4.

Councillor Gerbasi: Item 1 is…

Councillor Fielding: Item 1 is the Expression of Interest. Two is demand parking, three is Parking Authority Business Plan and four is the Golf Services.

Councillor Eadie: Four please.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, we've got four already. So, four, two. Yeah, Councillor Mayes. No, yeah, Councillor Mayes wanted four.

Councillor Eadie: So we're all stood down, is that correct?

Mr. Speaker: Okay, so who stood, did someone stand down one and three?

Councillor Fielding Just one, two and four.

Mr. Speaker: No, we've got two stood down and four stood down, so we have one and three.

Councillor Gerbasi: Did you want one? One as well.

Councillor Fielding: One is Expression of Interest. Three is the…

Mr. Speaker: Okay, so three is the only one right now for consent? All those in favour of Item 3? Opposed? Motion carried. Councillor Fielding, if you want to open on Item 1.

Item 1 – Winnipeg Golf Services Report on Expression of Interest #497-2011

Councillor Fielding: Sure. What I will do is briefly introduce this and at that point, I'd like to hear everyone's comments and hopefully I can address any questions kind of at the latter end. This, of course, is the Expression of Interest for Golf, it's something of course, the Auditor had identified as something that we need to move on and so the Expression of Interest took a long period to process, sometimes we get criticized for things going too quickly but this is one where we did some extensive review and analysis for it and we put some recommendations forward in terms of the short term, I guess the development and also operations, some of the golf courses. So that'll stand it down and I'll listen to everyone's comments and I'll comment at the end.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes on Item 1.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The…this marks I think the end of this Expression of Interest process which has been pretty high profile over the past few months. The recommendation is…pertains to four of the seven courses that were under discussion. On the positive side I think we aren't moving to sell any of the courses. Certainly I think there could be some debate over whether those, some of those courses might be better off as community green space than as golf courses but the debate for today simply pertains to the four courses that are currently City-run and operated. In that light, I'm not going to be in favour of the recommendation from the Committee to look at the managed competition process. I do respect Councillor Fielding I think put a lot of work in on this. As soon as he talked to me and

I'm sure talked to other councillors and kept an open mind about things and I think is entering into these. I'm assuming this will pass and there will be negotiations with the union or unions involved and I think Councillor Fielding's looking into that in a good faith way. We've had some discussions about models in the U.S. where there been negotiations with unions that succeeded and unions that kept the work. If my only comment here is to clarify and the numbers here relate somewhat to no. 4 as well so my comments here pertain a bit to the operating plan and if you look at page 17 of that operating plan, in essence the courses, the four courses that are in play here are, are making money on an operating sense. I mean about 100,000 dollars a year, why then are we talking about them losing $800,000 a year. That's not accounting trickery. There are some items that are on the balance sheet that would be on any balance sheet that overhead items that whoever operates the courses are going to start in about a $900,000 hole. Generally speaking, these are contribution to 311, contribution to property taxes and I see Councillor Fielding has e-mailed me about my questions of property taxes. I haven't even had a chance to look at that so perhaps he can explain when he closes, that one of the major items here is $285,000 in property tax equivalents and it's unclear to me from that line item if that's school taxes if that's city taxes if that's all notional. There's also $300,000 of depreciation which is costed in which leads to that bottom line being $800,000 loss. Certainly when I, I owned my own building and operated my business in Brandon, you had to take into account depreciation on the building on the equipment. You had to take into account property taxes. Those are all fair cost to, assigned to any business operation to this Special Operating Agency. So my point in the larger scheme we are going to be looking at if the negotiations with CUPE don't succeed and this is contracted out, I think we'll see a number sometime in the future and what I would caution is, I would hate to see a debate where it's saying, well the city lost 800 grand when we ran it but we contracted it out and now it's making 200 grand a year. It's been a great success. I think we have to be clear as we go through these negotiations. Would a private operator have to in essence eat the cost of the depreciation; eat the 311 costs; eat the property tax equivalent cost and there's one other major item here that's, that's into the three, the six digits which is interest on long term debt which is about 182 grand a year. So it's not faulting who runs the agency. They've been I think doing the best job they can. We've had weather conditions. We operated a 16 hole course at Windsor Park for good chunk of last year and that's not anybody's idea of how they'd like to operate a golf course, but in an accounting sense if we're going forward in talking with CUPE, I think it's important to note that there are…these things do run at a profit if on, in terms of the actual day-to-day, the revenue versus the expenses. It's the bigger overhead expenses that force the negative into the balance sheet and why we're going to have to vote later to increase the line of credit. So I'm not saying any of those are accounting trickery or that there are some misallocations here and putting depreciation on the balance sheet. My point is if we do proceed to contract these out, I think in comparing in the future we need to be clear, did the private operator have to bear the cost of depreciation, did they have to grab the cost of the property tax? I know the Canoe Club is operating with a private operator now. It's my understanding that they're paying the property tax as part of that lease which is certainly a benefit to the city but I leave it to whoever will be doing these negotiations to keep track of those items but I think that's important in any future comparison of how we're doing and how we're costing our operations on the golf courses. In respect to that the Canoe Club and I've noted this briefly with Councillor Fielding, we actually will be bringing CUPE workers onto the northern edge of that site to deal with the new city park that's going to be basically adjacent to the golf course. There may be some opportunities there to talk to the union and say, well, people are going to have to come right next door. Is there some flexibility at trying to get them to work on the golf course in the future, not saying we're trying to get out of that lease, not saying that there's a problem with the lessee, but that's the kind of creative thought that might be possible in this managed competition process to say, well maybe we can contract some of this work in, in fact, if we can do it at the right rate. So I appreciate the work that's been done on this by alternative service delivery. I'm not in favour of the managed competition process, so I'll be voting against but I do think we have to be clear on the numbers when we're talking about an $800,000 loss. It's not necessarily inaccurate, it just contains some items that we're going to have to be very clear in the future on whether we have…whoever takes over the lease, if indeed it is contracted out, whether they're responsible for those costs or not. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. I rise, I'm going to vote in opposition to this this particular report as I rose in opposition to the…I believe there was two or three separated clauses we voted on in regard to this particular issue of Expression of Interest. One of them was looking at the private management of the city owned and operated golf courses which I didn't agree with and I still will not agree with that today and I heard in the media that some people don't understand where people got the idea that we might be selling off some of our golf courses, some of the land. While there was a second clause we voted on that talked about looking at whether or not we should sell off some of the gold courses, or some of the land at the golf courses. So you know, this whole debate and discussion as it's gone along over time and I am…it is very considerate that due diligence that there was a long period of time taking before proceeding with the report and looking into and analyzing this stuff but I think that we should be clear that there were two different clauses that we voted on in how this thing proceeded and we voted on them as separate items and so I believe the Mayor has one vote and I believe the Mayor voted yes on both counts, so that is where the people of Winnipeg got the idea that we might be selling off some of our golf courses and in any event I will be voting against this particular report because I don't really, I don't think that there's necessarily a need to have these managed by a private company. I know

there's a you know, a whole debate that you can go about it but it's my particular belief that there's no need to go to a private management that these golf courses…there's a lot of questions to clear up and you know, the thing about accounting and cost accounting and financial accounting, there's a lot of different things to take into evaluation but I, you know, I don't know if under these new lease agreements where you have private managers will be paying the 311 transfer over to our 311 service for booking purposes, so there's a whole bunch of issues that are in the details of whenever lease is negotiated and so I can't really speak to what the real value is going to be, if you go to private management but I am against this just because I don't see really the need to go to a private manager of these four particular golf courses and I would also note, I'm hoping that any agreement, because I know that this probably has majority vote for, that any agreements that go ahead, make sure that the Windsor Park Nordic Centre is protected and it's actual cheap, affordable way of cross country skiing with the best trails that that will be upheld with any kind of private management agreement. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to…I think there's really two sort of major things we're dealing with here that are kind of different so it may be confusing for voting for or against it that there's an EOI process itself and then there's the issue of the decision to move forward with the managed competition approach in terms of our staffing of the golf courses. So on the EOI process itself, I think some of us felt the process was somehow flawed in terms of you know, Councillor Orlikow and I called for a consultations and having a more, in this, and having more public sort of process to consider the future of our green spaces and all of that. Now today we're at a state where, okay, we're not selling them so that's definitely a relief and people are very happy. There was a lot of public concern and a lot of work that the public was sort of put through in the feeling that they had to protect our green space, they felt it was threatened and I do want to acknowledge that the decision was made not to do that so I'm not trying to, I just think you do have to also acknowledge what people went through in the sense of fearing that these green spaces were going to be sold off for development. Certainly, I certainly support the fact that that's not happening but the other part of this issue is the decision to go to managed competition and I have some concerns about that process in general. I mean, ethically in some cases, I mean it depends on what you're looking at. The 311 system, it's been compared to that but that was a really big project and it was really a matter of looking at can the public service do it or can the private person do it and obviously the private sector couldn't even do something like 311 and it worked out really well and I think that was. I supported that. But this is 50 employees or something, I don't want to get too specific and a lot of them are students who make just over minimum wage. The other half of them are temporary workers. I mean, these aren't our highest paid staff and I just, I guess I fail to see where we're going to save a lot of money by having our own staff. These are people with lives, you know, have to bid against their own jobs in a system so I guess I have concerns and I didn't support going to managed competition as an approach anyway because I don't think people who have a collective agreement who are working for us should have to wake up one morning and be told okay you have to bid against the lowest bidder whether it's BFI or whoever else it is on your own job. There's just something unsettling about that and I question that process. I realize the intent is to, I'm not saying we can't do things better and look at other alternatives, I just, I don't really agree with this approach, especially with the small, small group of employees. They certainly don't have the capacity to bid against private companies and all of this in terms of 50 employees or whatever it is. So I just want to put on the record that I can't support it for that reason. I definitely support not selling the golf courses. I'm thrilled that we can, I hope we're going to move forward in the future with a better process in sort of reviewing what happens, if there is a, the chance to repurpose some of our golf course space you know, into something that's acceptable to, but the community needs to be a little, we all I think we learn from this I hope is that the topic of green space is something very indeed near and dear to the hearts of our citizens. It's something that they want to have a voice in and unfortunately just sending, send this EOI process did not really give ordinary citizens a chance to really participate and you know it was more about a business, model that obviously was not really acceptable to the general public and it's had to be, hasn't really got us anywhere so I just hope people will reconsider doing this differently because this isn't an issue that's probably going to come up in the future. So I won't be supporting the particular clause for the reasons outlined, I do thank the Mayor and other councillors for coming to the, whatever. I didn't see these bids, so I don't know why they made their decisions and I can only speculate but I thank them for coming to the decision of not disposing of these properties as, from being green space to being something else at this point because I don't think we've had the proper dialogue to make that decision at this point to date. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased that there are no plans to sell Winnipeg's publicly owned golf courses but should we not have a business plan and we can scrutinize before making any major decisions regarding our golf courses? I mean, a proper business plan that outlines expenditures through maintenance et cetera and deal with each golf course, not the sham, the one that we have here and should we not have public consultation on the future for our golf courses? Are we afraid to hear from our citizens? These golf courses were once all profitable. Why are they not now? Is it because we have not re-invested in their upkeep? Is it now because we charge them taxes? This I do not

understand. They are green spaces that we must preserve. We do not charge the library taxes. Why are we charging our golf courses realty taxes? And what's all this gobbly-goop about modified management, managed competition. What does it mean? Surely we should know that before accepting that unknown direction. I cannot support this, I don't think we as a council should be supporting it. You know, this is a…what is Modified Managed Competition? I want someone to explain that. I don't have a clear idea from reading what that is. What are you asking the unions to do? We should not support this clause.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I…we're back to the great Winnipeg golf course debate which seems to be taking up awful a lot of our time around these chambers in the last several years and even prior to that we've reviewed this file several times over the last 10 years but I guess I just need some clarification. I feel in some respects that we're being processed to death here because last May, which is about 14 months ago we, this Council approved and I supported the golf services organizational review which had a few motions. The first motion which was to divest ourselves of City owned golf courses for commercial and residential development. We know that's taking up the most attention and that's being filed today but the second motion was that in the short term we conducted competitive bid process for the operation of City run golf courses. That was adopted 14 months ago to conduct the competitive bid process to operate the golf courses and I'm assuming from that process 14 months later that nothing's come of that so from that competitive bid process in the interim we've adopted a mixed management or whatever it's called a managed competition process several months ago, the report came from ASD which is fine. And this process is saying that we are going to initiate negotiations through a modified management competition process for the operation of four golf courses. So I need clarification from the Chair, how that process is different from the process we'd started 14 months ago where we endorsed a competitive bid process for our golf courses, how is the modified management competition process different from that? I need assurance from the Chair that…I think we need to measure ourselves against the best. We need to look at best practices all over the, all over Canada and make sure that we are doing the good job with our public assets. So I want to make sure that…I'm not afraid of competition. It's a great thing, but I want to make sure that there's an opportunity for the public sector…for our own services for the unions to be involved in this mixed management process because I want to go to competition but I want to, not prejudice, I don't want someone's come back a few months later and says but you voted for this. We've already voted to contract this out. That's not what I'm voting on today. Councillor Eadie makes the great point. The skiing association in Windsor Park is a tremendous asset and that has to be, that has to be protected going forward no matter which model we go forward on. Councillor Mayes made some very good points on the… how do you measure this. I mean, it's clear. The line out there it's a good political line that we lose a million dollars a year but if you look at the numbers, we transfer between 6 and 700, 000 dollars from the golf courses to the City of Winnipeg including I think about $75,000 for 311 and when I golf at Windsor Park, I don't even call 311. I call Windsor Park directly. So I'm not sure what the SOA is getting from the 311 services. On top of that we've depreciated all these golf courses $300,000 which is a part of the one million dollar loss so it's a good line out there. The media love it, but it's not reality if you check out the consolidated statements. So, to focus in on the vote today, I want to ask Councillor Fielding, recommendation 1, we initiate negotiations with the MMC, Mixed Management Competition for four courses? That's a process that the public sectors are going to be involved in that the unions are going to be involved in and it's not the fait accompli that we're contracting this work out because if it is I'm not voting for it. Number two, Winnipeg Public Service report back to ASD with the recommendations resulting from the MMC process with the intention of providing sufficient time to transition to an alternative operating model. The presumption there is that we're going to that model and I need clarification on that, in fact I may even ask that on 1 and 2 separately just to make it crystal clear. Number three, EOI is closed, that's easy to understand and number four, that the requirement for a deposit be waived for negotiations through a mixed modified management competition if, perhaps the Chair of the Committee can clarify that, that 4th recommendation. Those are my comments, Mr. Speaker. It's…this is a file that takes a lot of energy, a lot of time, a lot of administrative time, a lot of community time. I see other people in the gallery today that were followed this from Day 1. I commend them for that. It was never our intention to go out and sell our green space for commercial development, certainly it was not my intention for it, but you've got to benchmark what the City does against you know, what other cities do and best practices and I think our citizens demand nothing less, so I'm going to stand down. I'm going to ask for Councillor Fielding to clarify.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I wasn't going to speak to this but as I started to listen to everyone talking about golf courses losing money or not losing money when we go forward that they might actually be making money or maybe still losing money. The reality is in Winnipeg we have too many golf courses. We do. I don't think that's a bad thing. I think you know, it creates a great deal of opportunity for people to get out there especially in the summer months after being you know, pent up in our houses waiting for the snow to disappear and to get out there. You can argue the numbers all over the place. Some of them make sense, some of them don't make sense you know, whether or not you use 311 as a booking service or whether not you phone a golf course directly, the City is certainly going to, if we go to

contracting out to a private contractor. They're going to have to make up that $80,000 the year that the golf SOA pays for 311 service right now. Right now we're paying ourselves the taxes in this, not an outside entity paying taxes. You'll note that some of our current operating agreements involve somebody paying a lease payment plus the municipal property taxes and so we're not looking for to be, to absolutely 100% be on the positive side. We may still lose money even if we go through this modified management process but you might find a better way to do it and that's all this is about, doing some exploration; trying to find a better way to do business and hopefully hang on to this wonderful amenity that we have, Councillor Vandal mentioned the skiing at Windsor Park, just another piece that was able to come to the table to help make the green space more viable to help keep it alive and you know, one of the big things that we get out of the contracts that we have at the private sector right now to operate is we get the capital improvement sewn in. Because when you look at buildings you know, remember when we sold the parkade, everybody talked about the differed maintenance, but we have that existing on our golf courses as well and you have to quantify all of these things and, so I like what Councillor Vandal said that we have to be true in our process; that we're not just saying that we're going to contract out. What we're doing is we're going into a process; it is truly a competitive process that allows our folks to compete in that and that we're measuring it properly. We understand that if we are moving to contracting out that, with that there are financial implications and you can't just look at the financial implications for the golf SOA, you have to look at the financial implications for the city. I remind my colleagues in the early stages of this SOA and some other SOAs, we were taking dividends. We were actually taking cash out of these SOAs and putting them in to offset tax increases so we're creating some of that long-term debt or that you know, that the annual losses, we were doing it because the city was taking the cash from the entity known as the golf SOA. So we have to be very…as the ASD Committee goes through this process, we have to be cognizant of all of the pieces and how they play out in the overall financial statements of the City of Winnipeg and if we just go to that bottom line in the SOA, that number doesn't tell you a whole lot. We have to look at you know, does the SOA no longer have the ability to provide $80,000 a year towards the operations of 311. Who's now paying the property taxes? Is it an outside entity or is it still the City itself paying the property taxes? All those types of things. Are we still using depreciation and amortization in the same way? So, there's a lot of work to be done here. I'm confident you know, we talk about this as being a lengthy process; yes it's a lengthy process but it's a good process. And I'm confident that we'll continue in this process and hopefully land in the right place that gives us better value and enables us to keep our golf courses for a long, long time to come.

Mr. Speaker: No further comments? Councillor Fielding, oh, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, I think in the context of what we're trying to address and I want to thank Councillor Fielding for the report. You know, we as a city are facing huge challenge with regards to the state of our infrastructure and we have to start looking at alternatives in terms of service delivery Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not. We're raising taxes now for the first time in years. I think it's crucial and incumbent. We recently all attended a strategic planning session and one of the issues that came out of that was a need to be fiscally responsible and it's crucial that we as a Council do everything we can to try to deliver our services as efficiently as possible. Especially, Mr. Speaker, knowing that we are truly when it comes to infrastructure the challenges we're facing with infrastructure, we are on our own as a city. We heard that loud and clear in the last provincial budget. They basically slam the door shut on any sort of alternatives with regards to revenues Mr. Speaker to address our growing infrastructure deficit. We will be…have no doubt in my mind Mr. Speaker, in light of this, have to look at what other cities are now doing, setting aside money raising taxes to go directly into funding infrastructure and increasing that funding. It's going to be not a pleasant part of what we might have to do, Mr. Speaker, but the reality is we can't as stewards of the city continue to let the infrastructure deficit go off the scales in this going right now. We know the Province does not want to assist us. There's no interest there at least, right now from what we're seeing in terms of addressing this, we're, we, we have to start looking at all options, Mr. Speaker, we're looking at the property tax issue and I think we're looking at hopefully not with ideological lens but what needs to be done and the same thing goes Mr. Speaker, in terms of the reality with regards to how we deliver services of the city. If we don't find ways to save money in terms of our services and our service delivery you know Mr. Speaker, it just means the cost will be higher on the rate payers ultimately of the city. So we know that golf is losing money, we know that those are dollars that could be better spent elsewhere. And so we have to start addressing this Mr. Speaker, it's incumbent and we're moving forward on that. I know it's not going to be, it's going to be difficult, it's going to be tough. It's not going to be easy for this Council but the reality is we need these resources to be able to be some of the core services that we know are not being addressed and that really is what's coming down to, Mr. Speaker, is priority. So those are my comments and I encourage everybody to support the report.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: I'd just like to make a few comments based on what I've heard and also what I've heard in the Charleswood-Tuxedo community because Tuxedo Golf Course is one of the golf courses listed as part of this and as well, a year and a half or 14 months or so back when the Auditor did his report as well as when the business plan came forward last year and you know many have said it's important that we as a Council balance being fiscally responsible with trying to move forward, we're trying to fix roads, we're trying to reduce crime in our city and we're trying to create

more opportunities for our youth and I kind of think that kids playing golf are likely not out robbing the 711 if they're busy and they're engaged in something so I think golf has grown and I just want to make a couple of corrections. To say that this is a small endeavour, 40 to 50 employees, 40 to 50 employees I believe was the number quoted. You know and how could there possibly be any savings among these wages? Well, there probably could be, probably, maybe. It's worth exploring and I think that this report coming forward will just be an exploration of that. It will see what kinds of proposals are out there, who might be interested and the concept of Modified Managed Competition, you know, as someone fairly new to Council still, this is a new concept. It's something that could be explored in nearly every department of the city so to say that this is small or insignificant…this is really just a small step towards something larger. I'd just like to correct something, too. We often hear too many golf courses as being the line for Winnipeg and I believe the Auditor's Report last year cited that we have more golf courses per capita so that's not saying we have too many, that's saying we just happen to have more than your average Canadian city or average other city our size and I think that's a great thing. I think the leaders before us preserved that space and now we are doing our best to continue to preserve it as green space for golfers primarily but for others to enjoy. As well I believed that the Auditors reported last year that our wages were approximately a third higher in the private sectors so that maybe some point in this exploration process that can be considered under the Modified Managed Competition Process or the MMC or something simpler we have to call it. Where we make our money, and I keep in touch with Tuxedo Golf Course and what they're doing is in kid's programs. The kid's programs are to capacity and I think that's great because kids come from other areas even of the City, it's not an exclusive club, it's an opportunity for young people as well as people of all ages to golf and to have a program and an opportunity to lean to golf in somewhere other than the private club setting and I think we as a city have some responsibilities to continuing, to providing that service or those opportunities. It's how we do it and under what guises we do it that are being considered here and will come forward through the ASD Committee. So in closing I hope that my colleagues will continue to support this. I think though, whether we had the MMC model come forward or whether we had a full out development proposal here on the table, I think there will still be some Councillors that will just disagree with, for the sake of disagreeing, so I hope that isn't the case. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor Fielding. It's all yours. We have some questions.

Councillor Fielding: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I've got a number of points here I'd like to raise. I probably should've made most of my comments in the introduction phase but I didn't so. Anyways, I'd like to bulk my comments now during my eight minutes. First of all, listen. I think we've made a tough business decision that's here. First of all, we've talked about the numbers that we're losing, Councillor Vandal and Councillor Swandel talked about you know, some transfers and that sort of…311 all the processes, but whether you believe me or the numbers that are in there I think we can believe the Auditor and on page nine of the Audit Report, they clearly identified 2009, we lost of our million dollars a year so the Auditor has put that on the table. This isn't a Council, Alternate Service Delivery putting this idea for it, this is an Audit's report that identified these things. The Auditor came back and said, you need to take a look at how you're managing your courses is the number one parameter which they had, they also talked about and I think the unions appeared, they had mentioned too for some of the courses, the private operated courses right now in terms of a lease agreements that are there, but the bulk of Brian Whitehead's report talked about the bleeding that's there. So we made a tough business decision, we wanted to stop in the initial bleeding that's happening at the courses right now, Really, it took priority for us to get the troubled courses under order. We know that you know, and the Auditor's numbers are million dollars a year, I think it's a little bit less this year, just under $800,000 a year. So suffice it to say that 800,000 or however you want to scheme the dollars, money that we wouldn't have for community club. It's money that would have put towards policing, it's money we would've have towards programming that's there because we're losing money on this item so you know, I think at some point, in any organization you need to look at your operations and if you're losing or clear lose money, you need to make some change. I don't think that there's anything wrong with that. I do want to touch upon this Modified Managed Competition Process, it's something that I've been working on for over a year through Alternate Service Delivery and I'll answer some of what Councillor Vandal's questions and a few others. First of all, modified managed competition or modified competition is something they've done extensively whether be through the night states, through other means. Indianapolis has done it, San Diego's done a whole bunch of work in terms of this. What they basically found is they've been able to save money in terms of some of the services they're delivering, in fact, a number of these projects both in Indianapolis and in San Diego… they actually found that the unions were able to beat the private sectors with these things so what we think is that this is a process. I think Councillor Vandal asked why are we going through this modified managed competition. And the answer is that it's Council Policy. It was passed here. Anytime we're looking to do any item like this, we go through a managed competition process. What that does is the unions are at the table with our management team. We look at costs and how we can deliver this so in a course in golf courses, we're going to look to see what a private operator can operate the golf course for. The unions at that point have an opportunity to be part of that; have all the data and essentially counterbid on that to make the process work, so I think it's a fair process. This is the start of the journey, journey is a strange word but, the start of the process because number one, we need to get all that data back so there's some great questions that Councillor Vandal and Swandel and Gerbasi and Mayes answered in terms of you know, are they responsible for this or that. 311, that's all part of the process that's going to happen. What we're doing is we're passing a process to measure how effective we are. Once this goes ahead

or if this gets Council's nod and goes ahead, all the numbers are going to come back to us so at that point we're able to iron out all those information but I think Councillors at the very least, this is something that's very transparent; the unions are part of this. It allows us to measure how effective we can do it. Maybe they're right, maybe the unions could do it more effective than a private operator, but at the very least I think it's a fiduciary responsibility to find out how effective we can be. This isn't Scott Fielding that's brought this forward, this is the Auditor that's brought forth. You know, we've talked about some of the properties and I've probably the most hawkish on this. I still truly believe to this day I think, it makes sense for development to have them this course. This is not what the report that came back from administration. This is not what we're moving here today but if you ask me in my heart of hearts, I think it makes a lot of sense. If you look at golf courses across the world, they have development on it. This doesn't…we're not taking away green space. In a lot of ways, you would enhance the green space that's there so no one is able to convince me that I don't think that's a good idea but what we're talking about right here. We're not talking about that. We're talking about our operations of our golf courses. The Modified Managed Competition will provide all those numbers, it will provide a business plan going forward. If it doesn't make sense, no one is going to use a private operator just for the sake of preferred private operations. We talked about the state of golf. I mean I'm a golfer. I love golf. We've got over 50 courses within a 45 minute radius here in the City of Winnipeg talking a little bit more about the problems. We know that in the mid 90s, you had 180,000 rounds that played on our golf courses. Now you've got under 90,000 rounds or just around 90,000 rounds so the state of golf has changed. I think the amount of courses that are there, it's not just how our courses have been run but I think it's probably just the amount of people that are golfing for it. So I think the process that we're going forward, I appreciate that people may not support this in an ideological basis and what have you but I think this just provides more information for people. If you decide at that point once the information comes back, you want to step off the bus, go right ahead. But the information will be there and then you can make a decision at that point but this just starts a process, transparent, allows the unions to be there and I hope that answers to the Councillor Vandal's question. It's not at least the vote right now to privatize I know of this, of the 60 or 70 proposals that we did receive 32 of them were lease agreements that are there so obviously there's interest in this process that we go forward. Councillor Mayes asked some questions, I did get the e-mail from our CFO in terms of some of the taxes. I think some of your questions were related …are essentially the courses paying property taxes, somebody send my private courses that are out there where the Assiniboine-Tuxedo all these and at least from the administration back from our administration. They are for the most part paying all property taxes that are there, the business taxes are paid, the monies that are paid back to the Province from the school taxes that are there and you know, I guess people just at the end of the day, I think this is something the Auditor asked us to do. I think we've taken a balanced approach on this too, right? I mean it's you have some organizations that basically called for us to eliminate every bladed grass that's out there and develop every course. You know, you've got some organizations some might be here today that says don't do anything or double down in terms of putting more money resources into golf. I'm not one that believes that idea but I think we hit a good balance here where we're looking to fix the bleeding, stop the bleeding, the million dollars that we're losing in golf on a yearly basis; go forward in a transparent way that's going to produce some numbers and will make some business decisions there. So I truly believe we hit a balanced approach for it and I think the question that I would ask of you before we vote on this thing is doesn't it make sense to get more information on this? Get more information of what those costs would be and if we can save money, great, if the unions can be part of that, wonderful. That's a fantastic process to go through. So that's exactly what this managed competition piece does. We don't take this lightly, we took obviously a long period of time to read all the proposals that were brought forward, sometimes we got criticized from…I dare to mention the water park of course you know, how theses process sometimes move quickly. This is something we took a lot of time and effort to make some decisions on and here we are, and I think it's a good next step for both. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal on a point of order.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to request that 1 and 2 be voted on separately.

Mr. Speaker: On 1 and 2. Yeah, all right. That's certainly… all right. Recommendation 1. All in favour?

Mr. Speaker: Recorded vote? Okay. We'll ask those who are in favour of Item 1 to rise. All those in favour?

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: Item 1 carries. Recommendation No. 2 in Item 1. All those in favour? Recorded vote again? All right, all those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Mr. Speaker: Motion carried. All right, Recommendations 3, 4 and 5. All those in favour? Opposed? Okay, one nay, I see, carried. All right, that concludes Item No. 1. We have 2 and 4 yet to discuss. What's the will of Council? Do we carry on here? Okay, carry on. So the will is to carry on so we will go to Item 2.

Item 2 – Implementation of demand based pricing at on-street metered locations and updates on other improvements to on-street parking

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to introduce this report. This is something has been going through our system for quite some time. I know there were some presentations made. I'm not sure if they're still here or not in terms of the consultation for it. I can list out all the dates, times and meetings that people like in terms of consultation that were a part of this. Of course all the business groups, including the Downtown Biz, Exchange Biz had a numerous meetings regarding to this. There is a public open house that was attended. There's some concerns about some of the, some of the aspects of how it's communicated, I saw it on TV I think it was on a Thursday or Friday that the release went out and spoke of and I think the meeting was early next week so and I'm fairly confident that there's a good process in terms of how we consult with it. Just want to say, really what this policy is about is…We know that in some high demand areas the frustrations that motorists here in the City of Winnipeg have is sometimes you're going around the block, two, three, four times, maybe 10, 15 minutes to find a parking stall and the issues are people are lined up on the regular street and they're blocking that and not only is that frustrating for residents but it's also frustrating for business owners that are trying to get people in their stores and so we have a part of this process going forward, support from some of the business community of among some of the groups. I believe we've got a letter here from the Downtown Biz that's supported and the Exchange Biz that are there. Is it our consensus in the business community? No, but we do ask some of their, some of their representations through the business to gather feedback on it and we did and I don't think I would've moved on it if I thought that it was going to impact business to a certain extent. We of course have not had any rate changes with the business, with any of the parking I think since the late '90s that are there. There's always some talk which is further to the turnover we're looking for the high demand areas to be turned over and on an 85% basis for it. This is not something that other cities aren't doing if you look at other cities I think Calgary has a five hour demand parking basis. I think Saskatoon and Regina getting some calls from over there to speed up my process so I will. But anyways, extensive public consultations have by this, I think this is a right step forward. I don't…this is not a revenue piece, not a tax grab as some people would say. I think if this was all about revenue we do two things. We would enhance enforcement to get more tickets. We'd also enhance the parking that would happen across the city as opposed to just one area but these are the areas that are part of it so. I'm going to leave it at that to let people speak to, and then I'll close on those comments but I think it is an important step forward for parking in around the downtown area. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Who stood down No. 2? I'm sorry. I missed it. Mike Pagtakhan? Councillor Pagtakhan. You're first.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Exchange District is one of Winnipeg's most colourful and vibrant and cosmopolitan neighborhoods. That's a fact and Mr. Speaker, it's the retailers, the on street retailers that really create that vibrant and eclectic shopping feel and experience for all Winnipeggers and tourists and visitors across the world. Now, I've had an opportunity Mr. Speaker, through the Exchange Biz, through e-mails that have been forwarded to me through the Exchange Biz, to hear from some of the retailers on Albert Street, on McDermot and some of them are long standing and some of them are well known across this country and none of them, although they do get the fact that there's a challenge and that there's a need to come up with a creative solution, Mr. Speaker, they don't feel that this is the solution to creating turnover. Why would anyone from the suburbs want to come to the Exchange District or downtown Mr. Speaker, when they could go to Corydon Avenue where there are no meters or to Academy Road? These are the questions that these very successful and astute business people are asking and I came across one solution from one of the retailers on the east side of the Exchange who came up with the notion of we'll keep the first hour free Mr. Speaker, but charge subsequent hours at a higher rate. Well, that was a pretty novel idea. When I bounced it off the Winnipeg Parking Authority, they said there was an issue with enforcement and perhaps technology. Why should technology, Mr. Speaker, be an impediment to the solution? I think we have an opportunity here to have more of an engagement process, more of a consultation process, Mr. Speaker and I would like to know going forward, it seems to be this is probably going to pass, however you know the business community and the retailers are kind of kicking and screaming, you know what kind of steps are we going to be taking to ensure that there's more consultation Mr. Speaker as we move forward, as we fine-tune this. I understand there could be an annual review but you know I think it's important that we reach out further have some one on one discussions that are perhaps will focus group discussions with some of the business community and incidentally Mr. Speaker, we're not voting on it today but as part of the strategy, residential parking, the permits for residential parking has been cited as…we have a residential parking program downtown and it's not…it's contrary to our by-law. However, Mr. Speaker, we've had so many efforts over the 10 years to try and create downtown development with Waterfront Drive, for the condominiums on Bannatyne. The developers and real estate agents have been marketing, Mr. Speaker the downtown residential parking permit as one of the pluses of living downtown. Now it's my understanding this program is going to be phased out or something to that effect and you know residents are concerned.

Councillor Swandel: Point of order Mr. Speaker. These are not matters pertaining to this report.

Mr. Speaker: We'll ask Councillor Pagtakhan to sort of stay within the framework of the issue before us.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Okay, so you know it's…that also impacts part of the downtown parking. So basically, Mr. Speaker, you know there's also been a test case, however that's been cited in the report and the test case although was done in the Health Sciences Centre or the St. Boniface Precinct. These are all matters of…these are all health care institutions and that's where our loved ones are cared for. Well, what's the similarity Mr. Speaker between the business community and theses other agencies where you have to actually see a loved one. It's not discretionary income for shopping, that's my point Mr. Speaker. So in a nut shell, there are solutions out there, although we may be inhibited currently by technology, I believe a technology is out there, Mr. Speaker, and a lot of retailers I'm hearing are really not in favour of this kind of an increase. It's a 100% increase, and although they do understand it, they would like to have more input to give more feedback and to be part of the process moving forward in a more engaged capacity. That's all that I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, and unfortunately because they're very skeptical at this point I'm going to remain skeptical on this and not be supporting this item.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. I won't be in support of this particular move here. There's a number of concerns that I'm reading in this, the initial expansion of the period of time that you have to pay for parking in downtown. I know it's a specific area indicated that it would go to 8:30 p.m., but it really, is really setting out what is going to be precedence for parking in the whole Centre Venture downtown area as we move forward and I'm quite concerned about that and how that will affect certain other businesses and operations in the areas for example like the Exchange District. The double of money, of money that they're going to raise, this is 100% increase and what that is is a parking is a competitive industry in downtown and we do have some surface lot as well as indoor parking and if you drive up the cost of the metered, at the meters on the street you're also giving room for that managed complication to actually raise their fees for parking on these, on the surface parking lots as well as indoor parking. So you're driving up the price on everything when you do this. This could be a fall, I'm not saying it's 100% or there's an exact correlation between the two, but it is a possibility and it does set a precedent for extending the hours of parking to 8:30 p.m. in certain area and I can't in good conscience vote for this. There are other ways of insuring that people are moving sooner like the idea about that three hour parking and we do have all that new technology that was installed in that I often bang into on sidewalks downtown. I don't know why that particular computerized technology couldn't be adjusted to do that given our free and so on, so anyway I will be against this for those reasons and I would just leave out a question. This will generate more money for the parking authority. There's no doubt about that. I don't know that it requires their need to

step up their enforcement but there will be more money generated and I'm hoping that you know, there is the issue of those surface parking lots, maybe they'll redirect some of this extra money, will get directed into things like funding more inconspicuous parking in our downtown areas. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: No further comments? Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Everybody wants free parking at the door of wherever they're going. Nobody wants to pay more, nobody wants…but they want it to be available whenever they show up. Parking is a finite resources, a finite resource and in our downtown, it's even more finite because of the way people build buildings and they don't have infinite seas of parking lots. On street parking is designed for short term high turn-over parking. At this point though, parking rates haven't changed since 1992, 1993. A buck an hour in a lot of cases, it's cheaper to park on street and plug the meter all day than it is to go into an off street lot. That should not be the case. Two dollars in some zones, one dollar in other zones, it's a good starting point. I don't think we're…our downtown is in a situation where we can charge two dollars everywhere but the idea is to provide availability. A lot of businesses find that they're losing customers not because of the dollar, two dollars an hour for parking, it's because there isn't convenient parking available near them. I fully support this report today. I hate paying more for parking but it's the right thing.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further? Councillor Fielding to close.

Councillor Fielding: Sure, thank you, thank you Mr. Speaker. A few things raised by Councillor Pagtakhan and thank you very much for bringing some of these forward. Well, you guys are forcing me to do this. I'm going to go through all the consultation sessions here but we had on June 14th, we had a downtown session and that was at Globe Theatre, that was focused stakeholder business. It's proposed a high demand, we had a consultation session on the 15th, the downtown session no. 2. It was well attended. We had a consultation on June 23rd then informed information session and that was a coffee with the parking guy, we had June 30th, the downtown session no. 2, Portage Place at the IMAX open to downtown business members that were there. We had June 19th exchange, I guess it was probably more to Councillor Pagtakhan's area, the Exchange Session and there was the Sports Manitoba focus on the East Exchange, the Cultural District 50 were on hand to deliver the message for it. On June, July 20th, Exchange Session No. 2 and it was focused, there was a line of apparently and their focus on the exchange business. There was over 50 people that were there, 50 handout delivering invitations were made to the…July 21st. The CAO made a presentation to Centre Venture Board of Directors, August 6, information session No. 2. It goes on and on, I won't bore you with me reading out the statistics. We did once again have the session so I guess my point with this is we've been going around a bit in circles on this for a while. We had the consultation. I think the consultation is there. Permitting process, that's something obviously if you've got permits that's there that we renewed for this year, but it's something that can be incorporated in this review that's happening, obviously the review that will happen kind of on an annual basis reviews, what streets, how effective it is, what streets will be added or not, that's something that clearly can be part of that process which I think makes some sense to it. Talking about reinvestment, I think Councillor Eadie brought this up, Making some reinvestments for the parking. We've made some gains and obviously there's some loans that were associated with the Market Square parkade in both across from MTS Centre and also in the Exchange District so we had made some investments in that. We're obviously investing some other dollars here at the Civic Centre Parkade as well. That's obviously a much need for it so I think we are reinvesting some of these dollars and once again I don't think this is a tax grab. There would be other means to do this if possible, really this is to generate turn over. That's a part of it and there's always going to be some dissention with the ranks of people but overall the business associations that represent these downtown businesses and exchange businesses that have signed onboard. They seem to like the plan, they think it's a good plan going forward for those businesses that still have some concerns. I probably advise them to meet with Randy Topolniski who is our COO for Parking and Corporate with an annual review just to make sure that streets with a high demand out areas that are there so that would be my suggestion but I do thank you for bringing that forward. With that, I encourage all Councillors to support this. I think it's a step in the right direction and if you can get that turn over, make some sense. You know, what we're trying to do is get employees obviously that are, maybe they'd be lined up throughout the streets into some of those parkades, which I don't think it's a bad thing so you can, customers comment you know, go into your store for 15 or 20 minutes to do some shopping, come back so I think it makes a lot of sense so I hope everyone supports the swing for it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Recorded vote? All right, for those in favour of Item 2, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Pagtakhan and Smith.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 13, Nays 3.

Mr. Speaker: Motion carried. All right, Councillor Fielding, if you'd like to open on item 4.

Item 4 – Winnipeg Golf Services (WGS) Special Operating Agency – 2012 Business Plan (Selection Report)

Councillor Fielding: Sure thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm ready to introduce this, I'd love to hear if there's any questions, it seems fairly straight forward. There's not too many changes to this year's golf plan but feel free to hear Councillors' questions and hope I can answer.

Mr. Speaker: I have to again… Brian Mayes, did you stand this down?

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be brief. I think we covered a lot of this turf earlier, tragically not intended, I think the…Councillor Fielding had e-mailed me actually just before we started this debate about, for example the property tax issue and in fact part of the number in there is the Blumberg number so but this isn't quite as simple as the four that we're looking at on paper made and on operations made about 100 but if you've taken to all the overhead, they lost 800, they're different items in here in…to be fair. The four we're looking to do the managed competition for where much worse than money losers and we were at, our bottom line was actually improved by having some revenues out of Canoe Club; having Blumberg; having Tuxedo having some of those, the property taxes paid so it will be a complex negotiation because I think you've got a lot of different numbers in here from I think 11 different courses being reflected in different ways so hopefully, and the number of issues that were the importance of the cross country ski operation at Windsor Park was pointed out by Councillor Vandal. Hopefully, Councillor Fielding can make an Emerald City out of these grains of sand and come back with something that we can all support for the golf courses because in terms of how the numbers are, I would say working here, it is a bit unclear but hopefully negotiations will lead to some success and we'll be back to consider. I think in some ways, the main issues with Councillor Swandel has said, which is do we have…I tend to agree with Councillor Swandel. We may have too many golf courses. That is a different discussion than do we have too much green space but for the short term, this is what we voted on this process and I wish the committee well in its negotiations.

Mr. Speaker: Just to be clear we paid the Blumberg taxes to the RM of Headingley. Any further comments? Oh, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Speaker Nordman, this isn't actually the, we've debated the other resolutions. This is just purely their business plan. I probably will be…I'm going to vote in support of this particular report. It does set out some need to borrow more money in order to accomplish its…but one of the interesting things about their business plan is that what would've been nice to note in here is that you know, you could engage the private sector and get more money if you're allowed the, maybe I don't know if any of the Expressions of Interest but you know the private sector people I talk to who would be interested in the golf course. They were interested in making money not on the golf fees but they were interested in making money off the 19th hole which you can make great strides and I don't know why we have to go to this whole managed process which is part of the strategy of the overall golf right now but I don't know why some new ideas weren't presented in this business plan like maybe, maybe you could have a private sector put in the 19th hole, pay a lease cost or whatever and make some money and which would be a very, generates a lot of income and I know that the Mayor can probably understand that there's a lot of money to be made in the 19th hole given his business experience so. Well, I don't know that you've had that but you know, anyway. The point being though is simply that, that is where I would say that there is a sort of you know a competitive approach you might want to look at but so in this report, I just wanted to note that there's no new ideas being presented. It's just presenting of course their plan and I also wanted to at this point actually thank the acting manager of golf services, the SOA, for accommodating, this is a great thing and you know this is a, the business plan but part of that business plan and it had a small financial interest maybe associated with but golf services now allows a person to bring in a specialized wheelchair/golf cart for people who are quadriplegic or can't use their legs and it allows them to actually stand up and swivel and drive a ball on the golf course and what it happened was they were trying to treat it like an actual golf cart but what it is is actually a tool to allow a person with a disability to golf just like a blind person uses someone to spot for the golf ball. And we on our courses don't do that so I'd just like to actually thank the Acting Manager of Golf Services to accommodate those people who have, who are using these new style of wheelchair/golf cart which is the only way that they're able to do golfing and so kudos to them.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding to close.

Councillor Fielding: I'll be pretty brief here but I think a lot of the questions were answered, Councillor Mayes had talked a little bit about I think cross country skiing. I believe that's probably the Canoe Club. (Inaudible) Windsor Park sorry…Windsor Park that you're referring to so you know any process that goes forward I think having an important amenities like that, which makes sense so let's let that managed competition process go forward and even if there was a lease agreements that were signed obviously that's something that I think that's important to the City so that would have to be incorporated in that. I support having those amenities for sure that's there. Not sure what else was mentioned. Councillor Eadie had mentioned briefly just not a lot of change to this. Yeah, not a lot of change to this because we're obviously proposing some substantial changes through management competition process so I think you will see some changes to it on his idea, the 19th hole well, I'm part Scottish and Irish so I'm a big proponent of the 19th hole so if somehow we can incorporate and make the golf courses better, I think that's something we could definitely incorporate or look at anyways in 2013. This of course is 2012 and like I said there's…we're extensively looking at how we're matching that so any good ideas in golf and making it more profitable I think is something that we definitely look at so we'll take that into consideration but this, of course, is for 2012 and everything is status quo until we look at the managed competition process going forward so thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of Item 4? Opposed? Motion carried. We have consideration of a by-law from Councillor Fielding for Alternate Service Delivery.

ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Fielding: Sure, sorry, I almost forgot, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that By-law No. 106/2012 be taken and read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: 109.

Councillor Fielding: I'd like to move that the By-law 209/2012 be read a second time. Well, I'm sorry, 109. Yes, apologize, Mr. Speaker.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 109/2012.

(Inaudible)

Councillor Fielding: Do I need to read the second one again? Okay, so once again I'll move that By-law No. 109/2012 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 109/2012.

Councillor Fielding: And I apologize for my mixing this up a little bit, I used to have lots of practice when I was the Chair of Property, Planning and Development. Councillor Browaty leads the charge in that now with all the by-laws, but I'd like to move that the ruled be suspended and By-law No. 2 or 109/2012 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

(Inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: In any event Councillor Pagtakhan moves Council adjourn. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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 12:34 p.m.