COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, September 27, 2012

The Council met at 9:35 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Browaty.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Announcements, we have a number of announcements everyone so bear with us. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, 2012 marked the 100th anniversary of the Winnipeg Art Gallery. As Canada's oldest civic art gallery, the Winnipeg Art Gallery has enriched and inspired Winnipeggers and visitors alike since it opened on December 16th, 1912, in the Industrial Bureau Exposition Building on Main and Water Street. Since that time, the gallery has nourished the city's vibrant art scene; mounted exhibitions of world renowned artists and is home to the largest public collection of Inuit art. I would like to say thank you and congratulations to the numerous Winnipeg Art Gallery staff and volunteers for 100 years of passion and dedication to this community. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Havixbeck, you have a couple of announcements?

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, I have two announcements. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I'd like to acknowledge all of our Winnipeggers who celebrated Yom Kippur this week. I wish you a sweet, healthy, happy prosperous new year and my second announcement is that tomorrow at one o'clock at Station 18, Fire Hall Station 18 in Charleswood, the Winnipeg firefighters will kick off their third annual Pink T-shirt, Pink Fire Truck Campaign in support of Cancer Care, and although Councillor Smith is wearing a pink T-shirt, that's a different pink T-shirt campaign. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two announcements as well, I'll try to be as brief as Councillor Havixbeck. The first is I have been given the happy task of offering congratulations to the Goldeyes. I think the Speaker saw my tweets from the playoff games and from the victory party that was held last Sunday. So nice to have a championship team back in Winnipeg so we should congratulate Misters Forney and Collier, the ownership group, great success, I saw it in the paper today that the Winnipeg led the league in attendance yet again so it's kind of become a Winnipeg institution, the Goldeyes and it was a really great rally there to celebrate the win at the, which the Mayor spoke very well so we should acknowledge that success and send them our congratulations. And the second item I want to make an announcement on we had a successful celebration of the Selkirk Settlers. The Speaker certainly was part of the organizing that and part of that is what is being held, price is right style, by Madison there, which is, that is taken from the restoration…that wood is from the restoration of Lord Selkirk's grave in Ortiz, France, that grave was restored in the late 70s through the efforts of a couple of folks from Manitoba including my late father, who being an academic, didn't think it was unwise to travel around France with pieces of dead oak in his luggage for several weeks to bring them back and to have them made into that by Winnipeg wood worker, Norm Peterson and Norm is no longer with us but I did want to bring that along, that's something that's been in my family, a commemoration of Lord Selkirk and certainly Winnipeggers had a good role in getting that grave restored and making it really a suitable monument to Lord Selkirk. So again, we've had a wonderful celebration. The Speaker has volunteered to use that to bang his gavel on which I appreciate and I'll pass along the recognition to Mr. Peterson's widow who is still a good Winnipegger. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes and just to highlight on your comments regarding the bi-centenary of the Selkirk settlers, the 200th anniversary which was celebrated earlier this month, we just like to congratulate Lawrence Prout and Phyllis Fraser, the two co-chairs of the organizing committee for the outstanding job and presentation they made on our city's behalf as the recognition of the beginning of settlement of western Canada, largely came in 1812 with

the arrival of the first group of Selkirk settlers. So congratulations to the committee and a job well done. I'd also like to recognize, and given that I'm the Liaison Councillor for the Mayor's Senior Advisory Committee and we'd like to acknowledge that October is Seniors Month in Manitoba, Seniors and Elders Month, and it all kicks off with Seniors and Elders Day which will actually be held tomorrow at the Winnipeg Convention Centre. It's a day that has been celebrated in Manitoba on an annual basis since 1989 and it recognizes older adults are an asset to our society and provide an opportunity for these individuals to share their challenges and rewards of being an older adult in our province. I encourage all Manitobans and members of the City of Winnipeg to participate in the many events which will take in part within the city and the province over the month of October. And given that we have our age-friendly motion on the floor today, it's somewhat appropriate that we become age friendly, basically, in the Seniors Month. So that concludes our announcements for today and we'd like to move adoption of the minutes and Councillor Browaty, would you like to prove that for me?

MINUTES

Councillor Browaty moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on July 18, 2012, be taken as read and confirmed.

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

Do we have a delegation with us today? Not here? The gentleman that did register, unfortunately has not been able to join us, so we will move on and commence the meeting with the Executive Policy Committee for report A of July the 11th, 2012. Mayor Katz.

REPORT "A" OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED JULY 11, 2012

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. The report from September 5th.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED SEPTEMBER 5, 2012

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 7.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. And now the report of September the 12th.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED SEPTEMBER 12, 2012

Mayor Katz: Once again Mr. Speaker I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. September the 19th.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED SEPTEMBER 19, 2012**

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

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. All right, Mayor Katz we have three motions all of which are automatic referral. Can we deal with them one at a time or in a group?

Mayor Katz: Let's do one at a time.

Mr. Speaker: Motions 1, 2 and 3. Oh I'm sorry, 1, 2 and 5.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS**

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

WHEREAS the taxi cab industry is a vital component of an effective transportation network in the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the council adopted Transportation Master Plan included an enabling strategy to 'seek to improve access and efficiency of the taxi system by expanding on-street taxi zones';

AND WHEREAS the council adopted Downtown Parking Strategy included an enabling strategy to 'Investigate other demand-side strategies to provide a diverse range of short-distance Downtown transportation options that enhance mobility. These areas would require collaboration with service providers, regulatory agencies and others. Areas of potential include bike and transit integration with parking facilities, point-to-point shuttle services and improved taxi service;'

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Public Service be directed to work with the appropriate civic departments and key stakeholders to develop a downtown taxi strategy including but not limited to investigating converting loading zones in the downtown to be used as afterhours taxi stands, examining the potential use of taxis in fire lanes, and increasing the amount of taxi stands in the downtown;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Public Service explore taxi stands citywide at shopping centres and larger commercial areas including examining the potential use of taxis in fire lanes;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Public Service report back to Executive Policy Committee within 120 days.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of motion 1, automatic referral? And those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Motion…

Mayor Katz: I move that we suspend the rules.

Mr. Speaker: All right, as someone would like to move to suspend the rules.

Mayor Katz: I would move it for one and two.

Mr. Speaker: One and two, all right. Suspending the rules on motions 1 and 2. All those in favour? Opposed? All right. Introduce the motion please, Mayor Katz, one.

Mayor Katz: I'll do…

Councillor Gerbasi: Just a point of order. We haven't dealt with the other motions yet. We'll vote…deal with them after or…?

Mr. Speaker: Well, there's only No. 5 at this point.

Councillor Gerbasi: No. 5, we'll deal with after this?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, thank you.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as I believe most people are aware of, there has been considerable dialogue with the taxicab industry, specifically about being able to service the citizens of Winnipeg and having sufficient space available for parking as far as taxi stands. I think we all know that we don't have sufficient space. It should be part of an overall plan. I can tell you that myself and Councillor Swandel, along with members of the Chief of Police and other members of the WPS, we met with representatives of both taxi companies, trying to address their concerns. There are some legitimate concerns. I think it would be incumbent upon us to have the department look into it and see what they recommend, as well as we do have one ongoing right now as far as dealing with… we have the opportunity to add more room right now for taxi cabs to increase the ability to have more taxi stands. So basically what this is is asking our department to look at this and come up with some solutions and hopefully do it as quickly as we possibly can.

Mr. Speaker: All right then. Seeing none, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Would you like to introduce number 2, Mayor Katz.

Motion No. 2
Moved by His Worship Mayor Katz,
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi,

WHEREAS the Building Canada Plan and a number of important federal-provincial transfer agreements vital to Canada's cities and communities, will expire in March 2014;

AND WHEREAS Federal investments over the last few years have helped to slow the decline of our cities and communities, and the Government of Canada has committed to develop a new long-term plan for municipal infrastructure funding in consultation with municipal and provincial / territorial governments;

AND WHEREAS a seamless transition from the Building Canada Plan to a new long term plan is necessary to ensure that municipalities can continue planning their capital spending effectively;

AND WHEREAS the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) has launched a campaign to ensure the new plan reflects municipal priorities across the country and asks its member municipalities to pass a Council resolution supporting the campaign;

AND WHEREAS our community has continuing infrastructure needs, such as existing roads and bridges, public transit and new infrastructure related to growth that can only be met with through the kind of long-term planning and investment made possible by a national plan;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council endorses the FCM campaign and urges the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities to work with FCM to ensure the new long-term infrastructure plan meets the core infrastructure needs of cities and communities;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Council urges the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities to ensure that the new long-term plan is fully in place when existing programs expire in 2014;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT a copy of this resolution shall be sent to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, to the Provincial Minister of Local Government, to Manitoba MP's, to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and to the Association of Manitoba Municipalities.

Mayor Katz: Very briefly Mr. Speaker, and then I'm going to ask Councillor Gerbasi to jump in. As we all know, Councillor Gerbasi is our rep at the FCM, Mr. Speaker. We're putting forward a motion to basically address what I would say is extremely key is infrastructure throughout which includes everything. People don't understand when you talk about infrastructure. It's roads, it's bridges, it's libraries, it's community centres and it's fire paramedic stations and it's transit, it's everything. And this is, we're in support of what's going on. Councillor Gerbasi contacted me, I think, last week, I believe she was somewhere in Quebec, I'm not sure, and told me about it and I said I would be supportive and it would be a pleasure to bring it forward and with that I'll pass it on to Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be brief. I just wanted to update Council that FCM, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities is launching a very powerful campaign to renew our infrastructure agreements that expire in 2014. It's been very positive discussions and building a relationship with our partners at all levels of government to move something forward. And what they are asking Councils across the country to do is to show their support for the campaign, to have an agreement in place and money flowing by 2014 so that things can move forward. So it's really quite simple. Just hoping to have unanimous support from Winnipeg and we'll join the other hundreds of municipalities that are bringing this forward. Now, the campaign is going to be looking at all of our infrastructure programs including gas tax, potential new infrastructure programs, the Building Canada Fund and renewing all those funds into, to meet the needs as much as we possibly can of municipalities, large and small across the country. We've got…I mean I don't need to tell you much more about the infrastructure issue. I see…but I just think it's very positive, the meetings that have been held at FCM, after a lot of work and effort and discussions and discussions. There has been pretty much a consensus of how we need to go forward to it's very positive and hopeful for the future. Thank you and I thank the Mayor for supporting it and all of you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I thank the Mayor and Councillor Gerbasi for this motion. Recently I attended the National Infrastructure Conference in Regina this month where, of course, this was the federal role in infrastructure was definitely a big topic of conversation. So this motion is very important. Mr. Speaker, the challenge that we face with our infrastructure is growing every year. The federal government has, in the last decade, shown leadership with regards to specifically, their decision to earmark two billion dollars across the country for their gas tax program. That, Mr. Speaker, has translated originally translated Winnipeg just, to nearly $42 million a year. That program, which has been renewed by this government, is crucial Mr. Speaker, in terms of what we've been able to do with infrastructure. We have leveraged that money, a lot of it through our P3s to do infrastructure work throughout the city. The reality is though, Mr. Speaker, that it's unfortunately, far from enough to address our growing infrastructure deficit and not only ours but municipalities across this country. Believe it or not, the actual amount that we originally received from Ottawa is actually declining. That's something maybe that's not well known. It's actually declining because the formula to receive the gas tax is based on per capita share and based on the province's per capita share and even though Manitoba's population is growing, our actual share of per capita or our actual percentage of population, compared to the rest of the country, is actually shrinking here in Manitoba. So our gas tax amount is actually dropping annually, Mr. Speaker. So we need to address a long term solution. The federal government has had a practice of announcing infrastructure programs every number of years which are great, the last one which we are going through now, Building Canada. The reality is, Mr. Speaker, that that is, it's not a long term program to ensure that there is sustainable funding and the challenge with that is in a private sector as we know, Mr. Speaker, they need to have those resources to be able to budget, to be able to expand to ensure that we have a competitive private sector so that we can deliver infrastructure in a competitive manner. Now, Mr. Speaker, the reality is the federal government today collects well over $5 billion in fuel taxes nationally. Of that, less than half of it is being returned to municipalities. So the question is where is the other $3 billion? And I think that's actually an old number, Mr. Speaker because now the cost of gasoline and the price going up there as the percent goes up Mr. Speaker is probably closer to 6 billion from what I understand. But nonetheless Mr. Speaker, let's say 5 billion, less than half now is going back to municipalities in the forms of, in the form of infrastructure program. We were fortunate, Mr. Speaker. It was…and I say fortunate lightly only because of the fact that we had the massive stimulus program that occurred, but it was only there because of the fact that the federal government had the bejeezus scared out of them because they thought this whole country was going into a depression along with the other global leaders of the western democracies, Mr. Speaker. And so they came with a massive spending program. Well that's over, Mr. Speaker. And that was distributed throughout this country. Winnipeg got I think 20 million or so for bicycle paths. But the reality, Mr. Speaker, that's over. We now, Mr. Speaker, have to address the long term infrastructure deficit and a long term funding solution. It's great to hear that the federal government is working co-operatively with FCM. It's great to hear that there is a positive working relationship. But, words are cheap, Mr. Speaker. We need action. We need action from the federal government. We need the federal government to step up to the plate. We appreciate Minister Fletcher's recent consultations with the municipalities in Manitoba. That's much appreciated. But Mr. Speaker, it doesn't go far enough. We need to have a federal government that comes to the table. Now, there's been lots of talk about the renewed relationship, Mr. Speaker, with regards to the federal government. I would remind Council that ten years ago there was or just under ten years ago, there was a renewed relationship under the previous Prime Minister Paul Martin who at that point, prior to the government being defeated, was actually proposing sector tables. Formal, a formal forum, Mr. Speaker, where municipalities could meet directly with Ministers and indeed, with the Prime Minister. Municipal leaders across this country. Of course when his government was defeated, that was wiped out. We have not yet really recovered from that, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that you know, Jack Layton decided to bring down the Paul Martin government. So the reality is, Mr. Speaker, we're hopefully going to get back to something where we can have that relationship with the federal government again because the reality is, we know the challenge we have here in Manitoba with regards to our provincial government. They've turned a blind eye. They've closed the door in terms of dealing with these issues with the City of Winnipeg or other municipalities as far as that goes. We really need to have a strong and

active federal government and it's in their best interest, Mr. Speaker. It's in their best interest in so many ways. For every dollar they spend that we know that they get it back beyond what they actually give us in the form of income taxes, in the form of sales taxes, in the form of economic spinoffs. It's in their best interest because they are the ones responsible for the trade and the nation and international trade. We need strong infrastructure Mr. Speaker to facilitate trade and economic development and growth. It's in their best interest Mr. Speaker to have strong cities, engines of the economy, Mr. Speaker, right across this country. So, I'm happy to support this motion. I would encourage our representative at FCM to be vigilant and to be strong and to speak forthrightly at every opportunity she has. These issues cannot go away. The federal government cannot pay lip service to this. We need action. We need action now. The fact of the matter that this country's arrangement in terms of taxes and responsibilities are reversed, we're the most core responsibilities are delivered by the lower level of governments to get the taxes collected or going to the highest level of government is unfortunate and it's a product of confederation unfortunately that we're still living with today. There has to be a change. And so, Mr. Speaker those are my comments and I'll be supporting the motion. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? Mayor Katz to close.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think everything has been said on the floor of Council. I certainly encourage everyone to support the motions.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no more speakers. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have another motion on the EPC Committee. Unfortunately, I'm going to rule that the motion is out of order and…Motion No. 5. It's on a separate, yeah it's on Property and Development. Four is on Property and Development so motion 5. I will…(inaudible) but that's on Property and Development okay so we're just dealing with EPC motions right now.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan,

WHEREAS public interest and trust is upheld when a separation between the political and administrative bodies of government exist and pecuniary relationships between politicians and senior civil servants do not exist;

AND WHEREAS the senior Government of Manitoba spells out the separation between the political governance and bureaucracy to ensure the public interest is upheld in its policy and ethics guidelines – specifically dealing with conflict of interest on the following web page: http://www.manitoba.ca/csc/policyman/conflict.html;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City's administration examines the City's by-laws and policies on City governance and civil service employment for provisions defining the separation between the political and administrative processes that reflect the sentiment in the Province of Manitoba's civil service "values and ethics guidelines" and where no similar provisions are made, the City administration make recommendations to have such provisions reflected in Winnipeg's policies.

Councillor Eadie: (Inaudible) this motion out of order?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, sir.

Councillor Eadie: Okay, may I stand to speak in opposition to, or challenge the Chair's decision?

Mr. Speaker: No. Well, you can challenge the Chair all you want, but it's still out of order.

Councillor Eadie: That's okay I would like to speak to challenging the Chair and speak my piece.

Mr. Speaker: Well, first of all, the whole notion that we control our own Conflict of Interest is erroneous because we're a creature of the provincial government and if Councillor Eadie wanted to bring forward a motion suggesting that we ask the Province to review our Conflict of Interest by-laws. That would be appropriate but the fact that we are looking at our own, we're governed by the Province of Manitoba basically and at this point in time the information that's provided within motion No. 5 is only dealing with us looking at our own bylaws as opposed to what we should be doing is if you're serious about this, Councillor Eadie, asking the Province to amend its legislation. (Inaudible) I'm sorry, at this point I, the Chair has ruled and I would encourage you in the future to do your…review your by-laws or have our legal department look at it before you bring it forward to the floor.

Councillor Eadie: (Inaudible) change to take away any reflection of laws in there. It refers to policies and evaluating whether or not to make sure our policies reflect the rules that we live in.

Mr. Speaker: I'm trying to be polite here Councillor Eadie, but I'm going to ask the Council if the ruling of the Chair should be sustained and move forward. All in favour? Opposed? Well, unfortunately you will have to, the motion of the Chair is sustained and we will move on to the by-laws up for consideration.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, sir.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, actually. I'd like to make a point. I'm moving to challenge the Speaker on this particular decision and I don't understand how you can call the vote when I'm challenging the Chair. So could I please get clarification on that and I'd like a standing vote on this particular decision of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: We've already had the vote, sir so we're moving on, so.

Councillor Eadie: I don't understand how the speaker can call the vote on his own, on a challenge on his own decision. That's a Deputy Speaker's role, I believe.

Mr. Speaker: I don't know where you get that information from, sir, but that's not our by-law operation.

Councillor Eadie: That's not?

Mr. Speaker: Moving on to the consideration of By-laws, Mayor Katz.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 122/2012, 123/2012, 124/2012, 125/2012, as well as 126/2012.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 122/2012, 123/2012, 124/2012, 125/2012, 126/2012.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker, I'll move the By-laws numbered 122/2012 to 126/2012 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 122/2012 to 126/2012 both inclusive.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that the rules be suspended and By-laws numbered 122/2012 to 126/2012 both inclusive, be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: We have Question Period for the Mayor. John Orlikow please. Go ahead.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have two questions for you today. The first is dealing with policing and specifically response times to policing for the police. So my question…trying to phrase it so I can get the question right…there's been two incidents in the recent time, I'd say in the last month and a bit, where the Police have had a very…been unable to respond. One was in Lindenwoods where it was two hours for the Police to respond to a break

and entry in progress. The other one was on the news last night where the Police did not respond to citizens who had stopped a drunk driver, and the Police were not able to respond at all. These are…as I know you share…are very serious matters, so my question is, what is the Police doing to make sure that the response rates are there including when they aren't there, when will Council know about that?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you I thank the Chair and I would certainly concur with Councillor Orlikow that obviously safety is an issue and when there is a call regarding safety we certainly want very prompt response time. I can also tell you Mr. Speaker as the Councillor is aware of, this Council has passed…they're doing a review right now of the W.P.S., and obviously that would come as part of this review, but on that last specific question that just happened last night Mr. Speaker, I've got to be very frank here and tell you I don't have the answer why that took…why it wasn't responded to as quickly as it should have been. All I can do is assure the Councillor that I will speak to the Chief and get a response and be happy to share that with them in both instances. I think having the reasons for that certainly would be something that I think we're all deserving of and I'm more than happy to do that.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. Second question.

Councillor Orlikow: This is an "are you aware" question, which I believe you are aware because your office has been helpful in dealing with the fact that there's a rail line that's operating in River Heights that is expanding its operations down, right in a residential neighbourhood. The incident was brought off by Silos, however the public may or may not be aware of, and this is why I'm trying to make sure you're aware of, the Silos are only the start of that. They're looking at two transfer stations built right in the middle of a residential neighbourhood. They're talking about increasing train traffic which will block our streets on Academy, Grant, Corydon, Taylor. Cars are not going to be able to get across as easily anymore. We can't control the noise, when they work, when they don't work, because again, we've had that same problem in Lindenwoods with the whistling and some other short line problems. We have dust issues, we have…we don't know what's in these silos; they don't have to post that to us, they don't have to tell us what's being off-loaded on the trains. All these issues are coming forward very quickly. Your office has been so far very helpful in trying to help us work with, not only C.N., B.N.S.F., the Federal Government, the Province. I just want to make sure that you are aware that this is such a serious issue for the neighbourhood.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Orlikow, yes as the Councillor has stated, my office has been working on this. I am certainly aware of it. Being the Mayor or the Councillor for the area, and having those types of scenarios take place and having zero knowledge, wondering whose authority this was done on, is not a very good feeling, so I certainly know how Councillor Orlikow feels. I can tell you we're looking into the legalese of it and you know, preliminary information. I'm not sure they even have the authority to do what they've done, but they've done it and that is being followed up and hopefully we'll get a final answer and I think move on this as quickly as possible, so I very much share the concerns of Councillor Orlikow.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Councillor Harvey Smith has moved a motion in regards to slowing the speed down on residential streets, not arterial streets, but residential streets from 50 to 40, and there was a CBC report where the Mayor has explained that maybe the solution is to have speed bumps, and I wanted to ask, through you Speaker Nordman, the Mayor, does he actually believe that we can find the money to put in speed bumps on all the residential streets that we have analyzed by traffic for speed studies and so on in the City when we can't even afford to actually fix our residential local streets in terms of their very poor condition.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Eadie, I am very much aware of the motion. As you recall it wasn't that long ago that this Mayor and this Council brought up school zones and decreasing the limit. That's number one. Mr. Speaker, I think the first thing that everybody should realize is that we should let the department, and in the interview with the media I specifically said, that the department should go through and do what they do, analyze, come back with recommendations, then we can make an intelligent decision. That was number one. I said in the meantime, if there are people who live on a street, and they are concerned, because quite often you've seen situations where there's a major regional street, sometimes it gets really busy during rush hours and people will cut across residential. We know that's happened. I'm sure Councillor Orlikow has seen it happen in his Ward and many others, and in those situations Mr. Speaker, the public does have the right to get a petition and put in speed bumps. You see it all over the place. What I was doing was pointing out to everybody that there is an option available right now if there is a genuine concern. You can debate the issue whether it should be 50, 40 or 30, okay. You can debate that all you want. All I was saying is

there is action that could be taken immediately. In the meantime, our Department will do their due diligence, they'll report back to us, and then we'll have the opportunity to vote on it Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Eadie: Yes thank you for that information, for clarifying. Second question is, we are supposed to establish a Police Board, and Councillor Wyatt and I moved a motion last year in regards to establishing a Police Board. Mr. Speaker Nordman, could the Mayor explain how we're proceeding to establish and who is going to make up and how are we going to establish the Police Board which comes into law on, I believe, it is December 1st.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to the Councillor I thank him for the question. I'd be more than happy to explain that. As everyone knows, the Provincial Government is setting up the rules. There's still work being done on that, but I think the key factor is Mr. Speaker, regardless of the size of your municipality, there are costs to be incurred in having a Police Board. I can tell you when I first met with the Provincial Government and the former Attorney General, we talked about these costs, they acknowledged there would be costs, and there was funding to be part of this process. In the meantime, discussions have gone on but no funding has been announced, so I can tell you that yours truly along with the F.C.M., which represents all of the municipalities, have…I don't know where the letter has gone or it's in the process, but sending a letter to the Provincial Government asking for verification of this funding, because in certain municipalities it could be $50,000. In a city such as ours Mr. Speaker, it could be a million dollars, and we're looking to find out where that money is coming from.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. That's the Association of Manitoba Municipalities. Thank you for your answer. Just a follow-up question to that, the proposal that Eadie, Wyatt had was that…and this is not reference to money…proposal was that each of the five Community Committees would select one City Councillor to sit on the Police Board. Have you considered letting that happen?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm open to all suggestions, but I think there would have to be some dialogue and maybe Councillor Eadie could lead this, because in the parameters set down by the Provincial Government, they were limiting the number of elected officials on there, and if they're prepared to open that up, I'm certainly prepared to listen and I would certainly urge Councillor Eadie to go down to Broadway and have that conversation.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Mr. Mayor, just a brief update…we had opportunity, myself and a delegation led by yourself, to go down to New York to visit the bond raters agency over the last few days. Obviously the bond rating is very important in terms of how we borrow money. It's essential for a municipality. Just want to know if there's a brief update you could give, Mr. Mayor, on the results of that and some of the discussions with the bond rating agencies.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Fielding it would be a pleasure Mr. Speaker. We obviously met with our bond raters, Moody's and Standard & Poor's. As well, there were other meetings that took place with some funders. It's preliminary right now but I believe as a result of the many good things that are happening in our City, I believe we'll be maintaining our double "A" which I'm very happy that would be the case. In addition to that, contrary to what so many people think, we continue to borrow money Mr. Speaker, and I can tell you right now we're looking at approximately, you know, a hundred million dollars that we could be going out into the market place. We're looking at potentially forty-year terms. The interest rates right now are exceptional; under four percent. This is something that the C.F.O. is working on right now, and I would say to you it was a successful trip. A lot of hard and good questions were asked by our bond raters and with the team that was there, I believe we were able to address everything, so I'm very optimistic that the result will be what I said and we'll be able to get some long-term money at extremely good rates, and once again, this is all going into infrastructure Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Smith: Yes Mr. Mayor. My question has to do with the Esplanade Riel pedestrian bridge. Why hasn't the lease been signed since 2010? Their lease was up in 2010. Why has not a new lease been signed?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you. Through you to Councillor Smith, I obviously read that story in today's paper. My understanding, from what I've been able to garner so far, they're still negotiating. What they have is, I think it's called a…you continue the lease until you finalize a new one. I'd be more than happy, since it just came up this morning, to look into it further and get some further clarification. I'm not convinced that a restaurant on the Esplanade Riel is going to be a successful venture because it's short-term and very difficult to access. But the realities are, if the lease did expire in 2010, there should be a new one signed or not signed, one or the other, and should be moving forward. So I will get the answer for Councillor Smith either later today or tomorrow and get it to him immediately.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Smith: In every lease, there should be an over-hold clause. In this clause, the tenants should be paying either 150 percent or 200 percent rent until the renewal is finalized. Has the tenant been paying an over-hold…

Mr. Speaker: I think Councillor Smith, you're getting into the, you know, minutiae of the leases and that's not our…

Councillor Smith: Well, it's a reasonable question.

Mr. Speaker: I think the Mayor already answered the first question that he'd get back on information, so is there a question here?

Councillor Smith: Yeah, the question is why haven't they been paying an over-holding clause amount?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would…I'm very much aware of an over-holding clause which exactly…which specifically states you continue to pay what you've been paying. I don't know until Councillor Smith just said what they've been paying. Obviously I don't negotiate the leases Mr. Speaker, but as I said earlier, if that is the case, I will find that out, get factual information, and once again get back to Councillor Smith A.S.A.P.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Smith: My last question is, if there is no lease now for two years, what has the Department done to market the space?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think the first thing we have to determine is, if it's been two years of over-holding, what have they been paying? That's number one. Number two, if they are negotiating good faith to get a lease, that's a different story. We'll have to determine that. If they're not going to…if you don't have someone who wants to lease the space, then obviously the department will go outside and see if they can find someone who's interested. Once again, all valid questions, and I'll have to get the answers because I'm not aware of it at this stage of the game. But I certainly will look into it Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question is on one matter and that is, over the past two weeks my office has started to get even more calls on something other than gravel back lanes, which is usually the number one issue in St. Vital, and that is the issue pertaining to the new garbage/recycling/solid waste collection system that, as we all know, we're moving to on October 1st. The issue though, most people who have called in have said, "we'll give it a chance", but I've had a number of calls about leaves, and people are saying, "we want to do the right thing, we want to get this into the system, we don't just want to throw it out, we don't want to dump them in the river, but you're saying we can't put them out in plastic bags anymore." Now we, as Councillors, were told the paper bag system, they're available everywhere, and that has proven not to be the case. To quote Councillor Vandal's assistant, Julien Desaulniers, yesterday, they're sold out at Canadian Tire. So I don't know if people are hoarding or what, but I would ask you Mr. Mayor, could we have some look at an accommodation on the leaf issue for this year at least, whether that's keeping the "leaf it up" depot at St. Vital Park open, which is what a lot of people in my Ward want, or some measures to at least for this year allow people to continue on without putting them out in paper bags. You can use other receptacles but a lot of people are concerned saying, "we want to comply but we can't find these things that you said would be easily available",

so my question is, can we have some sort of reasonable accommodation, to steal the language from another motion here today in terms of the leaf collection at least for this year.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I believe that is a very reasonable request. I think we all know that this Council finally, after years and years of debate, we do have a waste minimization program in effect. This is all part of it. Councillor Mayes is correct. We did talk about the paper bags. I don't know if someone's cornered the market and bought them all and trying to sell them at a profit. I want you know Councillor Mayes, it was not me. I want you to know that right now in case you hear any rumours okay. The other scenario is that if that is the case, I think we should look into what other options are available, definitely fair, and I'm happy to maybe work with Councillor Vandal and try and move something forward and see what we can do as quickly as possible. As we all know Mr. Speaker, the season is upon us.

Mr. Speaker: Any other? No? Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I was encouraged to hear the Mayor make a comment that he is going to refer to the experts, the people in the Department, in regards to the suggestion that we lower speeds on residential streets to 40 kilometres an hour. One of my peeves since being a Councillor is I almost think there's too much political interference on setting speed limits on regional streets. I think it needs to be set based on the engineering, based on the experts. Would the Mayor be willing to consider motions in the future to review speed limits on regional streets?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would say that's my job to basically maintain an open mind, and obviously in the end Council decides, but I've heard debates where members of the public think speed limits on regional streets should be increased. I'm sure we've all heard that. I'm sure Councillor Browaty has heard that and many others. So whether you're increasing or decreasing, you know, if a motion come forward you send it to our Department, they do the due diligence, they're the experts, that's where the engineers are, they come back with a report and then we vote on it. So short answer, yes I would.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. Would the Mayor be willing to acknowledge that some of the regional streets where perhaps…and again I don't have the ring, I'm not an engineer…but some of the streets where we do extensive photo radar enforcement are in fact streets where there have been political motions in past. I'm not saying this Council but Councils before us even, have artificially set speed limits are too low on regional streets.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I've obviously heard those types of comments. I'm not a professional. I'm not going to say it's true or not true. The realities are is that if any member of this Council believes that to be the case, whether it's in their Ward or not, can always…as you can see we're dealing with many motions here today…can always put forward a motion. It'll go through the process, and I think it's very astute for us to look at these things because the reality is, things are always changing Mr. Speaker. Always changing okay? New neighbourhoods are springing up, there's different demands, there's decline etc., so yeah, let's always look at the big picture and that's something I think that whether it's Councillor Browaty or anybody else that has a concern or an issue, by all means. I encourage you to bring it forward and let Council, through the expertise of our Department, look at it and hopefully make a very wise astute decision.

Mr. Speaker: That's it Councillor Browaty? Third question? No? Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise today to bring a concern to the Mayor's attention regarding residential growth in our downtown. In recent months, we've started to see a slow-down in new residential coming into our downtown and the reason for that, as best I can surmise, is there is an increase in the value of non-residential property. So where we were getting a lot of our residential coming out of non-residential property being converted to residential, we're now seeing a slow-down in that, in that that increase in value is causing some folks to really think about whether or not they want to convert to residential. The City and the Province have both put forward a great deal of money by way of multi-family tax credit programs. I think we've got about $40 million of incremental tax value at work right now, but even with that we're seeing some of the money being allocated but the action not being taken as quickly as we really need it to be to have it happen. To this end, there's a need for further incentive I think, or a need to close this gap between what's happening with the value of the non-residential property and how we get it to become

residential property. You might recall that in 2005 or in 2006, with the Waverley West development being brought on board, the Provincial Government had committed that the profits from the development of Waverley West, the M.H.R.C. portion of that, would be re-invested into housing in downtown. To date I've seen a couple of small pieces done in downtown, but looking at how development has proceeded there and the pace it has proceeded, those profits must be huge by now. They should be able to release some greater amounts of cash. Can you let us know if there is any information coming into the Mayor's Office about how much profits there are and how much is being re-invested in the downtown?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Swandel Mr. Speaker, first of all I do believe we made, to date, great strides in our downtown. We all know that the most important thing we can do to rejuvenate our downtown is to have more people living, and not that long ago, according to the Department, percentage wise, we had the largest growth happening in our downtown. A lot of it came as a result of this Council providing the types of incentives that Councillor Swandel referred to. We know the cost of converting older buildings because of the change in code etc. It can be very expensive and sometimes isn't economical. We provide incentives of $20,000 per door. We were out there on our own for several years. Eventually the Province became part of that, and we put out a lot of money, $40,000 a door, and my understanding is that all that money is spoken for. One of the things that I have discussed with CentreVenture, that if there is a project going forward, we do have time parameters on it. If someone's approved, and you know they've got to get started within a period of time, if that's not going to happen, then we should move onto someone who's ready to move right away, so that's number one and I do believe the program we put into effect on our own and with the Province has been extremely successful. As far as the situation with the Provincial Government and the development that the Councillor is referring to, I'm very much aware that one of their commitments was to take profit and invest it into housing in the downtown. I believe it probably would have been the category what we all call "affordable housing". I think that was a great idea. You know, kudos to the Provincial Government for making that commitment. I can tell Councillor Swandel through you Mr. Speaker, I don't know what's happened to date. It would be realistic at this particular point in time for the Provincial Government to have a pretty decent idea of where things are at, and I certainly would have no problem, you know, writing a letter requesting how things are going and what they are projecting to do as far as investing and housing and the downtown. Get back a response. Hopefully it will come with some numbers and then share it with Councillor Swandel and the rest of Council. That's the way the whole deal started and that's the way it should be, but I don't have those specifics. They haven't been offered to me but I am happy to ask for them.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to ask that you…I would hope that you would be asking for some kind of detail to come, because when I see the types of numbers that we're getting in some of our joint venture pieces of development that we're doing in the City right now, profits are quite larger than what we've…or projected profits seem to be quite larger than what we'd originally thought. So will you be asking for a detailed accounting and the mechanism of how they contract this to ensure that these real profits are being directed into downtown housing and not into some other project for the Provincial Government?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I can ask just about anything. Whether I'm going to get that type of definitive, precise answer from the Provincial Government, keep something in mind, I think someone mentioned here earlier, we are a creation of the Provincial Government. The Provincial Government basically has all the power. We have very little power. So when you're asking a question of that of course, I would ask very nicely...that's number one…and get some answer. I don't believe, maybe I'm wrong, you know, if they're going to give us a complete accounting. I highly doubt that. But the realities are, it's important for us to know at this particular point in time what kind of dollars they are planning to invest in our downtown. That was one of the commitments. I think what the Councillor is really asking me, if they come out with a number that he or others think is ridiculously low, are we going to go challenge that etc., etc. Well of course we can have all sorts of discussion and debates here on the floor of Council. What we can do within our power, I'm not sure there's a lot, but I certainly will do everything I humanly can to try and get as much detail and I would expect them…I think they want to be, I mean they know the need for affordable housing in the downtown. So I'm hoping they would give us as accurate a number as they can. You know, if the number is 10 million and there are people on the floor of Council who think it should be 30 million, I don't quite know if we have the authority or the power to ask them to open up their books and show us exactly what was made. You know, I'm happy to look into that, but I think that's where the Councillor, you know, might be alluding to. I'm not sure, but I will endeavor to get an answer and I think everybody wants to see more housing in our downtown, more affordable housing in our downtown. What you're seeing right now is extremely good and we want to keep that going and this certainly would help, but you know, I'm sure knowing Councillor Swandel, maybe he can tell me exactly if that's what he's looking for and then I can take it from there.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I hope that our local media would ask for that level of transparency and accountability from the Provincial Government the same way that they ask of City Hall. These are tens of millions of dollars we're talking about. We need to see those numbers. We need to get this work done. We need to have increased residential in our downtown and I hope that our local media takes up the cause to ensure that those dollars are being paid to do what they were supposedly allocated to do.

My final question, Mr. Speaker, is also related to Waverley West but in another vein. Given that there has been a regular back and forth as to where the extension of Kenaston is going to connect to the Perimeter Highway, to date there's been no resolution on the exact location…or to the Perimeter Highway not Pembina Highway…that there's been no definitive location stated, will now look like we will not have that connection until out into 2014. That's causing construction cost increases. Will the Mayor endeavor to get a solid answer, to bring the engineering groups together from the City and the Province to get a solid answer to get the connection of Kenaston done to the Perimeter so that we can get it done in 2013 and start to alleviate some of the traffic problems that are occurring on Waverley and other street in southwest Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Swandel, just on that other issue Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to speak for any other entities, but from my point of view I can assure Councillor Swandel that I'll do everything within my power to determine exactly what the Provincial Government will be doing as far as housing in the downtown as part of that commitment. I think at this particular point in time I'm going to be an individual of good faith and believe that they're going to do exactly what they committed to. I have no reason to believe anything other than that at this particular point in time, so I will start with that approach but I certainly will ask the question.

As far as Kenaston Mr. Speaker, I've got to tell you it's extremely disappointing that this has dragged on. We know when these projects do drag on it ends up costing us more money. Time is money. We all know about construction inflation Mr. Speaker, and I would be more than happy to sit down with our Departments that are involved, get the Provincial representatives at the table and try and bring closure to this and get it done, and 2013 certainly would be the goal. We know what's going on there, we know what's needed. It should have been done. It hasn't, but yes, he has my assurances that I will endeavor to do that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, and that concludes question period. Moving on to the next standing committee, Downtown Development, Heritage, River Bank Management, meeting of September the 10th. Councillor Swandel.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 10, 2012

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce the report, move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. And do we have…no motions, no by-laws? Do we have question period for Councillor Swandel? Councillor Eadie.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Eadie: Speaker Nordman, through to the Chairperson of Downtown, a question I have is related to…in regards to the housing issue downtown, and I'm not quite sure where the boundary of CentreVenture is but there's a number of housing concerns that have been going on in the…I guess on the shoulder in the Spence Neighbourhood in terms of the creation of, and rising prices of housing in that particular neighbourhood, so my question is does the, in terms of residential in downtown, does it take into consideration what is happening in regards to the shoulder neighbourhoods around it?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Not specifically, but policy-wise we always try and look at shoulder neighbourhoods whenever we're dealing with any of our policies at the City to ensure we're not creating a negative impact on shoulder communities when we do create boundaries. I think Spence neighbourhood is Councillor Gerbasi's ward, or Councillor Smith's ward. There's a lot that goes on to do with the provision of housing and the provision of affordable housing in those neighbourhoods. There's some strong neighbourhood organizations. I wouldn't know the detail on them but I would encourage the Councillor to talk to Councillor Smith about that or to Councillor Gerbasi who also heads up our Housing Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Eadie: Than you Speaker Nordman. The Chair of the Downtown, Heritage and Riverbank Management Committee is the Deputy Mayor, and I would like to ask a question if current issue regarding a transaction of a corporation in the United States, if the Deputy Mayor is asked if the Deputy Mayor has evaluated it according to the laws that the Speaker referred to when I tried to move the motion about the public trust and public interest. So my question is directly, have you done anything to measure that transaction in terms of The Municipal Council Conflict of Interest Act?

Councillor Swandel: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you very much. Then I would also ask the question of the Deputy Mayor if he believes that there is an ability, or if the public interest has been offended and does he actually have trust that we can continue business in this city, given these kind of transactions between senior civil servants and senior elected officials.

Councillor Swandel: That was two questions. My answers would be no and yes.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions for the Chair of Downtown? Seeing none. Councillor Browaty. Standing Committee on Property and Development.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 11, 2012

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of September 11 and move Items 1 to 15 as consent for No. 10 and 12.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'd like to be declared and just speak in opposition to number…be recorded in opposition to No. 14, please. Standing it down?

(Inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: Opposed? Carried.

Item 10 – Lease Agreement – Portion of 2370 Burrows Avenue – Garden Grove Child Care Program Inc.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. I look forward to the comments and questions from the member from Point Douglas.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to…I just noticed that we have a delegation from the Garden Grove Child Care Program here. I wanted to give my thanks to them. This is a great new story for the Garden Grove Child Care Program. They operate out of Ecole Garden Grove in the Point Douglas ward and what they have done here basically is a very special relationship between the City of Winnipeg. They work with a local community centre, the Tyndall Park community centre satellite building which is under-utilized in the community and they are going to be providing a several hundreds of thousands of renovations to enhance our child care program. Plus Mr. Speaker, they are also going to allow the community to use our space during non-daycare hours and I just wanted to applaud them, thank the chairperson and the committee for their support and the Mayor in EPC for their support as well.

Mr. Speaker: No further comments? Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I just want to echo what Councillor Pagtakhan said. I'd like to congratulate him for his work in getting this very important project done in his area.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Number 12.

Item 12 – Local Area Planning Initiatives for 2012-2013

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I believe it was Councillor Havixbeck who stood this item down. I'll look for her questions or comments.

Councillor Havixbeck: Well, I have a few points to make about this. I disagree with this plan or report as it is. I would ask my Council colleagues to send it back to the department to revise based on a few reasons. Number one, this report was initiated out of a motion from the P and D committee. The first time was February 2010. The second time was July 2012. The first time was in February 2010 by Councillor Gord Steeves requesting an annual planning document by the department. This is the first report that I could find. So I ask why does it take from February 2010 to September 2012 to get such a plan? That's my first point. My second point is the report would appear to be reactive and not proactive. In that, it lists what developers have brought forward in our city in mostly suburb areas and while this is important, that's not that all that there is in the City of Winnipeg at this time and going forward in terms of planning. The report does not address strategy such as the Downtown Exchange District, University of Winnipeg, Red River College, University of Manitoba, which was just in the paper today. It also ignores the implementation plan for Our Winnipeg. Section D sites one of the challenges under, the previous approach has been responding to a distinct lack of detail in regards to long range planning at individual neighbourhood levels and I would argue that this is still not as detailed as one would like it. It also lacks time frames and numbers of staff and I think that with such a large number of plans going forward that we would want to know and taxpayers would want to know the cost, the amount of time. Some of these plans have been worked on for seven to ten years so where is the end? I guess, one could argue. So again, it's reactive, emphasis on suburbs not as much emphasis on our downtown and little or if any on infill housing and it ignores costs and time frames and where is the value for taxpayers would be my question.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, yes.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Councillor Havixbeck is actually dead on and I'll give her an example where I feel that we are waiting to become reactive almost. There is a very exciting opportunity happening in the River Heights-Fort Garry ward. It can be very exciting. It can be very good for the City of Winnipeg and also may not be exciting, it could be plain Jane, it could be disjointed and it could actually have a great negative impact on the local neighbourhood. There's what I'm talking about. This is the largest infill opportunity, I think, in Winnipeg's history. We have the Taylor lands going on, the Parker lands going on, we have the sugar beet lands going on. We have them all being kind of connected somehow with rapid transit. We have some road works going on, we've got Pembina underpass going on, we have water trunk lines going through. We have this amazing number of projects, city projects that are all in the public interest, all going on at the same time. However, there is no planning for all of this. It's a shot in the dark kind of model. When I go ask the Ddpartment about this, they say, well go talk to them because we don't know about that. Well, how can you not know about that if it affects that. How about the traffic? Why haven't we talked about this? We know that we're going to have these traffic problems. Why aren't we getting ahead of that? We know that the community is going to be very upset if we do high density here. If we put the rail line here that's going to affect the development for the developer as well so how is that all playing out together? How are the sugar beet lands going to be developed when you have such a small isolated community right beside it. So these are things that I am stressing need to be addressed in holistic kind of way. I have mentioned this to the administration. They have their different opinion on it. However, I believe this plan, the lack of… no planning for the area, the City of Winnipeg, it's going to miss out on some incredible opportunities to provide incredible benefit to Winnipeg. Not just for my neighbourhood but for all of Winnipeg and I believe unless we have a plan that looks at the whole area together, because this is all happening within the next couple of years. They've already started digging up the lands on Taylor. Why? We don't know. There hasn't been…no permits for us. Parker lands are moving forward. The Fort Rouge Yards are moving forward and then they will come over us. Sugar beet lands, the developers are there. Again, no one knows any of this though, no public person…the public hasn't been engaged. We talked about rapid transit. Well, that's a very nice thing to talk about but how does the development play into that? How does the road access into certain lands play into that? How does this all work together? Wouldn't it be nice to have this new development on the Parker side and just over the tracks we have the Taylor development linked together. Can the city help link these through walk bridges? Can we do something to link a residential with a commercial? That to me is great. Then you can just walk across a bridge without having to run and pass the CN, the Police. You can walk across the bridge and you can actually go get your groceries and walk back. That's something in Our Winnipeg. We want to do that but there's no planning to that so a developer develops something without the City

involvement, they may just build something where exactly where that bridge needs to go if we decide to do a bridge. So again this plan needs to be focusing and Councillor Havixbeck is right, it's all outside. They take forever but again, we have an opportunity, I would say for another month, to be proactive but after that, it's going to be piecemeal by piecemeal reactive and I believe sincerely that the City of Winnipeg and the people in the River Heights-Fort Garry ward are going to lose out unless the city comes forward to do a holistic look at the whole area at the same time. So again I won't be supporting this plan because it's glaring omission of not doing that. There is the idea of a secondary plan for the Beaumont Neighbourhood when the development comes, but by the time the development comes, the roads are going to be settled if there is going to be a road, rapid transit is going to be settled, many initiatives…waterline is going to be settled, Taylor line has already developed. We're going to be…by that time it's far too late so again I won't be supporting this plan because I believe again with Councillor Havixbeck, it needs to be much more proactive and this is a glaring omission in the plan.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I just rise…I didn't support this at EPC when this came forward and the concern I have, first of all, I just want to say I know the chair has pushed hard to get this report here now and I want to thank him for that. I know he's in an awkward position because as a chair he introduces the reports and brings it forward however I know he's not being pleased as well in terms of the fact that this has taken this long to get here. This Council adopted resolution in February of 2010 even though it's not applicable in a sentence, it's not...this Council specifically that voted on it is still Council Policy that stays with us and the Council concurred in a recommendation that the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development adopted the following. Number one that a policy be adopted which requires the Winnipeg Public Service to annually submit for the information of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development on or before its February meeting date, a list of secondary plan initiatives for the coming calendar year which will form part of the Planning, Property and Development Department's annual work plan. That Mr. Speaker, and then it goes on to speak to 2010's work plan. That, Mr. Speaker, was adopted by Council. This is…this, I'm reading to you from the minutes of the Council meeting. That clearly did not happen. The first report that we have before us today is the one that's in front of us right now. There was…there was a report that came in March of 2010, but then after that, 2011, there was no report that came forward on or before its February meeting and there was no report this year of 2012 until this report has come forward. You know, it's a concern Mr. Speaker and I'm raising it and I'm flagging this and I'm saying this because even in the report itself, it's almost as if the Council motion that we passed in February of 2010 didn't exist. It's not even reflected in the report. They say the reason for this report on July 3, 2012, the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development moved that the Public Service report back to the September 11, 2012 meeting of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development listed a secondary plan issued as well. Yes, we did do that. If you recall Mr. Speaker, you are on the committee in July. Out of frustration that the Council Policy that was set was not being followed. So the reason for the report really shouldn't be about the standing committee move the report, or move the request, the reason for the report is the Council Policy of February of 2010. And you know, you can say you're splitting hairs but the reality is, Mr. Speaker, if we don't…you know, we can sit in this room and we vote on all the policies we want, okay? But if they're not being implemented, if they're not being followed by the Public Service, then we're really wasting our time and unfortunately the taxpayers' time, the people's time. You know, this is a…quite a serious thing, Mr. Speaker. And you know, I'm not going to get into the details of the pro or con, you know I think it's important that policies adopted by this Council be followed by the Public Service. I don't understand how that could…that doesn't happen on something as significant as this where we up growth in this city and we're trying to manage growth and we're trying to manage of growth of existing neighbourhoods that are trying to deal with infill developments or work with it. These initiatives are crucial. Anyway, Mr. Speaker those are my comments. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think what this whole discussion we're having now highlights is the real issue is not…I mean there is an issue if administration isn't bringing a report forward, I agree the report should be brought forward in a timely fashion. I agree with that. But the issue is what's happening with our planning and how is it being done? And the problem is, we don't have enough resources in neighbourhood planning. I mean, that's the problem some of us have been talking about for years and years and years if you look at Winnipeg in comparison to other cities they have large planning divisions that deal with local neighbourhood planning that address the kind of proactive planning that Councillor Orlikow was talking about. So what our good planners, the few of them we have left in that department are struggling to do is work with the resources that we as a council have given them in our budgets. So I think rather than whacking our poor planners around that are trying to get whatever they can get done and working incredibly long hours to get the planning that they can get done within the resources we as a council have given them, I don't feel like beating up on them at this point in time. I see how hard they work. And you know if you look at this report, it's a status update telling us what's happening. Well, we can do two existing neighbourhoods, the Corydon and the warehouse district estimated that it could be completed by 2013 or 2012 you know it says in the report. They're just basically saying we can do two plans in two years you know with the amount of resources we have. They're being

honest and telling us that they don't have any…enough resources to do it or they're telling us the resources they do have. The reason there's all these other precinct plans and suburban plans and all of that is because we're doing a massive amount of you know someone argue sprawling suburban development and the developers are required to provide a plan as part of that so those things can move ahead so we've seen Waverley West and all these other ones done by the developer. We've seen in the Fort Rouge yards. It was a developer-led planning process again because it had to be done quick and we don't have the resources and you know I think an area master plan came forward that was quite extensive because planning gave them the guidance of what they had to include in it and it was very, very extensive, but that's how we're having to do things and it's not because planning isn't doing or working hard enough. It's because we have not given them the resources that they need to do the type of planning you see in cities like Vancouver and Portland and Edmonton, and other places that invest in their planning department. So I just want to put that out there. You know it's really just a status reports telling us here is what we're doing with what you've given us. So I thank the planning department for providing us with that and I think we should simply move on to other business where…I don't think we're going to get into the details of all the different plans, that's for a book I'll be writing after I retire. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. I just wanted to speak to this issue. I think that Councillor Gerbasi is really reflected what I think is the biggest problem in that our Planning Department doesn't have the resources to come up with even secondary plans and looking at, let alone the whole development of big new areas in which Councillors Havixbeck and Orlikow reflect, and I do agree with them in terms of frustration, that we need to be out ahead and having the community before a developer even looks at developing we need to talk to the community and say you know, what should be happening in this part of the city and how should that growth be working? So I do believe we need to give the resources. I just wanted to cite…I have a lot of issues with the Planning Department in terms of all these different subdivisions and creating these tiny little lots because we need density and there's all these Our Winnipeg and Complete Communities that are considered and I kind of really have a problem with the way they evaluate whether or not they recommend a subdivision or not. But given that, it was my experience being on the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee, our meeting that we had in…seems like a long time ago but we had a nine and a half hour meeting this month in regards to Waterford Green which is a…what they call, a precinct development plan in which the developer actually went out to the community around, did consultations, four consultations with the community and yeah, there were a number of real concerns set out by people living in existing homes in this particular area which is in the Meadows West, Inkster Garden area near north, Keewatin North, Jefferson, and there was a whole number of issues but what I appreciated and we spent a real long time, what I would call actually not just the hearing but I would call it a three-way negotiation to make sure that this particular development reflected what the city would like to see, the concerns of traffic, the concerns of actual sidewalks in areas and we considered -- there was just a whole host of issues that we dealt with that said we upheld it, certain conditions need to exist and I understand that the Planning Department is struggling with how to develop or share the cost of, for example on ramps on to Chief Peguis Trail as that gets developed, there's a whole host of issues that are very difficult to plan and I could tell that the administration through PP and D and as well through, I guess it would be Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works representatives there, representing what they would expect to see in streets so there's a real lot of work that goes into this. So I'm actually just going to accept this report and I'm not sure, you know, whether or not they will be able to reflect more in a subsequent report, I don't know. But I would just like to say that I think we should just accept the report as information and I think that as we move into our new operating budget considerations, we deal with what is across this whole city that concerns the citizens that we really aren't planning our cities growth in an appropriate fashion and let's actually make sure that our department does have the resources because I do know that they were very hard at what they try to do and so that's all I have to say, Speaker Nordman.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. I guess, to close Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. I appreciate everybody's comments here this morning. First of all, I'd like to acknowledge what Councillor Wyatt said. I think when any body of elected officials whether it's a community committee or standing policy committee or this Council as a whole requests or puts out the piece that the Public Service is going to be providing a report by certain date, they should be sending it back to the particular body that asked for it, explaining why the document or providing document, providing why it's not available. There are two types of planning type documents. Developer-led and City-led. When you're talking about a single property owner, in many cases like the Parker Lands, chances are it's going to be the proponent that's dealing with our project that's going to come forward with the planning initiatives related to it. We saw that exact same developer in fact, very successfully go through that procedure in the Fort Rouge Yards. Sure, it's a change in the community and of course it's controversial. I know Councillor Gerbasi has taken more than a few lumps on that one but it was the right to do and you know we moved forward on things like that. During that period of time, it wasn't like the department was doing nothing. Instead of coming up with a secondary plan for each existing mature neighbourhood, Complete Communities took a look at all existing

mature communities. Things aren't that different necessarily between parts of 1960's Transcona, Garden City or Westwood. There's a lot of things that are common in mature neighbourhoods that could be looked at on a macro level. You don't have to look at the specifics in every case on every single part of the city that has a, you know mature neighbourhood like these in different areas. As a result the Our Winnipeg process, the Complete Communities process that was being done during most of 2010 when there wasn't a lot of secondary plans being done. I was looking at the same kind of issues but on a macro city-wide level. That's the type of thing that came out. In regards to Councillor Havixbeck's comments about roads in the specific document, the City-led initiatives isn't enough, maybe it's not, maybe there are other more resources required there. But the point was the time frame that she had asked for originally that may have been absent in the first versions of report. They were in there and they showed time frames for the City-led initiatives. We can't say what the economic conditions are going to be for new developer-led initiatives that are on the outskirts of town or in this case, for example, the park and lands. But again, that's up to the development community to do. Our Winnipeg went further and identified areas within the City of Winnipeg that are subjected tomajor redevelopment. They are areas that were former industrial, former employment lands that no longer make sense to be that way anymore. Perhaps now instead of being an industrial, it could become a commercial area instead of being industrial, maybe it's ripe for multi-family development. Looking at transportation, it's in transportation corridors. This is all part of the Our Winnipeg process. We spend a lot of time, energy and money on. So again during this time frame, they should've been updates to standing policy committee, I agree. But I assure you that the department and our planners aren't doing nothing and there is a lot of stuff that's coming forward in those times and dates in the report that's before us today.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no more speakers, All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Now, we have…it says notice of Motion but the wrong document was put forward and Councillor Gerbasi. (Inaudible) It's a motion. We have both motion and notice of motion and so the wrong document was used and you'd like it to be a motion today? Yes. Okay now, normally a motion is automatically referred.

Councillor Gerbasi: I would be happy if Council was willing to suspend the rules and deal with it today.

Mr. Speaker: All right. All those in favour of suspending the rules to deal with motion 5...4? Opposed? Four, four, four, I apologize. All right we suspended the rules so Councillor Gerbasi, please introduce your motion.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
MOTIONS

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT an external and objective Real Estate Management audit be conducted, going back 5 years, which will review the processes and policies used for all major land Acquisition, Sales, Transfers and External leasing activities including all transactions where commissions or management fees were paid with City of Winnipeg funds.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So what did you say? These are not the kind of issue that any of us enjoy having to deal with particularly. I think frankly a lot of us would prefer to be focusing on garbage bins, transit service, neighbourhood planning, improving public transit or even budget discussions would be more fun but, there is really no option any more to carry on with how things have been done before and put our heads in the sand. I think we have to address this issue in a comprehensive way. I'm going to read the exact wording of the motion that I'm putting before you today, as seconded by Councillor Orlikow. I thank him for that. "Be it resolved that an external and objective real estate management audit be conducted going back five years which will review the processes and policies used for all major land acquisition sales, transfers and external leasing activities including all transactions where commissions or management fees were paid with City of Winnipeg funds" and the reason for this motion: there have been a series of real estate transactions from the Winnipeg Parkade sale to the Water Park Proposal to the Fire Hall land swap that have left the public with the strong perception that something is wrong in our City Hall. Other questions have been raised about processes of RFQs, related to property sales and management. There are perceptions out there that our city is not operating in a fair and equitable fashion with all business people and developers who are doing business with the city. The public perception of how things are being done at this, in the city is not something we can feel good about or sit idly by and ignore. A truly objective and in depth external review of these and other transactions over the last several years is absolutely necessary. It would be our effort to restore public confidence. While I recognize there is an external review that is to happen specifically on the Fire Hall land swap issue, I think most people have come to a point we agree that a broader review going back a number of years is necessary in addition to that. Certainly any information gleamed

from the Fire Hall review can be built in as part of this broader audit. I would note and the wording of the motion that says major issues so that we're not, we can't obviously, and every single transaction can't be reviewed. This has to be done according to the standards that an auditor would look at an issue like this or whoever would be reviewing this would look at it that way and do it in a manageable fashion. Obviously it's going to cost money to do this but I think it's something that we've come to a point where we agree it has to be done and I just wanted to say that this issue is not political. It crosses all party lines and any ideology. You see Colin Craig and the Labour Council they sour everybody seems to be on the same page and I think most members of this Council. It's not about right or left but about right and wrong. So I urge this Council to vote unanimously for this motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Swandel and Eadie.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be speaking and voting in favour of the motion. Yesterday I had the opportunity to put together a basket of materials from the kiosk here because a group, the retired teachers of St. Vital had asked for a basket of stuff. A group that Councillor Vandal and I both supported: the retired teachers and I was sold the stuff but I was told well you're really supposed to have a letter because the auditors want a paper trail on this. We're really supposed to, we've got an Excel spread sheet on this and you know, we'll trust you this time but the auditors want a paper trail. It's a $60, $70 transaction conducted within City Hall but we're very mindful of what the auditors want and the rather obvious irony of that situation hit me that we've had a summer where there's a lot of public concern about some very major transactions in the City and I do think we need an auditor, an external auditor to look at those. I don't know if it's going back five years. I would've supported what Councillor Wyatt was speaking about a few days ago in the paper about a couple of, I think three specific transactions I'd been fine with an external review of that. I think ten years would have been overkill and that idea was been kicked around but if five years is what's on the table in front of us, I'd be in favour of that. I don't think people haven't been saying to me, well let's go back and look at that police station transaction or any other specific transactions but what they have been saying for the past couple of months, whether I've been at people's doors and I hit a lot of doors in St. Vital this summer, whether it's been at the daycare. I was at an event at St. Mary's Road United Church the other day and people come up and say what is going on down there with that Fire Hall situation? What are you guys doing? And I think we owe it to the public and we owe it to ourselves quite frankly to get an external audit that will certainly look at the Fire Hall transaction and if it's going back a few years, certainly some other transactions have been a concern but, I'm not terribly concerned about the exact length if that gets amended or the exact number of transactions we're to look at but certainly the public is very much concerned about the Fire Hall transaction. We do need some external review of this to restore some faith in the integrity of this body and in the public service of this, of the City of Winnipeg because we think if we had a summer where some very serious questions have been asked and we need to get those answers. I don't know how quickly we'll get that but we do need I think an external review of what's transpired. I'm not calling for anybody's head. I'm not calling for anybody's job but I want some answers as to what happened in terms of process, what the numbers are because I'm getting all sorts of different information. Oh, that piece on Mulvey is worth X, no, it's worth one-tenth of X. I don't know. I'm not an expert in property evaluation but I do want the experts to take a look at this, take a look at the processes and come back to us with some feedback so we can go to the public and say this is what's happened and this is the action we're going to take so I will be in support of the motion. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I understand what's being said here. I listened to it carefully. I'd like to go to ten years because listening to Councillor Gerbasi, I think it's important to spread over at least past into another Mayor's term so this really isn't political because so much of this stuff is being done by innuendo and inference, is I consider blatantly inappropriate and unfair. You know there is…the media has rights today. They didn't have prior to 2009 due to a Supreme Court case involving a developer by the name of Grant and the Toronto Star. We need to be very careful here. There is something that happened here that is wrong. I'm pretty sure the motives were well intended but some mistakes were made here and I think that's pretty evident. So to take the politics out of it, I would ask the movers for a friendly amendment to take it to ten years so that it spans more than just this Mayor's time at City Hall and takes the political piece right off the table. So I don't know if the movers are willing to do that but to get my support I think we really need to go to ten years and take the politics off the table.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel has moved a friendly motion, amendment. (Inaudible) Okay, let the other speakers go first. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Just for clarification, Speaker Nordman, I can also speak to the moved amendment. It's not moved? Okay. There's no moved amendment, okay. Thank you, Speaker Nordman. Speaking to this issue, I've been spending a lot of time dealing with people who have lost the public trust. I'm out there in the community and I hear this stuff all the time. The media keeps running stories, there's controversy around whether or not the right decisions are being made and all these things are happening and the provincial government has rules that establishes that Deputy Ministers need

to be considerate of being in conflict and concerned about perceived conflicts not allowed to partaken engage in relationships that look to the public and I'm talking about the public I'm talking to every day and the people are not separating the two issues that I was talking about and that what this particular motion is bringing as well. The public is not separating them and so this whole issue I think is very important. I am supporting this motion and I would also say that while it's interesting that when you look at financial transactions and you look at people, often they talk about you need to save your records for seven years, I would be supportive of extending this for ten years because I think that Councillor Swandel definitely does bring up a very important point but I also need and I am very concerned that I, personally, as a City Councillor, I have lost trust and it's awful because I'm stressed out about this. I can't get my job done representing the people in the Mynarski ward while all this stuff is going on and I think that the only way to restore the public trust is to have an audit like this and we also need to deal with the other issue I mentioned. It's not on topic so I won't actually say it but you know it's my expectation that we act in the public interest. When I got into public politics and I was elected, it's the public interest that we uphold. We need to be concerned about taking decisions that are good for the whole city, for the residents of this great city of Winnipeg. We need to be considerate of that and the public trust that we're spending their money in an appropriate fashion. So I wholeheartedly support this and I would also support if somebody wants a friendly amendment, I'm okay with going ten years. I know it's going to cost a lot of money but you know what, we need to restore the public trust here and I'm all for that. So thank you very much, Speaker Nordman, I will be voting in favour and I believe everybody should unanimously be supporting this idea, supporting this basic motion and hopefully others will consider what Councillor Swandel, the Deputy Mayor has pointed out might be a good idea as well. Thank you.

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

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, it's been said quite well by a number of the speakers here today. Obviously, the topic has been about the Fire Halls. I very much support the process going forward, I'd like to see an independent person take a look at, come back and say exactly what happened with some recommendations and also some accountability by the way in terms of this. So I very much support that process going forward with what Councillor Gerbasi put forward I think is reasonable. I can tell you I pride myself on trying to be an honest broker you know any issues that I deal with them. And I'm getting the same phone calls and people calling me at night or meeting me in supermarkets and asking those exact same questions and quite honestly I have those questions as well. And that's another issue and I think that process is well underway but just to clear the air I think it is important that we look at real estate transactions. You know I think it's important that the auditor is involved, he is an extended, an outside auditor, make sense. What I think also is important is the scope of this, right, take a look at this because if you do send these things the outside sometimes, you've got accounting firms that are there, it's not a government world which shut something like this down so I think you do have to be just putting on my chair of Finance hat, you know have some sort of financial guidelines that are there. We're not looking to spend tens of millions of dollars on this but I think we need to get to the bottom of it, money needs to be spent and I think we can have outside person and I think also there's been people from our administration that have gone through a lot in you know I think there's probably been some mistakes made but they would even say. They would like you know this as an opportunity to clear their name but to have the record you know going forward with it. So I'm very supportive about this whether it's ten years, five years, doesn't make a difference to me. I think the scope is important so I'm hoping that this does pass and I'm hoping that the scope comes back through City Council. We are able to kind of identify what it's going to take a look at because at the end of the day, you don't want this to be two, three years and millions and millions of dollars but I think we do need to spend some dollars to make this happen. At the very least, this clears the name for the city and people will have faith again in terms of what's happening with the real estate so I'm very supportive about this and I think Councillor Gerbasi hit the nail on the head. I think every one of, any political lock who wants that to happen and people to have faith back in systems. So I think this is a tool that we can use for people to re-engage in the system that have some faith and respect for our process going forward because as Councillor Eadie mentioned quite clearly, you know when you're dealing with these types of items, it distracts you from a large amount of the good things that are happening in the city. We've got great developments that are happening. There are always robust debates over where we spend our dollars but it really is a distraction. So if we can put this out, have an independent person review these things and they'll come back and if there's any recommendations not just on the one that Mayor Katz had identified in terms of the independent auditor for the Fire Halls but also the real estate. You know I'd be more than happy to change our process, if the processes need changing, by all means because I want people to feel that it's a transparent and trustworthy system because I didn't sign up for any of, you know in terms of any actions that I don't think are appropriate so I very much will be supporting it and I hope each, I hope it passes unanimously actually, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Well, I would echo many of the comments that have already been made today but I think that given what we've all faced in the last month, in dealing with the whole Fire Hall issue, I think that this is a great move whether it be five years, ten years, 12 years ago was actually when the last audit was conducted on the realty

management section. I think it's a great step towards restoring public confidence because I really think that that's on shaky ground, and I would like to see a random sampling in that time frame so I support either the five or the ten but some short of random sampling as well a comparison of brokers. I think that's you know, multiple brokers in that. I don't know who couldn't support a call for transparency and openness whether it be five or ten years. This is something within our control that we can do here and we sit around the table and we comment on how many things are out of our control. This is well within our control and should be supported. It should result in fairness across the board and that would be my hope. I think the longer time frame is essential in this. I think that it's important to see what has changed from that last audit to today. And if anything, what the motion doesn't address though and what I would hope that an auditor would tell us, because so we have a report that comes forward, I would hope that they would tell us where, if any changes might need to be made in our systems and I think that's imperative because our administrative, our policy systems, you know, are they still being upheld and if they aren't, what can we do to correct that going forward? I also think that this motion may lack some concreteness around the time frame. That's no reason to send it back though. I think I'd like to see this done quickly, early in the New Year if not by the end of this year, three months should be an adequate time frame. So I'm just, I'm putting these thoughts out because I think they are important that we look at all facets of this. So again, to restore public confidence, the professionalism of City Hall, I think that it's an intelligent step forward so I hope that it will be unanimous.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just want to thank the movers and the seconders, Councillor Gerbasi and Orlikow for putting this motion out here. I will be supporting this. Like Councillor Mayes and Councillor Eadie, you know I've been out in the ward and when I get calls from the suburban part of my ward where I normally don't get calls Mr. Speaker, and they are calling me saying that the neighbours are talking. We'd like to meet at the school or the community centre regarding an issue and the issue regarding the Fire Hall. You know that's a real cause for concern and really does speak to that idea that I think the public trust has been breached. And like Paul, Councillor Havixbeck did say I think time frame is extremely important here. For me five years is sufficient, I think three years, our terms are only four years, Mr. Speaker. Three years for me is going back would be provides a sufficient pattern of practices that we could reflect on and make some changes with respect to processes but I'm okay with five years only for the fact that time is of the essence, Mr. Speaker. We've got to move quickly, we've got to and restore the public trust quickly and do it effectively, so with that, I just want to say that I will be supporting it, I will be supporting the five years. Like I said, I'm open to the 10 years. I have no problems with that however I think that you know if you're going to cut, if it's going to get dragged out more than four or five months, then I'm not really interested in seeing that happen. I'm good with five years, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: I definitely support this. You know, we've heard a lot about the land swap deal but you know I believe it's only the tip of the iceberg. I think there's a lot more deals, a lot more things that need to be examined. I like the scope of this motion because it shows that. And you know, one way of clearing the air is the election. But I don't want to wait for the election. I want it done now. So that's why I'm supporting this motion.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, in terms of the five year issue, I'm supporting the motion but in terms of the five year, ten year solution would be going back a minimum of five years. The reality is Mr. Speaker if an auditor starts, an external auditor starts this work and there is serious concerns that lead beyond the five years, they're going to want to pursue that. That's the reality. I mean, the auditor will want to do to ensure that they do a thorough job. They are obligated to so a thorough job based on their designations so they would not want to have that restriction potentially on them if they had to go five years and a day in terms of their work. So that may be a solution. You know, the reality is, Mr. Speaker, this is coming out of the issue of the whole Fire Hall matter and you know I was just talking to some municipal officials who are in Alberta, the municipal conference is out in Alberta for the Alberta Urban Municipalities, AUMA in Edmonton at their annual convention. And this is the talk of municipal officials. Specifically how do you build a Fire Hall on private land? How is that possible? You know we do many things as municipalities. We build libraries, we have, you know, we supply police protection, we look after roads, we pick up garbage. One of the core services of the municipality and it goes back to the beginning of municipalities is fire protection. You can, to this day, Mr. Speaker, go to small municipalities and they may have a tiny little hole in the wall when it comes to their municipal office but they've got a nice Fire Hall. It's a sharp looking Fire Hall and it's on municipal land and they own it. I don't know how you build a Fire Hall. I know when it…you try to do something Mr. Speaker, I or anybody wants to get anything built, we've got to move them. You've got to have a motion at a community committee, Councillor and then you've got to follow it and you've got to try to see, you want to, if you want to do the simplest things Mr. Speaker, we have to have a paper trail. We have to be able to bring it and to argue for the dollars and make it happen now. You know that is the part that I just don't understand, Mr. Speaker and my

view on this issue is…my, I've gone from disillusionment to depression and now anger in terms of this issue because I just don't know how that can happen and I can assure you Mr. Speaker, my confidence in our most senior management team has been severely shaken. Severely shaken because this would have will to have gone across a lot of desks and I want to know how did this happen? I want to know that. I want to know that. And I want to know what's going to be done to restore confidence and I want to know how this can never happen again? Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Sharma followed by the Mayor.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For many of the reasons my colleagues have already pointed out, I will be supporting this motion as well. I think it's a very reasonable next step and if this is what it takes to restore the public confidence and increase transparency, it's absolutely the right thing to do and as far as amending the time period to 10 or 12 years even I think that would provide a real good context and it would deal with process as a whole. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some very profound and well thought out words have been spoken over the last little while, Mr. Speaker. There's obviously two issues here. I think everybody is very cognizant of trying to get answers to the questions regarding the fire paramedic stations. I know I spoke to members of EPC and many other councillors regarding the auditor's discussion. But with yours truly and I believe everybody found that to be the right thing to do, I haven't heard anybody say it wasn't, so that is moving forward. On a separate issue of the audit, as I stated this morning on CJOB when I was asked the question about this. I certainly am fully supportive Mr. Speaker, but I do believe it should go a longer period of time. The reason I say that to you Mr. Speaker, many years ago there were issues very similar to what's being discussed right now. As a result of that, there was an audit done. That's over 12 years ago Mr. Speaker. The realities are, there's no more than three councillors who are here at that particular point in time and even though I agree with what was said earlier about terms and when Councillor Pagtakhan talked about that, keep in mind, many of us have been here for two years, six years, eight years, twelve years, whatever the case may be. So it's been discussed by many people but to be very frank with you, to move forward with this and to actually say we owe it to the public and restore the confidence, we should go right back to when the last audit was done and let them decide which projects to look into whatever the case may be and I certainly don't have any problem with you know an outside, if we don't want to use our auditor, go outside, I've got no problems with that. But for my point of view, they should have the ability to go right back to when the last one was done and then we can move forward and then we can show the public exactly what it is and hopefully restore that confidence. That certainly would be my opinion and that's what I would definitely 100 percent support.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. I wasn't going to rise because my colleagues are so eloquent but I think on this issue I have to get myself on the public record if not for today, then maybe for tomorrow. So here we go. An external audit is required to respond to the fact that many Winnipeggers have lost faith in the city government is working in their best interest. Public trust is based on the belief that when elected representatives spend public's money or sell public land that those transactions provide the best value to the public. This trust is earned through engagement, transparency and to the adherence that Council is the ultimate decision making body. It is Council's role as the ultimate authority to ensure that the policies are filed and the way in which transactions are conducted are in people's best interest. Transparency and public trust are constant. It must be the fore front of all decision making. Another constant is the ever increasing value of city land or land in general in the City of Winnipeg. The city is running out of land, the price of land goes up, therefore there's increase amounts of money to be made or lost depending on how well the city conduct itself. The external audit should be supported by those who have questions and those that don't. For those that have full confidence that there's nothing going wrong in our system and for others that do have questions. The audit will provide an external view which will help earn public trust to help ensure that the public interest has been maximized and provide the public with assurance that their trust is warranted. The audit will provide the City with the best practice from all across Canada and will improve the City of Winnipeg's processes by looking at some of the best practices throughout Canada. Again, it's been 12 years since we've last done this. There's probably some better practices out there. And this again, the external auditor, he may come back and say there's nothing wrong at all because of better practices that you can put into your policies or where you're weak. That again, so again both sides, people who have concerns about it, people who think, have full confidence, in the end of the day the process will be better. The confidence of the public will be at least worked on to be restored. Now, regarding how long they should go back and whatever, again, I'm not that long, the 12 years in a tooth kind of Councillor but I think a recommendation from Councillor Wyatt of a minimum of five years is, at a minimum of five years, is appropriate because the auditor will decide what things to look at. They'll look at all the things and they will decide this and this and this and it maybe something from 11 years ago. Again, I don't want to hamstring the auditor on that. They'll choose as they see fit. I don't know how external auditors work. I know this would be very special, specialist I'll be coming in for it. But again, I have my…we're talking about the Fire Halls, but again when

I first got elected I had very strong concerns about how the land swap regarding, the Parker lands came out. There was concerns about the valuation, there was concerns about no public input before it went out to. There's concerns about did we actually adhere to our own existing policies when we did that land swap. There's some questions about that. The water park, I still believe that the water park, that parcel 4 was never publicly tendered properly. That's my contention. I may be wrong but again, we only tendered it for a water park and so I don't believe parcel 4, there was no public input and we saw the backlash in what happened if we do that. And the question of using the public subsidy for that I think that maybe part of the auditor. The Fire Hall, again we're building a Fire Hall on land we don't own. I think we all agree that our policies were not followed and there are questions again of valuation. How were these land prices determined. Was it before TOD, was it after? So there's some good questions in there that I think the public has…I don't think I know the public has the right to know. The new police station, well I was quite shocked to find out that part of our cost recovery from the new police station was selling the old police station and the parkade and then after we approved, we find out oh, no, we can't sell it because of this caveat we didn't know about. Well again, that's concerning. That is very concerning. I raised concerns about before about the city getting involved in commercial leasing. I'm not sure if that's the city's role to be leasing property on a (inaudible). I'm not sure about that. We've also had some issues raised about the property manager contracts on how they are chosen and remuneration that they are paid. These are questions that the public has the right to ask and they have asked. The golf courses, in my opinion, it was a complete waste of time for everyone, money for developers and for the public which were taken into an anxiety train for no purpose at all. There was a lack of public transparency and I question the use of using a request of interest rather than a public tender and I raised this before. So again these are some of the areas where I see some concerns but again maybe some external eyes will say this is maybe a better practice for use as used out here. And they can bring that forward. So therefore, I believe it is in the public interest and I believe we do have Council's support on this that the external audit should occur and I do agree. I hope it gets unanimous support.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty followed by Councillor Vandal

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. I, too, like everyone else around this table, was disappointed by the daily announcements over the last month where we're getting little piecemeal details as to what was going on with this transaction, completely inappropriate in my opinion. I'd like to thank, however, the Mayor, Mike Ruta and the City Auditor, Brian Whiteside for when they realized that the public had questions, Councillors had questions, EPC and the Mayor had questions that they decided to bring in the external auditor. They did the right thing. The Mayor's press release on Monday in conjunction with the auditor spelled out a lot of the details as to what was going to be or what is to be in the audit on the Fire Hall transactions. Reviewing the processes that resulted in a proposed land exchange agreement; assessing the adequacy of controls policies and procedures that are currently in place; assessing whether Council was kept up to date with any changes and the correct approvals were obtained. Evaluating the value to taxpayers; providing recommendations for improvement unnecessary and recommending any disciplinary actions that might need to be taken. I agree that we should go back to the previous audit, need to review again, body, the people around this table have changed. We need to go review it to see if the recommendations from the…the recommendations from the previous audit have been implemented fully and if not, why not? My feeling is we should go back to the previous audit, take a look, see what's been done since then and I think it all, it should all be rolled into a single audit. So they were not duplicating. This is going to cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. I think we can do it with one audit to find the answers and the external audit to be the answer to everything. Again we should do this in consultation with the auditor in my opinion, the City Auditor.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, there's been a lot of good points made here today. I made my position clear on this a few weeks ago. I think there should be an independent audit come in and look at the latest deal, certainly the Fire Hall deal. And I think it's a good thing to go back a minimum five years up to ten years because I was around when we had the last audit. There were a lot of improvements brought forward, policy changes. There certainly was nothing worse than policy improvements that were found out in that last audit. I think it's important. It's public trust, it's public assets however, I will say this Mr. Speaker, contrary to some of the comments I've heard here this morning, is that I am not in a rush to judgment on this thing because I don't know what I don't know on it. I get dribs and drabs of information. I think we need to let the auditors go in there and do their work and the only thing I am sure at this point Mr. Speaker, is that mistakes were made, as mistakes are always made in any of our civic processes whether it's today or whether it's five years ago or twelve years ago. So I'm not in a rush to judgment. I think we need to let the auditors so their work bring forward their recommendations and ensure that we have improved civic processes as we go forward both on the Property side, the Public Works side, we're doing an external review of Public Works. We're doing an external review of police services. I mean there's always room for improvement and if you think there's not room for improvement then you are simply, you're simply dead wrong. So that's my only message that is not in sync with most of the other messages is that let's not rush to judgment but let the auditor do their work.

Mr. Speaker: That's it. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Thank you to everybody. I think it was a very, very brave discussion today and an important discussion. I'm going to get to the issue of a friendly amendment. There's been a number of ideas tossed out about how to proceed with this. First of all, there's been comments that we need to do this quickly. We want to have answers in three months. Other people have said we need to take our time, ensure this is done thoroughly and effectively. Some people have said we should go back to the immediate date that the last audit was done in 2000. Others have said, you know go back three years, go back five, go back eight, go back ten, to twelve and I think would say first of all, I would say that I agree that it has to be done properly. We're not going to whip it off in a couple of months. I don't believe an audit this extent I don't think it's likely but obviously it can't go on forever. It can't cost millions and millions of dollars, but it has to be done thoroughly so I think in listening to everybody, I would also point out one other point that the previous audit that was sent obviously if you are doing an audit of something that you previously audited in 2000 and changes were made and I'm thinking that obviously would be part of the part of the auditors process without even saying that they would take a look at the previous audit. Look at what was found then, look at the recommendations that were found then and what changes were made and if all the changes weren't made, you know, go forward with that as part of the new audit so obviously it would build on the previous audit and I think Councillor Wyatt's suggestion of a friendly amendment that it go back a minimum of five years opens the door to review anything as far back as we want going back to the previous audit without extending it to you know 10, 12 years of, you have to look at every transaction. I mean this motion came out of the concern of what specific larger transactions that have occurred within the last five years so not that they shouldn't look further back, they certainly want to look at everything, you want to look at the previous audit and have them look at the recommendations from that. So I'm going to be accepting and I concurred with my seconder to change, the only change would be going back a minimum of five years which opens the door to going back as far back as the auditor feels is necessary and I agree with Councillor Browaty, I mean it needs to go in the hands of the auditor. They need to decide what it needs to be looked but we're giving, the purpose of this motion is to give direction about what Council's saying what I'm hearing from everybody here today is that this needs to be thorough, it needs to be external you know, an audit as opposed to our own City departments reviewing it that were involved in the transactions. It needs to go back far enough to deal with the concerns in the public's mind and it opens the door to looking at anything that might have happened earlier as well if there's concerns there. So with that amendment of a minimum of five years which opens the door to, for going further back. I think it addresses the concerns raised here as well as the concerns about the affordability of this and the practicality of it. I would move the motion as amended with a friendly amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Do you want it read that back, Mr. Clerk or we're okay with that?

Clerk: (Inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Recorded vote? Okay, recorded vote. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Mr. Speaker: It's unanimous. By-laws, Councillor Browaty.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that by-law No. 112/2012, 113/2012, 114/2012, 115/2012, 116/2012, 117/2012, 118/2012, 119/2012, 120/2012, 121/2012, 127/2012 and 128/2012.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 112/2012, 113/2012, 114/2012, 115/2012, 116/2012, 117/2012, 118/2012, 119/2012, 120/2012, 121/2012, 127/2012, 128/2012.

Councillor Browaty: I move that bylaws numbered 112/2012 to 121/2012 both inclusive, 127/2012 and 128/2012 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 112/2012 to 121/2012 both inclusive, 127/2012 and 128/2012.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rules be suspended and by-laws numbered 112/2012 to 121/2012 both inclusive, 127/2012 and 128/2012 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?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Question period for Property and Development. Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I wanted to ask this of the Mayor but we ran out of time, so I just…I know that the Mayor's an ex-officio for the Property and Development Committee and I guess this is also within the purview of the Property and Development Committee Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to ask the Chair if he was aware that during the Public Hearing of the Waverley West and proceeds going back to the City of Winnipeg through Downtown, that there was a big "and" that was also included in that, and that was also the Downtown and the Inner City in terms of providing funding to accelerate the provision of affordable housing and housing both within the Downtown and the Inner City Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to know if the Chair was aware of that.

Councillor Browaty: I believe earlier today, in fact, it was Councillor Swandel that pointed out that the Province of Manitoba had certain obligations from the Waverley West subdivision in that regard, and I was aware of it just this morning.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yeah. I just wanted to…okay, well that's good. I wanted to know if he was…well, I'll just stand down.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks. Councillor…never mind. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Chair, at our July 8 Council meeting, July 18th, I asked whether the Senior Planner recruitment was under way in the Property Department. Can the Chair tell me where that hiring is at?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I believe the Councillor for Charleswood-Tuxedo is aware that this Council hires four people exactly. That would be the C.A.O., the C.F.O., the City Clerk and the City Auditor. We don't directly hire anybody else whether they're a Chief or a Director, that's not…or a Chief Planner in this case. Just to point that out. Again, because the Chief Planner is such a significant role…position within the City, and setting the direction and the tone, of course that is a matter that is of interest to all of us here in this Chamber. My understanding is they are currently reviewing the short list of recommended candidates for interviews and they are anticipating holding those interviews in the next two to three weeks, so the process is currently on-going.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions for the Chair?

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, thank you for that answer. My next question is regarding the local area of planning initiatives. When does the Chair anticipate that that will come forward on an annual basis to Council?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: The current directive from the Standing Policy Committee is to report annually at the February meeting. It's been suggested that that might not be the best time of year to do that. It will be an annual basis. We

should ask at the next meeting though as to when that's going to be so that that can be set in stone and we have that expectation going forward.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Last question.

Councillor Havixbeck: Three times. Permits. I continue to hear a number of complaints from people looking to have demolition permits, building permits. In fact I had one last week, and somebody just in a conversation asked me what the status of their permit was at. It was for a project not in my Ward, but the constituent was asking about it, so it's someone who lives in my Ward doing work in another Ward. And within 24 hours they got their permit, so you know, I don't know if me asking about a permit is what the stimulus was but I'm finding that there's a lot of frustration out there. Given the new permits process that was implemented in the spring, can the Chair give us some update on where that's at?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: When it comes to the residential types of permits and inspections that need to be done, the summer months are definitely the busier times of year for that type of activity. I do know that at times, waits were getting a little longer than the Department ideally wanted, and in fact, some movement was being made. You don't want to delay your commercial and industrial type of inspections that are being done, but there were some instances where people were being moved from the Commercial and Industrial side to the Residential side. There were also certain quadrants that had longer queues and waits to get inspections done, and those were balanced out as well during the summer months as well. In regards to a particular case, I'm not familiar with the details on this particular one. You know it's a good chance it was a coincidence. It's no secret. Sometimes we, as Councillors, get phone calls from constituents. There's a voice mail, "when is my street being cleared?" Three voice mails later "thank you Councillor Browaty for getting the snow cleared." Kind of a secret here. We didn't actually help get that done this time. Could probably have been a coincidence but if Councillor Havixbeck would like me to look into this particular one we can certainly do that…my residence on Chopin, sure let's keep the credit here.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions for the Chair? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. I had a particular permit issue actually for a plan to build a house in my ward, and while I understand that the processes have been made better, one of the interesting concepts with this one was that there was a recommended change after it went through the planning process to ensure that the permits could go ahead to build a compressed wood foundation, and what had happened is the architect had made the adjustments, the engineers had made the adjustments to the plans and it was re-submitted to the Permits Department, but then it was subjected to a…it had to…they were told that it had to go through another six-week process to look…or more…to look over the whole plan again when it was just a quick amendment that was recommended by the Planning Department in the first place, so my question is actually, if the Councillor Browaty would ask for a report on how things are progressed with the new permit system evaluated at a time when there aren't a lot of permits being applied for. Maybe we could get a report in January as to some of the specific issues and maybe some of the tweaking that might need to be done for that plan. Would Councillor Browaty be in favour of that?

Councillor Browaty: Again, earlier this year, we implemented a process where the signatures and seals of engineers and architects were going to be taken as proof that the plans were appropriate in some cases. I don't know if this particular case that Councillor Eadie was referring to is even going to be part of that particular plan, but we can certainly look into it. That said, we have a new process in place. We want to see how many people are taking advantage of it and the success of that program, so no problem getting a report back on that matter.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further questions. Oh, second question, okay.

Councillor Eadie: Councillor Browaty is the Chair of Property, Planning and Development, and I realize he works with different administrators, but within the Civil Service Commission there is talk about the public interest being upheld by having Deputy Ministers not entering into what could be perceived, or be a conflict with their Minister, to ensure that the public trust is there, and I'm just curious if the Councillor Browaty believes that given the work that he does for his Committee, and being on E.P.C., if he has trust in the ability of the C.A.O. to do his job.

Councillor Browaty: I thank the member for his question. I don't think this is the appropriate venue to discuss personnel matters. We don't have privilege as other legislative bodies have, and that's all I'm going to say.

Mr. Speaker: Good enough Councillor Eadie. Thank you. That concludes our Public, or Property and Development. We'll move onto the Standing Committee of Protection and Community Services. Councillor Havixbeck.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED SEPTEMBER 6, 2012**

Councillor Havixbeck: I'd like to introduce the one item, Community Incentive Grant for Fred Douglas Lodge or Fred Douglas Society and move that forward.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried and we have no motions I don't think, no, and do we have any by-laws? None. Any questions for Protection and Community Services? Councillor Eadie.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. I'm on, of course, Protection and Community Services. Councillor Eadie and Councillor Wyatt moved a motion back in 2011 when the current Chairperson I don't think was the Chairperson, but this was a motion to set out the City's parameters in terms of setting up the Police Board for the City of Winnipeg which is allowed to have up to a much more extensive bigger police board than is necessarily there, and we could select up to five City Councillors and one the C.A.O., for example, to sit on there and then select four community members to represent the community and then the Province appoints theirs. Those rules are in place and always were when we moved the motion in the first place, so I'm wondering if Councillor Havixbeck would bring to E.P.C., because it is an E.P.C. decision in terms of…and the Mayor…in terms of proceeding with the establishment of the Police Board and how the City itself will select its own representatives to be on the Police Board, but the limitation there is simply that we can't have more than 50 percent of the Police Board being Council members and City administrators as voting members on that Police Board, so would you be…my question is Councillor Havixbeck, would you please bring this to your next E.P.C. meeting and engage the E.P.C. because we don't have to ask the Province anymore in terms of how we pick and decide who sits on our Police Board. Would you consider doing that Councillor Havixbeck?

Mr. Speaker: The Chair.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, with an explanation. I'd like to clarify though. Councillor Eadie mentioned that five City Councillors could be appointed, four community members and two from the Province. This Police Board is planned to be up and running by December 1st, and there are five representatives that the City can select, so Councillor Eadie is referring to, I thought, nine. So nine doesn't work with what's in the plan. As well, I believe the Mayor, during his Question Period, spoke to there being some costs associated with this, and we're continuing to wait to hear from the Province on when we can have some costs picked up that will be associated with that Police Board. So my answer is, yes, I can absolutely bring that forward to E.P.C.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Eadie: Actually the provisions in the Act from the Province about Police Boards allows the City of Winnipeg actually to establish a much bigger Police Board than the other smaller municipalities in this Province, and under that, what we could do, as long as we have 50 percent or less representative from the City of Winnipeg and at least 50 percent from the Community, two picked by the Province and it could be four picked by the City as well as the C.A.O. and five of the Community Committees could select one of their members to sit on the Police Board. The Police Board is a real essential ability for this City to be involved in policing, because it's going to basically be removed from the City of Winnipeg other than the budget for the Police Services. We won't be able to, as a Councillor represents inner city, for example, I would not be able to be represented and so, there is an ability to do that where you could have a twelve member Police Board. The rules are there, the regulations are there, the legislation. We could do that. So I'm hoping that you will bring that to E.P.C. There's no number nine. I believe it's you can have up to thirteen, or I can't remember the exact number, but twelve is within the limits allowed by the Provincial legislation on Police Boards. So if you could please, clarification carry that forward.

Mr. Speaker: Question. Yeah.

Councillor Eadie: My question was would you bring the plan that I suggested…

Mr. Speaker: …to E.P.C.

Councillor Eadie: …which does fall within the parameters of the legislation rules contrary to what you answered in the last question.

Councillor Havixbeck: I'd be happy to open the floor to all Councillors to provide input to who they feel. They have suggested names, suggested people. I think that would be welcome.

Mr. Speaker: Last question? No. Alright. Seeing none, we'll move onto…oh I'm sorry. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: I apologize.

Councillor Wyatt: Not a problem Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I missed you.

Councillor Wyatt: I think one of the most important decisions this Council…one of the important decisions that will be made on behalf of this Council, because we don't directly make it, will be the hiring of the next Chief of Police, knowing the challenges that we face as a City. It was recently reported, I think it was in the month of August, that you were on a hiring committee with the members of the Public Service. In the past it has been, though not the rule, but the practice that the attempt has always been to try…I understand from talking to the previous Chair when the hiring went on…to try to arrive at decisions through consensus in terms of actually trying to fall on a candidate who would be applicable for the job. So could you confirm first of all that that you were on this committee and that you resigned from it, because I don't always believe what I read in the Winnipeg Free Press. So…

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes.

Councillor Wyatt: Alright, now that that has been confirmed, what is happening now? Where is it at? Do you have any idea? I realize that you are not on the committee anymore but you were our representative in many ways; not just E.P.C. but Council's representative on that committee. Where is that at?

Councillor Havixbeck: As the Chair, I have periodic updates from the Administration, and I can tell you that the hiring continues to be underway, that an appointment may be imminent. I would also add that there is no legal or statutory obligation for a member of Council to be part of that hiring. There are four positions that Council actually hires; that being the C.A.O., the Clerk, the Auditor and the C.F.O., not the Police Chief.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Wyatt: Could you tell us why you resigned from the committee?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes I can. I had a discussion with the chair of the hiring, and I felt that a decision was not being made by consensus.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the chair of Community Services? Seeing none? We'll move onto the report for the Standing Committee of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Vandal.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED SEPTEMBER 11, 2012

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will move items 1, 2, 3 as Consent.

Councillor Wyatt: Three, stand down.

Mr. Speaker: Stand down three. Just opposition to one for Councillor Browaty. Councillor Havixbeck, you put your hand up. Also opposition to one? Okay, but you're not speaking to it.

Councillor Wyatt: The children

Councillor Vandal: We should have a recorded vote, maybe.

Mr. Speaker: All right, we have three folks that are not in favour of item 1. All those in favour? item 3, we'll also move item 2. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Now, Item 3, please.

Item 3 – Establishment of Construction Criteria – Minor Repairs on Regional Streets

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This report is self-explanatory if you read the recommendation, if you read the reasons for the report. I believe it originated actually the motion from Councillor Wyatt. I may be wrong there but I believe that's where it originated so I'll stand down, try to answer.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, just a quick point of order I see the hour. I move that we continue with our work through lunch hour in hopes of the completing the agenda.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Thank you. We're almost done. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I see how hungry everybody looks. I'll make a point of speaking for the entire 10 minutes. No, Mr. Speaker, yeah, the chair is correct, Councillor Vandal is correct, I moved this motion earlier this year for the east side of the city, witnessed construction at the intersection of Regent and Lagimodiere where traffic was shut down for in two lanes for weeks on end to do a minor utility repair, or utility cut for an expansion of a business near that intersection and the…upon speaking with the Public Service and Public Works Department, the frustration was also expressed by them that the challenge that they've had is pushed back from industry, the industry that does that type of work saying that look at…smaller contractors aren't capable of having the capacity to conduct work after hours on the weekend and therefore this is what we end up getting…and the restriction in terms of…or the ability for them to place restrictions on that type of work based on the previous resistance from industry and you know it was interesting some of the comments around this coming forward, the response from the …was consistent with what I heard from Public Works. The reality is Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely necessary. You know as the City's growing, our regional streets are becoming more and more important to us. Just the other day, yesterday there was construction in Councillor Vandal's ward on Marion near Youville where again a utility cut was necessary with a new construction, the new high rise building there, and it backed up traffic, rush-hour traffic returning going outside of the downtown all the way to the Norwood Bridge right into the downtown, right into, on to Main Street. It was a huge impact. I realize Councillor Swandel might be rushed and he might have a lunch appointment but please bear with me. But, well I know they serve nice lunches, Councillor Swandel, but I'm sure they'll wait for you. But anyway, the reality is Mr. Speaker, you know, well this needs to be done. And I want to also know Councillor Fielding who has spearheaded this issue actually for some time in terms of trying to get general construction work on regional streets done in a timely fashion and 24 hour and weekend construction and again the resistance that has been met there in terms of trying to get that addressed. This is not as big of a scope of a…this is addressing smaller repairs, utility cuts, but nevertheless, you know construction which directly impacts the flow of traffic and I sincerely hope this empowers the Director, the Public Service to require expedient work, 24 hour work, a weekend work. I sincerely hope that the Director does not hesitate using these hours to ensure that on major… on regional streets because it's actually crucial, Mr. Speaker, if you believe in you know the whole greenhouse gas and environmental issues you've got traffic backed up sitting there idling and causing major delays in our city for some very minor, that repairs that could be done that we do have the capacity. There is the industry in the city to do, it just means that it would be larger contractors, it's not smaller ones that would be able to have that capacity to do the work. So I'm supporting this and I encourage all members of Council support this. And I'm…I want to thank the chair of the Standing Committee for getting this report back as quickly as he has. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Just a few quick comments on this. Yeah, this is something that I've been talking about for years and years and years and it usually seems I have to kind of hammer the drums on our administration and criticize them you know kind of throughout the year but I can say there's been some success this year. One-third of all major projects in the City of Winnipeg are using evening, weekend construction. And Councillor Nordman and myself assure that God's country St. James over there has constituents that I know, just one example in my own ward, we were going around Sturgeon Creek around the Grace Hospital and that project has been going ongoing and for people that live in that area, they know it's, how much construction is in there. Two weekends in a row, I went on a Sunday afternoon and there was construction workers there. I took a little video clip of them. I don't think they were too happy about that but it was a good news story and I was putting it on, celebrating the fact that they were doing some work. And then last Sunday I was driving at 10:30 at night at the same location and noticed that they were doing work throughout the evening. So I think, we're not there yet in terms of the work that needs to be done, in the evenings and weekends I can tell you there's an

economic argument not just for citizens that are sitting waiting in line trying to get to work but also a large amount of businesses, I remember down McPhillips area in Councillor Sharma's ward a few years ago had some major problems with a lot of construction and some you know lost business because of it. So there is an economic argument. There's an environmental argument in terms of greenhouse gas emissions that are a part of this and it just makes sense. And a lot of cities are doing this and I think this…we're stepping in the right direction with the administration so I want to thank the CAO and administration for going forward and Councillor Wyatt for bringing that motion forward as well as to the chair. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, it's all been said this is an improvement for traffic flow. I want to thank Councillor Wyatt for originating the motion and Councillor Fielding his work and I'll call the question.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of Item 3? Opposed? Motion carried. We have two motions brought forward for today. item 3, motion 3 is an automatic referral.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Vandal,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Katz,

WHEREAS the implementation of the Garbage and Recycling Master plan is sometimes impractical for addresses and lots with multiple dwelling units;

AND WHEREAS there is sometimes an incongruity between the number of living units on the assessment roll and the actual situation;

AND WHEREAS there is currently no flexibility in the administrative responses to these situations;

AND WHEREAS the lack of administrative flexibility has led to citizens being told they would continue to be charged for services which would not be provided;

THEREFORE BET IT RESOLVED THAT the Public Service develop a "reasonable accommodation" policy for addresses with multiple dwelling units at the same address or for addresses where there is an incongruity between the number of living units on the assessment roll and the actual situation;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT under no circumstance will billing occur for a dwelling unit which does not exist or where services are not being delivered to that dwelling unit.

Mr. Speaker: As is.

Councillor Vandal: I'd like to move that the rules be suspended to deal with this. This came up earlier in the meeting where there are paper bags that may not be available or enough of them for the new recycling plan, yard waste pick up so.

Councillor Wyatt: That's six.

Councillor Vandal: Six, six.

Councillor Wyatt: We just voted on three.

Councillor Vandal: We just voted on three.

Councillor Wyatt: Referral. We voted to refer three.

Councillor Swandel: It's automatic referral. Nobody stood it down.

Councillor Vandal: Yeah, I'm moving to suspend the rules to hear six, sorry.

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

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Vandal,
Seconded by Councillor Swandel,

BE IT RESOLVED that City Council authorize the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works to maintain one or several "Leaf-It-Depots", within approved budgets should paper bags for leaf composting not be available in Winnipeg.

Councillor Vandal: And I'll just read it. Be it resolved that Council authorizes the Public Works Standing Committee to maintain one or several Leaf It Depots within an approved budgets should paper bags for leaf composting not be available to all Winnipeggers rather than regroup an entire Council meeting give the committee and the Director the authority if there is a shortage of bags, only if there's a shortage of bags to keep the one or two Leaf It Depots open.

Councillor Fielding: I've got a not necessarily a problem. I just want to scheme this. We've actually had these drop off centres in St. James for close to two years. It's kind of a heartache to kind of have it happen but, really for two years I've been getting a lot of calls, a lot of, that people think it makes a hell of a mess here in St. James, the Civic Centre. So I'm actually, one of the selling points for this was closing these things down. Now that being said, I'd like to kind of get a consult from administration maybe there's something that could be worked out from our end too so. If you are amenable to that, to speaking to the Director and hoping to facilitate a meeting with me. I'd be supportive of this I guess in nature.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, obviously I'm in favour of this given my question earlier today and I appreciate the mover and the seconder trying to move it forward. I've never had a complaint about the depot at St. Vital Park. I know the administration expressed concern. Councillor Fielding is quite right. Just yesterday we heard stories about motor oil at some places and half a kitchen being left at some other places. I've never heard of those complaints. What I have are people as I said earlier complaining about the ability to dispose of their leaves. So I think the sense of this is that paper bags not being readily available. I don't want to get into …everywhere. I'm sure there's some available somewhere but the intent of the motion I think is trying to work through this. We're going to have some other issues with the recycling and the garbage. I don't think we need to pile on the leaf issue as well, at least for this year so I appreciate the motion. I am in favour of it. I do think it would go a long way to alleviating the concern in my ward if we kept the St. Vital Park Depot open. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Just, I think that I'd be remiss as a city, as my own Councillor, I think it's this fantastic, thank you very much for bringing this forward. However, I just want to make my pitch that the Waverley Depot was a fantastic Leaf-it depot as well. So if we're considering, we have no problem with the Waverley Depot Leaf- It Program so that's also maybe another option.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Just quickly. Along Scotia we have many yards that have a quite a lot of trees and in talking to Councillor Mayes the other day. He was talking about yards where they have like a hundred bags full of leaves that they have every year and there's some many lots along Scotia in my ward where this problem exists and I never heard a complaint now, the administration who took care of the Kildonan Park Leaf- It to us might have had an issue. I don't know if that was an issue at all but I know that I used a Leaf-It to us at Kildonan Park and the people along Scotia were especially the ones who were quite concerned that the…that the Leaf-it to us, program was being removed so I've quite, I'm in support of this motion to at least consider Kildonan Park staying open, at least until the bugs are worked out this year in terms of supply of bags and so on.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: I was just going to say a couple of things. First of all, we're providing a new service at picking up leaves at everyone's door step and this is a transition we're in change of the process. Apparently, you know we heard Canadian Tire didn't have any bags so now when we're in a motion on Council to change things because one facility was out of them. You know, at our Public Works seminar the other day, they talked about that they've spoken with the retailers. You know it could be a bug that's simply worked out. I guess you know, I'm not going to, I understand that it's

frustrating if you're going to buy bags and they're not there. You know, it's every two weeks, they're going to be picked up at your door. The intention in our budget is to close these centres and you can still bring your leaves to Brady landfill if you have a hundred bags and you've hired a truck. These people who have yards this big, I can't relate, but you know if you have that many leaves, you can take them to Brady landfill for free under the current system. I mean, I guess the motion, the wording of the motion I guess, I can live with it because it says within approved budget so which I assume means so it won't cost as any more in implementing this plan so I don't really care about the fine if they can do it for no cost . And secondly if paper bags are not available in Winnipeg, which I think is not going to be very likely to take place because I think they will be available in Winnipeg but I'll support it if it makes people comfortable but the reality is you know, we're going to be picking up leaves at people's door steps and that's, and part of the plan was to close the depots as that. I just think we need to allow people time to adjust to the new plan and, but that's fine, I'll support it if it'll make people more comfortable.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Well, I echo a lot of what's been said. I don't mean to belabor this. I think it's more than just one store being out. I've heard from constituents that is lots of stores out of these bags. I think something new and a change comes with its challenges and I think that this is a good step to alleviating some of that. I have complaints from constituents that there are now 20 to 40 bags sitting on their lawns waiting for pickup and they don't have the time or some seniors don't have the ability to go to the Brady landfill so that's not always conducive. I just would like to raise awareness to Charleswood-Tuxedo on this. In that our Leaf-It with us Program was in Assiniboine park in the parking lot. We removed last year to just to the west edge of the Assiniboine Forest and now have a police station going up there. So I would just want to raise awareness that if there is a need and this is the direction we're going in that that be made public and that the needs of Charleswood-Tuxedo be taken care of.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I won't reiterate how I was against the whole program from the beginning.

Mayor Katz: You just did.

Councillor Browaty: Oh, should I get, never mind. All I'm going to say is, I think perhaps we should leave this in the hands of the Public Service. I think there may be an opportunity, if there's really a shortage or difficulty in obtaining these bags this fall, the trucks are coming down the street every other week anyway. Why cannot this fall only until supplies are sufficient, they can pick up leaves and yard waste in plastic. And they can use up the…I mean they have to pick up the stuff somewhere if it's from the Leaf-It Depot, they have to remove the plastic anyways for proper composting why not just this fall only allow them to pick up bags from, plastic bags from people's homes? People still have like bags left in their homes as well like is it the environmental thing to throw them into the garbage? It's probably better to even use them in this case to for a purpose before you dispose of current supplies. Yeah, I mean there's a lot of retailers that sell these things, Rona, Canadian Tire. Canadian Tire is not the only one, I know Julien provided good information yesterday but Home Depot, Shoppers Drug Mart, apparently carries them even. I don't want to say I was trying to corner the market but I was down at Wal-Mart in Moorhead in August. They had a pallet full of them. I'm guessing Cass-Clay County doesn't have a yard waste program because they were blowing it out for a quarter for fives, bags verses two bucks here. I stocked up personally but anyway.

Mayor Katz: What about the rest of us?

Councillor Browaty: If anybody needs one or two, it's on this table here

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, it never ceases to amaze me how people miss the obvious. Fall comes once a year, right now there's appears like there might be a bit of a problem with getting leaves picked up in paper bags whatever. This is just giving the authority to the Public Works Department to deal with this matter rather than having to come back to Council because at the next Council meeting, most of these problems will be gone anyway. Doesn't need any of this rhetoric. This is pretty straightforward, putting a procedure in place that allows the administration and the Public Works Committee to get something done to meet the needs of the people. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: I agree with Councillor Swandel, and by the way you can use your old garbage bags or your old blue boxes, fill them up with leaves and they will pick those up and you can keep those forever.

Mr. Speaker: All right. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. We have some Bb-laws, Councillor Vandal. Oh I'm sorry, Councillor.

Councillor Swandel: Recorded in opposition.

Mr. Speaker: All right, got it.

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

Councillor Vandal: (Inaudible)…twelve be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 129/2012.

Councillor Vandal: I will move that B-law 129/2012 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 129/2012.

Councillor Vandal: I will move that the rules be suspended and by-law No. 129/2012 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. Question period for…go ahead, Councillor Havixbeck.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the chair, this summer it was reported in the media that there were three times the number of watermain breaks throughout the city. Almost daily, I am going through my ward reporting watermain breaks. One homeowner had four watermain breaks on their property, lost a 50 year old Elm tree, which we know that the city likely won't replace for up to two years. People have been without water for three or four days in some instances. My question for the chair is, how well is the city managing this?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Well Mr. Speaker, I know that going back to the year 2000, let's go back to '95. In '95 there were 1,100 watermain breaks every year. In 2011 there were 550. We've invested since 1990 over $120 million to renew our watermains. Of course watermains are a very important part of our overall infrastructure deficit, and we all know that there is…we could be doing a better job if we could find more money to invest in watermains and waste water treatment plants, so yes it has been a bad year. I'm told it's because of the lack of precipitation; the ground dries, the earth shifts, and that has that effect on watermains, and the Administration have told me that once the precipitation starts, the watermain situation will settle but certainly any situation please call 3-1-1 to begin with, call our Administration if there is not adequate response and we'll be on it. It's a serious concern.

Councillor Havixbeck: My next question is also related to that. All of these areas, I'm noticing, are 50 years plus in age. I guess I'd like to know what is the infrastructure plan for possible replacement or better addressing this infrastructure issue?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: I believe there is 11 to 12 million dollars every year for watermain renewals in the Department. Is that enough? Absolutely not. But that has been the case going forward over the last 10 years. We have reduced our watermain breaks by half from 12 years ago, and I think we need to do a better job on that. We need to find more resources and that's all part and parcel of the entire…our challenges with waste water and water treatment, those

issues, so next year, I don't have the budget in front of me, but I think there's about 12 million for watermains. Could we use 20 million? Absolutely. Is it going to happen next year? Not likely.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Havixbeck: You say that like, we've gotta get going here, but this is really important. Brown water. For months now, I've had some residents who have had brown water. There's been various news releases issued on this. It's, no matter how you cut it, still disgusting. Whether it's safe to drink and to bathe in and clean our clothes in, it's still disgusting. I want to know what's being done about that.

Councillor Vandal: Again, Mr. Speaker, the Administration tell us, and there was an email going out last week about the reason for the brown water. It's a lack of precipitation, ground shifting, sediment moving out of the pipes and into people's taps. The directions we're given is to run the water for 10 minutes and then try it several minutes after that. If that doesn't work…the long term solution Mr. Speaker is we're waiting for some precipitation, as silly as that sounds, and the Administration are telling us that once that occurs the sediment should go away.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works has the overall responsibility for the Garbage Master Plan, and like Councillor Browaty, I had concerns with that Master Plan, and I know that actually it affects other Departments other than Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works in terms of dealing with how many bins people have to pay for, how many garbage services people have to pay for. But my concern is that the bulk waste issue, while it has gotten much better and I have to say that, although I can't see it, I hear reports from everybody that our back lanes in the North End are looking much better, but we do still have to deal with bulk waste dumping and irresponsible renovators, and so my question to Councillor Vandal is, I can't remember the specific date for a resource recovery centre. I believe it's the next one to be built for the area of the Northwest Winnipeg I believe, and my question is will you talk to the Administration about getting that resource recovery centre put in place as soon as possible, as the Brady Landfill resource recovery centre really is not serving the needs of North Winnipeg, North Kildonan, you know, to simply say take leaves all the way to Brady Landfill. Like…come on, let's get serious right? So would you commit to do that Councillor Vandal?

Councillor Vandal: Absolutely I will. I will follow up with Councillor Eadie. In fact, I took a drive-around with Councillor Eadie several weeks ago in his area to look at the back lanes and that situation, and I'm committed to keeping the communication going with Councillor Eadie and our senior administration.

Mr. Speaker: That's it? No more questions for Councillor Vandal. Seeing none. We have no report from Finance. Oh…on which, from which department, Finance, okay. No report on Finance, no motions, no By-laws but we do have questions. So question for Councillor Fielding go ahead, Councillor Eadie.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman and I know everyone is really hungry but the chair of the Finance Committee is our representative on the NASCO, north of, Mexico to Canada trade corridor and we had the opportunity to participate in a conference and this has definite implications in terms of the financing provisions for the city, the ability to pay for things because economic development is important. I would like to hear from Councillor Fielding, his impressions of the day's meeting and if things are looking good.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you very much. Thank you Councillor Eadie. Councillor Eadie was one of the Councillors that came. I think Councillor Browaty was there, Councillor Vandal, Councillor Nordman, and Councillor Mayes as well came to the conference. NASCO really is a coalition of…you know, from Mexico to the United States to Canada. I actually just got appointed this year. You know, you're around Council long enough, you start to really want to focus in on stuff that really interests you, and the economic development side of things is something that I really enjoy, and so I've really enjoyed my time on the Board there. I got fairly active just in organizing Committee, helping to organize the conference in Winnipeg. Great attendance. We had people coming from Mexico, all over Mexico, economic development agencies, politicians throughout the United States and also through Canada. I think we had over a hundred delegates from outside of the Province. Yesterday we had…there was a Board meeting that was there. You know, the

big part in what I've learned over the last year is Winnipeg is a really big player in this. I mean, we know CenterPort. I think I'm probably the biggest champion on CenterPort. I really believe in what's happening and what can be done if done right. So CenterPort really is a linkage to markets abroad, in my opinion, done right, can really revolutionize our economy. The conference really focused in on ensuring the competitiveness of North America. We've changed the name from NASCO…I won't give you exactly what it stood for before, but we're going to be known as NASCO as we go forward, and really what the focus is is to make North America more competitive on the global market place, and I think some fantastic speakers were out. We had some people that talked about trade from the United States, from Mexico. You had CentrePort, Diane Gray was there, that talked about the project that were there. There was fantastic dialogue. Really interesting things and I've become fascinated with this. The Shell Oil production and what's really happened in North Dakota has just revolutionized what can happen in the corridor that's there. North Dakota right now, I think, it's the second to Texas in terms of oil production through the natural gas, and it's just amazing. There was 600,000 barrels of oil that's there, so not only just from a transportation front, but you've got to get the water, you've got to get chemicals, you've got to get a lot of the building portions that are there, so I think some really great progress was made there. We're very happy that Winnipeg was a focal point for this and they really see what CentrePort's happening there is really a step forward in terms of the whole linkage of the transportation system. It represents close to 71 million people, over a trillion dollars in commerce on a yearly basis, and I know Mayor Katz was, I believe, the one that started the initiative so he deserves some credit to having Canada a part of that. We also established a cities committee so that bigger cities will focus on, because our issues might be different in some rural parts that are there, so I think it's been very successful. It's going on today. If we can get over there for the rest of the day, so I hope that answers your question. Thank you very much Councillor Eadie for coming and sharing some of your ideas and thoughts with it, and so that's…if anyone else has any questions, the conference, I believe, is in San Antonio next year in October, and like I say, it's been kind of a boom and it's great to have people enjoying Winnipeg for all it has. It has been the last three days.

Mr. Speaker: Any other questions? Yeah?

Councillor Eadie: I have a second question related to, sorry to say, garbage. As I understand it, the Assessment Department is the department that's responsible for assessing whether or not a home is a single or duo or triple family home, and through the garbage thing we're going through, a number of households were made single-family homes and there is probably not only maybe a couple hundred of these situations in our City, but these people are ending up having to pay double and triple bills for waste for multiple families when there's only one family living in it, and there's over 200,000 homes that are assessable in this related to garbage. Can I get a commitment from the chair of the Finance Committee to ask the Assessment Department to just trust the individual households that they are a single-family home? It's not a big inspection. They can go and look to make sure there aren't that many people, but the point is that I think it's such a minuscule amount compared to the overall City that I would like you to just ask the Administration to trust those households that they are only single-family and they only have to pay the $50 for their garbage.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Yeah that's an important question. I think it does relate a little bit to the motion if I'm not mistaken, Item number 3, that I think it's been referred to our Administration, but it talks about the Public Service develop a "reasonable accommodation" policy for addresses with multiple dwelling units at the same address or addresses where there is, you know, a discrepancy I guess between the number of people living units on the assessment rolls and the actual situation. So this is under "circumstances will a billing occur for the dwelling unit", so I believe that is incorporated with the review but I can most definitely ask our Assessment and probably coordinate through the Director of Water and Waste to be a part of those discussions because I have gotten some calls myself on that, and with the big changeover it is important.

Councillor Eadie: The last question. Thank you. Councillor Fielding through the Speaker. Actually I didn't have time to read the motions. I got them kind of late, so I didn't realize Item 3, sounds like it deals with the issue but just…I don't know if you know this but when Assessment was looking at some of the homes in my ward, they were talking about people having to remove their kitchen cabinets and remove the electrical and all this stuff that's been there for years. It would cost them thousands of dollars in some cases to renovate it, and so that's why I simply ask the question, you know, we should just trust these families. It's pretty clear that there's, you know, when there is no stove there, there is kitchen cupboards and the electrical's there. You know what? They're not used, we should just trust them. So…but it's good to hear it's an item.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Yeah, I was just was saying I agreed in the end, and you know I think that common sense should prevail with these types of things as opposed to, you know, looking at…there's one example that I heard about, or heard about I guess where someone had rented out a space. This is a previous owner of a house, like I don't know, 10 or 15

years ago and somehow our assessment rolls it was different, but there was a single home for it but yet they're getting two carts and had to pay $2 and that doesn't make any sense. So a part of that I think that's got to be some common sense when we do these things and I think working with Councillor Vandal maybe and the Department we can come up with some sort of common sense solutions to address these things on a one-off basis.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. This question is through you to the chair of Finance as well as the Alternate Service Delivery Committee. I was just wondering if Councillor Fielding has any update for Council on the current status of the Civic Centre Parkade. Is there any opportunity to re-open it or is it going to be part of the whole redevelopment of the site?

Councillor Fielding: Thank you Councillor Browaty. As I understand it, I actually spoke to Randy Topolniski and I believe the engineer's report, I believe it is coming over the next week or so, will be coming back to us, so we'll have more information at that point but I think until they do that review and they come back and establish what our next steps are, we'll have to wait to see what the engineers have to say and at that point, I think what's important is to release that, get all the information out so everyone knows exactly what exactly is going on and what our next steps can be and what the financial implications for these things would be.

Mr. Speaker: That's it. Because I'm up here, I'm going to ask Councillor Steen to move the report of the Governance Committee which he sits on and just introduce the agenda item for next year's schedule of meetings.

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL DATED SEPTEMBER 13, 2012

Councillor Steen: Introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda item 1.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you. Councillor Steen moves adjournment…oh, question.

Councillor Eadie: Question for the chairperson of Governance, the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, there is no question period for Governance so.

Councillor Eadie: There isn't.

Mr. Speaker: No, sorry about that. Phone me. All those…roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 12:32 p.m.