COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, December 12, 2012

The Council met at 9:42 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Mayes.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Our pages today, we're joined by Madison Fedyck of Glenlawn Collegiate who resides in the North Kildonan Ward, Madison. And Midori Matthew who is a St. Mary's Academy student and resides in the Charleswood-Tuxedo Ward. Thank you ladies for being here. And we'd just like to welcome our friends in the gallery. We could also like…the Mayor would like to have a few moments just to have a few words.

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As you mentioned, this will be the last Council meeting of the year. We all know that the festive season is upon us, Mr. Speaker, and I just very much want to wish everyone a very happy holiday season, a very merry Christmas as well as a happy, healthy new year.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, sir. Happy Hanukkah. I likewise would like to extend my greetings and as you all are aware, we'll be getting together for lunch, either after this meeting or in the middle of this meeting, well, that'll be your decision, I guess, to see how long we go today. There's one last chance for you to sign up for Operation Red Nose on the 20th. So come on out and help us help some folks. So I'll just make that extension.

MINUTES

Mr. Speaker: We would like to adopt the minutes from the previous meeting. Councillor Gerbasi moves the meeting minutes of November 14th and 28th. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have no delegations as the list stands so I guess we will move right into Executive Policy Committee meeting, November the 28th.

REPORT "A" OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED NOVEMBER 28, 2012

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent Agenda Items 1 to 5.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none being stood down, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. The report, sir, of December the 5th.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED DECEMBER 5, 2012

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 10.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none being stood down, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have with us today a, results I guess of the meeting that was held this morning at nine o'clock. Mayor Katz.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 12, 2012**

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the rule be suspended and that Items 1 to 9 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated December 12th of 2012 be considered.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour in standing it down or suspending the rules? Opposed? Carried.

Item 1 – Citizen Member Appointments – Committees, Boards and Commissions

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

Item 2 – Loan Guarantee Increase – CentreVenture Development Corporation

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor Mayes would like to…yeah, Mayor Katz, would you introduce that? And we have one…

Mayor Katz: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief and then I'll be happy to listen to what Councillor Mayes says. Mr. Speaker, this is a situation where as you know, we've been trying to clean up our downtown and basically make sure that it's a safe environment for everyone. One of the challenges was some of the hotels in the downtown area and this is one of them that has been identified out of the five. As you know, we have moved forward on the St. Regis and now it's the Carlton Inn, as well as the Carlton Inn is definitely part of the overall development for a future hotel and possibly some other development. This is basically a short-term situation where this will give them the funds to basically acquire the property and then the property will be sold to the private sector and those funds will be repaid. So I'll be happy to listen to Councillor Mayes and any other Councillor.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes

Councillor Mayes: Now that that clarifies one of my concerns in terms of the repayment from the private sector so. That had been the question I wanted to ask.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, yes.

Councillor Orlikow: In theory, I definitely support it. I guess my question though is why is CentreVenture playing the middle role? And why isn't a private sector just buying the property? I'm not sure what…why the role of CentreVenture and then CentreVenture flips it back to the private sector? Why isn't the private sector jumping in first? I'm not sure, I'm sure there's something. If you could explain that to me, that would be great.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker through you to Councillor Orlikow I appreciate the question. Mr. Speaker, the realities are and I think we've all seen that CentreVenture has played the facilitator on many properties. I could name many but in the interest of time, there's no problem. CentreVenture is also able to act in a manner different than Council and able to basically sit down and do deals. The whole idea of this which I think everybody knows, is that a hotel has to be built on that site, and that is part of the equation for the funding of the Convention Centre. It fills that gap of approximately $16 million from incremental taxes and basically, what's happening is CentreVenture, through its board, deals with the private sector, is able to facilitate, get things moving much quicker. This is also part of the shed district that has been approved by Council as well as the incremental tax that has been approved by Council and the Provincial Government and as I say, they can move at a much quicker rate to get things done whereas Council would take a lot longer and they've been very successful on many projects of this ilk.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions, comments? In close if you like, Mr. Mayor

Mayor Katz: I think it's all been said, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Thank you. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 3 – 2013 Local Improvement Interest Rates

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 4 – Reactivation of Local Improvement Taxes Deferred on Roll No. 14098674000 (King Edward Street) pursuant to By-Law No. 114/2008

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 5 – Reactivation of Local Improvement Taxes Deferred on 2584 King Edward Street pursuant to By-law No. 56/2009

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 6 – Repayment of Debt in Winnipeg Enterprises Corporation using Entertainment Funding Tax Revenue by the Winnipeg Football Club

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 7 – Memorandum of Agreement – United Fire Fighters of Winnipeg, Local 867

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none, all in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 8 – Municipal Garbage and Sewage Servicing – Shoal Lake No. 40 First Nation

Mr. Speaker: Stand this one down. Councillor Orlikow. Mayor Katz would you like to open it?

Mayor Katz: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a situation where we are working in conjunction with Band Lake No. 40, as far as their…basically their waste and we have a scenario where we do have the ability, where they will ferry their waste over to our track; we will then take it and dispose of it properly. I should also let you know in advance that this is something that we will be getting compensated for as well. So, this is a deal that's been put together by water and waste and the members of Band Lake 40 and I would be happy to trying to address any questions the Councillor may have.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. I guess as service agreements go, this one's not so bad in regards that I don't think it's going to drain out Winnipeg population to move to Shoal Lake. However, I am concerned about two factors here. First one is I think the city is getting involved in some, in a conflict that's happening in the area between Band 39 and Band 40. And also with the Federal Government who should be taking responsibility for this. So I am quite concerned about the City getting involved in that type of conflict and more so I'm also concerned about the fact of…we're talking about this is going to help the water shed for the area. However, as I read this, barges or whatever methods, it hasn't been determined yet, are going to take the waste, human waste and garbage waste, closer to the intake valve to get on to the train to come to Winnipeg. I'm not sure if I have full confidence of the safety and how they're going to transport this. It hasn't really been done yet. So we're going to be taking that waste closer to the intake valve. I guess my biggest worry is that they don't transload it off the barge correctly, falls in the water, contaminates the water. We're getting closer to our intake valve. So I guess maybe my belief that this is getting better for Winnipeg is not a hundred percent resolved. So I believe A, that we're getting involved in something we probably shouldn't be getting involved in, in internal conflict in the area and B, I'm not a hundred percent confident this is actually going to be environmentally good for Winnipeg. So, in that regards, I wouldn't support this.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you. I know this is late coming to this council and we probably haven't had a chance to read the report, but I just want to take a minute to read part of page 4 of the report which says that shoal lake First Nation Band 40 landfill was closed on June 1, 2012. Shoal Lake No. 39 owns road access to Shoal Lake No. 40's ferry crossing and is not permitting Shoal Lake 40 municipal garbage and sewage to pass through its territory. Shoal Lake No. 40 is

attempting to arrange a temporary holding site for the garbage…for the garbage in the town site. Sewage septic fields are being maintained but the holding tanks will eventually need to be pumped out. And Shoal Lake No. 40 is working with Aboriginal Affairs on the long term solution to this, so I don't see this being an arrangement that's going to last forever. But I think given that the landfill was closed on June 1st, given that there's some real need for help here, I think it's certainly, it's prudent for us to go in and offer our services. It's certainly the neighbourly thing to do and I don't think we're going to be there forever. So, of course, our engineers and our experts are going to be monitoring the situation from start to finish. So, I appreciate Councillor Orlikow's concern, but we're told that safety, of course, is the first order of business moving forward and that this is a good short-term solution but it's not going to be a long term solution.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none. Councillor, Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I do appreciate the comments and the questions. I think the key thing that everybody has to realize, Mr. Speaker, as Councillor Vandal has said, this is a short term scenario and the reason it's being done, quite simply, is to protect the environment and to protect the water supply, and this is exactly what's been recommended by the experts, so there is validity to doing this Mr. Speaker, so I certainly hope Council will support it.

Mr. Speaker: Including the comments, all those in favour? Opposed? Councillor Orlikow is opposed.

Mr. Speaker: Motion carried. Thank you.

Item 9 – Service-Sharing Agreements with Neighbouring Municipalities

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, just the other day, there was a Council seminar on this so I'll just wait to hear what any Councillors have to say and I'll try to address the issues then.

Mr. Speaker: First up, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I appreciate there was a Council seminar yesterday and I appreciate this is a difficult issue to discuss because of legal implications, but we are voting on the matter today. I read in the paper this morning that the Free Press somehow had access to information that the rest of, many members of Council, I don't know anybody who had access to it but I can tell you, a number of Councillors did not have access to the letter that the Free Press had access to, so I just put that concern on the record that you know, I'd like to know how that happened. But I'd also like to know what is in that letter and from what I've read in the Free Press, from what I read in the Free Press, it was presented a little bit differently than what we were told at our seminar in terms of the seriousness of the issue and I'll just leave it at that, given the legal situation. So, I just wanted to put on the record my concern about you know, the integrity of our information and the transparency of our information because as a member of Council who's voting on something like this, I actually support not selling our water so I'm fine with what we're doing today but I would appreciate if we're going to have an information seminar that it provides us with the information and I'd like to be on the level of information on the receiving end as the Winnipeg Free Press is. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Just for future reference and Councillor Swandel reminded me but we didn't want to interrupt you Councillor Gerbasi and this is for everyone's concern. Articles in the newspaper are not relevant to what we're discussing in this chamber, so just, we shouldn't allow that in the discussion point. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: My comments don't deal directly with Councillor Gerbasi's concerns, just I wanted to talk about this item briefly since this is one of the very first items I voted on last year when I was sworn in almost a year ago to the day and somebody then took the opportunity to denounce me for voting for sprawl. So it's important to remember what we're trying to do here is take some existing infrastructure and extend it a bit to service West St. Paul. Parts, that area, West St. Paul where it meets the perimeters is actually closer to the building we're standing in then the large chunks of my ward inside the perimeter not to mention the expanse that's outside the perimeter. So I think what we're trying to do here is do something environmental to extend the benefits of sewer and hopefully at some later day, water though that's a little more contentious out to some area that don't have City sewer and water right now. It's not about voting for sprawl. This is a little more complex than some of the critics have said in that if we can promote that sort of getting on the city water, the city sewer for those areas, there's an economic benefit but there's also a certainly environmental benefit and I want to commend Deepak Joshi, our COO who's talked to me and has agreed that sometime in the new year, we'll try to talk to the people who are in the city but not on City water and City sewer and see if it's economic to maybe extend that out and get those environment benefits. Maybe it isn't environmentally possible or economically possible but we should

be trying I think to get more people on City sewer and City water if we can possibly do it and this is part of that initiative. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah, I am, again on a service sharing agreement, I didn't support it before and I was one of those guys who had mentioned about urban sprawl, exurban sprawl we call this one because actually it's even beyond our city boundaries and again, this is better. But when I first got elected, I started meeting different developers and see how things develop in the City of Winnipeg. The general consensus I was told, just follow the pipes. You want to know where development is happening, just follow the pipes. If you follow that, we can't develop unless there's pipes. Now we have pipes heading out into the southwest quadrant of the city, we'll be seeing a lot of development happen there. So again, it extends to the same result if you extend your pipes to outside your borders, that provides more development opportunity for rural municipalities that are growing at least double the rate the City of Winnipeg is growing. This is in percentage wise. Every person that decides to moves out, and not…again there's always going to be those people that want to choose to live, Peter, Paul, Mary. That choose to live outside of the City of Winnipeg and that's their own mistake, they should live within Winnipeg. There's lots of great things here to offer. However, this will only encourage those other people who are kind of contemplating "do I want to live with the neighbourhoods when I live now or do I want to be able to easily access Winnipeg, live outside of the city, have my regional roads built so I can quickly whip in and commute and have that kind of service, pick up all the services within the city and then head back out again?" Again that's that middle group that I'm worried about that are making those choices and again we always want to allow choices but we need to be creating an atmosphere where that choice is to stay; where they say you know what, I don't want to go live out in West St. Paul. My neighbourhood here is revitalized, it has exciting shops, it has, I can walk around to restaurants; it's that kind of atmosphere that I like, single family houses, beautiful tree canopies, whatever maybe, whatever neighbourhood makes neighbourhood special. That's really where I think our, still our focus should still remain, making our individual neighbourhoods grow rather than helping the rural municipalities grow, we should be focusing on the neighbourhoods. So again, if we did put in some regional roads and we're maybe, we're enhancing our local neighbourhoods, I'd have a little easier time with this. I have a little easier time with this because it doesn't include the water so again, the biggest problem we do have is tact differential between the two parties. They pay a lot less taxes than we pay in the City of Winnipeg. It's also a lot cheaper to build out in the rural municipalities than it is to infill in Winnipeg. So again, these disadvantages Winnipeg has for growing are only exacerbated by extending water or in this case, sewer services out. That said, I don't live in a bubble. I understand that we have a capital region. I understand there's a lot of provincial pressure to grow that I also understand that it is growing. It is a fact, we have places in Transcona that are living right next door to each other, Springfield, same thing. So I understand that we have to find a way to work together. But again, I don't see that packaged together. I see it as doing one off things here and there. So again, I don't have a lot of confidence in the service sharing agreement. Again, we're quite explicit, many of us beginning, the last service sharing agreement where we said whoa, there are some legal issues here, we were assured that there's no legal issues. It's all our opinion is fine on that one, again so I'm not really full of confidence that this process is going to be moving forward and I would say in a way that would benefit Winnipeggers so again, it's getting closer and I know we have to be working together, but I still, I'm not confident this is still the way to go so I won't be supporting it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make sure that we understand fully what it is that we're talking about here. We're talking about the extension of services to some specific areas under specific criteria, in this case, there's amendments to our old policy. I get a little apprehensive when I hear terms like ex-urban sprawl being batted around. I want to remind all my colleagues that some of the challenges we have of having enough developable land within our own boundaries that would service for 25 years. We've seen explosive growth in new housing development and we know that we need to be creating opportunities right now outside of our boundaries because quite frankly, we don't have a good capital region policy. We don't have a strong, I believe, strong standing policy from the Province as far as where we should be growing and how we should be growing and expanding our boundaries. Most of other jurisdictions, prairie cities: Saskatoon, Regina, Calgary, Edmonton, you would see the provincial governments taking stronger actions as far as redefining the boundaries to ensure that we are operating within our boundaries. So we're faced with some difficult decisions here and we have to make them in all of our best interests. Mind you, the people that we represent do not all want to live in the 1920s neighbourhoods or 1910 neighbourhoods. Councillor Orlikow said this; he doesn't live in a bubble. We realize that young families they like to be in new neighbourhoods with new schools and new community centres. So the term ex-urban sprawl is easy one to bat around, it's more related to sort of a trend that happened in the United States with onset of interstate highways and there's sort of people were able to jump 10 miles outside of urban districts and build these sort of 10,000, 20,000 little homes, little clusters that gave them whatever benefit whether it was hiding from the evils of the city or lower taxes or the ability to go out and do whatever they wanted in the natural areas around there. So let's not lose sight of what we're doing here. We, you know,

the legal opinion stuff, I think we are still just fine as far as the legal opinion from what I understand. The issue that's come up is not one of the legal specifics; it's the fact that international joint commission has now come to table, it wants to take a look at this. We welcome that. We believe we're still on the right side of the issue and the joint commission wants to look at it, let the commission look at it. So look at the report, understand what it says. And I encourage you all to go back and read the original Greater Winnipeg Water District Act and what it says, and how it's been changed over the years because if we were sticking closely to what was originally done, I can tell you right now, Tuxedo wouldn't have water and sewer. So and you know, if we were to grow the boundaries of the city further, right now would we actually have an issue? I don't think that it would be. I don't believe that there is one today. So let's not lose sight of what the real issues are here. A lot of it you know, everybody I believe in this chamber is fully supportive of CentrePort. A lot of what's driving this is the need to get some servicing out to the CentrePort lands that are outside of our jurisdiction because it's the most readily developable land as far as the cost of putting the infrastructure and I think the difference in cost is something like 20 million in those areas compared to 50 or 60 million to get, to loop over to the city land. I stand to be corrected on that. I haven't looked at the numbers in a long time, but you know if we could have those employment lands and you think we're challenged on residential lands you should see how challenged we are for employment lands. If we can get employment lands immediately adjacent to the city in play, I think it benefits us all. And when you're trying to do economic development, I think we all just received a copy of our economic development strategy the other day. We did try to do that having access to the proper lands are extremely important and having those lands properly serviced are even more important, so let's not lose sight of what it is that we're doing here. We're not trying to just go off willy-nilly and build something all over the wonderful prairie that we live on. This is orderly, this does make sense and I believe it's a good way to move forward.

Mr. Speaker: Anyone, further? Oh, Ross, sorry.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. I have to say that this agreement is something that I had to seriously consider in terms of how it actually is benefiting the environment that we actually as a city extend our services to West St. Paul to help avert the contamination of the soil and having repercussions for the environment. However, I have a real problem with extending services out to, outside of the city of Winnipeg into the capital region for one main reason and that is, is that we have a whole bunch of costs here in the city that are not being covered even under this agreement. Yes, we do receive some revenue that we will be able to use to fix some roads and that sort of, those kind of issues but really, this agreement doesn't help us deal with the real problem of…our city keeps cutting service because we have not made the right decisions in terms of being able to provide adequate services that people are paying for and the capital region under this agreement is still not going to be helping us pay for the infrastructure and the services that everybody uses. The transit service for example, which is overburdened and we can't, we seem to be shrinking the number of stops and shrinking the number of bus routes that we have. This agreement while it does protect the environment on the outskirts of our city, it does not help us deal with our real problems in terms of infrastructure and fixing our roads and streets. Which, if you are expanding and allowing West St. Paul to expand in terms of who moves out there, all you're doing is providing an option for people to not stay in the City of Winnipeg and pay property taxes and frontage levies that go to fixing our roads and streets. So I can't support this. In terms of CentrePort, I would be supporting an agreement there because CentrePort is actually going to provide, well hopefully, whoever sets up their businesses in the Rosser Area aren't bringing in temporary workers once they set up but one would hope that people will receive employment opportunities, live within the City of Winnipeg and just take that simple commute to CentrePort or live close to CentrePort and have jobs and actually pay taxes in the City of Winnipeg so that we can afford to pay for our infrastructure. So that is a very different kind of agreement than what we are doing here. So I won't be supporting this motion today for the reason that we need the capital region to start throwing in and chipping in to help us pay for our infrastructure and our service issues inside the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker. I just…I wasn't going to speak but then I heard Councillor Eadie's speech so I felt I had to speak. You know, let's be very clear about this, Mr. Speaker. One of the major reasons why we're doing this is because of a request we have received from the provincial government. The provincial government knows full well that they have botched the capital region file. They have completely botched it and it goes right back to the Paul Thomas Report when the first, when the government, this government got elected originally under Premier Gary Doer and appointed professor Paul Thomas to head up the capital region commission and came back with a whole bunch of recommendations and the government decided to stick it on a shelf and ignore. The reality is that development has been approved through municipal plans by the provincial government whether it be the…used to be called the department of intergovernmental affairs, now it's called local government. They've approved municipal plans in these municipalities to allow for development without proper and adequate levels of service to service that development. And then they realized that they have a problem. They're part of this. It's not just the municipal councils that have approved this, the Provincial Ministry actually approved the development plans. They have come to us, "can you help us deal with a situation where we have now residential developments with inadequate water supply and inadequate sewer services." So Mr. Speaker,

let's be very clear, one of the major factors that's driving this is the request from the provincial N.D.P. Government before us today. Number one, that's West St. Paul. Number two, Rosser, same thing. It's their CentrePort. It was the Doer legacy of CentrePort which drove this, Mr. Speaker, to provide services into CentrePort. Rosser does not have the capability of providing sewer and water services into CentrePort, Mr. Speaker. They came to us. Again, we are trying to assist and accommodate the provincial government in their request. I'm not too sure if…reference to the transit service, we've actually been making huge investments now back into transit after decades of not doing it. We've increased the size of the fleet, first time in decades. We are hiring more bus drivers than ever before to handle more buses on the road. Is it enough? Absolutely not, Councillor Eadie, you're absolutely correct. We could be doing more of that but the reality is we're going in the right direction. We're reinvesting Winnipeg Transit now but let's be very clear why this is before us today, okay. This is coming, this is a request from the Provincial Government to assist them in areas which yeah, mistakes were made and hopefully now they will be able to clean up by having out of this. Unfortunate because of the other issue that the water can't be supplied. That's very unfortunate but that's a separate issue. At least the sanitary service with regards to the sewage lines could be, we have the capacity in the North End Treatment Plant, we know that. We have a lot of capacity and therefore it makes sense to extend the lines. So those are my comments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise today and I guess I have to show my partisanship in this in the fact that I'm a chairman of the partnership of the Manitoba Capital Region and I represent the City along with Councillor Browaty. And this really is an issue that I think for us as kind of the big dog in this story, shows the degree of support for and we've already talked about being good neighbours here today, as being a good neighbour. Unfortunately for the folks of West St. Paul, they've been forced by the Clean Environment Commission because they have a problem with failing septic fields in their community. There's not a lot of them. There's approximately 3,000 homes in that municipality but a large percentage of their septic fields are in trouble. And if I have the choice between them hooking up to our pipe or them building a lagoon right next door to the Perimeter Highway inside the Perimeter Highway if that were the case, I would select the pipe option every time. Also, with Rosser being just a municipality of less than 2,000 people and the portion of their community that we're going to service through CentrePort, 60 percent of which is in the RM of Rosser, I think it's only prudent for our own protection that what goes into Rosser will in fact affect particularly St. James Ward and St. Charles Ward, that we would make the right decision and support that and allow that infrastructure to be developed. At this point we've also had requests from others within the partnership to have them be considered. And I think this displays a degree of trust which we have not had within this organization for a very long time going right back to the early day when Mayor Susan Thompson, with colleagues Rodney Burns and Bob Stefaniuk from Richot really put together the original format of the Mayors and Reeves of the Capital Region. We've had many fits and starts over the years as to how successful that organization is going to be and this is one project that seems to have, from the standpoint of the other partners, the other 14 entities that exist within the partnership, a huge degree of support and I think it will allow us to go forward and build the trust in the future. So I just want you to know that I certainly for one vote will be supporting this project and when other opportunities come down the pipe, no pun intended, we will hopefully explore those at the time and make sure that we are good neighbours. Remember, there's 700,000 of us and about 60,000 of them. You know, we're not going to be overrun by other members of the partnership of the Capital Region. So I would ask you to give your serious consideration and support to this today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nordman. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Yes. I was actually as well wasn't going to speak but I thought I would raise and add a few points to this. I know it is Christmas session here, we're trying to get going with things but anyway, with the environmental piece I think that is a really important piece. We know and Councillor Nordman chronicled exactly what's going on quite effectively I think in terms of some of the environmental issues that are being faced outside of the City of Winnipeg. We know these are serious issues. We know that we have a capacity to service this. So I think just in terms of the environmental side of the equation whether it's a good neighbour policy or not or just in terms of a good Manitoba policy to ensure our sustainability in terms of the environment, it does make sense in terms of the extension from what's going on. If you have the extension of sewer systems, it would make more sense in terms of the environmental impacts that are going on right now so I think that's a very important part. You know there's always arguments of urban sprawl. I think that's the issue that comes up all the time here does this create urban sprawl? You know, for me, it's…what I get concerned of you know, when I hear this is why aren't we willing to compete? I think Winnipeg is the best in the region. You see what's going on in our city, you see the great services, the amenities we have. There are some great projects that are going on. There's the Assiniboine Park and a whole bunch of different quality of life factors, the City of Winnipeg has. You have active transportation, you have a number of other things that I don't think they have in some of the rural settings that are there. I think there's a good amount of people out there in the City of Winnipeg that wouldn't even consider moving out. I mentioned this before my in-laws live out in the RM of Springfield in Oakbank, beautiful place you know, would I consider moving out outside of the City of Winnipeg? Absolutely not because I love living in the City of

Winnipeg. There's great amenities, there's great things that are going on here; there's great momentum. I personally just do not believe that there's going to be some massive exodus of the City of Winnipeg to some of these surrounding areas if we somehow hook up their sewer and water systems. Obviously water, we're not talking about here. I think the environmental impact speaks for itself and anyone that's serious about that and serious about the environment can see the environment is an issue more than just the City of Winnipeg. You should not be just concerned with the City of Winnipeg, you should be concerned about the environment in and itself. I think that there is a process that's in place in terms of the water as Councillor Wyatt had mentioned and that's being looked at. We've asked for an approach that's going to make sure that the hearing happens in a very quick facet to make sure that we can that we can provide those services that are there. There's also the element, two different points here in terms of choice. People have a choice; not everyone is going to live in the downtown and it kind of goes to the urban sprawl verses where you're going to live. Well, you know what, there's a lot of people who'd like to live in the suburbs and like living in that environment. I mean, I quite enjoy living that. My neighbours enjoy living in the suburbs. There's some great things that are going on in new developments, Waverly West and somehow it's always went into this urban verses you know downtown and infill development argument. I think you can have both because people want choice. They want to have an ability to live in Sage Creek. They want to have an ability to live in the Waverley West. Some people are going to want to live downtown. They are going to want to enhance that and that's great for them but I think providing choice is very important for our citizens and I think that makes a stronger community for Winnipeg, a fuller community if you will. The last point I want to mention briefly is the CentrePort. CentrePort, and we all know and I think there's buy-in from all levels of government in terms of the aspects of this. This is right in my backyard and I can tell you how important I think this is in terms of the future development for the area and I think anything we can do to enhance that, you've got to think beyond just you know, this is our bubble, this is the City of Winnipeg, you've got to think globally what's going to make sense for the community and just on the economic development basis, CentrePort, I think can really revolutionize what's happening in our city in terms of the transportation, in terms of trade that can provide great jobs in the City of Winnipeg. And if a part of it is outside the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg verses inside, you can't just put this blocker on and say we're just going to look at it from a City's perspective, you've got to look at it from Manitoba perspective or a global perspective. What that's going to mean to our community. So that's why I agree with this report, I hope everything falls into line in terms of the water and that's a little bit outside of our hands and we'll see how the you know, we want to make sure that those decisions are made in a timely fashion, so we can move forward with it. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you and Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much. Some very good comments, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I just want to share some factual information. You heard the fact that there is growth in the Capital Region. There is growth today, there was growth yesterday and there will continue to be growth and that's without having a service sharing agreement. It's going to go regardless. The problem that we have that was pointed out earlier that growth right now, there is absolutely no policy, no controls and the City of Winnipeg has zero input into that planning as a result of the carte blanche they were given by previous provincial government. Now the realities are, Mr. Speaker, in this situation, guess what? We will have a say in planning in the future which is extremely important. As well as the added benefit that some of that revenue will be going towards our regional roads which is something we've been talking about when we talk about infrastructure. And the other scenario is, Mr. Speaker, I heard some Councillors talk about the environment. In some areas in the Capital Region, there is raw sewage floating in the ditches and I guarantee you that Councillor Orlikow knows where that ends up. That's not a positive scenario. So if we care about the environment we should be stepping up to the plate, there's no doubt about that. And it's interesting how some will try to separate West St. Paul from Rosser. They're exactly the same, exactly the same. There is no difference. The only difference that exists is that the taxpayers have invested close to a quarter of a billion dollars in CentrePort and if we don't have service sharing there is going to be some real, real issues and concerns. So if you look at the big picture, this is a step forward and I certainly hope that Council will support this. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Recorded vote. All those in favour will rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Orlikow and Smith.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Deputy Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 4.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion carried.

Mr. Speaker: Congratulations on your maiden voyage. We have no motions today. Mayor Katz, we have a by-law.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – FIRST READING ONLY

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that By-law No. 147/2012 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 147/2012.

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

Mayor Katz: I would move that By-law No. 100/2012 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 100/2012.

Mayor Katz: And I would move that By-law No. 100/2012 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker. I move that the following bylaws be read a first time By-law No. 149/2012 and By-law No. 150/2012.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 149/2012, By-law No. 150/2012.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker, I move that by-laws numbered 149/2012 and 150/2012 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered No. 149/2012 and 150/2012.

Mayor Katz: And I move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 149/2012 and 150/2012 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question period. Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Smith, Councillor Mayes. Go ahead.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There seems to be deterioration in the intergovernmental relationship between the City and the Province. Based…things have been tense for a while but it seems to be getting worse based on what I'm hearing and seeing out in the community. The Province is a powerful funder to the City and we are partners in many important areas including public transit. We have all sorts of asks into the Province for everything from transit funding to Dutch Elm Disease measures. Yet the approach to intergovernmental conversations either directly or indirectly seems to be one of confrontation, derision and in some cases insult hurling. Mr. Speaker, the Mayor is

Council's intergovernmental representative and has the role of negotiating with our biggest funding partner. What approach will the Mayor take in going forward in terms of discussions with the Province? Will it be diplomacy or simply continuing the current level of hostility?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi, many innuendos but I have no idea what she's specifically referring to. So it would've been nice if she made some specifics but I will say this to you, Mr. Speaker. Less than five minutes ago, this Council moved forward on service sharing as Councillor Wyatt said, a request from the Provincial Government and it was Councillor Gerbasi and others who voted against it but thank God, the rest of Council did support it. I can tell you Mr. Speaker, I have had meetings, several meetings this week with many Ministers on many topics and we are moving forward and we do have a good working relationship. So it would be very nice if maybe Councillor Gerbasi could get specific and share something and maybe I can address it in detail.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Well, okay. I guess it's…diplomacy is a delicate subject and I didn't want to bring up specific insults that have been hurled. I think many people are aware of what happened at the AMM Convention; the speech by the Deputy Mayor. You know, the Mayor is the one who speaks to the Province but the Deputy Mayor is your representative. And, so I think you know, I think people are aware that there were some pretty unpleasantries in terms of diplomacy there so I guess I'm just asking if you are going to continue with the same sort of approach, I think you can say it all you want that everything is wonderful and we just passed service sharing but the reality is that's not what I'm hearing in the community; that's not what I'm hearing from out there: that things are wonderful between the Province and the City. I don't think they've ever been worse and I'd like you as the Mayor to tell us how you are going to address that and how you're going to improve things.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, it's certainly appropriate for me to speak for myself. As you can appreciate any member of council can make any comment they want including Councillor Gerbasi. We all have that opportunity. We're elected officials. But, I can assure Councillor Gerbasi if she were to speak to a Minister Ashton. Any one of the Ministers, okay, Minister Lemieux, any Minister and ask them if there's a good working relationship with them and the Mayor, I think she'd be surprised to find out that there is. So maybe that would be the appropriate thing and if that's not the case, I would appreciate that being shared with me because I can assure you that is the case. And I'm not exactly privy because I wasn't at the convention exactly what she's referring to. Have I heard stories? Of course, I have heard that.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Gerbasi: The reality is, what I am saying Mr. Mayor and I…is that there is a reality out there. I disagree. You know, I do talk to various people. I don't want to discuss…this is an issue of diplomacy so it's very difficult to raise here. I don't know where else to raise it. The Mayor appoints people in high positions to go out and they…what they say has a lot of pull, and so to just say it's a member of Council just speaking, I think there's some accountability for intergovernmental relationship and what I'm asking as the person who's responsible for our intergovernmental relationships, are you going to do something to improve them because they need improving. You can trust me on that, you can deny or you can say I'm making this up. I'm telling you, I'm…I travel in a lot of circles and this is what I'm hearing from a lot of high level people not necessarily on all sides of the political spectrum that the relationship needs improvement and I'm asking you if you have any intention of doing something to improve it.

Mr. Speaker: Response from the Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, you know once again, I can tell you that just last week I was in discussion with the Minister over a specific project and they thanked me for assisting them just last week I met with Minister Ashton and Lemieux and they thanked us in working together. So it would be nice if you are dealing with something as opposed to dealing in a grey area, we can try to make it black and white and if there is a specific Minister or elected official that is saying what the Council is saying then please share that with me and I'd be happy to meet with them. You know, I'm not sure whether this is being expanded or it's all about the AMM Convention because that seems to be referred to over and over again. So I would very much appreciate Councillor Gerbasi identifying specifics and I would be happy to talk to the individuals involved as opposed to rumours, innuendos, comments. Those are made all the time but let's deal with the people that we're dealing with face-to-face. You know is it a Minister Rondeau or is it a Minister Ashton, is it Lemieux, is it Oswald? Where is the problem? Is it the Premier? Because you know what, just last week, Mr. Speaker, I was at an

event with the Premier and things were A-Okay. Does that mean he may have been upset about other comments? He never brought them up to me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Mayor, earlier today you referred to it as the Christmas period and every year you've held a party where you invite Councillors and department heads to it. Are you having such a party this year and if so, where it will be held?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I thank Councillor Smith for that question. I know when he comes to the parties, he loves to take home the leftover food so I can understand why he wants to know when it's taking place but the realities are, Mr. Speaker, when that is done, every councillor will get the invitation at the same time Mr. Speaker, I can assure you of that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Second question? Cathay House didn't come up? No. Anyway, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'll try to elevate things perhaps from that. Some months ago, Mr. Mayor, you've been a champion of opportunities for aboriginal youth for you to talk about in your state of the city address. Some months ago, the Councillors on the Riel Community Committee got a letter from the Louis Riel School Division that talked about the school board had recently been made aware of the City of Winnipeg Aboriginal Scholarship and Service Awards Program offered to Winnipeg School Divisions. Students, Louis Riel School Divisions has approximately 1200 self-declared aboriginal students. We believe many of these young people would greatly benefit from the same opportunities offered to students in the Winnipeg School Division by the City of Winnipeg. Perhaps that came in, I note that Councillor Orlikow was a trustee a few years ago with the School Division so we'll give him some credit for working on that program being extended to Winnipeg School Division but my question is, are there steps being taken, are there…being looked at within the city to see if we can expand that scholarship program out beyond Winnipeg School Division and have it available in other school divisions?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Mayes. I do thank him for the question and I can share with him that the Public Service believes that the program should be expanded, that's number one, to address the specific question. Number two, since this was created by Council, any changes would have to come back to Council so obviously they would have to be a report because this is something I believe that they're in concurrence with and will be working on to move it forward.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I look forward to seeing that come up. I'm sure there are budget implications but my second question has to do with a media story. But we're not used to the term, media story, we'll say census report from late October which talked about Tagalog, now being the language, the second most commonly used language at home in the City of Winnipeg. I ask Councillor Pagtakhan to coach me on the pronunciation. There is a Tagalog being the language of the Philippines, fastest growing language in Canada according to the census over the past five years. I know we've made some great strides in French Language Services under Councillor Vandal's term as the Coordinator of French Language Services but I wonder Mr. Mayor if you could report back at some point to Council on what services are available through the City of Winnipeg in Tagalog and other languages. I know the city staff had made on the website, the garbage guide, the garbage and recycling guide you, there's a reference, there's a, in Tagalog there and I picked up a multilingual leaflet at the finest library in the system, the St. Vital library and they talked in here about books being available in Tagalog, in Filipino at various different branches so if we could at some future point get a report back on this issue, not at the expense of French, not at the expenses of the aboriginal languages but what is the City doing to recognize this growth in the Tagalog? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker. Through you to Councillor Mayes as the Councillor is aware, French is an official language along with English for our country. There's no doubt about the phenomenal growth in the City of Winnipeg within the Filipino community. I believe there is close to 60,000 at this stage of the game and I think we're very blessed to have them here. And I think the administration does, in certain situations and Councillor Mayes just pointed out a few of them. Well, we do make services available in several languages, there are several others in the waste management scenario where we made it available in several languages and I would be happy to look into and see if there is anything further

that is being planned at this particular point in time. I don't have a specific answer but it's something I'd be happy to look into.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. The Winnipeg Public Library provides books in many different languages and I'm wondering if the Mayor is aware of the Winnipeg Public Libraries reaching out to bring in different language materials for people to borrow from the library?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of everything that goes on within there. I know they do have a borrowing direction. I'd be happy to look and see what more services but I do appreciate the Councillor sharing that information with us. As you know, the public libraries are there to service all citizens in as many languages as possible and I'm sure there's always room for improvement Mr. Speaker, as well but then again it's also based on funds available.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thank you Speaker Nordman. Recently on the news the issue of dealing with crime came up and they are talking about what other cities are doing in terms of moving forward in prevention and I would point out that it was the pleasure of myself to be around in 2005 for the budget consultations when Mayor Katz decide to add to the grants to other organizations the Graffiti Gallery who provides a lot of prevention ability in our communities. My question to the mayor is, with his person in charge of the budget, Deputy Mayor Wyatt, is the Mayor looking at trying to expand our grants to other organizations and organizations who are making a real impact in our communities and trying to grow that in our 2013 budget?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, as Councillor Eadie is aware, we certainly have made significant investments in organizations had through grants and the graffiti situation was certainly one of them. There are many, many, many other organizations that we provide funding through grants and they provide a very good service for us. The other side of the coin is, Mr. Speaker, you can't continue to increase unless you have the revenue coming in, as I believe the good Councillor knows, is that our revenues are limited through basically you know, property taxes and user fees. We've been you know, doing everything we can to get consumption taxes and get a share of consumption taxes so far that is not been the case but if it were the case, we could be doing a lot more. So any decision we make is based on revenue and obviously our revenue has to increase because our expenses continue to increase.

Mr. Speaker: Last question:

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Given the Mayor believes he has a good relationship in the intergovernmental discussions, ongoing discussions with the province, would the Mayor commit to asking the province for us to be able to utilize, I think it's approximately $25 million that we pay to the province for social services and would the Mayor be committed to asking the province if we could utilize some of that money ourselves as at the municipal level we're closer to the ground and utilize some of that money for expanding our grants to other organization that are having an impact in our crime situation?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I think that you and all the Councillors are aware that over the last few years we've been asking the provincial government for a share of the pie, a fair share of the pie. We've asked for the gas tax and a refund of the provincial sales tax and asked to get something from the motor vehicle fee you pay considering all those cars drive on our roads which are deteriorating, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, and I think we all know the answer has been no to date. And we also know that when the…what most people don't know that the City of Winnipeg pays the province approximately $25 million and at the request of Councillor Eadie I would be more than happy to send a letter making that request and maybe this is the one we get lucky on.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? Seeing none, we'll conclude question period for Executive Policy Committee and the Mayor, and we'll move on to the Standing Committee, Policy Committee for Protection and Community Services. Councillor Fielding. I'm sorry… Councillor Browaty?

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED NOVEBMER 19, 2012**

Item 1 –Award of Contract for Supply, Installation and Operation of a Photo Enforcement Program

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. I'm here to move Item 1 of the report from the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services from November 19th. I just want to make the comment that while I haven't said a lot about this up until this point, I do support photo enforcement, What I don't support is politically motivated speed limits. I'm very thrilled it see the Manitoba Highway Traffic Board right now, is going and reviewing a whole number of speed limits throughout the City of Winnipeg. It's about the engineering and the science of it. It's not -- it shouldn't be politically set. It's about the engineering of the roads; it's about sight lines; it's about the way roadways are built and I fully support their motions on this. Some people say we should use the resources to put more police on the streets. I don't think it's one or the other. We can certainly do more…I think we should take existing police resources and spend more of it doing traditional traffic enforcement. In fact in week one of the festive season check stop program, besides finding impaired drivers, 34 traffic-related provincial offence notices were given. Five suspended drivers were found when these check-stops were had on the side of the road. More traditional enforcement is also necessary and I think that that should be done within our 1400 or so police officers we have within our force right now and so again it's my pleasure to move the motion on photo radar today.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. I'm in support of this motion to bring forth a new contract for the photo radar that we utilize at intersections and mobile unit. And I would also bring up to people's attention that there is a dedicated…that district 3 has a dedicated traffic police officer out there working in that area, so I think that our Winnipeg Police Service is directing some of their resources towards actual people, person-related traffic ticketing and so on and maybe catching suspended drivers and so on. But I do have a concern. I'm voting for this motion but it is a 7 year contract. I am a little bit concerned that it goes kind of long in terms of that contract but I would point out in the presentation as this was moving through the City of Winnipeg's political process, we did have the honour of presentation by a person who is examining the signage that we have and pointed out that one of our biggest issues in the city, the mobile photo radar unit seems to set up wherever our signage is lacking, where a sign has not been fixed and they seem to be catching a lot of drivers who are exceeding the speed limit in those terms, and I believe that…and there is nothing stopping us voting for this particular contract. The city can improve its signage and if people believe that it's just a money grab we will and we should improve our signage so that people can see and then the mobile photo radar unit will catch people who are actually purposely speeding and there are drivers who purposely do that and make a conscious decision to do so. So it's not just that the signage is missing. And I think that the cameras that are set up at intersections, while some people will debate whether or not that provides safety, this pedestrian in this City of Winnipeg will tell you absolutely that having the cameras at these intersections where people can see they are set up, it does calm the traffic in these intersections and it does provide for a safer environment for pedestrians to utilize those intersections and, as I understand it, we can move cameras around and examine adding with, I think it's with the approval of the province, but we can examine setting up cameras at various intersections where there needs to be a real calming so that people get the message, who are driving, that there are pedestrians and whenever there is a pedestrian/automobile accident, the faster you drive the worse the pedestrian gets injured. And so people need to consider that when they are speeding. And we do need to slow down some traffic in various areas of this city because it is a real problem. So I will be supporting, Speaker Nordman, I will be supporting this motion today and we can do other things and we have to do other things to ensure that drivers are aware of what the speed is; that drivers are aware that there are pedestrians that need to be safe on our streets, in our intersections, and that's all I have to say on the issue.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steen.

Councillor Steen: Everyone dreads opening up their mail to see a ticket for a speeding ticket, including myself and the reality is that that photo radar reduces the number of accidents and the severity and property damage. The report shows a 46 percent decrease in T-bone accidents. Although there is an increase in rear-end accidents, 15 percent. However, over all there has been a reduction of injuries from crashes: 24 percent and the 13 percent reduction in property damages. Over 80 percent of the public support the red light cameras and what surprised me the most was that even those we were convicted, 74 percent of them agreed that the cameras were a good idea. I've indicate to the Chief of Police that I would like to see the cameras installed at the most dangerous intersections and it's all about safety to me. I also encourage drivers to get winter tires. It's a good day to say that. And it will help the road safety and I'm sure it will help the rear-end accidents, too. Mr. Speaker that's why I'm supporting this motion today.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Steen. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Of course I will support this motion. It's obvious. But the thing about that amazes me, why do we warn the motorists where these cameras are? Just imagine if we didn't warn them, we would have in effect, people really following…more people following the traffic laws on speeding. Et cetera. You know, it seems to me to warn them -- like, if we really want to improve the behaviour of drivers we shouldn't be warning them at all. Period. And to seems to me a logical conclusion. I'm just dumbfounded by the fact that we warn them. I don't understand why we're doing that. It makes no sense whatsoever to me. Now, Councillor Eadie also mentioned the traffic signs. I sponsored a gathering here at City Hall where I invited all the Councillors to come to it and this fellow showed the craziness of some of the traffic signs. And since that time he sent me an e-mail saying they corrected a few of the instances already. So it has some effect. But we would be giving less tickets out if the signage improved. Now as I say, warning people, it does some good. I voted for this at the standing committee but it would be a hell of a lot better if we didn't warn people and we forced them to, in effect, improve their driving in the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks Councillor Smith. Any further comments? Nope. Last but not least, the Chair. Are you speaking or are you closing? Okay. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. I was very curious to hear and I am still very curious to hear where Councillor Fielding is at with this one because this is one of those true decisions where I come to Council floor not knowing where I stand. I hear very good arguments on one side and I see the possibilities of better situation on the other side. Bottom line is that there is no other opportunity at this point to look at other modeling. What could work and what couldn't work and we are presented with this one option. Again, I wish I had more options to go look at, but we are presented with one option which is to carry forward on the photo enforcement program. Now I don't have much of a problem with the cameras at intersections. I believe contrary to my esteemed colleague that we do need to be doing better signage, warning people of areas where there is a quick change in speed. For example, I have one of the worst on Grant. I'm very happy that working with public works and the street people we have actually improved considerably some of the signage and you'll see them up there where it's more of a yellow with a warning of what's coming up and placement of height and we're also looking at some other measures that are coming forward. We also know that the province is presently looking at the school zone issue. When do we have school zones when we don't have school zones. And again, one that was at really galls me is when I drive down Academy in the morning you know, 9:30 and there's one of these photo radar cars waiting on Sunday morning outside of Kelvin. To me, I have a hard time swallowing that's for the safety of all. Again, if it's a school zone time, I would understand that but Sunday morning, it's pushing the envelope but I believe those kinds of issues will be resolved once the school zone issue is resolved with the Province. So I also am concerned and I've mentioned this before and I would like to see Council move forward on this. Money that is raised through photo radar or even traffic should go back into traffic safety. It should've been going back into a general revenue. I know there's some issues on how you resolve that within the accounting procedures but I think for the public's knowledge and belief in our system, that if that revenue is going back into exactly traffic safety for example, improving the signage we still have some streets that no matter what you do, cars are going way too fast. Is there other mitigation things we can be involving in there? And I think that the public would know that it's kind of like a food bank. Our job in the food bank is not to have a food bank any more. You want to have progressed to the point where people don't need to come there. Well, we need to have an account that says we want to show people that we are actually dealing with the issue on a bad intersection and this money's going towards that issue and I think that would help people have more confidence in the whole collection of the cash and where it's going but that said I'm faced today with the proposal that I have as a non-EPC member, I get to peak at it after it's all kind of vetted through and the bottom line is the t-boning. It's a t-boning. The same problem with the and I'll say the word, the traffic circles. Traffic circles and t-boning is the number one cause of death. It is no way around it. t-boning in an intersection is the cause of death. Again, one thing that these lights, the camera lights do help with is prevent the t-boning. Same thing with traffic circles, they prevent t-boning which is a cause of really fatalities and that really is our focus of providing that safety. The data here does show to me that that does happen, so again, while I think there can be and I hope Councillor Fielding will maybe enlighten me on some other points I'm missing, however at this point I'm leaning towards supporting it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I guess that's it. Councillor Fielding, it's your chance.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I would've known Councillor Orlikow was on the fence, I could've added so I would've said, although he may be older, you're aging a lot more gracefully than I am, you're more articulate than I possibly could be. So thank you, Mr. Speaker. And first of all, you know, sometimes in life I think you've got to stand up. As a group you make decisions on Executive Policy Committee and you know, sometimes you've got to put a little water in your wine in terms you don't get everything you want all the time but so long as you're going in the right direction. This decision is something that you know I'm taking a particular stand on and something that I spoke of for a long period of time. There's been some media campaigns from some of the groups and I agree some of the aspects that they were talking about, I'm not sure if it's necessary in terms of location, I think there's some concerns with it but overall

for me, you know I think what it comes down to is: is this really about public safety? Is this about revenue? Is this about a better way of policing? And that's kind of where it breaks down for me. I first would like to say that in my opinion, that it is, it's little more public safety, it's more about the other unfortunately. I'd also like to say that I respect everyone's opinions on the subject. They are different than mine. I respect a lot what the Police have to say and the new Chief, I think the new Chief has got a…potentially will be one of our greatest police Chiefs around so I do respect very much what they have to say on the topic but I just fundamentally disagree with the policy. And so I'd like to go over a number of points in terms of what my position is and why I will not be supporting it. Number one, we know the history of the program. First of all, it's started probably close to a decade ago and that was exactly the premise of the program. Would it add safety to our drivers? Would it be able to change people's attitudes, change people's behaviors? It's never been one in terms of the revenues that are there. We know that other jurisdictions have tried it. Other jurisdictions have also left it. I also know that I think that there is a better way. Number one, I think that…and the report kind of identified this. It compared verses photo radar verses adding more police officers on the streets. So the numbers that were used and these are Winnipeg Police Service numbers, what they chronicled is that you could have 57 new officers on the streets for the same amount of dollars and cents that you have for the photo radar program. We know traditionally it's cost about $5 million to operate the program, brings in $10 million. The numbers are changing here from about 3.4 to about 9 that are there. But in my humble opinion I think that there are so many more added benefits that you get from the traffic enforcement and I want to let it be known that I'm very much in favour of the traffic enforcement, I think it's very important to our community not just in terms of safety, in terms of a whole bunch of other things. So I very much support that element to it. I just think that having more officers on the streets, if you're with that 57 officers on the streets, that could mean five to seven officers in your ward, Mr. Speaker. It could be five or seven officers in St. Boniface, five or seven officers in Elmwood, five or seven officers in River Heights or elsewhere, that could control the streets and that wouldn't necessarily mean that you wouldn't have the traffic safety that would be there. It would be just a traditional law enforcement that would be there, would be the traffic officers that you see pulling people over. And for the most part, the equation, whether you get these tickets in the mail or not, you know when someone's pulled you over, for the most part, you've done something wrong. I think that there's so many more added benefits that you have with traditional police officers as the photo radar. Number one, they're pulling people over on the street. They actually have a police officer sticking their head in the car finding out, number one, is someone drunk? Is there some sort of criminal offence that's been going on? Are they on a loose? A whole bunch of other stuff. There is an interesting stat that says police capture criminals the second most beyond tips, from traffic enforcement. That's something you definitely cannot get with the photo radar that's enforcement that's there. The third point is in terms of augmenting what's there in terms of the police force, if you've got what I call lungs and legs, 57 more officers on the streets and if you've got a bank robbery that's happening, if you're going down Academy near you know, Pizzeria Gusto or one of these places where there's a traffic signal that's there. If there is a bank robbery that's happening just down the block, the police can be pulled off and help augment what's happening in the community or if there's a drastic dispute. That's something that definitely cannot happen with the photo radar system. Changing attitudes and behaviors. Well, once again I think if you have traditional officers that are able to pull people over, demerit people. It's going to have more of an impact in terms of changing people's attitudes and behaviour than if you get a ticket two, three, four weeks later, whatever it is. Maybe yourself or your spouse, you child, whoever is using your car. You lend your car to someone. You get a ticket in the mail. How does that change behaviours and attitudes? There's no way in terms of the merit system that's going to be there. I just think that it's, getting a ticket three or four weeks later, you are mad at yourself if you never did it yet you pay your bill and you move on but I don't think it makes a bit of a difference in terms of the change in the attitude. Safety, well, there's been a lot of talk in terms of safety and Councillor Orlikow mentioned it's … I know those reports have been brought forward in terms of the t-bone collision, they're saying a reduction, I think it's 46 percent. There's also enhancement in terms of rear end collisions that's around 15 or 16 percent people where they wouldn't have had any accidents before but we know conclusively that because of photo radars being brought into the equation, that's causing harm. You look at a doctor, what they swear in in terms of their oath, they talk about do no harm. That's the least of what people do when that's there. So in my opinion and the argument as well, t-bones is always more of a, you know, it's more of a serious accident for rear end collision. My point to that is if you talk to someone who's had a loved one that's died in an accident because of rear end collision, doesn't make a difference to them. We know conclusively that adding this device, adding this system into our streets, does cause at least 15 percent more people to have rear end collisions and hopefully that doesn't lead in to fatalities. Public opinion polls. While there's a public opinion poll that was brought in in the report, you know, I don't disagree with that report. I think if you'd asked the generic question would those be the numbers? It possibly could be but my point is I think if you had an opinion poll and they've done some on the TV news and that's sorts of when they do it. I'm not sure how accurate they are, if you have people that are calling in or just doing it on the internet. But if you ask the question as proposed: "Do you support photo radar or you support having 57 more officers in the street? I think the answers would've been dramatically different. In fact, one of the TV polls did it where 70 percent of people support having more officers on the street than actually having a photo radar system. One thing that Councillor Smith brought up which I think makes a whole heck of a lot of sense in terms of you know, the signage that's
there, at the very least, I'm generally in agreement that it's probably going to pass this motion today. but why are we letting people know that we're going to enter photo radar area if the true premise is to have safety, then why would you notify people where these signs are? What happens is if people going to speed, they slow down into these areas and

speed right back up right after so I don't think it does anything. It might produce some safety effects for that one particular corner but for the rest of the time, I don't think it does very much. In terms of revenue, there's been some talk in terms of revenue. Well, how would this impact the revenue that's there? And some of the revenue that's brought in, above and beyond what our expenditures are, you know it's almost twofold if you look at what the past contracts were. Do they go to pay for policing? Yeah, I think there's been some good things instead of going to the black hole of our bottom line. I think to certain extent it is putting officers on the street. But at the very least, well my proposal…

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

Councillor Fielding: It bares the fact that if you've got a traditional, you've got a traditional law enforcement, they'll bring in revenue as well. And this once again isn't about revenue but even though report seems to isolate the fact that you know, it does make some financial sense for us to do it but my point is if you have traditional law enforcement, if you had the same amount of officers, you're going to get that revenue that's there so you're still able to pay for police officers and you're going to get so many more added benefits in terms of having those live officers in the street or the public safety as a whole. The revenue piece, the police put in the report, not sure it's comparing apples to apples, oranges to oranges. When you do …down and ask them further questions in terms of the comparisons for it. You know, in terms of the police officers that's there, they're using a 16 year police officer. They are incorporating overtime cost that would be a part of it. I think we're going to compare apples to apples. You should get compare the same amount of time period that you would be using for the officers versus the photo radar program. Another element is the seven year contract and I guess they're saying you've got to advertise that fees over something but that's a very long time in terms of an extended contract for seven years and the five year extension clause that two of them I don't think makes a lot of sense. So in conclusion Mr. Speaker, and I've been pretty vocal on the subject. I'm not trying to monopolize the time here but I truly think that having more officers on the street makes a lot more sense. You're getting the important traffic element that's there. You're getting the traffic support but you are also allowing officers to catch criminals that are on the road. We know that's worked in the past. We know it can work again. We know that it can help augment officers on the street for other crimes that are happening and we know that traditional law enforcement makes a lot more sense and changes actually people's attitudes where you're going to have people more safe in the community. So I very much support this. You know I know that recently at the We Day presentation, my family loves it, we enjoyed it so much and one of the lines that stuck with me, one heart with courage makes a majority. So if I'm the one heart with courage here, I'm going to stand up for what I think is right in principle and I'd like to request a recorded vote on this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: I want to see a recorded vote on this. I think you've got to get back to the basics here. We started this because it was about safety, we knew there was revenue that came with it. We directed the revenue into the police service to pay for additional officers and other services in the police. Without this, you actually lose 50 something officers or maybe more because the revenue doesn't exist. The math is straightforward. There is a revenue stream that comes with this and I for one like having abusers pay. You know, the idea of fines, penalties, putting some hurt out there, especially with a program that works, is a great idea. This program does work, it's proven, we can see it from the revenues going down that the behaviour does change and you know, just Councillor Browaty's point, Mr. Speaker that this should be about science, behaviour is a science as well. This is not pure engineering. These things all happen for a reason. We asked all the time, our department to go out and do analysis. We ask them to look at four-way stops you know, as a way of traffic calming in our neighbourhoods so we ask them to look at putting speed humps in on different streets as a way of calming traffic in neighbourhoods. That's because sometimes the anecdotal information, the behavioral patterns that are happening have an impact that is outside of what just general engineering would do. And if we stuck to purely general engineering and the standard when you enter our city, you'll see that sign says the speed limit is 50 kilometres an hour unless otherwise posted. So you know there are scenarios that are created that allow you to drive faster and we know going through this school zone issue right now that there are scenarios created where they're allowed to be slower. You know, the photo radar and it's a provincial legislation; it is specifically designated in zones and areas that are considered special, whether it's school or playground zones, construction zones or high incident red light camera intersections. I've referred to this for a long time as the idiot tax. I've got a few of them in my day. I call myself an idiot. You know the first one you could understand, the second or third at the same location, that's on me. But I can tell you, I haven't had one in a long time. My behaviour changed and I think a lot of us out here would say the same thing and I know that it's changed the behaviour in my family whether it's my wife or my son or extended family members and those places where you know, the science said that these are dangerous places, we've been able to change the behaviour and we can see that by the reduction in revenue. You know, it's really easy to stand up because there's some folks out there that don't like the fact that there are regulations when you have a car. Driving a car is a privilege, it's not a right. I believe safety is a right and we should do all we can to ensure safety and I'm not going to get into the debate of whether a T-bone accident is worse than a rear end accident but I think we can all see the reduction in injuries that have happened as a result of these cameras and certainly a change in the behaviour for the positive. It's good behaviour modification. The idea that police officers out there doing this work would get you more

revenue in a far greater benefit I know that not to be true. Our budget showed that last year coming into this year's budget that police officers were asking for or coming into last year's budget, they were asking to lower the number of traditional enforcement because they don't think they're going to beat it. We specifically passed in the budget a number of years ago. I think I was even the Chair of Finance at the time, more money for officers that were just dedicated to traffic enforcement and even letting them go out there on overtime or was it…it was to allow officers to go out and do overtime and do more traffic enforcement because we had some issues especially on some of our busier streets. When we permitted that because we knew that the revenue would offset the cost and what would happen was those officers were all diverted into other areas and they never got to do that and there was a hole in the budget. So it's about behaviour. It is about money. I don't care you know that I don't mind having people using fines as a punishment for people to change their behaviour. I like that. I think it's what we should be doing. Let's change behaviour. Let's make our roads safer. Let's make this city a place where we are not scared to drive our children down the road or to cross an intersection. You know, and I encourage you all, I mean it's easy make this a bit of a political debate but I encourage you all to think about it from all the sciences, not just the engineering. Many of us have been I think Councillor Wyatt was there, I've been there, Councillor Orlikow has been there where they're advocating to increase speed limits from 50 kilometres an hour to 60 kilometre an hour on our four lane divided roads. I mean I've got University Crescent in my ward which is a four lane divided road, parts of it has open ditches on the side. They call it a rural cross section road, but you know it goes through a residential neighbourhood. In that neighbourhood, do you want that car going off into that ditch if there's slippery roads? No you want that car traveling a little bit slower because it's a rural cross section road in an urban neighbourhood. You know so is that politics or is that anecdotal information that's in that science of behaviour that allows the adjudicators in this case, in the case the speed limits the Highway Traffic Board to make an informed decision on what those speed limits are to be. And the base of those speed limits is 50 kilometres an hour. The rise to 60 kilometres an hour was something that was set many years ago. The change back to 50 was something that was done when behaviour showed that that was necessary and the information flowing forward from that shows that it was safer and that there were less accidents or less magnitude of damage and injury. So let's continue to do this program, that's working; let's get the revenue from it; let's put that revenue back into our police department or in other places and let's be responsible. Let's, you know this is, it's easy to criticize this because there's people out there who just don't get it. They think that driving a car at a rapid speed is a privilege or is a right. It's not. Driving a car, period, is a privilege. Driving at a fast speed is breaking the law and let's make sure that we're making these communities safer and just one final comment, I would like to say that in construction zones we've had this debate going back and forth of when a photo radar camera should be there. A former assistant and my son both worked construction for a year or two and they'll tell you what they find when they return to some of those construction zones on a Monday morning after there's been no workers working there and what they find is littering of automobile debris. Get some bumpers, side view mirrors, I think back to the time when we were doing the Fort Garry Bridge where you had to slow down to 60 kilometre an hour to come into this chicane I guess they call it. There was no shoulders, there was nowhere to get off the road and people were constantly speeding there and it was a place where we had to put, we put photo radar out there all the time because it wasn't safe whether there was people there or not and this is about changing peoples' behaviour and it's about making it safe. And if you have a collision at 60 kilometres an hour on that bridge. In that situation that was created there, it would be just as dangerous as having it at 80 kilometres an hour regardless of whether there's workers there or not so. Let's not just make this an easy thing to throw it out there because there's some folks that can stand up and articulate that they don't like it, that it's just a tax grab. It's not just a tax grab. There's cash involved but there's also behaviour change involved as well. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Swandel. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'll try to be brief, Mr. Speaker. I tend to disagree with Councillor Fielding on a lot of things but on this one I actually tend to agree with him so I'm sorry to deny him that moving speech about one heart and one…but on this, I tend to…a lot of points raised, a lot of good points in terms of behaviour modification, certainly getting a ticket based on photo radar would, one would hope, modify your behaviour. I remember when I was 18 and got pulled over on Jubilee and got a speeding ticket. I don't speed on Jubilee any more. It modified my behaviour. So I think you get just as much if not more behaviour modification from traditional enforcement. I've got a number of people call or e-mail on this and none of them say take away the cameras and let us run rampant in the city. They say replace it with traditional enforcement. People understand that there's a safety elements here however, I think from my view and certainly from the view of the people who contacted me, the traditional enforcement would have a greater impact. I am pleased to see that the province, the Highway Traffic Board, doing a public consultation on the speed limits on some of the routes that were talked about. I think that's what a public consultation can be important so I'm glad we had some Councillors go down there for that and that sort of speed limit issue is I think is a separate issue and I have some concerns about Fermor, in that being a 70 kilometre zone as it passes places like Glenlawn and the Y and the Library but I think that's a separate issue, the speed limits, as opposed to trying to get safety through the photo radar as versus traditional enforcement so on this one, at least I'll be voting with Councillor Fielding. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I think no one likes the idea of having to pay a fine when one gets a fine. But the reality is, Mr. Speaker that if you obey the law and you don't speed, you're not going to get a fine. I think what it boils down to, I hear what Councillor Fielding is saying and I think enforcement and more enforcement from the traditional means is a great thing. The reality is Mr. Speaker, we can't afford to put police officers on every corner or as many corners as we like with these, what we have with these cameras. We've gone from 1100 officer complement seven years ago and now Mr. Speaker, to 1400 officer complement. It's a huge increase in a short period of time. We've increased the complement. We do this photo enforcement. We need, we need the new officers. With the challenges that the Police Services is facing. There's no doubt about it; but the reality is Mr. Speaker, we also need this service. This is not the be all and end all this is just one more tool, if you talk to the Winnipeg Police Service, they view this as one tool in enforcement. Now the reality is Mr. Speaker, when you boil the issue right down to, I think what this debate is really about is, this is an ideological debate. It's an ideological debate Mr. Speaker, for those who are on the right of the political spectrum who believe that they should not have to pay taxes or very low taxes period. They view this as a cash grab. They view this as a tax. This is the nature of this debate. This is what it's really come. This is what it's about. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think that's nonsense, to be blunt. I really believe this is a practical solution to some of the challenges we're facing as a city when it comes to enforcement on our roads. So I'm not going to get dragged into this ideological debate that some folks would like us to have, I mean, there are those who actually believe that you know, there should be absolutely no taxes, you know, libertarians and let society go where society goes you know, more an anarchy. But the reality is Mr. Speaker, we have a system, the government, where we have to pay fines and taxes to have society function. This is part of that. We're trying to bring a level of safety to our roads, throughout our city. It's been cited the Highway Traffic Board, some of the Councillors who attended. I frankly don't understand where the Highway Traffic Board is going. All the data and evidence that is being assembled in North America and Europe is arguing that we should try to make our cities safer, safer for pedestrians, safer for seniors, safer for children. One of the most disturbing statistics is the rate of the amount of children who do not walk to school any more. They don't walk to school and you can say well they don't because parents are concerned about their safety in terms of not just cars but predators but the reality is Mr. Speaker, they're also concerned about the safety with vehicles. This is a huge problem. If you ask somebody who's 40 years old or older, they probably walked to school. But if you ask somebody under 40 today, chances are they did not walk to school, they were driven. We have to, and you can look at the rates of obesity now amongst children. It's all linked together, Mr. Speaker. We have to get back to a society where we can make our communities safe but the automobile is not first and foremost in how we design and develop communities, Mr. Speaker, that it's people, that it's children, that it's seniors, that is the residents who live in the city who come first and foremost and that means slowing things down. Not slowing things down, not slowing things down like we had this morning, Mr. Speaker, that was ridiculous. That was very slow. It was a crawl to get here, Mr. Speaker. I'm not advocating that. What I'm advocating for, is that we don't necessarily need to have on, even regional roads, the kind of speeds that Highway Traffic Board is advocating for going through residential areas. It doesn't make any sense and Mr. Speaker, I realize that there are those who want to get you know to, from point A to point B faster than ever before and that's maybe popular to say that too and try to speed things up, but in terms of safety, in terms of the statistics, in terms of fatalities, in terms of injuries, it's directly linked to speed. It's directly linked to speed. And you know, Mr. Speaker, I mean the reality is more people die in this country from automobile fatalities than they do from homicide. It's a fact and injuries on top of it. And yet we're trying to build a society that moves in the other direction, Highway Traffic Board, frankly half of them are not even from the City of Winnipeg. They're appointed by the Provincial Government from outside of the city. I think they're out to lunch but they're doing their thing, okay. You know, and if you call that a form of democracy where you go there and they allow anybody to speak for three minutes, Mr. Speaker. Imagine we let somebody here speak for only three minutes at this Council Chamber, hoh, it would be on the front page of the Free Press, shut down the democracy at City Hall, and merely three minutes and no question answer afterwards. They said we're not doing that here. We're not allowing questions and answers amongst own Board members. You know, what is that? That's you know, so you've got a little dictatorship going on over there on Weston Drive. So you know but Mr. Speaker, the reality is, you know, they're going to do what they're going to do, but I think there will be…I have a lot of faith that in the long run, the research and the information that is coming forward is going to move cities in different directions including our city. This is one tool, Mr. Speaker, just one tool to assist in that. That's how I look at it and frankly, the technology is improving. We are going now to digital technology. I can see in the future where the cost for this technology falls and we'll actually be able to have more cameras on more intersections freeing up police officers Mr. Speaker to do the kind of work that Councillor Fielding is calling for. So, you know, and for those who ideologically believe they shouldn't have to pay any taxes that probably it sends a chill up your spine when I say that but Mr. Speaker, you know what, it's going to make a safer city for all citizens of Winnipeg in a long run if we have you know, and I, like Councillor Swandel, I've had my fair share of, I'll say right now tickets as well. Do you like anyone? Absolutely not but if I didn't break, if I was obeying the speed limit, I wouldn't have gotten that ticket, Mr. Speaker so. Anyway those are my comments and I'll be supporting the report. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you a kinder, gentler Wyatt. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to say I like the kinder, gentler Wyatt. I don't know if he is listening to my comment. I just said I like the kinder, gentler Wyatt. I think he made some really, really good points. In fact, he made most of the points I was going to make but I did want to go on the record on this quite important issue, it's a seven year contract, it was something that was started a lot time ago. I believe that it was…it is about safety you know, but there is a revenue component but we need revenue as a city to have safety. We have to pay for our police service which is, what is it 43 percent of the budget? I'm not sure, it's a very large part of our budget. So to have a revenue source as Councillor Wyatt indicated we need to pay for that. We do have traffic enforcement out there, above and beyond photo radar that is used and if we lose this revenue source it will be a lot more difficult. In fact, the numbers don't add up to just simply stop photo radar and we'll have all these new officers. I don't believe that would really be as…I mean if you could just do that but even if you know, so I…the other thing I wanted to mention was the report itself, our police have told us in this report that safety is a real issue here. Those serious accidents that benefits from this from having this and that those serious accidents would go up and that there would be more injuries so I think that's pretty basic. The red light cameras clearly are extremely essential. They have high level of public support, actually for the whole program according to the information we have here. So I can't argue with that. I was just going to also briefly comment on everyone's been talking about those hearings at the Highway Traffic Board and we're talking about speed and I'm a…I sent in a presentation like many of the Councillors here. I've gone there, represented there. They're talking about, the ones this week, increasing the speed in the downtown area from Broadway to, from Osborne to Main Street. I don't know if all of the public is aware, Main Street at Assiniboine at the end of an active transportation corridor right through Portage and Main, all the way to Manitoba Avenue on Main Street and Memorial. That's in our downtown area. There's the "need for speed" advocates seem to have gotten this on the agenda. And I just wanted to mention, I checked the City of Winnipeg collision statistics on those particular streets and between 2008 and 2010, we had eight pedestrians and seven cyclists hit on Broadway, on the street they are talking about. Five pedestrians and six cyclists on Memorial and on Main Street, in this area, south of Portage, seven pedestrians and seven cyclists, in total 20 pedestrians and 20 cyclists hit by cars on the very streets they are talking about increasing the speed. Just to give you some facts behind this and we know that at 50 kilometres per hour, 65 percent hit will die as opposed to 90 percent at 60 kilometres per hour. So I don't really know what more evidence is needed and I hope the Highway Traffic Board is going to back right off of this very inadvisable move. Anyway, it's pretty much been said, Councillor Wyatt actually, I agree with pretty much everything he said. We have to balance. We have to provide public safety somehow. And if you don't speed, you will not get a ticket. It's very simple whether there's photo radar in place or not and if we can get some revenue to pay for policing services that are 43 percent of our budget, I don't know why we wouldn't do that. It will contribute to the safety of our city. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty to close.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. It's all about balance and safety. If you want safety, let's go back to the horse and buggy and forget about cars at this point. That's not practical and that's not real, either. Councillor Gerbasi is absolutely right. I mean, when she mentioned Broadway, I don't think there's any good reason to increase the speed on Broadway, for example. First of all, I'm not a traffic expert. I don't think anybody around this Council here wears an engineering ring. I've joked before that we play traffic engineers on TV though. Every day, you know we have constituents coming up with their own opinions. They are armchair engineers, we are not. We are not engineers though. We have to listen to what makes sense and balance that with the political realities. South Pembina Highway, way out in St. Norbert from the bridge, 50 kilometres an hour in that section? Completely ridiculous. Huge long stances of visibility. Doesn't make any sense why it's 50 or 60 or 70 kilometres in those parts of St. Norbert. I'm not an engineer but I can tell you that for a fact. The notion of per capita, sorry of additional police officers, we have almost, if we're not number one, we are I believe number two in per capita police officers per population, per capita. Why can't we have more officers on the street as well as photo radar? It's about safety. We can do both. I think a lot of good comments were had here today and this is good debate. I'm of the opinion that even a photo radar ticket is very behaviour changing. I'm not like Councillor Wyatt where I've got a history of a stack of tickets, but I've had two. I've had two and that's a motivating factor. It's almost 200 bucks I think these days for the most basic photo radar ticket. For me, that's a very motivating factor, I don't know about everyone else around this table but again, I think this is the right thing. It's a piece of the safety puzzle, it's not the only thing and I'm more than pleased to move this motion on behalf of the committee today.

Mr. Speaker: Seems to me a long time ago, we had a request for a recorded vote, so all those in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Fielding and Mayes.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 14, Nays 2.

Mr. Speaker: Motion carried. Standing Policy Committee…oh no, we've got no motions, we've got no by-laws to be considered. Do we have question period for the Chair of Protection and Community Services? Councillor Mayes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: Now that I have endeared myself to Councillor Fielding, I will now detract immediately from that. My question though is on the subject of the arenas which we've dealt with in previous question periods. We have declared a crisis, we're using 2007 data that we were using 2007 for facility condition indexes. That was what was before Council in the 2010 debate. That was what was referenced in part in the expression of interest that went out. I've talked to Councillor Fielding about this and I just want to get on public record. I would like it see whatever updated FCI numbers. There are, in fact, the facility condition numbers that were before Council in 2010 and these are always seven numbers didn't include the arena that's in my ward, St. Vital arena. So my request is at the earliest possible convenience, can we get the updated facility condition index numbers. We're saying it's a crisis because we've got five arenas over the point five on facilities conditions if we really mean it's a crisis, let's see how bad it is. Let's see what the most up to date numbers are for these arenas.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you. From one right wing ideal law to another. (laughter) Back to…No all kidding aside. You're right absolutely with the facilities. The indexes and first of all, they are based as Councillor, I think the Councillor knows and actually it's a learning experience for myself and it's actually done through a facilities through building, building facilities maintenance but essentially they review them every five years or so. So the last was done in 2007, they're not just done for arenas they're also done for the pools and so that's going to happen early in 2013 but what Councillor Mayes is talking about is the conditions of them and they make up different things. They talk about the life cycle renewal, the deferred maintenance, the code compliance issues, functional, if there is any inadequacies of the building. And that's what makes up the facility, one in the rating scale is something that's a showcase facility and five is something that's in crisis situation so as you get closer you can visualize what they are. Some are in crisis condition and that's been a chronicle 2007. So in early 2013, I think we can probably do over the next month or so. Obviously there is some interest to do some arena activity and there's some imminent projects happening right now and so I think it makes imminent sense to have it done. And if we can get it done in the first quarter, I think that makes some sense.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions for Protection? Seeing none, then we will move on the Standing Policy Committee of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Vandal.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED NOVEMBER 26, 2012

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move Items 1 through 8 as consent.

Councillor Swandel: Two.

Mr. Speaker: Stand down two. Councillor Eadie, what was…? Two and six. Seeing no others, then we will vote on 1, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 2 – Comprehensive Strategy to enhance the Protection of our Urban Forest from Dutch Elm Disease

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a report that originated at last year's capital budget hearing. If you recall, we had some delegations, citizen delegations from people who were very concerned about our Dutch Elm

Disease problem. We heard them again at Public Works Committee and we tasked the administration to look at this in a comprehensive way and come up with a solution. Essentially, the administration have identified the problem. They've identified the solution. They are suggesting a cost share between the Province and the Municipal, and the City of Winnipeg and the recommendations are before us so I'll wait to hear what the issues are and I'll try to address them in closing.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's no doubt about it, the report shows, the information shows that our Dutch Elm problem is growing faster than anticipated. We've had a couple of very mild winters and some very dry summers. I don't know if that's what's causing this. I'm not a scientist but I know science is important to us all but my…we need to be doing something more. You know, the elm trees are such a big part of the identity of the City of Winnipeg and especially in some of our older neighbourhoods whether it's Tuxedo, River Heights or all the way out in Elmwood or North Kildonan. You could see them throughout the city lining our streets and our boulevards and you can even see a picture of the City of Winnipeg in one of the annual reports of the…was it the Evergreen Society, or organization, it was a national not for profit organization, the champions of urban forest and took the canopy of the City of Winnipeg and used it as an example of what cities should be doing. So, I'm wholeheartedly behind this. I think the idea of creating opportunities, incentives for private property owners to be doing some work on their own properties or be banding together with the neighbours to help fight this is a good idea. Where I'm a bit challenged is knowing and I think we would all agree that there is an issue out here, is that the recommendation in the report is that whatever we do, our additional commitment is contingent upon the Province bringing money to the table. Now, the Province is always been there, putting money into Dutch Elm Disease but I truly believe we need to move forward regardless of what happens in our discussions with the Province. The report rather than being as prescriptive as it is, perhaps should say or the recommendations perhaps should say that the City of Winnipeg is committed to its share of these funds and will work to increase the amount, to double the amount through negotiation with the Province. I don't want us to go into next year without having these additional funds in our hands because of some negotiation or discussion we are in with the Province or you know as, a lot of times happens is, we've got these blocks of money from the Province and they'll just allocate some of the previous block of money and say that it's for Dutch Elm Disease and it's not really real money to us and so it creates another challenge for us. So I'd like to know, and I don't know if we can do it on the fly here, Councillor, you know if there is a friendly amendment that you can think of that if we're all in agreement that makes sense that I believe from the City's perspective, we're saying let's move ahead with this. We do have a real issue in front of us. We're willing to put this money up if the Province is there. Let's also say if the Province isn't there or if they're only partially there, that we're still willing to move ahead on this very important cause for the City of Winnipeg and I know it's challenging to do that just as I speak and I don't understand how this whole report walks and talks with itself but I think it's important that we take action regardless of what the Province does and hopefully they'll be there I think they've certainly been there in the past but let's not close the door on ourselves here.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Well, Mr. Speaker, I very rarely agree with Councillor Swandel, almost never but he's entirely right. We should be proceeding on this course even if the Province doesn't come forward or doesn't come forward to the extent that we would like them to. The fact is we've lost half our American elms since Dutch Elm Disease appeared on the scene. Half of them and we're in danger of losing them all unless we go ahead forward with this comprehensive strategy to protect our urban forests. You know, these trees make life so much more enjoyable in this city. You know, I mean for example, when I walk down my street in the summer, it's cooler because of these trees and even in the winter with the hoarfrost, they are beautiful. You know, they make life in Winnipeg so much more enjoyable. You know and they increase the value of the homes, too. Imagine Wolseley without the elms, what it would be like. And it affects the revenue to the city as well. Because the value of the homes would be decreasing without these trees. You know, and they increase the value of the homes too. Just imagine Wolseley without the elms, what it would be like. It affects the revenue to the city as well because of the value of the homes would be decreasing without these trees. You know the trees themselves are estimated at a value of $806 million for the boulevard and park elms so it's incredible what these trees do for us and we should proceed regardless to what extent the Province comes along with us or not. It's important. We are in a crisis situation. We could lose these trees in the next number of years if we don't take action now. After all, we've lost half of them already and we could lose the other half if we don't proceed.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. I won't get into the importance of our urban canopy. I spoke at the Executive Policy Committee on that. I am dismayed about the tied commitment regard…into this proposal. I understand that the City is going to be working quite closely with the Province to advocate for this, for their portion. And just be clear that it isn't a 50/50 deal. We are asking more of a 75/25 deal because we're cost-sharing, it's those buffers that we do want

from Richot and Springfield. Oh, that's all on their own dime and it's about what I've been told from the department, about two million that the Province would have to kick in there as well. So we're asking for the two plus the two from them and then our own two. I would have preferred to see their leadership by the City saying we understand the problem. We are going forward. You probably should come on board with us. That wasn't the strategy chosen for this one however I just want to send out the flare that now that this is getting sent off to the budget process regardless of the Province comes on board, I hope that our Councillors will all agree that at a minimum we should be putting in our two million to do at least what we can with that money even though it won't be as comprehensive as it could be that Council will vote for the two million during the capital budget time. So again, I'll…I did advocate to separate those two, it wasn't the consideration of EPC at that time. It looks like it's still not consideration today but I do believe that we all understand the value of the urban canopy. We all have a data now to support that so when the time does come that will be able to at least if the Province doesn't come forward which I hope we all are working towards…the Mayor, it's mentioned in the past that if you have an issue, you want to advocate with the Province, go right ahead. Again, I think that should be coordinated through the City's efforts however the direction that we provided that, I can go ahead. So I have been trying to get in to the Province and talking to the different various ministers to make sure they are aware of the issue. Because really, I know our streets are falling apart in the neighbourhood. I know our back lanes have already fallen apart. I know that we need to do investment into our community centres. I know we need a lot of investment but for established neighbourhoods such as River Heights and even Lindenwoods, the trees are vitally important. We'll make do with community centres. We'll make it happen because that's again a capital that we can put money directly into. This problem is a hundred year problem. We put that little twig down, which is again good on the department for not doing little, little twigs. They're little bit bigger but if you…I invite anybody to come down to the River Heights ward and see now five, five could have them stopped, the hot spots that are popping up all over the neighbourhood and walk down those streets where we've ripped out all the trees, all the trees. Some of them have two trees left out of ten trees, they have two trees left and they're just hanging on because they're generally…the reason they don't have a Dutch Elm Disease is because they're by some corridor that is too dirty for the bugs to really enjoy it. I guess so that they could choose big happy trees down there more on the boulevard. We still have the issue of private property trees. This is still a big issue. We still have the issue of people illegally burning firewood, elm firewood. They've just got to stop doing that but again these are all issues and then on top of this my concern is if we hold off any longer, our new friendly ash borer beetles are going to be coming to town. Right now it's still held in Minneapolis, it hasn't come across the border. We have the depots and the check spots to see where it does come. But Ontario's already proven: Dutch Elm Disease is horrible. It's a slow grinding killing of our urban canopy. The ash borer beetle is not so sensitive. It comes in and wipes out the ash trees and there is absolutely nothing that a city can than try to cull them off as fast as they can before it spreads. The States have spent billions and billions of dollars on how to try to…how to deal with the ash borer beetle and have been unsuccessful. So again, we need to get a grip and a good plan for Dutch Elm Disease so we can get locked into that, focusing on that and then when that ash borer beetle comes, we're going to need another pillar to how to deal with that problem as well. So this is the time, this is the time, this year to let's get on board with the Dutch Elm Disease. We've done a great job. We're role models. Go to Montreal, go to Ontario, see what a lack of plan does cost you. They are wiped out, too late. Winnipeg is a role model on how to save our urban canopy. And this is the time when Winnipeg should be showing the leadership, should be going forward, not doing these commitments only I'll do it if you do it kind of motions, however we will have that opportunity when it comes back to the capital budget to do make sure that we show our own leadership. So again I will be supporting it with a little reservation knowing that the capital budget will be coming up and the problem doesn't come on board, I hope they will, that we will have the opportunity to show our own leadership. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll just make a brief, a few comments about things that haven't been said yet. But much of what I've heard, I agree with. Elm trees form the canopies of our city, Charleswood, Tuxedo, River Heights, Wolseley. What would these areas and what would our city look like without them? Many people come to Winnipeg in the summer and when they get off the plane, their first comment is "oh, your city looks beautiful". We need to continue to take pride and to work towards reinforcing that those kinds of comments occur. Not a lot around IKEA got reported other than the traffic and the IKEA opening, but IKEA was very generous in giving us, us, towards saving elm trees, $80,000. Minimal attention was paid to that on November 28, yet so significant. Every time since then when I run into Dorothy Dobie, she says what a fantastic thing it is for our city. That can translate into thousands more elm trees; that can help contribute. This small motion here today that's before us, I would love it if our Council could be unanimous and show real leadership because that sends a message to Broadway, saying we've stepped up now you step up and how could they disagree with that? How could they say no, you're not doing enough; you're not doing your part; the City of Winnipeg is not doing their part to save our elm and save how our city looks. People move to these areas. Let's think about property values in our city. People move to areas because of the beautiful, rich, elm trees. Demand for homes in River Heights, Tuxedo, all those areas is at its highest peak right now. Properties are still being sold over their list price. One might attribute that, to certain degree, to the elm trees, to having mature trees. It is as Councillor Orlikow said, it's 100 year, it's an 80-year-old problem that's going to grow for us in our city. So whether or not the Province is at the

table, it is important but this is a leadership role that our city will show, that this Council will show to the Province and saying, we're at the table now you be at the table. I've asked people about this in my ward. If you had the choice, trees verses roads, most people are saying trees. They are buying properties because of the proximity to forests, to trees and to tree-lined boulevards that we are losing very fast. I can't really say much more than what has been said, but I encourage this Council and I encourage the Province because I know they pay attention to when we do here and taking this first step towards showing leadership on this issue; passing this today sends a message that we want to work with you and that we want to work collectively towards saving what our city looks like. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I just want to clarify a couple of things Mr. Speaker, here. First of all, in terms of some of the math that's been thrown around. The existing program is 3.7 million. Provincial government contributes 1 million of that 3.7 million which equals basically 27 percent of the entire program and what we're asking for, Mr. Speaker, of the provincial government, just to keep it in perspective, is another expansion of the program basically doubling it first year to 3.8 million and then leveling off to 3.7, in a following year additional to the 3.7 so a total of 7.4 in total, but of the second 3.7 Mr. Speaker, that is where we're asking for equal funding from the Provincial Government so when you combine the two 3.7 initial programming you have now, with a new program of 3.7 and you add in the one, you deduct a million from the Province plus the 1.9 million we're asking from the Province which is half of the 3.7. Mr. Speaker, it actually works out that the Province is only at the table on 39 percent of the dollars. Sixty one percent is the City of Winnipeg. So the majority of this program is still being funded through, vast majority is funded through the City of Winnipeg. So let's keep that in perspective, Mr. Speaker. Yes, we are asking the Province to reinstate their program, mainly in the R.M. of Richot and Springfield. I mean, it's necessary because that's where the beetles come and they follow the rivers in, okay. There will be a cost to them. There might be an opportunity for the Province to recover some of that from those municipalities though. That would be their business to work out that with those municipalities, but the reality is Mr. Speaker, that in terms of this overall program, we are the majority stakeholder here. We are funding the majority of it and we're asking the Province to come in less than 50 percent of the overall new program, 39 percent, all right. I don't think that is a big problem. The Government prides itself on being the environment, to react the fact, you know pro-environment. I mean the fact of the matter is their record is anti-environment. You know, they haven't kept to Kyoto; they haven't done a lot of things. They are not pro-environment but let's see, maybe this is a way for them to step out and show a different light here in terms of their environmental commitment. The fact, everybody has been talking about how the trees and the beautiful tree canopy in the city. Well, we all recognize that, but it's not just a benefit to the citizens of Winnipeg. This is directly tied to the economy of the city. The tourism, folks have talked about visitors coming to the city, that's a provincial responsibility. Mr. Speaker, it ties to the environment, another provincial responsibility. We are asking for the Province to come in 39 percent. I don't think that is unreasonable over all. Especially when we're talking about saving the canopy of the elm forest, one of the last great stands of elm forest of any major city in North America. So, I just want to kind of correct some of the numbers being thrown around here. The fact of the matter is this is still the 61 percent funded by the City if the Province steps in with the level of funding that we hope they will do. New money, Mr. Speaker, new money from the Province. Not a shell game taking money that we're, they're giving us now and moving it from an existing city program to this program. We are requesting for this to work. It has to be new money. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't take long. A lot of the comments that already, that I would've said have already been said. I thank Councillor Wyatt for clarifying the numbers a little bit. That's quite helpful. I just actually did want to say, stand up to say thank you. I guess a few thank yous are in order. This was an issue as people were calling on our last year's budget. That was brought forward by community members and Councillors Smith, Orlikow and others that have been advocating for a long time about our tree concerns. It was brought forward by concerned citizens, a lot of them in the Wolseley area and other areas and Council heard them in the last budget process and the Public Works Committee, I'd also like to thank who sent that…took them seriously, took their information and work had the department work with them and work on the issue to come back with this new strategy we have in front of us today so I think it's something we could all feel proud of that that work was done. It was done based on concerns from Councillors and from the communities they represent, and from those citizens who put in a lot of time and effort to bring those issues forward to Council. So lots has been said about this as a negotiation with the Province. We all hope it's successful but the fact that we are talking about doubling our commitment as a city, as a province, whatever, to save our tree canopy, I think that's a very significant moment in this Council's history and I think we should all feel very proud of it and support that today. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal to close.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just want to bring everybody back to the report and the actual recommendations. There are three recommendations. Number one, is the City of Winnipeg formally approach the

Province of Manitoba to request that buffer areas be reinstated in Richot and Springfield? Mr. Speaker, that's a no brainer. If we don't get that, then you have to stop the entry of the beetle into the City of Winnipeg through our rivers. We've got to get that from the Province, otherwise we're throwing good money after bad inside the City of Winnipeg. I don't know why that was cut but clearly our administration have looked at this in a comprehensive way and they're saying that's the first thing you do. The Province I hope will reinstate that. Number two, the City of Winnipeg requests the Province to cost share Scenario 2 which is the full enhanced management strategy. Again if you read the report, there are two scenarios. The first scenario is a targeted enhancement management, targeted enhanced management which is basically in the words of the report, it's a basic, the management program. That costs $2.2 million and the second scenario is the, what do they call it? They call it the full enhanced management which cost 3.8. Our administration are recommending we do the full program and we ask the Province to cost share that with us. The one thing I can say, the third recommendation is that all of this be sent to the budget for discussion during our budget which is going to start very soon. The one thing I can say as Chair of the committee is that the 1.9 is in the budget. We had a press conference in Wolseley. We've talked about it. The community's been there. The community are excited and I thank them for their work they've done. In fact, I met with them this week and they're off to talk to their representative in Wolseley on the Provincial Government. The best I can say is that our 1.9 is there. If the Province are not going to play ball at all, I mean it's possible that with our 1.9 we can easily make it 2.2 and do the first option which is not the recommendation of the administration. They're saying we go all the way to the 3.9 program. So my suggestion to everybody, and it's been a good discussion, is that this is going to the budget. The budget is going to be rolled out very soon. We're going to have public consultations on the budget. I'm sure we're going to talk to the constituents, our constituents who brought this forward to begin with and I'm going to say let's have those discussions in the budget. The 1.9 is there. Are we ready to make it 3.8 right here and now or next month? I think we're going to have to talk to our Finance Chair on that one, but the 1.9 is there. The report is comprehensive. The existing program we have is second to none and we've had our experts go in. They've done their homework. They're recommending Program No. 2 as the full enhanced program so. I hope this moves by, this is approved unanimously. This is an important issue. I agree a hundred percent with everybody who's talked about the importance of the elm trees to the City of Winnipeg. I'd like to call the question on this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no more comments or concerns, all those in favour? Those opposed? Recorded vote. It's already unanimous. Here comes Councillor Sharma. There we go. No, all right, so are we…okay. We've called a recorded vote.

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.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 16, Nays 0.

Mr. Speaker: And it seems that we've made… the motion passed. Seems that we've made the twelve o'clock hour and we have a commitment, we will be reconvening at 1:30. We're adjourned.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
December 12, 2012, at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: …for Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works and have completed discussion and vote on Item 2 and Councillor Eadie has stood down Item 6 so Josie…

Item 6 – First Charge on the 2013 Capital Budget – Regional, Local Streets and Waterways and Grade Separation Project

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, this is the first charge on our '13 capital budget. It's here, was approved by Public Works and then executive committee so I'll stand down and see what the concerns are.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. Actually, in terms of this…I guess it's what you call a first call so that you can take care of some winter works and do the prep work you need to do as our budget is changing…our budget process is changing where we're going to be voting on our operating and capital budget at the same time and so I'm okay with this motion but it has indications to me that maybe we're not going to be addressing in an appropriate fashion with the failing streets and back lanes, sidewalks and so on in the older neighbourhoods of the city. So, what I would also like to see in terms of this particular item here is when it comes time to showing us our, showing us the budget that's coming up, I'd like to mention and I thought this was a good place to bring it up because when we talk about our local roads, we're being charged a frontage levy. It's called a local street renewal frontage levy on our tax bill, and it collects as I understand, at about $43 million and we utilize only about half of that for doing street back lane renewals and we're also using it for the tbo and filling potholes which is an operating item actually. So what I'm hoping for as this new budget process moves along for the capital budget, as this motion is beginning that process, I would like to see the revenues matched up with what we're expending so we can actually see if all of our $43 million is being spent on what we're telling the taxpayers we're spending it on. And so I just thought I'd bring it up with this motion, I will be supporting the motion, but I felt that this was an appropriate time to draw attention to the people who will be bringing forth the budget that we should have. We should be reporting in a manner that shows the revenues and how we expended all of it on the programs that we say we're spending the money on.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel. I know you're here some place. Okay.

Councillor Swandel: I'm right here.

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just trying to sort out in the Charter, it makes a reference to when the capital budget has to be tabled. I believe it was amended years ago to say that the capital budget had to be tabled by December 31 of each fiscal year. And the capital budget must be adopted for that year and I'm unclear as to whether that means the end of the year that we're going into or the end of the year that we're in, because if it's supposed to be done by December 31 of this year, I don't think we're on track to meet that, if that is in fact the requirement. I know we've always tried to get it done before January, just for this specific reason, to get these improvements done so, but it's going to need, we're going to need some clarification here. I don't think it's a major issue, I think the Province, we've had this issue in previous years, and where a budget has gone past the date. I think maybe the operating budget in the year Mayor Katz was first elected went past the required date because we were in the middle of an election and the Province was able to deal with that to give us their blessing to go past the March 31 date for the operating budget. So I just want to make sure that we're on the right side of the law here on when our capital budget has to be tabled. If it doesn't have to be tabled til December 31 of next year, then we're fine. The wording is, you know, it's somewhat ambiguous and you know, we just want to make sure, I don't have a particular problem with getting work out there tendered early but I just want to make sure we're meeting our requirement on the capital budget because my understanding is we're not planning on tabling it until the next year and perhaps the Chair of Finance can let us know what those dates are and we can sort this out with the Province going forward.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, just on that Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is getting clarification but the interpretation or the wording is under the Charter right now as it stands, that capital budget and forecast before December 31 of each fiscal year, Council must adopt a capital budget for that year, and a capital forecast for the next five fiscal years. I think it's clear but we just, as Councillor Swandel rightly pointed out, we want to side on the right side here in terms of the interpretation of the Charter. The Clerk is determining that, but it appears that based on the wording here, the capital budget would be in order to still bring forward in January, which is the plan.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal to close.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Relative to Councillor Eadie's concerns, Councillor Eadie's always been very consistent in bringing up this point to our budget. I will certainly take that under advisement and when the capital budget is rolled out in its entirety, I believe in January, 2013, as it has been, I think in the past, certainly it's been adopted after December 31. That will certainly be taken into consideration. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no more comments, all those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. That completes the items for Infrastructure Renewal, we have some by-laws.

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

Councillor Vandal: I will move the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 151, By-law No. 152, By-law No. 153 and By-law No. 154/2012.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 151/2012, By-law No. 152/2012, By-law No. 153/2012 and By-law No. 154/2012.

Councillor Vandal: I will move that By-laws numbered 151/2012 to 154/2012 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 151/2012 to 154/2012 both inclusive.

Councillor Vandal: I will move that the rules be suspended and By-laws numbered 151/2012 to 154/2012, 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? Motion carried. Question period for Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. No questions? Snow removal? No? Nothing. All right. Well, seeing none we will move on then to…oh, Councillor Eadie.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Eadie: Pardon me Speaker Nordman. Through you to the Chairperson of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. You know I'm sorry, Speaker Nordman reminded me about snow and I had a really big concern. There is a very…there is a real serious concern. A couple of weeks ago our sidewalks on Priority 3 residential streets were in a real bad icy condition, and I want to know why it wasn't…that it was decided not to sand those sidewalks to keep people safe, as we…you know, you remove the 18 Leila bus and then you don't sand the sidewalks so that when people have to walk further to a bus stop, if you're 75 or whatever age, I want to know why was it decided not to sand those residential P3 sidewalks?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Councillor Nordman, I mean Speaker Nordman. Certainly I will…that was news to me. Councillor Eadie's question was news to me. I will take it under advisement and I will ask the Director of Public Works to get back to the Councillor and myself.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Another sanding question. I've had a number of calls in recent days as the temperatures have gotten colder. The back lanes have been icing up. I understand it's not within our Snow Clearing Policy to sand back lanes is what I've been told, but there are difficult situations occurring especially if there's a bit of a grade at the end of a back lane and cars are sliding. Is it possible to have the…to get the Chair of Public Works to talk with the Public Works Department about looking at least doing some spot sanding in dangerous situations within the current budget? Right now all they can answer is that they have to stick to the current Snow Clearing Policy. I'd hope that we could find a way if there are some dangerous situations out there, that we could address these concerns.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Dangerous situations will not be tolerated. I will talk to the Director of Public Works and get back to Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Councillor Vandal, I would like to ask you why my sidewalk in front of my house has not being sanded.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: I will take that one under advisement as well and get back to Councillor Smith.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further questions we will move on to the next Standing Policy Committee which is Finance. Councillor Wyatt.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
DATED DECEMBER 3, 2012**

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce and…the report of December the 3rd,' 2012 and move adoption of Consent Agenda, Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We do have a by-law.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. I'd like to move that By-law 155/2012 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 155/2012.

Councillor Wyatt: I'd like to move that By-law No. 155/2012 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 155/2012.

Councillor Wyatt: I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 155/2012 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question Period for Finance. Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Eadie.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Mr. Speaker, and Chair of Finance may wish to take this under advisement rather than his usual more fulsome answers, but if he has an answer for me today that would be terrific. And he and I have talked a bit about this. We'll soon be sending out the quarterly billing under the new waste collection system is soon going to kick in. Included, and most people will see that on their water bill, however we've got tens of thousands of folks in the City of Winnipeg who aren't on city waste or city sewer and water including about 900 residences in my ward south of the Perimeter. It would seem that the system we've adopted is to send out four bills quarterly: a $12.50 bill. We're paying somebody no doubt to generate those bills to send them out. We'll pay somebody to monitor collection. We may even have to pay someone to go after the scofflaws who don't pay the 12.50. I'm wondering if we might have a more efficient way of doing this, billing less frequently or tying it into…these are the same people who are getting a $250 rebate on their property taxes because they're not on city water and sewer. I'm not sure if we can connect the two together without some by-law changes from Council, but is there a way we could look at trying to make it more efficient than sending out

quarterly statements to some of these residences that aren't on city water and sewer in order to get the $50 fee for garbage and recycling.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I will take it under advisement Councillor Mayes and ask the Public Service to look into this. It's a good question and have them look into it and respond. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes. Councillor Wyatt, we've discussed this about the…having consultation meetings about the budget and from Councillor Vandal's comment this morning, I gather there is going to be such a meeting. Can you explain further on that?

Councillor Wyatt: I don't recall Councillor Vandal's comment this morning, so what are you referring to specifically?

Councillor Smith: Councillor Vandal referred to having pre-consultation meetings about the budget in one of his speeches this morning. Now, it doesn't matter if you recall that or not. What is your opinion? Like last year, every year, Councillor Fielding had meetings. This year we're not having one or what?

Councillor Wyatt: That's correct.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Smith: Why not?

Councillor Wyatt: Well that's another question.

Councillor Smith: Okay, why not?

Mr. Speaker: Third and last question.

Councillor Wyatt: The budget, as mentioned earlier, is coming forward at the beginning of next month. We're bringing forward the Capital and Operating budgets. We have a report and audit done from 2008 that encouraged us to combine our budgets and to bring forward a joint budget so that's what we are doing. And because of the fact that, by and large, the budget has been put together, public consultations now would be somewhat insincere in the fact that the budget has been, in large effect, put together. So the motion that was passed recently though, that maybe Councillor Vandal was referring to, was at the Finance Committee which moved that there should be a new process for budget consultations early on for the…in the formulating of the 2014 Capital and Operating budgets in the first half of next year, so that we can at the beginning, truly bring in public consultation and get public feedback and ideas, not just in terms of Open Houses but through other methods, and incorporate that, hopefully, as well as possible, some of the ideas in the budget. So, the commitment is there. Councillor, I agree. It would have been nice to have consultations right now but I think it's better to have consultations that are real rather than consultations that are just there for the sake of consultations, and I know Councillor Fielding did a lot of great consultations but he had the ability to have the time to do that ahead of time. You know, we just don't have that now, but the commitment is there in terms of the next budget to build a better process and a lot of that work, the ground work, was put in place when Councillor Fielding was Chair of Finance, so picking up where he left off.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Question about failing streets and back lanes. I was attending a gala evening at the Association of Manitoba Municipalities and I heard the Finance Chairperson talk about how Transcona got a bad deal when the City of Winnipeg amalgamated with the other cities and so my question really is this: we have the City of Winnipeg and we are what we are today, and having the responsibility of being the budget boss, I want to know, what is this Councillor going to do to fix the heavily failing streets in West Kildonan which was one of the other cities that merged. Maybe we got a bad deal in West Kildonan as well. What are you going to do in this upcoming budget to fix those failing streets which, if we don't do it now, we're going to still be trying to catch up to those when all the new streets will be failing. So, what are you going to do?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. The budget will be coming shortly and hopefully some of your questions will be addressed.

Mr. Speaker: Second question through the Chair.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Given that the people of West Kildonan are paying the frontage levy that says it's going to fix the failing local streets, can you commit today that you're going to spend all $43 million that is collected on fixing those local streets which we tell them we're doing?

Councillor Wyatt: I don't know who we are telling them we're doing. I've never said that. Maybe the Councillor has, but again, the budget will be coming forward in the new year and I think some of the Councillor's questions will be answered at that time. But I'm glad he was at the A.M.M. convention and heard the speech that was there, and it was well received by the delegates and it was a great convention, so...

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Eadie: Yeah. The question is then, how are you going make up to West Kildonan that you're failing them?

Councillor Wyatt: I don't understand the question Mr. Speaker, so…

Mr. Speaker: That concludes question period.

Councillor Eadie: Not from West Kildonan.

Mr. Speaker: If no other questions coming forward, the next item on our agenda is the Standing Policy Committee of Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management. Councillor Pagtakhan.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT DATED NOVEMBER 29, 2012

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce the report of November 29th and move consent agenda Item No. 1.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no comments. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have no motions, no by-laws. Do we have a question period for Riverbanks, Downtown, Heritage? Seeing none, we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee for Property and Development and the Report of November the 6th, Councillor Browaty.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of November the 6th and move adoption of consent agenda Items 3 and 4.

Mr. Speaker: Stand down 4, okay. All right then we will vote on Item 1, all those in favour? Opposed. I'm sorry, Item 3, I guess it is, Item 3. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item 4.

Item 4 - Subdivision Rezoning – Rosser, Old Kildonan bounded by Jefferson and CPR, Inkster Gardens Neighbourhood bounded by Jefferson Avenue, King Edward Street and CNR line - Waterford Green DASZ 15/2012

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is an exciting development that I know the area Councillor is in full support of. I'm looking forward to hearing his comments.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to stand it down just to basically say it's a great news story and to thank my colleagues, Councillor Eadie and Councillor Sharma for bearing with us on that marathon community committee. We got out of there basically at 1:30 in the morning, talking back and forth with the developer but this is a, something that's really a good news story, Mr. Speaker. For the last ten years and for the last 25 years in this part of the city, there hasn't been any kind of development and finally the Province of Manitoba opened up these lands to provide a really solid development that includes some retention ponds, some active transportation, a lot of linear park ways for people to walk through the neighbourhood as well as public art amenities as well which is pretty key. And this morning as well Mr. Speaker, there was a delegation of the Knights of Rizal, the Order of the Knights of Rizal, the Winnipeg Chapter. They were here this morning and I just basically wanted to stand this down basically and perhaps through, oh good they're still here, that's great and just basically state that you know we've been working with the Order of the Knights of Rizal. Doctor Jose Rizal, Mr. Speaker, is a national hero of the Philippines and there's a huge contingent of Filipinos that live out in the northwest quadrant of the city and some years back Mr. Speaker, they worked together to advocate for the renaming of a street, a portion of Keewatin, a small portion of that to be renamed as Dr. José Rizal Way and today with this development sort of extends that up to the future of Chief Peguis Trail. Mr. Speaker, and the good news here is that the developer as part of his public art dedication is going to be erecting a statue in honour of Dr. José Rizal. There will be a seven foot statue on a eight by eight foot by five foot Tyndall stone cenotaph and it's just a real great tribute to the Philippine community to the Order of the Knights of Rizal who are, from all sectors of our citizenry, who do great projects that stimulate youth and of course Dr. José Rizal himself was a great hero and academic, a writer and he sparked evolution that created the independence of the Philippines from Spanish colonization. So it's with great excitement that I stand here today to put those few good words on the record and I hope for unanimous support on this Council. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty says he's got nothing to close with and that he's happy with the presentation as it stands so I'll call the question. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carries. And we have some by-laws.

Councillor Browaty: No, no, other report. The November 30th report.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, we have another report. You're right. We have November the 30th.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED NOVEMBER 30, 2012

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of November 30th and move Items 1 through 6 and no. 9.

Mr. Speaker: One through six. Okay, one through six, and eight, nine. Okay, one through six and nine. No. You're standing down nine. Okay. What are we doing then? One through six.

Councillor Browaty: That's it.

Mr. Speaker: All right. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Clerk. Okay, Item 9…

Councillor Browaty: No, it would be seven.

Mr. Speaker: Item 7, okay, Item 7, here we go.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: As you may be aware at EPC, as a result of the Shaw Park having a digital sign, I recused myself, So I'm going to recuse myself again on this matter. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Item 7 – Digital Sign and Billboard Regulations and Fees

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I'm pleased to move this item.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Oh, Councillor Smith. Would you like to speak to this? Seven.

Councillor Smith: Seven. Councillor Browaty, you remember I brought this up I don't know how many, almost, I guess a year ago about the downtown ones. The sign, for example at Portage and Main, has not paid a cent to the city and I'm really concerned about that sign as well as other signs downtown that have multi-messages, different advertisers. Now you want to…this says another 180 days. Are we, is there really a chance we're going to have it? By the way, I should tell you this, I was talking to the head of Property and Development last year this time, actually at the Christmas gathering. And I said I wanted to be present at some of these consultation meetings with the industry. He said, "Harvey, no way. They'll be frightened if you're there." You know, it seems to me that we should be warning to get information and the more information I have, the better it is, but we're waiting now like, that sign has been up there how long at Portage and Main? How long do you think that's been there? It's been there an awful long time. We're talking about years and they haven't paid one cent to the City of Winnipeg. Why? Why not?

Mr. Speaker: It's a comment. Any other comments? Councillor Browaty to close.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. Again, one of the reasons that the report took as long as it did is we wanted to make sure that we did work in the revenue piece. As it turns out, it came out just with the report and the industry had not seen that ahead of time. That piece is not, we're not voting on the revenue piece on today. I can assure you that, I understand that the Assessment and Taxation Department is actually meeting with industry stakeholders tomorrow and that it will be in there very quickly and the issues we'll bring about revenue, I believe the revenue piece will be city wide upon implementation and the policies in terms of the usage of signs and that will be different in the Downtown Zoning By-law compared to the city's general zoning by-law outside of the downtown which we're voting on here right now. I appreciate your concern and appreciate your patience, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Call the question, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 8 – Declaration of Surplus Land – 200 Berry Street and 409 Mulvey Avenue East

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

WHEREAS there has been no Public Service review provided to identify whether or not there is any civic or community need for the property at 409 Mulvey Avenue East.

AND WHEREAS the area Councillor has not been briefed or consulted about declaring this property surplus.

AND WHEREAS there is public concern about a lack of diligence and proper process being followed in real estate transactions, including concerns about lack of consultation with ward Councillors.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 8 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, dated November 30, 2012, be amended as follows:

1. *Amend Recommendation 1 by deleting the words "and 409 Mulvey Avenue East as described on Schedule "A"".*

2. *Add the following new Recommendation 4 and renumber the remaining Recommendation accordingly:*
   "4. That the proposal to declare 409 Mulvey Avenue East as surplus to the city's needs be referred back to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development to allow the Winnipeg Public Service to brief the area Councillor and report back on the matter."

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I understand that there is an amendment that was distributed.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be very brief. I'm asking that the property at 409 Mulvey East as described in Schedule A be referred back to the committee for a couple of purposes. First of all, this declaring of these lands surplus and there was…three of properties originally were associated with the fire hall thing but, this came forward simply as a political motion with no administrative report attached and normally when we declare land surplus, we would have a report with an administrative review explaining that it had been circulated and also, there would be consultation with the area Councillor. That's our appropriate process when it's an administrative review. Now, I'm aware that a political motion just to declare something surplus can happen without any of this process taking place. But I'm not sure that that's advisable considering that we are aiming towards a more transparent approach. Frankly, nobody has discussed this properly with me, from the administration has not been directed to it, it's simply been a political motion to declare of property surplus which means immediately selling it. Now, I'm not saying I oppose it. I don't have an opinion until I have the proper information, and I think we should be carrying out in the light of all that's happened, we should be carrying out due diligence and all I'm asking for is that this be referred back to the Standing Policy Committee, that the administration be directed to consult with the area Councillor and to do quick, short report explaining the due diligence that's been done on the property to determine no civic use or public use or whatever. I'm just asking Council to support that. I think it's very reasonable and that's my request on this motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Just to speak to the motion. I'm trying to find it here but my recollection is that there was a great deal of consultation that was done with regards to all of these lands that they were originally brought forward in, there was sort of an omnibus package to do these stations, you know the four stations, the four additional stations as part of that declaring the land surplus or bringing the revenues from these lands into that equation was part of that. I can't find that specific report quickly but I don't know if there's anybody else who specifically recalls that but this was part and parcel of that and I'm pretty sure we were all if not unanimous, strongly supportive of that, selling these lands to help fund the new fire stations, but I stand to be corrected. But I'm pretty sure that there were lands identified in that and that's why we started moving forward in this process. So I'll wait to hear back.

Mr. Speaker: Any other comments? Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, very much. My recollection of that report where we decided to go ahead and build new modern facilities for our Winnipeg Fire Department, the replacement of the certain stations, I don't think it did actually address specifically the land on Mulvey as being part of it. First, I think discussion of Mulvey was back in August of this year when that land proposal that came out of the department that Council was not aware of, it was the first time it was proposed so, the Council was assuming it's had it since August to approach the department and discuss it. At the same time, I do know the policy is that the area Councillor should be consulted when the city land is being declared surplus for sale. I'd be okay at this point laying over that portion for 30 days or some very reasonable amount of time, so that she can be informed what the City's decision is there or what the public services recommendation is. I am aware that the boundaries of the sale do not include, for example, the…I think it's the Police Service River Bank Patrol Unit which is on that particular parcel of property and it also maintains as consistent with City policy, the river frontage land to do linear paths and that. But again, she raises a point, again, I think it's obvious she's had an opportunity to approach the department but you're right, you should've been approached first. I'm fine with allaying the portion on, to Mulvey, specifically over 30 days.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi to close.

Councillor Gerbasi: First of all, I don't know about approaching the department but I just want to point out I stood on the floor of Council when this matter came before us a month ago, whenever it was. The first time and also pointed out that I'd not been consulted on the Mulvey property, I don't know how more public I can be and asking to be consulted than to mention it on the floor of Council and the whole matter of all three properties were referred back so you know, to put the onus back on me and say I should've approached them. I mean, I think you know, I'm not trying to point blame but I don't really think it's in fair if we want to follow proper process as well, I appreciate you're willing to do that. I'm not sure if 30 days is adequate. The motion does not say 30 days. I assume you'll bring it back as quickly as possible but I am asking not just for them to talk to me quickly but to do just a brief report showing that they've done the due diligence in going through the departments and having it circulated which is our property process, so I thank Council for their consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Call the question on the Motion 2. All those in favour? Opposed? Yes, we are voting on Motion 2, Councillor Eadie. So motion passed. Those opposed? Thank you. Okay, so we're going to Item 8 as amended. Do you

want to speak that Councillor Browaty? All in favour? Okay. All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Okay, that's Item 8, as amended. And Item 9.

Item 9 - Urban Design Strategy and Image Route Strategy Review and Update

Councillor Browaty: I think Councillor Mayes stood this down. I'll be more than happy to hear his comments or questions.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: It's a comment that the Chair of Finance may be able to clear up or Councillor Browaty may be able to clear up. I'm in favour of the basically just laying it over but one of the image routes here that's been talked about is Route 1 which becomes Fermor when it enters my ward. The local Biz has been talking to me about wanting to do some work, enhancing Fermor. We've got one of the recommendations here from months ago was that a funding strategy be developed for image routes and referred to the 2013 capital budget for consideration. So we're getting this report back in February and whereas you're looking at that budget, It would appear in January, early February. So I'm wondering how these two processes are going to run together. Maybe we're…truly nothing prohibits us from debating image routes as part of the next budget but my concern here and I appreciate it's not question period but my comment is how are we going to work these two things together? I'd like to see some more funding for the image routes but if that recommendation comes a month after we do the budget, we'll be waiting another year. So I don't know if a subsequent speaker can clarify the thinking on that.

Mr. Speaker: Defer to Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. I actually do have a note from the department on this particular matter and I should have mentioned it earlier when we were discussing this but I realized that during the meeting here. Image routes and their design intent need to align with the road network and classification system. Good urban design reflects and reinforces the values of our community which are identified through consultation. Many of those building blocks have been identified through the Our Winnipeg process. Examples, strong neighbourhoods, a vibrant downtown, great destinations, urban forests, strong wings which connects all elements of roads, trails et cetera. And while the Public Service has reviewed the design criteria for the image routes, several key building blocks of an urban design strategy are still to be completed including bicycle and pedestrian strategy currently initiated, complete streets which is pending, the digital sign and Downtown Zoning By-law review which are under way and just dealt with a big portion of that, the Transportation Standards Manual, which is underway. The Heritage Buildings By-law which is under review and …strategy which is in development and testing, that's the department's rational for the 90 day layover.

Mr. Speaker: All right. So seeing none. No one further to comment, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have one other motion.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Swandel,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS Council, at its meeting held on November 14, 2012, adopted Items 1 and 2 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated November 6, 2012, namely, the Area Structure Plan for the Waverley West - West Neighbourhood under File SP 1/2012 and the Subdivision and Rezoning of the Waverley West - West Neighbourhood under File DASZ 8/2012;

AND WHEREAS at said meeting, Council amended Section 7.4.3 Sidewalk Policies of the Area Structure Plan (Schedule 1) by adding the following:

(3) Sidewalks shall be provided in the boulevards created between a frontage road and collector street aligning with the collector street sidewalks;

AND WHEREAS the amendment to the Area Structure Plan is not consistent with the following Clause in the proposed Development Agreement for the Subdivision and Rezoning under File DASZ 8/2012, namely:

Part C - Agreement Conditions

16. The Developer shall, at no expense to the City, construct a) in all streets in the West Neighbourhood measuring 22.0m in width or greater, except where frontage roads are constructed, 1.5m wide by 100mm thick Portland cement concrete sidewalks on the standard alignment, 0.3m off the property line, along both sides of the street; and b) in all streets in the West Neighbourhood less than 22.0m in width, excluding cul-de-sacs, 1.5m wide by 100mm thick Portland cement concrete sidewalks on one side of the street, at back of curb, as determined by and to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.

AND WHEREAS Section 235 of The City of Winnipeg Charter stipulates that any development in the City must be consistent with Plan Winnipeg or any secondary plan;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council revisit its November 14, 2012 decision on Item 2 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated November 6, 2012 and delete Clause 16 under Part C - Agreement Conditions of the proposed Development Agreement (Schedule "C") for application DASZ 8/2012, in its entirety and replace it with the following:

Part C – Agreement Conditions

16. The Developer shall, at no expense to the City, construct 1.5 m wide by 100 mm thick Portland cement concrete sidewalks a) on the standard alignment, 0.3m off the property line, along both sides of the street in all streets in the West Neighbourhood measuring 22.0m in width or greater, b) on one side of the street, at back of curb, in all streets in the West Neighbourhood less than 22.0m in width, excluding cul-de-sacs and c) aligning with the collector streets sidewalks within the service islands of frontage roads, where constructed in the West Neighbourhood, as determined by and to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.

Councillor Eadie: (Inaudible) move suspension of the rules to debate?

Mr. Speaker: All in favour of suspending the rules to debate this motion 1? All those in favour? Opposed? (Inaudible) I'm sorry.

Councillor Swandel: I would prefer it go to Property and Development for…

Mr. Speaker: All right. Introduce your motion, Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: It's automatic referral, you don't need to…(inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: We're going to a recorded vote, all right. We need two-thirds to suspend the rules. All those in favour of suspending the rules and dealing with the motion and debating the motion, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Eadie.

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 1, Nays 15.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel would you like to…we just have to automatic referral on this motion. Okay, thank you. All right and do we have some by-laws? We do have some by-laws, Councillor Browaty.

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

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-law No. 146/2012 be read a first time, I guess, first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 146/2012.

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-law 146/2012 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 146/2012.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 146/2012 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question Period for Property and Development. Councillor Mayes.

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

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

Councillor Mayes: Hate to take another kick at the same can here, but the discussion I actually found a little more confusing than enlightening on the point about the image route. So just for clarity are we going to get the report about a funding strategy a month after we're debating the budget or are we going to get some of the funding strategy? Is it going to be for the image route? Is that going to be incorporated into the 2013 budget discussions to the best of your knowledge?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I'm not…I don't…my recollection of what's coming up in the budget, I can't say at this point but again, the 2013 budget is coming along. It should be pointed out as well that there will be funding for image routes coming from the future digital billboard and actually billboard fees that are going to be coming forward, and I think the intention was that that would be the enhancement of what was previously for image routes.

Mr. Speaker: Second question? Seeing no further questions for Property and Development that pretty much concludes our agenda. I'd just like to reiterate what I said at lunch time and offer our congratulations to Mayor Katz and his wife, Leah on the birth of their new son, Aidan, so mazel tov. A great way to start off the holiday season, so again best wishes to everyone and I'll accept the motion to adjourn from Councillor Gerbasi. All those in favour? 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 2:28 p.m.