REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE

ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

DATED MARCH 12, 2001

On motion of Councillor Gerbasi, the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, dated March 12, 2001, was considered clause by clause.

Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,

That the Consent Agenda, Clauses 1,2 and 3, be adopted.

Councillor Gerbasi requested that Clause 3 be pulled from the Consent Agenda.

The motion to adopt the Consent Agenda, Clauses 1 and 2, was put and declared carried.

2001 Final Operating Grants to Cultural Organizations
Files FG-1.1 and FG-3 (Vol. 42)

413 - 1. On November 7, 1984, Council established the Winnipeg Arts Advisory Council and delegated it with the responsibility for screening applications, definition of criteria and recommendations as to appropriate grant levels for cultural organizations. The Winnipeg Arts Advisory Council forwards its recommendations to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services.

On March 12, 2001, the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services considered and approved recommendations from the February 26, 2001, meeting of the Winnipeg Arts Advisory Council for final instalment grant funding to various cultural organizations.

Council Policy on Cultural Grants administered by the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services (C302) provides that the Committee shall adjudicate all applications within the global allocation and have final authority to approve grants, which qualify under this policy, to an amount of $50,000.00 per individual grant. It shall submit to Council with its recommendation for approval, all requests for grants in excess of this amount.

The Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services recommends:

I. That the final instalments for the 2001 Primary Operating Grants be approved to the following cultural organizations:

Organization	Category	2001 Interim Operating Grant Received	2001 Final Operating Grant Recommendation	Total 2001 Operating Grant Recommendation
The Royal Winnipeg Ballet	Dance	$79,200.00	$184,800.00	$264,000.00
Le Festival du Voyageur	Festivals	$27,600.00	$60,400.00	88,000.00
Folk Arts Council of Winnipeg Inc./Folklorama	Festivals	$32,700.00	$69,300.00	$102,000.00
The Winnipeg Art Gallery	Museums/Galleries	$102,000.00	$238,000.00	$340,000.00
Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra Inc.	Music	$53,370.00	$124,530.00	$177,900.00
Manitoba Theatre Centre	Theatre	$47,850.00	$112,150.00	$160,000.00

II. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing recommendation.

Adopted by consent.

Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services dated March 12, 2001

Community Incentive Grant Application – Casa du Minho Portuguese Centre
File PR-2.6 (Vol. 14)

414 - 2. The Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services has been advised that the Casa du Minho Portuguese Centre requested that their Community Incentive Grant application be referred to City Centre and the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committees for consideration at their February 2001 meetings. The Casa du Minho Portuguese Centre Community Incentive Grant application, in the amount of $36,500.00, is to assist with Phase II facility renovations of the centre, located at 1080 Wall Street.

The application does not meet the eligibility criteria contained in the Community Incentive Grant Program.

On February 6, 2001, the City Centre Community Committee recommended approval of a Community Incentive Grant to the Casa du Minho Portuguese Centre in the amount of $18,250.00 to be funded from the Daniel McIntyre Ward allocation.

On February 13, 2001, the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee recommended approval of a Community Incentive Grant to the Casa du Minho Portuguese Centre in the amount of $18,250.00; $9,125.00 to be funded equally from the Point Douglas and the Old Kildonan Ward allocations.

The Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services concurred in the recommendations of the City Centre and the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committees, and recommends:

I. That the following eligibility criteria for the Community Incentive Grant Program, be waived in this instance, namely:-

a) The organization is to be a non-profit community recreation and sport organization or a non-profit organization offering recreational services, and

b) The project is to make a significant contribution to the long-term benefit of the community-at-large in terms of improved facilities.

II. That Community Incentive Grants from the following Community Committees be allocated as follows, namely:-

a) $18,250.00 from the City Centre Community Committee;

b) $18,250.00 from the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee, and

c) That the Community Incentive Grant, not to exceed a maximum of fifty (50%) of the total project cost, be approved to the Casa du Minho Portuguese Centre, for the purpose requested, subject to the following conditions:

i) Confirmation of other funding sources;

ii) Approval of final plans and specifications for the project by the Director; and

iii) The applicant entering into a formal agreement with the City of Winnipeg.

III. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Adopted by consent.

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services dated March 12, 2001

Chemical Pesticide Spraying
File PA (Vol. 11)

415 - 3. The Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services has been advised that Winnipeg has carried out an organized mosquito control program, aimed at the reduction of nuisance and disease-carrying mosquitoes, since 1927. Although the Insect Control Branch has responsibility for the control of several other major urban insect pests affecting public health or the property of the City of Winnipeg and its citizens, mosquito control has always been its primary concern. The legal basis of the various insect control operations is Section 429 of the City of Winnipeg Act. A specific insect control by-law does not currently exist.

In order to accomplish long-range, intelligent, and environmentally sound mosquito control, their management must be accomplished by using not just one but all available pest control methods. This combination of methods into one thoughtful ecologically-valid program is referred to as Integrated Pest Management (IPM).

A typical mosquito control program, employing IPM principles, first determines the species list and abundance of mosquitoes through larval and adult surveys and then uses the most efficient, effective and environmentally sensitive methods of control.

The City views water management, sanitation and mosquito larviciding as the preferred methods of mosquito control. Improved drainage and containment of run-off water through ditch construction and maintenance is encouraged. The removal or proper storage of artificial containers on private and public properties is also encouraged through various public education campaigns. However the largest component of the mosquito control program is the mosquito larviciding operation. The mosquito larva is the most concentrated stage of mosquito development and occurs in discrete aquatic habitats. By targeting larvae in ditches, stagnant pools and containers, countless mosquitoes are destroyed before they reach the adult, biting stage.

Larviciding of all known breeding sites within the City is carried out on a regular basis each spring, following snowmelt, and in the summer, after each heavy rainfall. Occasionally, as resources permit, larviciding is partially extended up to 8 km beyond the City limits. However, during some summers in Winnipeg it becomes necessary, at some point in time, to carry out a relatively short adulticiding program, including residential fogging. Although not the preferred approach to mosquito control, adulticiding can be an effective supplement to larviciding, reducing adult mosquito populations to more acceptable levels.

In 2000, the Insect Control Branch Operating budget was $ 1,571,174. Typically, 85% of this amount, or $1,335,498, is spent on controlling mosquitoes in the larval stage of development, either through larviciding, source reduction or public education and cooperation. However, to be most effective, mosquito larviciding needs to include not only areas inside the City, but must extend beyond the City limits to include each of the municipalities within the Capital Region. Any exemption or exclusion to this larviciding effort would negatively affect mosquito abatement results within the general region.

In 2000, the direct cost of larviciding some standing water sites within a 4 km area beyond the City limits was approximately $412,500. Only those areas that are easily accessed and were judged to breed the largest populations of mosquitoes were larvicided in the 0-4 km area. Many important mosquito breeding-sites that are outside of the City are routinely left unchecked because of limited resources. As a consequence mosquito larviciding is often less than adequate.

The rural municipalities included in mosquito control in 2000 and the approximate cost associated with each is as follows:

Municipality	Year 2000
Headingley	$ 128,500
Rosser	$ 30,000
West St.Paul	$ 25,000
East St.Paul	$ 40,000
Springfield	$ 60,000
Tache	$ 24,000
Macdonald	$ 55,000
Ritchot	$ 50,000
St. Andrews	$ 0
St. Clements	$ 0
Total	$ 412,500

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services dated March 12, 2001

Although the expenditure of monies for larviciding efforts outside of the City is substantial, it is not sufficient to ensure adequate control for the City of Winnipeg. To ensure that mosquitoes do not become a problem for Winnipeg, it is important to increase the extent of mosquito larviciding to at least 6 km beyond the City limits and to include all sites that breed mosquitoes. It is estimated that in recent years, to extend larviciding to 6 km beyond the City, an additional $612,500 in annual operating costs would have been required. However, as detailed later in this report, new national standards for pesticide use will inevitably make this cost higher. The extent of these cost increases is unknown and can only be accurately estimated after a very thorough examination of the standing-water sites outside the City. The total estimated cost that would have been associated with such an expansion of the mosquito larviciding program into each of the rural municipalities is listed below. (i.e. before the adoption of new national standards for pesticide use).

Municipality	Year 2000	Additional Requirement	Total Spending (0 - 6 km)
Headingley	$128,500	$101,500	$230,000
Rosser	$ 30,000	$ 60,000	$ 90,000
West St. Paul	$ 25,000	$ 45,000	$ 70,000
East St. Paul	$ 40,000	$ 60,000	$100,000
Springfield	$ 60,000	$100,000	$160,000
Tache	$ 24,000	$ 56,000	$ 80,000
Macdonald	$ 55,000	$ 95,000	$150,000
Ritchot	$ 50,000	$ 60,000	$110,000
St. Andrews	$ 0	$ 25,000	$ 25,000
St. Clements	$ 0	$ 10,000	$ 10,000
Total	$412,500	$612,500	$1,025,000

Naturally, any extension of larviciding efforts beyond the City limits would have positive effects for the rural municipalities themselves. By increasing the larviciding effort to 6 km beyond the City it could be expected that Winnipeg would have to resort to adult mosquito control only rarely and that the communities near to the City would have a significant problem with mosquitoes only after periods of above normal rainfall. Those residents living near the edge of the expanded larviciding program would experience only marginal benefits.

Adult Mosquito Control

Traditionally, during most summers in Winnipeg, it becomes necessary, at some point in time, to carry out a relatively short adulticiding program. Adulticiding is of course the application of insecticide to an area to reduce adult-mosquito populations. Usually, adulticiding is done to alleviate unacceptably high levels of nuisance mosquitoes. Much less often it is used to reduce disease-carrying mosquitoes, as occurred in 1975, 1977, 1981 and 1983. The most common forms of adulticiding are ultra-low volume applications or “fogging”. Fogging produces small droplets of insecticide which are carried by light winds through areas where mosquitoes are present. The mosquitoes are then killed within hours of being contacted. Although not the preferred approach to mosquito control, adulticiding can be an effective supplement to a rigorous program of larviciding, reducing adult mosquito populations to more acceptable levels.

During 2000, the cost of adult mosquito control was $238,000. When adult mosquito control (residential fogging) is required, the cost is funded by the approval of an additional appropriation of funds.

A 5-year history of adult mosquito control costs is as follows:

Year	Cost
2000	$238,000
1999	$135,069
1998	$ 82,332
1997	$ 10,259
1996	$ 13,352

In recent history, the maximum cost for adult mosquito control was $283,394. This cost occurred in 1991. In contrast, during 1992 and 1995, adult mosquito control was considered unnecessary.

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services dated March 12, 2001

Chlorpyrifos

Chlorpyrifos is an insecticide that is used extensively by the City of Winnipeg for larval mosquito control. It is an organophosphate compound that has been used by the City of Winnipeg for mosquito control since 1976. Its major advantage is that it is economical and highly effective as a mosquito larvicide. A disadvantage of this insecticide is that it is not selective. Other aquatic organisms in water treated with this product may be killed.

On average the City treats 28,303 ha of mosquito breeding sites each year.

A 10-year history of mosquito larviciding activity is listed below:

Year	Hectares
2000	25,804
1999	25,296
1998	32,191
1997	26,967
1996	29,452
1995	23,342
1994	42,279
1993	30,505
1992	24,977
1991	22,220
Average	28,303

In 2000, 98% or 25,388 ha of the mosquito breeding sites were treated with chlorpyrifos. The other 2% were treated with B.t.i., a biological insecticide. A simple cost comparison of the liquid and granular formulations of these two products is listed below:

Material	2000 Cost	Rate/ha	Cost/ha
Chlorpyrifos (granule)	$ 4.37/kg	1.5 kg	$ 6.56
Chlorpyrifos (liquid)	$22.99/L	0.11 L	$ 2.53
B.t.i. (granule)	$ 6.00/kg	6.0 kg	$36.00
B.t.i. (liquid)	$34.95/L	1.0 L	$34.95

As is apparent from this comparison, an obvious difference between chlorpyrifos and B.t.i. is the cost. However, a significant advantage of B.t.i. is its environmental sensitivity.

Products containing B.t.i. are ideally suited for Integrated Pest Management programs because the active ingredient does not interrupt activities of most beneficial insects and predators. Since B.t.i. has a highly specific mode of action, it is an insecticide of minimal environmental concern.

Year 2001 and Beyond

The City is being challenged to find alternative materials and methods for mosquito control. In the near term, the most viable option is to select from a small group of other larvicides to combat mosquitoes that are breeding in and around more sensitive locations. In the longer term source reduction strategies and perhaps more innovative controls can be developed and adopted for use. However, at present there are no easy control options in development or nearing operational use.

A description of the insecticides that are available for use as an alternative to chlorpyrifos is listed below:

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services dated March 12, 2001

Product Name	Formulation	Active Ingredient	Cost	Rate/ha	Cost/ha
Vectobac 200G	Granule	B.t.i.	$ 6.07/kg	6kg/ha	$ 36.42
Vectobac 1200L	Liquid	B.t.i.	$34.95/L	1 L/ha	$ 34.95
Teknar Granules	Granule	B.t.i.	$ 6.00/kg	6kg/ha	$ 36.00
Teknar Liquid	Liquid	B.t.i.	$34.90/L	1.2L/ha	$ 41.88
Altosid Granules	Granule	Methoprene	$20.03/kg	11.2kg/ha	$224.34
Altosid Pellets	Pellets	Methoprene	$56.25/kg	7kg/ha	$393.73
Dimilin	Wettable Powder	Diflubenzuron	$ 395./kg	.19kg/ha	$ 75.05

The most reasonable approach to mosquito control in future will entail a significantly greater use of the insecticide B.t.i., along with the additional use of the insecticide dimilin. Not only are these insecticides themselves more expensive, they also demand more expensive application costs. On an annual operating basis, it is estimated that approximately 7000 ha of standing water will require treatment with B.t.i. granules; 2250 ha will require treatment with B.t.i. liquid; and 750 ha will require treatment with Dimilin WP.

A summary of each of the additional costs associated with this change in pesticide use is listed below:

	Annual Cost (beyond 2001)	One-Time Cost
Insecticides		
B.t.i. granules	$ 206,010	
B.t.i. liquid	$ 72,000	
Dimilin WP	$ 54,075	
Helicopter Rental		
115 hours @ 710/hour	$ 81,650	
Staffing		
4 Utility III (17 weeks)	$ 64,338	
4 Utility II (17 weeks)	$ 49,527	
3 Technical Assistants (17 weeks)	$ 32,482	
Truck Rentals		
5 @ $ 750/month x 4.5 months	$ 16,875	
Spray Equipment		
4 @ $ 7500/ea		$ 30,000
Miscellaneous		
Fuel, Safety Supplies, Operating Supplies, etc.	$ 20,000	
Totals	$ 596,957	$ 30,000

The full cost of these changes will need to be realized beginning in the year 2002, if the level of mosquito control is to remain the same as in previous years. For 2001, the PMRA has determined that a phase-in period will be in effect which will help to offset some of these longer term costs. PMRA has determined that existing inventories of chlorpyrifos should be used according to current label directions and thereafter chlorpyrifos should be used according to new label directions.

In consideration of this, the additional cost for mosquito larviciding in 2001 is estimated at $ 178,189.

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services dated March 12, 2001

This figure is detailed below:

	Year 2001	One-Time Cost (2001)
Insecticide		
B.t.i. granules	$ 60,000	
B.t.i. liquid	$ 6,990	
Dimilin WP	$ 9,875	
Helicopter Rental		
25 hours @ $ 710/hour	$ 17,750	
Staffing		
1 Utility III (17 weeks)	$ 16,085	
1 Utility II (17 weeks)	$ 12,382	
3 Technical Assistants (17 weeks)	$ 32,482	
Truck Rentals		
3 @ $ 750/month x 4.5 months	$ 10,125	
Spray Equipment		
1 @ $ 7500/ea		$ 7,500
Miscellaneous		
Fuel, Safety Supplies, Operating Supplies, etc.	$ 5,000	
Totals	$ 170,689	$ 7,500

Anti-Pesticide Registration

In accordance with Manitoba Regulation 94/88R under the Environmental Act, the City of Winnipeg applies for a Pesticide Use Permit which subsequently allows it to proceed with its various programs for insect control. Associated with this permit are certain terms and conditions. One of the conditions that is sometimes contentious related to residential fogging, whereby an individual that is opposed to the use of insecticides on or adjacent to their property can have an area around their residence exempt from the fogging program. In 2000, a few individuals seized this opportunity and very strategically solicited support for their opposition to effect a large area of exclusion with a minimal number of registrations. It should be noted that the entire registration process is seen as a compromise position between those individuals who would like the program for mosquito control to proceed and those individuals who are opposed to the use of pesticides. In 2000, this balance appeared to be somewhat distorted. In future it is suggested that only original, self-composed letters of registration be accepted as requests for spray exclusion. In the past form letters have been accepted for registration purposes. By leaving the registration process to the initiative of an individual, those rights to the individual would be protected, yet the success of the overall program would be better ensured. Any amendment to the registration process would need the approval of the Province.

Not only does the City of Winnipeg exempt individual properties from the residential fogging program, it also makes allowances for the exemption of property during the mosquito larviciding program. These registrations, unlike the registrations in opposition to residential fogging, are not mandated by the Province but rather are informal City policy. Each mosquito breeding-site that is excluded from the control program simply contributes to the mosquito problem to the extent that the need for adult mosquito control becomes more likely. Since residential fogging is the least preferred option for mosquito control, it is considered important to do all things reasonable to effect control during the larval stages of development. Unlike residential fogging, the application of pesticides during larviciding is very much site specific. Larviciding also allows the use of environmentally more friendly biological insecticides. For these reasons it is recommended that the City change its policy so that there be no spray buffer provided during mosquito larviciding operations.

The final limitation to effective larviciding are the current restrictions to pesticide use on private property. The City of Winnipeg has authority under the City of Winnipeg Act, Section 429 (1) to “carry out any work that it considers necessary within the city, or within a distance of 15 miles of the city, to suppress mosquitoes, flies and other insects.” Further, under Section 429 (5), “council may pass by-laws for the prevention of mosquito breeding,

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services dated March 12, 2001

including by-laws prohibiting or regulating the keeping of receptacles capable of holding rainwater out of doors." However the City does not have authority to enter onto private property for the purpose of larviciding, if such action is opposed by the property owner.

Although the number of individuals who object to larviciding on their private property is small, their action can have negative consequences to the overall success of the mosquito control program. Therefore, it is recommended that the City develop a mosquito control by-law that includes the right of access onto private property for the purpose of mosquito larviciding. It is also recommended that each of the rural municipalities in the Capital Region be encouraged to do the same. To achieve this result, the Province would need to amend the City of Winnipeg Act to give the proper authority. It is envisioned that this by-law would assign responsibility for mosquito control to the land owner in the event that the land owner objected to the city's application of mosquito control efforts. However, if after a short period of time, and before the mosquitoes developed through the larval stages of development, the owner of a property neglected to apply a program of mosquito control to his land which is similar in nature and as effective in result as the City's, the City may then proceed to apply its mosquito control program to the property. The City of Calgary is an example of a municipality that has such a by-law in place.

The range of actions discussed in this report are aimed at reducing the negative impacts of mosquitoes within Winnipeg by using environmentally sensitive approaches as much as possible.

On July 6, 2000, the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services requested that a report be provided that outlined the following:

a) A breakdown on the costs of larviciding, including the costs for larviciding within capital region municipalities within a 12 kilometer radius of the City of Winnipeg; and

b) A draft budget which provides a comparison of larviciding programs for The City of Winnipeg and surrounding municipalities with the cost of the existing larviciding/fogging program which the City currently carries out.

Council approval is required in order to request that the Province of Manitoba amend The City of Winnipeg Act and Council approval is required for the establishment of new policy.

The Financial Impact is outlined on Appendix "A".

On March 12, 2001, the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Community Services considered a report from the Director of Community Services dated March 5, 2001, with respect to Chemical Pesticide Spraying. The Committee concurred in Recommendations 2 to 6, inclusive and referred the following, Recommendation 1. to the Standing Committee on Fiscal Issues, namely:

"1. That the annual operating budget of the Insect Control Branch be increased by an additional appropriation of $178,189, beginning in the year 2001, and that future consideration be given to increasing the annual operating budget for the Insect Control Branch by an additional $448,768 beginning in the year 2002. (i.e. A total of $ 626,957 more in operating budget than in year 2000). This to accommodate a significantly greater use of environmentally more sensitive biological insecticides and to maintain current levels of insect control."

The Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services recommends:

I. That Council enter into discussions with each of the Rural Municipalities of the Capital Region, and with the Province, with a view to extending mosquito larviciding efforts to 6 km beyond the City limits on a cost-sharing basis.

II. That the Insect Control Branch continue to rigorously pursue new opportunities for mosquito control that are effective, economical and environmentally friendly, including such options as source reduction in cooperation with other civic departments.

III. That Council establish in 2002, a policy to provide for a no spray buffer on or adjacent to property during any program for larval mosquito control. This would better ensure effective mosquito control given the proposed use of environmentally friendly biological insecticide near residential properties, parks and playgrounds.

Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services dated March 12, 2001

IV. That Council request the Province of Manitoba to amend the City of Winnipeg Act to give the City the authority to develop a mosquito control by-law for mosquito larviciding on private property.

V. That Council develop a mosquito control by-law that would give the City the authority to control larval mosquitoes on private property, and further that Council encourage each Rural Municipality in the Capital Region to do the same.

Copy of attachment referred to in the above clause is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

The Executive Policy Committee concurs with the recommendations of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services and requests the original Recommendation No. 1, which was referred to the Standing Committee on Fiscal Issues by the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, be included as Recommendation No. VI., namely:

VI. That the Standing Committee on Fiscal Issues increase the annual operating budget of the Insect Control Branch by an additional appropriation of $178,189, beginning in the year 2001, and that future consideration be given to increasing the annual operating budget for the Insect Control Branch by an additional $448,768 beginning in the year 2001 (i.e. a total of $626,957 more in operating budget than in year 2000). This is to accommodate a significantly greater use of environmentally more sensitive biological insecticides and to maintain current levels of insect control.

Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Adoption of the clause.

In amendment,

Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
That the recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee be adopted.

The recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee was put and declared carried.

The motion for the adoption of the clause, as amended, was put and declared carried.

(See Minute No. 439 for attachment)

Assiniboine Park Enterprise Reserve Fund
File PR-7.1 (Vol. 10)

416 - ***Note: Clause 4 has been referred by the Executive Policy Committee to the Standing Committee on Fiscal Issues for report back within 30 days to the Executive Policy Committee to consider concerns relative to the establishment of an Assiniboine Park Enterprise Reserve Fund and/or the feasibility of creating an Assiniboine Park Foundation.***

Referred by the Executive Policy Committee to the Standing Committee on Fiscal Issues for report back within 30 days to the Executive Policy Committee to consider concerns relative to the establishment of an Assiniboine Park Enterprise Reserve Fund and/or the feasibility of creating an Assiniboine Park Foundation

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Lubosch,
Seconded by Councillor Vandal,

417 - WHEREAS The City of Winnipeg adopted “An Environmental Agenda” in December of 2000, which states:

> “The City is also mindful of citizen’s concerns over the use of pesticides, (and) “The City will develop an integrated pest management plan, use the plan for preventative measures, and develop a framework for reducing pesticide use and risk.”

AND WHEREAS the Environmental Agenda defines “A sustainable community” one that “employs ecological decision-making (e.g., integration of environmental criteria into all municipal government, business and personal decision-making processes), and

> makes decisions and plans in a balanced, open and flexible manner that includes the perspectives from social, health, economic and environmental sectors of the community, and
>
> minimizes harm to the natural environment, and
>
> does not compromise the sustainability of other communities and future generations by its activities;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development be directed to investigate new preventative pesticide control measures using landscaping and land drainage measures, as referred to in Clause 3 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, dated March 12, 2001, to control and limit mosquito breeding sites in the City of Winnipeg;

AND BE IT RESOLVED that The City of Winnipeg Secretary of Intergovernmental Affairs and other designated civic/provincial liaisons initiate discussions with the Province to coordinate the study and implementation of new preventative pest reduction programs for the City of Winnipeg and the Capital Region municipalities;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that any new policies and/or new financial budgetary requirements be forwarded to Council for consideration.

The Deputy Speaker ruled automatic referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services in accordance with Rule 16.1 of the Procedure By-law.

Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,

That the rule be suspended to allow consideration of the motion at this time.

Carried.

With the concurrence of the seconder, Councillor Vandal, and with the permission of Council, Councillor Lubosch amended his motion by adding a new resolve after the second resolve to read as follows:-

AND BE IT RESOLVED that a Special Committee be created to develop a Mosquito Control By-law and by inserting “, by-laws” immediately after “new policies” in the last resolve.

The motion was put and declared carried.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

QUESTION PERIOD

418 - In reference to an interim report on crime statistics in the City of Winnipeg, Councillor Prystanski questioned what efforts and resources were being explored to deal with the issue of increasing crime.

Councillor Gerbasi noted that the statistics released were not an accurate reflection of the true crime rate. The figures did not take into account all the pertinent data needed to make an accurate assessment.

In reference to reductions in the number of Police Officers, Councillor Prystanski inquired what the average complement of actual officers was over the last year, to which Councillor Gerbasi agreed to take it under advisement and report back.