COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, July 16, 2014

The Council met at 9:38 a.m.

The City Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Browaty.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, I understand that you have an announcement to make today?

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do have an announcement. I'd like to take a moment to congratulate and salute Mr. Mike Sutherland on his retirement from his position as the President of the Winnipeg Police Association. Policing is a noble profession and a difficult job that requires sacrifices. The biggest of which being that police officers put their lives on the line every day to make our community safe. For years, Mike served and protected the citizens of Winnipeg as an officer with the Winnipeg Police Service. He later went on to serve as the President of the Winnipeg Police Association where he served and protected the interests of all of the officers in the WPS. Police officers are true public servants. I know I speak for all of us on Council when I say a heartfelt thank you to Mike for his service. All the best in your future endeavours and your retirement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

MINUTES

Councillor Steen moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on June 25 and July 9, 2014 be taken as read and confirmed. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. We're going to move onto delegations now. Councillor Nordman.

DELEGATIONS

Councillor Nordman: Madam Speaker, if I could move that we suspend the rules so that we can hear other delegations that may want to speak today, and likewise the Report for July the 15th be adopted or brought on the floor.

Madam Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Eadie: Recorded vote on the suspension of the rules…

Madam Speaker: All in favour of suspending the rules to hear further delegations today? Contrary? Carried. And a recorded vote. I'm getting to that. Okay, so for both, for the delegations and to hear Item…July 15th, it will be a walk on report, so we need a suspension of the rules and it will be a recorded vote. So all of those in favour of dealing with the item today?

Councillor Swandel: Two separate motions?

Madam Speaker: No, because we wouldn't hear delegations if we're not dealing with the item today, right? So it will be together.

Councillor Gerbasi**:** Point of order, Madam Speaker. Sorry, did you have one first?

Councillor Fielding: Point of order. I want to make sure that there's clarification on the question right now. So you're talking about the EPC report that went through.?

Madam Speaker: The EPC report dated July 15th, that was yesterday's meeting at 3:30.

Councillor Fielding: So that includes also the audit report?

Madam Speaker: Yes, it's Item, 1, 2, 3 and 4. Yes.

Councillor Gerbasi**:** Point of order is on the delegations, normally we give a list of who is speaking and what does it mean just to say everyone can speak? Like are we just saying that? That's fine, but I'm just trying to understand what we're saying. Like who is speaking?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, do we have a list of additional delegations? Councillor Nordman?

Councillor Mayes**:** I don't know if this is what Councillor Nordman was referring to, I have four transit operators who wish to speak, I'm not sure if that's…who Councillor Nordman is talking about. Well, I can submit the names, but I'm not sure if that's what you're speaking to.

Madam Speaker: There are several delegations, I understand. So the transit operators and others, perhaps, so the question is suspending the rules to hear further delegations and to deal with the EPC report dated July 15th. A recorded vote was called. The agenda is in front of you, Councillor Gerbasi. It's EPC dated July 15. It's a walk-on report so we need to suspend the rules. Councillor Nordman, the delegations that we're hoping to hear from, are they related to the EPC report, the additional delegations?

Councillor Nordman: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Maybe let's separate it that way.

Councillor Nordman: It would be our Auditor and the individuals that we retained from KPMG.

Madam Speaker: So additional delegations just on the EPC report and to actually deal with the item today. And a recorded vote was called. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: So that is separate. The transit operators who wish to speak to it…?

Madam Speaker: We'll do that separate, yes, okay? A recorded vote was called. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Orlikow and Wyatt

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

Madam Speaker: Carried. Thank you. Councillor Eadie, yes.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I just need clarification, I think I accidentally voted for something I didn't necessarily want to support. The meeting of the EPC, June 16th, 9:00 a.m., do we need to also suspend the rules to hear those reports?

Madam Speaker: We can when we come to the item.

Councillor Eadie: But did we just move to suspend the rules to hear the June 15 and June 16?

Madam Speaker: July 15th, not June 15th.

Councillor Eadie: July 15?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: So, we still need to…

Madam Speaker: And that's because there's delegations here for that item.

Councillor Eadie: Okay, well, I was confused so I'd like to be recorded actually in opposition to that motion about the June…July 15th EPC.

Madam Speaker: Okay, as long as Council allows it, I'm fine with it. Okay, thank you. Okay, we'll now move on to delegations. Councillor Mayes at this time, would you like to suspend the rules for additional delegations on the transit matter?

Councillor Mayes: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. There are as far as I know four operators here. If you need the…do you need the names at this stage? I'll give you the names then…Tim Stones, Kim Jacklin Van Gerwen, James Van Gerwen and Gail Lameureux, stand all here in support…well, all here to speak to the Transit By-Law.

Madam Speaker: Sure, thank you. The Clerk can give me that in a few minutes? Thank you. We'll move on to delegations that are registered. First up is Mr. David Sauer in support of Item 1, the report of IRPW regarding the Transit By-law. Mr. Sauer, are you here? Okay, while he makes his way up here, Councillor Mayes, you're giving the names and we'll call the question. All those in favour of suspending the rules to hear further delegations on the transit item? Contrary? Carried. Good morning.

David Sauer: I do have some presentations if it pleases everyone. Thank you. Thank you very much. Unfortunately, the title is wrong, this is just sort of carried over, but it is for the Winnipeg…sorry for the City Council meeting today. Before I begin, I just want to sort of highlight for everybody the importance of this issue and how important Winnipeg Transit operators and members of ATU Local 1505, the importance of…in this issue… there's about a dozen of them here today in the gallery that are here to show support for this by-law and very thankful to Councillor Mayes for suspending the rules to hear additional speakers. The Winnipeg Labour Council is pleased to have an opportunity to present its views before this meeting. We believe public safety must be enhanced on Winnipeg Transit and this is an important first step in addressing those concerns. We would like to thank St. Vital City Councillor Brian Mayes for his continued effort to improve public safety on Winnipeg Transit. Councillor Ross Eadie has also offered public support for increased transit security measures as well. We are here in support of the report regarding the Transit By-Law, however, we believe there are concerns that need to be addressed moving forward. Winnipeg operator, Winnipeg Transit Operators are still at risk on the job. As of June 2014, 18 incidents of assaults against transit operators have been reported. That's this year so far in 2014. Evidence of the perils faced by operators became evident in October 2013, when Winnipeg Police released a video of a brutal assault against an operator; seeking the public's assistance in tracking down the assailant. The incident demonstrated to the public how quickly situations can escalate into violence and the need for increased safety and security on Winnipeg Transit. We applaud the report's recommendation that two cadets be deployed on Winnipeg Transit property and buses starting on September 1, 2014. We see this as a positive move in addressing this issue. We believe a visible security presence on bus, on a bus, like cadets an essential tool in ensuring safer transit. It is our hope that this could lead to more use of cadets on public transit or an eventual use of Winnipeg Police in this role. We are hesitant to see this eventually turn into a separate transit policing agency as we believe that cadets and Police are currently able to fulfill these duties. The WLC does have some concerns with sections of the By-law, the mandatory fare requirement could pose a problem for operators as assaults often begin over a fare dispute. There's also a concern of the WLC that this could unfairly target Winnipeg's low income residents. Similar to this line of thinking, we are concerned that the 90 minute maximum stay in a bus shelter or on Transit property could be used to unfairly target Winnipeg's homelessness or homeless population. The Winnipeg Labour Council is supportive of increased safety and security on Winnipeg Transit. We believe that the situation has reached a crisis point and the time for action has come. The WLC is pleased to support this by-law. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Sauer. If you could just stay by the bench and we'll take questions in a few minutes. I'd like to now call the additional delegations on the transit item, Tim Stones, Kim Jacklin Van Gerwen, James Van Gerwen and Gail Lameureux.

Tim Stones: Good morning all. I'm Tim Stones. I started driving a bus for the City 17 years ago. I've been assaulted three times. I've been punched in the face. I've had my sunglasses taken off, smashed on the windshield. January 9th, I

had a bottle of water dumped in my ear. Now that's happened to me twice. First time, I didn't report it because, you know, it's not my problem. It affects me physically, but it's not. Like the person who is attacking me has the issues. Now, I don't…this is a no sort of…I didn't speak to these people and these were not fare disputes. I've had individuals grab the steering wheel; take me up the curb; take out street signs, yet, you know, I come back to work, smile, and let people on. So whatever you guys can do to make my job better, so I'm not upset when I go home, I'd appreciate it. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Sauer, if you could come forward, are there any questions of Mr. Sauer? We'll take them at this time. Okay, seeing none, thank you very much for coming out today. Next is Mr. Dave Mouland in opposition to the same item. You have 10 minutes, sir, thank you.

Dave Mouland: Good morning, Madam Speaker and members of Council. My name is Dave Mouland and I'm here today representing Winnipeg Harvest and the Winnipeg Transit Riders Association. I wish to speak in opposition to two clauses of the proposed Transit By-law. First, let it be said that I will sing the praises of all safety issues covered by this by-law, even on the bus if need be. My real issues are two-fold. The first is not having bus fare. I volunteer in the call centre at Winnipeg Harvest taking calls from people who need help putting food on the table. In some instances, people come to our warehouse as they need food now and their neighbourhood food bank may not be running for as long as two weeks from now. We try all other options to get them there; borrow a vehicle; have a friend drive you…can they walk or ride a bike? Can a social worker help? When all else fails, then all that's left is free transit. In some of these cases people don't have tickets or money for the fare. So they have to ask for free ride to Winnipeg Harvest. In the past, the fare adjustment envelope permitted someone to get on the bus without a fare by promising to deposit two fares the next time. We understand that that's been phased out and it is now up to a driver's discretion; yet there is no mention of driver's discretion in the by-law as it is now. Are all drivers informed that they have the right to let someone ride free to Winnipeg Harvest? What are the criteria for letting the person on or is it just, "well, I'm having a bad day and so will you" kind of attitude? Doesn't this create a safety issue which could be avoided? About 50 or 75 Winnipeg Harvest clients a month face this desperate situation: no food and no bus fare. We at Winnipeg Harvest and at Winnipeg Transit Riders Association are willing to discuss with Council representatives and Winnipeg Transit whether we can come up with a better system. It does not make much sense to fine someone a hundred bucks because they can't pay bus fare to pick up some food to get them to the end of the month. If they are having this much trouble making ends meet, where is the money for the fine plus cost going to come from? The second issue is the 90 minute waiting period in bus shelters. Are we really that cold-hearted that we would remove someone from shelter because they have been there more than 90 minutes? Thankfully, I'm not like that. How is this going to be enforced? Are these people going to be taken to a shelter like Siloam or Salvation Army? Who is going to take them there? What happens if the shelters are full? Are all transit shelters going to be patrolled or only those in specific areas of the city? How are the fines going to be collected once the ticket has been issued to a destitute and homeless person? If the ticket is not paid, does that mean jail time? I do not believe that making a homeless person a criminal will solve the problem. This also applies to not having bus fares. Being poor should not be a crime. Thank you very much for letting me speak, and I have some copies of...

Madam Speaker: Give them to the Clerk, thank you. Mr. Mouland, if you can just stay on the floor, we may have some questions in a few minutes, thank you. I'd like to call Mr. Paul Gibson who is in opposition to the same item. Thank you, Mr. Gibson. Welcome, and you have five minutes.

Paul Gibson: Thank you. I live in Mynarski Ward. I'd like to speak specifically to the items on page 12, Part 3. Specifically Items J, K and L. What initially got my attention on the media about this item or this matter was to talk about prohibiting carrying of firearm on the bus. I have carried a firearm on the bus. I talked to the bus driver, he said, "Yeah, no problem." I carried it in accordance with the laws of the land on how to carry a firearm. There are many rules in the criminal code and the regulations pursuant there to governing the carrying of a firearm, and I carried it pursuant to those rules. If you look at…if you put section J, K and L together, they basically say that the only people that carry a firearm on the Winnipeg Transit property are a police officer, but according to the regulations that police officer will not be able to carry their pistol or ammunition because pistols are restricted firearms, prohibit…would be prohibited in section L. And it carries ammunition that has…that is in the Government Explosives Act and the firearms regulations. It also…gun powder is a flammable substance and that's in a container. I'm pretty sure…I talked to a bus driver on the way down here and he told me that three bus operators have been shot in Manitoba, or in Winnipeg. He didn't know the circumstances, I don't know the circumstances. I'm pretty darn sure it wasn't shot, the person shot with an illegally carried or possessed firearm on a bus. There's lots of rules that govern the carrying of firearms on buses. A restricted firearm or a prohibited firearm has to be carried in a locked case with a trigger lock on it and the ammunition carried separately. A long gun has to be carried unloaded. These things are not a danger to the bus operators or to the general public. Any danger from firearms or explosives comes from people who are not going to follow these rules and these rules are just here to make somebody feel good that they put these rules out there, but we're not going to accomplish anything other than that, other than to bother law-abiding citizens. I can't drive. If I want to go to a store and purchase a firearm, I guess I will have to take a cab, which is a lot more expensive than bus service and I thought we were trying to encourage people to take the bus. If I want to travel by bus to Alberta which I do with a firearm, to come back if I want to

take the bus home from the airport where the bus depot is, I'd have to take a cab because I can't take that. I wouldn't be able to take that firearm on the City transit bus even though it's carried and stored…it's not stored, it's carried in accordance with the Criminal Code and the regulations pursuant thereto. So I'd ask you to remove section K and section L from this by-law, and look at section J. Maybe it needs to be looked, worded a little better. It allows somebody to carry a cigarette lighter, but not to carry cigarette lighter fluid home from the store or to carry paint thinner home from the store or any other flammable liquid. And it prohibits them carrying matches home from the store or in their pocket. So that basically is my position. I'd ask you to remove the provision about firearms and about restricted and prohibited weapons from the bill because they are already covered under existing Federal regulations and Winnipeg city regulations that prohibit somebody from having a loaded firearm or from discharging a firearm. Again, the City, which under Federal law says that you cannot have a loaded…means that you cannot have a loaded firearm in the city. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions for delegations, Mr. Mouland or Mr. Gibson? Okay, seeing none, thank you. Next is Mr. David Sanders in opposition to the following items, Item 4, Report A of EPC dated July 2nd, regarding the inclusion of a question on the 2014 Civic elections ballot, also Item 4 of the report of the Downtown Development Committee dated July 7 regarding proposed Parcel 4 at the Forks. Welcome.

David Sanders: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. With regard to the first matter, this is a proposed resolution; it's for the inclusion on the 2014 Civic election ballot regarding the use of 1% of the Provincial Sales Tax towards fixing roads and bridges. I wish to oppose the motion proposed by Councillors Wyatt and Havixbeck on June 25th, and concurred in by EPC on July 2nd. I do hope that all Councillors have reconsidered this matter and that they will vote against this motion which reads as follows: "Be it resolved that the following wording and one question be placed on the 2014 Civic election ballot. The Provincial Government increased the Provincial Sales Tax by 1% from 7 to 8% without a required referendum. The 1% sales tax increase collects approximately $170 million every year from sales inside Winnipeg. Yet the Provincial Government is dedicating only $50 million a year for Winnipeg's roads and bridges, taking $120 million out of Winnipeg. Do you believe that all the revenues collected by the Provincial Government's 1% increase in the PST from inside the City of Winnipeg should be used towards fixing Winnipeg's existing roads and bridges? Yes or no". That's the proposed referendum for this fall's election in October. I believe the wording of the motion is factually incorrect. And the proposed question does not in my view represent the Provincial Government's core infrastructure program fairly. First of all, Bill 20, the Manitoba Building and Renewal Funding and Fiscal Management Act amended the law requiring the holding of a referendum last year in order to enable the Province of Manitoba to exercise the proper responsibility and authority of any democratically elected representative government to raise taxes for public purposes. Indeed, the leader of the opposition has already candidly admitted that his recent court challenge is unlikely to succeed. But I understand that the additional 1% raises more, some $275 million in a full year. The Provincial Government advised the Legislature that it required more funds for a variety of purposes besides municipal roads and bridges, including Provincial infrastructure and especially flood control works. For example, the citizens of Winnipeg continue to enjoy the benefits of the huge Provincial investments in the expanded Red River Floodway while the Province now tries to provide similar flood protection and mitigation works for the rest of Manitoba. And yet, the Province still now requires itself to pay one seventh of the total 8% Provincial Sales Tax, a total of $315 million annually, in grants to municipalities and local capital projects to the Building Manitoba Fund according to the Municipal Taxation and Funding Act. I submit the Province doesn't take 120 million out of Winnipeg. The Province spends its revenue on its priorities throughout Manitoba, including Winnipeg and including the city's roads and bridges, but certainly not limited to roads and bridges, nor limited to Winnipeg. The Province does make huge expenditures in the City of Winnipeg and for the citizens of Winnipeg. And today, I'm attaching a March 2014 Manitoba news release describing the Province's $5.5 billion five-year plan using every dollar raised from the one cent on the dollar increase in the Provincial Sales Tax to invest in core infrastructure, including Provincial roads, highways and bridges, flood protection, and municipal roads, water treatment and other municipal infrastructure. Over $1 billion will be spent on upgrades to highways which serve Winnipeg. The Trans-Canada Highway east and west, PTH 6, PR 373, PR 374, Highway No. 9, Highway No. 10, Highway 75, and the southwest quadrant of the Perimeter Highway over the next five years, including the completion of CentrePort Canada Way and the Headingley By-pass. The Province has also offered 225 million for rapid transit in Winnipeg. In the northeast, approximately 160 million was initially budgeted by the Province for Highway 59 work over the next five years, but even more would be allocated to the highway with the completion of the Highway 59 and Perimeter Highway interchange during that five-year period. And that project will see design and tendering take place this year with planned construction beginning in the fall of 2015 and completed over a three-year period. The size of the interchange project is similar to CentrePort Canada Way and it will be constructed along much the same lines. I do agree there's always good reason for seeking the cooperation of the Provincial Government and addressing the problems of the City. But I don't think that promoting such a divisive referendum is the way to go about it. I believe most Winnipeggers consider themselves to be good Manitobans, willing to share reasonably in both the costs and the benefits of Provincial programs and services as we also share in the costs and the benefits of Federal programs and services. And finally I do believe there is no legal authority permitting the City of Winnipeg to hold a plebiscite or referendum on a subject such as this. Our civic elections are held pursuant to Municipal Councils and School Board Elections Act which provides for voting only on the elections of municipal Councils and school boards and, a: a plebiscite under the Liquor And Gaming Control

Act and b:, a vote held under Part 2 of the Municipal Act which deals only with the formation, amalgamation or dissolution of municipal governments. I submit this motion should be defeated. With regard to the proposed Parcel 4, Forks rail side development, I have decided to speak up about the proposed plan for the development of the two large parking lots at the Forks even though the Forks Renewal Corporation is a client of mine. I was one of many people who helped to make the Fork's redevelopment possible. I was Provincial Co-Chair of the Canada Manitoba Agreement on Recreation and Conservation on the Red River Corridor and arranged for the Provincial expropriation of all of the privately owned land on the site, plus Steve Juba Park and Waterfront Drive all the way to Point Douglas. And I chaired the tri-level committee of officials which negotiated the first Winnipeg Core Area agreement which the agreement committed all three levels of the government to the redevelopment of the Forks in 1981. I do wish to compliment retiring C.E.O. Jim August, Consultant Angela Mathieson, the new CEO just announced: Paul Jordan and everyone who's worked on the current proposals for the rail side lot and Parcel 4. Last week, I was delighted to see Nick Diakiw in the public gallery watching Council's consideration of the Real Estate Management Audit Report. Nick was Chief Commissioner of the City of Winnipeg and also then CEO of the Forks Renewal Corporation and Winnipeg has been very fortunate to have such professional and dedicated public servants through the years. The preliminary vitalization concepts document on your agenda advocates expansive and exceptional public spaces; parkades with at least 700 visitor parking stalls and incredibly sensible and far-sighted community cultural land bank to reserve space for future community facility once it is identified and funded; pedestrian oriented retail shops and appropriate residential development, with tax increment financing to pay for the public amenities and parkade construction rather than to subside the private developers. For me, the highlight of activities at the Forks today came in 1999, during the second Winnipeg Pan-American Games, when a crowd of at least 50,000 Winnipeggers and guests came together to see in hear Great Big Sea perform on the Scotiabank Stage and because of the additional development and fortunately which has been allowed on the site, since then that magic moment will never happen there again. I do think the priority for public uses of our special meeting place should be guarded jealously, and if there is to be significant residential development on the site, I would suggest the first priority be given to the student hostel proposal, which is originally suggested in connection with the development of the Canadian Museum of Human Rights and second priority should be given to affordable seniors' housing. In any case, the present report prepared by the Forks Renewal Corporation does state that following further public consultation…they're not done...these concepts and more detailed design in development guidelines will be refined and finalized for approval and adoption by both the Forks Renewal Corporation and the City of Winnipeg. Since the development plans are not yet ready for the final approval and adoption by the City of Winnipeg, I have to question once again why this committee and City Council should agree to the motions before you which I consider to be yet another attempt by the City administration to obtain the delegation of virtually complete authority over this new Parcel 4 project. I won't go through it right now except that there are significant recommendations here to take actions which as far as I'm concerned can certainly wait until the final concept plan is prepared and thus submitted for Council approval. I do note that as a matter of interest that the report refers to the value of Parcel 4 as being $6 million. The present assessment right now, realty assessment for Parcel 4, is almost $10 million, based on April 1, 2012 market value…much different figure from the one in the other department's report. Rather than blindly approve the recommendations submitted by the Winnipeg Public Service today, which suggests this committee recommend that City Council approve the attached preliminary revitalization concept document in principle, including the suggested municipal contribution of the Parcel 4 land with matching grants from Canada/Manitoba, plus Provincial and municipal tax increment financing for the public amenities. If both governments agree to this financial arrangement, it should be possible for the Forks Corporation to prepare the final plan and if and when City Council approves it, then it would be time to make all these…or decisions that are recommended to here today, but not now. And given the revelations of all of the audit reports being presented to Council, I submit that Council should never delegate to the CAO the authority to approve the terms and conditions of all agreements with The Forks Corporation and the Province of Manitoba on this or any other matter. If such frequent delegations of Council authority are intended to provide Councillors with plausible deniability response still even when things go wrong, this practice must surely stop now. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Sanders? Councillor Havixbeck followed by Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thanks you Madam Speaker. Mr. Saunders, I'm…thank you for coming here, first of all, but I am surprised that you have made no mention about the fact that there was another appraisal for the property of Parcel 4 in a file and that that came to light in the audit that we received at Council last week. Did you care to comment on that?

David Sanders: There's an awful lot in the report last week.

Councillor Havixbeck: Of course.

David Sanders: And a lot of different values placed by different people on that property. It is not self-evident what the market value of that land is for the purposes now of this arrangement with The Forks and the other governments, the

way in which the agreement is structured, the significance of the value of that parcel is only to determine the amount of grants that the City would and the Forks would like the Province and the Federal Government to provide. Because it's structured that way, if it's 6 million, you're looking for 6 million from each of the other governments as matching contributions. If it's 10 million, likewise. I suspect that based on the valuations that others are putting on it, that it would be the higher number that would be involved.

Madam Speaker: Anything further, Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Mayes: Thank you for not speaking in opposition to the Transit By-Law. You're one of our sharper critics and often well researched so I appreciate that you're not finding fault with the security provisions there. My question though is on the Forks as well and you've touched on some of the issues that are troubling there, and that's right, that in a way that if it's worth more, it's more just an issue of we're not selling for the private sector here, we're selling it back to the Forks or deeding it back to the Forks, so in a way it's kind of taking it out of one pocket and returning it to the other. But you're opposition and a number of people have written to us saying leave it all green, it's a gravel parking lot, there's not so much, leave it green, make it green. You're not saying that, right? You're saying, develop it but in a fashion where we aren't approving what's before us today, is that a fair characterization?

David Sanders: I'm not saying leave it green, but I do object to the notion that the Forks must somehow be self-sufficient financially and break even. In my view, that the Forks should not be viewed as something which loses money any more than Assiniboine Park or the Armed Forces or other public goods and services that we do finance. That has been a burden that the Forks has had to live under all this time because it was established that they should attempt to be self-sufficient. I think there should be…therefore, no push necessarily to seek commercial development if it means privatizing what should be a very public site. But the notion of people on the street, eyes on the street, activity, is important. And I think more tastefully done as the Forks intends to do is perhaps a desirable thing.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: My question is pertaining to the first part of your presentation regarding the motion with regards to the PST that's before us today and placing that question on the ballot as a plebiscite question. Are you aware or are you aware that right now as it stands that the Provincial Government of this Province runs every Provincial highway through every other municipality fully funds and maintains those highways other than the City of Winnipeg?

David Sanders: I'm not familiar with what the current policy is, but I believe that's what it used to be and in any event, in the case of the City of Winnipeg there's significant funding provided by the Provincial Government on cost sharing with the City on major routes.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay, are you aware that all of the projects that you mentioned are largely being funded as you cited in the press release, funded…thanks to the fact that the citizens of Winnipeg are now seeing the funds paid for in terms of PST collected in the city going to all of the projects that you listed previously in your presentation?

David Sanders: Part of the point of the presentation was that the projects in particular that I mentioned are ones which are entrances to or exits from trade routes to the City of Winnipeg and indeed, very…in fact, the perimeter route is, if you will, transportation route for people who live and work in the City of Winnipeg. But the main point to me is that we're all Manitobans.

Councillor Wyatt: So they can get to the city, but they can't get in. So are you aware that even if we broke this in terms of per capita, the motions proposing to do it on the basis of point of sale in terms of where the sales tax collected, but if we actually broke it down which is approximately 61% roughly, but if you're to do it on the basis of per capita which would be a little less, 55%, that would still give a large share to the balance of the province to do exactly what you're saying and then all of the roads and bridges and regional streets in the city which the Province refuses to fund, to be funding those projects, do you not think that is fair and equitable?

David Sanders: As I said, I think there's always room for discussions as to the particulars, but as to the notion that somehow only money raised in Winnipeg should be spent in Winnipeg, I would disagree with that as a principle. Okay?

Madam Speaker: Anything further? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: David, I'm trying to ascertain why you…well, first of all, I think it's very nice that you heaped praise on Jim August, which I would concur with and Angela Mathieson. They went through a very open public process to come up with a plan. They then came to our administration asking them to help make this plan a reality and yet, you're so critical

of the administration when all they're really doing is accommodating Jim August, Angela Mathieson and The Forks so they can hopefully move this project forward. Could you possibly explain that to us?

David Sanders: I'm suggesting that Council should retain the authority to approve all these matters and not delegate it all to administration. Clearly, from my coming here over the last year and a half, Council has a habit of delegating everything under the sun to the administration. You've delegated responsibility for all intents and purposes for a billion dollar project, southwest rapid transit corridor to the administration. At the same time, as you amended the policies to suggest that the limit for these with the Chief Administrative Officer is one million dollars. These don't match.

Mayor Katz: When you're referring to it, if you look at numbers three and four and five and six, these are all requests by The Forks, not by the administration. You're aware of that, correct? Fair enough. I accept that.

David Sanders: I just see them here.

Mayor Katz: Okay.

Madam Speaker: Yes. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: I just have one quick question. Are you aware that the tax increment financing aspect of that, does have to come back to Council?

David Sanders: Yes and in fact, some of these things do.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yeah. Okay, That was just all I wanted. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for Mr. Sanders? Okay, thank you. You may return to the gallery. I would like to go back now to the Transit By-Law item. I understand that there's some further delegations that didn't come up with Mr. Stones, Kim Jacklin Van Gerwen, if you could come forward, James Van Gerwen, and Gail Lameureux. Welcome

Kim Jacklin Van Gerwen: My name is Kim Jacklin Van Gerwen. I've been with Transit for about 10 years. I really have to say thank you for bringing up these issues. It gives me a peace of mind knowing that our safety is important. I've been yelled at, spit at and I've had people in the back of my bus in the motor part coming to the end of the line with me and getting out. Luckily, I had people back there telling me that there was somebody there, so I was safe because these people come to tell me, but if those people didn't come to tell me I wouldn't…I didn't…I wouldn't know what would've happened if I was by myself. I've had…I was off for eight months because of a very bad verbal assault. And having to have PTSD and having to be on pills to get through all of this. The important thing here is the safety of our passengers. It's bad that we get a sixth sense of who's going to be getting on the bus and knowing if they're going to be trouble or not. We pick our fights because we know that if a 300-pound guy gets on the bus and he doesn't want to pay a fare, have a seat. I'm not going to deal with somebody like that…that's when…exactly. And it gets to the point where, okay, we don't have any barriers there. We are sitting targets no matter what it is. I had a little old man get on my bus and I had to laugh because he refused to pay a fare because there was other people refusing to pay fare. Well, sir, you know what, you have a cane, are you going to use it on me if I'm going to say no? I let him go. I had another man say, "Oh, I'm with him." Well, the person that he's with didn't pay a fare so, of course, he gets on. What am I going to say? You know, they are intoxicated, they are…might be street people, or they're just having a bad day. What are we going to do if there's no barrier there? I'm sorry, but, you know what, for us to say pay double later is not going to go anywhere. I really appreciate having everybody look at this and support it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Would you like to address the Councillors as well? Thank you.

Gail Lameureux: Good morning, my name is Gail Lameureux. I am not a bus operator, however, I have a personal interest. I have worked for ATU for nearly 30 years and bus operator assaults are…is nothing new. My brother, Rene Lameureux was a bus operator for Winnipeg Transit and in his first two years rode to the end of the line or route if you will, and then had two men approach his bus and they in turn hijacked him and assaulted him with a knife. Thankfully, a citizen called 911 and he survived. He went on to drive for 31 years, but he was always aware of his passengers. That was 45 years ago and still today operators are subject to public violence. They need a safer workplace. My brother loved driving bus. Is it too much to ask that you can do a job you love and feel safe doing it? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Van Gerwen?

James Van Gerwen: Hi, I'm James Van Gerwen, and I have been a bus driver for 10 years now. I remember 25 years ago, when I used to take the bus going to another job I had, I used to be able to sit down, read a book, get to work on

time and it was a nice pleasant procedure. And in the last 10 years I've worked there, I've seen it degrade to a point where there's trash everywhere, nobody pays, well, not nobody pays, but people won't pay because they know they don't have to anymore. It's almost like they're trained and they're taught by other people that you don't have to pay anymore to get on the bus. I found shell casings on the bus. I have found used condoms on the bus. I have found many beer bottles, people drink, people do whatever they want. There is no more order in the bus system anymore. I believe this by-law will give at least the ability to take actions against individuals who are doing things that are unacceptable in society. And it will give me great pleasure in knowing that I will get some support having cadets on the bus as an actual figure that people may respect. And I believe it is a stepping stone for us to get Police, which I believe is going to happen in the future. Because of the way it's going, it's not going to be long until people are going to be shot and stabbed on the bus on a frequent basis. I've been spit at, I've been sworn at, many a times. I've had my doors kicked in, I've had people jump on my windshield; tear off my windshield wiper blades for no apparent reason. And I believe that something has to be done before something major does happen. And I'd like to thank you all for proposing this Bill and having it passed, but please don't let it fail. This is to my heart, thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions for our delegations? If you could please come forward. Councillor Mayes?.

Councillor Mayes: This is I guess either for Mr. Sauer who I think I missed earlier, but or for any of the operators. Thank you all for very much for coming. That highlights some of what's been discussed over the past two and a half years. There was one report that says, "Well, the cadets have more important things to do than what's in this by-law." There aren't cadets on there right now. I just wondered if you can clarify what that would mean to start having a cadet presence or a Police presence. We do have inspectors. We've added some more, but if you can just talk about what it would mean to have the additional presence of some cadets?

James Van Gerwen: I believe…I believe having the cadets onboard at least, it will give people sight and they'll know that there's actually a presence aboard. Somebody of authority onboard, I've had even as of this Saturday, I had an event where I had a bunch of intoxicated individuals get on my bus; just walk by me; no fare; drive on. They took their cellphone, had it blaring as high as possible. I told them, "Can you please turn it down?" They ignored me completely and I pulled the bus over. I called Control. I was going to wait for an inspector to show up and another passenger, much bigger than the first individual, gets up and says turn your f-ing radio down and looked at him square in the face and needless to say that radio went down, right? Ten minutes later that big individual got off the bus and a second later that radio got cranked right up to the top. I had people drinking beer, throwing beer cans out of my bus that same weekend. Again, called Control, nothing can be done. I says, "Well, they're probably not drinking anymore because the cans are out." "Well, continue on your way. We'll see what we can do" and that's all I get from them." Having a cadet onboard, I believe that with that situation, and it…when it happened with that radio, it was right in front of the police on Graham and Fort, right in front of the building. If I could've had somebody on that bus within seconds later, they would've known that this is not tolerated anymore. And issuing fines for things like that, I believe it's just a matter of time and it's just a learning process. Once you start telling these people it's not acceptable, hopefully they will stop doing it and it will make my life a lot safer and it will make the general public travelling on the buses a much more pleasant experience.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, anything further? Okay. You may return to the gallery. Thank you. We'll now move on to our next delegation which are Auditors from KPMG, John Heskin and Mark Bullen. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Yes, Madam Speaker. I just want to clarify something because I know Councillor Nordman moved the motion as approved, but I'm not sure if it was made clear and I believe that Council would like the opportunity to engage in conversation and questions. So if a motion is required to do that, I'd be happy to suspend the rules and move that we do have the opportunity to engage in questions and we need extension of time that we do that later on.

Madam Speaker: I think it's the extension of time that we'll need to. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Welcome.

John Heskin: Thank you. KPMG was engaged to perform an operational audit of the procedures and processes used during the construction of the Winnipeg Police Headquarters under RFP84/2014, the audit of the Winnipeg Headquarters Police Stations Headquarters Construction Project pursuant to a January 29, 2014, motion of the City Council to engage an external audit to look at the Headquarters Construction Project. We performed an operational audit of processes and procedures of…followed by the project team in the City in constructing the Headquarters audit. Commencing April 22, and finishing June 25th. We compared the processes and policies followed against leading practice as well as against a capital project framework that KPMG uses in assisting clients to implement policies and procedures in the construction processes as well as audit them. We also use aspects of our internal audit methodology in forming our work. We'd like to mention that we had the full and complete and frank participation and cooperation of the City staff as well we interviewed selected members of Council and we thank you for your participation as well. During the course of our procedures, we identified a number of gaps or deficiencies between leading practices and those that

were followed. I will summarize them into the main themes that are in our report. There's inconsistent compliance with the City's capital procurement policies and requirements as outlined in administrative directive FM-004 capital project administration, we found that reporting on project status against baseline budget, baseline scope and baseline schedule, was not consistent or timely or at an appropriate level of detail to provide senior members of the City Administration or the committees of Council to provide an effective oversight. We found that there was inadequate project management discipline related to contract management, scope and change management, schedule management, risk management and design management which are detailed in our report. There was a lack of appropriate segregation of roles and responsibilities between project management staff and end users of the facility and user representatives of the facility over the quarks of their project particularly during the design and construction phases. And there was a lack of consistent application of the City's procurement policies and guidance to promote open and transparent procurement related to major capital projects. We've provided a number of recommendations to address these gaps in our report as well as providing a suggested road map for the implementation of those recommendations for the City's consideration. The key recommendations include improving the governance and the transparency and enhancing the existing reporting around finance, financial cost and risk management to include reporting against baseline budget costs and scope, a discussion of risks that have been identified and trends and change notices there being proposed. For major capital projects that include two departments, one department being responsible for delivery and one that is budget holder to provide some additional guidance on who is the department that is responsible for the project to provide the initial level of oversight of the project execution. The next one was the evaluating options to ensure that the City's project managers have access to appropriate training, policies, procedures, processes, to support them in the delivery of capital projects and consider a project management office, centre of excellence, to provide that support because the large projects like this one are not common for the City, but there are a number of sort of small and medium-sized projects that would also benefit from that approach. We also recommend developing and implementing a sweep of standard construction management contracts that are for the City as opposed to developing them on a one off basis, have a standard suite. You could then provide training on how to appropriately manage the contracts, to manage the City's risks. And to revisit the City's procurement policies and provide some additional training to members of staff who would be responsible for executing the procurement as well. As I mentioned, we outlined an action plan to address those items in our report and we wait for questions from the City. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Would you like to speak as well? Not at this time? Okay, we'll take questions of the Auditors. Councillor Gerbasi, followed by Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to ask and I did ask some questions when we had the seminar yesterday, but on the public record, just wondering if you could clarify how it was that certain Councillors or members of Council were questioned or interviewed I should say, in this process and then others were not? If you could just clarify the decision-making behind that?

John Heskin: Our approach to determining which City Councillors to interview is we looked at the various Standing Policy Committees of Council, that were either to be receiving, reporting from the project, or actually did receive direct reporting from the project. We looked at the membership of the committees, we talked to the committee chair in the period of the construction project and we picked one other member of Council who was on the committee as well at random.

Councillor Gerbasi: …you did not interview the Mayor. Was that just…can you explain that?

John Heskin: We were looking at the oversight in governance. The Council's effective governance is due to the Standing Policy Committees. We determined that speaking to the chairs of those committees and the members of the committees gave us sufficient coverage in terms of understanding the governance and what reporting was happening.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A couple of things, at least to start, and I'm not sure if this is within your area of expertise, but the square footage figures suggest that…and the cost figures suggest that the Wiper Road, the shooting range, is roughly 3.5 times more expensive per square foot than the main building, the Graham Building. I'm pretty sure some of that…those numbers are coming out of the other audit that we got yesterday, the Turner & Townsend report, but I wonder if there's anything you looked at that would've explained why that range, outdoor range would be so much more expensive per square foot or if there were any…he felt that that was in some way an unreasonable figure for the shooting range?

John Heskin: That analysis wasn't in our scope, but you know, the possible square foot is directly related to the square footage of the facility. Other than that, I have no comment.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, that's what I'm trying…I'll pose that question to admin later as well I think as to why the explanation of why the shooting range seems to be so much more expensive per square foot. The other question I had at this stage was there was quite a good discussion on pages 12 and 13 in the report that talks about the early phases of this project back in 2009, 2010. My question is this; there was a report that came to Council and I think you've indicated that your scope did not go back this far. Report to Council, November 2009, gave a figure of 105 million for the redevelopment. Forget what the purchase, we had dealt with that in audit last week. We're continuing to deal with that, that had problems, but I just want to talk about the redevelopment today. So estimate given in November 2009, 105 million. Now we're at…that was obviously greatly exceeded. Two questions, one is, within the scope of your audit, did you take a look at the origins of that number or what…any issues arising with that number? The second question was on page 12 talks about a year and a half later, roughly a year later there was what's called Class C estimate of 130 and you say, look, that the contingency built in here was far too low at 130, is my question is, the earlier estimate, the 105, should that have had a much bigger contingency built into it? Or if you can talk about whatever comments you have to make on that $105 million figure and whether there should've been a…if the Class C needed a much bigger contingency built in, was the even earlier estimate, should that have been subject to an even bigger contingency?

John Heskin: We do not specifically look at the original $105 million…the makeup of that budget estimate, that was part of the business case to move forward with the project. Our scope started with design which is much later than that, which probably aligns more with the $135 million Class C estimate. So we didn't do any work on the 105 million. I think that it would be fair to say that it was in an earlier stage of design. Typically the earlier you are in a design stage, you would have a larger contingency but that's a typical practice, I don't know the specifics in this example. With respect to the Class C estimate, our experience is that…and the timing in which that Class C estimate existed was much earlier in the design process as well. There was a 12.5% contingency that's included in that, that number, our experience would indicate that that stage in a project where the design was, that 30% contingency would be more appropriate, 12% is at the lower end of the acceptable range.

Councillor Mayes: Okay, final question…can I take from that, if 30…if at the later stages, there should've been a 30% contingency, at the earlier stage, the $105 million estimate. There should've been, I mean, it would look something more of a…to me there was a greater magnitude of contingency built in 50%, are you able to comment on that? I appreciate it was before the scope of your work, but it seems to me if you're sitting here looking at a business case in 2009 and someone says it's $105 million, give or take 75%, you're going to be a little more…and I think Councillor Browaty touched on this yesterday, you're going to be a little more reluctant to proceed, so it should…there been a much bigger contingency built in in the 2009 number is my question?

Mark Bullen: The 105 million budget was essentially a rough order of magnitude, at that stage of the project, it was very high level of design. You'd expect a significantly higher percentage contingency than you would get at a Cost C stage.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Could the consultants comment on the whole issue of the secure…the surety bond, specifically in 2010, 50% of the…the City called for 50% of the total bid price to be $51 million of a $102 million project. In January 2012, that was reduced to $25 million and that bid closed on January 18, 2011. On February 10th, the joint venture was awarded. Did the consultants ask for that letter or direction from the Surety Association of Canada, and if it is or isn't, what did they find? And if they didn't, why was it not included?

Mark Bullen: We did not ask for that letter, but as we discussed prior to the EPC meeting yesterday, the important thing with sureties is that at the procurement stage all of it is prices based on the same requirements. If a decision is subsequently made after contract award to reduce the surety requirements that is usually a decision for administration and it can have a positive effect on the project budget, but it needs to be balanced with the downside risks.

Madam Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. The project director was a single source contract awarded by the City. Can the consultant tell us were these services, in fact, provided to the City of Winnipeg by that contractor? And did they verify payment amounts with the services provided?

John Heskin: Could you clarify what you mean by "the services were provided"?

Councillor Havixbeck: On page 19 of your report, you identified a proponent who was awarded a single source contract. That individual provided services for the City up until December 2013. Were the services, whatever the services were that were contracted with by the City, were they provided? And was the payment fair for those services?

John Heskin: The consultant was providing services. He provided project management and the oversight services. I will let Mark expand on the types of services, but he was providing project management services as opposed to engineering services. He did bill according to his contract.

Mark Bullen: The services provided by the consultants were essentially contract administration services and we have seen evidence that such services were provided. We cannot comment on whether the City got value for money for those services. We don't have records of the amount of time that that consultant spent on the project.

Councillor Havixbeck: I guess this is my final question, did the consultants look at the receipts and reconcile what was paid to whom and note any discrepancies on any of the contracts involved?

John Heskin: We did review payment to contractors and followed the City's review and approval of those invoices according to the delegations of authorities. There was nothing that I recall that we noted that was an error or something that would be challenged.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Councillor Mayes? Oh, pardon me, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. No preamble, I think we all know what the report says. We have a lot of work to do as Council with our administration to take these “ugly events” and turn them around. And what I liked about your report was the fact that you mentioned a lot of training. Can you…do you have any examples of other cities that I guess we…I think you called it “Center of Management Excellence”, that have set something similar up that we can review?

John Heskin: We have worked with other cities and assisted them in setting up the project management officer, a project management officer, a centre of excellence, which is setting up the policies and procedures as well as training to support City staff in taking on roles…the taking on the role of a project manager or as a contract administrator and how to interpret the contracts and how to manage them appropriately within the terms of that style of contract. We noted them in the presentation yesterday. And we can provide that information and make introductions to the City staff.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much, and that's the one that stood out for me because that’s going to move us forward into making sure that the things we adopt go through. If you had your top two or top three recommendations besides that one, what were the other two that you think the City should be really focusing on?

Mark Bullen: One issue that’s clearly very important is procurement policy, procedure, and compliance with those. I think it's very important that the City acknowledges the risks with single sourcing contracts. Obviously, they’re a number of instances on this project which is unusual. By definition, single sourcing is not a competitive form of procurement so I particularly would like to highlight that one.

John Heskin: I think they in sort of having a standard process for the City, practices around contract administration, types of contract, there's a number of different styles of contract for construction of large projects. Each of them has a slightly different way they should be managed effectively. So that is part of the training, but it's part of the framework that would be a key, and it's scalable from small, medium to large sized projects.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, any further questions? I saw someone’s hand up here. Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I'll keep going. Three more things, one is the pages…well, two relatively simple things first. The question was asked yesterday. Did the police want marble washrooms and say some of this on the police for extravagant change orders? I don't want to put words in your mouth, but I think the answer was no, basically, that police are not…

John Heskin: …it wasn't that.

Councillor Mayes: Right, so this is not the police gold plating, all right? And second question I had also was asked yesterday in private at least, now was there any criminality? I appreciate you’re not here as forensic auditors or legal council, but in your review of this, your audit of this procedure, was there any criminality or any criminal behaviour that you saw?

John Heskin: As you said, we did not…we were not engaged to perform a forensics audit. Based on the procedures that we've performed, the information we obtained and reviewed and the results of the interviews, we did not identify anything that was of concern in that nature.

Councillor Mayes: Final question is more on the numbers, again pages… I think it's page 13, there's a passage where it talks about the $105 million and then there's a paragraph in which the project manager, I'll read it out, "the project manager told us that in his view the $105 million redevelopment budget was inadequate, however, requesting additional funding for redevelopment budget was not an option. The combination of the original redevelopment budget and the FFE budget effectively secured additional funding" and then it goes on to say "it looks like somebody FF'd the furnishings budget, got routed into redevelopment. You spoke yesterday at least in private about your view of this two years at 09, there's no mention of FFE, there's a 2011 report that puts a number ever on $22 million in for FF&E. And I think your term…I think your term referring to that amount was crazy, but I might be misremembering it, but it does seem extremely high that, that would be as a percentage of the total project, that furnishings would come in at like 25%, 20%. It looks to me as a layman like there was an artificially high number here put in for FF&E in order to help fund the underestimated 105 million. Can you discuss that a bit, what your view was of this 22 million estimate for furnishings and how that…what ended up happening with that funding?

John Heskin: There was…the original $105 million budget and there was a separate furniture, fixtures and equipment budget, capital project budget, that was requested, those two budgets be combined because they were for the same building. And that was approved in Council to combine those two capital projects into the project that we audited. There was a budget that supported the $22 million of FF&E, so there's a detailed budget. It was high, but there was also being defined as a project went along, one of the things that is typical within capital projects is that in the change management process you will look for tradeoffs between items when you have an area where you're going to make a change and spend additional money, you will look where you can have transfer budget within and make some other decisions that will reduce budget. From looking at the project, it appears that's what's happened with the transferring of some of the $22 million. Effectively you went from $105 to $127 million budget, capital budget for the project. And as needs were further refined and choices were made on items like furniture, fixtures and equipment and other aspects of the project through design and in management of the project, those tradeoffs were made. And provided they were performed appropriately, it's a reasonable process within a capital project to have tradeoffs from one budget area to another.

Mark Bullen: Just one final point on that is, we didn't conduct a contra-surveying audit to put the magnitude of FFE budget, it does seem to us to be larger than what typically would be required and ultimately only approximately half of that appears to have been spent on FF&E.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Havixbeck, yes.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Madam Speaker. On page 6 of the report there's much discussion about oversight and no record of discussions, of minute meetings, yet when we were in our Council seminar yesterday, the CFO held up a big binder of notes or minutes or something, I didn't take a look at it, but we were told that the consultants were provided that binder of minutes or notes or whatever it was. Can the consultants comment on what was in that binder and how they can say it's not minute meetings per se, how they came to that conclusion?

John Heskin: I believe that the binder that was shown to us, those minutes and the notes from the project team meetings, our commentary is on minutes of meetings of the oversight committee not being maintained. That's the difference.

Madam Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, I want to go back to the project director and I believe that I as a Councillor, understood that that individual was to be providing some sort of engineering type guidance and services. And I'd like to know from the consultants, what exactly was provided from the project director for that $262,000?

Mark Bullen: Those are essentially contract administration services which could be described more generally as project management services. So coordination of the design consultant, the contractor, running meetings, engaging with the end user, so not engineering services, but management, but you wouldn't expect normally a lot of deliverables to come out of that, but that's in general the scope of work.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, anything further?

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Page 20 of the report, the last sentence, we observed that the winning proponent of our FPA 33, 2010 was CAJV. They did not submit a proposal, yet they were awarded the construction contract. Can you explain how that can be?

John Heskin: The winning proponent of that RFP was a joint venture of Caspian and Akman. The joint venture dissolved and the request was made to the City to assign the rights and obligations under the contract to Caspian, which was done. So Caspian ended up with the construction contract through an assignment of the rights and obligations of the Caspian-Akman joint venture who was the winning proponent of the RFP.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Fielding, followed by Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Fielding: Two or three questions here, just in regards to the furniture piece, I think that you mentioned, Mark, that the original budget of somewhere around $20 million add in kind of the latter part when you came back to Council the first time, you said that $10 million has been utilized for that. Is that kind of year to date numbers because, obviously, the Police aren't in the new headquarters and that sort so can you give us some more background in terms of what actual moneys were utilized and what is still there?

Mark Bullen: Could we possibly get back to you on that one? We have the figures in front of us.

Councillor Fielding: The second question is in regards to the meeting minutes that were…were talked about as well about the oversight committee. I appreciate the fact that none were there, but there was, you know, back to the big binder that Councillor Havixbeck had mentioned, were you able to term because we were looking for the project management or rather in the oversight committee was when decisions were made. So with the project management minutes, would you not be able to determine, you know, when decisions are made about changes within those particular minutes?

John Heskin: The project management in the meeting minutes would cover that. What we were looking for, for the oversight is where the decisions had to be made or guidance had to be given from the oversight committee.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. I just want to go back to this piece of project management, project director, the $262,000. As a percentage of project of this size, where does that type of service usually come in as a percentage of the project?

Mark Bullen: It's not usually a function of a percentage of the capital costs of the project. It's more a function of the costs of the resource, so, for instance, you could have a project that's $10 million that has one project director of the project, could be $100 million and you still have one project director. It comes down to the value of the individual's time.

Councillor Swandel: I have some involvement with a similar sized project. In that case the cost is roughly 1% of the value of the project, about 1.5 to 1.7 million. This seems like extremely great value at 242 or $262,000. Did it not seem like a very low number to you for project management services or project director services?

John Heskin: When you look at project management, you have to look at everything, not just one individual with salary. There were a number of project managers from the City side as well. I can't comment on value for money.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Fielding?

Councillor Fielding: One final question. You had referenced the fact that there's kind of a joint, say joint partnership I guess running it and then one of the partners I think is Akman, had pulled out. Was there any…did you do any probing in terms of why that relationship ceased to that point or what the concerns were? Was there anything relevant to I guess the audit, I guess is what I'm saying in relation to that.

John Heskin: We did not ask why the joint venture dissolved; we were looking at the process for the City around dealing with the requests for the assignment. So I've no comment on why the joint venture dissolved or not.

Mark Bullen: Councillor Fielding, just in response to your previous question about the actual cost of FF&E, the answer to that question is on page 13 of the report, on the third paragraph on the GMP contract.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Mark Bullen: 9.46 million.

Councillor Fielding: 9.46 is what it is to date?

John Heskin: As of the date of our work, so as of June 25th. It could be different by now because it's a month later.

Councillor Fielding: Yes. Right. It makes…I'm just wondering, obviously, there's more furniture and FFE that needs to be acquired and that sort before the Police go in the building so is that roughly the full amount or how much more you might not have done that work, but just to find out…you're saying that there's some flex in that number so.

John Heskin: Yeah, the answer to that question will depend…will be driven by, as the Police Service moves into the building. This covers the basics. There might be additional that would be in in their operating budget as well.

Mark Bullen: And that figure relates to the Caspian contract, so it may be possible that the City might be procuring FF&E from other sources.

Madam Speaker: Any other questions? Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Mark, you were asked the question yesterday at the Council seminar and again today regarding the bond change and I can also let you know that there's been some talk about that in the media. Your answer yesterday when asked that question, I quote, "was quite common". Is that still the way you feel today?

Mark Bullen: In response to which question?

Mayor Katz: The change in bond, surety bond; how it changed from where it was at the beginning and then moved down.

Mark Bullen: I guess what I'm saying is that it's not unusual for a project owner to change the requirements, the surety requirements, after they have a contractor onboard.

Mayor Katz: Okay. As well, yesterday we talked about the contingency, I'm going in with the 130 million plus. If they had had what you define as a proper contingency of 30% which I think you used the term, 30 being a conservative number. Would the numbers have pretty much balanced out then to where we're at?

Mark Bullen: I guess, first of all, I just need to qualify that the consideration of appropriate contingency might be was out of the scope of our work but a contingency at that time of around 30% would be more appropriate and in my personal view, than the contingency that was provided for. And one of the things with project performance that's important to note, a project can still be delivered well, but if the constraints in terms of scope, budget and schedule and the beginning of the project are not appropriate then project performance can be deemed to be, could be deemed to be poor, so for instance, if you don't allow adequate contingency at the appropriate stage of the project, it shouldn't be a surprise when the project comes in over budget.

Mayor Katz: Thank you for that clarification. Last question, it was alluded to on page 13, the project manager told us that in his view, the 105 million redevelopment budget was inadequate. And I know we're throwing out all sorts of terms, project manager, project director, it's very confusing, but I'm assuming in this situation you are referring to the engineer with the WPS, Abdul Aziz.

Mark Bullen: That's correct.

Mayor Katz: Okay. The question is are you aware that Mr. Aziz along with A-Com made a presentation in a Council seminar telling us that they could build this for $105 million?

John Heskin: We understand that there was that presentation. We are not aware that both were there.

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Okay. Seeing none, I thank you for joining us today. We will now move on to…Councillor Orlikow?

Councillor Orlikow: I will move suspension of the Rules to allow one more delegation to speak on this matter.

Madam Speaker: Okay, the name is?

Councillor Orlikow: Mr. Sanders.

Madam Speaker: Mr. David Sanders? All those in favour of suspending the rules? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Sanders, do you have a presentation for us? And is the delegation in opposition or in support?

David Sanders: Madam Speaker and Council, I'll be very brief. With regard to the Turner & Townsend report, this quantity survey review was not awarded to Turner & Townsend until March 26th for $165,000. Since it was released at 4:30 pm yesterday, I've scanned the 22 page value analysis report prepared by Turner & Townsend. I immediately asked for the other 318 pages of appendices. However, I've now been advised that while Council was given an opportunity to look at the appendices yesterday, the Councillors were not supplied with all, with and will not be supplied with copies. They were informed that due to the secure nature of a Police headquarters, they are sensitive matters and these include pages that cannot be publicly released. Well, I think, here we go again. I for one, need to be shown why the following appendices cannot be published. Appendix A is the Caspian Project revised contract cost break down dated February 18, 2014. Appendix B is the furniture and furnishings cash allowances and the office tower project cash allowance. Appendix C is the area analysis. They've come up with a much larger area for the purpose of their calculation than has been used here before, and certainly, I would like to see how they calculate it and I'd be surprised and certainly it wouldn't be necessary to show us the particular location of particular Police operations within the building. And Appendix E is the documentation list which will be their source documents and Appendix F is the CIQS, the Canadian Institute of Quantity Surveyors Elemental Cost Analysis, these are the building blocks. And Appendix G is the general requirement calculation which includes some rather simple basic construction matters and also includes the construction management fee which among other things, tends to be a percentage of the sub trades. Turner and Townsend conclude that the revised Caspian contract at $156 million is only 2.2% higher than their value of $153 million and they also suggest that the cost per square foot is within the range of the cost per square foot of other Police headquarters. I have a lot of concerns about the exclusions of certain costs in their analysis, including all engineering and design, and the use of a much larger floor area and the many adjustments, escalations and leveling done by T&T. After I have an opportunity to see some of the key appendices, I would be in a better position to comment on the analysis and I presume so would Council, and in fact, the administration here. I am concerned that there's no discussion of the engineering costs because as we know there's $5 million worth of engineering expenses which had to be redone and they are not considered in the Turner and Townsend report at all. With regard to the external audit of KPMG, that wasn't awarded until April 22nd for $199,500. Given the long delay in awarding the contract which took almost three months and the short time available to undertake the assignment which was less than three months, we shouldn't be surprised that KPMG does state that, quote, "these services are not intended to be an audit", and it's especially important to read their disclaimer that, quote, "comments in our report are not intended to be nor should they be interpreted to be legal advice or legal opinion". KPMG did manage despite the short time, to interview many of the key individuals with the notable exception of Armik Babakhanians, the President of Caspian Projects Incorporated, who is the prime contractor for this project who apparently decline to participate. Unfortunately, the City Auditor has continued to avoid using his authority under the City of Winnipeg Charter Act to subpoena witnesses and compel production of documents. Since the KPMG audit report was made public at 4:30 p.m. yesterday, I have scanned it once. It is definitely not a forensic audit, which would be intended to discover whether there's been any fraud or breach of trust or corruption, but it does confirm a litany of errors which add up to gross incompetence by the senior administration involved in this project from the beginning. And it also confirms that our City Councillors are generally ill-equipped to monitor and oversee major construction projects such as this, and they do require professional assistance to discharge their duties effectively. That's one of KPMG's recommendations. I did wish to read their overall observations into the Council record today, but I believe that they just did that and so I won't repeat that. They do provide some 25 recommendations for wholesale improvement in City procedures and staff capabilities in order to do a better job of other major projects. And the consultants also provide a roadmap for implementation which is just a notional schedule for making the recommended changes during the next year and a half. I gather that Council may approve the 25 recommendations and the implementation roadmap this afternoon, but I have to say that based on my own observations of how this Council and these administrators have behaved in the past year and a half, I have absolutely no confidence that they'll be up to the challenge. Last fall, Council adopted all of Ernst & Young's recommendations arising from the fire paramedic stations construction product audit and directed to the administration to implement them and report back to Council on a quarterly basis. The administration provided one quarterly report on January 29th, which largely defended its previous actions and has now failed to submit any further quarterly reports or implementation measures during the last six months. KPMG has documented a great many short comings with the people and the organizations involved in this sorry saga of Civic ineptitude and I guess my favourite is the revelation on page 6, quote, "we were told that minutes of the oversight committee meetings were not maintained. And as a result, there was no record of the discussions which took place or the recommendations and the decisions made. In our view, this contributed to an environment lacking transparency and accountability for project outcomes and also represented a significant barrier to gathering information during the execution of this audit". That's KPMG speaking. When Councillor Havixbeck asked for copies of the minutes of the major steering committee for the

new Police headquarters project last November, the senior administrators present at EPC declined to produce the documents on the grounds that they contain confidential and sensitive information. Well, I think they lied.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Saunders, I will caution you when you make such comments.

David Sanders: What can Council do about this, Madam Speaker and what should Council do with all this? By all means, go ahead and approve the KPMG recommendations today despite you approved the E&Y real estate management audit recommendations last week, but at the same time, please also forward both the complete Turner & Townsend report with appendices and the KPMG report to the Minister of Justice for review as you did last week. And then hopefully, we will have a serious forensic investigation of all of these Civic debacles. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. You may return to the gallery. We'll now move on to our reports. First we have this EPC, Mr. Mayor, on the report dated July 2.

REPORT "A" OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 2, 2014

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 3.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item No. 4, Madam Clerk.

Item 4 - Inclusion on the 2014 Civic Election Ballot –
Use of One Percent PST towards Fixing Roads and Bridges

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, I actually stood this down to give Councillor Wyatt the opportunity to introduce it.

Councillor Wyatt: I was hoping you'd let it go for consent agenda and then it was going to be adopted. All right, thank you, Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor. Before you today, Councillors, is a motion to place this matter on the Fall ballot. It states that the following wording and one question be placed on the 2014 Civic election ballot. "The Provincial Government increased the Provincial Sales Tax by 1 percent from 7 to 8 percent without a required referendum. The one percent sales tax increase collects approximately 170 million every year from sales inside the City of Winnipeg. Yet the Provincial Government is dedicating only approximately 50 million a year for Winnipeg's roads and bridges taking $120 million out of Winnipeg. Do you believe that all the revenues collected by the Provincial Government's 1 percent increase in the PST from inside the City of Winnipeg should be used towards fixing Winnipeg's roads and bridges?" It's quite simple question, very direct and very simple. The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, for the better part of a decade, I'd say for more than a decade, this Council has been urging through various motions and initiatives led by the Mayor, led by the members of Council, led by our sister association, the AMM, to attempt to acquire, to address the growing infrastructure deficit which, you know, everybody now is talking about with the upcoming Civic election, but the reality is we knew this looming infrastructure deficit just didn't appear out of nowhere. It's arrived, it's here and it's manifesting itself in a real way in terms of our roads that we drive on, the sidewalks that we see, but it's also there on things that we cannot see. It's there for all of the underground services, our water lines, our sewer lines, things are not as easily touchable or visible. And it's there for all of our Civic facilities, our buildings, our libraries, our arenas, every facility that is aged. Many of them now, you know, 40, 50, even as the Sherbrook Pool, you know, 70 plus years old. The infrastructure deficit is only going to get worse, Madam Speaker, in terms of the funding that we have earmarked right now and the challenge we face is not just one of funding our existing infrastructure deficit, we all know what the existing infrastructure is, and I credit this Council for putting in plan, and to place two plans. The local street renewal levy reserve and the local street regional street renewal reserve which, if future Councils follow that path, should assist in terms of addressing that infrastructure underfunding over the next 15 to 20 years, but it won't take…it won't happen overnight. However, it doesn't address all of the other infrastructure challenges we're facing as I have mentioned, our existing infrastructure, and it does not address the challenge we're facing in terms of our growing new strategic infrastructure that has been documented as well in terms of demand, as a growing city will demand, new roads, new bridges, new underpasses, new overpasses, new rapid transit, new rapid transit lines. Where is all that funding coming from? So for a long time, we fought for a piece of the growth revenue. In some cases, the motions manifested themselves by saying that we should have a share of the existing PST. In other cases the motions manifest themselves here by saying we should actually create a municipal sales tax. The Mayor led that charge with a former president of the AMM, Ron Bell,

on the floor of the AMM Convention. And at that time, CabCom with all of their powers of the Premier of the day, Gary Doer, went, used the power and before you know it, the municipal officials of rural Manitoba were running for the doors of the convention because they couldn't support something like this. But the reality is the issue hasn't gone away and is still there, and yet here we are, we were talking, if you can imagine, some five, six years ago about having a municipal sales tax dedicated to infrastructure. We were prepared to fight a referendum actually on that as per the balanced legislation, the balanced budget legislation required. What does the Province do? They institute their own increase in the sales tax. Surprise, surprise. This is on top of those initiatives. That's on top of the Business Council of Manitoba, taking a formal position and writing openly into the Winnipeg Free Press saying we believe that a sales tax should be increased to be dedicated to the infrastructure of our Province and our City. And then even a well-known individual who is well respected in our city, David Asper, wrote an op-ed piece for the Winnipeg Free Press. There should be a dedicated 1% increase to the infrastructure of the City of Winnipeg. This is the engine of the economy of the City he wrote. And so the door was opened, opened wide. And the Province just walked right in. And the government increased the PST to the surprise of everyone. And then we were trying to figure out where is that money going? And what we found is they're using…they're saying they're using the money for infrastructure, but not for Winnipeg. Now, Mr. Sanders made a point earlier. He said that it should be based on not where you pay the sales tax, it's based on where…based on per capita. Well, to…whether you base it on that which is where you pay the sales tax which according to our own staff, Georges Chartier, is the retail sales tax ratio is roughly 61% of all sales, ratio sales taking place in the Province of Manitoba, originate inside the City of Winnipeg. 61%, that's $168 million which is where we got the 107 million dollar figure from or if you use the count in terms of the census per capita count which is not that much different…55%, that's $152 million. Either way, whether it be 170 or 152 million, Madam Speaker, the reality is that it's a far cry difference to what we're actually earning and receiving right now from the Province in terms of 50 million which is actually…we rounded up that figure just to give them the benefit of the doubt. So, you know, I think we need to send a message, Madam Speaker. This is an opportunity to send a message to the government. We have been consistently lobbying on this over and over and over again. If we rely on our property taxes, we know we will have to have double digit property taxes to start to pay for the infrastructure deficits whether it be the new or existing. And not to mention, Madam Speaker, the finances of the City in terms of balancing its operating budget which we're mandated to do by the Province, where is that funding going to come from? Where are we going to find the funding for that…those costs, Madam Speaker, if we're having to also fund the infrastructure on the basis of the project? This is a real crisis that we're facing now. This is a real crisis. This is not about making a point in the election for the sake of making a point. This is a crisis facing us now. And we know for those who are running again, that this will be the number one issue on the doorstep and it's not going to be, you know, when you're moving a motion to do this or what kind of motions have you moved, by the way, no, they're going to say why haven't you fixed my street? Why haven't you fixed my curb, Councillor? Why haven't you fixed my lane that I called you about a long time ago? Well, you know, I moved a motion and you know, we've been lobbying the Provincial Government, I don't care about that, why haven't you fixed it? And that's the heart of it and that's why this question on the ballot is important, to send a message that there's a direct link. That's what's happening in this province today. You raise the sales tax and you need to take the majority of the money out of the city for well-meaning projects, I'm not begrudging the rural municipalities on all of their projects. I think they've got wonderful projects and they're important to the future of this province, but there's no balance in terms of what's happening now. We need to…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Steen moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: We need to have that balance, Madam Speaker. We need to ensure that somebody is standing up for this City. Who is fighting for the City? If this Council does not fight for the city, no one else will. No one else will, Madam Speaker. We have to fight for the City. This City has to have a strong voice to say to the government:, enough is enough. You've raised the sales tax, the money that is collected inside the City of Winnipeg, paid by Winnipeggers, inside Winnipeg should stay and it should stay for roads and bridges to fix the crumbling infrastructure of our City and it should be done now. In terms of if it's going to jump, you know, I'm more than happy if the citizens of Winnipeg voted in favour of the…if Council votes to put this on the ballot and the citizens of Winnipeg vote in favour of this, I'd be more than happy to sit down with the Province and phase in as the Federal Government when they brought out the GST or the PST or sorry, the gas tax funding to us, phased in the gas tax over five or six years. Right? They didn't give us the whole gas tax funding at once; more than happy to sit down with the Province if they want to phase in from 50 million now to get up to 170 million. You want to phase that in over five or six years in terms of the financing, in terms of the flooding going on, we understand that, we understand what it's like to make changes in the budget that are significant, but let's make that policy commitment. Let's see that happen. I don't think this is…this is a plebiscite, Madam Speaker, this is not a…this is a plebiscite and it is to send a message. And I think we need to send that message because we've been sending it for the better, for more than a decade at this Council, two Mayors have been doing it consistently and it hasn't been getting through. And we have to make a direct connection to this increase and the fact that the infrastructure and the roads of the City are crumbling and not being addressed. Thanks very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll just start off by saying I can't support this particular so-called referendum. I can…I actually feel for the mover of this motion in terms of how…actually, City Council unanimously voted to and we did request of the Province the ability to implement the 1% retail sales tax here in the City of Winnipeg to pay for our infrastructure and, of course, we were declined. So I totally understand the emotion behind this particular motion, however, just like a Phase 2 Bus Rapid Transit being on a referendum or the Chief Peguis Trail being on a referendum as to whether or not the City should spend money on that, it's very clear that in the places where they do these things that things don't get done because people generally won't support something that's not helping them or that they see won't be helping them. So it's very typical in terms of a 1% PST that, you know, the City of Winnipeg should get it all and, of course, Winnipeggers, we don't even have to ask the referendum, I know what they'll vote. They'll say, yeah, we need to spend it on our roads because, yes, the Councillor moving this motion is right. The people will be questioning us when we're knocking on doors, why didn't you fix our front street? Why didn't you fix our back lane? In answer to that, I would like to thank the mover of the motion who as a finance person made sure that we implemented and started a 25-year plan to fix our local streets and roads because we couldn't get the support of the Province of Manitoba, although they have jumped in. They're not totally matching it dollar for dollar, but they have jumped into our local street renewal program. So that's good, but we have had to take on the responsibilities also. We have had to do that and so when I'm talking to people at the door, I'll just say, well, we, the people, the past Council and the past Province, if you want to blame them too, for over 20 something years let our roads fail. There was neglect, nobody wanted to deal with it. The only thing that I ever heard come out of it in 1990s was a TBO program which works really good, I think that's fantastic. It protects any of the roads we have fixed and that's great. That TBO program is great and it still continues today and it continues to give longer life to our streets now, but I digress. In terms of the referendum, the City of Winnipeg and my family comes from the farm, comes from Treherne, Manitoba. That's where my family comes from, and I have to say that the City of Winnipeg isn't just an island unto itself. The reason that it is an economic engine here in the Province of Manitoba, it is the capital and it is where the majority of the people of this province have congregated, want to raise their families and raise their life, but it is the whole province that contributes to Winnipeg's ability to have that diversity of economy that we do have. So while we have the biggest marketplace for retail sales tax, I don't know what components, I've never measured it, maybe Mr. Chartier could sort of measure it, but retail sales tax is actually value-added. Suppliers too, people making product will have to pay PST on certain products, that then gets marked up and then finally when it gets to the final purchaser, of course, the PST is at its highest. So there's that whole contemplation, the value-added taxes, really, that's kind of what a retail sales tax is about. Yes, some industries are exempt, I imagine anybody providing cattle to a butcher or whatever isn't having to charge PST but anyway, again, so this referendum, I don't think is needed because what's going to happen is that the Province of Manitoba will be going into an election itself and not too long in the distant future and that is ultimately the referendum. The people of Manitoba, the people of Winnipeg, will tell that Provincial Government that exists today that brought in the 1% PST, they will tell them what they believe should've happened when they go to vote. So in terms of if people of the Provincial Government are listening to this debate, they know what the reality is they're going to have to face, and they're going to have to deal with it that way, but I don't see any need to have a referendum here. As I said, it's quite clear how that will go. If it's in the…people will vote for it if it's for them, but they don't really…somebody else, somewhere else, doesn't really matter. And actually, I shouldn't even say that because I'm listening to the flood forecasts for the Lake Manitoba and I know that there's a lot of cottage owners up around there who live here in Winnipeg. Hopefully, that the Province is utilizing their capacity now that they have to actually move forward and protect those people, protect more people of Manitoba to make sure that they don't have to worry about losing their hopes, their dreams, their lives, and so we need to keep that in mind as well, but leaving that alone, I don't think there's any need for a referendum here. I think that the City of Winnipeg, the people living here, I could, you know, I think that any election, which is the ultimate referendum, will tell people where things are at, so I'll leave it at that. I won't be voting for this particular motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'll try to be brief. It's…in a way, it's unfortunate, I mean, I don't support the motion…I, frankly looks to me like a bit of a stunt and as Councillor Eadie says, it's too bad, it takes away from somewhat…Councillor Wyatt, I think, said the courage to put through in the budget, for which is a dedicated increase, dedicated to the roads, regional, local, we've gone from 30 million in 2012 to 84 million and arguably even more because the Province just put in an additional 7 million you could claim for 90, but what we've been saying to the public, is we've gone from 30 million on regional local roads, sidewalks gone from 30 million in 2012 to 84 million in 2014. That's a pretty major accomplishment. That's what I'll be saying to people at the door. Infrastructure is the most important issue to the public, we know that. People say that to us in, at the door. People say that in polls, so, yes, infrastructure, very important issue, very deep problem, one we're having to address. Councillor Wyatt, I think in some of the budgets he's put forward, he's been trying to do that, that this, I think, is just kind of a stunt and won't get accomplished what we are setting out to do, which is trying to get more funding for infrastructure. So it does remind me though, I've used…used to go to these meetings when I lived in Brandon, at the Brandon Sun newspaper, the think tank, every Wednesday morning, and everyone would talk about Winnipeg's got the Perimeteritis, the Provincial Government's got the Perimeteritis, we never get our fair share out here in Brandon. We have this much population. We don't get our fair share and then either James Turner or

Kerry Roy would get up and say, yeah, that's right, we have 4% of the population, so we should close about two-thirds of Brandon University, so we get that down to the proportional share of the provincial population, we should only have 4% of the university spaces and we have 20% and everyone would say, “Oh, no, no. I don't mean that. I don’t mean to lose anything that we have now that's over our share. I just want to get our share up in other areas.” So it's a complex balancing act. You know, if you say, we deserve more for our fair share in Winnipeg on the roads. Well, do we deserve less for universities? Do we deserve less for stadiums? Do we deserve less for other areas where the Province is giving us funding than other parts don't get? And as Councillor Eadie said, there are obviously infrastructure needs throughout the Province and there are things that benefit different parts of the City that also benefit rural Manitoba, things like the floodway, certainly a major benefit in the St. Vital Ward and that's something where there's been a lot of Provincial support. So while I appreciate the intent and infrastructure is the most important issue that we're going to be facing on…at the door this year, I think I'll stand on our record of going from 30 to 84 million and our intent to keep going with the plan that Councillor Eadie talked about rather than trying to claim that somehow a referendum asking for more from the Province is really a bona fide solution. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I concur pretty much with everything that the previous two speakers said, so I won't repeat all of that. And I think, I do…I think we all appreciate what’s trying to be done here; obviously we want more money for the City. We want our fair share for the City, but I think there are different ways to get things done and this particular way, I completely disagree with. I think with our largest funding partner, we should have a degree of diplomacy. I see this as…I think a stunt or a bullying tactic is pretty accurate. That's what we’ve seen. And we've seen it many times over the last few years and it hasn't been effective. It hasn't been effective in achieving those things. Embarrassing people, humiliating them, is not a good way to negotiate. It doesn't bring respect to this chamber. And particularly on an election ballot, you know, it's bad enough. We had a significant debate about the transit one which there were some very good arguments and it was a very significant majority of Council who voted against the principle of having that on there, I can't remember if it was 14 or 13 whatever it was. Part of that is that the wording of the questions that keep being put forward are biased. They’re no trying to achieve something, I mean, you could almost use the word manipulation, it's biased. It's not a balanced question showing all different viewpoints. It's trying to accomplish something through a biased question that’s going on an election ballot that every citizen, they're supposed to be going there to choose their elected representative, not be drawn into some political point of view of one faction of Council or so on. So the question was identified as biased in that it was implied that the Province had acted illegally or improperly by not having a referendum. The law was changed so it was legal, as legal what they did there. Now, I mean it’s speeding on the public sentiment of dissatisfaction to do that. So I think for one thing, the question itself, if we ever were to have a plebiscite here, I think we would have to have an objective and a fair process of determining the question by objective, non-political people, who could at least review that and it could be done with some dignity to our election process than just putting out some political question and I just think that's unfair whichever side you're on. I mean, if it was a left-wing group of people or whatever group of party trying to do it, it would be the same thing, it’s the principle of what’s been done here is wrong. If it was a different government, it would still be wrong and I know I'll be accused of being…you know, defending, you know, that's not what this is about and I can, I think by the vote last time that's not what it's about for most of us or for everybody who voted against it. I think the election process, people may not look at it that way, but it is kind of a sacred thing, democracy, and to put a biased question in…it harms the sacred process to me, and I find it very disturbing, I really do. Regardless of the issue itself, which I think we all agree we need to get more funding for our infrastructure. We all agree with that. This is not the way to do it. It hasn't worked, it won't work, it’s…there's other political motivations to embarrass certain individuals, we're going into an election, let's see if our, the people who are voting want to re-elect us or whose ever running, that's what that election should be about. There's other ways to talk to our Province. We have a new Minister, Kevin Chief; the Mayor’s commented many times, he's had really good conversations with. You know, we're going to have a new Council. I think we need to take some measures to improve that relationship with the Province. Why haven't we always had a smooth relationship? And I think that there's some will there too to work better with us and have a smoother relationship. In some areas, we have had a smoother relationship, with, for example, the funding for the rapid transit and other new funding sources we’ve received over the last years, 50/50 funding for transit and we lost, we got it back. There's been some successes, obviously we want more, but this is not how you build a relationship and I firmly believe that there's other ways we can build that relationship, we can achieve those successes with the province. We are part of the Province and by this kind of adversarial bullying, biased, kind of manipulating our sacred election process, like I think it's appalling and I know the intent, it may be very, very good, but what…but this is wrong and I urge everyone to vote against it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. I think if you were to support this message you’re sending out there is, I want more taxes, more taxes are coming. You may as well put a ballot, something on the ballot that says, I want more taxes, a little box that says yes or a little box that says no, and see how people respond to that. I’m pretty sure we all know what the

response will be. You know, the logic of this just doesn't work; the math doesn't work. Are we saying that we're just abandoning our obligations outside of our boundaries for everything that we utilize that is provided by the Province of Manitoba, whether it's the highways, you know parks whatever. You know, it just, and, you know, it's just…it's not a good statement and it doesn't make any sense. And what we really should be working at is better relationships with the Provincial Government strengthening those relationships; better policy development in our own house which could include three year or five year capital budgets. You know, we know that we have issues with capacity, both in the design, you know, the engineering side and also in the construction capacity side. And that you know that even if we were to have a glob of money land in our lap, we couldn't do the work anyway. Right now, the Province is deferring some of its work to next year because it doesn't have the capacity, the entire Province, the City, Brandon, Thompson, everywhere, the capacity doesn't exist to do all the required work right now. And until you actually come up with a solid plan that shows how you're going to address that, and how you're going to create value out of any new revenue that you get, and actually deliver, things like this, that are just, you know, as has been described before are a bit of political stunting. And certainly, I think that if it were to go on the ballot and people were to campaign, the campaign message would be that anybody who supports this is saying they want more taxes because where are you going to replace the money that's going out there into the other projects throughout the city or throughout the province that we all benefit from? You know, it's not just…the money has to come from somewhere, you know, we've been very strong at saying that there's only one taxpayer here. You know, the City contributes eight percent and so if you use the same logic, there's no way anybody should support this motion if you agree that we want to keep taxes down and that we want to create value. So strengthen the relationships, develop policy and extract value out of the money that you have before you start deciding to take more money out of taxpayers' pockets.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We are facing an infrastructure emergency. We need to do something radical, we need to invest a lot more money in our streets, roads and all our public infrastructure. The reality is the only real tool we have for raising funds is property taxes. A 1% property tax increase brings in about $5 million a year. I commend this Council for taking some of the necessary steps to start going down that road to dedicate new tax increases towards infrastructure, but you know what, it's still not enough. The Provincial Government chose to break its own laws and increase the PST without going to a public referendum. Then they promised that the money would go towards what I think is the biggest priority out there, towards our streets and roads. They're bringing in excess of $215 million a year now with this tax increase, so now the year end…so they've received that money. We…Winnipeg deserves its fair share. Winnipeg property taxpayers are putting this money out, they should get their share for their roads and their priorities right here inside the Perimeter Highway. That works out to be about $170 million a year. That in fact should be on top of the $50 million that we already get towards, from the Province from gas taxes and various other pots. So it shouldn't be 120, you know, it's actually 170 we should be getting because again the Province promised every dollar is supposed to go towards this. We've tried forever to try to get a better deal to get growth related taxes. Again, municipal levels of government across Canada only receive eight cents of every tax dollar approximately. Yet, we provide the services that people count on each and every day. Things like Police protection, ambulances, parks, streets and all that infrastructure. The things that really matter to people on an ongoing, everyday basis. So, again, I think this question, I mean, Glen Murray, he tried the new deal way back when. It's been over a decade that we've been trying the various levels of…the various governments here have been trying to get a better share of these revenues. This brings attention to it, this gets people talking about it. This makes it a reality. I think everybody in this Council should be supporting this referendum question and every Winnipegger should be voting yes on this to send a strong message to Broadway.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, I picked up on something that Councillor Swandel said that we should be having better relations with the Provincial Government. How about having a better Provincial Government in terms of how they're making decisions I think is more of the relevant question that's there. I would actually be in support of putting in the additional question in this, I think the original wording there was some talk of asking our citizens, should the Provincial Government had introduced the PST increase without going to the citizens? We know that was the law of the land. Councillor Gerbasi talked about democracy. Well, democracy is the laws of the land. To change the law in my opinion, after the fact just to suit your needs in my opinion doesn't make a lot of sense. So from my point of view, I really truly believe this makes a lot of sense. I would've gone even further in terms of the languages there. I think at the very least, the way the wording is talked about right now where it's talking about the additional money that the Province, they talk about investing in roads and bridges and all these other things in the City of Winnipeg which by the way makes up the majority of their majority government that's there, so, you know, if you are going to introduce illegally, if you're out in the field, depends on what the courts have to say about it, you should be investing money in the City of Winnipeg, that is where the majority of people that are supportive are and I truly think that this is a good ballot question. I think it makes some sense. It brings some questions to it and we'll find out once and for

all what the people think in terms of where the money should be spent. Once again I'd be supportive of asking the question in it itself, should they have increased it because the Province refused to of course go to that referendum to do it. So that, I will be very much be supporting, am very happy to be seconding Councillor Wyatt's motion and very much agree with what Councillor Browaty had to say and encourage all the Councillors to support this and encourage Winnipeggers to talk to the representatives about this because this makes complete sense. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Fielding. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Madam Speaker, a couple of things. We talked about this last week actually, and I'll say the same thing back then today as I said back then. First of all, I don't think that asking for 100% of all of the funds inside the City of Winnipeg to come directly to the City of Winnipeg in a time of flood crisis for the Province of Manitoba is actually the best thing to do at this time. Whether we like it or not, and nobody likes it, but the communities outside of the city are going through crisis; trying to handle all the water that's coming in from the Assiniboine River, the other waterways. And those crises are real, Madam Speaker. Lake Manitoba, Lake Winnipeg, and I can guarantee that some of that money that will be accruing to the Province is going to go to help those communities that are in crisis now and if you read the question, "do you believe that all of the revenues collected by the Provincial Government, all of the revenues of the 1% increase in the PST from inside the City should come to the City of Winnipeg", Madam Speaker? All of the revenues. So what we are, in fact, asking the Province to do is to break those multiyear agreements with other municipalities outside of the City for infrastructure; to break those agreements. We're potentially asking the Province to break agreements that they have with universities of which we have three within the City of Winnipeg. University infrastructure is completely legitimate infrastructure. We're asking the Province to break those agreements with hospitals and research centres that we have inside of the City of Winnipeg which is completely legitimate infrastructure which, by the way, universities and hospitals contribute greatly to the quality of life of large urban centres such as Winnipeg, Madam Speaker. So although I admire the passion of Councillor Wyatt, we're all on the same page for increased infrastructure. We need to be spending way more money inside the City of Winnipeg on our roads, on our streets and on our back lanes than what we used to. As Councillor Mayes pointed out, we're up to $80 million a year, which is a vast improvement over where we were 20 years ago. I've said this many times on this floor. I'll repeat it one last time, from 95 to 98 I was on the Council that did not spend one penny on residential street repair during those three years, Madam Speaker. I'm proud to say I voted against all of those budgets, not a cent. And look at through the leadership of Councillor Wyatt; look at the improvement that we've made over the years with the dedicated 1% to residential streets. I mean, we've come a long way, but we need to continue making those improvements. Councillor Gerbasi makes a great point about the importance of elections in our city. I mean, we send as a country we send people to all over the world to observe democracy in action. I mean, we have to be careful and we have to be very, very clear on the questions that we send forward to be on the ballot because our elections are sacrosanct in Canada all over the world, I wish they could enjoy the democracy that we do in our city and in our country. And I think by sending a completely political, politically loaded question that has all sorts of implications for funding for tax increases down the road that we're treading on ground that I'd rather not tread on. And I also understand that the opposition leader, Mr. Pallister, has made a promise to remove the 1% should he become the Premier. I don't know if that's going to happen, I can't…I don't know what's going to happen in the next Provincial election, but I think it…you know, those are things that all come into consideration. This is…it is a tactic, it…if it passes today, it could be a very effective tactic, but I don't think it's serious. I think that we need to continue the diplomatic route with the Provincial Government and the Federal Government so I'm not going to be supporting this this morning.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As I make my comments today, I'm probably going to wear two hats, first of all, as a member of the Finance Committee and as somebody who has supported many of the ideas and concepts that Councillor Wyatt has espoused over the past seven or eight years, I understand his approach and the need to find more money to work on our infrastructure. That's my St. Charles hat. And the…I'll just comment Councillor Fielding mentioned that the existing Provincial Government has their majority because of the City of Winnipeg, there are 31 seats within the City of Winnipeg in the Provincial Legislature. Twenty six of them are part of the existing government. I don't know about my colleagues here, but I know that two members of the legislature that are also part of my ward have my office on speed dial. Many of the things that they seem to think are the City's responsibilities are things that the Province should be funding, and I think a message has to go out not only to them, but the citizens when a Provincial election does come along, that they not just be drinking the Kool-Aid that's dished out within the cabinet room at Broadway, but to have some backbone of their own and, you know, to stand up for the residents of their particular constituency. So that's my city hat. I'm going to put on my partnership with the Capital Region chairmanship hat and say as Councillor Swandel has mentioned that we have friends right here in the Capital Region, particularly St. Francois Xavier and Cartier which are part of the flooding problems west of here, and good on the Province and, certainly, the military who came and helped with a lot of the residents in those small municipalities, but nonetheless, helped their citizens to make sure that, you know, that they stayed safe and dry as much as possible as the Assiniboine potentially

spilled its banks. So I know that money is…some of the money is coming from right here in the City of Winnipeg to support those services and to support the Provincial public works that are out there managing the flood as it exists today. So as much as I am known to be sort of a hawk within this Council, I will use the wisdom of age in the seven or eight years here and agree with many of the folks that have already spoken that say this is not a tactic that I see as a valuable one as we go forward and, again, within the Capital Region the new Minister, Struthers, and likewise Mr. Chief who we have a very good working relationship with and our…moving that those initiatives forward have, you know, seen the bigger picture and they value the participation of Winnipeg in their departments and I think that we would be working across purpose to move those ideas forward. So as much as I agree with the intent, I will be disagreeing with putting it on the ballot this fall. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, I don't want to count the number of times. I've talked about the City needing a greater share of the tax dollars. How many times I've talked about 65 cents of every tax dollar going to the Province, 27 cents going to the Feds and us getting 8 cents, and we're not able to accomplish our goals. We can't pay for the infrastructure that has to one be replaced as well as the new infrastructure. That's just a fact. And I give kudos to Councillor Wyatt because the realities are when Councillor Mayes mentioned the record investments we're now making into our regional local streets and back lanes, a lot of that has to do with initiatives that came forward under Councillor Wyatt. I think we're very fortunate. I know some people don't acknowledge that to be the case, but we are investing those kinds of moneys. But the other side of the coin is, Madam Speaker, there is a time when I have no problem, you know, going to battle. I'll give you examples. When the Minister at that point in time made a commitment to the helicopter and made a commitment to cadets and then the Ministers change then changed their minds, I had no problem holding them to the fire and saying you made this commitment, you have to fulfill it, and they did. When we were doing stage two of rapid transit and the Province said they were in for one-third and we needed them for one half, yes, we kept on saying one half, one half, and the Province did come to the table. And I think that it was Councillor Gerbasi who may have mentioned transit. Transit was not 50/50, for many, many, many years. Conversations with then Premier Gary Doer, we got it back to 50/50. There is a time where you have to debate. There's a time when you have to discuss, that's part of the job, okay, it's not a matter of when you're getting along or not, you're here to basically represent the taxpayers, the citizens of Winnipeg, that's our job. But, Madam Speaker, I have said on so many occasions. I don't believe in referendums. I've said it over and over again on this floor of Council. It's the job of the elected officials to make decisions, not have a referendum. You could just as easily go out there and do a poll. We all know what it would mean, we've been through this before, and when we had the last potential referendum for Councillor Gerbasi's sake, I believe the vote was 14 to 2 against, so Madam Speaker, I will not support a referendum.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to thank Councillor Wyatt for moving this and I'm the seconder on this item. And I believe that this Council has worked very hard to try to find ways to get more streets done, quite honestly, get more bridges done. As Finance Committee, as a member of Finance Committee, with Councillor Wyatt, Councillor Nordman, we come up with all kinds of creative ways to try to do more with less and that deficit is just continually growing. And one of the biggest factors in this last year that nobody has touched upon is the municipal climate change issue. We have seen frozen pipes, we have seen roads that need more frequent clearing. We have heard all of that from people and anybody who started going to the doors is certainly hearing about all of that. We've seen MPI rates go up because of our roads. Roads and bridges is what's itemized in here but getting more money towards those things allow us to do more with what we already have, for sidewalks, for recreation centres, for fire halls because, yes, there's still continued need for that, so it's not just for roads and bridges. This frees up money for us to be able to do more things, and I'm prepared to fight for more of that piece of the pie. The pie has grown. A year now of an increase in our PST, of 1%, for a whole year this Provincial Government has been collecting the additional 1%. Our share of the pie has not grown correspondingly. That's all this question is simply asking for, that the city, the city that we each represent, some 35 to 65,000 people in, gets more of a fair share. This question is critical to helping our city move forward. We are…our hands are tied so often from doing so much more in our cities than we could be doing. This helps our city move forward. We've seen the sales tax increase. The money should stay here. This Council, although I didn't support those budgets that did so, raised taxes repeatedly to almost 11% in these past four years. So for anyone to say that the City has not taken action and the City has not tried to do more with less, there have been ASD initiative come forward. This Council has tried many things and there's still much work to do. So this fall and now, we're seeing it as our new Assiniboine Park Conservancy opens when the Museum for Human Rights opens, and when our Convention Centre is finished and we have even more people in our city, and they're constantly saying it because we have heard this, boy, those roads getting to and from those places are just atrocious. I can't see that doing anything else but the same thing is going to result in hearing anything differently. Some people have called it a stunt and bullying and embarrassing and humiliating and let me tell you when I put my name on something I by no means have that as a part of being part of those kinds of tactics. Putting it on the ballot, the purpose is…a referendum is costly, it costs millions of

dollars. We've heard that from time and time again. Putting it on the ballot, people are going to the polls. You will get the most numbers, the highest numbers of people responding to that question. It does the best we can with what we have. I am very surprised, and no one has pointed it out yet, that this went through EPC last week and no one said anything. My understanding was that it was unanimously supported. Nothing has changed on this item since last week that I'm aware of, no new information has come to light. I believe and, Madam Speaker, perhaps we can have clarification in the closing comments on whether this was indeed voted on at that meeting. My question is, was it read even? Did people just change their minds since last week? I guess I'm not clear. And I would also like to point out that at the time of preparing this motion, there was no flood crisis, this was a month ago, the crisis was not what it is today. But our roads will continue to be in this state, so I'm fighting for our city. I believe that the people who work in our administration have had their hands tied and are in fact choked because they can't do what they need to do with the existing resources. We need the ambulance to actually be able to get to the hospital on the roads, and right now it is unsafe. We have heard it time and time again and I'm not going to go there with all that has happened in the last while. So this needs to be two way, this needs to be one getting more money into our system and, two, we need to continue to work and work harder to find those savings and efficiencies within our existing system. There's much talk about the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Pallister, removing the actual 1%. Well, we are here and now and dealing with a government of the day. And this is what we have before us. So that's the basis for making a decision, not about who might be elected down the road and what they might or might not do so I believe that people will remember how we vote on this and whether we support getting more money in our system. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'm not sure if I have a point of order or not, Madam Speaker. If someone has misstated, misremembered their voting record on an item, Councillor Havixbeck is right saying there were three budgets, three operating budgets that totaled roughly an 11% property tax increase in the Operating 2012, Councillor Havixbeck did vote for that budget. She was EPC at the time and she is certainly accurate in saying she hasn't voted for the last two. I don't know if that's a point of order or not, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: I don't believe so. Are there any further speakers on the item? Okay. Councillors, well…excuse me…just…We have another speaker, but shall we break for lunch and then come back? We do need to close this while…

Councillor Wyatt: Finish the debate.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Smith? You have the floor.

Councillor Smith: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is an historic motion. You know, I've never seen the City of Winnipeg in effect say to the Province do this or else. And, you know, it…it's hardly the way to get increased funding. You know, if you want to negotiate, you want to have good relationships, you don't go ahead and do something that will…we know how the result will turn out. Everyone will vote yes for it. Because they want…they're faced with potholes and bad streets, but let me tell you this, what this will do more than anything else will sidetrack people from civic issues. Will sidetrack them from the accomplishments that this Council has made and then will sidetrack them from all the scandals that this Council has faced. You know, it doesn't deal with the issue. It in effect, causes a fair amount of confusion. It's not going to be good negotiating from having this on the ballot. You know, we should defeat this and let me tell you, Councillor Wyatt has lobbied me on this and I sympathize with him. But the fact is this doesn't help the situation any. Let us defeat this motion. It's historic, but we let…this…the City should not be telling the Province. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow?

Councillor Orlikow: Just very quickly to follow up with Councillor Smith on the historic part. When this motion came forward, I said, "Well, this is a pretty interesting idea that a single Councillor could throw this on a ballot at the last moment." How do the Americans do this? Because this sounds very Americanese to me and I couldn't find any…any …I did a quick search, Idaho, you know, Mississippi, a couple cities around there and looked just on up there, how they do the system, how do people get ballots, you know, issues on the ballot. It's a very complex and detailed process to make sure that the question is fair; to make sure that the right people are supporting it, making sure the other side has an opportunity to speak against it. There's a whole bunch of processes that are put in place and it sounds to me that there are certain people on Council that want to try to move this model, so if you really want to do that, I would say, take the question out first and ask about the governance and how that process sets up and then we can start looking at things like putting things on the ballot. This last minute thing right before an election is bad governance. What about we want to save every tree in Winnipeg? What happens if we want to make the Red River blue and stop dumping raw sewage in there? What about blah, what about blah, there's a bunch of things that could be done, but we should not leave that just

to Council just before an election to throw these issues out no matter how noble and good the intent is. We have to have protection, not just for us today, but for the democracy in the future, today and tomorrow. So I'll be voting against it until at least we have an opportunity to look at how these kind of questions can even come forward properly so everybody has a fair opportunity, not just from the hip and throwing it on.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to say that I was at Executive Policy Committee last week and, you know, we supported this I think. My reason for supporting this, Madam Speaker, was to allow the conversations to take place. This motion the way it's worded obviously, I believe in the sentiment here and I believe in the spirit and the intent of that, but I don't believe, Madam Speaker, in the way we're doing it and the methodology. So I just want to say that, you know, I think we have a great Minister responsible for the City of Winnipeg in Minister Kevin Chief and I think that the Office of the Mayor with regards to being the Secretary of Urban…pardon me of…Intergovernmental Affairs, you know, that's the way we should be doing it, Madam Speaker, through a diplomatic process, through the Intergovernmental Affairs Office and so I won't be supporting this one today, but I think it's important that I put my thoughts on this and that I support the intent that we definitely do need more in terms of revenue sharing from the Province of Manitoba for our infrastructure.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt to close.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I guess I've heard everybody's discussion and I liken back to what I…my initial comments which…who is speaking for Winnipeg? Who is fighting for Winnipeg? We have 31 MLAs in the Manitoba Legislature, Madam Speaker, 31 MLAs, most of them of the government stripe, the governing party. None of them are speaking for Winnipeg, none of them are defending the interests of our City. They're the one who instituted this. They've wiped out the balanced budget legislation. They've abandoned the whole idea of having a referendum before bringing in a PST increase which was part of the law and they're forcing the PST increase, and not only that, they're taking the vast majority of their revenues outside of the City now. So these folks are definitely not standing up and fighting for the interests of the citizens of Winnipeg. Yes, here, here. But that leaves it to us, and we're not fighting for the interests of the citizens of Winnipeg if Council does not support this motion. This is a clear common sense resolution, read what it says. "Do you believe that all of the revenues collected by the Provincial Government's 1% increase, the one they brought in illegally, in the PST from inside the City of Winnipeg should be used towards fixing the existing roads and bridges of the City of Winnipeg?" Now, how much common sense can that be, Madam Speaker? Don't kid yourself, Councillors, for those of you who will still be here in the next coming term, how tough it's going to be in terms of balancing your operating budget. You're faced with new pressing contracts coming forward that we're going to be putting huge pressures on your budget in terms of having to balance the operation. Combine that with increased fixed costs, other fixed costs that are going up, plus everybody gave wonderful compliments and I want to thank everybody in terms of the Local Street Renewal Reserve, the Regional Street Renewal Reserve, 1% and 1%, it's going to be tough to keep those programs going. At the same time, keep your operating costs down. At the same time, meet all those new contractual and fixed cost obligations that keep rising on the City of Winnipeg and all the demands that bring. You're going to have to make serious cuts, cuts to services, possibly, cuts to programs, how else are you going to do it without having to go in and raise taxes dramatically or abandon programs like this? The idea of having a sales tax to fund the infrastructure of a growing city is inherently smart. The City is growing, the infrastructure…the sales tax's growth in terms of revenue is like this, compared to our property taxes which are like this. We all know that and it's why we've been fighting for the idea of having growth revenue, going into this sort of infrastructure. We know that. We all know that, and over and over again, we have consistently been calling on the Province to do this. And what do they do? They jack up the PST without even talking to anybody and then they put it in their pocket. The citizens of Winnipeg are having their pockets picked and this council is letting them do it, you're going to vote this down. You know, I happen to, you know, I can appreciate, Madam Speaker, that the NDP members, card carrying members of this council, who are labour endorsed, their first loyalty is to big labour and to the NDP and the second loyalty are to their constituents, I can understand their motivation with regards to that, and I can understand where they're coming from. I cannot understand, Madam Speaker, the loyalty of all of those others who claim that they're on the side of the people, but they're still going to vote this down. That is what it comes down to, Madam Speaker, that's what this issue is about. This issue is about sending a message, yes, we have been sending message after message after message to the government. And, you know, two are…you know, they…we open the door for them to increase the PST just by the very fact that we've been calling for them, give us a PST and they did it and then kept the majority of the funds. Keep in mind, In terms of the rural municipalities, most of the Rural Municipality money, they're collecting 276 million as we know of now, in terms of the PST increase, so over 100 million still go into the Rural Municipalities based on this. If we did it on a per capita, it would be well over 100 million. So they will get their share of funding. They will get their share. Does this affect programs immediately? Absolutely not. As one Councillor tried to say that we've got to stop everything and everything would crumble and we can't build hospitals and bridges, nonsense, Madam Speaker, nonsense. Can we phase this in over time? Absolutely. This is to send a message to the government. We need some common sense here. We're prepared to

pay an increase, I believe that the increase of the sales tax if applied and dedicated to the roads and bridges, I think the majority of citizens of the city would say yes. They'll even keep it as long as it's going to roads and bridges inside the City of Winnipeg. And I think that the Conservative leader of the Provincial Party might have to revisit his position, but as long as it's seen as picking the pockets and going into a big bank account, black hole on Broadway, the citizens of Winnipeg will never support that PST increase, and nor should they, and when the next Provincial Government comes in, which is hopefully sooner rather than later, they wipe out that because the government sold everybody a bunch of pile of nonsense when it came to selling this to the people that they're getting infrastructure back, they're not. The money is leaving the city. It's being sucked out of their pockets into rural Manitoba, great. I'm happy for them. But the reality is it should be fair. It should be fair and the fact is Winnipeg is the economic engine of the city, folks. The economic engine that drives the city. This is a good motion, this is a good motion, the issues with regards, the original versions of it as Councillor Fielding pointed out and Councillor Pagtakhan rightfully pointed out, were amended so that we wanted to be seen as not sticking a needle in their eye, but obviously all those ideas of compromise have gone out of the window. So here we are and you now have a chance to vote on it. I would hope that you support this because I'll tell you what, in the next Civic election, it will be about infrastructure, it will be about roads, it will be about how, why aren't you fixing everything and why is this not being addressed? And you can be guaranteed that your Provincial MLAs whichever party they are, whichever, in your area will be saying, your Councillor should've be doing that and why weren't they? Think about that, folks, because that's what's going to be happening.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll call the question. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Havixbeck and Wyatt

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Mayes, Nordman, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steen, Swandel, Vandal and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

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

Madam Speaker: Motion is lost. We will now adjourn and reconvene at 1:30.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
July 16, 2014, at 1:30 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: We are now on the Report of July 9, EPC, Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 9, 2014**

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 6.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, No. 4, okay. So I will call the question on…I'll call the question on 2, 3, 5 and 6, all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk, Item 1.

Councillor Wyatt: I declare a potential conflict and will leave the chamber.

Item 1 - Complete Communities Amendment - Residential Subdivision without a Full Range of Municipal Services Plan - SPA 2/2014

Councillor Browaty: Question.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Yeah, you can call the…I think the Councillor stood it down because of potential conflict so you can call the question.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item No. 4, Madam Clerk.

Item 4 - Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Grant – Siloam Mission

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I believe it was Councillor Mayes, I'd love to hear what he has to say, but just to give you a little bit of history, I think we all know the phenomenal job that's been done by the Siloam Mission when it comes to providing shelter and how they're looking at a much larger project. We also know that United Way is basically working on a long-term plan to basically address homelessness. This is a scenario where they will be investing millions of dollars in an area where nobody else really wants to invest any money and basically providing much better and larger facilities to, unfortunately deal with issues that are real and must be dealt with, this is something that I very much will be supporting and I certainly would love to hear what Councillor Mayes or any other Councillors have to say on it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker. I pulled this largely because last week in the media rush to report on the word "singing" in a 16 page by-law about transit and in that rush, some of the other good things we have done around here didn't get any attention. This is one of them, it's $4 million grant spread over a long period of time and it's based on the increase to value that will be accruing in terms of property taxes to…from the addition to the homeless shelter. So it's not that we're reaching into our reserves to give money out here. This is based on the increased value in the neighbourhood and my commendations to Councillor Pagtakhan for his work on this. So I have been meaning to ask the Mayor to give some comments to this because it was an item that is an important item that hadn't received frankly any attention I think other than perhaps in Metro gave it some attention, so I'm pleased to see that it's before us today. I'll be supportive, I don't know if the Mayor has any further comments.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: I believe we addressed this issue in EPC, Madam Speaker. I know that yours truly and many other members of Council were actually at the Siloam Mission during Christmas time, serving food and we certainly had the opportunity to basically see the presentation, and there's no doubt in my mind when this complex is finished, it will be something very special addressing some very important needs and there's no question, they bring the private sector to the table, which is something that government is not able to do. The number of volunteers that they have is pretty phenomenal. I believe this is truly a wonderful project and hopefully this will be supported unanimously.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour of the item? Contrary? Carried. Now, moving on to the Report of EPC dated July 15th. We've already suspended the rules.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 15, 2014

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to move that Items 1 and 2 be received as information, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay.

Mayor Katz: I guess I should be doing this one at a time. So, Item No. 1 to be received as information.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Yes, pardon me?

Councillor Wyatt: Where are we on the agenda?

Madam Speaker: EPC Report dated July 15th, Item 1.

Councillor Wyatt: July 15th. Do we have a hard copy?

Madam Speaker: We'll have the clerk read the item.

Item 1 - Winnipeg Police Service Headquarters Quantity Survey and Construction Project Audit Status Updates – April 23, 2014

Madam Speaker: Thank you, so I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 2, Madam Clerk.

Item 2 - Winnipeg Police Service Headquarters Quantity Survey and Construction Project Audit Status Updates – May 16, 2014

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I'll move that this be received as information.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 3, Madam Clerk.

Item 3 - Quantity Surveying Review of the Winnipeg Police Headquarters Construction Project

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: On No. 3, I would move that we adopt the recommendations and move forward to the administration for implementation.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 4, Madam Clerk.

Item 4 - External Audit of the Winnipeg Police Headquarters Construction Project

Mayor Katz: Once again, I would move that we adopt the recommendations and move forward to the administration for the implementation.

Madam Speaker: We do have an amending motion No. 9 from Councillor Havixbeck and Councillor Gerbasi pertaining to this item. Shall we deal with it at the same time when we open up the debate? Okay, Councillor…Mr. Mayor, you've introduced the item. Yeah, you've moved the item. Okay, so Councillor Havixbeck, you can introduce the motion now.

Motion No. 9
Moved by Councillor Havixbeck,
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg powers and structures are provided from Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, as outlined in the Winnipeg Charter;

AND WHEREAS Manitoba Justice has the mandate to ensuring that municipalities conduct themselves in accordance to with the relevant municipal charters and laws;

AND WHEREAS referral to Manitoba Justice for review will assist in restoring public trust;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 4 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated July 15, 2014 be amended by adding the following recommendations:

- *That Council forward the full KPMG "Winnipeg Police Service Headquarters Construction Project Audit" dated July 14, 2014 to Manitoba Justice for review, and;*

- *That Manitoba Justice responds to the request through the City of Winnipeg Auditor to Council.*

Councillor Havixbeck: Sure, thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to clarify with the Clerk, however, before I read it that there…the wording that was from Legal Services has been incorporated into this motion or I need to make that adjustment. Okay. It doesn't appear that it has been then. So whereas the City of Winnipeg powers and structures are

provided from Her Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, as outlined in the Winnipeg Charter and whereas Manitoba Justice has the mandate to ensure that municipalities conduct themselves in accordance with the relevant municipal charters and laws and whereas referral to Manitoba Justice for review will assist in restoring public trust, therefore be it resolved that Item 4 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated July 15, 2004 be amended by adding the following recommendation, that Council forward the full KPMG Winnipeg Police Headquarters Construction Project Audit dated July 14, 2014 to Manitoba Justice for review and that Manitoba Justice responds to the request through the City of Winnipeg Auditor to Council. Ms Boryskavich has sent us an email in the meantime that to replace the last with that Council request Manitoba Justice to respond to the request through the City of Winnipeg Auditor to Council so I just want to clarify that that's the wording that's intended on this motion and make that change. And I raise this motion and I thank Councillor Gerbasi for supporting me on this. I am deeply concerned by what I read in this report. This is the third and this has to be the worst, and, you know, I'm also deeply concerned by what I read in this, in this report. This is a third and this is…has to be the worst and, you know, I…I'm also deeply concerned by what I have not read or heard here today and having our questions answered; numerous questions not answered, not answered to satisfaction. And I would go so far to say that this report is difficult to support without this motion. This motion to me puts a safeguard in place for Council because we have had information put in front of us that hasn't been thoroughly shared, provided. No minutes, for example, on numerous meetings where we thought that there were minutes. We thought there was a process going on. And I'd like to know why and I'd like to know who is responsible and that is not evident in any of these reports that we are receiving. So I'm going to leave it at that for my opening comments. I will close on this motion and have more to say at that point and outline even more of my concerns. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, any further speakers on the item and the motion? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Just for clarity; this is on both the amendment in motion all in…?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Mayes: Okay. Thank you, Madam Speaker. On November 25, 2009, Councillor Swandel as chair of the committee rose to bring before this chamber a report, a proposal to buy building on 266 Graham, the Canada Post Building for 30 million, later revised slightly downward to $29 million. That purchase has been the subject of a previous audit last week that indicated that there were certainly some shortcomings and concerns about the nature of that purchase so I won't touch so much on the purchase, but there was a report that was voted on, voted on unanimously that day, it was not even a recorded vote, it was simply voted on in November 2009, and that…in that report, it's 29 pages long, it references twice, not only twice, the figure of $105 million for the entire renovation project. No details provided. $105 million.

Councillor Wyatt: Point of order, Madam Speaker. The Councillor cited a report that was voted on unanimously. It was not voted unanimously, not all members of Council were here for the meeting.

Councillor Mayes: Of the members who were here was voted, there was no recorded vote, so I don't know the exact attendance but I'll take it…I'll take Councillor Wyatt at his word there. I'm not meaning it in a critical capacity. I'm not going to be saying people should've leapt up and asked more questions. Clearly, there had been a Council seminar that's referenced in the Hansard transcript. The day before, sometime before that talked about that figure of 105 million and where it came from, and you'll probably hear other people talk about that as the afternoon goes on here. Clearly, the auditors didn't have the reason nor the source for that $105 million, but what they did say was, look, the figure that came a year later that was higher, the $130 million figure, that should've had about a 30% contingency built in so the earlier figure, the $105 million figure, certainly should've had a much bigger contingency built in and that should've been made clear to the Council of the day. It was Council Browaty yesterday who said, "Look. If I had before me, the business plan, but it said 105 million plus or minus 75%", I certainly would've asked a lot more questions. I would've had a lot more concerns, but that wasn't what was before Council then, it was…but there was this…this figure of 105 million. And as I said last night, this thing was doomed to be over budget from the start once you started from that figure. In fact, the questions I asked this morning were meant to show what's on page 12 and 13, the project manager realized very early on the budget's too low so we get an artificially inflated furniture, fixtures budget to go in there, in the end only about half, maybe less than half of that 22 million which they indicated was far too high for furniture and fixtures. Some of that gets rerouted into project and this whole drama begins from there in 2009. One point that's gotten lost here, I think that there was a report last night saying they wasted $75 million and that isn't what the quantity survey said. The quantity survey said, "Well, for a building of this size and this magnitude and this function, the price is comparable to what other cities paid." This has been touched on, I think, by Councillor Swandel. So if you're looking at the total price, this audit doesn't say $75 million got wasted. What it says is the building ended up costing about what other cities had paid. The reason we're all here though is because the original estimate was so low at 105 million and we're now at for the reconstruction at $180 million. So there need…we're still asking questions, we're still seeking answers about where that

original figure came from. We are implementing the recommendations which I'm pleased to see, but as I said before, this thing was doomed to be over budget from that initial presentation to Council of the figure of 105 million. To the gentleman who's been emailing me and asked me why I didn't ask the hard questions in 2009 and 2011, I was asking hard questions in 2009, I was asking hard questions of the School Board Superintendent because I was a School Trustee in Brandon at the time and a number of us, like Councillor Havixbeck who weren't here in 2009. I wasn't here for the 2011 vote, but all of this, this has occurred over a couple of different phases, every phase being over budget, so I'll be supporting the amendment to have this referred on to Manitoba Justice. I wasn't that pleased with the motion last week, it didn't have a timeframe on it for getting anything back. Frankly, I thought it was a bit vague, but certainly from what I'm hearing from the public, they want us to refer this on to Manitoba Justice so I'm happy to support Councillor Havixbeck's motion today. There were two I thought quite good speeches last week in the audit. Unfortunately, neither was mine, but the two that I thought were best were probably what Councillor Havixbeck said and Councillor Vandal said. So Councillor Havixbeck essentially said, "Look. You come in here. You're elected. You're full of energy and hope and you want to put things right and you come across some of these matters, which have been dealt with before or have been dealt with without your knowledge and you're faced with the choice of what to do. And this Council's voted to have these audits. It's taken a while to get them, but I think this Council is facing up to it and demanding some follow-up action implementing the recommendations, so I thought that was a good speech about the frustrations you can feel in this job when you come in with the energy and with the desire to see things done correctly and honestly. The other speech I thought was good last week was Councillor Vandal was saying, you can get… I'll telescope it down to "you can get things done without doing them dirty". And this building got done and the quantity survey says this building got done at a price that is comparable to what other cities have paid. So the issue here is not all of this money got wasted on the building. And I should say if you look at that 2009 report, there's a lot of information in there about the efficiencies from having one building and the ability to be closer to the courthouse. There was a reason to consolidate, all of that, unfortunately, has been lost because of the way in which this got done. So there actually was a pretty good business case to consolidate in a structure somewhere in the downtown area. It's worth going back and looking at that report, which also said, look, we'll use some of the money that was going to go into refurbishing the public safety building, and we're going to put it toward the new project. The tragedy, the unfortunate thing is in the underestimation of what the total project would cost. So Councillor Vandal I think had a point last week, which he was saying that you can do these major projects, you don't have to do them dirty because frankly, that's why we ended up here after all this time, all this energy, all these reports, all these audits is not that the building cost wildly more than it was supposed to, this isn't the Montreal Olympic Stadium with people sleeping in their cranes for 24 hours and getting paid. There's no evidence that the building when it was built was an exorbitant cost, that the evidence here, there's a $75 million overrun as to what Council was originally presented as the cost estimate. We still need some more answers on that. I'll conclude, Madam Speaker, by saying there's still more questions to ask, I'll be working on the…I'll support the amendment to refer to the Province and, you know, a number of people's names have come up, but there's only one name from that speech in November 2009, and the Councillor says that I'd like to thank our administration and in particular Phil Sheegl, our Deputy CAO for getting this done in reference to project. So it's a name that's unfortunately continued to come up. We're going to have to deal with this audit, but I have to say that's the one name that's mentioned here and I know Mr. Sheegl wasn't CAO at the time, that's whose name was talked about in November 2009. Mr. Sheegl is no longer with us. I personally…I'm to think that's a positive thing for the City. We'll be moving forward. We'll be doing the follow-up and look forward to getting a report back from the Province on this matter.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, any further speakers? Councillor Havixbeck to close.

Councillor Havixbeck: Once again, I'm deeply concerned with what I've read and what we heard and you know I have concerns around those that were not interviewed in this process and I have concerns about change orders and the number of change orders that did not hit a public agenda for approval and no accounting for much of the work. The project director, verification of receipts, invoices, contracts, what was paid, what was supposed to have been paid. No clear answer on why the Project Director was part of the project, and I also note that this same company is responsible for the work on the Stadium and the Convention Centre projects and I'm concerned about those as well. No clear explanation has been provided on why the surety performance bond was reduced. No explanation for this except that consulting may be arranging meetings, coordinating efforts needed to occur, and I have to ask is this what the City paid this money for? Why is there some accounting for dates, times of meetings, why is there no accounting for dates and times of meetings and accountability? On the joint venture situation, there's no explanation for what one proponent exited, no explanation for why another proponent was awarded the entire contract. No clear explanation of whether that proponent would've had the contract had they not had the other member of the joint venture in that arrangement. No clear explanation was provided about who said 12.5% of the contingency was acceptable versus 20 to 30%. And you know, I use the analogy of the bombers in this, because you think about how they were doing last year and you think about how they're doing this year and that, it could be attributed to the result of a change in leadership. It definitely had an improvement. And so I hope that every member around this Council chamber will support this motion that we refer this on to get all of these questions answered because I don't feel they've been answered here today for us. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, to close.

Mayor Katz: I think we should just call the vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Recorded vote has been called. All those in favour of...we're voting on the Motion 9. Yes, no, just the Motion, 9. Pardon me? I'm sorry/ Okay. All in favour of the amending motion please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Mayes, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Steen, Vandal and Wyatt

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Nordman, Smith, Swandel and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

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

Madam Speaker: Motion, amending motion is carried. We will now vote on the item as amended. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Moving on to the report of EPC dated July 16th.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED JULY 16, 2014

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, I'll move to suspend the rules. The rule be suspended, no, that's the By-law, my apologies…July 16th...that the rule of suspended and that Report of Executive Policy Committee dated July the 16th be considered item by item?

Madam Speaker: Madam Clerk. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 1 - Municipal Gas Tax Agreement

Mayor Katz: I move that Item 1 be adopted, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, standing down Item 1? Apologize, Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you; I just need some clarification on this municipal gas tax agreement, from either from the Mayor or the Finance Chair or somebody on Executive Committee. I guess it's…as to timing because if you read the narrative, the reason for the report, it says this gas tax agreement, is an administrative agreement setting out the terms and conditional for providing gas tax funds to the Province. Canada has not included the annual payment amounts Manitoba would receive. Similarly, the agreement between the City and the Manitoba does not include annual payment amounts. Instead, the City has received a separate draft municipal gas tax allocation schedule which is outlined as read, 14 and 15 is 39.9 million, 15, 16, 39.9 million, 16, 17, 41.9 million and on and on. You can read that, taken as read. And my question is we've received an extension on 2010 at 40.45 million each year for 2010 to 2014. So given that, we don't know what the Feds are giving the Province. We don't know what the Province is going to give us and there's a schedule that's attached that is actually less than what we are receiving now; my question would be why are we approving this now? What's…is this…should we not know those details before we actually move forward? And given the intergovernmental discussion, very passionate intergovernmental discussion we had this morning on the importance of getting more funding for the projects that we all value, why are we getting into this agreement now if we don't know what's in it and, in fact, the schedule that they've sent us that they want us to sign off on is less than what we are receiving now…by, you know, roughly $500,000 I believe, if not more. So clarification on the timing such as why are we doing this now, why is the timing important now? Why does the schedule have us receiving less money next year than what we're receiving this year?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Just to speak to it as well, Madam Speaker, I actually this morning I voted against this at EPC not because of the reasons as Councillor Vandal pointed out, I'm concerned with regards to Appendix A, specifically the eligible projects categories, historically the gas tax, as you know, Madam Speaker, has funded core infrastructure, hard infrastructure such as roads and bridges. I have a concern with regards to the fact that…and I understand that the Federal Government wants to make eligible issues such as recreation, infrastructure and tourism and cultural infrastructure and sport infrastructure and disaster mitigation infrastructure, but I believe that the gas tax's strength has been the fact that we have earmarked it towards roads and bridges and the Mayor fought tooth and nail to get that actually amended when originally the city of our size was not going to be eligible for gas tax funding for that and, you know, I'm not against the idea of infrastructure funding for recreational funding, I just think to use the gas tax program for this is potentially setting a wrong precedent. If you recall the gas tax is a permanent infrastructure program, Madam Speaker, which means that we have borrowed against it, 30 year dollars so we can actually take infrastructure costs and instead of turning them into a pay as you go scenario, we have spread that out over 30 years which allows us to actually invest in long term infrastructure such as our roads and bridges which we have been doing with gas tax. We use gas tax for Chief Peguis Trail. We've used gas tax for the Disraeli Bridge improvements. These are projects which are absolutely crucial to the future of our City. So the whole concept of us now getting into the recreational and, you know, I think it's a separate issue, it's something that has to be addressed by the Federal Government, and I can appreciate this is what they're requesting, but the fact of the matter is this does set a precedent whereby there will be a push to move our moneys from gas tax into recreation which then would offset…were you going to offset that too? Well, you know, you're going to have to offset that from your general capital borrowing and capital spending which we don't have fully funded like gas tax or through Building Canada which is now a 10 year program, but a 10 year program is a lot different, Madam Speaker, than a permanent 30 year program or a permanent program where you can have 30 year dollars. That's the challenge with regards to…what's being proposed here before us today. So this morning, I actually…I didn't support this. I would welcome it…if there's somebody…I can't refer it now back, but somebody else who hasn't spoken to this item could refer it back because I just…I'm not prepared to support it today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to make a few comments, if I'm inaccurate in some of this, please correct me. But based on, as your FCM member, I was pretty involved in our negotiations on behalf of municipalities for these infrastructure programs. And these categories I believe were put forward by the Federal Government, they're not the Province's idea or our idea, they're put forward by the Federal Government and the program that they told us was the program. So it's not something that was Municipalities' or the Province's decision. So this isn't going to change, this is how the program has been determined across the country to broaden what we can do with it. I think the key thing about the gas tax revenue, not only is it ongoing for a long period of time, it…the strength is that as municipalities, we have a lot more say in how it's spent than those application based type of programs like Building Canada Fund where we have to work with the Province more on that. So in this case, we…this council has made a number of decisions to and as Councillor Wyatt said most of that has focused on roads and bridges and basic infrastructure and that's what we probably agreed within our agreement with Manitoba, only 10% of it goes to Transit whereas…10 goes to Transit, whereas in other places, it's much higher, you know, there's a lot of different issues. But what I'm saying is this that this municipality had the choice and the control over how we spend it, so we don't have to spend it on some of these broader categories, it's just giving within Manitoba the municipalities the choice, but it was the Federal Government who decided to broaden these categories, so I don't see how sending it back is going to change that at all. The other issue you're raising is the amount of money and, again, I'm not 100% sure, but I thought it was done on a per capita basis, so it's not really something we can control or change. It's not really about negotiating this with the Province. It's really, this is how the program was announced by the Federal Government. We have to sign something with the Province to move ahead with it. I don't think we have a lot of say in any of this, so I guess I just don't see the point in laying it over. I don't know what would change if we laid it over longer. I don't know whether it would hurt anything. I don't it would help anything. Also, you know, we…the one thing that was achieved in the new overall infrastructure agreement which includes Building Canada and gas tax and all of those things. Well, we did get the gas tax indexed to, so it should be going up. That doesn't mean that overall, the package hasn't decreased because it's spread out over 10 years for the BFI piece of it, so there's a reason of the FCM in their announcements and their policies and I'm just advising you are not that happy with how the negotiations went overall and a lot of the principles that we represented all municipalities in Canada on, did not get addressed and we're still working on doing what we can there, but the fact is there were concerns about this that are still being discussed in terms of overall envelope of money and we…there's a window in five years to kind of renegotiate everything again, at least with BF…Building Canada fund, I mean. So I guess my point is that this is kind of fixed in the way the Federal program is set out and I'm not sure there would be much purpose or utility in sending it back. Thank you. Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: I appreciate some of the comments Councillor Gerbasi made. You know, I moved that we referred…I'm not really sure if there is a motion referred back to EPC, just that I mean I don't know if this is a time sensitive thing.

Councillor Gerbasi: It is time sensitive.

Councillor Fielding: Okay, why? Does any…I'm not sure if anyone can't have some contest to this, whether the Mayor at the end or not, sorry? You know, I don't know if waiting a month is going to delay this.

Councillor Gerbasi: Two months.

Councillor Fielding: Two months is going to delay this. I'd like to get some more information that Councillor Vandal raised some good points in terms of the money flow and how it goes down, a lot of it. So you know, I'd refer it back. I move a motion to refer back to EPC just so we can get some more information. You know, I don't know if we need a council seminar, but at least provide some more information and this may be a just plain document that Councillor Gerbasi just said, but I think just to delay it for two months is…isn't…

Councillor Swandel: So, you're making a motion to refer? Okay, so that takes precedent and I think we have to deal with that. We're not debating the clause now. Okay, so you've moved the motion to refer? I think that it's the wrong thing to do, but I just want to make sure because we can't stand down the debate, the clause.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Fielding, motion to refer?

Councillor Fielding: Yes. I just want some explanation on that.

Councillor Gerbasi: If somebody speak…if somebody…point of order. Is the…is there an option for somebody to speak against referral in these circumstances? I'm asking the Clerk, I believe there is.

Madam Speaker: It's a motion to refer without instructions.

Councillor Gerbasi: I believe there is an option to speak against referral by somebody. And that might be wise given the time sensitivity here.

Madam Speaker: So it is a motion to refer without instructions. The only person that can speak is the Mayor for three minutes I believe.

Mayor Katz: I'd be happy to, thank you, Councillor Gerbasi. Madam Speaker, there were many comments that were made and Councillor Vandal pointed out that there was less money and that's 2014. We're actually dealing with 2015 and moving forward. And I think that Councillor Gerbasi gave a pretty good explanation, very factual one, exactly what this is all about. This is for all intents and purposes etched in stone. You can love it. You can dislike it. It doesn't really make a difference, it is what it is. And for quite a while, we've been dealing with issues whether it's Building Canada Funds or now it's the gas tax where we had scenarios where other organizations, whether it's for cultural projects or recreation projects, it's a matter of one government sending it to another and saying if this government makes it a priority, we'll be there. The idea is to try to make it easier to say no. We all know what goes on here. This is what it is. Councillor Gerbasi made it very clear and we all know. We fought along with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to get it indexed; we got it indexed. We now have long term funding. We have something extremely positive that's been heralded by the "Big City Mayors" as a major, major accomplishment. Does Council want to say no to this at this stage of the game? I think not. It would be very foolish; it's not going to change. If you wish to refer it and delay it for two months, you'll be at the exact same point; I think we should deal with it now and move forward.

Madam Speaker: Motion to refer?

Councillor Fielding: (Inaudible) for me does seem a little more…I'll withdrawal my motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, so we'll continue. Next speaker. Next speaker is Councillor Swandel followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Swandel: I don't know that there's much more to say, you know, this is something that the approval is required, it's put upon us by other levels of government. I too at the very beginning really detested the fact that within the gas tax funding we had cultural and community facilities which we know, you know, includes museums and all of these other things and we structured our gas tax money in a way that just specifically service debt and I think even P3

payments on roads and bridges and then to now have groups that are out there trying to get contributions from all three levels of government saying that the gas tax is a Federal contribution, really puts us in an awkward spot. So the logistics of it as it relates specifically to this municipality and I'm sure Councillor Gerbasi can echo that when you're at FCM, many other municipalities see logistically that this structure created by the Federal Government is not very good for our ability to manage our finances. So you know, but this is very much coming down from above and if we want access to the money, this is how we have to do it. And that's really what this is saying, so it'll…might not taste good, but we kind of have to accept it and move on.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Okay, thank you, Madam Speaker, yes. I just wanted to quickly say after hearing some of the debate on this one, I believe I'm going to vote for this particular motion and it seems to me that while…and getting a side answer, it seems to me that all this does opening up disaster stuff is it puts pressure on us to spend money that way that as I read it, it is an agreement that says we can use this money for these items. And it still improves the infrastructure, roads and bridges, as Councillor Wyatt adequately stated. And I would say that the pressure on this City Council and the City Councils going into the future would be actually to spend the money on roads and bridges, not necessarily on recreation. We'll have to figure out other ways. So as I understand this agreement, we're not…the Feds aren't telling us what we're going to spend it on, they're just telling us they've opened up the categories in what we can spend it, and yes, there will be pressure from groups wanting us to spend money on recreation. I don't know why the added disaster unless the Federal Government is trying to get out of funding disaster assistance, I don't think that's appropriate, but, anyway, I'll leave it at that. I'm voting for the motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close?

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The realities are that no elected official, no level of government, want to say no to a good project. Whether it's a cultural project or a recreation project, no one wants to say no. By the same token, every level of government is looking for revenue. There always seems to be a major shortage of revenue. In this situation, you know, I think many members of Council would agree there should be separate pots for recreational projects, cultural projects. I believe that we all would agree that the gas tax is meant for infrastructure and transit and keep something in mind. That's not going to change because Council will have the final say. By the same token, it will give groups the opportunity on other types of projects to come forward and ask for money from that and it's going to be more challenging to say no, but that's what I believe Council will do because gas tax, if it's related to anything, it's related to our infrastructure, our roads, our bridges. This is where all of the vehicles drive on, whatever the case may be. It's very logical. It'll move forward and I do remember when the gas tax was first created, how we weren't allowed to use it for our roads and bridges and I went to Ottawa three times and they finally relented and I think we should keep on that track, no question about it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question, all those in favour of Item 1? All those in favour? Recorded vote has been called. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Vandal and Wyatt

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 14, nays 2.

Madam Speaker: Item is carried. Item No. 2, Madam Clerk.

Clerk: Item 2, guidelines for off-leash dog parks in the City of Winnipeg: further research.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, I move that Item 2 be adopted.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mayor Katz: Item No. 3, Madam Clerk?

Clerk: Item 3, Revised Award of Contract for the Provision of Telephone System Infrastructure, Related Equipment and Systems, and Cellular Wireless Services – Bid Opportunity 695-2012.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, I move that Item 3 be adopted.

Councillor Wyatt: (Inaudible) Revised award of contract for provision of telephone services, not the dog park. The package we have is Item 2, this item…what you were just quoting is Item 3.

Madam Speaker: So Item No. 3, okay is the award of contract for the provision of telephone service, telephone system infrastructure, well, we're renumbering it.

Madam Speaker: I'm just going to clarify with the Clerk for a moment.

Madam Speaker: So we're going to rescind the vote on the dog park item, okay because it ended at EPC. We'll move on to Item 3, the revised award of contract for the provision of telephone system infrastructure. Mr. Mayor.

Item 2 - Revised Award of Contract for the Provision of Telephone System Infrastructure, Related Equipment and Systems, and Cellular Wireless Services – Bid Opportunity 695-2012

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I move that Item 3 be adopted?

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Next item is strategic economic intensive grant.

Item 3 – Strategic Economic Incentive Grant – Neechi Foods Co-op Ltd.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, I'll move that Item 4 be adopted.

Councillor Swandel: Point of order, I think…just for clarification, Madam Speaker, we have the agenda for Council which does not include the dog park report which I think is what the mayor was looking at which was the EPC agenda which did include that, so just for clarity…my understanding is Item 1 was municipal gas tax agreement and Item 2 was the telephone contracts, Item 3 is the strategic incentive grant. That's the list we have in front of us so.

Madam Speaker: Are we dealing with the school zone item as well? Yes, that would be…

Councillor Swandel: That would be Item 4. So what we just approved as the telephone contract is, in fact, Item 2 according to what we have in front of us. The dog park piece ended at EPC. So that's why there's only four items here as opposed to five when we had it on the EPC. So I don't know if we need any motion to clarify that the last piece was Item 2, but we…the Mayor did state the clause that we were dealing with.

Madam Speaker: Yes, he did. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you and I appreciate that. Neechi Commons I believe many members of the EPC are obviously aware of it, but we're looking at $15,000 a year over 10 years as there were some I think friendly amendments changed from hiring a 50 to 40, and going back to last year I believe we've seen some major work done by Neechi having a great impact in the community. As I stated earlier, the fact that our department, through the leadership of Barry Thorgrimson came out with an idea of employment being tied in the aboriginal community, I think we all know how important that is, either jobs or education are exactly what they need to be empowered. This is something that I believe fulfills it. This is also something that Councillor Eadie has brought up on many occasions and I looked into it over and over again and I believe we have found the way for it to be a win-win. So I certainly hope this will be supported by all members of Council.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, you'd like to speak to the item?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I did want to speak to the item and I thank the Mayor for a…it was a bit of a long road to get to where we are and I appreciate the work that was done and I'd also like to thank Councillor Swandel for moving those

friendly amendments to the…to that report. And I just wanted to say very shortly that really Neechi Commons has become a very, very great asset for the North End and for this particular area of the community. The people that are employed there started back in March of 2013. They're learning skills. They're learning to work in a different industry than they may have been used to. There's a lot of poverty in the immediate area and the people, the proponents, have Neechi Commons have worked very diligently and hard to find people in the community who they could help, learn the skills and become highly employable and work towards a better future for themselves. And that is absolutely happening. I also would invite public chance to say, check out Neechi Commons, there's a lot of people from all around the city who are going there. It's a great place to have a lunch meeting if you want to. The food is excellent, the food is affordable and it's a great place to go grocery shopping, I do that myself there. And this incentive grant, I would point out as I did in the past they took what was basically an assessed property of a $400,000 and they created it into an assessed value that I read…had my assistant read to me is $2.29 million of assessment that was increased for the City of Winnipeg and for this particular area. So this is a very good incentive grant I believe and, again, I'll just end by saying my thanks and appreciation to the Mayor and EPC for moving this along and I hope that it is a unanimous decision to support this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, I did not support this at EPC and the reason I didn't is not because I don't support the initiative, I think it's a wonderful initiative. I used to shop at Neechi Foods when it was over on Dufferin Avenue. It was a co-op, it was housed there originally, and they do a great job. It's just right now as we stand the Government of Canada has committed $1.32 million in capital grants towards this project. The Province has committed $2.32 million of all those construction costs towards this project. This is a very expensive and well earned, obviously, grocery store on Main Street. I'm just saying, Madam Speaker, we have to be careful, we're starting, you know, we've given our tax increment financing for economic development where we know we needed to do it in terms of keeping jobs in Manitoba that we could lose. We know we've done it in terms of housing, we're strategic. This is a new area now that we're now giving our tax increment financing to that we really…it's being said that this is economic development, but it's…this is providing service in a service industry, yes, it's targeted in the North End, but this is something totally new. And I just want to point out that this, you know, our taxes represent 50% or more of what we collect as a revenue on the City when we give up those taxes, that's a 100…that's a huge chunk of what we earned. I just think we have to be very cautious on these sorts of things. I think what they're doing is great. I would prefer to see this come out of the youth employment, youth aboriginal strategy which I strongly supported that we increase in terms of funding. We tried to get it up by doubling it from a million dollars to two million. Unfortunately, the Province did not match that. They chose to go to 750,000 and that would've easily covered this program and I think it would've been a better policy decision to go that route versus going this route which really…it does…it could open up the flood gates in terms of other requests coming forward which I think is a concern seeing that this is not housing, this is not real true economic development as we've defined it in the past. And, yes, it's definitely a great project, yes, they do great work, yes they've received millions of dollars from public funding already from the Provincial Government and the Federal Government, whether or not it really should be eligible for incremental taxes from the City of Winnipeg at this time is what I find concerning about it or problematic so that's why I'm not supporting it. I want to make it clear that I support the work that they're doing there and everything that they're trying to achieve and employment for aboriginal young people, but I'm just saying that as a policy tool, this might be not the right way of us approaching this, considering Council has setting a precedent with regards to this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi?

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to strongly support this for a number of reasons. The other levels of government did support this, they also have other jurisdictions that we don't have in terms of employment, economic stimulus for small business, other responsibilities that we definitely don't have programs for and can't help with. This is tax increments financing which means it's not taking money directly out of our budget. The money wouldn't exist if the project wasn't going ahead. It's incremental taxes so in that sense it's not taking away so much from something else. This should've been done earlier in the process and we're doing it now. So it's tax incremental financing. We just approved a tax incremental financing program for Siloam Mission. Another thing that is…was praised by everybody today is a good initiative to support a need in our community to begin to address homelessness. We don't really have any other tools to do that as a city. This is a way we can do that. Those, again, are incremental taxes. We wouldn't be getting if the project wasn't going ahead. So it's not taking away from potholes or the other concerns that some people think are the most important things. Many other things are also important, including supporting our aboriginal community in the ways that we can. This is an incredibly positive business initiative of the aboriginal community in Winnipeg. It's something we should be very, very proud of. I should go to the new…they've taken an old building on Main Street. It's beautiful. It's vibrant. There's a wonderful restaurant in there. It's a meeting place and a place to get food, which we definitely have an issue with in the North End and in the downtown. And, you know, I really applaud Councillor Eadie's creativity and initiative and continuing to push for this and I also applaud EPC and the Mayor

and Councillor Swandel and everyone who made it happen. So I think this is a wonderful initiative. We should be proud of it. We should be proud of Neechi Foods in this city and it's a way we can help and I think we should, so those are my comments, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, any further speakers? Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just for the record, I think it's important for everyone to know that and I remember prior to Neechi going into that vacant building that stood there for many, many years, it was California Fruit and no one was rushing to go in there. We all know that there's a lot of work that has to be done in that area and I think we should commend Neechi Foods and the fact they got support from the other levels of government, good on them. But just talking about the City just for the record, when this first started and we inquired about giving them some moneys back as a TIFF, at that point in time, the impression was that there wasn't going to be no increase in their property taxes. Well, their property taxes did go up and they've gone up double of what they're getting. So just for the record, Neechi Foods is still paying property taxes. This is a good way of doing it. We're getting money; they're getting money, as was mentioned by both Councillors Eadie and Councillor Gerbasi. This is much more than just a grocery store, okay? This is a place where people come to meet. There's artisans there. It's a place where people get enlightened and educated on how to go out and do other projects. This is something good and we're giving away less than 50%, approximately 50%, of what we're getting so let's remember that, we're not giving it all away. We still are generating revenue for the City of Winnipeg and if Neechi didn't go in there, we'd be getting butkus.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I will call the question on Item 3, Incentive Grant for Neechi Foods, all those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 4, Madam Clerk.

Item 4 - Amendment to the Reduced-Speed Schools Zones By-law No. 76/2014

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am going to speak on this briefly first of all. Just a reminder to all members of Council: this is something that we had actually worked hard, this initiative came from us here on the floor of Council and actually started with me and the whole idea was to try to implement this for September of 2013. Due to circumstances beyond our control, because we needed the Province to pass certain regulations etc., we weren't able to do it, which I think is extremely unfortunate. We now have the opportunity to get it going so we at least have many of the schools onboard for September of 2014. And I know yours truly and Councillor Swandel have been speaking to the Minister to make sure that as we go, there's other schools that can be added on and that opportunity is here and also it gives the department the opportunity to do that. We can as was mentioned earlier by Councillor Swandel this morning, we can actually put the signs up, cover them, as soon as we get the go ahead, uncover them. This is extremely positive. This is protecting our greatest asset, our children. This should definitely be approved unanimously by Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on the matter? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, I only…I am supporting this, Madam Speaker, I just…I'm curious I guess because there was a long list of maybe the Chair can speak to this when summing up, or the Mayor…the concern I have is there's a long list of schools who were not included on the Reduced Speed Zones By-Law originally that came to Council. I know we raised the issue with regards to…in a Q&A with the chair that there should be a communication plan and I think that was agreed to by the chair that something should be done in terms of communicating to the City of why some schools are included or not. I guess I'm just curious in terms of the fact that we have three schools here and I definitely think it's great that three schools are being added to the bylaw, but there was literally dozens upon dozens of schools city-wide that were not identified on the list of schools that should've been…because of the issues with regards to setbacks and because of the issues with regards to the length of the street that they're on. However, the concern is that they'll cause come the fall, confusion in the minds of the public of why, you know, their child is going to school that does not have a speed zone reduced, and yet everybody…these other schools have street zones, schools that do have speed zones reduced and so I agree with the Mayor's comments that a child is a child is a child, however, my concern is we're adding three now which is great, but there's a whole bunch of others that are still off the list and I guess I'm concerned about it…how are these moving forward and the other ones are not? Why that's not happening and when are we going to see the other schools addressed that are on the list? This is something that concerns me, I guess, just from the point of view of the communications in terms of all of this being related in terms of all of these different schools that are not on the list. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I know I had a very short discussion with the Chairperson of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. These three schools are very interesting, one being on Jefferson, just in, actually in Madam Speaker's ward, but not on a street that runs through both our wards. It is a collector street not, unlike Inkster Boulevard where Inkster School exists, where Inkster Schools is not one of the schools that will see a reduction in the speed on Inkster Boulevard itself. Norquay School which, while this address is on Lusted in it, it does have a street that most of the kids have to cross and deal with which is Euclid, Euclid being another collector street in which made it ineligible under the regulations for it to be on there. So while I am voting for this report because I agree with the Mayor. We should all vote unanimously on this because I think that's important, I would like to hear from somebody as to what is the methodology now that the Province is using to allow us to add schools because like there…Belmont School in my ward is getting them but it's on a totally local streets, like there's no collector street that borders on it and you know it's good to reduce the speeds around there, but more danger that exists are the elementary kids who have to go to school on Inkster Boulevard and on Euclid. So I just want to make that point and concur with Councillor Wyatt about how exactly is this to proceed into the future. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. I wish people would read the reports and pay attention when these questions are asked and answered previously.

Councillor Wyatt: Point of order, Madam Speaker. There's no need for the Councillor to…so he can insult, we're asking sincere questions with regards to the safety of children.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Swandel, please proceed.

Councillor Swandel: I'm not sure asking people to read the report is an insult, but I can read, I'll just read the report in the time that I have. The recommendations 2 and 3 read as follows. "The Director of Legal Services and City Solicitor be authorized to bring forward directly to Council by way of a communication without the need for review by any Standing Policy Committee or Executive Policy Committee any proposed additions, subtractions or other modifications or changes to the reduced-speed school zones created by the Reduced-Speed School Zones Bylaw which are made possible by changes to the Reduced-Speed School Zone Regulation, Manitoba Regulation136/2013 or for other reasons. That's No. 2, No. 3. The Director of Public Works be directed to utilize existing funds over which he has expenditure authority to fund the costs of sign placements at reduced-speed school zones, which are created as a result of any changes made possible by Paragraph 1". So what this means is that the ones that were brought forward today, we have found technical ways to get them added in and going forward as the Province makes the amendments, as the Councillor said, as the Mayor said it to be in the introduction, they're still working on getting these regulations tweaked and if that happens, we'll be able to bring the others forward and this report creates an expedited process so that we could get them in. It may mean if we're going to get them on for the start of school in September that we may have to show up in September at some point and put them, bring them, allow them to be accepted as communication. But the intent here is to get everything done that can be done, it's not something that we have control over, this is done according to Provincial regulations, has been said I think now for the, I don't know, 13th, 14th, 15th time, the conversations have been very, very productive with the Province and Minister Ashton, Minister Chief have been very cooperative in trying to help steer this through the processes at the Legislature. And we're hoping that we'll have many more to add. It should be clearly understood by everyone here that regional streets, P1 streets, I think it's classified as a priority one street in the City of Winnipeg is not going to have this on it. So that means that parents, schools, either you know through the use of school patrol programs or other protections will take appropriate action to ensure that those locations are safe. But the Provincial legislation is that regional streets will not be assigned as reduced speed zones. You know, school zones with reduced speeds. So that's part of the legislation. That's not part of what they're looking to change. It is stuff that…it's been looked at changing as all those areas where we've got the anomalies of where the signs can go and where there's a minimum 200 feet and, you know, this was drafted by lawyers who were looking to make it, you know, bullet proof. And by making it bullet proof, they kind of killed a lot of the functionality of it. So there's some wiser minds at the Province, are trying to deal with the functionality and at the same time making it defensible. But, you know, absolutely 100% everything, everybody can do is being done. It's actually stated in the report and hopefully, we'll get that hammered home eventually, but there's nothing not being done here. It is all being done and as many locations as humanly possible will have a reduced speed limit in the school zone.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, just a reminder to everybody when this whole idea came forward, it was made very clear by the department that any schools that are regional roads don't expect to see a decrease. That's number one. That was made very clear. Number two, when these regulations came forward from the Province, there was a lot of concern because a lot of schools were being eliminated because they wanted signage, you know, 100

metres prior to, which was impossible to meet because it was a short distance on the blocks and I remember vividly being at the big city mayors caucus, which was in Niagara Falls and actually speaking to Minister Ashton. And it was made very clear at that particular point in time that he agreed there needed to be some adjustments made and he figured there could be some things done. He wanted some time to work on it and we certainly were prepared to give him that work because he totally agreed with everything that's been said here. The more schools that can have it, and let's not bring in regulations that just don't make any sense and prevent us from doing what's best, so I hope that might address some of the issues or some of the questions that some members of Council have raised.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question on Item 4, school zones, all those in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move on to motions. We have Motion No. 4 from Councillor Gerbasi. Yes.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Motion No. 4
Moved by Gerbasi,
Seconded by Nordman,

WHEREAS on November 6, 2013, Council appointed Councillor Jenny Gerbasi as Council's representative to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) for the 2013 – 2014 Council term;

AND WHEREAS Councillor Gerbasi was elected by the membership as the third vice president of FCM at the most recent annual general meeting;

AND WHEREAS Council is desirous of having a Council representative to FCM;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Councillor Jeff Browaty be appointed as Council's representative to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'd like to address this today as it's our appointment to the FCM Board.

Madam Speaker: It is within the jurisdiction of Council to address this so we don't need to suspend the rules.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, this is a motion by Councillor Gerbasi, seconded by Councillor Nordman that we appoint Councillor Browaty as the new FCM representative. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Congratulations, Councillor Browaty. We have item…we have Motion No. 6, Motion No. 6 is from…moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Smith, requesting a Special Meeting of Council take place next week. It does not indicate the time. Can you clarify that, Councillor Mayes?

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Smith,

THAT a Special Meeting of Council take place Wednesday, July 23, 2014, to allow further questions of the Winnipeg Public Service on the Real Estate Audit considered by Council on July 9, 2014.

Councillor Mayes: 9:30 and I think unless this…unless we deal with it today, it would become moot is my understanding from the Clerk so I guess we'd need to suspend the rules then.

Madam Speaker: It's again within the jurisdiction of Council. So all in…yeah, you can introduce it, at this time. Sure.

Councillor Mayes: So this is not procedural, this is on the merits then, Madam Speaker? Okay. So we don't need to suspend the rules. The motion is…and I thank Councillor Smith for his support, is intended to schedule a special meeting, it doesn't matter if it's 9:30 or 10:00 or noon or 1:00 in the afternoon. It's for next week. Doesn't mean it particularly matter if it's for Wednesday or Thursday or Tuesday, the proposal is for Wednesday. The idea is to try to ask more questions or I think it's out of the real estate audit that came last week. If people think that the audit we had today should be in there as well, I'd be open to that. The idea is to allow more time to bring some daylight into the

proceedings; to ask some more questions of the senior admin. About what has transpired that gave ground to the various audits that we've been dealing with. I know people have said, look, we don't want to…this isn't a witch hunt; this isn't a show trial. There's none of that here. It's an attempt to get more information. Councillor Havixbeck had a number of questions last week. They were challenged or ruled out of order. I think the idea here is to allow time for more questions; to get more information out into the public realm. That's the intent. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, any further speakers? Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I do actually appreciate, not …I do appreciate the fact that Councillor Mayes and Smith are addressing the fact that we've got to keep moving this forward. There's a lot, a lot of work to do. I'm not sure about how many questions I may have more about the audit, and whatnot, but my question will be is how are we going to keep moving this forward? How are we going to start incorporating some of these recommendations, some of these other players that we were going to bring in? How is all going to fit together? How is Council going to manage and oversight it? Those are the kind of questions I would have for next week. Does that need to be done next week? Should it not be done next week? So, I say we lean on the side of caution. We go for next week. I'll stay in town because the public does…doesn't want us to accept recommendations, putting our head in the sand and saying we're done. We need to be showing and we need to be doing, moving this file forward to make sure that this stuff doesn't happen again so I do support the motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Perhaps I'm not understanding of something, but we dealt with the audit last week. We've sent it to the Province. We've adopted the recommendations. We're moving on the recommendation. We've dealt with this audit today. And so the call is to come back next week to deal with the audit again? For what reason? I mean, I would think…I would think this motion would be moot or it's not…

Madam Speaker: It's in order, Mr. Clerk, correct?

Councillor Vandal: So that's what…it's simply to reconsider? Okay. Okay, I just…I'm sorry, I needed that clarification…I'm not…

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm a little torn actually. While I am supportive of this motion in terms of more questions for administration, the biggest issue I have with this is that, you know, I believe there are questions to ask of our administration, but I don't believe they are actually questions that should be in a public meeting necessarily. It seems to me that we had seminars prior to our City Council meetings. We got to question the auditors quite extensively on the real estate audits and we actually got a good chance to extensively ask questions prior to today's meeting of the KPMG auditors in terms of the Winnipeg Police Service Headquarters, many, many questions. But by the time the scheduled time for these things are over, there's no time to actually ask administration any serious questions. Yeah, there are comments from the administration in regards to the reports and that sort of thing, but there was no opportunity to really speak to our administration who are in key roles related to these projects. So for me, I really…I am going to decide how to vote after I speak. At this point, I really do believe though that we should be able to ask the questions of our administration in a different area because I don't think it's appropriate for us to berate our administration in a public meeting. So I'm going to leave it at that and I'll have to decide in the next minute or so I guess how I'm voting, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Once again, it kind of tie it in as well, I always want to side on the point of getting more information and getting more questions. You know, I think I have the ability to call our senior administration and ask all of the questions that I have, so I'm not necessarily sure we necessarily need a special meeting next week. As long as I can get reassurance from our administration, I know they're here. If I do have any further questions, at that time would be made available for me to ask all those questions and I look back and I see our Acting CAO nodding so he'll definitely make some time for me so I'm…supportive of that will going forward and if I've got some questions, I'll be answering at that point. So I won't be supporting the motion going forward, but I will be asking some further questions to clarify any issues that I have.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I have two suggestions, I guess, Madam Speaker. Number one, if we're requesting a special meeting for the real estate audit, should we not all be requesting the real estate audit, fire headquarters audit and police headquarters audit to be part of the same Council meeting on July the…being called for July the 23rd to reconsider all these items? So in other words, I don't know how you ask for one and not the others to have the discussions and questions. This…you know, and so I guess I would ask the movers, would they be prepared to accept that as a friendly amendment in terms of amending their motion to add those other two audits. And then the other question I guess I would have is that it's my understanding and it's more kind of a procedural question, my understanding is that any member of Council can, either through the question and answer period that we have with the Mayor, those questions can be submitted verbally in a question and answer period, but they also could technically be submitted in writing via the Mayor for that meeting and the Mayor could then be responding back via the next Council meeting through to the administration, all of those questions. So that there's actually ample opportunity for any public…for any member of Council to submit a question to the CAO via the Mayor through the Q and A item on the agenda that would then be submitted back with a response in writing which is actually far better than one verbally and one that your question could be considered and well thought out and also placed in writing. So that would be…I could…I guess that's more of a question of our learned friend, Mr. Kachur here if we can actually do that. And it looks like he's nodding, yes we can so...

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next, Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a couple of things, I first want to say that I appreciate Councillor Mayes and Councillor Smith bringing this forward. I think it is important. I think we saw last week that there were still more questions. And I think that we deserve the answers, we're a Council who has made decisions on this and although we have made a decision and decided to move forward on the real estate audit, you know, I'm supportive of expanding it to the other two, of course, and I do have some concerns though and I wanted to go back to Hansard from last week because there were eight questions that those auditors said they were going to go away with and get us answers for. One was from me, one was from Councillor Pagtakhan, one was from Councillor Browaty and five from Councillor Wyatt. And I would say that there will be considerable amount of work for those auditors to pull that together. And I will say that I think that we will have more questions after we see what they provide us. And so I'm not certain that a week away is an adequate time frame, but I would like both a private session and I would like a public session. I would like a private session to explore what we learn out of those answers from the auditors because these are important and there was a lot of information. Each time they said they would go back and refer and find their notes and there were pages and pages so it's all right in Hansard. You know, I would ask that this be amended to hold a council seminar in private closer to the first week of September when these auditors can be back available and provide this information and that a private meeting also be…a public and a private meeting be held in that first week of September so that…well, as early as we can, because I really don't think that we should end our last Council meeting without having these answers. So I'd like to see a friendly amendment at having a private council seminar to talk about what was supposed to come back to us and to talk to our administration and then have a public questioning as well. I think that citizens want to hear that and that the only way we'll get some answers is by having that. And I'm fully supportive of expanding it to all three of the audits. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Swandel followed by Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Swandel: So I'm assuming, Madam Speaker, that we'll be rescinding all the previous decisions made so that we can bring this back and deal with it again which is the usual step when you do something like this. So I would expect to hear that from the mover that we rescind the previous and that we vote on that, and then bring it all back because apparently what I'm hearing now is that what you people did last time where it was vote for this without knowing what you're doing. I've never seen anything like this before in my life, right? I just…I'm sitting here laughing out loud, you know, it's like the seconder of the motion to set it on the news that he was bored by the whole thing, and now he wants to come back next week and visit it again. You know, one of the things that we do with audits and you people are so adamant to have this stuff done, directed to do it last week and again neglected to do it today when you dealt with it is that there's some kind of a process for updates. When our auditor gives us our regular audits, we create a process and it gets reported on annually. These audits don't have any process created to report back to Council which is a mistake that you all made. And so that's probably maybe where some of your confusion comes from. Because all you really need to do is move a motion that the annual or quarterly updates on the progress of the recommendations and any further information on the answers to the questions return to Council, at some of our regular scheduled meetings or through the Audit Committee which is you all know is EPC, whatever, that would be an appropriate motion. But now you got this thing out there, you've asked for some kind of a judicial or justice or some other process review with the Province and you want to muddy those waters by having some other process. I think we're getting to the point where you've moved to the ridiculous. And I think the public is going to start realizing exactly what it is that you're doing and why and how much, what your motivation is here to embellish this and to keep trying to beat this dead horse. Recognize that what these reports say is there were process problems, but the recommendations say is this is how you improve these processes. If you want to publicly accuse somebody of something, stand up and say that publicly now so that they can defend

themselves in the proper channels, and I'm certain that those channels will probably be in some court somewhere because this process of innuendo, slippery and snide sort of you know comments, you know, mischaracterization of facts, you know, this…this is the epitome of it. We don't like what's being said today, nobody would even speak up and talk about it. Nobody would speak up and talk about it today. You just dismissed it and now what we want to do is create an opportunity to grandstand on it. So it's going to become increasingly obvious to the public what you're doing is grandstanding to serve some other purpose. Not to serve a quest for the truth, but to serve another purpose. Now, I don't know what that purpose is. I can predict that maybe it's the fear of going into an election trying to position this. I can only predict that. I can guess at that. I would hope that, you know, it's the nervousness of some new politicians, younger politicians or politicians from different types of processes as you go into an election, but what do you want to do here? Like how far are you going to go, what are you going…you're going to keep going and going and going until, I don't know, what till…somebody says at justice that there's nothing here. Does that answer your questions? You want to ask the question again publicly? You want to ask more questions, more questions? Like pick up the phone. When I have questions about it, I pick up the phone and I called CAO. I called the former CAOs. You know, I called directors of departments to explain this to me how this happened. You know, when the reports came to the committees. I read them. I understood. I even had debates about net present value calculations and what the assumptions were. I read all the reports. I understood them. I knew what was happening. I knew the time constraints. I put it all in context. You know, you want to say that there's process problems? Absolutely.

Councillor Wyatt: Point of order, I don't mean to interrupt Councillor Swandel, but just point of order. I might be able to help. If not…I'll be able to help. Is…I just…I raised the question and I noticed that the Clerk was nodding when I asked the question, but I just want to get this confirmed because this may address the concern that the movers of the motion are attempting which is in terms of…they want further questions. Can any member of this Council, including these two movers, be able to submit in writing at another Council meeting a question to the Mayor that would be sent via the Mayor to the public service for the purpose of then responding back in writing, is that a legitimate way of asking questions other than standing up verbally in a Council meeting, and also asking questions?

City Clerk: Absolutely.

Councillor Swandel: …answers to that before it was actually stated. That's exactly my point.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Swandel. You wish to continue?

Councillor Swandel: Well, unless somebody is withdrawing the motion, I…

Madam Speaker: We do have other speakers.

Councillor Swandel: I still have some time left. Going to do the best Gord Steeves that I can and Councillor Wyatt is great at using all that time and an extension as well. So I guess, the part I really need to hammer home is I think, if you're going to do this, you need to rescind the previous decisions made otherwise there's no point to doing this. Like if you're just going to leave it so that you're going to leave all the decisions in place, which you just want to come back to and you think it's…somebody has got to respond to you in a public setting. If I was our administration, I would say I…you know, this has been dealt with, I'm not going to respond any further and I think it would be within their rights to do that. And certainly, not having all the context here if you're just going to just…what I understand, all you're going to be able to do is ask for clarification because that's our process. We went through this process the other week. You know, we could…you couldn't figure out how to do it with them. Why would you think we'd be able to it differently again next week? So I mean, it's just sort of more of the theatre of the absurd and it's going to keep going, going and going until the guy falls off the trapeze or whatever, but I…it's just mind boggling. You know, I'm not bored of it. I'm just getting more and more entertained by it, you know, and unlike Councillor Smith, you may be bored with it, but it seems to be getting to a slightly greater level of entertainment. So I would hope that the mover would suggest rescinding the previous decision before moving forward.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Gerbasi?

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is starting to feel a bit like maybe it is…the Fringe Festival is on right now, so it might have something to do with all this. But I appreciate, listen, this has been a really difficult time for administration. It's been difficult for Councillors and it's been very difficult for the public. We're dealing with a series of very difficult audits. It's a very unpleasant circumstance that we've been through and we're in the middle of an election, not just about to have one in the middle of it and so we get into a bit silly season here. I mean, we just, we just voted on all these audits. We dealt with them in the sense that we move the recommendations forward. We moved the audit today as well as well as last week over to the Province to review. I have never had a problem contacting any of our administration and asking questions, and we've been doing a lot of winging motions around here without having time to

talk to the administration and run them by and work through our standing committees and do those things. So I don't know why, I think we just should…people should just relax a little bit. We've done our work on this for today. All summer long, you can send an e-mail a day to the administration and ask all your questions and they're not going to say no, I won't answer you. You can get your questions answered and if we need a seminar, we can get together and have a seminar to discuss those responses and decide then what actions we might need to take at a council meeting. We don't just have a Council meeting to have a chat. We have a Council meeting to move, policy in motions and activities forward. We can have that if we come up with something else that we need to do as a result of the answers to those questions. It seems to me the first step is to get more answers than go…than ask the questions and that's what we can do in the seminar or in private as one on one Councillors ourselves. I've never been not able to ask those questions. I don't know why we can't do that. So to have a meeting when some Councillors have already planned holidays, they may not be able to be here to have a public…I mean there are some who would like a kangaroo court. I think there are some legal precautions we have to be careful with. But we did have lots of discussions publicly with the auditors, with the staff and we can have more if it's needed, but this is just generally "let's have a meeting and grill people in public". I'm sorry. That's…I'm not on for that. We moved all the recommendations forward. We've moved this over to the Province. We can have a seminar and discuss that at any time we can e-mail or question at any time to the administration. Like let's not get carried away. This is truly becoming silly season and it's getting a bit embarrassing for all of us, like can we just move on with the other business of Council? I mean nobody is dismissing the importance of this. I'm the one who moved the motion on the real estate audit. I mean just because you don't agree with every motion that's put in front. Doesn't mean you don't care about this stuff, but I mean at a certain point, it's getting really silly. And there's…we can get these questions answered in a different way than this. So, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith?

Councillor Smith: Yes, Madam Speaker. Let me tell you this. We heard from the auditors. That was useful, but you know, the administration should be able to answer some questions. And you know, sure, we can do it through the Mayor or individual calls to individual people in the administration, but it seems to me that we…what I sense with this Council is everyone feels "well, we've dealt with it all", eh? You know, we forwarded to the Province. Let me tell you this. We should be able to deal with things ourselves and I seconded this because I thought it was worthwhile. We should be able to question the administration and we haven't been able to have that opportunity yet.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to Councillor Gerbasi, I must disagree. We've passed silly season by leaps and bounds. I appreciate this is an election year and I appreciate people are looking for their own gains, et cetera. But the realities are and I want to go back a week ago to a very passionate speech by Councillor Mayes where he basically made the reference about we, Council, ask for an independent third-party review and we got that and we accepted the recommendations and we're moving forward and then they're asking for a fourth-party review, which was going to the Provincial Government, which Council did approve, but that didn't seem very logical at the time. Madam Speaker, the real sad part is the administration's happy to answer any questions. As a matter of fact, I think they were extremely disappointed that quite often during their interviews with the auditors, their responses weren't always made public. And I think there was consensus around this table that if you want to ask the administration questions, fine. Let's go downstairs like we do. We have the same room available. Ask them any question you want because I guarantee you they'd be happy to respond, but let's not try to score points doing it in public, and that's exactly what's going on here, okay? I guarantee you and I'm not looking, I guarantee you the Acting CAO and other administration would love the opportunity to tell their side of the story to members of Council because they haven't always gotten that. They got the opportunity to respond to certain comments in the audit, sometimes they were recognized, other times they were not. They're not afraid, they're there. You don't have to go through me to ask anybody in the administration a question. They'd love to answer that question. But let's not pretend we want answers to questions because if you want that, we can do it in the Council seminar behind closed doors. What you really want, if you want in public, is something totally different and let's call it what it is. So Madam Speaker, this isn't something that I will support in any way, shape or form. We've accepted recommendations unanimously, I believe, except for one time. We basically passed last week and again this week to have the Provincial Government review this. And now, you want to go back? This makes no sense. No sense whatsoever. And with all due respect to Councillor Gerbasi, we're way past silly season. She's going to have to come up with a brand new phrase. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Mayes to close.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A lot of good debate on that, actually, but a couple of things to close with. One is Councillor Swandel is saying the younger…younger Councillors don't understand, but we're talking a lot about singing through like the Sound of Music, you are 16, I am 17, you are young and naive. You know, it's like, the…I think I'm year younger than Councillor Swandel so I don't think it's a question of youth or experience here especially

since I've got Councillor Smith on my side, so. Thanks. But in a way, I think I'm fine with all of the amendments that Councillor Havixbeck has proposed and Councillor Orlikow raised the point, don't…he says he's willing to cancel vacation. I don't think that's fair to ask the people if it…and Councillor Havixbeck makes the good point of their questions that are to come back…the answers to come back from the auditor that may lead to a question so fine to do it in the last week of August, first week of September, find that of all three audits as Councillor Wyatt pointed out in there. I think that's fair as well. Fine, too, if there is a public…if there's a public aspect of this. I think that's important in addition to having a private aspect. But, you know, someone says they are trying to give me a note, I don't think I need a note. I've got an "ace-in-the-hole" here, Madam Speaker, I wasn't here in 2009. People are saying, I read the report. I asked all the questions. There were no questions asked in 2009. There were no questions asked in 2011 when this was before the Council. It was voted on unanimously. So my view is let's have some more questions asked. There weren't asked 2009, which is unfortunate because that's how we ended up in the mess we're in. So I don't know, Mr. Clerk, if I'm accepting the friendly amendments…Fair enough. Okay

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will be voting on the motion in front of us that says we will be meeting next Wednesday, July 23rd. All in favour?

Councillor Gerbasi: Recorded vote.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of the motion in front of us? Motion No. 6. There's nothing in writing, Councillor Wyatt, so it's as presented. So all those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Havixbeck, Mayes, Smith and Wyatt

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Nordman, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Steen, Swandel, Vandal and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 4, Nays 12

Madam Speaker: Motion is lost. Okay, next is Motion 8. Motion 8 is from Councillor Wyatt and Mayor Katz on the Nairn Avenue overpass and it will be an automatic referral to EPC.

Motion No. 8
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Katz,

WHEREAS on June 25, 2014 Council approved Item 7 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated June 18, 2014, ("Nairn Avenue Overpass Traffic Mitigation Measures"), Recommendation 2 of which provided as follows:

"2. That improvements outlined in Recommendation 1.B and 1.C above, at an estimated cost of $350,000, be funded from the Transcona Ward share of 2014 and/or 2015 Local Street Renewal Program.";

AND WHEREAS the intent of Recommendation 2 was that funds from the 2015 Local Street Renewal Program would constitute a first charge on the 2015 Capital Budget;

AND WHEREAS Recommendation 2 needs to be amended to legally implement the intent as outlined above;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 7 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated June 18, 2014, approved by Council on June 25, 2014, be reconsidered, and that the recommendations adopted be amended by replacing Recommendation #2 as follows:

"2. That Council authorize expenditure of up to $350,000 for Nairn Avenue Overpass Traffic Mitigation Measures from the Local Street Renewal Program in 2014 or prior to the adoption of the 2015 Capital Budget as a first charge against the General Capital Fund, specifically the Transcona Ward share of the 2015 Local Street Renewal program, in accordance with subsection 288(2) of the City of Winnipeg Charter, to facilitate timely work on the Nairn Avenue Overpass Traffic Mitigation Measures project."

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, this has been given to me by Legal and the Public Service, Public Works wanting this to come forward today. This was passed by Council last month regarding Nairn, the…they're saying that the motion should've said "first charge".

Councillor Swandel: I thought we made that amendment last night.

Councillor Wyatt: No, it wasn't amended. It was…the first charge is the word they wanted in there and it didn't say first charge so they want the words first charge because of most of the work has been done to their credit at Public Works. Most of the work has been done in 2014 in Transcona.

Councillor Swandel: Point of order. Maybe we should suspend the rules to deal with the matter now.

Madam Speaker: Is that what you're trying to do, Councillor? Would you like to…all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Would you like to introduce?

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, it's pretty…I'll call for the question. It's a first charge that apparently they expended funds from 2014. They're getting our infrastructure money out there quickly and efficiently as our role project which is great. So that's the issue. This is basically the traffic light that's been installed at Mission and Panet Road which is in Councillor Vandal's word to assist with the traffic flows.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have Motion No. 10, is by Councillor Eadie and Councillor Gerbasi and this is a motion to do with the Machray Park Spray Pad. This will be an automatic referral to EPC.

Motion No. 10,
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi,

WHEREAS the 2014 Capital Budget was put together at a time when the Mynarski Ward Land Dedication Reserve allotment was not large enough to accommodate a $100,000 withdrawal for the Machray Park Spray Pad capital budget program for 2014;

AND WHEREAS the Land Dedication Reserve funds are now available;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Machray Park Spray Pad capital budget item be changed to reflect a $50,000 CIGP contribution and the LDR contribution be raised to $100,000.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Next, we'll move on to By-laws. Mayor Katz?

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2ND AND 3RD READINGS

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 35/2014 be read a second time?

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 35.

Mayor Katz: And I'll move that By-law No. 35/2014 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 35/2014.

Madam Speaker: Next set of Bylaws, Mr. Mayor?

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: I'll move that Bylaws be read a first time. By-law No. 80/2014, 81/2014, 82/2014 and 92/2014.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 80/2014, By-law No. 81/2014, By-law No. 82/2014 and By-law No. 92/2014.

Mayor Katz: And Madam Speaker, I'll move that the By-laws numbered 80/2014 to 82/2014 both inclusive and 92/2014 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 80/2014 to 82/2014 both inclusive and By-law No. 92/2014.

Mayor Katz: And I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 80/2014 to 82/2014 both inclusive and 92/2014 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: We'll now move onto Question Period. Any questions for the Mayor? Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker. Our public service did a very commendable job dealing with very difficult situations this past winter in regards to frozen pipes. I'd like to commend our Water and Waste staff for all the overtime, the 24-hour operating they did to thaw out pipes. I'd also like to thank the Interim Acting CAO for the work on communicating with Council. The frequent updates I think were very much appreciated and I think we were kept very well in the loop. My question is, climate change, whether it's human caused or just "cycles" continues, and the reality is we may see more incidents like this going forward. We understand one of the problems during the last frozen pipe incident was the lack of DDH machines, the thawers. Is the City looking at anything to acquire more, make more, buy more, so that in the future if we have another incident like this, we'll have better capacity to deal with it?

Mayor Katz: Through you to Councillor Browaty I thank him for the question. Just so everybody is cognizant, this was the first time we've had an issue of this major proportion. We've had frozen pipes, 100, 140, every year. It never got talked about but it's always existed, but this year was something beyond one's comprehension, and the realities are that the administration, from this terrible experience, has learnt a great deal and the answer is yes. They will be pro-active from what they've learnt this year in how to respond much better next year, God willing it shouldn't but if it does happen again. So yes, I can tell you they've been having these discussions and that is exactly what they will be doing and if these types of machines are not available, there are other ways to basically create some equipment that can do the job and other matters that we can do a better job. This was the first time. You know it's no different when we have a flood. We learn a lot. Second time, we're much better at it. So this would be the same scenario Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question?

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much for that answer. That's very encouraging. Would the Mayor be willing to work with the Public Service to provide Council and the public with details of those improved plans going forward?

Mayor Katz: I would be happy to, whether that might be through a Council seminar of something of that ilk or information session. Yes, absolutely.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi?

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Madam Speaker. My question has to do with the homelessness strategy that is underway, led mostly by the United Way and the Homelessness Task Force and there's this group of prominent Winnipeggers that a few months ago I attended a launch of their program, or their proposals that they're going to be bringing forward. There was aboriginal leadership there. There was major political leadership there from the other levels of government as well, and I really appreciate today what we moved in terms of TIF program for Siloam Mission. I

appreciate that. But this strategy, it was my understanding, was going to come forward and be engaged and led by, you know…have some leadership from this level of government as well in terms of the overall strategy which would include housing first and other things, and I also appreciate we're doing the homeless partnering funding distribution, but what about this overall strategy for ending homelessness: this 10-year plan. Where does the City stand on that? Are we part of that? Is something going to come forward to Council on that? I guess I'm just asking for an update on that.

Mayor Katz: First of all Madam Speaker, I was at those announcements and I spent a great deal of time with representatives of the United Way. I believe we very much support the idea of not just addressing homelessness but ending homelessness. If you recall I actually made comments in my State of the City address. Maybe there's a more specific question that Councillor Gerbasi might want to ask me on her follow up, and I'll try and answer that.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Is something coming forward to Council? I guess now it would be in the September meeting on the 10-year plan to end homelessness in Winnipeg. Is something coming forward for Council to commit to or be part of that initiative directly and specifically?

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, I think what Councillor Gerbasi is referring to is that they are looking for some financial commitment. I believe that might be what the Councillor is referring to. I can tell you that in the past, actually probably a couple months ago, I actually told the United Way that I was prepared to bring this forward. I was actually…we had a seminar on this and I know there were only five of us there but I was hoping to get Councillor Eadie to support that motion, but they basically want us to hold back and not move. They were still working with the other levels of government. I believe they might be at that point now where they want us to come forward and yes, when it's ready I'll be happy to bring something forward to Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Havixbeck?

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes thank you Madam Speaker. I was wondering if the Mayor could tell us when Council will be provided an update on the entire frozen pipes issue and any kind of plan for the future.

Mayor Katz: Well, the part 2 I think we already addressed with Councillor Browaty's question as far as plans for the future, so that's number one. Number two, it's my understanding that there have been weekly updates going out. I know I read update number 70, or 69 or something whatever the case may be. But I'd be more than happy to make that inquiry and see if I can get anything more specific for the Councillor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question?

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes thank you Madam Speaker. I'm wondering if the Mayor can tell us when the reports or the information will come back from the auditors that were promised to us last week at our Council meeting regarding the Real Estate audit. There were some eight questions recorded on Hansard where they said they would go away and come back with information. Does the Mayor have any idea when that might be?

Mayor Katz: No Madam Speaker, but I would advise the Councillor to speak directly to the Auditor and hopefully she can get that answered.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further Councillor? Any other questions for the Mayor? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Madam Speaker. Recently Dr. Joseph Du, a persistent Winnipegger if ever there was one, wrote to me asking that Council give some recognition to a committee that Bill Norrie created 35 years ago. It's the 35th anniversary of a committee that was led by a number of Winnipeggers and…well led by Mayor Norrie with a number of Winnipeggers to bring over Vietnamese refugees from a particular period, obviously post war in Vietnam but it appeared when a lot of Vietnamese were leaving that country and seeking asylum elsewhere. Dr. Du was part of that group and asked that we have some recognition. I'm just wondering if there could be some direction to the protocol folks and the Mayor's Office. I'm happy to work with them and work with Dr. Du. We do appear at flag raisings here. We have other ceremonies to try and honour the work that was done to help establish that community in Winnipeg.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Mayes I would be more than happy to work towards that goal and I'm sure Councillor Mayes can sit down with me and we can figure out the proper direction to move in.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes thank you Madam Speaker. Just a question of the Mayor who handles inter-governmental affairs. Is there any update in terms of …is there any update with regards to the status of what we placed into the operating and capital budgets last December with regards to the MoU with the Provincial Government in terms of the YM/YWCA? Anyway, just to see if the Province has done anything in terms of coming to the table with regards to the Memo of Understanding which we hope they would do to make those projects happen.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, just for clarification, I did tell Councillor Browaty exactly what the good Councillor would be asking and I was correct, so that's number one. I just want that on the record. Number two, yes I actually have had a conversation with Minister Chief and I know the objective was to find out are they supportive or aren't they supportive? Just give us a yes or no so we can move forward on this issue, and Minister Chief has stated to me very specifically that they were still working on it. They were definitely not against it. They're just trying to figure out the right way to do it and how to make it work, and I can tell you that conversation is very, very recent, and I believe, and Councillor Wyatt can correct me, I believe he has actually spoken to Minister Chief himself, but mine is actually quite recent as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question?

Councillor Wyatt: Did the Minister give you any idea of when the Provincial Government might be making a decision. As we know there is funding tied to that's sitting there that the YM/YWCA can use for design and property assembly and what not for all three properties, specifically the first one? Did the Minister give you any idea of when he will be committing his government to commit to the memorandum of understanding?

Mayor Katz: No he has not given me a definitive date but Councillor Wyatt is correct. We actually have money budgeted for that that's sitting there, and you know, I did say it would be much better for Council if we had that decision before our September Council meeting because after that there's prorogue for the election, so that would be an ideal situation but no there was not a commitment. As you can appreciate, Minister Chief also has other members of cabinet that he has to deal with and I know the ideal situation would be before we prorogue for the election, so that's what I was recommending would be the ideal scenario.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. Just a quick follow up Madam Speaker through you to the Mayor, just directly in that line to do with the YMCA/YWCAs…the new MWIA Agreement has a clause in it that allows us to do projects on our own, then the Provincial Government can do something on their own, just as long as they balance out. Given what Councillor Wyatt has said, the fact that we have money allocated there, we know that we can extract great value out of these projects. I know specifically in the south part of the City and Waverley West and we're talking about sort of a campus plan if things are acting much bigger than a YMCA but might actually tie in with a YMCA, is it possible for us to consider doing this as a stand-alone project so that we can get it rolling this year and then have the Province catch up in out years of the agreement? We wouldn't have a hundred percent of the money available to us because we'd only have budgeted our 50 percent, but it would allow us to get rolling.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, Councillor Swandel is correct. I mean, we can put in monies and in the end it's just a matter of balancing the total. We don't have to be equal in every single project. So that is one way. I can also tell you that in my conversation with Minister Chief, I made it very clear that I think this is a very positive step for the City. It would be beneficial for all citizens to have these, you know, modern world-class facilities. I very much believe that Minister Chief also thinks that. By the same token, he's still working with everybody else in the Provincial Government, but that is something that I would be happy to pursue.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Mayor? Okay seeing none, we'll move onto the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. Councillor Wyatt.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE DATED JUNE 19, 2014

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, I'd like to introduce the reports and move the adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2, please.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have no motions or by-laws for Finance. We'll move onto Question Period. Questions for the Chair? Any questions for the Chair? Okay, seeing none. We'll move onto the Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT DATED JULY 7, 2014

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'd like to stand down Item No. 4 and move Consent Agenda Items 1, 2 and 3.

Madam Speaker: Okay, you'd like to stand down 4 or 3, sorry.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Four.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All those in favour of 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6? All in favour of 1, 2 and 3? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 4 - Proposed Parcel 4 - Forks Rail Side Development

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I just want to put a few comments on the record and congratulate the Forks North Portage on this and Angela Mathieson, their consultant that they've retained to help them on this, as well as to congratulate our department through Mr. Barry Thorgrimson and his leadership and congratulate this Mayor and Council for doing the right thing. A couple of years ago, it's to send…and move the motion, Madam Speaker, to support a plan to engage the Forks along with the City in doing a public consultation and this, here we are today in July 2014 with a great economic plan moving forward. Madam Speaker, this is going to be a plan that's going to create expansive public space, exceptional public space with a tree-lined environment, mixed use development, commercial development as well as mixed income residential. It's going to convert basically Winnipeg's largest parking lots into something really a jewel of the city and I just want to thank the Forks for doing this public consultation and the public for their input and their interest in this development and so just some comments on the appraisal because there was some comments this morning regarding the appraisal that there was a 10 million dollar appraisal and just basically, Madam Speaker, that appraisal was based on a fully developed site with the highest and best use. This is not what this is going to be. This is going to be a public space with up to 40% development happening on it with the rest being public, public realm so the appraisal that we were using, the City used is basically $6 million and that's a more fair, very…reflects what's actually going to happen and as part of this, as it moves forward, Madam Speaker, there is also going to be another appraisal that's going to happen. And as part of this, as this moves forward, Madam Speaker, there's also going to be another appraisal that's going to happen, and with regards to that as well, this is also contingent on both levels of government providing a $6 million contribution to make this project happen. So I'll just leave it at that for now and close at the end.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I did want to say a few words. Appreciate the words of the Chair. He made some of the important points on this. As a member of the Downtown Committee as well, I was very pleased that our committee moved a motion calling on the Forks to work with our administration and lead this process forward in a… with significant, meaningful public consultation with the stakeholders as well as the community at large. That consultation process isn't over yet. This step for Council to move things forward to the next level, they need to know they have the land and that there's a commitment to this from us to move forward to the next level, but there will be more consultation yet before this is finalized and comes back to Council. I'd like to point out that this is two prop…this started with our property of Parcel 4, the City's land, but it also includes the rail side lands, the area that's part of the Forks and we're talking about the first and second largest gravel parking lots in downtown Winnipeg. And when you think about that, and you think about the fact that we're taking the first and second largest gravel parking lot to downtown Winnipeg and turning them into 60% public space, 40% mixed-use development, I think we're doing pretty well. And the way that it's possible for us to do 60% public space or for the Forks to do this is with the…though using a tax increment financing on the development that's happening there, so the incremental taxes will cover some of those costs as well as the costs of the land is something that the City is foregoing. So yes, the City is contributing public support to this project along with the other three levels of government we'll be doing, but that's the only way we're going to complete the Forks site in this way and I think there's been a very positive response, I'm sure not 100% of people are happy with every aspect of it, but when you take a place like the Forks that is…it may be…and it is actually in my ward technically, but I don't think of it as

my ward, I think about it as belonging to the city, belonging to the whole province, belonging to Canada. I mean this is an attraction that is incredibly important and we're going to be completing a major, it's almost hole in that attraction with significant public space, significant public investment and the housing development in there, which the design I think a lot of people have been really impressed with and there's been, I think the key thing is good planning, good consultation, good process which is something unfortunately was lacking with this property a few years before. So I think, you know, there's been a lot of things we haven't been able to feel that good about lately. This is something I think we should all feel very, very proud of as a city and I think it's going to be a huge improvement and amenity for our city and a completion of a large area within the Forks. It's very exciting, so I just want to make those comments. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes. I'll be very brief. I mean there's nothing that I couldn't add really about the space and the presentation on the conceptual plan and the amount of work that's gone into it. I think it's excellent. Perhaps the hair in Chis closing comments, though, could make more definitively certain for us whether in light of last week's audit, revelation that there was this 10 million dollar appraisal on file, not taking into consideration at the time of preparing this report, perhaps, could he give some, just give us some assurance that this would not be impacting where we're going and, you know, if there's a question for the department in that perhaps, you know, he would want to ask that, I don't know, I just want some assurance of that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Madam Speaker, perhaps maybe the Chair and the committee could recognize that the value that the land is being transacted at this time would be zero dollars. And in fact, if you consider the incremental taxes required to allow this development to proceed to make the economics work so that you can end up with 60 percent of it as green space required probably somewhere in the area of about 12 million dollars of tax incremental financing just on Parcel 4. I think combined parcels are more than that. So the valuation today on this parcel would actually be a negative number so I just want to make sure that that's clearly articulated and I agree with it. I support this wholeheartedly. I think this is how the site needs to be developed and requires some kind of incentive that's got to be a very unique development, the concept that…the consultation process and the consultants came up with is indeed a great concept, you know, sort of a green roof over parking and it really allows for this site to shine and to show well. But when you're considering appraisals, remember that the appraisals are specific for a purpose. The appraisal for this purpose, if we were to do it, would be a negative number, so you know, if you consider it for any other purpose, it would be a different number, but for this purpose, it's obviously going to be a negative number.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Just to follow up, and thank you Councillor Swandel, and that's…this information, just to make sure we're quite clear. It needs to be in the file. I think Council's willingness to say we see the public good in this land, we're not going to build a ten million dollar value, which is a whole bunch of high-rises everywhere. We're going to choose to take less value because we have a better route, well the value that we're choosing with the 60% green space. Wherever…doing it that we're going to take less cash in hand for land, there's a lot of really good value, reasons why we're doing that. The problem with a lot of the eyes, a lot of the information, it wasn't actually in the file clearly. So when someone 10 years from now goes back into that file and they see that and go, "I still don't agree with it, but there it is. Now, I know why". And then it'll be clearer. So my only point is to make sure that when we decide or how it works out that that's clearly put in the file for the future generations so we don't get caught again.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Madam Speaker, just for clarification, so everybody understands, whatever number you wish to use, 6 million, 7 million, 9 million, 10 million. It's not a matter of the City receiving any money. That number, we're looking for the other two levels, are partners in Forks-North Portage to match as a contribution which will help make this a much more likely possibility of being a successful project and that's what's that's all about. So just remember, that' what that number represents. We're looking for the other two levels of government to match that as a partner because we're contributing that to this. I just want to put that on the record.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Pagtakhan to close.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Ditto to what the Mayor and Councillor Swandel was saying so I won't repeat that. Just say this is a really good project. I'm glad that it's here and this is a really historic day for the Forks and congratulate them for moving this forward and call the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of Item 4? Opposed? Carried. We have no motions. We'll now move on to By-laws. Councillor Pagtakhan.

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

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll move that the following by-laws be read a first time By-law No. 83/2014 and By-law 93/2014.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 83/2014, By-law No.93/2014.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll move that By-laws No. 80/2014 and 93/2014 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 83/2014 and 93/2014.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 83/2014 and 93/2014 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Now move on to Question Period. Any questions for the Chair? Okay, seeing none, we'll move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED JULY 8, 2014

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of July 8, 2014 and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 9 and 11 through 17.

Councillor Eadie: Items 3 to…

Madam Speaker: Just, just one moment. Councillor Eadie, what would you like to stand down?

Councillor Eadie: Items 3 to 5, please?

Madam Speaker: Three, four, five. Okay, Councillor Eadie, Councillor Gerbasi, same? Councillor Orlikow, anything different? Okay, yes. Okay, we will be voting on 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14 through 17. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 3 - Subdivision and Rezoning – Parcel A, Plan 107449 and LOT 1, Plan 12012, 1501 and 1525 Dawson Road South - DASZ 52/2013

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty?

Councillor Browaty: Just to check with the Clerk. I believe 3, 4 and 5 could probably be debated together as they were one by hearing so if you would put Items No. 4 and 5 as well.

Clerk: Item 4…

Councillor Browaty: Were they not?

Councillor Eadie: No, four and five.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie you stood those down. Are you okay with that?

Councillor Browaty: I'll be all right. Three is separate. Never mind. Thank you. Right, four and five can go together but not three. Sorry. I will certainly respond to any questions or comments.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Eadie, could you stand that down?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, as I understand how this is working, I have some concerns with the…I believe this is the one where there is an extension of time for them to implement the re-zoning subdivision requests here and I'm quite concerned with that and I simply just have to…wanted to separate it so I could vote against it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay, any further speakers? Councillor Browaty to close.

Councillor Browaty: This is No. 3. My understanding was because the way this one was done, normally when you have a brand new subdivision that the rezoning takes effect as the lots come online and…tax based on it being rezoned because of the way this one was done, that's why that clause was added according to…it's a non-statutory precinct plan. That's why…why it was done this way…this has been done by…in the past, another subdivision was done this way and it is consistent, so I'll be moving it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of Item 3? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi: I would like to be recorded in opposition.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so noted. Items 4 and 5, shall we deal with those together? Madam Clerk?

Clerk: Item 4 - Secondary Plan, South of Royalwood…

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I stood them down the premise behind why I stood both of these down has to do with the same argument, so they can be debated together.

Councillor Vandal: Four is in St. Boniface, five is in Transcona so they should be separated.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Madam Clerk, separately.

Item 4 - Secondary Plan – South of Royalwood and Island Lakes, West of Lagimodiere Boulevard and North of Perimeter Highway – Precinct "K" - SP 3/2014

Councillor Browaty: My apologies for trying to combine 3, 4 and 5. They are very different. I don't know what I was thinking there, but I'll certainly respond to the comments following the comments said by my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. And I can understand Councillor Vandal's wanting to separate it, but anyway, as I will say to the…speak to the both four and five, I simply…I'm opposed to this for…I'm not even going to expose you all to it because I've been talking about it forever. You know, the City needs that…be planning its new greenfield precinct planning. We need to have better controls of how it's been laid out and I think that it's premature to start going ahead with these things and so I'm voting against it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Perhaps, I'll elaborate a little bit on what I think Councillor Eadie is getting at as well. I know it's been a long day, but I mean I think this stems from when we approved the new Our Winnipeg document, we opened up this massive amount of greenfield land. We also encouraged infill development and building up and all these things, but the problem is there is no mechanism and this was pointed out. A number of us expressed concerns about this at the time the plan was passed that these outer areas are going to get developed very, very rapidly and that is what we're seeing. I think almost half of them are being planned and we're going to seeing subdivisions coming forward. I mean some of them may be…it's better that we're doing planning than just developing them randomly without planning. But a lot of our planning resources are going into these plans. You know, if we could…we don't have enough planning resources. I know I'm getting the cord in plan. It's only been ten years and delayed two years, but you know, there's a lot of other neighbourhoods other than Corydon that need planning like, you know, people talked about Pembina Highway. People talked about South Osborne, people in Main Street. Other areas where if we put our planning resources, we could build density, we could deal with our sustainability as a city which is also in our plan, but what we've done instead is reacted to whatever, obviously the developers are going to come to us and say, I want to do Precinct W or whatever it

is and they're going to get support to do it. I mean they're doing a lot of the planning, but we still create a lot of work for a very minimal secondary planning staff we have. And all of these plans are coming forward and half of the plans, half of the areas outlined in plan…in Our Winnipeg are being developed already. And it's happening at…like a runaway train and…and the problem is I know some people believe that we're just going to make oodles of money. We're going to get rich over this, but the reality is it's increasing our…it's going to cause all sorts of costs to operating, to traffic congestion and we're having to expand regional roads and all these things and then we're at the same time providing more agreements with the Capital Region, which is great. We want to have wonderful friendships with them. We all do. We love each other, but they're going to have massive low density development out there as a result of these free-flowing, you know, agreements which are supposed to be based on some principles we have that it's not going to hurt that core interest of the City of Winnipeg in terms of, like why would anyone want to develop infill housing on the brownfield site in Winnipeg when we're just completely, massively opening this up. And I realize that there are some density happening and one of the reasons I realize is most of it's happening in Osborne Village and in my ward, we're allowing a lot of density that we're taking on as community to make the city better and it is happening in some other place as well as, but if you compare how much of that's happening compared to the massive nature of these huge greenfield developments all around the city and all the regional roads we're going to need and all the traffic congestion and the schools and all of these costs, I don't believe the cost benefit analysis that we get is inclusive of all the cost external to these projects. Certainly with Waverly West, it isn't. It wasn't. All these extra costs have come in with the roads and everything else. So that's what my concern is. I'm sure, you know, I understand that this is probably good planning if we're going to be doing this, if we're going to be allowing this level of development at this time, and I'm not saying we'll never develop it. Of course, we should. Eventually, we'll have to grow the city, we're doing it too fast and we're doing it all at once and it's not going to be sustainable and we're not managing it. We're not staging it in any way. We're just opening the door to it and I know I'm going to have a pile on after I sit down because I've been having them for the last 10 years. Every time I stood up, even with the six years before that, I had the same problem that this isn't understood here. But we are burdening our children and the future of the city without…with letting this free flow planning. We're not making it easy. There's a few developers that are, you know, do…jumping through hoops and trying to create infill development and they're not having a very easy time of it, but we should be making it easier for them. And we should not be making it this easy for everybody to do this. We're making it easy for them to do this and we're it easy for them to go out in the Capital Region and do it there, too. It's just a free for all. And honestly, I don't think this Council, I know you're all going to pile on me as soon as I sit down. You're going to go on and on about how wonderful suburban development is. I've been experiencing it for the last 16 years, but my point is…my point is that there is going to be a new Council and I sincerely hope they start listening to these kind of arguments and we start doing, putting some limitations on what we're allowing to happen in the city because it is not sustainable. You can have this word, sustainable 5,000 times in our city plan, but if it doesn't actually stage the development that's happening in the sustainable fashion, it doesn't mean squat. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So we now know as she refers to next Council that the future Mayor, Wasylycia-Leis and Councillor Gerbasi as the Chairperson of planning will be shutting down all development in the suburb and all growth in the…and absolutely that is exactly the agenda, let's make that very clear that is the plan to shut down and basically say that you have to live in Osborne Village or you've got to live on Corydon Avenue, and that's your choices or move out of this city into the Capital Region. That's the vision that Councillor Gerbasi is speaking to.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order.

Councillor Wyatt: That is what she stands for.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order, Madam Speaker, that's not the vision or the intent of what I was saying. That's not…

Councillor Wyatt: No, I was not the one who raised the next Council, Council Gerbasi, I'm picking up on the point she left out or left out on.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, you have the floor.

Councillor Wyatt: I do, thank you, Madam…you know, the reality, you know, for number...Let's just get some facts on the table since we had a lot of mythologies here or revisionist history or revisionist planning if you want to call it that. Number one, the plans that are before us actually that are…that these two Councillors stepped down are actually paid for by the developers. They actually come forward and they put forward and they spend in terms of public consultations, in terms of the planning documents, in terms of the traffic studies, our staff are very good at making sure that they pay for those costs. So it's not like Osborne Village, it's not like Corydon Avenue where that is a burden on our planning

department where those initiatives do cost the City money. These ones actually don't. Number two, we as a Council, attempted to do exactly what Councillor Gerbasi spoke of in terms of saying that these developments should be paying their fair share. We tried that through development area cost charges. And guess who said, no? Not this Council, her government. The NDP, the Provincial Government after Councillor Fielding or somebody leaked the document, leaked the document, by somebody in terms of the fact that it would…it got on…and the government reacted and said, "Oh, well, we don't want to do it…development cost here. We're not in favour of that." Well, here was the way for us to be able to save in terms of future infrastructure cost with developments like this. The very government, the party she's a member of has said, "No, we will not implement development cost charges to ensure that this happens, and we can help ensure development in orderly fashion". I'm 100% in favour of development costs here, just always have been and this Council is on the record of saying yes that we should be doing this. The government has stopped that. The government has prevented that from happening because obviously they listen to developers more so than this Council is accused those developers and that's really unfortunate. Point number two or number three that the Councillor likes to raise is in terms of distracting from the Capital Regions versus the rest of the City. Well, the reality is the city is growing and people do want to be able to live, Councillor Gerbasi, whether it be, they want to live in your neighbourhoods, they also want to live…thank you, Madam Speaker…they want to live in other parts of the city as well, and this is definitely one option, the city is growing and we're going to have a challenge, a huge challenge as we go forward with regards to our boundaries, with regards to exactly where this city can grow to and how far we can grow to and in terms of services and in terms of services into the Capital Region, it's going to be a huge challenge. You know, nobody likes to talk about the concept of annexation and the Capital Region, that makes them shudder, but the reality is we're going to have to cross that bridge probably sooner than later because of the growth that's happening now in the City of Winnipeg and with regards to the provision of services to handle that growth. There's no doubt about it that those are serious issues that are going to be causing not just service issues with regards to servicing the developments, but also issues with regards to actually providing regional services whether it be transportation; whether it be fire protection; whether it be library services, some of the soft municipal services that ideally those development cost charges would've helped us pay for, Madam Speaker. You know, when I look at the proposed plan, for example, the one in Councillor Vandal's Ward, St. Boniface, I see a mixture, a plan, a neighbourhood where it's not all single family homes has been proposed where you see a huge mixture actually, a large amount of density, high density residential development along the major corridors. I see nodes of commercial and what's called mixed use where you have residential and supportive commercial below those residential areas. I see a whole interconnecting bike path system that would be part of that if a pedestrian connection's so consistent with our active transportation policies. The city is growing and we'll have…we're trying to accommodate the growth. That's the greatest challenge we face to keep…pulling these reports down which the Councillors have done before that who pulled these two down for. They've done it before and they'd be making the point that this is terrible. Well, the reality is, you know what, the city is growing and yes, infill development is crucial. It is necessary. We've got to encourage that as well. But I mean, some of the Councillors who represent the older neighbours would probably want all of their taxes that they're collecting coming back into the neighbourhoods through the form of the turf, TIFF. Well, that' not realistic. We're not going to be able to do that. But what we can do is to ensure that the city continues to grow, to ensure that real estate and property values in some of the older areas of the city continue to rise to make those areas even more attractive to renew and that those who own and have the opportunity to hold property in those neighbourhoods have a chance to increase equity and their own personal wealth and well-being for themselves and their families and that's a positive thing for our city. So this is a positive report before us today since I think we're only speaking to one at a time, Madam Speaker. Number four, I think the development coming forward, it makes sense. It's been planned. It is laid out in a planned fashion. It's not going to happen overnight as some would think it would. It will literally probably take a better part of the decade to build the development like this out based on the size and skill of it, and it all of course depends if the City does continues to grow in the housing market continues to grow as the way it has been in the past. Those are my comments. I just wish that instead of getting into, you know, it has to be, you know, our neighbourhood versus this neighbourhood and that. And you've got to literally draw a line and that's the other part of this as, you know, we did have a planning exercise. It was called Our Winnipeg and there's a document called Complete Communities, where we did put a plan together with having a plan and well-thought out of where the next areas would develop and we did amend Complete Communities and actually reduced the amount of areas that were being put forward for future neighbourhood development to the frustration of the development community because we said, "No, this is going too far too fast, but we put a plan together with an idea of how those areas will unfold and how they will develop. The greatest challenge we face today is the off-site services that we need to pay for. We don't know how we're going to pay for those. That's why development cost charges are so important. That's why the Provincial Government should make those development cost charges and issue and address it rather than running and hiding like they're doing right now.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is the south part of St. Boniface. I want to talk a little bit about this development. It's…we've spent many, many hours at Riel Community Committee lately dealing with this one and another one, south of Fermor Avenue. This is approximately 550 acres of land that is south of Island Lakes, south of

Royalwood to well established neighbourhoods in the St. Boniface area immediately across the St. River…St. Vital, the very successful, lovely and very attractive area of South St. Vital. And if you, if you were to…if you are to follow Councillor Gerbasi's reasoning further down the line then, we would not have the South St. Vital today, Madam Speaker, where thousands of people, thousands of people currently live. There's…it's a lovely neighbourhood with parks, with community centres, with libraries. This is no further south than the area of Councillor Mayes represents in South St. Vital, so this is a natural extension of neighbourhoods that are existing, Madam Speaker, through the planning process, we made provisions for a secondary plan for the Seine River, something that we heard loud and clear at the community that people want to have their natural space protected along the Seine River so we are going to do a secondary plan to identify and protect all the natural, the historical and the cultural nodes for generations to come, Madam Speaker. There's provision for the southeast phase of rapid transit which is going to happen at some point in our feature, but there are plans for that, Madam Speaker. There are also…have a…there's also nodes for a school, eventually, and the community centre and, yes, we are going to have to spend some money. This is developer led. The infrastructure will be paid for by the developers. But when…Councillor Gerbasi is right just when it comes to the community centre, when it comes to the school, there's going to be some public funding from one level of government or another, but there's also a cost benefit analysis to this, Madam Speaker, that was with front and centre of the Riel Community Committee and the long and short of it is after a 60 year period, there's a 200 million dollar positive as far as acts of accruing through the City of Winnipeg compared to what we will be spending, Madam Speaker. So you have a positive cost benefit analysis and you have literally hundreds of years of people hours of employment that are going to occur through the development of this community. It's not going to happen in five years. It's not going to happen in 10 years. I think this is a 15 to 20 year phase out that's going to be market driven, Madam Speaker, and the developers are going to be, of course, selling the properties and constructing the homes, but as well as with other neighbourhoods, this is market driven. And I'm a firm believer in the diversity of our city and St. Boniface, is a large ward and this is about…this is quite far from the northern section, Madam Speaker. And I believe we can do more than one thing at a time, I believe we can move forward on development such as this as well as move forward on infill development and I invite each and every one of you to come out to the north part of St. Boniface and look at the change that's occurred over the last 10 years. There's got to be close to $100 million of a compact urban form development that's occurred along the Tache North, along the Tache Street, north of Provencher, all over the centre of the north part of this…of the ward actually, Madam Speaker, and there's more to come and I think what's positive about that is we as a City can do more than one thing, we don't have to do just greenfield development in the southern and the extremes of our city. We're doing…we're doing that and we're doing the older neighbourhood development and I know Councillor Gerbasi has a lot of development in Point Douglas and just look at what's happening at the downtown at the same time. And I don't…I don't really see this. I don't see this at all as being a capita region argument. In fact, this is an alternative to the Capital Region because people don't have the choice to live in areas like Dawson Creek and other new areas, where are they going to go? They're going to go outside of our borders. They're going to go to the Capital Region where we accrue absolutely nothing from the taxes that they're going to pay, and Madam Speaker, I see this as a necessary alternative to people moving outside of our boundaries so I'm a big believer in doing more than one thing at a time. I'm a believer in diversity. This has a positive cost benefit summary. We need to give people options, a wider range of choices of where they want to live, what they want to do, and I'm very, very proud to move this forward and I think I'll stand down and listen to the other speakers.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Last night, we had the final meeting for this term of the Mayor's Environmental Advisory Committee, a group I've been lucky enough to Chair, some people say the Mayor only puts cronies on this. We've got Andrew Swanson the biking man on there. We've got Elizabeth Cameron who's run for the Green Party on there. Those people aren't…aren't cronies, a very good diversive pro-environment group on there. What we talked about last night, one of the projects was a green back lane project that's going to be going in around Dorchester, McMillan in the Councillor Gerbasi's Ward. It's been years in the making, but it's going to be taken out on old beat up concrete lane and in September, October and putting a new green project based on a Chicago model. Why am I rambling on about this? I'm rambling on about this because it's a good project, but it's…is it just the old part of the city that's going to pay for that? No, it's everyone's going to pay for that. All the new development, the old development is going to be sharing the cost of rehabilitating that old back lane. We've been through this argument a dozen times. There are various other examples combined sewer problem that's in older parts of the cities being paid for by the new parts as well. I don't think Councillor Gerbasi is necessarily wrong. I think she's half right. There are problems if you have uncontrolled growth. You do need to grow up. We did just vote for a big project that the Forks that will have densification downtown. So Precinct K, I will frankly not miss discussing Precinct K, some very good work done by Councillor Vandal and there is Councillor Swandel as well. It's been actually a pleasure, went to two councillors on the community committee of the last couple of years, but there's been a lot of work done on the plan here. We're in here for hours. A lot of community meetings. We've done….it's not going to happen all at once. It's going to happen overtime and these seconder plans for the Seine River is going to be part of this, that actually comes with an area that's slightly outside of Precinct K as well so we can do some planning for an area that is outside of Precinct K. It's an exciting development. Councillor Vandal talked about the

merits of it where it's located to you graphically, it is just to say, this isn't untrammeled growth randomly agreeing to whenever the developers put forward. There was a lot of work put in, a lot of time spent with the community committee and there is going to be benefits both in terms of the Seine River Plan and we made sure there was space left for the 2031 projected extension of the rapid transit line into this area. So we are planning for the future to have rapid transit that the way the density is structured in this, just trying to make it close to the future stations. So there's a plan here. We're planning for the future, the very long-term future. This isn't going to come on all at once. It's a good development. I salute Councillor Vandal for his work.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. I just want to say it's great to hear Councillor Vandal sounding like a good liberal. I want to remind everybody what these lands are. These lands are…referred to as the freight bought lands, but these lands were acquired by the Province, I believe, in the 70s, maybe the early 80s as part of the land banking process. Some of…actually are joint venture lands we currently have in South St. Vital right now. We're acquired by both the City and Province. We jointly own them as land banking and we acquired them because of the spirit that we weren't going to have developable land in the future because there was a sudden land shortage in spike in the land supply and it wasn't a good place to want to…to live, to come to, to build a home. So the reason these lands are and, you know, coming online right now is because somebody at some point in time had the foresight to understand that let's not make the mistakes of the past. Let's keep enough…develop the land available to the City. And you just follow that through all the plans that have gone on through Plan Winnipeg and, you know, all of its considerations going back, I don't know how far, but probably into the 70s, you know, into Our Winnipeg and Complete Communities in...and the Complete Communities and Our Winnipeg, they don't just talk about residential lands. There's a point of lands, there's industrial lands and there's a whole economic strategy and other infrastructure strategies there. So I mean, there's a great deal of planning that goes into this, so for someone to stand up and represent this is like if there's something as broken as a great injustice to the work that's being done to get this from this point. It should also be noted that a great deal of our planning process would be tied up around developments or future development in precincts in…but might be considered the inner city. You know, the Parker lands, the Fort Rouge Yards lands, the sugar beets lands and all. These are taking sites that are former industrial site, brownfields sites and in our planning processes have been focused on those. And in those processes, it's…we've been able to access funds either from the developers or I think in one case, we actually accessed funds for the planning through FCM, and FCM champions, that type of process and that type of planning. I don't want to remind who I represented is on FCM, but probably thrown, pile it on but I should make that point. Let's not forget that our little clusters of density aren't just Osborne Village or Cordon Village. It's just, you know when you look at our secondary plans, the PDOs, our background studies to be done. We put great deal…they've been focused on those areas, but prior to having the City of Winnipeg, there were numbers of cities and we established Unicity. So each one of those cities, whether it's St. Vital or Transcona or the Kildonans or wherever, they…you'll say St. Charles, they all have, I don't think that was the City Hall. Assiniboia, okay, well, but they all had their own little clusters of density and so we see that happening as well. So we're also dealing with Unicity and we're dealing with, you know, with…I know just in St. Norbert, you know, I've got sort of five different villages, not in the ward, but in the area we call St. Norbert. There's Old St. Norbert, there's the town houses and Parc La Salle, there's Richmond Lakes, which is newer development. There's the Pembina Highway strip, which is multi-family and commercial and you know, you could see how it's evolved. So, you know, what we see going on here is as Councillor Mayes said, a good process of planning and it's in line with what we did coming out of the Our Winnipeg process which was lauded as one of the greatest planning processes in North American history. It's celebrated; it's received awards, inclusionary transparency, inclusionary process with its transparency, its engagement. It's received awards and so, you know, to have somebody stand up and criticize the result of that is a little troubling so, you know, and let's also not forget that Winnipeg is a prairie city. You know, and we learned this…I can't remember exactly where, but we talked about trying to force densification in the city and I think it was parts of the very beginning parts of Our Winnipeg when talking about a certain amount of density for single family housing. And it was our land drainage folks that came back to us and said, "Well, there's a reason why we have retention ponds. There's a reason why we have retention ponds. There's a reason why we need the lots of the certain side. The way prairie cities deal with land drainage is especially one that's underpinned by clay like Winnipeg is, is you've got it spread out a bit in order to be able to deal with the water and take a look around this, folks. We're dealing with a lot of water and it does get absorbed into the ground quickly and so some of the planning is very technical. It's not just the idealism of what a house should look like and what a street should look like. There's some technical components to planning, you know, how do you deal with land drainage? And, you know, in our processes, we're moving forward, we're getting into these in the new developments, these lineal sort of naturalized retention pieces in older neighbourhoods. We're getting into concretes or asphalts that will retain some of the water rather than letting it go straight out to the system, so there's a lot more that goes into this. My final comment I want to talk to you about is annexation because I know everybody loves it. But we are…when you talk about our plan and what we base it on when we looked at growth of the city, we are closing in again on not having that land supply and, you know, that was causing…that caused us to acquire lands like Precinct K, we're closing in, we're coming up to the point where there's got to be some sort of conversation again about where the city boundaries should be, where the lands of supply should be,

where the pipe should run and in a bigger picture plan because you know, if we're all to agree that we need a 20 year land supply, I don't think we have that. I don't know that that we're going to keep growing at the same right that we are, but certainly know that you're just looking today going forward. We don't have a 20 year land supply or the ability to service 20 years land given where the pieces for treatment or delivery of water are, so there are problems in planning. They're not, to my estimation, not the problems that were represented by Councillor Gerbasi, but there needs to be a better look at what we have and what we need and how we move forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I have to admit in the last years, it's been one of my favourite discussion points. And it's always…it's always…it's always great being able to sit beside Councillor Gerbasi in these types of issues, you know, so I'll start here, here we go. But anyway, I just want to stand up and, you know, when you're talking about this in nature about this project and some of the projects that are there. I think, first of all, this is a very good project that happens, I think. Choice number one is a very important thing. Councillor Vandal was more articulate than I am in terms of that, but the diversity of the city I think is important. I think people want choice in the City of Winnipeg. There's people that are going to want to live in suburbia. There's people that are going to live downtown and there's people like myself, who just…will choose to live in the suburbs because they think it's a fantastic place to raise a family. Your lifestyle may not afford it. I think it's important to have some incentives, have things that people can live downtown especially focused on young professionals, focused on people empty nesters that may want to live downtown, it's important. I bug Councillor Gerbasi about her war on the suburbs all the time where her war on the car, I'm not sure if that's actually the case or not, but sometimes the critics talk about that, but you talk about the ex-urban sprawl that we're talking about that's here. If you decide and there was a trade union that, you know, that just in the last few days, it's talked about a moratorium on residential greenfield development in the City of Winnipeg for 10 years, I mean, this is a ridiculous proposal because what happens is if you shut down development in the City of Winnipeg in terms of greenfield development, where are people going to go? We know from Our Winnipeg that it's going to be upwards of 125,000 people come to our fair city, good growth is happening. Where are they all going to grow? If we have our ways that are good friend, Councillor Gerbasi has to shut down residential development here in the City of Winnipeg, they're going to go to Oakbank, they're going to go to Headingley. They're going to go to all these other places that are creating a real donut around the City of Winnipeg where they're using our services. They come, people will come, they'll work and they'll leave. I know it's getting late in the day Councillor Vandal, but this is a good debate that we like to have here. My point is this, this, this is important development and in terms of cost benefit analysis, there's two of them, Councillor Havixbeck and Councillor Nordman were part of the Ridgewood South, very tough development we did. They had a very comprehensive cost benefit analysis going, Waverly West, another one of the big developments in the City of Winnipeg are last number of years, comprehensive cost benefit analysis that were part of it. And talk about secondary planning. You talk about Ridgewood. We're doing the Ridgewood debate once again, very…lots of residents came out, had a lively discussion on it. That development company, it was Qualico who led the charge spent almost $800,000 on the secondary plan for the City of Winnipeg, so to say that all our time and energy as the City is being done, it just there doesn't make any sense. Also in terms of shutting down residential development, if you do shut down residential development that Councillor Gerbasi and some of my other friends in Council want to do, what does that do to the existing marketplace? You're shutting down demand, you're shutting down through, you're impacting the supply, rather of housing that's here in the City of Winnipeg. What does that do to actual housing markets in there? It's going to drive up prices because you have less supply houses that are going be there. So I think that this is going to go up. I've disagreed with my good friend, Councillor Wyatt on the development cost charges. That's a debate that's going on. You know, I'm happy that Provincial Government saw the wisdom in that. That's one…one thing they did get right, which is fantastic. Someone said, I like to take credit for them dropping out because of the tax will probably take credit for that, but with us, there's two other points that I'd like to make this with Our Winnipeg, the planning document, it's a document that was…won awards in terms of the consultation process for a very comprehensive document that outlines where development can happen in terms of orderly development for it. You can't shut down all residential developments. We should encourage people, you know, in terms of density, in terms of moving downtown that's sorts, but you're never going to shut down all residential development. I just think that's wrong and once again, it's a great debate that we always have with Councillor Gerbasi. I'm sure she forgives me,, by the end of the meeting, with her war on the car and war on the suburban development, but it's maybe a "shock and awe" campaign from previous attacks in the past. I'm just teasing. But anyway, this is a very good development, I encourage all Councillors to support this. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on the item? Okay, Councillor Browaty to close.

Councillor Browaty: So I wasn't completely clear, Councillor Fielding, for or against development? Just kidding. I just want to take an opportunity here to thank public service and the consultants for the work they've done here. Again, Winnipeg has the enviable position that we're growing. The population is growing. Our Winnipeg had population forecasts in it going out 20 years. We're blowing those numbers out of the water is my understanding right now.

Winnipeg is growing. We're growing up and growing out. I mean, look at my Ward in North Kildonan. It's completely built out, yet we're seeing new multi-family developments coming up in the spots that were there, very exciting. You have a high rise. How often do you see high rise rental accommodation going up? I've known one that's well under construction, it will be occupied early in the new year on Rothesay. Things that, you know, you wouldn't have heard of 10 to 15 years ago. It's very exciting to see that we have growth that's not just, you know, greenfield, but again, people have the choice and when you look at these types of developments, they're not just, you know, the residential suburbs of the late 1970s. We're seeing a lot of multi-family going into these. You look just across Lagimodiere Boulevard in Sage Creek. There's roads and roads and roads of new multi-family apartments in there. And they're filling up and they're full, so I mean, we are building development subdivisions differently. This development as well as areas of higher density is part of it, so now I think it's very exciting and very pleased to move this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of Item No. 4? Contrary? Carried. So noted. Thank you. Now we're on to Item No. 5, secondary plan for the Gunn Road.

Item 5 - Secondary Plan – Area Bounded by Gunn Road, Perimeter Highway, Transcona Trail and Central MB Railway (to establish Transcona North Precinct Plan – Precinct "I")
File SP 6/2013

Councillor Browaty: I know that Councillor Eadie had mentioned that he wanted to debate these together. I don't know if he got comments up there. Perhaps, he wants to withdraw or remove this from the Consent or...

Councillor Eadie: No, I'm going to speak to it now because I think I've been…

Councillor Browaty: I will comment at the end.

Councillor Eadie: I think I've been vilified and I just want to make sure that everyone understands what I'm talking about.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, I'm not a member of the NDP Government. I'm a member of the NDP Party. And for our…Councillor Wyatt, to be coined as a somehow being part of that government. It is your government, too, Councillor Wyatt, that NDP Government because after the election they were the ones who won and they may lose after the next one, but this...member of the NDP Party does not get told how to vote. This person actually believes that there are a number of things we should be allowed to do. And so let me speak to the reason that I stood these down because, you know, I understand that Councillor Vandal and that the Riel Community Committee spent a lot of time working with the developer here. There's a secondary plan, and yes, the developer spent a lot of money, but as I know, I know that our City Administration, spent a lot of time working with them as well to determine, you know, what should be there to say that the City's own administration didn't spend a lot of time on this, they do because they need to, to ensure that all of the requirements that we require are there. Like you said, it's Complete Communities, there's a number of requirements. We need to make sure it's there and so…and on this particular one here, North Transcona, you know, I love Transcona. I go there quite frequently. I love these parts of the city. I have no problem with any part of the city. What…my point is simply about all of these precincts opening up and stuff, and I heard a much, much debate today about the need for money to build new roads and to fix our old roads. And yes, new properties that come online, the first year they bring money in and they help us out, but we have reassessment and to be led and I'd like to be pointed out where they factor in reassessment every second year into how much money and cost benefit analysis and stuff. I like that to be actually shown to me. But anyway, that's besides the point because I know that growth…green growth needs to happen. But what I do know is that we have this problem and I do know that actually the Province says when we ask for those development charts, the ability to do that under our chart, the ability to do that. I know that they said we have tools. We do have tools actually in negotiating agreements when these things come to our community committees, and that Public Service asked us, for example, to say Waterford Green, could you please, we would like you to pay for two of the onramps on to the future Chief Peguis Trail. We'd like you to play for that. Oh, no! The developer down the way never had to pay for that. Oh no! They didn't have to pay for that. We shouldn't have to pay for that. Well, we need to plan for the future and part of the problem is just that we're building greenfield all the way out, all around the city and all is I'm simply saying is I don't want to limit people's choices. I think that, you know, Precinct K is probably a beautiful place to live…living along or close to the Seine River would be great. But I know that they're not going to be pleasant about their drive up Bishop Grandin or St. Mary's or South St. Vital driving up St. Mary's Road and in St. Boniface were widening…Marion's widening is being put in there, that's because of the demand of traffic and it's not because of the older neighbourhoods and the building of density. That needs to be done and it's okay. It does need to be done for the people who live in those areas so they can get to work. I get that. It's important. So all's I'm trying is when I'm voting against these, and I voted against precinct plans in other parts of the city including in northwest district. You can ask

Councillor Pagtakhan. You know, I…any way, I appreciate that we need to have opportunities, new homes for people to buy so they don't move out of the city. I think that's very important. I would point out though, and here's another thing, soft costs, Councillor Wyatt mentioned soft costs. Madam Speaker, I have to say we had a questions of the Mayor today about the YM/YWCA grant that we're offering out that we want the Province to match and Councillor Swandel mention, he needs…this is in his ward. Waverly West, it's a great development, hey, don't get me wrong. I think that's great, but we're looking for it and we can't find the money to build the soft cost building that need to serve the people, that need to serve the people. And so, yeah, you can blame that on the Province if you want, but the reality is, is that when we're planning for these areas, we need to accept that and to say that there's a note to build the school, you know what, the way schools get built, like I can tell you up in the northwest and Seven Oaks School Division, they're always like, they're 10 years behind all the time to build the schools, like to say that, you know, there's going to be a school, like there's all these issues and so I'm just simply saying that we need to…more planned control way. I'm not saying the suburbs are necessarily taking away from the inner city or for my ward. What I'm saying is, is that we've got to be able to manage the growth somewhat better so that we're not complaining that we don't have money to extend the Chief Peguis Trail which needs to be done for comments purpose as well, like you know, anyway, I'm just going to leave it at that, Madam Speaker. So the only reason I…it's not that there aren't good plans or that good things aren't happening. I love Transcona, I love Transcona, it's great. I love the North End and I love St. Vital. Anyway, I love Winnipeg. It's a great city and it does need to allow for growth and…and there is a need for development charges because, you know what, this City obviously can't find the money to build this stuff, so I'll leave it at that, Madam Speaker. I'll be voting against.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to use this as an opportunity to remind everybody that cost benefit is a mandatory requirement of the secondary planning process…as part of the process…everybody who does a secondary plan has to do a cost benefit analysis. So you know, for somebody to argue that, you know, these subdivisions aren't paying for themselves, we've established the criteria of what a cost benefit is. They all have to show that they are paying for themselves, and they come forward and it's included in every report. In addition to that, there are many other requirements put on the developers. You'll see in the previous one that we just did, I don't know, but it's in the secondary plan or in the subdivision with re-zoning, but there was $300,000 taken as a contribution towards some community facilities. It should also be pointed out that in Councillor Eadie's ward, the community centres and recommendations for facilities weren't built by the developers, they were built by the taxpayers at large, so you know, let's…let's compare apples to apples here if you want to have the argument and if you'll do a cost benefit analysis on Councillor Eadie's ward, I'll probably be pretty happy that there is new development because that's part of what's paying for the infrastructure in Councillor Eadie's ward right now. I also want to let everybody know that whether you know it or not, again, I don't want to accuse anybody not reading reports, but Item 17 on your agenda today was a report called the local area planning initiatives for 2014 to 2015, okay? And I will read this quote from that report. This report reviews the current local area planning initiatives for 2014, 15 for the Planning, Property and Development Department, Urban Planning Division. This report will give implications on the work undertaking by the Urban Planning Division in 2014, will have implications on the work undertaking by the Urban Planning Division 2014, 2015. The current local area planning initiatives for 2014, 2015 include Corydon, Osborne neighbourhood plan, the review of existing plans for compliance with community committees direction, none of the development of a local area planning handbook, the South Point Douglas area master plan, a review of the Provencher Boulevard plan development overplay and the mission industrial local area plan. In addition to those plans, which you can see are either technical in nature or dedicated to infill areas, now the collaborative planning with other interests may include the following in addition to others which may arise. The old Southwood golf course infill and that is also identified as a major redevelopment site in Our Winnipeg. The parker lands infill, which is also identified as a major redevelopment site in Our Winnipeg. Now Precinct E, which is in…is a new community, Precinct I, north Transcona which is a new community, Precinct K, which is a new community, Precinct R which is the Red River X, which is, is a new community and finally the one that we just created when we…we did the Precinct K which was the Seine River Greenway Secondary Plan which everybody, I think, would agree is a good thing. So if you actually look at that and you'll see the distribution where the planning is. It's a pretty decent distribution between growing up and growing out, which is, if you remember when we did Our Winnipeg, that's what we talked about doing. We talked about growing up and growing out in an orderly fashion. Our planners that we seem to have some respect for, some of us anyway, tell us that this is orderly development. They support it. They recommend these things to us. We take them at face value. You notice some healthy debate involved in the process, but you know, we're driving down the path that we set out that's laying out the way we set it out. It's balance between growing up and growing out so I'm having a hard time understanding where anybody might have a problem supporting these documents.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I guess I feel a bit like a whack-a-mole today, but I think you should…you should thank me for continuing to raise these issues because, you know, I'm hearing people talking about transit lines in St. Boniface and other things that we're planning for and that we're aware of these things so, you know, debate is a healthy thing, but

I do recall when we had the…I appreciate I think Councillor Eadie captured, I shared his view with these comments about the Province and the growth paying for growth. When we had that growth paying for growth debate, it seemed to me that a number of people agreed that growth was not paying for growth which is why we asked for those monies. Councillor Wyatt who is busy right now, Councillor…the Mayor, other people were kind of admitting that growth wasn't paying for growth. So I'm not making this crap up…the stuff up. It came from our administration and seminar who talked to us. I mean, I knew it anyway based on other cities, other information and the fact that our development fees are really low compared to other cities, but I mean this is not based on nothing. This is based on what our only administration and many around this chamber said that we need to get, bet more fees because growth isn't paying for growth and our development fees are inadequate. So this is real folks, I'm sorry. I'd also like to mention, yes, I read the report. I know Councillor Swandel assumes perhaps that nobody else reads report. The local area initiatives…I talked to our planners a lot because I got massive amount of development going on, and they tell me that they've coursed a going ahead with all these precinct plans because that's what it says in our City plan. There's no staging, there's no deciding which areas should be developed first…it's everything's on so if one of these areas…the developer comes forward then they go to work helping them and working with them and they're just following the plan that Council approved for them and my point is that it is heavy…their workload, there's not enough work to do enough local planning even though, you know, there's a couple in there. They're taking a long time. They're taking a long time because we don't have the staffing to do them. So growth does not pay for growth according Councillor Wyatt and the Mayor and a bunch of others last time we had this debate but I guess it does now, so we're all good. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on the item? Okay, seeing none we'll call the question. All those in favour of Item 5? Contrary? Carried. Okay, so noted. Next item that was stood down was Item No. 10. Item No. 10. Item number 10 does have a motion for an amendment. That's right.

Item 10 - Subdivision and Rezoning – East Side of Shaftesbury Boulevard, South of Grant Avenue
DASZ 9/2014

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty if you'd like to introduce the item and then Councillor Havixbeck will introduce the motion.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. This was a…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty?

Councillor Browaty: Okay, thank you. This particular item came to the Property Committee with no recommendation. I believe that there was a split vote at Assiniboia Community Committee. It was approved by P&D and I understand there is a motion here to make an adjustment. I'll certainly respond after Councillor Havixbeck introduces her amending motion.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Havixbeck,
Seconded by Councillor Nordman,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council amend Item 10 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated July 8, 2014 to add the following conditions to Recommendation 2 (conditions of the zoning agreement):

- *Decrease the density on the south side of the project from 4 units to 3 units.*
- *Increase the landscaping along the south side to have a wall of spruce trees as a screen.*
- *Construct and maintain a 6' wooden fence along the south side backing onto the neighbours on Bard Place.*
- *Change the orientation on the south side so that the living rooms face north versus looking into the back yards of Bard Place.*
- *Amend to a 25' rear yard from 20' yard setback on the south backing onto Bard Place.*

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I thank Councillor Nordman for agreeing to support and second a motion to amend it and I just want to make a point of clarification that you received two, you receive Motion No. 1 and then Motion 1 revised so go by Motion No. 1 revised and so when it says is, "Be it resolved that Council amend Item 10 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated July 8, 2014 to add the following conditions to Recommendation 2, conditions of the zoning agreement: Decrease the density on the south side of the project from 4 units to 3 units. Increase the landscaping along the south side to have a wall of spruce trees as

a screen. Construct and maintain a 6' wooden fence along the south side backing onto the neighbours on Bard Place. Change the orientation on the south side so that the living rooms face north versus looking into the back yards of Bard Place. Amend to a 25' rear yard from 20' yard setback on the south backing onto Bard Place". I guess at this point, I see this as an item that is going to go through and I was not supportive of at the community committee level. Councillor Fielding was away so it was Councillor Nordman and I. Some of the rational that we heard was at there was no consultation. This motion or this amendment does not address the fact that there was minimal consultation but it does agree a number of the other concerns that the neighbours had and so I would like to see it going through. You know, having yards that have a front yard or front living space looking into backyards doesn't seem in keeping with this neighbourhood or quite honestly any neighbourhood in this city. The normal way that we see cul-de-sacs backing onto one another is the backyards facing the backyards. So I would hope that people would…Councillors would support that, and, you know, I'm trying to make the best case scenario out of something that I didn't initially agree with so, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: Madam…I'm going to move, Madam Speaker, this would be referred to P&D. This seems to be rather extensive. There's nobody here from land use. I'd be more comfortable with sort of referred back to P&D with the attached resolution for it to be looked at and considered rather than us doing something like this on the fly.

Madam Speaker: So is it a motion to refer with instructions or without?

Councillor Wyatt: If I move it with instructions, then I have to have second. I'm moving referral.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of referring the matter? Contrary? Okay, recorded vote. All those in favour? I don't believe…Mr. Clerk, can the chair…for three minutes?

Councillor Browaty: I just want to say that I actually support Councillor Wyatt's motion here. This particular parcel of land was the surplus city property. I think we need to speak with the department to see if this has any ramifications towards…I don't know the terms of the original sale. So for…so potentially there's other ramifications in terms of a sale price was the…planned subdivision and the rezoning and all that conditional upon the number of units. So I think it's appropriate that we consult the staff on this matter so I do support the motion referral.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of the referral please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Havixbeck and Nordman

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

Madam Speaker: Okay, Motion No. 1, revised will be referred. Thank you. Are there any other speakers? Oh, pardon me. That's right. Okay, now moving on to item No. 12, Madam Clerk.

Item 12 – Rezoning – 445 River Avenue
File DAZ 213/2014

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I believe that Councillor Gerbasi stood this item down. I will certainly respond after she speaks.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll just say…I just wanted to put a comment on the record. This is one of the most exciting projects we're seeing in the city. I know it's an infill project in the heart of Osborne Village, River and Osborne. It's going to be a new Gas Station Art Centre as well as co-op housing, housing for artists, a mixture of housing. It's exactly what our city plan has in mind in terms of densifying and it's also supporting the arts and artists in our community. So I just didn't want

this to just sail through without people noticing the amazing things that these people are doing. I also know that the Gas Station Arts Centre, which has a renowned comedy festival, which is one of the best in Canada now if not the best other than Montreal, but it's right there, almost there, and that the they're going to be doing Capital campaign as well to re-build a brand new theatre as well this house in conjunction with this housing. So I just want to say something positive. I think we should be acknowledging achievements like this that come from a non-profit community board to make this and other groups on in the housing area trying to get this done. I think it's pretty amazing so those are my comments.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Browaty to close?

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. I think Councillor Gerbasi said it very well. Very exciting.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on Item 12. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 13, Madam Clerk.

Item 13 – Zoning Agreement Amendment – 500 Academy Road
File ZAA 7/2014

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll certainly close on this item at the end.

Madam Speaker: This was stood down by Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is actually unusual because only one time prior to this where the area Councillor, in my history, where the area Councillor…I think the City Centre Committee was overturned so let me give you a little brief. Some people may understand…know this property because we approved the caveat just two years ago. We as Council approved the caveat two years ago when we converted the property on the request of the neighbourhood from an R1 Property to a C1 Property in the Academy Road PDO in which specifically was called Section 1A, which is a middle small retail section. It was quite disconcerting for me and I'll be very honest, one of the more low points for my disappointment because I really haven't heard of a reason why. The justification that would say to me why my three colleagues on the PP&D Committee, I don't believe EPC really talked about it all, there was a really large agenda that went for pretty quick. So why would they…was this…why would they counter the area Councillor and the City Centre Committee. I really didn't have a really good reason, so let me tell you some of the reasons why I voted against this one, for simple reasons. One is it questions us as a Council if after two years, a caveat can just be removed and put in another caveat, which triples the size of the property, protection of leaving that property at lower density in a 1A District. It's just removed two years later. It would be like a variance has been removed…some usage of a building just being removed. After two years because someone bought the land and didn't like it anymore, the caveat. The developer who bought the land was asked quite clearly at City Centre Committee…was well aware of the caveat when they bought the land. So why would Council approve something two years ago and then two short years later decide to remove it? The area Councillor is still here. He's against it. The PDO says small retail. I understand the administration has new staff. They may not be in a part of that whole process, but the visiting session we had on Academy talked about this. We want this as a way station between the two large nodes, which is down by Oak and the other down by Kenaston. Those are the larger nodes because they have back lanes, back lanes that run behind them if they are able to accommodate more than the small little node in the middle. So, why? We talk to EY, EY who was very clear. Listen to your area Councillor. He knows the area. I know this area. I know why when we did the rezoning from R1 to C. Well, we had no opposition here to that because the community has faith in us that we would hold that caveat. I even have faith in us that we hold that caveat. Now we're looking at square footage going from about 1500 square feet to over 3,000 square feet on the gross square footage. We're looking at five parking spots rather than 16 parking spots. We're looking at conditional use that even a medical clinic in the normal C1 Property could only…we had to be smaller, but we're going to expand that almost double the size in an inappropriate location. Was there an offer to the developer to say, can you at least look, coming down on size, the offer was made. The developer said no. Are there other lands available? Grand Park Festival. What a great spot for this. A lot of feedback from the neighbourhoods, some of them are happy and some aren't, but we have Grant Park Festival that we push through, which I think is a good development, which is ideally suited for this type of high traffic area. What about, you know, doing more parking we lost? We can't because it's so big. That's why it's five rather than 16 stalls. They say that parking will be on Academy. Parking, they can't cross Academy. There's so much traffic. All that parking will go down on residential streets, no back lane to exit out of, so it gets to all the way to Kingsway and finally the way down on the neighbourhood. So while I respect the fact that the developer is a very good man, I have friends we share in common. I know that the developer had a lot of its clients who are very appreciative of his great service calling in. Some of them actually live in my neighbourhood as well who are supportive of this project, but that's nice. But when you look at the grand scale of the 150, let's say about 200 east side, when I look at…when I total them out where they come from, all those city people in opposition are generally around that area. There's a few that are supportive in that area, but by overwhelming majority, the people who are in opposition to this

came forward, they live in that immediate area. People that would be in part of the Academy PDO with us who spent those weeks in those summers talking about the visioning. How do we see Academy growing? Because remember when I first got elected, one of the first problems we had was P3…and before that we had these similar issues so we said and Council to the wisdom said, okay let's set up the PDO so we can try to help facilitate this so people know that Academy House is going to grow. We're not going to be a Corydon with all the bars. We're going to be more historical. We just put in about half a million dollars into Academy streetscaping where it's historical parks, tree wells, monument signs, all the stuff just to make it the whole neighbourhood work together under our plan. So again, I asked this Council today, does because there's some clients of the developer. Do they override the neighbourhood and the area Councillor to City Centre Committee? I can't see how that thing is possible. Have we been completely outrageous with our demands by asking them maybe can scale it back a bit. Maybe can do the exact same side as the other side, but we can negotiate that. Was that an unreasonable request? No. It wasn't unreasonable request. Developers said no. I'm going to go all in and see where this goes. That's their choice. So, here we are at the end, where we know there's Academy pressure on Academy. We know that, but the neighbourhood came together with a division. I was at that vision ceremony, those vision sessions. I was at them. I know what we did in the PDO. I know why we didn't call it one, Section 1, Section 1 and Section 1. We called it 1, 1, 1A, small scale. This is not small scale. So I'm not being unreasonable. The area councillor knows the area. I'm not going to win votes on either side. I know that. If I just go through, part of my neighbourhood is not going to be too happy. If it does go through, part of the neighbours is not going to be too happy. That's okay. I believe what I'm doing, same thing as the Sir John Franklin Field which I'm getting a lot of trouble for as well, but that was a good development. I can stand by that one. I can even stand by the academy one if someone said to me why? Why we should break the neighbourhood's trust. Why should we ignore City Centre Committee? Why we should ignore the area Councillor. Why? I don't have a valid reason to give out there. I don't. It's not that we're saying it can't be redeveloped. We're just saying the scale of what they're asking for is massive. The developer knew what he was buying. I'm sorry that he wants to develop much bigger than we're allowing. So I would say, ask my colleagues today, my colleagues on the Property and Development Committee, it's okay. You made a mistake. Change the vote today. That's okay. For my other colleagues, ask yourself, is this the way you would like it to work for yourself as well…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nordman moves extension. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Orlikow: …when you do the area plan? And all of a sudden two years later, they dramatically change your area plan? Would you as an area councillor think that's a great idea? Of course not. We know our neighbourhoods. It's not like I'm being outrageous. If I was being outrageous or said never, ever, ever anything happened there ever. Again, I've proven that repeatedly other. I will support good developments. I will support developments even sometimes when they're not fully supported by the neighbourhood, but what I do believe is for us as the City Council, we talked about the large scale, you know, our audits of this and this, but this is actually at the core level of what we do. It's instilling that trust in our neighbourhood that when we give them a commitment, in two short years we aren't just going to toss it in the garbage and say, oh too bad, so sad for you. We decided for whatever reason because some clients of the developer are interested in having a local place to go to, that's not a valid reason to support this. Because it's a pretty picture? That's not a valid reason either. Those are not valid reasons. The questions to the board towards us today and to you as well, is you believe that an area Councillor, City Centre Committee and Council after two years can just change it like this and not go from a little change, go from like 1,000, 1,200 square feet, gross square footage to over 3,000 square feet gross square footage. So we're not even talking about a little change. We're talking a huge change. So if you believe that something that you want to happen in your neighbourhood, again, it's not so. I know no one wants that to happen to anybody, but for some reason, for this property, for whatever reason, I'm more than happy to hear my other colleagues get up and speak, I would love to hear why they believe that this property, against my wishes, against the City Centre Committee wishes, against the PDO, against the caveat, warrants this. I don't.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I've gone through this experience myself although I didn't have a PDO in place to protect me that was only voted on two years previously. Like really, I don't understand the rational of the Planning…Property and Development Committee. I really don't understand because, you know, it's great to have the…you know, the density, but when you have a plan or places where rezoned for a good purpose in 1993 and then all of a sudden you want to change it and you want to build something different. Anyway, I have to say I am totally in support with Councillor Orlikow on this and I really, Madam Speaker, I'm very conservative about it, very cynical city councillor on this council. It seems to leave out this innuendo that somehow where myself and maybe Councillor Orlikow may have to face this, I don't know. But the cynical perspective that somehow that I or any other councillor in their area is okay with this, but they want to see…be seen this fighting for the neighbourhood and somehow they are actually for and so you know that's cynical perspective, that whole thing. Here we have a sincere proposition to property and planning here. It was a decision of the City Centre Committee that we, as PP&D and this council should respect that two years ago, they put this plan in place and then all of a sudden, we're going to change it. And I can tell you that for sure,

the parking issue is going to become a huge problem and then we as a city have to deal with that. I know in the…I know up in my area, if we have to start dealing with parking issues, I'm going to be calling Traffic, they're going to calling in my area, Mr. Garwick and we're going to be trying to get a one hour parking on the street because, you know, people can't park. There's nowhere for people to park who actually bought houses and live on there, so this lack of parking, you know, anyway. For me, this is a bad thing and I think it's Council, it's time we actually sided with somebody here who actually knows what's best for this particular property here, so I will be voting along with Councillor Orlikow against the current report from PP&D. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a very difficult one for me. I generally do support generally what ward councillors base because they generally are the ones facing their residents from the whole, you know, in terms of how issues are done. So this one, I actually will be supporting the administrative report coming forward. I'm going to lay out a couple issues that I think are relevant. You know, if you look before us, we do have administrative report that went clearly says to support the side of…the one issue I know. And I guess I've got some familiarity with this, I know that that stretch quite well. My wife's got a business, you know, at the end of the around the area, but so I do know this area quite well. The parking issue that has been brought up is something that, I think can be addressed or is addressed through the parking plan that was there. I think there was some evidence that was put forward in terms of that point, in terms of the availability of parking that's there. Sometimes these decisions are very tough and I think that when you so have a whole bunch of residents that come out and do support where our post is something. It is something that the ward councillor and I know Councillor Orlikow is someone does listen to his constituents quite effectively which I think it's very important. But when people come out and they're opposed to something, that makes a lot of sense from the planning perspective you have administrative support. You've got Plan Winnipeg that supports these types of developments here. I think it does make a lot of sense. You do get the development. It is I think quite a stunning looking building, be quite honest with you. And I think it will add to amenity of the community. You look at some of the PDO that's part of it for the most part. It does meet the PDO that's there. I think that this is a doctor's office that adds value to the community in terms of what is going to be provided. It's not a, you know, some sort of chop shot or something that's going to add some major concerns to the area. I think it's going to add some value for the most part for the community. So I will be supporting the EPC recommendation coming forward to support this process and support the developments.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The Mayor just mentioned we have an important guest in the gallery. I'd like to welcome Minister Kerry Irvin-Ross. Thank you for popping in to our Council meeting today. Are there any further speakers on the matter? No further speakers. Councillor Browaty to close.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Obviously, all of us are elected by citizens you represent and we take very seriously the opinions and views and desires of the Ward Councillor. In this particular case, we also need to take very important consideration of our professional planners. They go to planning school. They understand what fits and what doesn't fit. In this particular case, we're talking about a fairly low impact commercial site that's being proposed here on C1 land. According to them, it is consistent with the PDO and the area, 1A that's…this is part of. These limiting factors are on there previously from the past. We're not intending to permanently freeze in place what existed on the site and again everything that's being proposed here does look appropriate in my mind and in my opinion and that of our professional planning staff so I will be moving this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour of Item 13? Recorded vote. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken with the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Pagtakhan and Steen

Nays

Councillor Eadie, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Mayes, Nordman, Orlikow, Smith, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

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

Madam Speaker: Item is lost. Next, we'll be move on to motion 2 which is a motion by Mayor Katz on the Garden City Soccer Complex. Mayor Katz.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS, in partnership, The City of Winnipeg, the Province of Manitoba and the Winnipeg Soccer Federation have announced, with the support of the Board of the Garden City Community Centre, the construction of a $21.482 million soccer multiplex and outdoor illuminated artificial FIFA regulation sized soccer pitch on the site of the Garden City Community Centre;

AND WHEREAS it is imperative that the new soccer pitch be completed immediately in order to be ready for play at the FIFA Women's World Cup Canada 2015 to be held in Winnipeg in the Spring of 2015;

AND WHEREAS in order to permit the Winnipeg Soccer Federation onto the Garden City Community Centre site to commence construction of the new soccer pitch immediately, the City and the Winnipeg Soccer Federation must negotiate and enter into an "enter to construct" agreement pending the City entering into a lease with the Winnipeg Soccer Federation of the aforesaid property;

AND WHEREAS authority from Council is required to negotiate and enter into the aforesaid "enter to construct" agreement with the Winnipeg Soccer Federation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT

1. *That the City enter into an "enter to construct" agreement with the Winnipeg Soccer Federation authorizing the Winnipeg Soccer Federation and its contractors to enter onto the Garden City Community Centre site to construct a FIFA regulation sized outdoor lighted artificial turf pitch and associated services pending the City entering into a lease with the Winnipeg Soccer Federation of the aforesaid property.*

2. *That the Acting Chief Administrative Officer be authorized to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of the "enter to construct" agreement referred to in Recommendation 1, on condition that the Winnipeg Soccer Federation must:*

    A. *Meet insurance requirements certified by the City's Corporate Risk Manager to be adequate to protect the City's interests;*
    B. *Provide an executed release and indemnity in a form certified by the Acting Director of Legal Services and City Solicitor to be adequate to protect the City's interests;*

    C. *Undertake, at its sole cost, effort and expense to return the property to its original condition in the event that the lease is not finalized;*

    D. *Prior to entry, provide a letter of credit or performance bond in the City's favour in an amount that is equal to or greater than the cost that would have to be incurred to return the land to its pre-entry condition that can be drawn on by the City in the event that the lease is not finalized;*

    E. *Meet any other term or condition considered necessary by the Acting Director of Legal Services and City Solicitor to adequately protect the interests of the City.*

3. *That the Proper Officers of the City do all things necessary to carry out the intent of the foregoing.*

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This matter is probably more house cleaning. It has to do with the…we've already…we know there's a $21 million soccer complex that's being built as well as there's the artificial field for FIFA. In order to get this going, we need to have the City enter into an "enter to construct" agreement and that's what this is all about. I believe everybody has the motion. It's pretty self-explanatory.

Madam Speaker: Would you like to suspend the rules, Mayor Katz, to hear it today?

Mayor Katz: Absolutely, I'd like to suspend the rules.

Madam Speaker: All in favour to suspend the rules? Contrary? Carried. And the introduction has been made. I'll call the vote. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, we'll move on to By-laws now. Bylaws for second and third reading. Councillor Browaty.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law No. 1/2014 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed. Carried.

Councillor Eadie: Record me opposed, please.

Madam Speaker: So noted.

Clerk: Bylaw No. 1/2014.

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-law No. 48/2014 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No…

Councillor Eadie: Please recorded me opposed, please.

Clerk: By-law No. 48/2014.

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-laws numbered 1/2014 and 48/2014 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

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

Councillor Browaty: I move that the following by-laws be read a first time, 84/2014, 85/2014, 86/2014, 95/2014.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 84/2014, By-law No. 85/2014, By-law No. 86/2014, By-law No. 95/2014.

Councillor Browaty: I move that By-laws numbered 84/2014 to 86/2014 both inclusive and 95/2014 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 84/2014 to 86/2014 both inclusive and By-law 95/2014.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 84/2014 to 86/2014 both inclusive and 95/2014 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried. We'll now move on to Question Period. Any questions for the chair? Moving on to the Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services Councillor Mayes, on the report dated July 4th.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED JULY 4, 2014**

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll move the report dated July 4, 2014, Items 1 through 4 inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Is there only…I just see two items here. July 4th, pardon me. Okay, so 1 through 4, Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Mayes: Yes.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move on to the report dated July 15th.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED JULY 15, 2014**

Councillor Mayes: I'll move the report dated July 15th. Do I have to do…

Madam Speaker: Suspend the rules?

Councillor Mayes: Moved to suspend the rules. Consider the report dated July the 15th.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of suspending the rules? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 - Agreement between the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation and The City of Winnipeg for the Winnipeg Police Service Stolen Auto Unit

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move No. 1. I believe we have to do them separately, this one, move No. 1.

Madam Speaker: Yes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 2 - Agreement to implement the Winnipeg Police Service School Resource Officer Program in the St. James - Assiniboia School Division, Winnipeg School Division and Pembina Trails School Division

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move No. 2, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have no motions for this committee. We'll move on to By-laws. Councillor Mayes.

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

Councillor Mayes: I'll move that By-law No. 94/2014 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Oppose? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 94/2014.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move that By-law No. 94/2014 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 94/2014.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move the By-law No. 94/2014 that the rules be suspended and By-law 94/2014 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question Period for the Chair. Any questions for Councillor Mayes? Seeing none, we will move on to the Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Swandel.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED JULY 4, 2014

Councillor Swandel: I'll move the Independence Day report, the July 4th, 2014 report and consent and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 9.

Madam Speaker: Okay, I suppose we'll just pull one because there's an amending motion?

Councillor Swandel: Oh, that's right.

Madam Speaker: So we will call the question on 2 to 9. All those in favour?

Councillor Swandel: Hang on. Hang on.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of Items 2 to 9?

Madam Speaker: Contrary? Carried.

Item 1 – Transit By-law

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Swandel,
Seconded by Councillor Mayes,

WHEREAS a Draft Transit By-law was approved by the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works on July 4, 2014 and by Executive Policy Committee on July 9, 2014;

AND WHEREAS the intent of the Transit By-law is to promote the safety, well-being, comfort and convenience of passengers and employees on the transit system as well as the safe and efficient operation of the transit system;

AND WHEREAS there is a need to clarify the intent of several provisions within the Draft Transit By-law;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated July 4, 2014 be amended by changing the Draft Transit By-law in Attachment A of the Report as follows:

1. Identify Winnipeg Police Service Cadets as "Auxiliary Force Cadets";

2. "play a musical instrument or sing" be struck out in clause 7(1)(h) and this change be reflected in Appendix B (Transit By-law Specified Penalties);

3 Section 8 be replaced with the following.

Prohibition on interfering with boarding, disembarking or seating

8 An individual must not occupy a position or act in a manner that interferes or is likely to interfere with the boarding or disembarking of passengers from a transit vehicle, or interfere with access to available seating.

4. Appendix B (Transit By-law Specified Penalties) be changed to add a fine of $100.00 for a violation of clause 10(b) (Leave or attempt to leave transit vehicle while transit vehicle in motion).

Madam Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: There is…I guess I should introduce the clause and the motion to amend. Let me just give my papers in order here. Just a couple of quick comments. The…as you know in the clause, there was some concern put forward about a number of items like one was spoke to this morning. I want to make sure that everybody understands it specifically on dealing with people in shelter that are there for a longer period of time, we do have a process. All of our people that deal with this, whether they're interacting directly or whether they're using some other service with the police, fire and ambulance to interact with the individual who may be using bus shelters for shelter. We utilize the number of social service facilities in order to address the concerns. We don't leave anybody out there at risk or move anybody along without ensuring that some sort of service is provided to ensure their safety. So I just wanted to make sure everybody was aware of that. The motion takes care of some of the other pieces that came up in debate or in conversation in the public, you know, just dealing with the, you know, that this word singing that pulled out of there. So we've taken the word saying right out of the by-law, the motion clears some of that stuff up. So I'll listen to everybody's comment, anybody who wants to speak to this, but you know, at the end of the day, what we're trying to do here is we're trying to formalize for transit this sort of system of maintaining order on the buses. It's not there to stop people from seeing to pull out of there and taken the word out of the bylaw and the motion clears some of that and I'll lich to everyone's comments and at the end of the day we're just trying to formalize for transit, the sort of system of maintaining order on the buses. It's not there to stop people from humming a tune or to abuse the homeless or any of those things that may have been represented as. It's just to maintain order on transit and to provide additional protection for our transit operators. I'd like to thank Councillor Mayes for being a champion on this and for seconding the motion. And I think, you know, we can go further as we go further with this because sort of that idea of championing the motion and as we go forward with the idea of the barrier and some other protection for our transit drivers is certainly worthy of discussion. We've got cameras, but we know that what we have right now isn't enough. So I'll listen and I'll comment in conclusion.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Eadie, Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Councillor Mayes, for bringing this forward. This is something that we talked about for a little while. This has kind of a dual track if you are with this obviously. This…the Transit piece comes through Transit. Thank you, Councillor Swandel, for explaining the whole process. Thank you for cleaning up the whole thing. It's…I think it has some, you know, they can make sense for the singing piece. It's probably one of these things that go through with the by-law and people saw it. They didn't think it was a major issue until it was brought up. That was sorted through. The bit of the issue that I have with this is number one, the funding. I understand through the report that the financials that the money will be paid for the first year under the Transit. Now, whether it comes from I think I was talking to the CFO about this. It looks like he's not here anymore, whether it comes from a direct grant or I guess a kind of a transfer into the Transit or having it come from the reserve or Transit reserve, hopefully is the right term. The reserve would be more of my preference because then it's not just the Provincial Government, the City Government, but it's also the user that helps pay some of the security aspect for this. So my one point, I will be supporting this, but it does come through and for the cadet portion of things. It has to come to the Police Board. We're going to have a special meeting to deal with this next week, but I can tell you right now that, you know, although I think it's a noble cause in that sorts. I don't think there would be willingness if the police in terms of making it a priority right now for the police to support it. If it isn't money that's coming from another system so the budget calls for 2014 dollars that come. I think there would be some sort of parameters put on the cadet piece whether it be a contract position or whatever else until we can sort out the funding, the long term funding of this into the future because I don't think the Police Board is going to have an appetite to pay for this, after the 14. I know it's a noble cause and, you know, we had some of those drivers here. I know there's been some horrible incidents, but to be fair, there is not an endless pot in terms of funding for public safety. There's a lot of competing interest whether you, you know, invest in something like the North Police Station, although that's capital dollars. What I'm saying is there's a lot of competing interest when you go for public safety so I'm going to be supportive of this, but we need to figure out a financing model that allows the transit system to pay for this as opposed to the Police because I won't be supportive of going forward unless we figure that out from the Police perspective or rather from the Transit and Finance perspective, but will be here at the Police Board so thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I definitely am in support of the amended by-law. Because I do karaoke, I practice my karaoke on the bus and hopefully it's not that offensive. Hopefully, it's not so offensive to people and I do ride the bus every day actually. I am the city councillor who rides the bus every day and I have firsthand knowledge of all these difficulties that drivers face as well as the passengers because the passengers, as well, are subjected to these violent people, people who have no consideration or respect for others. I could go on, I guess, but I don't want to go on too long. What I wanted to say is one of the amendments here, there wasn't really that much consultation in this by-law with the person with disabilities before I went ahead in terms of what the issues they may

have and, but I'd like to thank the head of Transit, Mr. Wardrop for listening to my concerns and one of the amendments here is to help assist so that people with disabilities are not blocked from seating near the front where there is a tag there that says, you know, you should give up the seat for a person with a disability or senior or whatever. I think that's very important. Things that may obstruct. It's my understanding on this by-law, the driver could ask or not allow a huge Cadillac carriage to come in and take up two accessible spaces when, you know, yes, everybody has the right to use the bus and it's great that strollers can come on and that sort of thing and it's more accessible, but, you know, really we all have to have respect for everybody's ability to use the bus. We want more passengers on the bus and many other passengers feel very threatened. So this by-law, it does make sense and I would point out that performance of singing or whatever performance you want, I do believe the head of Transit or the director of Transit has the ability to indicate or permit certain whatever, but you know, it wouldn't be good to have a loud band playing by the bus stop when someone is trying to listen to what routes are just coming up to the bus stop. So you know, those kind of things are there. So I think that's really well. When I ran in 2010 and I talked about foot patrol or community policing however you want to define it, I don't understand why, and maybe we should look at the parameters of this because we have a number of police officers doing foot patrol and the program works pretty good. But, you know, why do they have to just be walking on that patrol area? Why can't they ride the bus a little bit? Jump on the bus. Go to one end. Do the foot patrol back the other way. Somebody can jump on it and an officer can jump on it, for example, on a 16 Selkirk Avenue bus and cruise down to one end and they could walk the way back up as they're doing their duties as a police officer. You know, for me I think there are some ways and means to develop some way of having more police officers on the bus at least. You know, many people, when you have a uniformed officer get on the bus, those people who have the poor conduct, that conduct is not appreciated by anybody including the drivers. They basically stop. They get the picture of that at any point, they can get busted for this and I think that's very important. The final thing I will say is that in terms of this by-law, you know, there are a lot of people, we heard from a delegation who talked about turning away somebody and, you know, it could be somebody really poor in minus 30, and turning them away from it really take a bus to get somewhere is very difficult and I know that many people believe that somehow that is the Province's responsibility under Social Services, employment and income whatever, what have you and well, that is one consideration that, you know, you need to try to help those people so that they have bus fare. But, you know, I don't understand why and I tried to do this out of a little program and maybe we should look at this in the future to try to assist some of these people, because, you know, they can't work. If they don't have the money, they could, you know, there's a bus ticket loan program at the North Point Douglas Women's Centre and what happens is if you don't have money, you can come in there and you can get a bus ticket. I guess it'll be a new…some kind of new token that they'll have to offer under this program, but one of the things they can do is they can borrow and if they don't have money at certain point to pay the North Point Douglas Women's Centre, they can work it off by volunteering and doing something good for the community and minimum wage. We need to as the City of Winnipeg look at those kind of things to try to assist because we can do that. I don't know why we can't, but we really should be able to do that and I know a lot of people won't agree, but I just leave that out there. I'm voting for this by-law. It does say that you need to pay a bus fare to get on the bus and that's just the way it is and there are people who do abuse that. There are abusers who can pay and should pay to ride the bus and they violated, they're intimidating. We heard from a driver who's talking about that. I think some people chuckled it at the 300 pound person who said, you know, I'm not paying. Right? I understand that so, and that does happen. That's the reality, but so I just leave that out there. I think with the amendment, this is a great by-law. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think I will be supporting this. I'll be supporting the amendments. I appreciate the Transit Department coming up with them. I do want to make a couple of comments about kind of what went wrong here because it did kind of go sideways. Now, we've got it back on track. It's great. It's here because of the issue of safety for drivers and for passengers. That's something that's without a doubt necessary. We've heard the driver speaking this morning. If you actually take transit, you know if it is true or if your kids take transit, you hear these stories. There is a need to have order and to have the tools least so people know that order is expected and that's what this is aiming at doing. I don't know if people realize that there's a million rides a year on transit. That's a lot of people. Like we think, who cares about transit? It's only this whatever percentage. It's a lot of people that take the bus and use it. And so if we're going to make changes to transit service of any nature, bringing in the new fare system, bringing in the new transit by-law, even like this. I think there needed to be a better job of communication, consultation and education and I, you know, I think we have to admit that that could've been, should've been done better and I know we're rebuilding that department. We have a very tiny department of communication. There is obviously some work needs to be done there. This all, the singing issue broke out as I was my way out to the Winnipeg Folk Festival, so believe me, I didn't enjoy the continuous dialogue all weekend of why aren't you letting us sing at the Folk Festival. It's pretty funny. But I mean we're amending it. We're taking care of it, but I think it just illustrates the point that when you're talking about public transit, there's a lot of people affected and we need to consult with the community with disabilities. We need to consult with the transit riders. We need to educate the public and this by-law, was really about, which is a safety officers, new officers having the ability to enforce certain things, which we have to put in the by-law. You have to put in writing and that's what's happening here. I just also want to mention that the Canadian Urban Transit Association and FCM,

both organizations I'm very involved with and this Council moved a motion about stronger Federal legislation several years ago. We had a motion here about stronger federal legislation similar to what the Police have in terms of assault on drivers. That's something that's still is underway going through the Federal Government process. So there are other measures, but this is a real issue. Some of the issues were addressed in terms of the poverty issues then shelters, nothing is going to change in terms of our current discretionary processes about if somebody can't pay or is in trouble or any of those things, that it's just that if something really disruptive or upsetting is happening, the drivers have a route. They can call someone who can come and deal with the situation and they will have clear guidelines as to what to do. So I congratulate Councillor Mayes on working on this for a long time. I know he's been committed to it and the advocates from the transit union and drivers and others that have worked on this as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm a bit "verklempt" to finally get to the…what made it a finishing line on this. And I do want to speak for some time on this frankly. First person I'll…first person I want to thank is…first, there's a number of people to thank here, Jim Girden, who was the head of the Amalgamated Transit Union and John Callahan who is the head of the Amalgamated Transit Union and Chris Scott has been sitting here for nine hours, I think, who is taking John's place, because John's not here, former driver's dad was a driver, he's here and I want to come back to that later on. So there have been three different unions involved in this. It has been a long route. I want to congratulate Mike Sutherland who, as the Mayor indicated several hours ago, was involved in some discussions on this as we had to sort through and WAPSO as well as been involved in some discussion on this. Want to thank a couple of pretty…I want to thank the drivers who came down here as well. You know, I offered to introduce any of the people on Facebook, the hundreds of people who are all concerned about singing. I said, "Come down and meet the drivers. Come and meet them, come." Unfortunately, none of them agreed to do that, but I was very pleased we had the drivers here to put their story, to put this back in focus, to put this in perspective. There are a couple of intelligent women I would like to thank, my wife because I was ranting about this a lot last week when people started to think it was the singing by-law and it's the Transit security by-law. It's a serious business, not a joking matter and I want to thank Councillor Gerbasi who has been a great champion of this cause as well and in recent days when I expressed my frustrations with the way this thing went sideways and people focusing on the singing and the line was let it go. That doesn't matter. What matter is what we've done, what we're doing, what we're doing is getting the cadets, getting the cadets on the buses and that does matter. There's an article from a couple of years ago here in the Free Press that starts with Roy Martin could hear his bones break when the bottle of beer smashed into his face and it's a long article about transit drivers and the...what they faced and I've been to a bunch of meetings with a bunch of different drivers and heard a lot of stories that are like that, people getting assaulted and you heard it here. I don't want to get into that too much either. You know, people are saying we should lose our jobs because we missed the word singing. Well, I've apologized already saying, "Yeah, I missed the word singing because I was focused on the main stuff which was the transit safety stuff and I would point out one of the news organs that says I should lose my job because of the singing thing at a front page article spelling my name b-r-y-a-n, Madam Speaker, really not that hard to research the issue. Everybody can make the occasional mistake, even the people in the media. So yes, we missed the word, singing, it's been dealt with today thanks to Councillor Swandel and again Councillor Gerbasi who's been a very good to work with on this issue. What's the problem? What's the…is the issue the singing, no. The issue is not the singing. The issue is the problem that you heard before the drivers and their issues and all of the work we had to do with Dave Sauer, the three unions involved to get to this point. We are doing some good work here. We're doing the inspectors, we increased that by 50% in the last budget, a main reason I voted for the last budget, we are hopefully getting the cadets on and I want salute Councillor Fielding's been quite willing to talk about this. He said that the cadets should be doing the work. There are budget issues. Maybe we can't get them on until January 1st. We'll talk about that next week, but that's a funding issue. The core concept here is the getting the principle for the first time, for the first time we face it here today getting the cadets on the buses. So, you know, people, people have one day of fun with this, I think, and that's versus a lifetime of pain for a lot of the drivers. I've met with a lot of drivers who have PTSD. They can't work anymore. There's a fellow, Brian from the Interlake who came in and talked about some of the issues he's had to deal with due to the stresses he's faced, and it was…it wasn't a laughing meeting, it wasn't a lot of fun. It was a pretty serious meeting to see there grown men, some of whom are here today in tears at that meeting. So I think that's important for the public to keep that in mind that this has been a very long battle by a lot of different people, not just me, a lot of different people to get to this point. So you know, it's…it's…I want to end by saying a couple of things. It's not a singing by-law. It's Roy Martin's life. He's the fellow in the article who could hear the beer bottle smashing against his face. It's not a singing by-law. It's James Van Gerwen's life. You heard him here talking earlier today about getting smashed in. It's not a singing by-law. It's Chris Scott's life, he's here, he's a former driver. He's telling me how his dad got assaulted when his dad was a driver. So, you know what, it's not a singing by-law. It's about people's lives, it's about people's lives and safety and proud to have championed this and urge everyone to support it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you very much, Councillor Mayes. Councillor Smith on the same item.

Councillor Smith: I support this wholeheartedly, but I have a question. In the material, it says…I'm just trying to find the…bear with me for a second..18.3, fail to obey a rule made by the director. Can you explain what that's all about?

Madam Speaker: That would be Councillor Swandel in his close.

Councillor Smith: I'd like to understand why that's in.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Swandel to close.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you for all the wonderful commentary audit. I'll sort of go through this as we've listened to it and, you know, I think Councillor Mayes put the emphasis on the point that this is about safety and protection. It's not about some of the frivolous things that were picked up. It's not the first time we've seen that, not just in this city, but in other cities. What we're trying to do is some very important work than some people who just get it, choose to go off on a different tangent. So it's…that was good context to put this around. As for the funding, Councillor Fielding, he was talking about funding and how we keep this going forward. We will find a way to keep this going forward. It's a budget process issue. We know there's a complication there, budget process dealing with the Police and the Police Board and how that happens. We will find a way. That's, you know, that's what we have to do and that's what we will do. And we will also find a way to make sure everybody that these could be looked after, gets looked after whether it's somebody in a bus shelter or somebody needs to get on the bus because they've got to get to some urgent need, and we would hope that our drivers would err on the side of caution rather than getting into a debate about whether not somebody is worthy of…getting that special consideration. With regard to the clause mentioned by Councillor Smith, I think it means exactly what it says, where the director's made a rule that they will be able to be enforced. That's what that means. I don't know how much clearer that can be. But that's what that means. That concludes my comments on this clause.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will now vote on the motion, Motion 5. We're just voting on the motion first, yeah, just voting on the motion. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now, we'll vote on the by-law as amended. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Thank you.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: Okay, we now have Motion 3 from Councillor Havixbeck and Councillor Mayes. This is regarding transit day passes. It will be an automatic referral to Public Works.

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Havixbeck,
Moved by Councillor Mayes,

WHEREAS many cities within North America offer residents and visitors the ability to purchase a one day buss pass;

AND WHEREAS with 2.8 million visitors per year, a daily bus pass would serve as a convenience for travelers who choose to visit Winnipeg;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg Public Service prepare a written report back to Council about costs and the feasibility of implementing a day pass for transit riders.

Madam Speaker: Motion No. 7 is from Councillor Wyatt seconded by Councillor Fielding. This is on the capital integration project and this is a notice of motion, and will be dealt with next council meeting in September.

Motion No. 7
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Fielding,

THAT Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated June 3, 2014, (Capital Integration Project - Southwest Transitway (Stage 2) and Pembina Highway Underpass), which was adopted by Council on June 25, 2014, be revisited, and that the recommendations adopted be amended by adding an additional recommendation as follows:

A) That the final award for the South West Transitway (stage 2) and the Pembina Highway Underpass project be approved by City Council.

B) That the Public Service, prior to the awarding of any final awards, report to Council on a breakdown of the Capital Integration Project , for the intent of Council funding approvals, on the following basis, namely:

i) The Bus Rapid Transit Corridor and all associated costs; and
ii) The Pembina Underpass and all associated costs; and
iii) Land Drainage works and sanitary works as well as associated costs, including how those costs relate to developer paybacks.

C) That said breakdown reporting, as cited in B) be subject to committee/ Council reporting, including but not limited to quarterly Finance Committee budget status reports.

Madam Speaker: We'll now move on to by-laws. Councillor Swandel.

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

Councillor Swandel: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just so that we're aware as I do this, By-law No. 89/2014 will be as amended as we just moved the amendment on that by-law so I will move By-law No. 87/2014, By-law No. 88/2014 and By-law No. 89/2014, just 89 was amended and By-law No. 91/2014 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 87/2014, By-law No. 88/2014, By-law No. 89/2014 as amended and By-law No. 91/2014.

Councillor Swandel: Madam Speaker, I will move that By-laws numbered 87 to 89 both inclusive and 89 as amended and 91/2014 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed?

Councillor Eadie: Can you record me as opposed to 91, please.

Madam Speaker: So noted. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 87/2014 to 89/2014 as amended and By-law 91/2014.

Councillor Swandel: Madam Speaker, I will move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 87/2014 to 89/2014 with 89 being amended both inclusive and 91/2014 be read a third time and that same be ordered and signed and sealed…to be signed, be ordered to be signed and sealed. It's getting to the end of the day I think.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. So noted. We now have walk on by-laws for this committee. Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Madam Speaker, I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-law numbered 96/2014 and the By-law of the City of Winnipeg to amend the Reduced Speed School Zones By-Law 76/2014 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 96/2014.

Councillor Swandel: I'll move that By-law No. 96/2014 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 96/2014.

Councillor Swandel: I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 96/2014 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Move on to Question Period. Any questions for the Chair? Seeing none.

Councillor Swandel: I'll move adjournment.

Madam Speaker: Seeing none, Councillor Steen will move adjournment. I wish you all the best during the prorogue period. Enjoy some time with your families. Roll call, Madam Clerk?

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 5:28 p.m.