COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, February 25, 2015

The Council met at 9:39 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 Eadie.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Dobson, Eadie, Gerbasi, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Schreyer and Wyatt.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'd like to introduce our Page for today's meeting. Katrina Chanas is here with us today. Katrina is a student of Miles Macdonell Collegiate and she resides in the North Kildonan Ward. Welcome. Mr. Mayor, I understand you have several announcements to make today.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And good morning everyone, good morning everyone in the gallery and those watching online. As we commence our February Council meeting, I'd like to welcome everyone attending in the gallery and watching online. Earlier this month, as many of you know, I attended the Big City Mayors Summit in Toronto. It really was an invaluable opportunity to connect with 18 Mayors from Canada's largest cities including Mayor Tory of Toronto, Mayor Gregor Robertson of Vancouver, Mayor Nenshi of Calgary and Mayor Ivason of Edmonton, just to name a few, to discuss the issues facing some of Canada's biggest cities. In fact, many of the cities in Canada share the very same issues and challenges that we face here including funding revenues. We need to re-examine the way cities are funded. They should no longer be the small child of Confederation. At the summit, we discussed the three big priorities for cities ahead of the next Federal election including infrastructure, public transit and housing: three priorities for Winnipeggers and Winnipeg as well. Infrastructure, public transit and housing are key issues when it comes to building a growing, thriving, more modern city and I'm certain that the connections and discussions over the summit will play a part in Winnipeg's plans to move forward. As well, Madam Speaker, February is "I Love to Read Month" and as many of you know there's nothing quite like sharing a good book. City Hall has had the pleasure of hosting some students recently from Faraday School for a great tour and story session. And I know many of the members of Winnipeg City Council have also visited numerous schools in their wards to read with the students and I'd like to commend and thank my Council colleagues for those that are taken the time to meet with our younger Winnipeggers to teach them, really, the joy and beauty of reading. I'd also like to thank the many schools and students who have invited us to come and read with them. It's been fun to share some great stories and our love for reading with students from around Winnipeg. I'd also like to note that I'm wearing a pink shirt today and I'm thrilled so many of my Council colleagues are also wearing pink in some form or another today. It's a national day, Pink Shirt Day, it's a national campaign to take a stand against bullying. My pink shirt was purchased from London Drugs because the net proceeds benefit The Boys and Girls Clubs of Winnipeg and their anti-bullying programs. But, any pink shirt shows support for the cause. So I would encourage all Winnipeggers that might be watching this online or reading tweets, put on some pink today and in future years and support a great cause. Everyone deserves to feel safe and we have a responsibility to work together; treat each other with respect and care and stand up and say no to bullying and discrimination in our community and in our schools, our post-secondary institutions and in our work places. A strong community supports and celebrates each other in our uniqueness, differences and diversity and we have seen that Winnipeg is a compassionate community that comes together to face challenges head on. I encourage everyone to take a stand against bullying, whether that means wearing a pink shirt today to show they are a safe support or by practicing extra compassion at school or in the work place or simply by extending kindness to strangers. You know, sometimes the smallest acts of kindness make a big impact on someone's day and even in their lives and a pink shirt can make a small difference. I'd also like to note that this weekend is the closing ceremonies for the 2015 Canada Winter Games in Prince George, British Columbia. And I know that many young athletes are representing Winnipeg and Manitoba there and have trained diligently for the opportunity to compete among their peers from other provinces. And I'm proud to attend the 2015 Canada Winter Games Closing Ceremonies on March 1. As a proud sports city that throws a celebration like no other, Winnipeg is looking forward to hosting the Canada Summer Games in 2017, which also coincide with the 50th Anniversary of the Canada Games and our Nation's 150th birthday. It'll undoubtedly be the an unforgettable event for Winnipeg as Host City and for all competitors, coaches, judges, volunteers and really everyone involved in our community to make it happen. And speaking of unforgettable events, it's amazing that one year after the team's gold medal win in 2014 Winter Olympics in Sochi that

Team Jones, Team Canada has done it again. I'd like to offer Team Jones a huge congratulations on their thrilling gold medal win on Sunday against Alberta's Val Sweeting at the Scotties Tournament of Hearts. This is their 5th Scotties Tournament of Hearts win and the 11th time a Manitoba Team has won the Canadian Women's Curling Championship. I'd like to extend best wishes for luck and success at the upcoming Zen-noh Women's Curling Championships, in Sapporo, Japan and in all of the competitions until the teams return next February in Grande Prairie, Alberta as Team Canada at the 2016 Scotties. Winnipeg and especially your fellow curlers at your home club, St. Vital Curling Club are so very proud of your accomplishments. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Wyatt: Sorry, Madam Speaker. Just wanted to follow up on the Mayor. I just wanted to note a personal note that further to the Canada Winter Games, my…a young lady by the name of Taylor Wyatt was part of the Manitoba Ringette Team that won gold, my niece which…yes, which is indisputable proof that the athletic gene does skip generations. I want to note that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Schreyer, did you have your hand raised?

Councillor Schreyer: Oh, sorry. Just mentioning that…

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. We'll now move on.

MINUTES

Councillor Dobson moves the minutes from January 28, 2015 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Madam Speaker: Next is delegations.

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: First up we have Mr. Ken Guilford. Mr. Guilford, you are here with us today? Mr. Guilford is in support of Item 2 of the report of EPC dated February 18th, 2015 regarding the 311 audit. Welcome.

Ken Guilford: Good morning, all. Mr. Mayor, City Councillors and people in the audience. I am in favour of 311 because I have dealt with it, I work with it and I work with other people who don't feel that 311 is good because they can't get on. What I'm saying you try after 9:00 at night if you are up late or the alternative is to send an e-mail to 311@winnipeg.ca. I've done it many times and I work with the operators or whatever you call them until 1:00 o'clock in the morning. And always ask for a phone number and then you can date it back and talk about it. And I like to work with them and when I come up town one day, Portage and Sherbrook one day, to my surprise, a whole bunch of construction going on, road building whatever, and I was happy and I was sad because…And then I would like to say that I am in favour of 311. I think that's a great deal and I think that it's great to have such a thing in place and whoever thought of it, I'd like to talk to him and again thank you very much for your attention. Thank you. Any questions?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Guilford? Okay. Seeing none, I'll ask you to step down and you can return to the gallery. Thank you for coming out today. Thank you. Next, we have Mr. David Sanders in opposition to the two expropriation items from the report of PD dated February 17th, 2015. Welcome, Mr. Sanders.

David Sanders: Madam Speaker, my name is David Sanders and I have asked to appear this morning as a private citizen to speak in opposition to the two listed agenda items that is the expropriation of lands for two projects. They consist of recommendations that City Council approve the expropriation of private lands required to proceed with the Parker Lands, Manitoba Hydro Corridor for Stage 2 of what was once intended to be the southwest rapid transit corridor, extending the present busway south from the Pembina/Jubilee interchange to the vicinity of the University of Manitoba. You will note that the southwest transit way is no longer designated as rapid. Next week, it will be two years since I first discovered that the City's long standing rapid transit plan was being hijacked and that public lands and financial resources were being diverted for the benefit of a few favoured developers located along the Parker dog leg to the west

of the original route which was supposed to go straight south along the CN Letellier rail line beside Pembina Highway. As I began to investigate and to criticize the City's decisions related to this scheme, I found an atmosphere and a culture of the upper echelons of City Hall which was deeply disturbing to me as a citizen and offensive to me as a long time professional public administrator. I saw gross incompetence, mismanagement and misconduct of the types which are documented fully in the $1 million worth of audit reports which were subsequently ordered for the Fire Paramedic Station Construction Project, the New Police Headquarters Redevelopment Project and the real estate management review, and which have been referred to the RCMP by the Minister of Justice. I found a City Council whose members were generally unwilling to question senior administrators or to demand compliance with Council directives and who were there unfortunately complicit in the final results. Understandably, most of the former Councillors seemed happy to sweep every fiasco under the very lumpy rug on this Council floor. But that was then and this is now. It appears that all members of the new Council campaigned last fall on platforms involving greater openness, transparency and ethical behaviour at City Hall and accordingly I'm now asking that Council defer voting on these expropriations this morning until after the City publishes the various reports which purport to explain and justify these projects. But which have been withheld from Council and the general public so far. And in particular, Mayor Bowman's election platform document stated and I quote, "As Mayor, Bowman will lead and work with Council to ensure that the discretionary exemptions under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, FIPPA, will not be used to block the release of information. City Hall information that can be legally shared will be shared with Winnipeggers. Its release should not be an option to be decided by the political establishment at City Hall." And continuing with the quote, "We have a City Hall where it seems as if decisions are being made and presented to the Council as done deals", said Bowman. There is little opportunity for the Council, let alone the public, to voice their concerns or participate in debate. This has to change." He went on and asserted that the Winnipeggers are not as engaged as they could be and right now many roadblocks exist in simply accessing public information from City Hall. And I quote, "City Hall lacks consistency in allowing the public to be heard with respect to policy development or decision making that affects how we live, work and play", said Mayor Bowman. Assuming that the Mayor meant what he said, I wrote to him eight weeks ago on January 1, 2015 and asked that he arrange to release the critical reports regarding the projects in question this morning, which I had requested last May. My requests had all been denied by the Winnipeg Transit Department using the discretionary exemptions under FIPPA. I have appealed those denials to the Ombudsman who is still continuing to investigate my complaints. These are absolutely essential reports including the HTR Incorporated cost benefit analysis and the Deloitte Value for Money Assessment used to justify the $1.1 billion investment in Stage 2 of the transitway as well as the conceptual designs for the Cockburn-Calrossie combined sewer relief works and the Pembina Highway underpass. All of this information should've been published last year to comply with Provincial P3 project legislation. When I received no substantive reply to my e-mail to the Mayor, I appeared at Executive Policy Committee last Wednesday and asked him for his response to my January 1 request, face-to-face. And I was most surprised and deeply disappointed when he simply advised that my request had been forwarded to the City Clerk's office, which had already told me that they would be best just to wait the Ombudsman's report. Now, yesterday there was a glimmer of hope when the City decided to release the full text of the Stantec Core Fire Hall Access Management Study which was originally prepared in April, 2011. That traffic study was produced almost four years ago. Following the denial of the Canadian Tax Federation's Access to Information request and an ombudsman report recommending release in May of 2013, the City did provide a censored copy of the Stantec report omitting all of the access and traffic analysis and the conclusions and recommendations. But now, as of yesterday, we have the full report. We can see why the responsible Civic administrators wanted to suppress it. The censored material included the professional traffic engineers conclusion that and I quote, "locating a development of any kind within an interchange does not comply with industry accepted standards regarding traffic operations and traffic safety interchanges are areas of high complexity where drivers with multiple on/off ramps and weaving areas. Introduction of development accesses within these areas has the potential to create serious safety and operational problems." That was censored. Yesterday, the City's present senior administrators hastened to point out that there have been no safety issues during the past year of operation of the Fire Hall in the Route 90 interchange. Lucky for them so far. But absolutely no excuse for withholding and covering up the full study report from Council and the public for the past four years. So does the release of the Stantec report mean the Mayor's campaign promise will be implemented after all? Will we now see the critical reports on the southwest transitway and related projects? Yesterday afternoon, I received a letter from the Acting CAO which says in part and I quote, "the City now recognizes that its initial response to your FIPPA request did not adequately consider or apply the discretionary exemptions disclosure under the Act." Accordingly, the City has decided to revisit the records responsive to your request and engage in a more rigorous analysis identifying more specifically which discretionary exemptions to disclosure authorized by FIPPA are applicable in exercising its discretion and determining whether to release portions of the record despite the fact that they are permitted to be withheld. The requested records are voluminous and have implications for at least five City departments. Accordingly, it'll take some time to conduct the analysis required. Nevertheless we hope to have this work completed and a new response provided to you (me) by March 13 of 2015." And I suppose this sounds like progress. It's only one year since I requested these basic documents, not four years. However, I simply fail to understand why any further analysis required before releasing those documents which have already been submitted to the Federal government, which should have been released last spring to comply with Provincial law and which will include any evidence, which might serve to justify Council's decisions to proceed with this ill-advised scheme. The City can't be trying to keep the

proposed land acquisitions confidential. The acquisitions are all described in detail in the reports on this morning's agenda. What we are missing is any solid evidence and argument for proceeding with the most expensive capital project in Winnipeg's history. If Council continues to approve plans and budgets and expropriations without reviewing the business case for this scheme and eventually it blows up like the Fire Halls, the Police headquarters, the 30 or more real estate transactions, the Convention Centre, hotel, and others yet to come…there's more. It will be your responsibility. I know you all will be preoccupied shortly with the upcoming 2015 budgets. So please, I ask you to defer these expropriations this morning until you can review the uncensored analysis of the justifications for these proposed projects. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Sanders. We'll take questions at this time. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, thank you. You accused us of hijacking the original plan for the benefit of a few favourite developers by moving the proposed rapid transitway to the west. That of course was a report endorsed both by the Province and the University of Manitoba, so just for the record, did we hijack and bamboozle the University of Manitoba and the Province in our plot to benefit a few developers or would they…did they come to that conclusion themselves that they also wanted to benefit the developers since you are accusing us of hijacking a plan to benefit a few developers basically accusing us at a pretty profound corruption here. Please answer that question.

David Sanders: First of all, I have seen nothing in writing from the University of Manitoba. Secondly, when I inquired to the Province, they advised me that they were simply going along with the City's request.

Councillor Mayes: So all the written reports claiming that our part of the bamboozlement strategy then I take…

David Sanders: I'm sorry?

Councillor Mayes: All of the written reports issued over several years from the City saying that it's a joint…it was a joint committee that came up with the plan to go with the dog leg, all of that is simply our doing to benefit a few developers? Just trying to get your position.

David Sanders: I believe the record will show who was involved in making decisions to divert the route along the Parker dog leg that it was approved by the former Council.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, the record shows…

David Sanders: But it was not the idea...

Councillor Mayes: The record shows that it was a three-way decision, but you're saying it wasn't because people voted somewhere else.

David Sanders: Well, the record shows it was a nine to six vote by the former Council.

Councillor Mayes: My second question is this which is you've been pretty clear on election promises. Just for the record, you ran obviously, you were nipped by about 43 percent at the post…on the election results for Mayor. Do you think there was any confusion in the public when the Mayor who did win said that there was no option, that he was proceeding with the dog leg route? You seem to have a lot of election quotes here. Do you think the public was clear on endorsing the dog leg route when they voted for the Mayor who was pretty clear in his platform as was the second place finisher in her platform on how to proceed? Obviously, you didn't succeed…that doesn't seem to enter into your discussion here of what was said during the election. Can you please clarify? Do you think the public was bamboozled in the recent election campaign and fooled or hijacked in their support for a dog leg proposal?

David Sanders: I can find no reference to the Parker dog leg in the Mayor's 40 page platform. I can't find reference to completing all six of these transit corridors and in the very announcement put out with the Federal and Provincial and City governments the other day: a map and the attachments, the backgrounder provided by the City and the other governments, shows the route directly down the Letellier/Pembina route as originally planned and doesn't even show the Parker dog leg.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Councillor Orlikow and please bring your questions through the chair. Thank you.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just my questions just for clarification, there was a comment made that Council hasn't gone through the business case, the value for money reports, is that what…that's what the speaker is stating?

David Sanders: To my knowledge, all Council has seen is a summary without the supporting data and not the complete documents.

Councillor Orlikow: So I can tell the…I can just clarify that for the speaker, Madam Chair that yes, I personally have seen all the documents and read through them, 17, 15 times, itemized it, the Director of Transit, plus, the Director of Planning. Any Director has diligently responded to my queries about it so that is the report that I have seen and is available to Councillors to go read. It's not available to the public, but again, Council has those documents and has reviewed them. I still do have some questions, however, the documents are there. The data is there, it's just the public hasn't been able to access that data. That's my understanding of what the issue is, not that Council hasn't seen that data.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer, you have a question for the delegation?

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A question from Mr. Sanders regarding his comment that Winnipeg Transit Department denied responses under FIPPA…but it's my understanding, Madam Speaker, that the issues involved weren't just under the Transit Department, they…it was multi-pronged issue here. We're talking many departments working together to create this, and on that basis I just want to get a clear understanding from Mr. Sanders, is he saying that Winnipeg Transit Department denied the information on behalf of all the departments of the City involved under the FIPPA application?

David Sanders: In response to my requests for access to information, I received…there were two sets of requests. I received two letters, both from the Access to Information Coordinator for the Winnipeg Transit Department, responding to all of the requests on behalf of the City.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Well, perhaps…I'm new here, but I just want to know if, Madam Speaker, if he was surprised by that. I'm a little confused in terms of the process. I assume these FIPPA requests have to be responded from each department. Perhaps Mr. Sanders can comment on that, but of course, there would be more people to talk about or to talk to about that as well, but I would like a response from Mr. Sanders.

David Sanders: Well, I have to say I was surprised because one of the documents I requested had nothing whatsoever to do with Transit and yet it was the Transit Department who replied to that request.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, you're next.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So I just want to be clear about the decision on their route, Madam Speaker, in terms of…we decided on where the Phase 2 Rapid Transit Corridor would follow prior to any decision to move ahead with application and so on for money. We made a separate decision, Madam Speaker and there was a report provided to Councillors that talked about how Winnipeg Transit worked…the City of Winnipeg worked with the Province of Manitoba to determine which of three optional routes to take and they did a financial analysis and did a number of things and including the feasibility of going down the Letellier line, I guess it is, and crossings and so on and there was a whole analysis, Madam Speaker. So, what I want to just clarify here is, is Mr. Sanders clear though, when the Province says they are going with the City of Winnipeg's recommendation, they participated in coming up with that recommendation.

David Sanders: I understand there was some sort of joint committee, but no idea how often it met, who attended it and whether there were any decisions other than the statement that the Province is supportive of the City in this matter and continuously.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Eadie? No? Any further questions for the delegation? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to ask Mr. Sanders if he is satisfied with the sources of information on this and the process of those sources. What I mean, Madam Speaker, is my understanding when it comes to large scale engineering projects, and this being as Mr. Sanders says, the largest capital project in the history of Winnipeg or modern Winnipeg. This is a huge undertaking. This dwarfs the police station and issues like this and on

this basis when we are talking about mega engineering projects, we need stamped engineering reports. This is my understanding of how the industry works and how we pay for mega…I'm not talking about building a road or paving a road which is a million dollars a mile by the way, you know, in rural Manitoba. We are talking about a hundred million dollars a mile for five miles. My understanding is we need stamped engineering reports. That's my understanding. Maybe I'm wrong. But I…geese, it's hard for me, Madam Speaker, to vote for something that's going to cost a hundred million dollars a mile when we don't have stamped engineering reports. Since Mr. Sanders is here, I would like to get his opinion on his understanding, having been a provincial administrator, in terms of the quality of sources of information when it comes to such gargantuan and that term, Madam Speaker, in this case, isn't, you know, well, it's an apt, application of the word. What he thinks in terms of his confidence in terms of the sources of this information.

David Sanders: In response, I would refer you to my presentation to Council on March the 6th, 2013 with regard to the alignment in which I examine the report that the engineers have been provided which in my view was seriously, very seriously flawed. I set out in five pages, criticisms of that report. Serious ones and I refer you to them and ask you to look through them, ask yourself whether this is an appropriate basis for a decision. And then I would say to you, ask for the HDR Incorporated cost benefit analysis and have the nerve to publish it so people actually understand cost benefit analysis, can have a chance to advise you. The very report says that the Pembina Highway underpass is a cost benefit of .72. That means every dollar you spend you only get back 72 cents.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Sanders. That ends the question period unless someone like to suspend the rules. Councillor Mayes…put two more minutes on the clock. Councillor Mayes, you have a question?

Councillor Mayes: Can you tell us by name in the interests of openness and transparency, the names of the developers, the few favoured developers, your plural, which favoured developers, are we favouring by hijacking the route. Please provide names. That's your allegation.

David Sanders: Yes, the…as far as I know, the owners…they start with a numbered company whose address is B & M Lands, referred to usually as Gem Equities for it's the principal I gather is Andrew Marquess, the land swap, Parker lands for Fort Rouge Yards and the other developer adjacent to this development is Shindico for the Taylor lands on the north side of the CNR line and which does not require any storm drainage if this project goes ahead as planned. And which there is discussion of access at some future point for the rapid transit corridor.

Councillor Mayes: Now, you're accusing us of hijacking $490 million in public money to benefit Gem Equities and Shindico. Do you have any actual documentation, any reference, any e-mails, any correspondence that would support what's really a pretty serious, criminal allegation on your part that you're making here in public, that we are hijacking a route to benefit Shindico and Gem Equities. Do you have evidence? Do you have any actual emails or correspondence to support that allegation?

David Sanders: First of all, I have not made a criminal allegation. I referred to the City hijacking it and I'm referring particular to former senior administrators.

Councillor Mayes: You are making a criminal allegation that the former City administrators hijacked a $490 million project.

David Sanders: I'm not making a criminal allegation, but I'm looking forward to the RCMP report on the Parker land swap.

Councillor Mayes: Your term is hijacked. Your term is for the benefit of a few developers, few favoured developers, but you're saying there is nothing criminal about that.

David Sanders: Pardon.

Councillor Mayes: You're saying there's nothing criminal about that.

David Sanders: Remains to be seen.

Councillor Mayes: Okay, so you are making a criminal allegation that the Council is trying to benefit Shindico and Gem Equities.

Madam Speaker: That ends question period. Thank you, Mr. Sanders for appearing today. Thank you.

David Sanders: Thank you, Madam

Madam Speaker: Moving on to the next delegation which is Mr. Mike Davidson in support of Item 1 of the report of the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Committee dated February 10th, 2015 regarding the snow clearing review. Welcome Mr. Davidson.

Mike Davidson: Good morning, everyone, Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor and Councillors. Just to start off, I realize that there's not…a lot of new faces on Council and I realize as well, Local 500 realizes that this Council has inherited a lot of challenges. So in my comments today, I don't mean to be disrespectful when I'm referring to some past decisions. So just keep that in mind, please. And Local 500 of course is in favour of the snow clearing motion that has been outlined and we support the motion. We know that the citizens of Winnipeg want/deserve timely and effective snow clearing services. They consider this a core City service. In fact, top quality services needed and tested most when weather conditions are harsh as we witnessed last year. Even the Firefighters Union expressed their deep concern that failed snow clearing in some situations can result in serious safety issues for Winnipeggers in terms of reduced response times to emergencies. Additionally, MPI reported drastic increases in collision and accidents due to poor road conditions last year. The City needs to review its snow clearing practices including a review of the continued use of contracted snow clearing services. We would also like to mention that one of the problems we've encountered more and more has been the reluctance on part of the City to share costing data and information in general. We hope this trend has finally come to an end and we look forward to working together to provide the very best services to the citizens of Winnipeg we both serve. I'm sure many of you read in depth the Free Press story last year by Dan Lett from January 25th, 2014 titled "epic fail" or "perfect storm" which gave somewhat of a fair analysis of how the weather events of December of that year and early January of last year unfolded and I think the story, the reason I put it in our presentation here today as well, I think it encapsulates a lot of this whole issue and that's just simply the fact that there's not enough data to make any sort of analysis related to cost or quality comparators between the private contractors and the public operators and this is something that we should all be concerned about. CUPE Local 500 was in receipt of a freedom of information request that we submitted in the fall of 2013. The response to this request is quite troubling and we requested copies of any reports or analysis comparing in-house snow removal verses contracted out snow removal. The time frame for this request is from January 1, 1998 to the present and we received the following response: "the Public Works Department does not maintain performance, productivity measures on private verses in-house snow clearing contracts, primarily due to the way in which operations are designed." So we do have a big concern about that and it continued to say, "the different approaches to service delivery prevent this type of comparative analysis or reporting requested." So as I mentioned in my remarks at both the standing committee and EPC committee, despite snow clearing being a core service, the City has not even attempted to review or compare private verses public snow clearing in nearly 17 years. They say it's not possible. But from when we filed that, you know, this might even go back four years. I think it's fair to say that we need some type of comparator. This is a…it's a huge cost item and to look at this objectively I think is very much needed. And on December 17th, 2013, Local 500 provided a brief to City Council on the operating budget. At this presentation, we noted that the operational review of Public Works released in June 2013 highlighted the fact that snow removal which is 80 percent contracted out, is one area of Public Works where costs exceed those of peer cities. The report further recommended that the City review the cost of contracted verses in-house snow and ice services. Our FIPPA, in addition to the recommendations of the Public Work review proved that not only does the City fail to act on its own reports, but it's failed to act responsibly to review, analyze and present alternatives to the contracted service that makes them 80 percent of our snow clearing. Local 500 continues to remain that publicly delivered snow clearing can provide good value and higher quality of services to the citizens of Winnipeg. We have heard that some opponents to snow clearing are concerned that the City will have to buy new equipment, take on the cost of depreciation and will bear any additional costs associated with the service. But the reality is we're already paying for this. Contractors factor in the cost of equipment, staffing and depreciation into the contracts which we pay for in addition to whatever profit margin they're seeking. We know that Winnipeggers have concerns about the current state of the City's snow clearing service. They care about quality, the quality of the job and they care about it being the best bang for their buck. The local will continue to reach out to Winnipeggers to hear experiences with snow clearing. We know that they want their voices heard. At the end of the day we all want better services for our City. We strongly urge Council to take seriously our position that snow clearing in Winnipeg should be phased back in-house. And I'd just like to add to that too. The City of Winnipeg is a good employer who provides good training, make sure that every employee has valid drivers' licences, follows health and safety rules and what are the costs to manage all these contracts, to manage control of the field operations to…who's monitoring the equipment to make sure that it's road worthy and it's safe? These are all questions that I think have merit and I think that they deserve to be answered. Thank you for listening to me today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions? I see some hands, Councillor Gerbasi followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thank you, through you to the delegation, very much for the presentation. This has been an issue we have been talking about for a long time and I also share the frustration that we are not doing the evidence-based collection of information to be able to make an informed decision about these services. It's a hundred percent contracted out and or virtually and we don't have the comparative data any way to

compare those two things and that's a huge problem. Do you have some advice in terms of…or experience in terms of CUPE doing some research or other research that's out there on what has happened in other Canadian cities that have faced similar challenges? I have heard other cities that have moved…moved things back in-house. Is that information that's available that might help with this process?

Mike Davidson: Well, we know that in a lot of municipalities, we did get the comparator that what's snow clearing is costing here compared to other peer cities. That should be an alarm bell right there. But until we really get the figures that we need…the data that we need to do a true cost analysis, we don't know what our operation is really costing us. So I think before we can come to decisions on where we want to move in terms of what a ratio should be, I mean, even back in the 1960s and the 1970s, there was always a complement of private contractors that would help out in an all-out plow. That always has existed and somehow that changed. We know that a lot of municipalities have brought the service back in-house because of cost and to keep public control of the service and I think that Winnipeg should have a good look at that. They should…we should get the data and we should have a good look at that, but that's true, in a lot of municipalities, there's more of a ratio, but the evidence is pretty clear, our costs are higher compared to other peer cities. Just based on that we should have an analysis of what's going on here.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: And we talk about this in terms of cost and obviously cost is the big driving issue here, but do you think this analysis should also include level of service and the impact of the availability of the private sector at times if we don't have the capacity to deal with the things that are happening in our City.

Mike Davidson: Oh, absolutely. I think that we have to look at that. We also have to look at what is the cost of the damage to publicly owned property such as curbs. A lot of our members in the past that worked in Streets, they knew how a back lane bent for example or street curb, and because of that, they were very good operators in the sense they knew what they were plowing. I think the other thing that has to be taken into consideration is the simple fact that if your property gets damaged for whatever reason, are you dealing with the City at that point or are you dealing with the contractor? I think our finding so far indicated that the citizens of Winnipeg want to be dealing with the City of Winnipeg. They don't want to be dealing with the contractor, so and that's what we call loss of public control. I think the citizens of Winnipeg want public control over a very core service. We live in Winnipeg. We get a lot of snow and that hasn't changed throughout history, 50s, the 60s, the 70s, people want good snow clearing. People want to be able to drive down the street and not get stuck and we want our emergency vehicles to be able to do what they need to do, to put fires out; to get people to hospitals and because of that, we should take this very seriously.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. After the winter of 2013, 2014, totally unusual winter, there was some analysis done of the problems that were occurring and Council had a recommendation and voted in September and I'm just…in September on shrinking some of the zones, as well as increasing and going to longer term contracts so that the private sector could deal with their equipment problems and make sure that they had the appropriate equipment. So my question is: is this delegation aware of that decision that was made in September of 2014 to move ahead and negotiate a longer term agreement so that these private sector companies could actually buy equipment to do a proper job?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Davidson?

Mike Davidson: Well, I think one way or another we're already paying for that equipment. When a contractor bids, they factor in all those costs including the price of the equipment that's...they know what they are doing. So we are paying for that new equipment one way or another.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Eadie, anything further? Okay, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much again for your presentation. You came before IRPW and EPC and we appreciated hearing from you. And both of the committees moved it onto here and I will be supporting a motion that comes forward today to move it on. I appreciate your comments and through the KPMG study that was done of Public Works, it was deemed that there is a very great efficiency in the Public Works Department. We will look at this; Public Works will look at this. We expressed working together on this going forward. I understand you have a website that's up and data that you're collecting. It would be great if you'd be able to share it with the City also and going forward, you know, we'll work together on this and obviously, I really don't think that people care who plows the snow. I think people care what they are paying for it and the level of service and I look forward to working together with everyone on this.

Mike Davidson: Well, thank you for your comments and I think yeah, there is a lot of merit in saying that who plows the snow, but I think it's common ground to say that Winnipeggers want a good bang for their buck. They want the service to be good. I guess at the end of the day, Winnipeggers will decide whether they received that or not and I look forward to working with you as well. And we do plan on compiling in our data, hopefully we'll be able to get some data from the City as well and once again, I thank you for your comments and look forward to working with you as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Morantz: Madam Chair, I just want to start off by saying of course as Chair of Finance, I'm always looking for ways for the City to operate more efficiently and I welcome the comparative analysis and we'll see what the result of that is. I did ask you this question in EPC the other day, I thought I would ask it again and then I have a follow up question if I might, but in your presentation, Mr. Davidson, you paraphrased Mr. Lett's article where you say there's a simply not enough data to compare the cost effectiveness essentially between private contractors and the City. And later on in your presentation, you say Local 500 continues to maintain that publicly delivered snow clearing can provide good value and higher qualities of service to the citizens of Winnipeg and then you say basically "we strongly urge Council to take seriously our position that snow clearing in Winnipeg should be phased back in-house". I will have one follow up after this. But I'm just wondering if you can reconcile those statements, if on the one hand, you agree and I think you said in EPC that you thought that Mr. Lett's article was bang on as I recall your words. How do you reconcile that bang on article with the position of your organization that snow clearing should be phased back in-house?

Mike Davidson: Well, I base a lot of that on just the simple fact that when we did our presentation on December 17th, 2013 at City Council on the operating budget, we noted that 80 percent of the snow that…snow removal which is contracted out is one area of Public Works where costs exceed those of peer cities. You factor that in and consider that our wages for our members are among the lowest out of any big city in Canada. Now, that came forward, it's an older report, but that didn't come from me, that actually came from the Free Press who brought that to my attention. You factor all that in, flags go up and all we're saying is where costs exceed those of peer cities, there's something out of line here. At the very least, we should have a look at that and as I said to you at EPC, I knew you were going to ask me that question, figure guys, I knew you would cite that but yeah, sticking my neck out a little bit by saying that we provide good quality services. We continue to do that, but just based on the fact where we know that costs exceed those of peer cities, there is something out of line here. But I appreciate what you're saying and being a former treasurer myself of the Local, yeah, money guys tend to look at the money situation.

Madam Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Morantz: Madam Speaker, yeah, just a follow up question. So I'm just wondering and I'm assuming that, you know, once the comparative analysis is complete and let's assume that we…there was a clear determination that it was much more cost effective to have the private sector clearing snow, would your organization then support the continued private provision of that service and the expanded private provision of that service if you were certain that it would be a…there would be a cost savings to the taxpayers of Winnipeg in them.

Mike Davidson: I think a number of things have to be factored into that. It's not just the cost. It's the quality of service. There's also...the analysis of public property that has been damaged. There's also the analysis of property damage by the residential homeowner and businesses. I think all those have to be taken into consideration...

Madam Speaker: Is there a motion to suspend the rules to add more time? Councillor Lukes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mike Davidson: …I don't think it's as clear as that. I think you have to take in those items that I just listed into consideration. It's not just cost. We can always find somebody cheaper to do it and the other thing is what we have to realize too is the City of Winnipeg is a very good employer in the sense that makes sure that health and safety standards are being adhered to; that the road equipment is safe, safe to the public; that we're following the rules so to speak. I think all those issues have to be taken into consideration as well as going back to the 1950s, the 1960s, the1970s, we always had a complement of private contractors when we did plowing simply because the amount of equipment required even back then was necessary. So we're not opposed to that. I mean, that always happened, especially on all out plows. That's nothing new. So the briefs that I've looked back that go way back in time, there was always that factor in there that the private sector did work with public forces to maintain good snow clearing, ice clearing in the City of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you Mike for coming and I understand I've got to address you through the Speaker. So I just have a…I…as you may know, I used to work with Councillor Dan Vandal, former Councillor, I used to get calls from people who may have had their properties damaged by private or public, you know, contract…private or public provision of service in terms of snow removal and I'm just wondering and I think you touched on this, but I do understand that the claims…the claims when private contractors are involved are little bit more complicated for the residents and, you know I'm thinking of…and I've come across this issue at the door even in the last campaign, residents coming forward with damaged properties and they've started interfacing with our City of Winnipeg Claims Department. Do I need a motion or…?

Madam Speaker: Yes. Councillor Morantz moved that we suspend to add further time. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Allard: Thank you. So and I know you've touched on this in your presentation, but I've always thought it was a little bit more complicated for residents to deal with the Claims…or interface with the Claims Department and try to recoup damages to a private contractor than if it would be if we were dealing with just one party. So I don't know if there's…I know part of this is getting information that we need in terms of examining provision of service, but I wondered if you had further comment on that particular type of situation.

Mike Davidson: Well, what I would say is the calls that I've received, it's funny how a lot of residents will call our office and I'm not quite sure what they think I can always do or CUPE can do. But yeah, there was a level of frustration for sure where there was property damage. They knew who the contractor was and then dealing with the City and they felt that the City wasn't doing its due diligence by helping them with the problem, that they had to deal with the contractor and go through Small Claims Court, et cetera, et cetera. So in our view, when, you know, a lot of times we mention in some of our presentations loss of public control, that's what we're talking about. When people, in other words, if there's something in your area that you don't like and you bring it to the attention of your elected official, you have an opportunity at election time to vote them in or out. When you are dealing with contractors, part of that democratic process, perhaps one might view, is taken away and there is a level of frustration. That's what I sort of have experienced by talking to residential home owners and a business owner who called my office and I spoke to directly. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Mike for the presentation. Just briefly, I know I think it's Ottawa where there's a mix of private and public, but it's more of a 50/50 balance. We have a mix here, but it's much more heavily weighted for the private sector in delivery. Can you just flush that out a bit? Are there other cities that go with more of a 50/50 model? And is that what's currently been done in Ottawa?

Mike Davidson: Yeah, especially in peer cities where they get the type of snowfall that could cripple or handicap their City in some way. The evidence is pretty clear that…I wouldn't say the majority of cities, but a lot of cities that I've looked at, they do have a mix of private and public simply because you have to utilize the equipment to its maximum. And in our history has indicated that that's always been the case that we've worked in co-operation with the private sector, in particular, to conditions where we've had storms, where we've had all out plows and then there's always been sort of the maintenance time that sort of rotated through the city where they really fine tooth residential streets. That's always existed, but you're correct, right across Canada. And like I said, the other thing that jumped out was our costs exceeding those of peer cities. Well, we should look at that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my understanding, Mr. Davidson has mentioned municipalities have gone back to in-house. My understanding is…you talked about peer cities, and my understanding is Calgary's costs have gone up with privatization and that should be checked, but that's my understanding, that they've gone up in contracting. You know, our new Mayor has mentioned lack of satisfaction with private snow clearing. And Councillor Lukes makes the point, bang on; it is that people care about what they're paying for it and the quality of service. And that's what it comes down to. So if there are no records, comparative records, then why was it privatized in the first place? How can you make such a decision which is a major one without analysis? And what relevance is there in changing the way we do our snow clearing if we are not going to sustain the analysis? And Madam Speaker, that doesn't make any sense to me. But since Mr. Davidson is here, I'd like to ask the question to him. Why did we change it in the first place if we don't have the analysis to even make…find out if we even made the right decision?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Davidson.

Mike Davidson: I don't disagree with you. I think what you are saying makes sense. I think any time that we are involving figures, we should…we should have the total analysis to make the good judgement call. And what you raised

there is valid. The reality is, is we don't know how far back a review was actually done. We just went when we filed our FIPPA that was 17…like we used that date. But the reality is we don't know when the last time a review was actually really done and we questioned that and we questioned that and I think we have a good reason to question that, just given the fact that just the very simple fact that our costs are, compared to other peer cities…

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Davidson. If you could wrap up…Thank you.

Mike Davidson: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you so much for coming out today. We will now move on to committee reports. First we have the report on EPC dated February 4. We will deal with each item separately as there is a motion on Item No. 2. Mr. Mayor on Item 1 or we'll have the Clerk read it out. Item 1 to have the Clerk read it out. Madam Clerk, Item 1

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED FEBRUARY 4, 2015

Item 1 - Subdivision and Rezoning – 15-35 Minerva Road
File DASZ 33/2014

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce.

Mayor Bowman: I'll just introduce them. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Any speakers on the item? Okay, I think there's no reason to close. We'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 2, Madam Clerk.

Item 2 - Whistle-blower Protection for Civic Employees

Madam Speaker: Okay. Mr. Mayor, Item 2. And I apologize, I have made an error here. It's another EPC report that we need to pull an item. So Mr. Mayor, if you could just continue, we'll introduce number 2.

Mayor Bowman: I'll just…I'd like to introduce it. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Okay. I'll call the question on Item 2. Motion? There is a motion on here. This is what happens when we get things at the last minute. So we are on the right track. Okay. Mr. Mayor, we have Item 2. If you would like…yes, he did. Okay, so Councillor Gillingham, you've asked for an amendment here. Could you please introduce your motion?

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Gillingham,
Seconded by Councillor Allard,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Recommendations 1 and 2 of Item 2 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated February 4, 2015 be amended by inserting text as noted in bold below:

1. *That the Province of Manitoba be requested to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter or The Public Interest Disclosure (Whistle-blower Protection) Act, to include statutory whistleblower protection for civic employees and members of the public appointed to Boards and Commissions by the City, consistent with the protections given to employees under The Province of Manitoba's Public Interest Disclosure (Whistle-blower Protection) Act.*

2. *That all new employees of the City of Winnipeg and all members of the public appointed to Boards and Commissions by the City, receive as part of their orientation, information on the Fraud, Theft or Related Irregularities Administrative Standard.*

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And my apologies to you and to my fellow Council colleagues for bringing this in at the last minute. It would've been…I was thinking of it and I didn't bring it forward sooner. What this is is simply an amendment to expand the scope of the whistleblower protection that Councillor Allard introduced to go beyond Civic employees, but also to include members of public, the public appointed to Boards and Commissions by the

City. The reason for it is simply that we have many dozens, probably of members of the public that sit on our Boards that are appointed by the City and they are often in a position probably to see things and if there is something untoward, then they're in a position to maybe bring that forward. Just want to make sure that they are protected in doing so, so that they wouldn't, you know, they have a mechanism to report something that they see that is concerning and that also, that they would not, you know, see their place on any respective Board in jeopardy because they are kind of serving the public in the best interests of the public. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any other speakers? Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you. Madam Speaker. I wonder…I'm going to speak to this motion, but I realize that this motion has never really been considered by this chamber. I know it's gone to, you know, it was automatically referred to EPC and I think some of the Councillors haven't really heard any presentations on it other than reading the actual motion. So I don't know if there's going to be an opportunity to speak to the...

Madam Speaker: This is your opportunity to speak on the item.

Councillor Allard: Okay. So…thank you, Madam Speaker. I just…in terms of introducing the entire package and thank you very much to Councillor Gillingham for...

Councillor Orlikow: Point of Order.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Allard: Yeah, go ahead.

Councillor Orlikow: …amendment the first before we speak on the motion to tie it?

Madam Speaker: You can speak on both of them, concurrently.

Councillor Orlikow: Could be on both? Thank you.

Councillor Allard: Okay, thank you for the clarification. I was kind of thinking along the same lines, which is why I asked for the clarification. So, well, thank you to Councillor Gillingham and my Council colleagues for considering this motion and to thank you very much to His Worship Brian Bowman for seconding the motion. I just want to put a bit of context to this whistleblower motion. Many of us were elected on restoring accountability at City Hall and I think that this is a…it is a concrete measure to bring us in that direction. It came to my attention doing a bit of research that our City of Winnipeg workers didn't have the same types of whistle-blower protections as are available with other levels of government and so this motion I think neatly provides the City of Winnipeg employees or will provide once we have the necessary Charter amendments with the assurance that they're going to have the same types of protections that are available at the Provincial level. And, I wanted to…I wanted to give Council the opportunity to use their headsets too, for interpretation. So I just wanted to relay an anecdote that happened to be on the campaign trail.

(Speaking in French) Alors, quand j'étais... quand je faisais campagne, durant la campagne électorale cette été, j'ai eu une interaction avec un résidant qui disait savoir des choses qu'il aimerait communiquer avec moi ou qui aimerait communiquer avec le publique, mais ce résidant n'avait pas l'assurance ou ne sentait pas qu'il pouvait me faire parvenir ces informations ou faire parvenir au publique ces informations, de peur qui potentiellement pourrait avoir... qu'il pourrait y avoir des percussions négatives par rapport à son emploi. Alors, je pense que c'est un.. cette proposition va un pas dans la bonne direction envers rétablir l'importabilité au Conseil de Ville. Et j'aimerais remercier le Conseiller Gillingham pour son- pour agrandir l'influence de la proposition et aussi au Maire Brian Bowman pour avoir appuyé cette proposition.

Translation:
Councillor Allard: So, when I was...when I was campaigning, during the election campaign this summer, I had an interaction with a resident who said he had things that he would like to share with me or with the public, but that he did not have any assurance, or did not feel that he could transmit this information to me or to the public because he was afraid that there could potentially be...that it could negatively impact his job. So I think that it is a...this proposal is a step in the right direction to reestablish accountability at City Hall. And I would like to thank Councillor Gillingham for his…for expanding the scope of this motion, as well as Mayor Brian Bowman for seconding this motion.

Councillor Allard: So just to wrap up, thank you, thank you very much for your consideration to all of my Council colleagues and for, I hope, what will be a unanimous support for this motion. And I'd like to call for a recorded vote on the question. If I do that now or later, I'm not sure.

Madam Speaker: Sure when the time comes, sure.

Councillor Allard: Okay, thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Mayor Bowman.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to also thank Councillor Allard and Councillor Gillingham for the amendments. I've read them, agree, you know, more advance notice would be welcome, but these amendments are good, they're sound and they simply extend the scope and reach of the whistle-blower protection that we're seeking to bring in force today. I'd also like to thank the Province for and the Premier in particular for the willingness to discuss strengthening the Charter. As you know, there were discussions that I had with the Premier in advance to the speech in the throne making improvements to the Charter and these types of changes to restore trust and faith in City Hall is something that I'd like to thank the Premier for the opportunity to work collaboratively with the Provincial Government on these types of matters. And I do support the…not only the motion but the amendments to the motion. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Dobson.

Councillor Dobson: Okay, the whistle-blower law is great importance to me. I wish to thank Councillor Allard, Mayor Bowman and of course Councillor Gillingham for bringing in the amendment because it makes it a little bit stronger. Door to door last election, I was promoting whistle-blower protection and I came across City staff who are fearful of reporting apparent wrongdoings. The promotion and strengthening of the whistle-blower law should lessen their fears and I think let this be a positive step in making a more accountable City Hall.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham, do you wish to close on the motion? We'll call the question then. All in favour? Recorded vote, you'd like? Okay, so all in favour…we're voting on the motion before us and then we need to vote on the item as amended. So we will vote on the motion before us. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Dobson, Eadie, Gerbasi, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Schreyer, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Madam Speaker: The vote is unanimous. Now, we will vote on the item. Do you wish a recorded vote as well or…? Would that suffice? Yes, vote on the item all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Thank you. Mr. Mayor on the report of EPC dated February 11, 2015.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED FEBRUARY 11, 2015

Mayor Bowman: I'll simply introduce it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so you'll move consent of agenda Items 1 and 2. Okay, so you would like to pull No. 2, the 311 Contact Centre.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, please.

Madam Speaker: Okay, pardon me. Councillor Wyatt, we are on February 11th. The report has just one item. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor on the report dated February 18th.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED FEBRUARY 18, 2015**

Mayor Bowman: I'll introduce both, thanks.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all in favour?

Councillor Eadie: No. I want to stand down Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Wyatt, you wanted to stand down one as well.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, that's right.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so Madam Clerk.

Item 1 - CentreVenture Development Corporation – Long-term Funding Solution

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Wyatt. Okay, you know what, we'll have the Mayor introduce the item first if you'd like to.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The…we had representation from Public Service at last week's EPC meeting. We were advised that ongoing discussions are occurring with CentreVenture to continue to look for long term funding solutions and this motion is intended to allow those discussions to continue. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: And I would like to remind Councillors that are speaking to the item to speak to the item before us only. Councillor Eadie, the item before us is Long Term Funding Solution. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: First, before I proceed to speak to this report, can you just clarify, so when we stand one down, you want us to report the report number and what the item is, is that what you said?

Madam Speaker: No, I just reminded Council to speak to the item before us which is the Long-term Funding Solution.

Councillor Eadie: Oh yeah, yeah, no, I get that, absolutely, absolutely. There is a number of CentreVenture issues I understand, Madam Speaker, so as I speak to this motion about the long term funding, I of course support the administration's request to…for an extension as things have changed since the original motion was moved. I think it was in June of 2014, and it was to come…the administration was to come back with a report and Madam Speaker, I would like to just understand that…I understand the administration brought it a bit late. They were supposed to come back with a report. They came back and asked for an extension a bit late, but I think that given the issues going on with the City's administration at the senior level, that I really see no reason for them to apologize especially when other items were arising in December, January of 2014, 2015. Things that are really going to make it difficult for CentreVenture to deal with financial issues that it has to deal with on an ongoing basis with their ongoing strategic plan which actually began in 2014…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, I want to…

Councillor Eadie: With $750,000…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, Councillor Eadie, I want to remind you that the item before us…

Councillor Eadie: Seven hundred fifty thousand dollars is the item.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie. Yeah, it's…we're discussing the 120 day extension.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. And I'm speaking to the motion which is 120 days and how difficult it will be for them to find $750,000, which is their strategic plan which is all part of the whole motion if one reads through the whole motion, one will notice that it is about the issue of $750,000 and the long term extension of CentreVenture, Madam Speaker. So I will just continue on my line of discussion in this matter. Their strategic plan moving into the future with CentreVenture and again, the requirement for another extension of days to continue is there and I just wanted to express that the difficulty with CentreVenture and how they're going to proceed and I'm not sure we'll hear in the budget next, on March 3 it'll be tabled, we'll find out if CentreVenture is able to get the 750 that they need for this particular year,

2015, Madam Speaker, in which they need continued $750,000 into the future. So, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to express my concern that CentreVenture giving what it has to deal with, given the requirement that they need an extension of time because we're looking at how CentreVenture works in the future, which may have some financial implications as well, Madam Speaker, so I just want to say I support the extension of CentreVenture and just wanted to mention that there are a number of issues and problems that we're trying to deal with, with CentreVenture, who do a great job for downtown and have gotten a lot of things for downtown as it proceeds and we hope that they can continue. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further speakers? Mayor Bowman to close.

Mayor Bowman: I'd like to thank Councillor Eadie and all members of Council for their ongoing efforts to look for ways that we can improve the accountability and the value for money in our work here at City Hall, but also with our agencies including CentreVenture. And I also appreciate Councillor Eadie's support for this extension.

Madam Speaker: We'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk, Item 2.

Item 2 - 311 Contact Centre Audit – December 2014

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce.

Mayor Bowman: Sure. Thank you, Madam Speaker. The issue of 311 is something that I and I know many of you heard during…members of Council heard during the campaign that Winnipeggers were looking for improved service. I'm pleased that we've received this audit which began before my term as Mayor but we had the benefit of receiving the recommendations in the audit. I also understand that the Public Service will be implementing the recommendations in this audit and I think that goes a long way to moving us in the right direction so I welcome any questions and, of course, would ask for the support of Council for this motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, I believe you stood this down.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, I guess I stood down just sort of clarification from His Worship, the recommendation from the report says that EPC concurred in the recommendation of the public or that this be received as information. And I guess my concern is, are we receiving this as information or are we actually…we implementing the recommendations? Because receiving as information typically means that you're filing the matter and will not be following up on the recommendations immediately verses actually saying we are recommending that the recommendations all, I think 13 of them or something to that effect, be actually implemented.

Madam Speaker: Next speaker is Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Of course I had the same concerns that Councillor Wyatt did. I hope that the recommendations are being considered. What they might do to try to improve the service but, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to speak…as this is an evaluation, the report that we're dealing with today, of 311, how it's worked. I believe since it was implemented in 2009, is that right? Anyway, 2009, very difficult service. It's a service that I think the general public, as I worked over the last four years, the general public doesn't really understand the 311 system and that it is really a clearing house. It does provide some direct service, but however, in many of the things that they deal with on and ongoing basis, they're provided with scripts and different information. They're given with here are the recommended time lines for certain issues from departments because our departments, and sometimes they are very long, Madam Speaker, because departments like Forestry, dealing with issues, they are totally underfunded. I understand our City Auditor is looking, but anyway, that's not the issue. The issue is that many of the departments set out the days that will be taken care of. No 311 operators actually go out to inspect situations to find out how to solve those cases. So, Madam Speaker, it can be frustrating. But definitely the waiting time, for people that actually call in with their Civic problems, waiting times are an essential thing that we do need to deal with and I noticed a number of residents talked about that. And…but, you know, I must say over the last couple of years with the implementation of the garbage system and the water, frozen pipe issue, you know, those…those are complex issues to deal with because it involves a number of different areas, Madam Speaker. And so I can understand why it's taking more time to deal with these complex cases and issues because they have to be…some parts are forwarded to one department, some need to be considered by other. For example, if your garbage cart is stolen, it can involve not only the solid waste department, but the water and waste billing system because you can pay for it on your water bill, so then there's issues of payment in there and so you have all these different things that are happening. And so, and that's the way it goes. There are synergies. When we came up with our garbage system so there are reasons that they are getting more complex, but I must say, I haven't read the full report, the evaluation, but one of the things that I don't think is emphasized, that nobody really paid much attention to is the 311 system is an excellent system in that we are gathering all of the complaints and

issues that the citizens of Winnipeg are dealing with in one place. It allows them to store the information in regard to these cases, and they are stored in a data base and the beauty about that is that as a City Councillor and as Council and as the Mayor, it is a great opportunity to be able to say, "I have a policy idea to solve, try to solve some of the issues related to why people are calling into 311 and it's a valuable, valuable resource", so it is important that the 311 operators take the time to properly record the information related to the issue. And I know one of the difficulties is in trying to come up and determine a policy, Madam Speaker, regarding any of the issues is that, with the waiting time, if people get frustrated and eventually they don't call in anymore. We're not finding out what really is happening on the ground with our different services and what the quality is and how it's doing because people are just, you know what I'm not bothering. It's too much time, I don't want to do it anymore. So I think that it's important that we really look at some of these recommendations and the 311 and see how we can deal with it. For example, in there, there was a recommendation that talked about maybe having no operators from say 10:00 p.m. to I think it was 6:00 a.m. or whatever time that is. They would have to be open at a certain time…interesting that our solid waste now is getting, they're starting to pick it up at starting at 6:00 a.m. when we originally had to have it out by 7:00 a.m. So this morning, as I was waking up and my alarm went off and I turned it off and low and behold, I set it for 6:00 a.m. and I fell back to sleep, but guess what, my garbage was being collected at 6:15 a.m., which I'm grateful that it's being collected. I think that's very important. But anyway, so for people to call in, that's very important that we make sure that the hours because some people get very upset because they have different sleeping times and sleeping hours and you don't want to put your cart out too late if you're in a neighbourhood where…if you'll put it out the night before, you're technically exposing it to fire and theft, theft we're not covering the person who is the victim of a theft, has to pay for their cart. So it's important that we look at what the time is, but and in that recommendation, I don't think they really said it, but you know, at night time, you could still staff 311, a number of people have been e-mailing 311 and I know in the neighbourhoods of William Whyte, Dufferin, St. John's, the people appreciate the ability to e-mail to 311 and deal with their issues that way. So anyway, we do need to improve the times that people are on the phone before they can get their thing in. I really…I don't recommend that we take any service off 311, you know, at Transit, it's a great thing as a blind transit user, one of the most fantastic things for me, is that when I'm out on the streets, say Pembina Highway and I'm at a bus stop, but I don't know what the five digit number is, I can call 311 and I can get the information. Normally, if I know the stop number, I can call 287-7433 and I'll get the time of the next bus, but so 311 is essential. I wouldn't want them providing that kind of service, so looking at taking certain services off, 311 is much easier to dial in the middle of winter, Madam Speaker. So anyway, I'll leave it, with that, and I…well, I think Councillor Wyatt mentioned again the whole thing about information, it might be too late, but maybe the Mayor will recommend, will explain to us if they're following through on some of the recommendations, I think it's Corporate Services that overall handles 311. So anyway, thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Mayor Bowman: Sure. Thank you very much for the questions and comments. In particular, Councillor Wyatt's question I think is valid. We do expect that the Public Service will implement all of the recommendations and I'd like to also acknowledge that…I was elected on the mandate of positive change. And I know many, if not all of you, were also elected on similar platforms, these are the types of improvements that we're looking to do whether it's snow clearing or 311 service. We constantly need to be looking at how can we improve the service and so this audit is something that was received by EPC as information and moved to Council accordingly. I certainly saw the value in the 311 Centre and the staff who provide us with invaluable service day in and day out during the precautionary boil water advisory. That was an opportune time for Winnipeggers to be reminded and for Councillors to be reminded that the value of 311 when citizens had questions that they needed to be answered in a timely manner. The 311 operators and 311 services were part of our emergency preparedness action that occurred in those two days when we had to issue the precautionary boil water advisory and it's a service that is, is very important to me and I know to the citizens of Winnipeg. The audit recommendations, one of them that…I just want to note for Council and really all for Winnipeggers as well, is one of the recommendations asks that the Contact Centre management explore increased use of interactive voice response technology or IVR technology, to route the majority of transit information requests, which we're advised represents approximately 41 percent of the total calls received in 2013, that can be handled by existing technology to free up existing resources to improve the call wait times. That's something that would ultimately come back to this council, but I think that is really, from a public policy perspective that's going to be a key question that we're going to face once we receive additional information is whether or not we want to look at cost savings to channel those…the high volumes of calls for Transit into an IVR automated system or not. There are increased costs to the status quo. We could free up resources to, to for non-transit related calls if we made such a move and I think that's something that we should be, we should be anticipating coming back to this council in due course. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We now have Motion 1 in front of us. Moved by Councillor Lukes and seconded by Councillor Allard regarding Council's representation on the Taxicab Board. We will deal with this matter today. Councillor Lukes…not needed. Thank you. Councillor Lukes to introduce your motion.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Lukes,
Seconded by Councillor Allard,

WHEREAS on November 12, 2014, Council appointed Councillor Lukes as the Council representative to the Taxicab Board of Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS all regularly scheduled Taxicab Board meetings are scheduled for Wednesdays, creating conflict with regularly scheduled Executive Policy Committee meetings, to which Councillor Lukes has also been appointed;

AND WHEREAS Councillor Eadie has expressed an interest in being the Council representative to Taxicab Board of Manitoba;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Councillor Eadie replace Councillor Lukes as the City of Winnipeg representative to the Taxicab Board of Manitoba for the balance of the 2014 – 2015 term.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I just wanted to bring this forward. Due to my responsibilities at City Hall being on EPC and Council, I am unable to attend the meetings that are scheduled by the Taxi Board, which is disheartening because the Taxi Board, I was able to attend the meeting with the Taxi Board folks and it's very interesting and it's very related to transportation and our roads and streets. So it's with chagrin that I'm passing this on, but I simply can't attend the meetings. So I'm very pleased to see that Councillor Eadie has offered to be on the Board and I think you will provide really valuable information to the board and back to City Hall and to our department, IRPW. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. I'd just like to thank all my colleagues and Council. Looks like, I was the only one who put in for it, but just so you understand, I was quite willing to take on the Taxicab Board. As, Madam Speaker, Councillor Lukes has explained, there is a lot of direct relationship between the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. What is interesting though, in terms of the Taxi Board and taxis and transportation in the city and actually the sidewalks and conditions of streets have a great effect on persons with disabilities and persons with disabilities, many of us do utilize taxis in many circumstances because some of us aren't allowed to drive, so and others have extenuating circumstances in terms of being able to afford to buy a motor vehicle that's accessible and so on. And I'm quite, very, very, very, very, very, very familiar, Madam Speaker, with the taxicab industry. And I think it's a very interesting time to be involved as well in the taxicab industry. I noted that the Mayor talked about the conference study he attended and I listened with great enthusiasm to our Mayor speaking at the Big Mayors with the…what is it, Evan Solomon on the politics, whatever. And one of the issues there and one of the questions from the crowd was about this new internet uber transportation and, so I think it's a really interesting and exciting time to consider transportation. Transportation needs from persons with disabilities perspective, but also just transportation overall. With change, comes the need for consideration of many different dynamics and so I really appreciate that I'll be serving until this November, 2015 until we make a decision again as to who will represent on Taxicab Board. Of course, Wednesday mornings I'm not on EPC, so therefore, I am able to do that except for if they booked a meeting for Council Wednesday morning. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Lukes, do you wish to close? Or I can call the question. Call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move on to By-laws for EPC. Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: I'll simply introduce them. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay. I think they need to be read. Read them the first time.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move By-law No. 26/2015, By-law No. 27/2015, By-law No. 28/2015, and By-law No. 29/2015.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 26/2015, By-Law No. 27/2015, By-Law No. 28/2015 and By-Law No. 29/2015.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, you can read the By-laws the second time.

Mayor Bowman: Yeah. I move By-law No. 26/2015 to 29/2015 both inclusive be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 26/2015 to 29/2015.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that the rules be suspended and By-laws numbered 26/2015 to 29/2015 both inclusive be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: We now have question period for the Mayor. Councillor Gerbasi. I've got lots of hands, so keep your hands up for just a moment.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay. Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question to the Mayor is regarding the Building Canada Fund and I'm wondering if the Mayor would provide Council with an update of where our discussions are at in terms of our priorities and applying for the funding and if he could just give us an update. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: I'd like to thank my Council colleague, Councillor Gerbasi, for the question. We have received a letter from the, let me back up. Previous Council voted on six tasks for the Build Canada Fund, four were submitted. We have recently received correspondence from the Province of Manitoba asking that this Council consider and prioritize the current applications for Build Canada. As Councillors will know, held a Council seminar this week to discuss this matter and to provide additional information, especially to those of us that are new on Council and at that meeting it was the feedback I received was that additional time would be welcomed by Council as well as additional information from the administration and so what we will be doing is asking the public service to provide additional information on the cost benefit analysis of the four current applications for Build Canada. I will ask the Public Service to provide additional information at next week's EPC meeting. The written submissions that we receive will be forwarded to all members of Council for their benefit and the plan would then be to have a Council seminar and then have a special meeting of Council within the next few weeks so that we can provide that prioritization list to the Province to help continue to move these applications forward. And I'd like to thank all members of Council for their diligence on this matter. These are sizable amounts of money, we want to make sure that Council is provided with as much information as possible, so that we can make an informed choice. And in advance of our additional works in this regard, I'd like to thank members of Council for their time and attention to this important matter. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: My question for the Mayor, Madam Speaker, is in light of the recent boil water advisory for the City of Winnipeg, I'd like to know what is the City doing, the department doing relative to testing of the City's water distribution system? If the Mayor could provide an update, it'd be much appreciated.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you and thank you to Councillor Pagtakhan for the question. We received an update recently from Diane Sacher, and the public service on the independent review that's occurring of our testing. The province is also taking actions to ensure the quality and safety of our drinking water. I'd like to once again thank Winnipeggers for their efforts and their patience during the precautionary boil water advisory. Was not something that I anticipated having to deal with within my first 100 days of taking office. But there can be very few more important matters than ensuring the quality and safety of our drinking water. I'd also like to thank the members of our public service, who conduct invaluable

work on Winnipeggers behalf to provide us with quality drinking water. And we will anticipate and wait for the report back from the public service, I believe we're expecting it in March and we'll obviously be able to take a look and review that report when it is received. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes. Second question, Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Madam Speaker. I just want to thank the Mayor for his response and that update. On another matter, Madam Speaker I wanted to ask the Mayor, he now his website up the 1Winnipeg website that talks about racism as a reaction to the Maclean's article. I wondered if the Mayor could provide some update to this Council in terms of what he's hearing, what he's heard relative to the 1Winnipeg website.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker and thank you to Councillor Pagtakhan for the question. I would like to thank Winnipeggers and members of Council for their show of solidarity in the face of the Maclean's article. As all Winnipeggers and really all Canadians will know, racism and intolerance is not something that exists in any one community. It's a challenge in cities around the world. I've been very proud of the response that Winnipeggers have shown. The 1Winnipeg.ca website is one small first step in the action plan that I'll be rolling out to help us break down barriers and increase tolerance and understanding within our community. It was launched one week to the minute of our historic press conference in the, right up there, right outside my office. And since then we've received really an overwhelming amount of responses and feedback on the 1Winnipeg.ca website. I would encourage all members of Council, all Winnipeggers, and in fact all Canadians to visit the site and share their thoughts on how we can do a better job of building bridges within our community. The website is an opportunity to provide for greater education, and so, there are thoughts and views that are expressed on the website that Winnipeggers and even members of Council and I may disagree with. But what we're seeing happen on the website is conversations happen where perhaps people who've commented on these issues in a way that we fundamentally disagree with. We have an opportunity to educate and to change minds and change behaviours. There has been a number of ongoing meetings that I've been having in concert with the 1Winnipeg website. Yesterday I had really the privilege and the honour of meeting with Justice Sinclair, who's doing incredible work on behalf of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and I'm anticipating his report being released this year. And I think there'll be ongoing lessons that we can learn from his work as well as the work that's going on in our community. I'd also like to compliment really the all members of Council in very short order appeared for that historic press conference. And what we've also done is sent out an invitation to those that were able to attend that press conference to book it in their calendars for next year, because press conferences are great, there a very tangible symbol of our actions, the website is a good first step, but there's going to be a lot more action over the course of the next year and I want to be held accountable for what have we actually done a year to the day of our historic press conference. And so we will invite members of the media, we will invite all Canadians to be a part of that when we report back to them on what we've been able to achieve together. We're not going to end racism, we're going to try, we're going everything we can to lead the nation and show what Winnipeggers are all about. And 1Winnipeg website is one small step in that effort. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Madam Speaker. I have two related questions for the Mayor, and I was pleased to see the Mayor mention is his opening remarks today about the Canada Games 2017 coming to Winnipeg and I know the Mayor had campaigned on exploring at least a bid for the Pan Am's in 2023 or the Commonwealth's in 2022 and fortunately we have, due to some good work done by the community we have a fairly major games coming to Winnipeg in 2017. I'm wondering if the Mayor could arranged for a Council seminar or take other efforts to try and start promoting awareness. When I was out in Prince George a number of people certainly weren't aware that we were the next Host City. I commend the Mayor for his support for this initiative. But I have some follow up question, but I wonder if we could get a commitment to have a Council seminar. It's a great, its three million dollar bid, three million dollars capital cost and we've get about a 160 million economic impact. Edmonton's book cost just preparing a bid book was three million bucks for the Commonwealth Games, which they later abandoned. So good value for money here, and I wonder if the Mayor could just speak to the plans for the Canada Games 2017?

Mayor Bowman: The short answer is yes, I'd be more than happy to facilitate a Council seminar on it in at the appropriate time. I'm looking forward to visiting Prince George and seeing our athletes in action and cheering them on. And I'd also like to thank Councillor Mayes for his representation of City Council and Winnipeggers at the Canada Games recently. I've received some excellent feedback on his participation and representation of all members of Council while he was in Prince George. And I'll be doing my best to do the same, to the best of my ability this weekend. What we'll likely do is work with the organizing committee to make sure that we get all relevant information to City Council in due course. And I would encourage all members of Council to do what they can to continue to raise awareness about

this really important event that we're going to be hosting in Winnipeg in the coming years. So take to social media, talk to your friends and family, do what you can to support the volunteers who are working really, really hard right now to put on what I expect will be an outstanding Games here in Winnipeg. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you for that, and just for the record I did see Councillor Wyatt's niece play in two ringette games on the gold medal winning team, so pleased with that. The [inaudible] would like to know that this was the first games where there was a host Aboriginal nation recognized. I think that's important and also, to use a few words en français if I may in my question that…

(Speaking in French) Les Jeux Canada sont complètement bilingue; c'est important pour toute la Ville, pour la quartier Saint-Boniface, pour la quartier Saint-Vital. C'est une opportunité pour la Ville de Winnipeg de travailler avec le communauté francophone, et je sais que l'équipe Winnipeg 2017 travaille avec l'Université de Saint-Boniface pour dévelopeer une centre de communication.

Translation:
Councillor Mayes: The Canada Games are bilingual; that is important for the entire city, for St. Boniface Ward, and St. Vital Ward. This is an opportunity for the City of Winnipeg to work with the francophone community, and I know that Team Winnipeg 2017 is working with St. Boniface University to develop a communications centre.

Councillor Mayes: So I just would like the Mayor to, I just would like recognition that this is an opportunity I think to work with our Aboriginal communities and Metis communities as well as the Francophone community and just would like that recorded to make sure we don't miss what could be a good opportunity to respond to the Maclean's article among other issues that we have in the city.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yeah, the Mayor wants to respond.

Madam Speaker: Yes. Mr.

Councillor Eadie: That was quite a lot.

Mayor Bowman: That's okay.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker that was quite a long preamble to the second question.

Mayor Bowman: I'll just thank Councillor Mayes for his suggestion. I agree, I haven't had an opportunity to discuss that with the organizers but I'll certainly relay that on our behalf that if there's anything that could be done to really celebrate and highlight the strength of our Aboriginal and Indigenous community which includes First Nations, Metis and Inuit, here in Winnipeg during the Games. And really on a broader level I know that's something that we are trying to do to the greatest extent as we celebrate the growing Indigenous community here in Winnipeg and the Canada Games is an excellent opportunity. So I thank the Councillor for the suggestion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie. Followed by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker I have a bit of a preamble before I ask the question to our new mayor. In December the 11th, 2013, Council moved a motion, moved by actually the former Mayor Katz to establish an ethics commissioner's office, to establish budget money in the 2014 budget to move ahead with that and the fourth item was to search and find convince the province to within the City of Winnipeg Charter, provide investigative powers so that they might recommend to Council sanctions and Councillors, statutory officers and so forth. And that actually number four under the Code of Conduct of the City of Winnipeg that code does exist and we have abilities to do sanctions according to the ethical workings of the employees of the City of Winnipeg, and there are other Acts and whatever that deal with Councillors. But Madam Speaker, on one part, what I'd like to know is, what is the status of ethics commissioner, this motion and I'll reserve another question after. But what is the status of this motion that was passed by Council December 11th, 2013?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: I'd like to thank Councillor Eadie for the question. I am working with the province to make changes in the Charter and I'm pleased to hear of their openness in the Throne Speech last Fall. And so I think I haven't had a member of Council say they don't support the creation of an ethic's commissioner and I very pleased with that support. And it's just now a matter of working with the province and I am very pleased with the working relationship we're having right now with the province on this very important matter to restoring trust and faith in City Hall. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. Does the new Mayor know that within the City of Winnipeg Charter, the City Auditor has the ability to pass on investigative powers to who he deems possible, which could be a commissioner within his own office? Does the Mayor know that you could already do it? You don't need to amend the Charter?

Mayor Bowman: We are seeking to amend the Charter so there's absolute clarity about the roles and the processes we'll be following. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Third question, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Having visited the, anyway I don't know why, did the Mayor ever find out why there isn't an ethics commissioner now because there were some duties that he could do, without investigative powers that we could've had an employee hire somebody to provide us advice? So does the Mayor know that our employee's Code of Conduct needs to be able to cover more in terms of our statutory officers certain things that within the province, that Deputy Ministers are not allowed to get into business deals with the Minister responsible for the work the department's. So really I'm wondering if the Mayor is examining the employee's Code of Conduct or can we refer to have somebody evaluate the employee's Code of Conduct, because I tried to make some movement on that in the past and basically I thought that the administration's recommendations were kind of poor regarding that issue.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Mayor Bowman: What questions being asked? Please.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, could you?

Councillor Eadie: Yes. The employee Code of Conduct actually, I'll make it even more simple. Is our new Mayor aware that our employee Code of Conduct is lacking and needs updating with the guidance of someone like an ethic's commissioner?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: I'd welcome any improvements that we could make. And that's exactly what I would want to do once we get an ethic's commissioner is in fact start reviewing, not only the policies but the enforcement of those policies. So it's an excellent recommendation and I thank Councillor Eadie for his comments.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker. Mr. Mayor when last year Council considered the Building Canada Fund, Council endorsed the following six projects: Waverley Street Underpass, the Marion Street widening/grade separation, improvements from Archibald Street to Lagimodiere Boulevard, Chief Peguis Trail Extension from Main Street to Route 90, Louise Bridge Replacement; the William R. Clement Parkway Extension from Grant Avenue to Wilkes, and the widening of Kenaston Boulevard from Ness Avenue to Taylor Avenue; and that number two: the proper officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent for the foregoing. When the new Council was elected, at one of their first seminars they were briefed by the administration with regards to what projects have been approved by Council and unfortunately at that briefing, unless the Councillors had known that clause passed on June the 25th, 2015, they were informed by the administration back in November that six projects are passed, they were only informed that were four projects that have gone forward and they were silent on two. At a meeting that just held on Monday, again the administration is silent in their package on two projects, and are only talking about four that have been submitted. I guess the question I have to you, Mr. Mayor, is who is running the City? Is the public service running the City and deciding which projects we're putting forward to the Provincial government and federal governments? Or is this Council the one, who's deciding which projects go forward to the Provincial government and Federal governments? Because clearly that's not the case, it is now been almost June of last year and there's two projects that this Council, Council elected approved, we can change it, but they stand on the record and they have not been submitted yet. Four have out of the six.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Well I can simply response that this Council is supreme. And we are taking steps to ensure that the will of Council is being respected and implemented. I can't speak for the actions of the previous Council, or the Council that Councillor Wyatt and others here were on, nor can I speak for the acts of the previous senior members of our public service before. I assume the position of Mayor. The reason why we hosted and I facilitated a Council seminar was to exactly have these types of conversations to ensure that Council had the opportunity for input. That's also why I would like to provide additional time for Council to have another Council seminar and for additional information to be provided to EPC and to provide that information to all members of Council. Ultimately, the prioritization of the matters that have been submitted, is something Council needs to consider and vote on and certainly with regards to the two that weren't voted on, it is up to ultimately this Council to continue to ensure that it's will is being respected. I can't answer why the two were not submitted. We have received some clarity recently in our Council seminar and we'll continue to do our best to ensure that the will of Council, previous Council in this case, is respected. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Second question. Just to point out actually, Council did vote on all six, so it was voted on. But the fact is, as well, the Louise Bridge is directly tied to the eastern corridor, so it's the only project out of the six that actually is rapid transit implication. But I guess, the next question I have, Madam Speaker is this, is this letter that we received on February the 23rd from a Fred Meier, I've never heard of him before, Deputy Minister, he's inside the bureaucracy of the Province of Manitoba, telling the City of Winnipeg that we have to set priorities. I've never seen a letter to this extent. Who is a junior bureaucrat, and who is he to dictate to the Mayor of Winnipeg and the members of City Council, that you now set priorities? Why are taking, why is the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg taking marching orders from a junior bureaucrat at the Province of Manitoba? You were elected Mr. Mayor to negotiate for the good and hard well-being of the City and to get a better deal. This is something that's not acceptable. We have our priorities and the province will have theirs. Let them set their priorities, but these are ours. To have a junior bureaucrat dictating us.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: Anyway, that's my question.

Madam Speaker: We've heard your question. Thank you.

Mayor Bowman: Part of what I was elected to do was work collaboratively with our Provincial and Federal partners and that's exactly what we're trying to do. I hear the Councillor's concerns about the letter and ultimately this Council is working much more collaboratively than, I believe previous Councils have worked. And I believe the relationship with the Province and the Federal government has improved since our swearing in on November 4th. And so we will continue to do our best to work collaboratively, of course while looking out for the best interests of the Winnipeggers that we are elected to represent. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Third question.

Councillor Wyatt: Working out collaboratively, can the Mayor give us any updates in terms of that collaborative work with the Minister of Municipal Affairs? What progress have we made as a municipality and what announcements can we come, our budget's being announced next week, can we expect new announcements from the provincial government in terms of it's restoring some collaborative relationship that genuinely in just not talk, but action, in terms of dollars to the City of Winnipeg to address the infrastructure deficit that we face?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. And I thank Councillor Wyatt for his comments and questions. Obviously I'm not in a position to make announcements on behalf of the provincial government at this time. I will continue to work with our provincial partners to ensure that the priorities that Winnipeggers have expressed in spades with regards to infrastructure renewal are honoured and acted upon. We have had a number of announcements that we've made since the election with the Province. One of which was recently was the Federal government's contribution to phase two of rapid transit, as Council and Winnipeggers will know. The Province has also stepped up to work with Winnipeggers and this City Council to ensure that phase two of rapid transit is completed with the appropriate funding. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Mayor? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. I apologize I didn't think we'd have questions for the Mayor until this afternoon and then I might not be as prepared for my question as I would've hoped. Nonetheless, I do feel this is very important. This is regarding the issue of CentreVenture and True North and the purposed project for the hotel construction at Carlton, and what we've gone through over the last couple of weeks, couple of months on this issue; and also the issue of the vote that we took in the last Council session, I believe the last Council session regarding the Mayor's motion to have open tendering for the construction of the hotel despite the fact that CentreVenture was quite within their purview in that situation especially to have a single-sourced agreement proposal with True North, Mark Chipman's company.

Madam Speaker: Do you have a question, Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: Yes ma'am, I certainly do. Which would have made no sense without my preamble, so thank you Madam Speaker. My concern, Madam Speaker, if you'll indulge me, we didn't do regarding the Mayor's motion, we didn't solve the Mayor's problem because he wanted open tendering. We didn't solve the problem of the Mayor's concern CentreVenture not having open tendering because it was an exception only to this one, and that's my concern Madam Speaker. We're not solving the Mayor's problem, we're not solving mine, we're not solving this issue. So I'd like to ask the Mayor if, for the sake of fairness and balance, if he would consider working with myself and other Councillors to sort of clarify and develop the intent of his motion? So it's not an unfairness against True North, but it is in fact in the spirit sort of, some sort of fair and general principles of tendering. And not dealing with merely True North, which I think doesn't deal with the issue.

Madam Speaker: Could you clarify your question, Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: Yes ma'am.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: To clarify, our last the Mayor's motion this we voted to have open tendering for the construction of the hotel at Carlton Street, making an exception to CentreVenture's agreement with True North. Which was alright, it's within their privy to do so. We implied that there was something wrong, that this should be done better by opening the tendering. But I don't know in fact now why we did that. The Mayor has a problem with.

Madam Speaker: Can you tell us what the question is please?

Councillor Schreyer: Will the Mayor consider enhancing his motion, creating a new motion, working with us to create a new motion so that his problem with CentreVenture and how they contract out is solved? Because that didn't solve anything, it just made an exception over that one issue.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: If I understand the question correctly, the EPC has created a working group on mandate review. It's being chaired by Councillor Orlikow. I'd like to thank him and the other members of that working group, including Councillor Mayes and Councillor Lukes for their efforts, and I also note that there has been dialogue, Councillor Orlikow has had dialogue with the Chair and the Executive Director of CentreVenture to look at how we can make improvements on our end, with regards to the mandate and the governance of CentreVenture. And those efforts will ultimately come back to EPC and then ultimately if any changes are purposed, we'll come to this Council, as it should, for consideration and action, if necessary. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further? Second question.

Councillor Schreyer: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. My concern is that we.

Madam Speaker: What is the question, Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: I hope.

Madam Speaker: There is no preamble on the second question.

Councillor Schreyer: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. My hope is then ask the Mayor that he prioritizes this issue. The fact that we actually unanimously voted on something in the last Council and that is highly prioritize ramifications in terms of what the EPC deals with.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, your question please.

Councillor Schreyer: I ask the Mayor that he prioritizes the issue of what actually the Council voted on in the last session. The sole sourcing the issue of the contract for True North at Carlton Street hotel venue, that that be a leading priority in the EPC's report because we all voted on that one.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: I think that the, to answer the Councillor's question, if I understand it correctly. The issue of the processes that we've and I have expressed with regards to 220 Carlton are part of the discussions for that we're having with CentreVenture on how we can improve the mandate and the governance. And they will of course be given adequate attention for how we can improve the process on a go forward basis. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Third question, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Just to clarify because the Mayor was again uncertain perhaps of my questioning. Bare in mind, this is the only issue in which we actually passed a unanimous motion by Council. So let there be no ambiguity about this. This is the one issue in which we all voted. This is the exception, so let this be clear Madam Speaker. I'm talking about what we did in the last Council vis-à-vis.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, with all due respect, do you have a question?

Councillor Schreyer: Does the Mayor understand my question? That the one single issue of making an exception to True North, we didn't solve a problem with the issue of how CentreVenture goes about doing their contracts.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Sorry, I'm sorry it's not entirely clear what the question is. But what I will say is that I do thank the Councillor for his concern on this matter, and I thank all members of Council for their ongoing diligence on how we can focus on downtown, we can help them improve the processes by which.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham, you wish to suspend the rules to add more time? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor, you may continue.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. My ongoing commitment is to citizens and to Council is to work to ensure that the decision making process at City Hall is much more transparent and by extension more accountable. As we've discovered, key steps in the processes were overlooked with regards to 220 Carlton. Most important of those overlooked was that Council was not given a choice and furthermore was expected to move taxpayer dollars without conditions to ensure value. As elected officials, we're accountable for our taxpayer dollars, and we're not doing our jobs if we allow an unconditional flow of 3.75 million to any project without asking the hard questions and expecting complete and full disclosure for the use of taxpayer dollars. We must ensure that the funds will contribute to what a solution is that is best for Winnipeg and that meets the needs of the Convention Centre. The results of an expression of interest as we have unanimously agreed and as the Councillor's noted ensures the best solution and the details about the business case for any development will explain how the Convention Centre will also benefit. CentreVenture has had the opportunity to proceed with any deal all along. All we have said at Council is if we are to send more funds to CentreVenture, millions of dollars, that we need public accountability and more information and to that end, I have confirmed the meeting in the coming weeks with CentreVenture and the Convention Centre Board Chairs to work collaboratively to find a publicLY accountable path forward. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Thank you Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Wyatt you had your hand up earlier. We had suspended the rules to add more time. Do you...

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, okay. Time has run out. Time has run out. I guess my question was along the same lines. I think in the last month or so, and just a bit of a preamble, I want to first of all thank the Mayor for doing everything he did in the last month and try and keep Council appraised of the situation as best as possible. I believe that the Mayor was in an extremely awkward position where after an election, information was shared with him in an informal basis, that had he gone forth with that, I think there would have been equal criticism of the Mayor in light of the fact that of the relationship of the Mayor, and this major developer in this city and just the optics of it. And he was in between a rock and a hard spot. So I think the decision made by the previous Council was an accurate and fair one. Now in light of the events that occurred since the Council decision, unfortunately and the press conference by Mr. Chipman and the video that he's displayed, it clearly has had a big impact of the citizens of Winnipeg and it's even had impact on myself, I've

seen it and it's quite impressive and it's really something that's quite unique. In light of that, is there an opportunity Mr. Mayor in the next coming days or weeks that we could revisit part of the decision made in February, to allow the process that has unfortunately unfolded prior to you becoming Mayor, to allow to either fail or succeed, hopefully succeed and that would a wonderful development could occur in downtown Winnipeg that would benefit us all. But whatever hindrance that we now have in place such as the EUI that is placed on by Council to enact immediately that CentreVenture's refusing to do because of their legal obligations to the option, that we maybe amend that delay it slightly until June or July, to allow it to succeed or fail and then go forward with regarding the marketing of the properties if necessary. Because at the end of the day, if this project actually does happen it would be wonderful for the city, if half of it happens or even a third of it happens, it would be wonderful for the city, based on the fact you right now have a grey, ugly parking lot down there and we need 220 rooms to fill for this Convention Centre. So first of all I just want to say Mr. Mayor, you've done a terrific job in shepherding this, I think you're between a rock and a hard spot and I think you have the support of this Council, if there's anything that can be done to overcome this divide and bring the parties together, Mr. Chipman has done a hell of a lot for our city and making it develop and grow and prosper and I just hate to see this kind of thing continue. And I just would hope that we could be able to maybe overcome this in the coming days and weeks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Well thank you to Councillor Wyatt for his comments. Look everybody involved in this matter with regards to 220 Carlton, is I believe doing their best to continue to develop our downtown and that includes representatives from the Convention Centre, from CentreVenture, and also True North. I think everybody wants what's in the best interests of Winnipeggers, our job as a Council though and everyone will have their own motivations as organizations and entities as is their right. This Council's responsibilities to protect taxpayer dollars and accountability and whether it's public monies there needs to be public accountability for these spending of those monies.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you and that will end question period for the Mayor. We will now move on. Would you like to continue? Okay I saw a hand. You can wrap up Mr. Mayor, we'll add a minute to the clock. Councillor Gillingham moves the motion. Councillor Gillingham moves one minute extension. Pardon me? Okay, Councillor Gillingham moved that we add one minute to the clock. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. I can talk for five minutes if you'd like. I just as you know, I can. I'd just like to say the reason I've reached out to the Chair of both the Convention Centre and CentreVenture is to try and see if we can move forward in a collaborative manner. We voiced, and I have voiced my concerns about the processes, we've heard from other parties as well. Their views on this matter and we all want what's best for Winnipeg. For me and this Council, I know that public money requires public accountability and so public expressions of interest is something that we've asked for. And if that's not something that CentreVenture or True North wish to proceed with, they don't need to. They can continue with the current arrangements that they have, if they so choose. That being said, I don't see harm in sitting down and seeing if there are ways forward and if there are is anything that can come of those discussions, obviously I will bring that back to this Council for consideration. And I'd like to thank everybody for their efforts and feedback on this important matter in the last number of weeks. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. We'll now move onto the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. We have no reports, no motions, no by-laws. Question Period will begin. Any questions for Councillor Morantz, the Chair?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Assuming that this was a possible something that maybe was not considered. I got the schedule yesterday, I think we all got the schedule and I didn't see in the schedule the seminar, in the past what we've done, just so the new members are familiar, prior to briefing the media, we've been having a seminar for Councillors in the morning and I didn't see anything in terms of that. I'm not sure if that meant to have at least a few hours to get a briefing so members of Council could get a briefing and then ask questions prior to the media getting the brief and asking questions and maybe that was just something that was overlooked. And I didn't catch it there maybe others did. But I looked for it, but I couldn't see it so.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Morantz?

Councillor Morantz: I'm happy to relay to…Madam Chair through you to Councillor Wyatt that there has been a Council seminar scheduled and it is from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. on the third day of March.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question, Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: And I thank you for 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. I just…from experience you're doing two budgets, right? You might want to have some flexibility there just in terms of time, just only because you know what folks are going to have lots of questions and to get through two budgets I think in two hours I mean your lock down on the media is two hours, right? So if there's a little more maybe we could push the media back…lockdown back a bit it would push the EPC meeting. I don't want to be stepping out of my bounds by making these suggestions, but just some thoughts. That's all I'm suggesting so.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Morantz?

Councillor Morantz: Sure, I appreciate your concerns and I think really your concerns relate to the difficulty related to the entire process in fact. Coming in and bringing in a budget right after an election and here we are, we're tabling it on March 3rd. This year for the 2016 budget will be much different. I'm not sure that the schedule can really be changed for March 3rd, but I would like to say that once the budget's tabled, I am very much looking forward to having many, many full discussions with all of you regarding the decisions that we made and there will be ample opportunity beyond the Council seminar that morning to have fulsome discussions together or one on one and I welcome the opportunity to do that and debate the issues with all of my Council colleagues. And I also want to thank all of my Council colleagues for all of the input and really assistance that they provided to me over the last number of months which as I've said many times has been a very, very difficult budget process and so I want to thank you all for your input and your assistance. And there'll be much more to say on March 3rd.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker and we generally…personally I'd like to thank Councillor Morantz, I think in a short period of time it's taken on a pretty gargantuan task and tried to work collaboratively with the rest of Council. I have a technical question I don't think needs answering today but last year when we voted on the capital and operating budget earlier that same day we had a vote on the Police Board budget and I don't know if that was a one-of thing due to the transitional nature of that organization coming on stream or if we're indeed doing that again this year? There was some debate in which Councillor Fielding as Chair of that Police Board at that time kind of led discussion. So I don't know if we are voting on that on the same day or if our procedure will have changed somewhat this year and I don't need that dealt with today but obviously by March 23rd we should know what's going to be in front of us. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Morantz?

Councillor Morantz: Sure I mean now that's a good question and of course it's being my first budget cycle and not completely familiar with that entire process. But I'm sure by the time we get to the Council seminar everything will be made clear as to the order of things and we'll be able to answer your question. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thank you, sorry, thank you Madam Speaker. My question is relatively a simply one, our Finance Chair, head of the budget process this year is new, and given that we have these really tight timelines Madam Speaker. I just want to ask respectfully ask the Chair of Finance to ensure that the excel spreadsheets that I usually get for the books both the operating and capital books that I get those spreadsheets in a timely fashion not long after the budget books which I can't read are tabled.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Morantz?

Councillor Morantz: Sure I mean again that's the first I heard about it but of course, whatever information we need to get to Councillor Eadie, Madam Speaker, we will get to him. And I will in fact after we conclude our meeting today speak with Corporate Finance and make sure that they are ready and prepared to provide that information at the appropriate time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Chair? We'll move on to. Yes.

Councillor Gerbasi: It's 12 o'clock, I'm wondering if we're going to break for lunch?

Madam Speaker: I'm wondering if we're wanting to just proceed to the next one. Downtown Development, there's no reports, just question period or is the will of Council to break now?

Councillor Gerbasi: It's your call, I just…

Madam Speaker: Okay. Well we will move on to one more. Okay. It's the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage, and Riverbank Management. There's no reports, no motions, no by-laws. Questions, any questions for Councillor Mayes, the Chair? Okay so is the will of Council to break or proceeding with the agenda? Break? Okay so I'm sort of not sure where we're all sitting with that. Well we have Property and Development to get through and…okay, so the will of Council is to break now and adjourn to 1:30, okay? Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
February 25, 2015, at 1:30 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayor, Councillors. I'd like to reconvene our Council meeting. We are at the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Councillor Orlikow, on the report dated February 3, 2015.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED FEBRUARY 3, 2015

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll move Items 1 and 2, please.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Orlikow: Any questions, comments?

Madam Speaker: Yes, okay. Madam Clerk.

Clerk: Item 1 - Extension of Time – Proposed Subdivision and Rezoning on land located at 740 John Bruce Road East, File…

Madam Speaker: Okay. I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Clerk: Item 2, Rescinding of May 24, 2006, Council Decision to declare 1201 Archibald Street Surplus to the Needs of the City.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, would you like to introduce the item?

Councillor Orlikow: I don't think…sure, I'll wait to hear from whomever…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, you no longer wish to stand it down? Okay, that's okay. We'll call the question then. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Orlikow, the report dated February 17th, 2015

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED FEBRUARY 17, 2015

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll introduce the report and move adoption on Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2

Madam Speaker: You'd like to stand down both or is it one of them? Okay, both? Madam Clerk.

Item 1 - Expropriation of Lands – Cockburn-Calrossie Combined Sewer Area - Drainage Upgrade Project

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, would you like to introduce?

Councillor Orlikow: No, Madam Speaker, thank you very much. I'll just wait to hear the comments and I'll reply afterwards. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes. You're No. 2? Who stood down No. 1? Councillor Wyatt? You have the floor.

Councillor Wyatt: I'm going to keep my comments brief. I just…I was in the Standing Committee where we dealt with this and I think we were in a very difficult situation. In terms of this land drainage issue, we heard from the department at length so I want to thank Councillor Orlikow for the work on that, and the one issue outstanding here I guess I just wanted to put on the record was…and the concern I guess I heard in the Standing Committee being that I don't think I had addressed fully, was that the fact that we're here to vote on the expropriation of lands required to build this drainage pond/retention lake in the Cockburn-Calrossie combined sewer area program. But the entire program, the department at the time could not give us the global budget of the entire program. There is a number of phases that…this is outside of Phase 1 apparently. This is Phase 1 as north of Taylor. This is part of other phases. They could not give us the numbers in terms of what their total budget was. And that's just a concern to me. And it should be to all of us. And even though I could appreciate the fact that maybe only preliminary design work has been done, and therefore the department is reluctant to share information along the lines and numbers and then, you know, being held to those numbers at a later date, when we know they could be, you know, plus or minus…plus, you know, minus 50 percent or plus a hundred percent as they say. But nevertheless that should be stated and we should still have an idea of what that budget…those budgets are. Therefore, my understanding from the Clerks is that there's a by-law to be walked on, on this item and requires two-thirds of vote of Council. I won't be supporting two-thirds vote of Council. The By-law can wait a month. I like to see the Department's numbers in a month's time before I vote on the By-law to begin the expropriation. But, I don't want to hold up anything here in terms of other paper work that has to be done, so I'm supporting the expropriation. But I'd like to know what the Department's budget is. We don't have an idea on that right now and a project of this size and scale is a little concerning to me. And, this is how we kind of…you approve one little part of a project then all of a sudden, you're in for a pound…you're in for a penny, in for a pound and that's how it kind of happened in the past around here and believe me, we've lived it and I don't want to live it again. And I'm sure there's…you know, the Department is very knowledgeable, qualified folks, they're doing their job. I'm not criticizing them, I just think that we need to know that going forward on what those costs are, therefore, I'm going to support the expropriation, but I won't be supporting suspension of the rules to consider by-law today or by-law today. I'll be more than happy to look at it in a month from now. The other clause I stood down by the way, Madam Speaker, just for members of Council to know, when you write an expropriation motion, there's also been a by-law that comes forward and the by-law is…once the by-law is passed that's what actually sets the date from the expropriation going forward. That's what benchmarks your market date that you're going to base the expropriation on if you have to go to the expropriation tribunal. By-law in the second item is not before us here today. It's not ready, so it's coming in a month's time anyway. So, by not dealing with the By-law on the first item today, I don't see how it's going to have a negative access. The other one is more specific to the rapid transit project itself. So, anyway, those are my comments and I just wanted…just so because I know many of the Council members were not at that Standing Committee meeting. So thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers on Item 1? Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I was on the committee as well with Councillor Wyatt and we did have a good discussion about those concerns. And we are going to be getting further information brought back in the future. But I mean, just to clarify, when we're talking about combined sewer, drainage upgrades, it's not really a single capital project, it's essentially a program and this was explained to us by the director that it's an ongoing program which is essentially an endless series of projects that's going to go forward almost indefinitely into the future. So, you know, it's pretty hard to have the answers to every one of these projects going forward and I guess I just put a caution that, you know, if we were to wait a month, we'd be adding another month on the time period, which is fairly tight, too, for the project supposed to start within a year, you know, in 2016. So I really don't believe we would be getting…we might get some new information, which is important and I think I totally concur with asking for the information and getting more information on. I think we should get that, but just keeping in mind this is not like a capital…the…in general, combined sewer upgrades are going to continue for decades and decades to come as ongoing programs, so you can't really put a final amount on that. So I'm not really sure I would support delaying this further on those grounds although I totally support getting the additional information that we will be getting whatever they can give us at the committee. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. So I'll just give a brief…if I may, just for my colleagues, the Cockburn-Calrossie is a combined sewer overflow for the Lord Roberts and Grand Park area primarily which is in the City of Winnipeg. Any dip in our topography is a puddle. And this area has that so they get about once every two year basement flooding protection verses our ten, five-year model and that's what this project is for. So it's people believe it's for other issues but 95 plus percent of the Cockburn-Calrossie water retention pond is for the combined sewer overflow for that area. And that…so that's really important for people to recognize. Some other people asked about other lands that we could possibly put this pond. There are none. This is a deep water pond. This is not a small little shallow pond, it's a very large pond that will be naturalized around it and we're hoping to do some nature reserves. They kind of format around there as well to enhance the area. However, and the cost in…Councillor Gerbasi is correct, this is a partly combined sewer overflow project program that continually rolls out, however, that's dated. Councillor Wyatt was asked and rightfully so about some more details and the numbers. We are endeavouring to get that. I'm not sure what department…committee that will go under either Infrastructure or comes through PP and D, but we're getting that information together now. So, there really…there is another option, there really is not another option, people. This is where the pond has to go. Do I want the pond to go here? Absolutely not. But, this is the only space where we can put that pond. So, unless you really want to leave Lord Roberts and Grand Park areas to this flooding issue, that will be the result. We do have pipes already in the ground going towards the pond area and pipes going out the other side. This is a critical piece and like I said there is no other place we can put this pond. If there was, that would be wonderful, but again, this will allow for infill development to happen and right now, we're prevented from doing so. Not just for all the Grant Park area and everywhere else. So if we believe in the infill. If you take the rationalization that really there is no other place where we can put this pond. There isn't really a reason to delay it. The numbers will come forward. It's part of the utility. They have this budgeted throughout. That's not to say that we should've been given better numbers and more exact numbers and I believe we will, but at the end of the day, this project has to go forward. So I leave it at that and hopefully, we'll have your support to bring it forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of Item 1? Contrary? Carried. Item 2, Madam Clerk.

Item 2 - Expropriation of Lands – Capital Integration Project (Southwest Transitway (Stage 2) and Pembina Highway Underpass)

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow to introduce.

Councillor Orlikow: No, Madam Chair. I'll let my colleagues speak first and I'll reply again.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes, I believe you stood this down.

Councillor Lukes: I'm not as well versed at it. I have notes. So I've got to read my notes. I don't come from a lawyer background. Okay. As a representative for the constituents of South Winnipeg St. Norbert Ward, I'd like to take this opportunity to speak to you, Mr. Mayor and members of Council on the topic of rapid transit as we're discussing on this agenda item. Firstly, Mayor Bowman, I'd like to thank you for your leadership on the benefits of rapid transit in a growing modern city. Those of us who spent years studying and working to improve alternative modes of transportation know improving public transit, walking and cycling conditions dramatically increase a transportation system's efficiency and ultimately promote more development, economic savings and benefits for a growing city. Ground work has occurred prior to your arrival, but I'm very pleased to hear and see your strong leadership and focus on multiple modes of transportation for our growing city. Thank you. And I want to thank Councillor Gerbasi for her unwavering support of rapid transit and active transportation and for exerting such an effort over the last ten years, educating members of Council on the many benefits of the multimodal transportation system, grueling work I know. But you have helped to lay the foundation for future generations and I thank you very much. And I want to thank the four members of this Council who took me up on my invitation this past December to physically tour Stage 2 of rapid transit corridors, Mr. Wardrop, and to learn and see more about the largest single investment the City is about to undertake. Thank you, Councillor Schreyer, Gilroy, Browaty and Sharma and Councillor Orlikow, I know you know the route intimately. So you're excused from the tour. I didn't realize until Mr. Wardrop told me prior to our outing two months ago that no Councillors have ever toured the route with him. Master one thing, imagination is another, but to physically see the route and the surrounding environment and the land use gives the perspective like no other. Thank you for your desire to understand and learn. South Winnipeg's St. Norbert Ward is the second largest ward in Winnipeg. We have 53,500 residents, 500 less than St. Boniface and we're nowhere near finished growing. Waverley West, projected to be the size of Brandon, is filling up faster than anticipated. The Southwood lands that the U of M are in the final planning stages for denser development. Combine this development with the U of M's growing population, this year it was around 29,000 students. They're continuing to grow and expand their base of students and with a number of activities being held in our new Investors Group Field Stadium, South Winnipeg is well positioned to embrace the extension of rapid transit. I heard this message loud and clear from the majority of constituents on my campaign. People want rapid transit and they're willing to pay for it and they want it soon. But I did hear concerns about the dog leg route. And, you know, Mayor Bowman, I did express

this concern to you when we met for the first time after being elected. And I promised I would investigate further. Mr. Mayor and members of Council, I will share some interesting developments I've experienced in the past four months. Prior to being elected, as Councillor Gerbasi is aware and many members who were previously on Council, I was an advocate and some would say a rabid advocate of active transportation. And as an advocate, you pursue, you make calls, you make inquiries, you dig for facts, you turn back layers and you work hard trying to build your case for whatever you are advocating for. And it's hard to build a case as an advocate because you're not given all the facts. You're just not. Now, today, I'm on the other side of the table. I sit as Chair of the very department I advocated so hard to get facts from and today, administration answers my calls and they answer my questions and they even deliver information to me. Still surreal. Community leaders also call me and offer guidance and advice to help me in my decision making process. And my beloved 53,500 residents call me and offer advice and insight non-stop. I was elected to be accountable and to ask questions and I've been doing just that and after four months on the other side of the table, I've been focusing daily on the rapid transit file. I worked with my colleague, Councillor Orlikow, administration and others. And I've asked questions and received answers. And, Mr. Mayor and members of Council, the answers I'm receiving are very concerning to me. I, as do many constituents of South Winnipeg St. Norbert and residents all over the city, have great concerns about the process surrounding the decision of the dog leg. The validity of projected development and revenue the dog leg is expected to generate, and the lack of adherence to core land use planning and transit oriented development principles and complete communities directions and strategies. And I know the last thing many of you wanted to discuss again is rapid transit, and I know many of you just want to get it done, and I want to get it done, too. But I was elected to bring the concerns of my constituents forward and ask questions. And in the light of openness and transparency, and the type of process that was followed by previous Council on many infrastructure projects, and in light of the multiple audits that have been brought forward related to process and sadly, more that will be coming and in light of now losing much of the anticipated development land to the pond due to process, whatever process that was, I think we have to be asking questions of the single largest project the City is about to undertake in its history…in its history. This Council has inherited a troubling past and it's our responsibility to peel back the layers and to do our due diligence. I want to be a hundred percent clear, building rapid transit…building a rapid transit corridor in South Winnipeg is absolutely the right thing to do. But it is the process surround the decision of the dog leg route that I and many others have grave concerns about and we must look further. I must look further. I can't…I must look further. Our financial partners absolutely expect us to conduct due diligence on any project we undertake. And our constituents expect us to conduct due diligence on any project we undertake. I will be supporting the expropriation to ensure we keep moving forward on the development of rapid transit. There are no shovels in the ground. Every project has adjustments. And we may have to make adjustments as we keep moving forward. But we must keep moving forward. I wanted to share with you the concerns of South Winnipeg St. Norbert constituents and myself, because we will be the first benefactors of rapid transit when it is complete. And I will continue to ask questions in the days and weeks to come and bring information forward to my colleagues and taking action where need be. Transparency and accountability is the foundation on which we were all elected and I'm going to adhere to that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Allard or Councillor Mayes, pardon me.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just before I begin on what I plan to say, there is a device that's being used by some people here which is because the Fire Halls were over budget, because Police headquarters were, it was over budget, anything the City does is under question and we'll probably be over-budget or is subject to audit or should be so there is a concern, just for the record, Phase 1 rapid transit went through on time and on budget. So that the Police headquarters is over budget, inarguably true that the first phase of rapid transit was on time and it was on target and on budget, inarguably true. So I think that we shouldn't mix apples and oranges here when we're looking at what we might be going forward with in terms of Phase 2. We heard a remarkable allegation this morning and I want to read it out because it was from Mr. Sanders and Mr. Sanders is often quoted in the media often, you know, identified by this one media journal in the City as the man who should be mayor, the man who should be CAO, et cetera. And so what he stated this morning was, next week it will be two years since I first discovered the City's long standing rapid transit plan was being hijacked, his word, hijacked and that public lands and financial resources were being diverted for the benefit of a few favoured developers, located along the Parker dog leg to the west of the original route which was supposed to go straight south along the CNR Letellier line. So he's saying in March, very precise statement, March of 2013, he discovered the hijacking of what the route was supposed to be along with Letellier. And I did ask which are the favoured few developers that those of us who were here at the time favoured in this and I have to say as a lawyer, if these allegations are true, we would be thrown out of office and I would certainly be disbarred and you're essentially alleging a $490 million fraud on the taxpayers, $490 million being diverted to help which developers? I asked him. You name them. You're making the allegations, Gem Equities and Shindico. Now, he's saying Shindico, he's saying land along the Parker dog leg. Well then it gets a little grey because of course the Shindico lands are nowhere near the dog leg. They're above the railway tracks whether the dog leg or the Letellier route was built actually wouldn't impact on the land that Shindico owns, but those are his allegations. We hijacked the process to benefit Shindico and Gem Equities, $490 million project. He discovered this hijacking March of 2013 because why? It was supposed to go down Letellier. Well, here is the transportation master plan. Here it is, November of 2011, showing the dog leg saying southwest corridor

alignment to be determined. So November, before I'm here, perhaps I wasn't part of the hijacking then, it was all done before it was here in November of 2011. So clearly, November 2011, there was some doubt as to…and all of this relates to be expropriation. This was certainly raised by the speaker this morning in relation to the expropriation and I'm responding to his allegations pertaining to the expropriation which is necessary because of the dog leg route. So the dog leg was certainly in the mix November 2011. No set route. So what happened after that? It was a report March 2013. It's out there in the public. Dillon Consulting had done a whole study of the different potential alignments. Nine different criteria used, public consultations, Province involved, City involved, U of M involved, Dillon Consulting involved. They came back and recommended the dog leg route. So, was it a secret hijacking? Apparently not. Dillon Consulting must have been in on the conspiracy then if you follow Mr. Sanders logic. So then the route was chosen in March of 2013 to be the dog leg. He also thinks there is much to be made, so nine criteria not just transit-oriented development. This routes go higher on things like alternative AT availability. There's more room to do that if you go along the dog let than if you go along Letellier. He makes much of a map that was included in the Mayor's recent press announcement with Shelly Glover and I think Kevin Chief of the federal funding as if to suggest, well look, they use this map and the map shows it going down Letellier, perhaps suggesting the Feds didn't know what they were getting into for their $140 million. Well, if you actually look at that press release, this is a link to background information. Immediately below it is another link to the exact map of the dog leg route. So the Feds knew what they were getting into. The Province knows what it's getting into, the City knows what it's getting into. What do we conclude from that? Either the Province and the Federal Government and Dillon Consulting and U and M are in…all in on this hijacking or they don't care. They don't care that the proper route has been hijacked to benefit Andrew Marquess and Shindico according Mr. Sanders. They don't care. It's only a couple of hundred million dollars. They don't care what the route is. So that's one potential view of the facts. Also, he indicated when I asked him he said, "Well, it might have been senior City admin," but he also says that Councillors don't ask questions, therefore they are complicit. So we're complicit in the hijacking of $490 million of public resources. It's going to benefit Gem Equities and Shindico, the people named by Mr. Sanders. So I guess we have two versions of facts and if I'll try to stick to the facts here. We have an…incidentally, this 2004 map that Mr. Sanders keeps touting as evidence that it was always supposed to be built on Letellier...the western corridor is south of the Assiniboine River and now it's north. I look forward to an extended discussion of what hijacking and corruption must have led to the western corridor being moved up above the Assiniboine River. Perhaps, Mr. Sanders can fill our heads with that since obviously a map that's been published in 2004, there have been revisions. You must have voted on it, Madam Speaker. You were here in 2011. The transportation master plan was passed almost unanimously before I was elected. The western corridor moved. The south west corridor moved. The idea that this map somehow indicates it was always supposed to be along Letellier and we hijacked it in 2013 is frankly ludicrous. So, you have two potential versions of the facts. Mr. Sanders: "the City has engaged in a hijacking of the biggest project in City history to benefit Shindico and Andrew Marquess". Either the Province, the B and M and Dillon Consulting and the Federal Government are party to this hijacking or they are oblivious to how they're…all these hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent. I prefer my version of the facts which is, we had Dillon…in 2011, it was clear no route had been chosen. It was clear Dillon Consulting, outside firm was hired to do an assessment. Fact: nine different criteria used. The winning configuration was the dog leg that we subsequently voted on in 2013. You know, just after I was elected I met with the Rapid Transit Coalition, people like Paul Hesse and Harry Wolbert. And I said, "Why don't we go down Pembina? Why are we building it where they ain't? Why are we building out in this dog leg?" And their view was, no that's what you should do, you should be encouraging people to try to live closer to downtown. We don't want people continuing to build further and further out. Let's make it easier for them. We keep saying, "Build up, don't build out. Let's put our money where our mouth is. Let's try and induce development closer to downtown." So I'm going to side with the Rapid Transit Coalition. I'm going to side with Dillon Consulting. I'm going to side with Dillon Consulting. I'm going to side with the people who made this vote in 2013 that the dog leg route was the right way to go. Now there are reasons to oppose the dog leg route. Councillor Orlikow has given some pretty eloquent ones over the years. You can talk about the environment. You can talk about cost. You can talk about some other factors. But if you're going to come down here and accuse me of routing $490 million to benefit a man I have never met, Andrew Marquess and Shindico, maybe you should have some documents, maybe you should present them when you make this allegation, otherwise I'm going to suggest Mr. Sanders is making a in essence criminal allegations here. He says, "Well, maybe it has yet to be proven whether it's criminal." He is the one making the allegation that City Councillors and City admin have hijacked a $490 million project to aid developers. All I can say is if you're going to come down here, bring some paper, bring some proof or stop making these allegations because frankly, I'm…there's a pretty compelling alternate statement of facts as to why we chose that route.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Councillor Lukes mentioned concerns she has with the dog leg and it happens to be that we've actually began that…we'd begun financing the dog leg before the budget has occurred in terms of the budget allocation for the completion of the south Winnipeg rapid transit corridor. We'd begun because we had the vote on giving Manitoba Hydro a few extra million dollars for them to contract their side of their Hydro…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, we've already had that debate. Can you speak to the item before us? We've already had the debate on the early works project that you are referring to.

Councillor Schreyer: Yes. My point is…I think it may be a point of information. Despite the concerns which you mentioned now, it happens to be that we did already vote on it. That's…that's my point, Ma'am. But I was the only one to vote against that. I just want to make that point of clarification. My concern as well when it comes to Councillor Mayes' comments about Mr. Sanders this morning, when it comes down to openness and accountability, Mr. Sanders, I did not…I'm not suggesting that his allegations are correct by any means, Madam Speaker. But he does express suspicions by the public. It's all very well for us to go forward from now in a spirit of openness and accountability, but people still have suspicions about how things have been happening at City Hall and people want answers and I don't think they've received them. And until we have that clarity and openness about what has been happening, people will continue to compare this Council and our new projects, such as rapid transit to what's going on at the Fire Hall or the Police Headquarters. And I wish to make that point, otherwise we're going to be getting more comments from people like Mr. Sanders. Fair enough. And it's going to be very difficult for people to have trust in this government, if we don't deal with why half the Council has changed in this last election. A Mayor who felt he didn't have to run again, a new CAO coming up and for these very reasons, I think we need to give, to restore trust in City Hall, not just by going forward, but also by explaining what has happened so people can have trust when it comes to what's going to be much larger capital expenditures. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi followed by Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think…I appreciate hearing the comments today from everyone and I know this is…I think it's an important conversation to be having about this. I wanted to put in my 2 cents in terms of how we are looking at this. Transportation planning is a long term thing. It's…and unfortunately, when councils change and politics change, sometimes, you know, it takes some time to…it can actually throw things completely off the rails. In fact, I've heard a story in Ontario that they actually dug over a kilometre of a subway tunnel. And then when the Mike Harris government got in, they went back and filled in that tunnel. So if people think there isn't money at stake when we change our minds over and over again, which is what's happened on this second phase of rapid transit…of this southwest transitway, over the years, we've been talking about finishing and building this transit way since the 80s. I mean, I think we need to step back and look at the big picture, you know, and recognize what is at stake. And I appreciate, everyone has the right to ask those questions and to consider it. But I hope when you consider that, the answers you have and you consider the whole thing that you look at the big picture of what's at stake. If for some reason this council decided to change its mind which, which when you start talking that way, it sounds like you're leaving that possibility open and I've had a couple of Councillors talking that way that yeah, you know, yeah, we'll support this, but you know, we're still leaving the door open to change our mind and I guess I just want to caution you about that. You know, it's already been discussed, Councillor Mayes, length about the route decision and he is correct. It was looked at, it was studied and the decision was made. You may not agree with it, many people did agree with it. The majority of people agreed with it, who made the decision and it was based on the study in front of us. I'd also remind you that because this project is a P3, which we didn't have a choice based on the Federal if we wanted to access the Federal money, that was the route where that money was available so that was the way we went down. And that limits the amount of information that can be made public. So some of the information that's talked about is going to be limited and that's unfortunate. But we have the information we are allowed to have under that process and that's the reality of building large capital projects in Canada right now with the P3 program. And I also wanted to just clarify, if anybody isn't sure, what we're talking about in terms of the finance at stake. We all know we're almost at our debt limit. We all know the gas tax money is gone. We have $225 million up front in cash committed to, from the Provincial Government. There is an election coming, things can change. We have an announcement on the federal funding so we have our partnership funding in place. It's already been approved. And I don't know if anybody has thought about what would happen if we went, you know, decided to change the route. I mean, you would have to go back and do detailed design again. You'd have to do functional design again, you'd have to study, the whole thing again. And you would add years and years of cost escalation, plus you'd have to go back to the drawing board with your funding. So, if anybody is suggesting that we're going too fast by building the second half of a half built transitway of our first transitway in Winnipeg, I believe Ottawa started in the 80s and we studied it at the same time. And they built it and we didn't and look where we are today. We're trying to finish our first line and we're hemming and hawing about it. I mean, we need to get on with it. And it's not being inpatient, but as I mentioned in previous Council meetings, Calgary is proposing five new BRT lines as well as an LRT line in the same time period that we're…you know, rushing to build…to complete a half-finished transitway. It's been studied; the cost benefit analysis has been done, 1.37, it's…the number is there. The numbers are there. We don't have numbers like that for our numerous road projects that everybody just kind of rubber stamps because a minister wants it or it's in their ward or they'd love to be able to announce a new road. I mean, this has proven that rapid transit has benefits as Janice eloquently outlined earlier. We're talking about an integrated transportation. We're talking about active transportation. We know the problems on Pembina Highway…can be absurd if we don't do this. We're building the City of Brandon out there. And, you know, this is a planned, long-term plan that's been in place for the City

for 30 years. We made the decision about the route based on the reports in front of us and we have the funding. So, I just think it's fine to…it's fair to ask the questions and it's fair to have this discussion and it's important to have the discussion and I think it's important we understand it. But, even if you find there's some things that you are not a hundred percent comfortable with, are you a hundred percent comfortable with giving back $225 million and starting over to the Province? With going to P3 Canada and trying again because you would have a completely new proposal. To add another two to five years minimum before we see the first phase of rapid transit built, we're waiting till 2020 right now, folks, and we have a mayor who was elected on building out a BRT system. We have the second candidate also at least to committed to build this transit way. So, you know, it's…pardon me if I sound inpatient, but I mean seriously, we have had this debate over and over and over. We've debated the route, we've debated all these different issues and we made democratic decisions and if every time there's an election, a Council just basically starts over with its transportation plan, we will never build anything, at least not anything to do with the long term transportation plan like building transit. And I mean, I think the cost benefit analysis on this was done…Ross chaired the rapid transit task force that Councillor Pagtakhan and I sat on, it was recommended that BRT is the right system and it's just so frustrating that we continually debate this over and over and over at every council meeting. I mean I don't mind having the discussion, but I guess I'm just saying as a caution that we make sure we don't set the City back, that we move forward. We've made the decision, the money is in place, and I just hope that we're not going to get thrown off the rails. You know, we hear people, you know, I appreciate David Sanders coming here and he has some points, but I think we can all agree that some of the arguments are kind of partially through and partially not through. A lot of things are blended together. You know, nobody was…the land swap was not ideal. Obviously, I was the person who moved the motion to have the audits about the land swap. I didn't agree with the land swap. So I think it's quite possible we didn't get the right value for that property, but does that mean we should stop rapid transit for five years and another five years and give back the over $400 million in funding to the other partner who just stopped because we're not happy that a CAO or whoever orchestrated that deal. We've audited it. We're going to do better going forward, but seriously, we have to look at the big picture of the decisions we're making and I think it's fine to express our doubts and what not, but I certainly hope we're not going to waiver and I know, you know, waiver from the goal of being a city that has rapid transit. And that's really what you're deciding, like you may feel you're deciding well, let's just not to do this. No, you're putting our city back another five years. We don't have more money just endlessly coming forward. There's a lot of other priorities that I know all you have. So I urge you to consider that and to look at the long term implications of this discussion and in the actions we take. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Yes.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Point of information. Councillor Gerbasi mentioned the bus rapid transit system being constructed started in the 80s in Ottawa. I was living in Ottawa when they were constructing it. They are now dismantling the bus rapid transit system or lines in Ottawa in favour of light rapid transit.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. Yes...

Councillor Schreyer: Councillor Gerbasi…

Madam Speaker: Point of order? We'll move on to our next speaker at this time, Councillor Gillingham followed by Councillor Wyatt. Thank you.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll get kind of right to the point on this in regards to what is before us to instruct Legal Services, the City Solicitor to be…to initiate expropriation proceedings. I listened to the news yesterday come out in regards to a past project, specifically, Station 11 and information that was withheld or didn't come forward in a timely manner. My concern, my expression is that just we have some measure of assurance here that as Council…and it's been noted a couple times that we have all of the information, all the reports that we need before making any decisions, further decisions as they come. I'm…I'm…that's critical to me. I think it should be critical to us as Council. If it means we slow down a little bit. We slow down a little bit. But I think it would be fool hardy of us, irresponsible of us just to say, well, we think the reports are going to come or we're trusting this or that. If there are reports that we don't have that we need as Council to make our decisions, then I think it's incumbent upon us to wait for those reports, ask for those reports before we take, you know, further steps along this massive project. So I'm just hoping that there that we can be assured, you know, by those that are in those positions that all the reports we would need, all the information we would need would come to us in time. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to clarify some discussion also here and take liberty I guess for Report 1. It was made very clear to us that the Water and Waste Department is funding that work. This is a

Water and Waste Project is funding now work. This is a Water and Waste project, not a Transit project and we do know that the department, Water and Waste has had projects over budget namely the water treatment plant.

Madam Speaker: Councillor…Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I know I'm speaking on this…I'm tying the reality, okay fair enough. The other thing we understood very clearly was that that project is separate from the transit project completely, completely other than a little bit of the drainage from the track, but the reality is that drainage can be accommodate elsewhere so whether it's transit, rapid transit, that goes for or not, doesn't affect rapid transit, number one. Number two, let's get back to the issues of what we're before here…to what we're talking about here today, which is the expropriation of lands. Now, this is interesting because…for this project to go forward, we have to expropriate quite a level of parcels or lands here. And ironically, it is tied to the one we dealt with before in the sense of the property owner that we're negotiating with on those lands, Gem Equities. And I hope, Madam Speaker and I'm sure it is the case that Gem Equities is negotiating in good faith with the City of Winnipeg because here we are on this clause coming forward to expropriate land for the purpose of building a rapid transit line running right adjacent all of their property, that rapid transit line will have a direct benefit to the property owners adjacent to the transit line and they would be one of them who could benefit from that, and there's nothing wrong with that. There's nothing wrong with that. All I'm saying is that we vote today on the expropriation and a month from now, we vote on the by-law. And I'm hoping that over the course of the next month as was alluded to in the previous report by our administration, that the good…that the in good faith negotiations will continue between the City of Winnipeg and Gem Equities so that we can resolve the issue with regards to acquiring the land for the retention pond without having to go to expropriation. But in a month's time, if this Council is informed that we have not had any progress whatsoever and now we have to vote on the money by-law to build a rapid transit line across the front of their lands, which approximately to the lines. You know, this members of Council are going to have a hard time with that, real hard time with that. So you know, it works both ways. It's a two way street, life and business. And I trust that there is good faith negotiation going on now. I have no other reason to believe that's not the case. I'm sure they're a very reputable firm. So, Madam Speaker, those are my comments. I'll be supporting this clause and I thank Councillor Orlikow for speaking to it as the way he did it in the committee and going forward and then we'll deal with the money by-law hopefully successfully a month from now. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to go off the top of my mind and memory because I kind of was part of City Council here from 2010 to 2014. And we had many debates and discussions and this whole related to the route, this expropriation we are talking about is a requirement now because of where we are at in the…in this whole planning out and finishing off a transit line. And so, I'm going to first sort of address one issue about this, and that is that no matter where we are building a rapid transit line in the City of Winnipeg, it is to the benefit of the whole system. I mentioned this at the last Council meeting. It is not just the benefit to the people who live in the St. Norbert Ward. This is a benefit to the whole city. We have a Mayor who campaigned on…the reason the Mayor campaigned and supported getting rapid transit, all the routes done as soon as possible is a healthy transit system has rapid transit that all enhances the rest of the system. It's a mass transportation system. And so while there would be few people immediately benefiting in the Mynarski ward from rapid transit down to the U of M...there will be...there will be because you won't pay parking fees, you know what, if you can get down to University of Manitoba from up here, my kids decided not to go there, but, you know, if you can get down there fast, you don't have to own a car or whatever. So the point is though, is that a healthy transit system like they have in Ottawa. Ottawa's problem, Ottawa's only problem with their bus rapid transit is their transit became so successful, now they need light rail. That's the only reason. But we are far from there because we didn't we haven't proceeded like Councillor Gerbasi has mentioned. It took a long time. But this…so I just want to make sure that that's clear. Because the people that I talked to in the election, when they talked about BRT, I had to say, well, I support it because it's part of a whole transportation system and I'll use the term, you know, Winnipeg is not a hick town. We need to have rapid transit. So, this expropriation has to happen. I want to just revisit though, when they looked at the three routes, so we made a decision on the route before we came down…before transit who has done a very diligent, diligent budget…they…I trust them. Phase 1 came in on time. It's great. On budget, too. I have great confidence in our transit department's ability to go out there and do the due diligence that's required. I have confidence, but I don't want us to totally tie in what we're paying for right now with when we made a route decision. This expropriation is directly related to when we made the decision on which route, the Phase 2 to finish this line off, would go. And so, in that, and we made that decision then Transit was able to go out and do, and get a higher class estimate of what the costs were going to be, looking at it. But costs were kind of looked at and when we decided to change the route and just so everybody remembers, we passed the transportation plan, which I…incidentally I voted against. But we passed the transportation plan and then after that, at least a year or more after that, we then solidified and we passed an amendment to our master transportation plan to set out what our route is going to be. So that all needs to be very clear because I think the public gets confused between Council's decision to go ahead with the budget that was determined, a full budget, a proper class estimate so we can come down to with some final numbers and it is a P3 so there's going to

be a bidding process. There are some documents that we can't show. It's a bidding process and whoever the P3, whoever that private sector business is, is going to actually, basically, technically, they hold it. It's theirs until the end of the P3 agreement. So part of our expropriation here is part of that P3. So but in the other routes that were proposed, like we're talking about expropriation here and Councillor Gillingham rightly so said he wants to find out and get information. But I don't see us running away with this. You know, if you looked at the Letellier Line and if we decided to go down there, not only was there issues about the bus and how it's going to interact with streets like Clarence and whatever those streets are, technically we would have to close those streets off, access to Pembina Highway, I think. But they said, well, all these special, but there was a high level of an expropriation need. And what the developers own, there's some business land along the Letellier Line. What developers were going to benefit from that if we decided to go down that line? Were we going to be accused of trying to benefit some developer if we went down Letellier? Because somebody could've made the argument. That's not the truth. The truth is expropriation was going to be needed no matter which route we take. And here we are today. I'll be supporting this motion to expropriate this land, negotiation in good faith, yes. I don't know when they did the land swap deal, if there was ever discussion that Gem Equities was going to swap you this land, but, you know, you may have to give up some of this land, I don't know if that discussion ever happened. Prior to me, I don't know anything about it. All is I know is we're at the point now where the route was determined because of a whole bunch of different factors and expropriation and benefit to other people's land would happen no matter which line we pick. So I'll leave it at that. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further speakers on the item? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just like to complement each of the member of this council for voicing their thoughts on this important issue today. This is exactly the tone that we need to have with City Council where we are doing our due diligence. We are asking the questions and we are supporting the will of Winnipeg that was expressed in the election. I've been steadfast in my support for rapid transit and I appreciate the support of this Council to continue to pursue building a growing, thriving, more modern Winnipeg with a modern public transportation system. I'd like in particular to thank Councillor Orlikow as well as Councillor Lukes for their ongoing diligence in asking the tough questions that we need to ask…that Council is expected to ask when we're dealing with millions and millions of taxpayer dollars. So it's entirely appropriate that we are having this discussion; that the views and the concerns are being expressed in the way that they are today. I can say that I've seen first-hand the incredible diligence that is being made by Councillor Lukes in particular with regards to this question and on related issues with Councillor Orlikow. They are doing exactly what we need them to do, and to ask the questions and to do our due diligence. And so that needs to continue. I will be supporting this motion as I gather many…many of you will as well. And I just want to commend and thank everybody for their efforts. This is going to be an ongoing effort. I, too, am inpatient as was mentioned by Councillor Gerbasi. I would've liked to have seen this done before taking office, but the reality is these are big dollars and these are complex issues and so we need to do our job. That's exactly what we're doing here today and I want to commend everybody for their efforts. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Orlikow to close.

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and thank you everybody for your comments. As we…I just want to clarify a few points that I have heard. This option of requirement for the Parker lands for the BRT, that wasn't 2009 if you look at the land swap or the land exchange I think we should say, if you look into that motion, there's actually…I wish we had the foresight then as we don't have with the pond, there is a buy back provision with Gem Equities for the portion that we need for this BRT line because at the time we weren't sure which route was going. But they're clearly marked in the motion. It could go this way or could go that way. So those were the two motions there so with the foresight and kudos to our administration to actually put that clause in there. It will be saving the taxpayers some value, some money. But it is there. There is a buy back clause. I just want to clarity that. Also there's been questions about the reports. You know, we've had some discussions about reports being made public, okay. Well, that's…there's some issues with that regarding some of the information that's in there, it's a little more difficult publicly. I still would like to see some of this information come out more publicly, the value for money, the business case scenario, the environmental assessment report, the alignment study report, but we as Councillors, you can have it. I have them. I've read them diligently a couple times over again, and I first wanted us to call out Mr. Wardrop for being incredibly patient with me. I yelled and argued with him and Councillor Lukes was shocked at one of our meetings that I speak to an administrator like this, but Mr. Wardrop understands what a serious issue this is. Yes, there's some environmental issues for me regarding a forest that would be impacted by the TOD development and hopefully we can still work on that problem. We are still working on that issue, the dog…the Brenda Leipsic dog park relocating that again. We've had some really good movement on both those fronts so I'm in…quite supportive of that, but those are more of local issues for myself as a Councillor and as environmentalists, however, I haven't ceased to having discussions with Mr. Wardrop. Every meeting I have, he provides a little bit more information and doesn't satisfy me on everything. But we could all sit here and take in pieces out one by one and say, well, look, this idea doesn't work. This one piece of the puzzle is bad. Well, the dog leg is not great in every respect. North Letellier Line great in every respect, but it's that that basket of the

matrix that we have to be looking at. So yes, there was comments about Letellier Line. They're looking at 30 to $40 million in expropriation costs because it really is right in the middle of a residential develop I mean commercial and some residential. The other argument that we had in the past was build it and they will come. Well, that's the mode we've chosen. Hopefully, they'll start building stuff there. Other cities have found that they didn't come, and they didn't build. But again, so you have a high expropriation value verses very low expropriation value, but you can't just take one piece and just only use one piece. You have to look at the basket of all the goods. And that's called leadership and that's called our job. So again, we can all sit here and just pick one out that one we don't like. I don't like it losing a forest or potentially losing a forest. I still believe that there is some value in Letellier Line because that…all that value overweigh all the other negative parts for the Letellier Line such as the difficulty of building it; the increasing in the cost verses the potential of what development will there because there actually is existing development on that line. So again, as we march down the line here, we keep moving forward, the options about realigning the route become narrower and narrower. We know that. The more we invest in, the more the sum costs are there; the more difficult it is to try to change our route. I don't think we're at that point yet to be honest with you. I'm still in discussion with it, still trying to get some information from Mr. Wardrop. But I can tell you from my sake, I am able to bring this forward today, even with some reservations on a few items. I'm still able to bring this forward today. I think we can resolve some those issues forward, however, I haven't ceased my…I haven't "ceased and desist" with Mr. Wardrop yet trying to get some more information. And I really ask my colleagues on Council, please go through the reports. I have them available. I even have them highlighted for you if you like as they make…there are quite extensive reports. They are available to you. I would be more than happy to share my notes on it. So you can get the value for money. We still have the idea of the P3, that's another issue. Again, these have all moved down the line. What will happen if we say to the…our funding partner, "We are going to change the route now." Will that blow out all the funding? Possibly and that's a huge consideration. We can't do this on our own. I think it was…some tweet this morning in Ontario said, "Toronto, we don't have our Provincial and our Federal partners. It's going to take us a hundred years to get to the subway down because the City can't afford these things just on our own. We just don't have that capacity." So again, there are some problems I have with the dog leg and correctly so Mr. Wardrop has pointed out there are some significant problems with Letellier Line as well. Again, that doesn't mean we should stop asking questions. So we really…this is that big of a project. So again, we're moving forward. The really…the only full taking of land here on the expropriation is the Parker lands there which is down right below the pond. And we do have a buy back provision for that. The other takes are very small. There's a couple actually…two other takes that are little bit bigger farther down with some fourplexes, but most of them are cutouts, curb cuts, parking lot, parking stall or two, but they are not excessive. So the most excessive one we actually do have the buy back in. So that's what we're talking about today. Shall we…should we move this forward? Now, why are we…I don't…we…I talked to the Mayor about this, we weren't too keen about bringing things forward like this. We want Council to have the opportunity to have more questions, but we call the announcement came quite late and so we are caught now because we need to get those shovels in the ground. We need…the processes are moving on, we need to make sure that these lands are available and therefore for the legislative process of expropriation, we have to start this process now. It needs to get moving or what's going to end up happening is we're going to be still stuck in land negotiations and we're going to be delaying the project even further. Delaying the project further, there better be some very good value reasons why we're doing that because it will cost us even more money. So again today, we're asking to move the project forward with expropriations. We're not saying we're going to expropriate lands. We're not saying that we're still negotiating with everybody, but again, for the legislative process we have to get that process moving. So in the end of the day, to me, this is another step, down the path, however, it's not the end of the path for me still, I'm still meeting with Mr. Wardrop. And I would recommend everybody, read those reports. I'd be more than happy to sit down with you and share some of those information with you, and I guarantee you Mr. Wardrop is as well. So again, on the motion today, which is really just to begin the process of expropriation so we can get it built on time and therefore on budget, we need to be moving this forward, so the allegations of the Parker lands regarding Mr. Marquess, I know for a fact, Mr. Marquess is not too keen about losing that one third of his land for the pond. I know he's not. He wants to develop that land because that's where he really makes his money and every developer needs to make money. That is the model. So how does this going to happen in the future? He will do some development on that property, but again, that property is very complicated because of the lack of services in there. But I've looked back. The Parker land swap, there were some issues with the evaluation, but if I think you step back and I'd be more than happy to do it in private, some of the pluses and minus, this is not a home run for Mr. Marquess, either. We need…regardless of where the route goes, I believe he will be developing regardless. He may get a 10 percent upgrade, but it won't be huge. So again, to try to find evil, and I know where it's coming from, I recall this from, you know, it's our history a little bit where the public have lost some confidence in our ability. Again, we can only do that by proving that we know what we're doing and we're going forward on something. So if anybody does have any questions and concerns, I'd be more than happy to try to answer them the best we can. And that's a public's right and your right. But again, besides just sending out these accusations that are…well, I'd say they're accusations about criminal activity. And really, I understand where that's coming from, but I personally have not been able to see it or find it and I have dug. I believe the administration, when they did the Parker lands swap, were not aware at the time, of the Calrossie, but they were aware of the BRT and they accordingly did that. So there's…I don't see any reason not going forward with the expropriations today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Call for recorded vote. All in favour, please stand.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Dobson, Eadie, Gerbasi, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Schreyer, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The vote is unanimous. Okay, we'll now move on to By-laws. Councillor Orlikow.

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

Councillor Orlikow: So which one are we on? So we just have a little bit of changes here. This is 15.

Madam Speaker: Thirteen of 2015.

Councillor Orlikow: Oh, 13, that's why I missed one, too. Oh, what happened to…I'm sorry, what happened to By-law No. 15? Okay, so it's going to be No. 12?

Madam Speaker: There is no By-law 15.

Councillor Orlikow: Whether…No. 12, I see. Sorry. By-law No. 12/2015, By-law…

Clerk: No.

Councillor Orlikow: Is that right?

Madam Speaker: Thirteen.

Councillor Orlikow: We're not proceeding…that's not proceed one, right? Yeah. The City of Winnipeg to approve plan subdivisions on land located on Elizabeth Road and Plessis Road in the Riel Community be not...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, yeah, will read…

Councillor Orlikow: That's the right one?

Madam Speaker: Okay, the one you're striking. Sure, go ahead with that.

Councillor Orlikow: …be not proceeded with at this time.

Madam Speaker: Call the vote on this. Mr. Clerk, do we need a vote on it? No? Okay.

Councillor Wyatt: A question. One on procedure…we are not proceeding with which by-law number? With 12?

Madam Speaker: Twelve of 2015.

Councillor Wyatt: Twelve as well. Okay.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I move that the following by-laws be read for a first time, 13/2015 and 14/2015.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, this is a unique situation here and I'd like to postpone it to give us a chance to get briefed on the matter, reading the by-law, you know, it doesn't often come before us where we have the by-law recognizing the quashing, a by-law…

Madam Speaker: Would you like to…?

Councillor Wyatt: One thirty six, No. 46/13 and 141/13.

Madam Speaker: Would you like to lay it over to next meeting?

Councillor Wyatt: Is that amenable to the chair? Okay, then that's what I'll do. If there's a way we can have this…I'm sure there's a reasonable explanation why we're quashing by-laws, but it just jumped out at me when I saw that so…I know, but I'd just like to know the details of what's going on so.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Moving forward, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: So it's just move by-law…

Madam Speaker: So we have this motion before us.

Councillor Orlikow: Yes. I see the rules.

Madam Speaker: So Councillor Orlikow, we have a motion for By-law 13 on the floor and we'll vote on that to lay it over to next meeting. Okay, I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Let's carry on.

Clerk: By-law No. 14/2015.

Councillor Orlikow: I'll move that 14/2015 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 14/2015.

Councillor Orlikow: I move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 14/2015 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Do we have an addendum by-law? Councillor Orlikow?

Councillor Orlikow: I'll move that the rules be suspended and that By-law No. 11/2015 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 11/2015.

Councillor Orlikow: I move that By-law No. 11/2015 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 11/2015.

Councillor Orlikow: I move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 11/2015 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move on to Question Period. Any questions for Councillor Orlikow? Okay, seeing none, Councillor Schreyer, you have a question.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Yes I do.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. Comments were made to the media in the last few weeks in regards to budget proposals by the departments, in particularly actually from Community Services and potentially…well from Community Services. I do recall our Finance Chair mentioning that EPC had the intention to go to the Councillors to discuss issues of options for efficiencies in Community Services' proposed cuts, as we all said proposed cuts, I don't see any.

Madam Speaker: Is this a question relevant to the Chair?

Councillor Schreyer: Oh yes Madam, this is absolutely, this is my preamble. The issue also is Madam and this is why the question, that Councillor Morantz also as the Finance Chair said to discuss also infrastructure issues with the Councillors which is Planning and Property Development. Now in my meeting and I was grateful you know for this aspect of process, that there is some process going on with Councillors. However, I have not had a meeting regarding options from regarding infrastructure. I've not had my meeting with Planning, Property and Development. I ask the Chair of Planning, Property and Development if I will be able to have that meeting regarding budget proposals with options Madam?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow?

Councillor Orlikow: Sure, the answer is yes. I am more than happy to have a meeting and talk about infrastructure and municipal accommodations, I guess is what we're specifically talking about, not roads. And Planning, Property and Development that's the area that we are in. Be more than happy to have a meeting. However, before or after the budget, it would probably be more fruitful to have it after the budget. But the questions that you're probably going to be asking are much more longer term, and I know we had a commitment from our Councillor, from Councillor Morantz and from the Mayor to have a much more broad in-depth process that will start sooner in the year so we can have more of the long term questions. But if you have anything in the short term, I'd be more than happy to sit down and talk to you about it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Schreyer: Would Councillor Orlikow agree therefore that it's best to do this after budget, that it is more difficult to make decisions long-term decisions within the budget on such proposed cuts?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow?

Councillor Orlikow: I think we all realize and I sit on the other on this side and even EPC's quite clear that we the process is too fast and to have the engagement that we would like to have at this point. However, you're assuming that there are cuts being made, you're assuming a lot is proposed, you're assuming that they're there. So I guess I would wait until you see the budget. And the timeline is very quick. But you know, Council is agreeing whatever Council decides in the budget will be so. And I'll try to help get your answers as quick as I can, either before the budget which would be what March 3rd or after.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, we'll move on to the next committee. Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. There are no reports, no motions, and no by-laws. Question Period for the Chair. Any questions? Okay, seeing none, next committee is Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Lukes if you could move the report dated February 10, 2015. Thank you.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED FEBRUARY 10, 2015**

Councillor Lukes: I would like to move the report, move adoption of the Consent Agenda.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: We now have a motion…Motion 2 before us from Councillor Allard and Councillor Browaty regarding rail safety. This would be an automatic referral to the Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. ***(City Clerk subsequently ruled that the motion pertaining to Railway Safety falls under the purview of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, not the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Therefore, the motion has been automatically referred to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development.)***

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Allard,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

WHEREAS Winnipeg is intersected by many rail lines;

AND WHEREAS in many residential areas, rail lines pass very close to people's homes;

AND WHEREAS the Federation of Canadian Municipalities published its "Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations" in 2013, which included extensive and detailed recommendations for setbacks, barriers, and other precautionary measures;

AND WHEREAS there may have been an increase in rail traffic carrying dangerous goods such as oil and other flammable materials passing through the City, and there is reason to believe this trend will persist;

AND WHEREAS the two year anniversary of the Lac-Mégantic disaster is approaching on July 6 2015, and the lessons learned from that tragedy must be applied to improving the safety of Winnipeggers;

AND WHEREAS a serious derailment could lead to great destruction, injury & loss of life;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg Public Service explore how to improve safety for new development in proximity to railway operations and to report back to Council and provide recommendations within 120 days.

Madam Speaker: Moving on to By-laws, Councillor Lukes.

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

Councillor Lukes: I move that the following by-laws be read for a first time. By-law No. 1/2015, By-law No. 2/2015, 3/2015, 4/2015, 6/2015, 7/2015, 8/2015, 34/2015.

Councillor Allard: I just want to ensure that Councillor Browaty and I's motion is being referred to the proper committee. I had thought that it would be the type of motion that would be referred to Planning, Property and Development. I just don't want it to get sent down the wrong path.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, could you verify that?

Councillor Allard: It…I mean, the motion is about new development. Anyhow, I'm just raising it.

Madam Speaker: Okay, we'll come back to that in the moment. Councillor Lukes if you could read your…

Clerk: I'll read the by-laws now. By-law No. 1/2015, By-law No. 2/2015, By-law No. 3/2015, By-law No. 4/2015, By-law No. 6/2015, By-law No. 7/2015, By-law No. 8/2015 and By-law No. 34/2015.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, I'd like to move that By-laws No. 1/2015 to 4/2015 both inclusive, 6/2015 to 8/2015 both inclusive and By-law No. 34/2015 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws Numbered 1/2015 to 4/2015 both inclusive, 6/2015 to 8/2015 both inclusive and By-law No. 34/2015.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, and I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-laws numbered 1/2015 to 4/2015 both inclusive, 6/2015 to eight/2015 both inclusive and By-law No. 34/2015 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Regarding Motion 2, we have received clarification. Councillor Allard's motion on rail safety will be going to the Committee on Property and Development rather than Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Thank you. Question Period for the Chair. Any questions? Councillor Mayes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: I wanted to commend Councillor Lukes who proposed after the, we just had the first residential snow plow of this winter and Councillor Lukes, for the lack of a better term proposed a post-game debriefing session for the Councillors with the administration, which I think is would be a very good development if we can get it scheduled. So I'm just trying to find out how that's progressing because it is useful to know what's going on in other wards, whether certain things that are going on. My ward, for example, had a bunch of streets plowed a second time, due to deficiencies. I'm not sure if that happened elsewhere, or if my ward had a lot of deficiencies. Those that sort of information sometimes hard to get purely out of the admin but I think it would be useful for all of us to get together and I commend Councillor Lukes for making that suggestion. Just wondering where things stand with that?

Councillor Lukes: Okay, great. This was my first residential snow removal as was many Councillors here. We weren't able to have a Council seminar specifically on residential snow removal. It was quite an experience I found. I've asked for a Council debrief, I guess, is probably the best term that I asked for, and I'm actually just waiting to hear when that debrief will occur. I've asked that Public Works be at that debrief, that 311 be at the debrief, that the Winnipeg Parking Authority be at the debrief, and Corporate Communications. Maybe this was sort of a non-event in the way of snow removal, but I found or learned a lot of things that I think that we could do better and I would like to hear from my colleagues and I'd like to hear from the departments and I've not heard yet when that will be. But it will be, it will be at some point.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan, followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Madam Speaker. I have a snow clearing question for Councillor Lukes, through you to Councillor Lukes, and I just want to I had heard that she had actually rode on a piece of snow clearing equipment. So I'm just curious to know what she learned from that experience and as well as you know just some information in terms of the massive snow clearing operating that the City undertakes year after year. And our City, you know I've heard that we're one of the best in North America, and maybe just some information in terms of how many kilometres we clear annually.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Okay, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Yes I did go out that sort of a visual that you said there. But I did want to go out and I wanted to experience it and understand the complexities of it because I wanted to be able to speak to it. So I did go out with one of the contractors and we went out at 11 o'clock at night and we drove around doing streets in an unnamed neighbourhood. And it's a very…you know, I know that these guys do it day in, day out, but it is a very complex process driving this you know 20 foot long piece of equipment, not wanting to shear off a fire hydrant; not wanting to shear off guy wires; watching out for parked cars, driving cars; there's Grandpa out there at 11:30 in the middle of the night sweeping his driveway off. It's a very complicated process. And then I wanted to know how many streets, how many kilometres of streets do we actually plow and I brought the numbers because I figured someone might ask me. Snow removal is a complex process. Winnipeggers are passionate about it. Here's how many kilometres of P1s: 1,828 kilometres, of P2s 1,431, or P3s 3,684, those are our beloved residentials, 85 kilometres of enhanced plowing around

schools, which we approved and put through, 928 kilometres of back lanes, and 130 kilometres of AT paths. We're not going to get it all perfect, there are going to be some deficiencies, but administration, working with administration and working with the contractors and City staff, will go back and fix those deficiencies. Some areas of the city, I'll talk about the south end, Waverley West, have no trees. The snow blows in more frequently than it does probably in River Heights. A snow event in the city this size may be an event on the north end, and not on the south end. There's a lot of complexities involved in snow removal. And Winnipeggers are passionate about it, one thing I promised and campaigned on was to do better communication between the City, between the Councillors, and between the constituents. I think we can always improve on communication, I'm looking really in this debriefing hoping that we can maybe do a better job of communicating we can always do a better job. It's a complex operation, I'm very optimistic of what this report's going to bring forward that administration is working on, and yeah I could go on about snow removal, but I won't so thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Madam Speaker, I just it's more of a "did you know?" question. There's a "did you know?" to the Chair of Public Works that there's an important street connector within our city that opened on February 5th of 1912. It's been serving our city quite well for the past 103 years, and I just wanted to ask Councillor Lukes if she knew that the Arlington Bridge is 103 years old, serving 15,000 drivers daily?

Councillor Lukes: I did not know that. Thank you. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker. Through you to the Chair. After the opening of our 300 million dollar plus water treatment plant, there were extended bouts of brown water identified in Winnipeg, in particular in the summer of 2013. It was identified by engineering companies that there was a problem with the process that added additional manganese, which was corrected in February of 2014. Following that problem, it was decided to do a very expedited by-directional cleaning process of the various water mains throughout the city, which was supposed to take over two seasons. I understand different parts of the city have been done, I'm still getting complaints more so than normal about brown water incidents in the North Kildonan ward. I was wondering if the Chair could update Council on how that process is coming and when we can expect to see the rest of the city completed?

Councillor Lukes: Okay, brown water. You gave me a little bit of heads up that you'd be asking this, so I dug with administration, so… and appreciate that I'm new in this role and learning, so this is, and I find this very interesting I'm sure many of you. Water main flushing to clean the water main system takes six years to clean all the water mains. But in 2014, administration decided to perform an accelerated fast track program to address the discoloured water. So the recommendation in the 2014 report to Council was to clean all 2,600 kilometres in a two year program, compared to the six year program. So on July 3, 2014, the press release was issued advising that the water main cleaning program had begun. And water main cleaning starts in May but it was delayed because the resources were required last year for the frozen water pipe emergency response. So the press release advised of this delay and the water main cleaning will be completed in the Fall of 2016. Water main cleaning is a seasonal program and it can only be conducted from May to October. And administration informs me they're still on track to complete as per last year's press release. And I can forward that on to you, to remind you, it was July 3rd, 2014 so...

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Chair? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. Councillor Lukes mentioned that the snow clearing in Winnipeg has it's complexities. It's certainly a serious issue. Councillor Lukes mentioned that Winnipeggers are, what is the term that she, passionate about snow clearing, very true. Not only that, Winnipeggers I have found in this last election are specifically very concerned about the quality of our snow clearing. And we had Mike Davidson this morning discussing the issues of in-house versus contracting snow clearing. And I have found in the election that people have very serious concerns over the quality, primarily it seems to me, Madam Speaker over the quality of the contracting of snow clearing. We talked about lack of comparative analysis, which is I find it hard to believe Madam, because why would've we made the decision to start contracting if there was no analysis in the first place? Unless.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, we had much conversation on this earlier. Do you have a question? Because this is Question Period.

Councillor Schreyer: Yes, absolutely and that was my preamble and because of my comments. I ask again for clarification from the Chair, from Councillor Lukes, if she intends to partake in the endeavour for a comparative analysis in the current era of contracted snow plowing?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes?

Councillor Lukes: Absolutely I intend to intake in the endeavour of the analysis as much as administration will let me, and we will go through the reports. I've invited Mr. Davidson for information that he has to provide and I've been in conversation with the Manitoba Heavy Construction Association to provide me with any information they can give. There's a committee that's been formed internally that's going to be looking at this and the report will be coming forward in June and you know, because Winnipeggers are so passionate about it, we have to do an excellent job of this, and we have to report back on it and we have to comb through it with a fine tooth comb and I'm confident that that will happen. I've had a long relationship with Public Works on drilling and getting to the bottom of things. And I know that that will continue.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, since Councillor Lukes is in this position to do this and I'm very grateful for how she endeavours in these issues that she undertakes. Will she be able to bring back to us, in context of this analysis and this forthcoming report, some greater history to this to bring along with this, because we weren't here, what were the factors, what was the report, which should be a consistent and relevant report, that led to the decision to reduce in-house snow clearing down to 20 per cent or so?

Councillor Lukes: Okay I'm going approach this in an open and transparent manner and if the City has that data and that information I hope that that will be included in this report. So until I talk to administration on that and find out from them if they have it, I mean obviously they must have something. I have no idea what it is. Whatever it is, hopefully we can include it in that report. But the idea on this is to be open and transparent on the information that we gather and bring forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. We're talking about snow and I learnt a little bit of direction that the snow clearing operations through Public Works works with the Parking Authority and apparently is direct, the Public Works…there's a Public Works person who directs the Parking Authority as to where to go in terms of dealing with parking tickets and towing. But in that Madam Speaker, discovery that you know this was a year in which we had probably the most parking tickets issued and over 6,700 as I'm sure that that is the number known and I'd like to actually thank the administration…everybody talks about how the administration wants to protect all this information and not release it, well I did get a report of all 6,700 and something tickets, it doesn't say who got the tickets, but it does give you a sort of block by block where it was and in that issue Madam Speaker, it said that streets like Pritchard had the most number, oh I think it was Lipton actually in Councillor Gilroy's, but in there and I've only done a preliminary study of it, but Madam Speaker this is a "did you know?" question really. In analyzing it, Pritchard Avenue for example goes from the Red River all the way out to Keewatin; Manitoba actually goes past Keewatin, yeah Pritchard ends at Keewatin I believe, anyway, which is in Councillor Pagtakhan's ward, but there were 78 parking tickets on Pritchard all the way from there to there, so it's a street that got highlighted in red, assuming that the poorest neighbourhoods. Now there are probably some issues, but what I did is an analysis, Madam Speaker, and this is a "did you know?". Did you know, and there's probably a thousand houses on Pritchard, did you know that there were eight parking tickets issued on Cail Bay, which I believe is in Madam Speaker's…and I'm asking the Chair of Public Works did she know that eight parking tickets were issued on a street that has only 32 houses? That sounds like a pretty high, so anyway, we do need the debrief and I'm just wondering if the Chairperson of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works got some information like that or not?

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much for your question. Actually I did. I went direct to the Winnipeg Parking Authority and I had found a bit of a glitch in the system on cars being towed and being reported and how the owner of the car found the car, or didn't find the car. And understand that there was a glitch in the system on how the log was reported to 311 and how calls would come in and information would be given out on where the car was. So I've been doing some foot work with Winnipeg Parking Authority, I have more questions exactly what you're saying on the distribution of the areas, and that's why I really would like to have a debrief. I think we all have a lot of questions, and I actually hope there's not a residential snow plow again this year, but there very well may be. But I think we need really to be better aware and have a better understanding of the process step-by-step. When I was out with the contractors, you know, the question was well when does the Winnipeg Parking Authority come out? How does the director of the area notify the Parking Authority to get them removed before plows come? There's a step-by-step-by-step process and I'd like to actually have that mapped out and see that and have speaking points on how it goes, how we all understand how the flow goes so.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: You're welcome.

Madam Speaker: Okay that ends Question Period, we'll move on to Alternate Service Delivery Committee.

REPORT OF THE ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY
DATED JANUARY 19, 2015

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yes. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I'd like to introduce Report No. 3 of the January 19th meeting and I'd actually like to move that the report be adopted except for Recommendation No. 9, which is specifically about the evening and…the evening extended evening parking.

Madam Speaker: I don't believe we can do that, Councillor Browaty. That would be an amendment, right? Just one moment here.

Councillor Browaty: Okay, so it has to go with...we can't adopt it except for Item No. 9., which we want to refer back to EPC. So what I should've done that back at EPC. I can't change that now. Okay, sending the whole thing back to the Alternate Service Advice Delivery Committee. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: So, you might refer it to…

Councillor Browaty: Sorry, I move that we refer it to...

Councillor Eadie: Can the chairperson move referral?

Councillor Browaty: Okay. I move the recommendation of EPC.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so EPC is recommending it go back, Mr. Clerk? Yes. Okay, so…yes, so we'll vote on the item then as it came forward
.

Councillor Allard: Can I just ask for clarification?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I just want to know…are we voting for downtown parking, new downtown parking piece...?

Councillor Browaty: Which we're referring it back to ASD.

Councillor Allard: Okay. Just wanted to be clear.

Madam Speaker: The item is here just for your information, right? Okay, EPC has already referred it back.

Councillor Browaty: My apologies for the confusion.

Madam Speaker: So, we'll now moving on to Question Period. No Question Period. Okay, you're off the hook Councillor Browaty. Okay, moving on to Governance Committee of Council. Councillor Gerbasi, could you please move the report dated February 5, 2015 on my behalf.

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED FEBRUARY 5, 2015

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes, I move the report and adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

Councillor Eadie: Two please. Sorry. This is Governance…2 please.

Madam Speaker: Item No. 1, Madam Clerk. We'll vote on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 2 – Lobbyist Registry

Councillor Gerbasi: Madam Speaker, this motion was a motion from Councillor Eadie, seconded by myself so I'll wait to hear his comments.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I just…I stood this down because the motion, like…I moved, we moved this motion on the lobbyist registry and totally forgotten that Councillor Fielding had moved a…while not the same motion, a similar motion and so it's kind of…motion that's gotten caught up along with and it's being referred to the Auditor. I just wanted to speak to this report. I'm going to vote in favour of it, but what I want to do is the direction of where this is going, is an interesting one and that, Madam Speaker, I did ask the question about the Ethics Commissioner is supposed to be one established. Lobbyist registry is something that leads to conflicts in ethical behaviour and so on and technically I think maybe a lobbyist registry falls…would fall kind of under a mandate for a particular way of dealing with. As it is right now, Governance is seen to sort of follow the process with this resolution as with the one from Councillor Fielding. Council voted to send it to the Auditor and so the Auditor is dealing with it although I know the Auditor's department is having legal deal with it, but Madam Speaker, when you talk about lobbyists, people who lobby government, they don't just lobby politicians, there is the lobbying also I believe or potential lobbying of administration who carries out Council's decisions and so on. And I think that it's a complex issue when you start talking about a lobbyist registry in that way. If…for example, if any developer was meeting with the head of administration of the whole City administration, I would say, unless it was on a contract negotiation or something like that, my concern is that a lobbyist registry should track whether or not potential businesses, individuals and so on would be involved in not only just lobbying politicians, but also possibilities of lobbying administration and so on. So, it is a complex issue. Technically if we're only looking at the lobbyist registry from the perspective of Councillor, elected politicians and the meeting with those lobbyists, that issue is one of…should be considered one, really, of legal…City Clerks Department, the City Clerk's right now are the ones responsible for the process in terms of if you look at the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act, it is, I believe, if an individual Councillor wanted to file a complaint, against another Councillor for example, thinking that some wrongdoing was happening, what happens is that the process for a City Councillor is to go to the City Clerk. So, there's been a lot of discussion, which office properly is to deal with this. But ultimately, all these…and you know, we have to give kudos to our new Mayor, Madam Speaker, but we all campaigned on more transparency, accountability and so on, because of all the issues that arose in the inadequacy of what we have in place to have dealt with many of those issues. So, really, there's a lot of cost, a lot of money involved, related to this kind of thing and so when I see the lobbyist registry and it's dealt with by the Auditor, I'm not sure what department will ultimately be…which office will be involved in making sure that once a registry…once a law is in place, who is responsible to making sure that everything is being implemented and done properly. So I just wanted to speak on that issue because I talked to a number of people out in the community and some people who are good advisers, long time experience with City Council, different areas…I'd actually like to thank the former Councillor, George Fraser for giving input on this motion that we brought on the lobbyist registry and there's a lot of debate about, you know, which is…who…which office is the most appropriate to do that. So I just wanted to put it on record. I think that ultimately when all this…these issues as the Mayor referred to in Question Period, the Ethics Commissioner office, and things are proceeding, they are not in place yet, but they all need to be taken in context. So I appreciate that and I just wanted to mention those issues. But we all know for sure that we need a lobbyist registry. We need all these things in place and so I'm happy that someone is dealing with it and that the auditor is working with the legal department to determine how to implement. In this motion, we had proposed some different models. The City of Toronto has a model. Do we join the Government of Manitoba Lobbyist Registry which I understand has some issues in terms of who's sort of policing and making sure the lobbyist thing is happening and be followed through, but thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be voting in favour of this motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I want to rise and support the motion. I'm just if and I don't know how…who can answer this, but where the previous motion would've gone and, you know, yeah, that would be the question. And also, I notice there's no time line on this motion, so I've just wondered if there's any indication as to…in terms of process as to when it might…when it might happen. So those are my two questions.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, just to clarify, the previous motion did go to the City Auditor and we are expecting a report imminently. We can't...

Councillor Allard: So we already have…

Madam Speaker: It isn't, Councillor Allard…it isn't Question Period. Would you like to speak to the item?

Councillor Allard: Oh, to the motion? Can I speak again to the motion?

Madam Speaker: Speak to the item.

Councillor Allard: To the item on the motion? So follow up to that is if we've already passed this motion in the past then we have a new motion with no time line. Would I…I'm just wondering to, I guess the author of the motion, can he…he can…can he answer? He can't answer. Okay. I…those are my comments for the record and I would just wonder when we might get a report from the auditor given we don't have time lines and given I understand this has already been placed on the books in a prior motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further speakers? Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't have the previous motion in front of me, but Councillor Eadie is indicating that there may have been some time lines on that one. In any case, the work being done on this one is kind of just rolled together with the other one so that all the intent of this motion and the others are working together, so, we sometimes have these motions without time lines. But hopefully, we'll continue to…it won't be too long in coming. So I guess…I guess that's it, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, Councillor Gillingham will move…oh, pardon me. There are by-laws there? Okay, sorry. It's missing from my page. Councillor Gerbasi.

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Gerbasi: I move that By-law No. 15/2015 be moved a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 15/2015.

Councillor Gerbasi: I move that By-law No. 15/2015 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 15/2015.

Councillor Gerbasi: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 15/2015 be read a third time and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And Councillor Gillingham will move that we adjourn. Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Roll call, Madam Clerk.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Dobson, Eadie, Gerbasi, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Schreyer and Wyatt.

Council adjourned at 3:16 p.m.