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

The Council met at 9:43 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 Gillingham.

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 Councillor Wyatt.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, I understand you have an announcement today.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and good morning everyone. I'd like to welcome everyone attending in the gallery today, welcome, and those watching online. Thanks very much for being here with us. I'd like to begin by extending my congratulations and in fact our congratulations on behalf of the City of Winnipeg to Janice Filmon on her appointment as Manitoba's Lieutenant Governor. I've had the pleasure and privilege of knowing Janice for over 30 years. She's not only a tremendous and a respected community leader; she has a warm and giving spirit that she shares generously by volunteering her skills, time and talents to work with Local, Provincial and National organizations. She's worked tirelessly with a variety of organizations through her service as a member on a variety of boards of directors and in her capacity as a fundraiser to make a positive impact in our community. I strongly believe that her genuine enthusiasm and commitment to Canada, Manitoba and in fact Winnipeg, as well as her fellow citizens, make her a very fitting choice to serve as Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba. I'd like to take this opportunity to say thank you, also to the Honourable Lieutenant Governor, Phillip Lee who served Manitoba since 2009 as the Queen's Representative. Thank you very much for your years of service and very best wishes in the future. Clearly, March has been an extraordinary…extraordinarily busy month for all of us. Monday, City Council held a special meeting to discuss the 2015 budget and I'd like to thank my Council colleagues for their collaboration, their hard work and diligence during the challenging budget process. Council is committed to meeting the goals of Winnipeg and on Monday, City Council's voice came together to pass the 2015 Operating and Capital Budget by a vote of 14 to 2. And I'd like to say thank you to all of the organizations and individuals who took time out of their days to speak to City Council and share their perspectives. Your voice is important to each and every member of this City Council. I believe the budget was a great exercise in collaboration, Madam Speaker. And I look forward to working together with my Council colleagues over the next four years to grow a modern and thriving City with quality life improvements for all Winnipeggers including infrastructure renewal projects that we're going to be discussing today. I'd like to also acknowledge that today is Greek Independence Day. Greek Independence Day is a holiday that pays tribute to the freedom and independence and celebrates Greece as the world's oldest republic and the birth place of democracy. In honour of the special day, City Hall is flying the Greek flag from sunrise to sunset. Winnipeg's Greek community traces their roots back to the early 1900s. The community was established as an organization in 1917 and continues to grow today and I'd like to say thank you to our Greek community members, of which are here today for sharing your rich heritage, culture and traditions with us. At this time, I'd like to invite Ms Vicky Scouras up to the podium to say a few words on behalf of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, Winnipeg Chapter.

Vicky Scouras: Thank you, Mayor Bowman. Madam Speaker, Your Worship Mayor Bowman, members of the City Council, ladies and gentlemen, I bring you greetings from the Greek community of Winnipeg. You may not know that 194 years ago, this event would not be possible because Greece was under Turkish occupation for over 400 years. Being under occupation does not give you the liberty to enjoy your own language, your music, your rights as a human being, your religion and raising your country's flag is unthinkable. Despite its oppression, Greeks never gave up the passion and the desire for freedom. Like the embers of a fire, this passion and desire for freedom was smoldering in the hearts of all Greeks. The spark of the Greek War for independence set the desire alight. Against all odds, a few determined and very brave individuals created the fire that would not be stamped out. All Greeks at this time, March 25th, we pay homage to those great men and women who gave their lives for us to have a free country, and for the entire world to visit and enjoy our beautiful Greece. Greece's wealth of history, natural beauty, arts and culture were also freed. There were many stories to tell of that time; many examples of heroism that I could speak to, however, what I want to speak to you today is about one of the outcomes of the war of 1821. Yes, the war gave Greeks their freedom,

defining the land that we know as we know it today as Greece and permitted us to follow our religion and maintain our culture, but another significant thing to come from that war was the creation of our flag, the flag we raise today. All flags tell a story. The Greek flag tells the story of the war of 1821. Before the war, of this war, there was no one flag that defined the people of Greece, rather, there were many flags, flags that were representative of a company or a group of fighters, a region or even a family. When freedom was finally won, the time had come to create one flag that would unify and define its people. And what do we see in the flag? Why is it so appropriate that we raise it today? First, we rose against the Ottomans to fight for our freedom of religion. Hence, the flag very clearly depicts the symbol of our orthodox Christian faith, the cross. Second, the colours blue and white represent the blue water of the sea and the white froth of its waves. The sea provides sustenance in the form of food, but also passage to new worlds where commerce and trade would greet Greek's wealth and prosperity. The sea, where numerous battles were fought during the war of independence and where heroes were defined in our battle for freedom. And finally, the stripes, nine to be exact. Each representing a syllable of the battle cry that would become the momentum behind the passion, and energy of the revolt, "Eleftheria i thanatos", which means "freedom or death." These were the words that led the Greeks into battle in 1821. These were the words that gave them the courage to sacrifice their lives; to define a land that today we know as Greece, the courage to fight for the right to practice their religion without fear, and the courage to stand up to oppression. Ladies and gentlemen, I am very passionate when it comes to the idea of National anthems and nation's flags. To be able to sing your National anthem and to raise your flag is the ultimate sign of freedom. I'm grateful to Canada, a country that gives me the freedom to stand here today and share my heart to you and I pray and strive to be a worthy citizen of this great nation. So I say thank you, Canada, thank you ladies and gentlemen. Zíto i Elláda, Zito Kanadás, long live Canada and Greece. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you so much for joining us today and City Council does truly take pride in flying the Greek flag today. Thank you.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Vicky. As we move into April next week, I'd like to wish everybody a very safe, healthy and happy Easter and Passover and I hope you'll enjoy the warmth, friends and family as you celebrate and enjoy a much deserved long weekend. And that was especially focused at each member of City Council I know who's been working very hard recently. So thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Pagtakhan, I understand you have a presentation to make.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. In March of…March 9 of 1814, Taras Shevchenko was born and Taras Shevchenko is a great Ukrainian poet, artist, writer and political figure in Ukraine and a much loved hero of Ukrainian people across the world. In Winnipeg, we have a couple of important places that honour Taras Shevchenko. We've got in Councillor Eadie's ward at the southwest corner of Burrows and McGregor, there is a Taras Shevchenko Park, also on Main Street just right by Aberdeen, we've now have a Taras Shevchenko, an Honorary Taras Shevchenko Way and I have the great honour, Madam Speaker, of attending a concert at the MBCI on March the 8th of this year, earlier this month, and it was an incredible tribute to Taras Shevchenko, and at that concert, I was presented on behalf of the Ukrainian Canadian Congress and Ukrainian Canadian Community here in Winnipeg with a painting by a local artist, Orysia Sinitowich which I have here today and I wanted to call the Mayor up to receive that painting and it's going to be proudly displayed. I want to thank Mr. Rick Walker, Manager of Library Services for agreeing to display the painting at the West Kildonan Library. And as a huge heritage in terms of many Ukrainian people living in the Seven Oaks West Kildonan are, and so it's my great pleasure to present this painting of Orysia Sinitowich to Mr. Mayor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you very much, Councillor Pagtakhan for sharing that presentation with us here today.

MINUTES

Councillor Lukes moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on February 25, 2015, be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: We'll now move on to delegations. First up, we have Zach Fleischer from the University of Manitoba in support of the U-Pass item. Following that, we will hear from Laura Rempel, also on the same item. Good morning.

Zach Fleischer: Good morning. Just to clarify, so I'm here representing the Canadian Federation of Students and we represent over 42,000 strong within the Province of Manitoba at four different post-secondary institutions and we've been a long proponent of the U-Pass. We first saw it come through at actually Brandon University as Councillor Mayes will point out where they pay $15 a year to ride the bus all year which is a pretty good deal. We're not quite there in Winnipeg, but I'm glad to see it's moving forward. I want to make a quick note about the culture in Winnipeg and we often here especially with winter like…weather like we're seeing right now, that we are a car culture. And I want to ask members of City Council, how many of you took the bus to work this morning?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Fleischer, this is your opportunity to make a presentation. Yeah. It's not Q and A, thank you.

Zach Fleischer: Okay. Is that Q and A? Okay and I think it says a lot about our city in that a lot of people don't take the bus because it's not convenient. It doesn't come when we need it. It's not frequent enough. The routes don't go where we need them to be. And I want to say and I want to point out that this is our opportunity to change Winnipeg and I think that we see a lot of…a lot of enthusiasm from this Council in particular in changing how we do things in Winnipeg in making a difference, in changing the culture. I think there is an elephant in the room for all governments right now and that elephant is climate change. And if we don't start to…and I think that cities are in a very unique position to lead the change and lead the fight against climate change. We've seen the…and we've seen the shift from Federal Governments, Provincial Governments, taking the lead and cities are really, really at the forefront of this agenda. And it's through programs like these, the U-Passes that are really, really the place that we have this happen. The university or post-secondary institutions are the perfect places to make this happen. If we can change, you know, what we see is that university enrollments turn over every three to four years, so it's a rapidly changing environment that people come…students come in and they leave and, you know, through that, they're introduced to new ideas, new ways of getting to and from work, school, pleasure, all of those…all of those areas. And if we're able to increase ridership in universities and acclimate people to taking public transit as well as…as both in, during their time at university as well as later on, then that means that we can build a sustainable ridership growth that we need to properly build a rapid transit system and, you know, I'm quite excited to see that we have a Mayor that's firmly committed to building four or I think it's five rapid transit lines. And this is vision that we haven't seen in a long time, but we need people to be taking the bus in those situations and we need people to be supportive of improving rapid transit. And the only way we can do that is by growing ridership in the long term. What we saw in Edmonton, Calgary, different schools in British Columbia, the University of Regina also just passed a referendum this week as well around this issue is that in the long term these programs change riderships to and from the institutions, but that students keep on to or students once they graduate, keep on taking the bus. And it's not…it's not something that's strange to them, it's not something that's unfamiliar. And if we're able to improve transit service quality to students, it means we're improving it to everyone as well, especially considering that the first rapid transit leg connects the University of Manitoba to the downtown and by virtue of that, south Winnipeg to the University to Winnipeg which are the two schools that are being affected by this program. At the end of the day, if we agree that it's important for us to change our habits in terms of transportation and it's something that we can all do to fight climate change, then this is one of the best things that we can do, is approving this program, putting it in place and making it happen. This is a potentially, a fundamentally transformative step for the city. I understand that there's going to be a lot of discussion around infrastructure projects and I'm sure that there will be spirited debate. I'm looking forward to seeing it, but if we really want to say; if we really want to look at changing the culture and making and challenging the status quo that we have for the next 10, 15, 20 years, for my kids, for the future of the city, then this is a program that we need to be passing today, that we need to implement and something that really puts Winnipeg forward and on the map. So, in closing, I think that every member of this Council should feel comfortable voting for this. You should know that by doing this, you're building a better future, not for four years and I understand that there's…there's always the electoral game of wanting to look good for your constituents and do what's politically popular in the short term, but you should know that by approving a program like this, you're building a sustainable future for a more, for a greener and more equitable Winnipeg. So thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: If you could just remain on the floor and we'll hear from the next delegation and we'll take questions following that. Next is Laura Rempel, if you could come forward and we'll put five minutes on the clock. Thank you. Great. Welcome.

Laura Rempel: Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to Council today. So, I'm Laura Rempel. I'm the President of the Graduate Students Association at the University of Manitoba, and I'm here representing my 3700 graduate student members. I'm also a city…a recent city planning graduate and transit rider so this issue is close to my heart and is an important investment for the City in the long term sustainability and providing accessible and affordable

transit for everybody. So therefore, in the reports that you've been provided by Transit, graduate students are included as an option because a year ago, in the original City Council motion, it was just the University of Winnipeg and the University of Manitoba undergraduate students that were included in that motion and so I'm here to request that you include graduate students in the current or in the implementation of the U-Pass Program. Following that motion, we, the graduate students held a referendum and we saw a very impressive turn out and 59 percent of our students were in favour of implementing U-Pass. So this gives me great confidence in supporting this motion to you. Also, there's a lot of support at the university. President David Barnard has expressed support for U-Pass. Environmental youth sustainable transportation has been prioritized at the office of campus planning through our commitment to transit oriented development in the south woodland development and also, the sustainability office through multimodal transportation methods in reducing the university's environmental footprint. Also, graduate students will be making up a larger proportion of the student enrollment on campus. By 2023, the university is targeting to increase the population of grad students to 20 percent, so we're currently 3700 and we will be approximately 6400, so that's a good reason for us to get involved as well. We…University of Manitoba Students Union, the undergrads and the grad students requested to the Board of Governors to…pending City Council approval of U-Pass, we requested that they collect the fees on our behalf, and that motion was unanimously approved by the Board of Governors. So if City Council is agreeable with this motion then we will be ready to work together to implement the U-Pass and would be excited to do so. So thank you very much for the time. That's all I have.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, we'll take questions now. Councillor Wyatt, you had your hand up. Do you have a question for Mr. Fleischer, is it?

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, Mr. Fleischer, thank you. Thanks for your presentations, both of you. Just a quick question and just to speak to…you mentioned Mr. Fleischer the…and thanks for coming and speaking to us with regards to the U-Pass today. You mentioned the Building Canada Fund which is also on the agenda this morning, which is now going from a five year program to a ten year program. My question is more of an "are you aware" question. Are you aware that the four projects that are being considered before us today, that none of them are rapid transit projects in terms of building another rapid transit line? Are you aware of that?

Zach Fleischer: Well, Councillor Wyatt, I think it's a well-known fact that I don't sleep and I was reading over the Council agenda last night, and I did take a quick look at it between, you know, two to three other projects that I was working on. My kitchen table is a busy place and it is true that you noted that…that there is no rapid transit infrastructure development within those programs. I'm confident that through our collective wisdom that or through your collective wisdom, that City Council will arrive at a conclusion, at a place where rapid transit is deemed to be a priority and it's included either in this funding arrangement or in another one that comes up. I'm hopeful that we come up with a long term financially sustainable plan to develop rapid transit in the city because it's been a long time coming and it's time for us to get on that bus, no pun intended.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. If I may say, Mr. Fleischer, I do believe you intended the pun, just not…and I'm very grateful for it. And just to respond to…may I speak directly to Mr. Fleischer?

Madam Speaker: It's through the Speaker's Chair.

Councillor Schreyer: Okay, to respond to Mr. Fleischer's question to Council about who took the bus this morning, I would like to say that I did take the bus home last night. I'm guessing…I'm the second, guessing, I'm the second most frequent bus user of Council. That's just a guess. And perhaps so. And I firmly believe that it is the enhancement of the vast majority of our existing bus routes that will give the people of Winnipeg confidence in the reliability and serviceability of our public transportation system. Now, we speak of…and Ms. Rempel spoke of graduate students, but I would like the opinion of actually both you, Mr. Fleischer and Ms. Rempel, in terms of what their opinions are of other post-secondary education and their inclusion in this type of pass, bus pass.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Fleischer.

Zach Fleischer: So, I've done a lot of reading on the subject. I've been coming to these Council meetings particularly on this subject for about two and a half years now. And what we see in the ranking, and what we see from the results, and one of the reasons I really do like this program and I truly do believe in this program is because it's an evidence-based program, so I'm advocating based on evidence not on…not on what I think is right, but what I've seen and what I've read and what we see is that other institutions will…and other students see how successful these programs are and then from there, the politics come around and people start to advocate for their institutions so maybe in the long term, maybe two or three years down the line after this program is implemented, Red River College gets involved or maybe the

University of St. Boniface gets involved and we start to see more partnerships arise out of it. In the long term, that's a positive thing because it means that the total operating cost to run it, because you're putting more people on buses, means that the City's paying less for infrastructure cost and the City pays less of the subsidy to encourage people to take the bus. So I think it's a positive thing. I think that we should move forward first on getting this off the ground and having the grads, the undergrads at U of M and the U of W student body as a whole get on board with this first and once we see that it's a roaring success that it will be, then we'll move forward from there and I think that it will come naturally at that point in time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Ms Rempel, do you choose to just add anything at this time? Okay, thank you. Next is Councillor…last question, Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, thank you, Madam Speaker. Happens to be that when I studied at the University of Manitoba, I took the bus to attend the University of Manitoba. I didn't take the bus happens to be just given the logistic when I started at St. Boniface College, but my understanding is that St. Boniface College is part of the University of Manitoba. In fact, it is so I would like perhaps, there is some information you could provide us. Mr. Fleischer stated that the supplies to students at the University of Manitoba Fort Garry Campus as what I…I guess he's implying, not University of Manitoba, St. Boniface campus. Could I get some clarification on that from perhaps Mr. Fleischer or anyone who has information on that?

Zach Fleischer: I'm sure Councillor Allard will correct me if I'm wrong on this one, but my understanding is that the two institutions are separate in respect to agreements of this nature. As it currently stands, the proposed program would encompass the University of Manitoba, Bannatyne Campus and the Fort Garry Campus and I understand that there's cross collaboration with the Université de Saint-Boniface, and U of M. So there's certain academics aspects of it that are shared, but I don't think that…the program wouldn't run under this because the student body there hasn't passed a referendum at this point of the game.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. On to Councillor Mayes and then Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker and thank you, Zach. One of…thank you for your work on this. Always a professional tone here. I remember…you were here at the last meeting and the former Mayor and some of the speakers before you were in essence trashing the Mayor and you spoke very movingly I think and professionally about his contributions on this item and some other things so I appreciate that tone. And my question was going to be about extending and I think you've covered that that there is the option to extend to U of St. Boniface, Brandon U downtown Winnipeg campus, for example, we've talked about that. So I guess that that issue needs to be clarified. Thank you for doing that. I guess I'm left with an are you aware question which was in terms of the BRT, just to be clear on this. Apparently, history didn't long note my comments yesterday, which is the Marion/Archibald project does interrelate with the southeast rapid transit corridor south. There is some opportunity there from the Building Canada applications to work to dovetail BRT with the Marion/Archibald plan, but can you just clarify then, so in terms of the expansion of the program, we could expand U-Pass out to…out to Brandon U downtown campus out to downtown Winnipeg campus out to CMU which is in I think Councillor Morantz's ward, out to USB which is in Councillor Allard's, there would need to be referendum now, is that right?

Zach Fleischer: Yeah. So I think what we can see in happening in this case is that the program launches in Winnipeg in September 2016 within a year or two it becomes…you know, people have become very publicly aware of how to operates and the benefits that it brings and then from there, schools might express interest and through that, I think that there's a potential even to lower the cost because you would just have the economies of scale working in favour. I mean if you're adding…if you're adding 1100 students at USB, Université de Saint-Boniface or you're adding, you know, 3,000 at CMU, I'm just ballparking the numbers, and that might not shift tremendously, but I mean if you're adding 28,000 at Red River, then…then you can start to play with the numbers a bit and it means that the City can actually contribute a bit less per student and student costs can also go down, and especially when we see the cost of living is going up, the cost in tuition is also going up, that means a break for students and that means a break for my members whom I'm representing here today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Morantz: Thank you, Mr. Fleischer and it's a pleasure to see you here. I know we met a few years ago and I was on a campaign trail and I'm very pleased to see this program come forward. I think it is an excellent program. Just…I'm always, since I got here, looking at things through a financial lens since I've been appointed to Chair of Finance and I just…I wanted to talk to you about like when I look at the financial impact, there is always and should be, in my view, subsidization from society generally for transit. I just want to get your views on what degree of subsidization you think would be…is appropriate and how you sort of came to that when you were costing this out because just

looking at the direct cost in 2017, will be $2,144,500 to the taxpayers, split in part through the Province, but nevertheless, the Province and the City will share in those costs and I'm just kind of curious to see what your views are around the degree of subsidization and if we bring, which I anticipate will happen, either referendums forward or if other referendums come forward for other institutions, what the impact, the financial impact may be on the City with respect to that subsidization.

Zach Fleischer: Thank you very much. It's an interesting question right because you're always asking from a financial perspective, where is the best value for our dollar and I think that that's a good quality for public servant to have. I mentioned before, you know, the elephant in the room is climate change and that's…it's a very difficult issue to quantify because we can't always measure the financial impact of the dollars that we're spending now, compared to where…where the benefits are later on. So in my view, anything that we can do to get people out of individual cars and taking collective transit through either carpooling…

Madam Speaker: Could you wrap up, Mr. Fleischer? Thank you.

Zach Fleischer: Yes. Through buses, through walking or cycling is viewed as a positive I think should be considered as part of the conversation. At the end of the day, I think that this is money well spent from our member's perspective if the City wanted to subsidize it more, I'd be very…I'd very…I would endorse that wholeheartedly, however, I think that this is a good balance. We've worked with transit. We've walked with the previous Council to arrive at a number that we think is financially sustainable for the City and provides good investment for the City as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you very much. Thank you, Ms Rempel. Next delegation is David Sanders. Are you here today, Mr. Sanders? Okay. Mr. Sanders is in opposition to five items: Fort Rouge Yards Brownfield Development Project Loan Guarantee, Item No. 2, Expropriation of Lands at Polo Park. Next, Expropriation of Land 1780 Taylor Avenue, he's also in opposition to the two Confirmation of Expropriation motions and the Building Canada Fund Application. Welcome, Mr. Sanders.

David Sanders: Okay, thank you, Madam Speaker. With regard to the first matter, the Fort Rouge Yards Brownfield Development Project and the Loan Guarantee that Council's being asked to have approved this morning, you're being asked to agree that the City enter into an indemnity agreement with First National Financial LP, First National or by that organization will provide security to the City for the $10 million loan guarantee to be granted by the City to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the FCM, in support of second mortgage financing to be provided by FCM to Gem Equities Limited in respect to the Fort Rouge Yards Development. Before you vote on this extraordinary matter, I hope that one of you will ask what this indemnity agreement is going to cost and who is going to pay for it, because that's not in the material in front of you. On October 19th, 2011, City Council agreed to guarantee repayment of up to $10 million of loans from the FCM to Gem Equities, there would be developer of the yards at Fort Rouge adjacent to stage one of the southwest transit way. This was an extraordinary exception to Council's loan guarantee policy and criteria which permits the City to guarantee loans only for non-profit organizations. And since the FCM loan is to be secured by only a second mortgage, subject to the priority of the intended first mortgagee financing the construction of the promised buildings, if they do ever go up, there are a lot of risks involved in guaranteeing the FCM secondary position. Now, back in 2011, Gem Equities reportedly had non-binding loan proposals from a potential first mortgage lender. As part of the due diligence required…inquiries required to the Chief Financial Officer, the CFO was, and I quote, "to examine future commitment letters for compliance". There's no reference to such loan commitment letters in today's report. If Gem Equities still doesn't have binding first mortgage loan commitments, I wonder how the CFO can say he has completed his due diligence review of the project proposal and furthermore, since the original commitment letter with respect to the FCM loan and the City's loan guarantee has apparently expired, why would the City now renew its guarantee especially if First National is now prepared to assume the risk of default by Gem Equities? Let them do it. Secondly, with regard to the matter just now on the agenda this morning for the Building Canada Fund Application, I'm not sure whether this is the end of the 2015 Capital budget debate or the beginning of the 2016 Capital budget debate. But I gather that yesterday morning at an in-camera Council seminar, the Civic administration presented four major transportation projects in order of priority. First, the Waverley Street underpass, secondly, the Kenaston Boulevard widening, third, the Marion Street widening and grade separation and fourth, Chief Peguis Trail Extension WeSt. Apparently, the administration felt they couldn't provide the information necessary to be even put forward Louise Bridge or the Clement Parkway. I understood that the administration had provided Councillors with some cost benefit analysis and reasoned argument but I did not find anything on the City's website until, by chance, 2:00 a.m. this morning and then I found a power point presentation under the heading quote, "Building Canada Fund Application", which I presume was presented to Council yesterday morning. In the afternoon, members of Executive Policy Committee decided to shuffle the priorities, moving Kenaston to the bottom and the list now recommended to Council this morning includes first, Waverley Street at an estimated cost, a very rough estimated cost of $175 million. The Marion Street project secondly, now at 250 million. Third, the Chief Peguis Trail Extension West, to Route 90 for 400 million and Kenaston widening at 375 million total $1.2 billion and the Federal government were to pay 25 percent that would be 300 million of

the 467 million available. Now apparently the chair of public works was rather unimpressed with the analysis presented by the administration and she subsequently voted against EPC's revised priority liSt. And now that I have finally seen as example of what passes for a cost benefit analysis, I completely understand why the administration has redacted or censored virtually every number in the cost-benefit studies and reports I have recently received regarding the southwest transit way project. Our staff appears to be incapable of producing, documenting and explaining reliable estimates of the relative benefits of alternative projects and courses of action which Council must have if it is going to make rational and effective decisions on such matters. For example, do any Councillors know what the administration means when they say in the report that I found last night that "the Waverley Underpass has a cost benefit score of 11"? I certainly don't know what that means. A cost benefit is a ratio not a number. Do you have any idea how the engineers chose the number 11? There is no supporting information in the presentation. The benefit criteria list that is there is gibberish unless you happen to be building a stage in Wescana Park in Regina. You'll see it in the bottom right hand corner of that chart.. And this is all very scary. I think Council would do well to listen to Councillor Lukes and not be stampeded into making major decisions without proper consideration and justification. The Federal government's Building Canada fund is offering 467 million over the next ten years, that's not tomorrow, that's ten years, to pay a maximum of 25 percent of the costs of P3 projects, public private partnerships. All the proposed projects are over $100 million and therefore under the new rules they all have to go through a P3 screening process before the Federal government will agree to fund them. Canada will not pay for land acquisition or many of the costs which are incurred before approval in principle is given. And has anyone here given any serious thought to how these projects will be financed? The Province has. As one of the major reasons for the increase in the PST to enable the province to access the matching promised Federal funds during the next 10 years. And I see the City's PowerPoint presentation ends with a suggestion that the City's share of these four projects could be financed by a 10 percent increase in property taxes but I rather doubt that that is Council's plan. On Monday, Council did approve the 2015 Capital budget and the 2016-2025 year forecaSt. This is six years now and here is what it contains for the proposed Building Canada fund priority projects. The Waverley Street underpass: no mention whatsoever. The Marion Street realignment Underpass: no mention whatsoever. The Chief Peguis Trail Extension West; no mention whatsoever. The Kenaston widening, there is project 214 allowing 5.9 million over the next six years for bridge design and there's a general project to page 15, allowing for 5.2 million to be spent in the next six years for Building Canada Fund projects design which would conceivably apply to some preliminary work on these projects. Now, in fact, preliminary design studies have been completed or are under way for the Waverley underpass and the Marion Street project and Chief Peguis Trail Extension West and the Kenaston widening. In fact, that one I think is pretty well complete. So by now, the City should have sufficient information to prepare and publish meaningful cost benefit analysis, not what we see in the present power point presentation and to complete the BCF applications properly. Respect to the final two matters of expropriations on your agenda today, this is regarding the extension of St. Matthews to Route 90 around Polo Park and also the site of the famous infamous fire paramedic firehall at 1780 Taylor. Today, Council is being asked to ignore the well founded recommendations made by the two expropriation inquiry officers who received evidence and testimony regarding the proposed expropriation of lands now required for the extension of St. Matthews Avenue to Route 90 and for the already constructed new fire paramedic station at 1780 Taylor Avenue. In each case, the extent of the expropriation was exacerbated by errors made by the Winnipeg Public Service, proceeding now with expropriations recommended by the City's real estate officials to counteract those errors is likely to result in unnecessary grief for the affected property owners in the short-term and higher costs for the City's taxpayers in the end. So I trust that any Councillors who vote on these matters today, will have read the inquiry officer's reports themselves, they're on your agenda, particularly the recommendations on pages 84 and 86 to 90 of the Polo Park report and the recommendations on Pages 16 to 20 of the Taylor report. Once again, I recommend that this committee, this Council reject that the recommendations from the Winnipeg Public Service accept the recommendations of the inquiry officers instead. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Sanders, we will now take questions. Councillor Mayes, you have the floor.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You stated here a month ago that Councillors like myself, like Councillor Gerbasi, to give two examples, were complicit in the $490 million hijacking of the second phase of BRT solely to benefit two developers, you did name them, Gem Equities and Shindico. Now, I notice on page four, page five of your presentation, you're saying we should ignore the recommendations of our public servants when it comes to the expropriation of Shindico lands and we should accept Shindico's position. We should ignore the position of our public servants. Can you explain this seeming discrepancy as to why we would've hijacked a $490 million project to benefit Shindico and now you're here chastising us for agreeing with our public service and not agreeing with Shindico.

David Sanders: Councillor Mayes, I don't recall mentioning Shindico today. I recall suggesting that you should've followed the recommendations of the inquiry officer. Okay? Secondly…

Councillor Mayes: Are you aware that the land owner in question of the lands on Taylor is Shindico?

David Sanders: Oh, of course, I am, as you are.

Councillor Mayes: Okay. So…

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Seeing none, okay seeing none. Thank you very much for appearing today. We will now move on to committee reports. First is EPC, Mr. Mayor, on the report dated March 4, 2015.

Councillor Orlikow: …Item No. 1, Conflict of IntereSt.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so noted, thank you. Mr. Mayor, on the report dated March 4, 2015.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED MARCH 4, 2015

Mayor Bowman: I'll ask, thank you Madam.. Okay, if I could introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 through 4, please.

Madam Speaker: Okay, I'll call the question on Items 1, 2 and 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 4 – Vacant Buildings, Taking Title to Vacant and Derelict Buildings, Neighbourhood Liveability, and Zoning By-laws – 2014 Performance Measurement Report

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, would you like to introduce Item 4?

Mayor Bowman: I'll first allow for questions from Council, thanks.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, I believe it was you that stood this down.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Actually, I just wanted to say I didn't get a chance to speak at EPC when this report, our very extensive report on a number of by-law issues. It's actually quite a good news story inside these particular reports. The City has made great strides, I believe, to make our neighbourhoods a better place; to ensure that we don't have too many vacant buildings, boarded buildings. It's inevitable that you get the odd one, but it was really a blemish on the City of Winnipeg for many years and it is progressing quite well as the reports will tell you. But I just decided to stand this down, Madam Speaker, because of the issue that just currently arose, in terms of…there was a report in the media, it was talking about how much garbage there are in the back lanes in the North End. I think a reporter went around and went to various parts of the City and discovered that particular neighbourhoods had lots of garbage in the back lane, looked very, very awful, verses other sort of inner city neighbourhoods, although I don't know that they covered off a whole bunch, but they followed what was reports to 311 from people who are fed up with how our back lanes look in a particular neighbourhoods. And so, the issue there…and Madam Speaker, I just wanted to mention is that there was great success. The By-law Enforcement do blitzes in the North End and it is improving the way things look. It's improving in getting people to take responsibility for the condition of their homes, responsibility for garbage and so on. However, one of the issues and I just wanted to raise this because I think it's something that we really need to consider because ultimately the people who are dumping the garbage are people who just don't care. And they need to take responsibility. And what By-laws does is they go down and they investigate each one or in a proactive blitz, they'll just go through a whole neighbourhood, identify the issues, get the responsible people to deal with it and clean it up. But the problem is in the winter, we don't have that same proactive approach. We don't…as a matter of fact, the snow covers a lot of the garbage. Back lanes get plowed. They get piled in and so we don't necessarily see this stuff in the winter, but it's there and so, Madam Speaker, I think as we move forward and I just want to bring this up because really, I can't see any other way of getting people to take responsibility. We're doing everything we can. There is organizations like the William Whyte Neighbourhood or Residents Association, the Dufferin Residents Association, the Selkirk Avenue Biz takes a big responsibility, the North End Community Renewal Corporation, the Winnipeg Police, the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service, we all are doing what we can to try to get our neighbourhoods looking good. And so, but we do need to focus and I just wanted to bring this attention to Council that we really have to, somehow, catch these people who are not taking responsibility for their garbage carts in an appropriate way, people who just don't care. There's other issues that need to be identified. But so, I just wanted to make it clear that we, as a city and we, myself as a City Councillor, and Council, we've taken decisions in the past to try…make these improvements. So, Madam Speaker, I ask the public to bear with us and the people who live and care about their communities to bear with us, we are going to get on top of this. It's just every spring, it all of a sudden shows up and so we need to start addressing it in the winter time as well. So thank you, Madam Speaker. This is actually…these reports are a good news story. The City is making great progress in improving our City. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on this item? Okay, seeing none, Mayor Bowman to close.

Mayor Bowman: I have nothing further to add. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Moving on to the…Mr. Mayor, on the Report A of EPC dated March 18, 2015..

REPORT "A" OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 18, 2015

Mayor Bowman: I'll introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 8, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Wyatt: Two, six and seven.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, similar? Anyone else had their hand up? Okay, deal with item. I'll call the question on Item 1, 3, 4, 5 and 8. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 - St. Vital Minor Hockey Association

Madam Speaker: That was stood down by…yes, Mr. Mayor, do you wish to open on the item? Item No. 2.

Mayor Bowman: I'll offer comments and questions, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: That was stood down by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I stood it down, Madam Speaker, to rise on a point of order, because I'm sure it's a very good cause and I'm sure there's nothing to it, but there is no report attached to this item, there's just a motion here that went to EPC on March 18th, and now to Council. But, there is no report that I can see. I looked at the Council agenda or the EPC agenda and I'm looking at this of agenda and typically, you know, for such items, we have an administrative report, it's not just motions saying that money is going to go here, money is going to go there.

Madam Speaker: So, you're rising on a point of order?

Councillor Wyatt: Point of order.

Madam Speaker: But, I see Councillor Mayes has his hand up. I think we should afford him the opportunity to speak to that. Were there any other hands up? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I wasn't going to pull it, but give me the chance to talk about St. Vital Arena, I will seize the opportunity, probably to the regret of all concerned. It's a good project. I want to thank Councillor Wyatt for approving the 2014 budget along with me that he helped craft, which included a $400,000 capital expenditure grant for the St. Vital Arena. You'll know, Madam Speaker, that there are, I believe, 18 city-owned arenas in the City of Winnipeg, only two, only two are run by groups other than the City. Councillor Dobson has one out there at Allard, I have the other one: St. Vital Minor Hockey has run that arena for decades unlike other arenas where average loss is probably about $200,000, St. Vital Minor Hockey runs this at a loss of only about 20,000 or break even. So, St. Vital Minor Hockey came forward with some needs for some capital upgrades to the arena. This is not to be confused with the Dakota Community Centre which we're coming to a few items now in Councillor Lukes' Ward, also in St. Vital. The St. Vital arena is an older facility at Meadowood and St Anne's Road. So in the last year's capital budget, we approved 400,000, a great project to help with capital needs of St. Vital arena. There then began a long dance around the Mulberry bush about what to use that funding for. The arena folks who have run the facility for decades indicated their first preference would be a new Zamboni, I had no difficulty with that. Mr. McGinn who is on our City staff who I have described as a man of great integrity said, "Look, under the agreement that's in place, they can't actually use the City funds for a Zamboni." And so we began a long back and forth and a number of e-mails trying to figure out while not all of it's from the arena's budget, some of it's from my own ward budget that I had to put in, a condition of Councillor Wyatt to his credit insisted on last year, so we've got a total 400,000, 100,000 of which came from my ward's parks and recreation funding. In short, they need a Zamboni. They run the place. Their first priority is a Zamboni. I don't want to saddle this with too much bureaucracy, but that was their preferred first expenditure out of the 400,000. There's no opposition from our arena's

folks from our…from our fiscal folks, however, I would've preferred just to approve the Zamboni and let them roll, but Mike Ruta and Mr. McGinn who are great…great…men of great integrity and said, "Look, to do this properly, you've got to go through Council." So I hope that's an adequate explanation for Councillor Wyatt and again I thank him for his support for the budget last year that provided 400,000 for the St. Vital Arena.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, you know, Madam Speaker, I hear what the Councillor is saying and I know exactly what he is trying to do, and I applaud him for that and I know it's a worthy cause. It's just whenever we've had items like this, typically it does require a report. I just…I think it's important that we don't fall…go down this path where we just simply, you know, have a motion without some information in terms of what the Councillor just said, which is indeed if the CFO signs off and Mr. McGinn is signing off, then I don't have an issue for that with that because they're both stand up individuals and…but unfortunately, I don't have a report that says that and that's the concern that I have, and that's why I stood it down. I don't want to create red tape needlessly. It's just typically whenever we've had to move funds around from one program to another, especially if it does not meet criteria in light of the…and I know Zambonis are an acute issue, not just for City owned arenas, but for community clubs across the city, a real acute issue because of the fact that a brand new Zamboni is basically what the price is here, $125,000. And that's, you know, if you're a basic Zamboni. So I would just encourage that in the future that this…these matters do have some sort of administrative report attached to them.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'd like to move this as a referral back to have a report done as there is some other concerns that Councillor Wyatt hasn't outlined that I think it requires a report, so I'd like to move referral back to the administration.

Madam Speaker: So, I will call the question unless the Mayor would like to rebut. There is three minutes. Okay, so I'll call the question. It is to refer the matter back to committee. Which committee, Councillor Eadie, just clarify? I was conferring with the Clerk. Back to EPC? Or where would we be referring this Mr. Clerk. To EPC for report. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Mayes: Madam Speaker, point of order. It also requires a separate report. They're looking to replace the basement doors I believe. Would the Councillor like a separate report on each and every item of the remaining $275,000? I believe there is some plumbing. What informational requirements will we have on that? Councillors are saying that they don't want to add unnecessary bureaucracy so if we're going to have a report on a Zamboni, well…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, with all due respect, you had your time to speak on this, I'm sorry. The matter…the report has been referred back. The matter has been referred back for full report and that's what Council just voted on. Yes.

Councillor Eadie: I just wanted to let everybody know that there is another privately run arena called West Kildonan Community Centre that often needs assistance similar to this kind of issue.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, yes, this matter is closed. We are now moving on to Item No. 6, Mr. Clerk.

Item 6 - 2015 Mill Rates for the Education Support Levy and Special Levy

Madam Speaker: Okay, Mr. Mayor do you wish to open?

Mayor Bowman: I'll just wait to hear questions or comments.

Madam Speaker: This was stood down by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I just want to vote against it.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Are there any further speakers? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Wyatt: That's why I stood it down.

Councillor Mayes: Well, we don't have a report…And we haven't had that requirement in previous years. This is No. 6, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, I'd like to speak to this item and I know we have at least…we have at least four former trustees on this board spread across at least three different School Divisions, and traditionally there has been an approach here that has spoken against items like this and in the newspaper last year indicated that I didn't realize the animosity that Councillors feel towards School Boards and I agree, I don't because I don't share that animosity and my view is that was then and this is now. We've got a new Council here and we have a chance here to do something historic and that is to work with the School Boards and not express animosity toward them. They are an example of local democracy. I know in Louis Riel School Division, you had people ranging from age 19 to in their 70s running for school trustee. I think they do good work. You could find fault with the tax increases here, but they would probably say, "Well, some of us didn't get as much money from the Province as we wanted", which is exactly what we, the City have said as well. There are a number of projects we deal with School Boards that are exciting. I know Councillor Allard said it's doing some good work with Louis Riel School Division at Windsor Park Collegiate. I know Councillor Lukes, doing some good work on transportation to schools with Pembina Trails. We've got the Outlook School, the cricket project by the school…the Seven Oaks School Division that you put a lot of time in on I believe, Madam Speaker, and I've been doing some work with the French School Division, La Division Scolaire Franco-manitobaine on the needs of one of their high schools. We do have a chance here to really do some co-operative work, I know…I was at the School Board meeting last week, I know Councillor Dobson was there, Councillor Lukes was there. So I think we have a chance to maybe change this relationship around and do something progressive and do something innovative which is what we're trying to do and trying to work together rather than maybe repeat some of the animosity of the paSt. So, we are obliged every year to pass this item and usually there's a bit of theatre where people denounce the School Boards. I'm not going to do that though. I'm going to say we've got a chance to do something new, to do something innovative, to do some good work with the School Boards on some projects. I think for the average taxpayer, they don't care if it's half funded by the City and half the School Board, they just want to see the new play structure like some of the ones we're getting up around St. Vital and other areas. So my pleasure to introduce this item and I do hope we can start turning around our relationship with the School Boards and move forward. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer followed by Councillor Orlikow and then Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I simply would like to hear from the Councillor who stood this down and to hear his point of view on this.

Madam Speaker: Next is Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I regretfully say that I was deleted out of Councillor Mayes' partnership modeling so I want to get up and start…add to the partnership modeling and how it benefits the City of Winnipeg and what I believe our future with School Boards are and that's why we need to have this…a relationship. Kelvin High School right now is embarking on a new gym, paid for by the Province. However, in the River Heights Ward, we have a serious problem of lack of senior active living programming and space. So we have two choices that we see right now. Either to have the community centre build their own gym through our funds, they're going to be coming forward and trying to get a new gym. However, that's actually not required now if we can get this project off the ground. So we're attempting to raise about a million dollars from the community to add into the Active Living Centre component of that new gymnasium. So seniors and other community members will have access to that. We also have another agreement going on with the Queenston School, there's a new gym as well for after-hours programming and the school trustee and chair of the board has been working very collaboratively with us to…how do we expand and open up our schools even more, getting rid of the old idea before which was joint service sharing agreements. We're looking at a new modeling. We even have a more exciting project. That one is exciting enough, but the Grant Park recreational area plan that we just embarked on and thank you Councillors for approving the study funding for it. We actually may…we may attach a library, our new library that we're trying to figure out where to put it in the area. We may attach it to the high school. The school is willing to re-shift their classrooms around because they see the advantage of being able to have a library that not only services their population, but also will allow the City and the School Board to work together to benefit all the neighbourhood. Now to me, that is partnerships. We know that the money comes from one pocket. Our job on the School Board…on the School Board and for all elected officials and on City Council, is to try to find ways that we work together and I think there's a lot more opportunity where the City Council can work with School Boards to help minimize both the cost for both organizations. So I'm very excited to stand up and support this. I understand that, you know, Councillor Schreyer was asking. There is the old model of they call it 80/20 where we'll get…this has been presented before, 80 percent of funding of School Board funding will come from somewhere, 80 percent of it from somewhere, just not property tax. No one has explained to me where that 80 percent will ever come from, but that's the model that's been out there. Get School Board taxes off my property and shift that responsibility, 80 percent of that responsibility to the Province. Again, as soon as someone can tell me where that funding is going to come from, maybe we can have a debate rather than just having a statement made. So again, we have to be moving forward in a collaborative manner

with our School Boards and with all other levels of government. We have the Building Canada…we have the Building Manitoba where we need to be working with the Province, same kind of regard. We all have the same objectives which is serving our neighbourhood. The School Board's objective is primarily serving the students and the kids that they serve. Ours or their parents or the Province is everybody, so again, to stand up here and say, "We just want to have it removed off." And even I've heard the idea, let's remove School Board taxes off and let School Boards send out their own…their own letter…their own assessment letter. Well again, that may be politically very nice, but very, very expensive to do. So again, is that the best use of public money? So we just don't look tarnished? No. Do I understand the fact that we have the School Board taxes and the civic taxes on the…the property tax on the same bill that it limits our ability on one side for the City to use that vacuum that is 80 percent magically appeared from to fill up our own coffers allows us to have a little more flexibility? I understand that, but again those confrontations are still continuing and we should. I appreciate the Province, what they've done with seniors and how you get a rebate there. I appreciate that with the farmers, I appreciate that, however, we need to be finding ways not just to slam down School Boards, not that slam down different levels of government, but to try to find ways that we can work together for the betterment of all people so again there is only one taxpayer.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Morantz: I would like to say there is an issue with the school taxes and it needs to be said I think and it needs to be discussed, but I think you start off by stating the problem. And they're…it's a tax fairness issue. There are many, many individuals who own homes who pay the school tax, who, for example, maybe they never had children, they're paying into the system there. Or they sent their children to private schools or their complaints are around the fact that they own a cottage or they're also paying but maybe don't have a…in another municipality and don't have the right to vote. There are a number of, many difficulties I think which have been acknowledged around fairness with the…with the education tax. And I do applaud the efforts of the Province to try reducing the impact of the education tax and it reminded me a lot about the debate we had around the business tax and we were able to reduce the business tax by a point. And, you know, eventually, I think that many people feel that the goal should be the same which is to ultimately eliminate the business tax, but Councillor Orlikow is correct, where is the money coming from? So, but my main point is this and I don't know maybe it's maybe for this floor or not, but the report before us says there is no financial impact to the City of Winnipeg organization as the establishing of the education mill rates as revenue neutral to the operating budget. And Madam Speaker, I have to say, I have a big problem with that because I can't imagine any organization collecting $500 million a year for another organization and remitting it to that organization, collecting it from the taxpayers, receiving the funds, accounting for the funds and paying them out and not charging a fee to do that, not receiving anything, no remuneration at all for undertaking such a major, major endeavour. And so I think that that's a discussion that needs to take place. It's a huge effort by the Public Service and make sure these numbers are correct, we have to pass this bill, we have to make sure that the right numbers are on the tax bills and send them out and collect them, account for them and remit them, we receive really nothing for that according to this report which says that it is revenue neutral. So I don't think it's enough to say it's revenue neutral, that's not costing us anything, it's costing us a lot and we should be receiving something for those endeavours and that's the point that I wanted to make, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy followed by Councillor Eadie. Councillor Eadie?.

Councillor Eadie: Councillor Gilroy…

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah, but I think you are first.

Madam Speaker: No, I had you on the list first unless you would like to switch.

Councillor Gilroy: Oh, no, I'm first? Okay, sorry, yes. As a former trustee, I really understand the importance of working closely with other levels of government, and I think we have really set the tone this Council of being a collaborative and working Council that's willing to work with other levels of government and also, work amongst ourselves. And I really want us to show the School Board that we're willing to do that here. This debate goes on and on. The matter before us isn't the matter about the collection of property taxes, that's not up to us to decide right now. It's up to the…it's for us to decide on whether we're going to have a good working relationship, and the comments that we make here will determine that. We do get some compensation. It might not be as much as we want, but we do get some compensation. We also have many joint use agreements where they're using our school gyms, using our facilities and we're using their facilities, so I think that we need to have a good working relationship. The public school system is a very, very important asset and we all benefit from our young people being well educated, and when we talk about our crime stats and those kinds of things we're talking about the public education system being a part of that. So I just want to hope that we have a good conversation regarding the public school system because I really want us to be able to have a good working relationship moving forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise as a former Seven Oaks School Board trustee, and very active person in the dealing with accessibility, the Manitoba Association of School Board Trustees, but that said, and given mention the work I did at that level, I think I'll like to just clarify some issues Madam Speaker, because I heard…I know we had a lot of new Councillors on here and there's a lot of concern and many arguments are always presented in the paper, and so ultimately though, just to start, Madam Speaker, I'd just like to say that…and everybody says this ultimately it's all the same taxpayer, we can talk about…and we all share and we all pay taxes that go into health care, we pay taxes that go into this place and that place and maybe we don't use them, but that doesn't mean that they don't need to be paid for because you never know if you're going to need them. We're always interested in that our families are doing well and the point is that whether a couple has children themselves or not, they probably have a brother or sister who have children. It's all in the interests of making sure that our society, Winnipeg, in our example, is a place that families can grow and prosper and do well and yeah, you do have to pay taxes. It's really part of it. But it's all sharing in the cost that it takes for us to all enjoy a decent life. So, I'll give you that, but let me give you some specifics, Madam Speaker. We, in the last budget we passed on Monday, we talked about the benefits of $1.7 million to go to the 6.5 into regional roads. That $1.7 million is arising because we're going to find places where houses where people made additions, finished basements, added air conditioners, added patio decks and so on and so forth Madam Speaker. But what happens is we're going to be finding those after. Today, when we set this mill rate, just for people's knowledge, when we set this mill rate today, the amount of money that it says it derives for the School Division, that is what they will receive. That is what they will receive. We will collect and that is what they will receive. We pay them the amount that they have identified. When we add new assessment through there, we, the City, end up in a position where we end up with higher valued properties and we keep that money. We keep that money. And I invite any new Councillors to have a discussion with, I think he's not acting any more, Mel Chambers, our administration from Assessment, to talk about those issues because there's a balance too, and I know that Councillor Orlikow, over the years as a School Board trustee, understood a lot of this and there's trade-offs. So it isn't a pure cost to the City of Winnipeg to collect the property taxes on behalf of our citizens and they're all the same taxpayer. So if there was a separate system to pay your school property taxes and your city property taxes, you're adding extra bureaucracy. You're adding extra workers to do that. What happens is it just happens to be efficient. It's the same taxpayer. It is efficient for the City of Winnipeg within our boundaries to collect it, and I know with the Seven Oaks School Division, it is within the efficiencies of the municipality of West St. Paul to collect Seven Oaks School Board taxes in that area. So you need to keep this all in mind. We heard about many great projects from former trustees. We try to share. I know there's always been arguments and it's always very difficult but there's a balance that we need to work and whenever we slam School Boards at this division here it doesn't help our relationship, because we do need to work together to provide a better life in our City of Winnipeg for that. There is much more I could say, Madam Speaker, to point out the discrepancies; as a matter of fact actually, our Finance chair lives…I did an analysis. You know what Madam Speaker? I'll just send him the analysis to demonstrate to him some of the real inequities when it comes to reassessment as we talked about in the business tax. It was referred to…reassessment and assessments have a very interesting effect, depending on where you live within the city, but it has nothing to do with the mill rate and collecting the School Board property taxes and forwarding them the amount that it says they are going to get when they pass their budgets and what was on our assessment roll. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Well he insisted. I want to just rise maybe just to set the record a little straight here to some of our new Councillors that they should know that, I have, in terms of this item, I cannot recall slamming, attacking, criticizing the School Boards. I do recall slamming and attacking the Provincial Government. I do recall that. But, I know the School Boards have the system they have and they have the funding mechanisms they have like we do. They are a creature of the Provincial Government like we are, legislated. We are basically, we are a corporation legislated by the Province. We are here with their will, and the School Boards are the same. And so I have understood the challenge that School Boards face in terms of trying to balance their budgets and the hard time they have. What I find interesting about the debate is just, you know, kind of the spin being made in terms of attacking School Boards. The reality is it's actually the Provincial Government that has not stepped up to the plate here. And to answer some questions that have been kind of raised by some members of Council that, you know, they want solutions, they want to find solutions, let's find a solution to the problem rather than criticize it. A little over a decade ago there was a committee struck by the Association of the Manitoba Municipalities. Yes, the Councillor is aware of it. I'm wondering why he didn't mention it. It's called the Education Working Group, and the Education Working Group was made up of municipal officials, school trustees and the Provincial Government, and they sat down and they rolled up their sleeves and they went to work to try to find a solution because the AMM position, by the way, which we're a member of, our municipal association, is to return us to a 80/20 split in terms of funding of School Divisions; 20 percent from the property tax base, 80 percent from general revenues out of the Province, and that organization, that working group, made recommendations to the Provincial Government, solutions to their problem. I believe one of them was actually to deal with the sales tax and raise it. And

Gary Doer's words at that time, and he was a relatively new premier, says “I was not elected to raise taxes”, and he killed the recommendations out of that group which his government was a part of as well. So, I stand here not to criticize our School Boards and not to say…I understand fully the challenges that they’re facing. I stand here and I have stood this down because the fact of the matter is we hear from our ratepayers day in and day out, and you cannot ignore the fact Councillors that, now that you are now members of this Council instead of a board, for those of you who were on boards before, that the education taxes continue to rise as a share of the overall property tax bill. In 2013, according to the report before us, and there is a report, in 2013, 53.25 percent education taxes made up of the overall property tax bill on average in the City of Winnipeg. That rose to 54.5 percent and now is rising to 54.6 percent. It continues to go up every year. The frustrating thing about this Councillors is that we heard a lot of debate on Monday about the whole issue of freezing taxes and, you know, the impact that’s had on our infrastructure deficit and everything else. Well the frustrating thing is that this Council did freeze taxes and in a couple of years cut them, and in that entire period of time, was there a huge difference made up on the tax bill to the ratepayers, to the home owners, to the people who receive the bills? No. Why? Because the School Divisions filled that void. And that entire void that we created on the bill, moved out of the way, they stepped into. Why? Because that's the only mechanism they have to fund their budgets. You cannot blame them. The Provincial Government refuses to address the challenge that is facing the School Divisions of this province and the challenge that it is facing the property taxpayers of this city, which is why this Council, a motion moved by Councillor Pagtakhan, why this Council endorsed a policy that the education taxes should be completely removed from the property tax bill. And that is the official policy of this Council. Until that changes, that is the official policy. Yes, technically this is one of these strange reports that we actually have to vote on because if we don't vote it, apparently they can remove us from office if we don't pass this, or be put in jail apparently Councillor Pagtakhan. So, who will bail who out, or not? But nevertheless, nevertheless, it's been symbolic and as (inaudible) pointed out, I have symbolically voted against it and it is symbolic because it has to pass, but to make the case that we know that…look it. You look across the country and other jurisdictions, other provinces fund their education system, their School Divisions, their schools, with a different model than what we have, and that is the frustrating thing because other models exiSt. We don't have to reinvent the wheel. It just takes a Provincial Government that is prepared to have some control of their finances and make some decisions with regards to how those services are funded with regards to School Divisions. So that's why I stepped it down and I want to thank members of Council for discussion on the item. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Madam Speaker. It's kind of funny because I think this might be the 17th time we have had this debate here that I’ve been here, because every year, Council is forced to, you know, we make this…we approve this and we don't really have a choice, but I support it because we have to fund our schools. But I just wanted to clarify a couple of points. One, Councillor Morantz talked about the cost and that there must be a coSt. Well the report in front of us says there really isn't a coSt. That it is cost neutral. I don’t think the issue is an actual physical cost as Councillor Eadie point out. There is an efficiency if we’re sending out a tax bill, to put it all on one bill, and then I believe there’s a little bit of interest we get while we’re holding the money and so on and so on. It actually is cost neutral. I don't think that's the issue. I think the issue is the tax room, theoretically, that we might get or other arguments that could be made, but I think the “elephant in the room” that I just wanted to point out that no one’s talked about, that Councillor Wyatt alluded to the model we have and how that's the problem. Well the model we have is called another level of democracy of having School Divisions, and if they don't have the ability to tax, they really don't have any power at all to be another democratic level of government. And if you don't believe we should have School Boards at all, you know, then eliminate them 100 percent, you know, just give it to the Province and we can let the political party of the day decide the decisions for our children in each of our areas and our neighbourhoods and so on. But as a parent who have three kids go through Winnipeg School Division One, they got an absolutely incredible public school education. And I’m just going to say it because I don't think we say it often enough. I don’t know how many of you want to be teachers, but you know, it's not a profession I would want to spend my days. I’m so impressed with the way they love our children and care for our children and I’ve seen it first-hand with my family and the incredible experiences and love and support they’ve had going through our public school system. You look to the board and they don't have systems like that. They’re focused on taxes and they’ve made sure that there has to be a referendum to raise taxes and no taxes ever get raised, and they don’t have…they have one of the worst education systems if you look at America as a developed country, they should be a lot higher rated in the world than they are, and we have a good system in Winnipeg. We have a better system than in Ontario and other places, because we have these School Divisions that care about our kids and we have elected people that get elected to those boards, so I just wanted to point that out because we don't often talk about that and I have to say this is the first time we’ve had this debate where there hasn't been a lot of bashing. There’s been a respectful debate about the different points of view on it, and I actually really appreciate that. I think it is important this was pulled off the agenda and that we talk about it. But instead of just, you know, crapping on other levels of government or complaining, I think that we have to recognize why we have School Divisions and what they do. Yes, the tax burden is difficult. We have to recognize the Province has financial challenges too in health care and education. And so it's not that simple to just find the money, and I think we’re going to find the money for our financial challenges by having a different approach with the higher levels of government that have the power over us, and that's going to be by

working with them and supporting them and solving our problems together rather than having a big hissy fit and a fight with them every year. So I really appreciate this new tone here and I think it's really helpful and I think people have different opinions. I know there's kind of an ideology about education. Some people feel the public schools are great and they should be…you know there's all sorts of different opinions. There's a lot of opinions the public has about education. There's no one view. But I just hope people realize how great our public school system is here in Winnipeg and I credit the School Divisions with that, and then you have to credit the Province that funds them as well. So I thought I'd make those comments and I thank everyone for the debate.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer, I saw that you had your hand up, but you have already spoken to this item.

Councillor Schreyer: That was a point of information if I may Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: I believe that was your speech earlier.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker I made a point of information or a request of information asking Councillor Wyatt to speak as he was the one that stood this down. I believe that those were my sole comments on this issue.

Madam Speaker: All right. Go ahead.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I'd simply like to say Councillor Gerbasi had said this is the 17th time this is been debated in this Council. She says every year, so yes, maybe this 17th time is for Councillor Gerbasi as she is the dean of this chamber, and I certainly appreciate her comments as she hones them over 17 years of debate on this very issue and this is what it's about. I must say that this is just one of those issues where I'm very grateful for this debate. I'm learning and I'm looking forward to further discussion with the Mayor and Councillors and other levels of government, including for, you know, researching the considerations of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities and Councillor Pagtakhan's motivations for his initial motion regarding the Provincial Government's role in the education tax levy, and I'm just glad to be here today and look forward to perhaps making my contribution after greater consultation and research on this issue. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Schreyer. Seeing no other speakers, Mr. Mayor shall I call the question or would you like to close?

Mayor Bowman: I think everyone said enough. I'd like to call the question.

Madam Speaker: I will call the question on Item 6. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 7, Mr. Clerk.

Item 7 – Jonathan Toews Community Centre – Field House Development Proposal

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Allow Council to speak please.

Madam Speaker: Okay. This was stood down by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, thank you Madam Speaker. I stood it down, again, similar to the report…to the second last item we dealt with. You know, again, a very worthy project. It's funding, I'm sure, is you know, a good project in terms of what's being attempted to be done here. I think the challenge is that the…there's no report, and I just find it frustrating to see the fact that there is no report in terms of this project. I understand the "whereas's". I understand the "be it resolved", but, and I understand that this is towards procurement of design of development services for the project and the funding source be the City's contribution of 15.9 which we approved, but again, there's just no report to this and I'm just wondering why this is before…maybe the Councillor for the area can explain this and then, you know, I'd have a better appreciation for what's being done here. But it's just, I'm just hesitant without a report which we typically have for these types of items, especially when it's a significant amount of money.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes. You have the floor.

Councillor Mayes: Well I'm touched by the new found concern for these projects in St. Vital Madam Speaker. I would like to reference the following three reports, all of which Councillor Wyatt has voted for. February 2013 in which this Council allocated $5 million to this project. Lengthy report. April 2014 in which this Council approved a further $2 million for this project. Lengthy report. June 2014, again, when Councillor Wyatt was a member of EPC. Voted for it. All of those

reports contained all of the information that is needed. No one has ever asked me about this project, ever, except Councillor Lukes, to her great credit who has been a real champion of this since she was elected, and it's actually in her ward. So, I'm delighted to see the new found interest that hasn't been displayed before in moving this project forward, a project which has miraculously united everyone from Justin Swandel to Christine Melnick to Teresa Oswald to me, to Sam Katz to Mayor Bowman to Councillor Lukes. All of us have worked very hard to move this project forward. If you want to needlessly delay it, that is certainly the right of this Council, however, I can advise this project has been discussed since the fall of 2011 and is shovel-ready once we get the design done. There will be a further opportunity to discuss this matter as Councillors would know, or had they had bothered to ever ask us about it, we've had a number of series of meetings with staff. Brad Erickson has done a terrific job on this and I hope you had relay that Mr. Jack to Mr. Erickson, our head of Municipal Accommodations. We've been having monthly updates. I am surprised to hear on the floor of Council that we now need reports on Zambonis and on a design grant. There is $7 million set aside for the Jonathan Toews Field House by this chamber. It's been voted on three separate times by Councillors. Now, we can delay it further and request a report if we really want to and what it will say is exactly what's in the rather lengthy motion here, or if you really have a new found concern about the viability of the project, I would refer you to any one of the three reports that is already on the public record, none of which have ever been questioned by any member of Council to me. June of 2014, April of 2014, February of 2013. It's a great project Madam Speaker. We were there to announce the funding for it. The then Mayor, the other Councillor and two of local MLA's. It's been heavily supported by the Province, heavily supported by the volunteers who have worked long and hard and who I am sure will be very, very angered if this project is further delayed because people haven't asked for a report prior to today. I certainly could have provided any question, any issue. I think Councillor Lukes and I would have been happy to respond. We spent an enormous amount of time on this project. So I guess we got surprised by the new found interest in the St. Vital Arena and the sudden desire to have a report on that. I want to reassure Council there are already three very lengthy reports on this matter. This is a design issue. We need to hire someone to go forward to make this project happen Madam Speaker. If we want to needlessly delay this and ask for a report which would essentially repeat what's in existing reports, that can be the will of this chamber. However, if you really want to delay and possibly kill the project, that's a good tone to take, and I appreciate there are some whose goal that is. But, from my view, it's a great project. It's had the support of Councillor Lukes. It's had the support of her predecessor. It's had Provincial support. If you have questions look at the reports. If you have questions come to the Councillors who care about the project who have worked tirelessly on it, like Councillor Lukes and myself, and ask the questions. Please do not come here and suddenly discover a new found need for a report. It's a design feature. There will be another report in June, Madam Speaker, in which Councillors can vote on the loan guarantee and on the business plan, all of which you requested when you voted on it in June of 2014. If you want to kill the project, you will have plenty of time then Madam Speaker. So for those who pulled this down thank you for your new found interest in the project. Thank you for your support on three prior occasions for the project. It's a great project. I'd be delighted to see it proceed. If we want to kill it today by asking for a report I would caution you that you certainly haven't been consulting with the people who run the community centre.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Mayes. Next is Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I rise to speak to this actual report. I tend to agree somewhat with what the Councillor from St. Vital has said, although I think he has got a…anyway doesn't matter. That would be out of order. Sorry, Madam Speaker. I distinctly recall this being in the capital budget program. I will remind the Councillor from St. Vital though that last year I voted against the capital budget so, he said we voted for it. Council voted to do this project and actually, Madam Speaker, it is a good project. So I think that's important, but it is very clear here, and I believe this is actually a capital program, not just a direct grant to some place. I can't remember exactly, Madam Speaker, but it seems to me that any of the financials related to this particular project would more than likely have to be reported to the Finance Committee, and so that process is going through, unlike the very deserving St. Vital Arena, not to say that they're not deserving but Madam Speaker, this one is quite different than the previous one that got referred because the previous one that got referred, all of a sudden it's identifying some strange account that I never heard of until actually awhile back and I just had some concerns about reports and where we find money because I know that the West Kildonan Memorial Community Centre is always looking for money. It's run by the community, it's a great facility as you know Madam Speaker, so I leave it at that and I think that this is a good motion. In order for this project to go ahead it does need money and it will be, I believe, reported through the Finance Committee, so thank you very much Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes?

Councillor Lukes: Madam Chair, I'd like to support Councillor Mayes' comments. As you know, I'm new here. This is a project in my ward and my ward has a pocket that goes into the St. Vital Ward. When I came on board here this is $15.9 million project that right away set flags for me in that it was maybe not on track or I was unaware of where it was at, so working with our Acting CAO, Mr. Jack, I organized multiple meetings to sit down with administration, multiple meetings with Councillor Mayes. We are meeting now with the community centre. This is a project that had started and was in the

process. I needed to be up to speed. I've gone through the reports. I've sat down with everyone in administration that touches this project. I am confident about the process now, a., understanding the process and b., understanding the funding and how it's being put together. So I, too, hope as Councillor Mayes, that everyone will support this. It's a very good project that's underway and I am confident about what's going forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close? Okay. I will call the question on Item No. 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. I'm hoping this is the appropriate time to request that we suspend the rules so that we may speak on Item 8 of Report A of the Executive Policy Committee which I believe is the most salient point.

Madam Speaker: Okay…yes…we've already passed Item 8. Councillor Schreyer feels he missed the opportunity to speak to it so if it's the will of Council, they'd like to suspend the rules just to speak to the item and we wouldn't be opening up the vote again. Because I think people may want to put some, you know, positive comments on the record. Is it the will of Council? I'll call the question. All in favour of suspending the rules? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Schreyer. Oh, read the item again?

Item 8 - Appointment of Chief Administrative Officer

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker and thank you Council for re-opening the opportunity to speak on what I believe is the most salient point of today's Council, and what should not be ignored. This is not merely an opportunity for me to speak. I'm very grateful for this opportunity but to open this up for Council to make comments on what is such a very important decision, and in my opinion not just a very important decision but such an excellent one. It happens to be by circumstances that we are so fortunate to have a Chief Administrative Officer that really we can all have confidence in. In this new era of City Hall where we need to rebuild people's trust in governance of this institution, I am so grateful for the circumstances and for the decision making by the Mayor and the selection committee for choosing Doug McNeil, Deputy Minister for the Province of Manitoba for Infrastructure and Transportation and Emergency Measures, as the new Chief Administrative Officer for the City of Winnipeg. It's been my good fortune for the past three years before I came to City Hall working as an assistant to the Honourable Steve Ashton, Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation and Responsible for Emergency Measures, to work alongside the department led by Deputy Minister Doug McNeil. I worked on one side of Minister Ashton's office and Deputy Minister McNeil worked on the other side with his office and we worked on two floods together - 2011 and 2014, and as well, a rather intense infrastructure development agenda throughout this province. I want you to know that in my opinion, having the good fortune of working alongside his department and getting to know Deputy Minister McNeil, a consummate professional. Not only has he worked for the Province of Manitoba, he has also worked for the City of Winnipeg. Perhaps there are other Councillors here who can make comment on that and his contribution to the City of Winnipeg previously, and it is at this time that I just think it's a wonderful choice that we can all have confidence in, and I'm very grateful for the circumstances that he be our new Chief Administrative Officer and thank you very much.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I actually meant to stand that one down but my voice was a little hiccupy, so I'm glad that we voted to allow us to make comment. I wanted to say that I had no problem voting for who's going to be our new CAO. I believe he will be in place in the next week or so. The…and given the challenges we've faced over the last--since I've been a City Councillor, I think that the background with Mr. McNeil is very good for us at this time and I think it's great. Very well qualified, Madam Speaker. And so I had no problem voting yes for our new CAO. However, I just wanted to point out slight…it's not the end of the world, however, we know that committee was selected to interview and short list and, well, short list, interview, re-interview more than likely, consider it and, it was great to hear that, as you know there was a prior process. We never received anywhere near, I believe, the quality of the kind of people as Mr. McNeil in that list and so I think that that's great. But I would point out though that before…and I know it's EPC's responsibility, but you know, when I was on the Seven Oaks School Division, if we were making a very important hiring decision, there would be a committee, we'd short list and we'd go and we'd do interviews and work we'd through it and then what would happen is when it's a board decision, board concern, we would then explain the short list and we would explain why we chose one person out of that bunch and explain that. Now, there was no violation of any privacy act that I know of in our doing that. So for me, I don't understand the rationale that somehow we were not able to at least know… you don't even have to put a name on who the short list was, but you could explain that we had quality people and so on and so forth. I don't want their resumes. I don't need that because I have confidence in that committee to make its selection. There are some very qualified people on that committee to make that kind of selection. But just, you know, for

information sake, openness and transparency. Like, we all need to learn to trust each other. I think it's important that when decisions are going through, we have all the information, we have, all have the same amount of time to consider things before we make decisions, and so I just want to leave that there. But again I really appreciate the work that the committee did to select because I know that that was a very difficult process I was involved in and I know yours was even longer because you had a lot more people applying. So thanks to the committee for selecting what I believe, or who I believe is going to be a great CAO for the long term. Please, at least five years Mr. McNeil. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none. It's a pleasure to have Mr. Mayor to close. Thank you.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you very much Madam Speaker, and thank you very much to Council for unanimously approving this excellent candidate to serve as our next CAO. I want to start by first thanking each of the members of our CAO selection committee. They did outstanding work. We had a number of competing priorities and demands on our tie over the last little while, and each of them gave their all in making what I think is an outstanding recommendation to EPC and ultimately to this Council. As you know, a critical component in moving our city forward and face the challenges ahead is hiring a new CAO who's going to understand large infrastructure projects and a willingness to work in a collaborative, open and accountable way. We were very pleased as a committee to have a number of very well qualified individuals, somewhere in the range of 150 candidates, many of whom from within the City of Winnipeg, many of whom that were from out of province, and I think that speaks to the renewed energy and renewal that's really happening here on City Council and at City Hall, and the interest by some very well-qualified individuals who want to be part of this. And for that I want to thank each and every member, or each and every individual who put their name forward to serve as our CAO. I believe Doug McNeil's knowledge and his expertise in working for the City of Winnipeg as well as the Province of Manitoba is really going to be a valuable asset as we work together to restore trust and faith in City Hall. His career is very well suited to serve as our CAO. He is experienced in managing an annual budget of $1.6 billion. He's provided advice regarding the floodway expansion and he's acted as a key member of the Province of Manitoba's flood fighting teams in 2011 and 2014. I also want to speak to the discussions that we had at our Council seminar yesterday and some of the comments that were just made by Councillor Eadie, Madam Speaker. They are very well received. How can we do a better job of ensuring each member of this City Council has as much information as possible to do your job? And so in the weeks and years to follow, I look forward to receiving any good suggestions that any of you have for how we can improve the process of selecting our CAO. It is, as I'm sure you can imagine, a balance behind the needs for confidentiality for individuals who are applying for a position while they hold current jobs, as well as our ability to get as much information in our hands and the hands of Councillors as possible, and if there are ways we can improve the process, I, for one, am certainly open to that. But I think today is the day to recognize that we have a real opportunity with the new CAO, someone who comes very well qualified, and I hope each of you will take time between now and the start date for Doug McNeil to start serving as our CAO, to reach out to him, to welcome him aboard and to let him know that he has the full support of City Council. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. We are now on to the addendum report of EPC. Mr. Mayor if you could move that the rule be suspended, that the addendum report of EPC dated March 24 be considered one item at a time.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED MARCH 24, 2015

Mayor Bowman: I'll move the rules be suspended.

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

Item 1 – Repeal of Public Health Licences – Doing Business in Winnipeg By-law No. 91/2008, and Consequential By-law Amendments

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. As many of you will know, this issue has been a long time coming. There's been an agreement in place with the Province of Manitoba to have us get out of the business that we're dealing with here today which is specifically public health licences and sending them out. In order for us to fulfill our obligations under the agreement that has been in place for a number of years, effective at the end of the month we won't be the ones actually sending the bills out. Safety inspections, health inspections, they are going to continue and Winnipeggers can be rest assured that their safety is something that, between the different levels of government, is taken very

seriously, but obviously as we move forward, we will need to, by the end of this month, make changes to our by-laws and that's exactly what this addresses. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further speakers? Seeing none, shall I call the question Mr. Mayor? All in favour of Item 1? Contrary? Carried. Item No. 2 Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 – Building Canada Fund Applications

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce.

Mayor Bowman: I'm sure there won't be any debate on this one, but I will kick start the discussion. By way of background, June 25, 2014, as has been mentioned by Members of Council, I was not here at the time. Previous Council, many of you were on that Council, adopted six projects for intergovernmental funding and they are as follows: Waverley Street underpass, Marion Street widening and the Archibald…sorry grade separation improvements from Archibald Street to Lagimodiere Boulevard; thirdly, Chief Peguis Trail extension from Main Street to Route 90; next, widening of Kenaston Boulevard from Ness to Taylor; Louise Bridge replacement, the and William R. Clement Parkway extension from Grant Avenue to Wilkes. January 24, 2015, received an email from Acting CAO Michael Jack. He had forwarded an email and a letter from Deputy Minister Fred Meier from the Province of Manitoba noting and I quote "in order for Manitoba to advance the funding request to Canada, we request that Winnipeg identify the projects for priority for funding." As you know, four priorities, sorry four applications were initiated prior to the October 22 election and certainly before my election. And so the request came in from the Province for us to simply prioritize the four applications that previous Council submitted. February 23, 2015, received a follow-up letter from Deputy Minister Fred Meier in which he states "We require that Winnipeg City Council prioritize its projects via formal Council resolution." In my view, a reasonable requeSt. We've placed four "asks" from our Provincial and ultimately our Federal partners. I think it's a reasonable request to find out in an open and transparent forum such as this, what are our preferences. Now, that does not, and it should be noted, that does not preclude us from trying to get all of them, and we should and we will.
February 23, 2015, as you know, I called a Build Canada seminar. All of Council was invited. Regrettably I know at least one was not able to attend but we had a good showing and we had a good discussion. We received information from our public service. We wanted to have as much facts as possible to make an informed decision, and that was my objective with that first Council seminar that we had over a month ago. At that Council seminar, Council asked for a cost benefit analysis to be provided before a decision could be made, and I encouraged all Councillors to ask questions of me, standing committee chair and of the public service on anything that you learned at that first Council seminar. Yesterday, we had a second Council seminar to provide you with even more information. All of Council was invited. I know know Councillors Gillingham and Eadie were away on Police Board business and I understand have since received the materials that we provided. The recommended priority from the public service when we asked for a cost benefit analysis so that we could simply prioritize the four "asks" that we put forward, were as follows: Waverley number one, Kenaston number two, Marion number three and Chief Peguis number four. As you know, we then had a Special Executive Policy Committee meeting that was initially intended to deal with the matter we just voted on, Item 1, and in order to get the discussion going today we moved a motion that we're going to now consider. When we did so, we moved Kenaston to number four. Now, that shouldn't, in no way shape or form, indicate that Kenaston upgrades are not necessary. They are absolutely necessary, not just at peak times of traffic congestion around rush hour, but at all times of the day. There was a need for economic development and for commuters to do the work on Kenaston. All four projects are necessary, however, Kenaston is before the courts in terms of the Kapyong issue, and while it is before the courts, in EPC's view, it doesn't make sense to at least prioritize it. The "ask" is still there though. Now I can update Council also on the two that weren't applied for. There were two that were applied for. Previous Council voted for six and I want to let you know that we've been advised, and we've made queries that actions are being taken on both William R. Clement Parkway as well as the Louise Bridge to progress them. My understanding is, there wasn't sufficient financial information to proceed when those four applications were made during the time of the previous Council, but the reality is that we have four applications that have been made and we can make a choice. We cannot decide on priorities or we can work in a reasonable and co-operative way with our Provincial partners and ultimately our Federal partners to let them know what the will of Council is, and I don't think there's anything wrong with letting our Provincial partners know on our wish list what are the key priorities. I look forward to a debate about what those priorities are and ultimately Council will be supreme and I can assure you that as Mayor, I'll fight and advocate for those priorities to be met. But we need to do our job. The public administration presented a matrix considering all four projects including a cost benefit analysis at the Council seminar. For far too long, decisions on infrastructure, in my view, have been way too political. Two Council seminars asking the public service to do their job, provide us with the cost benefit analysis, is moving us in the right direction. We could ask for a lot more information and we could debate this for the next year or the next two or the next three years, but the reality is, is that there are three parties involved: the Provincial and Federal Governments, and a request has come in for us to prioritize and so we shall.

In the motion that you'll see before you, Waverley has been ranked one. Rail safety is critical. Traffic volumes and demand is most significant at Waverley by a factor of ten. Forty trains cross there per day in comparison to four to eight trains per day at Marion. It should be noted, however, that the spread in terms of the ranking is very narrow between the two. They are both very important and very worthy initiatives. So too is Chief Peguis. Centreport, Councillor Lukes made very compelling arguments yesterday at EPC and I want to thank her for them, that Chief Peguis should be in the fold, and it is. All four are. We are not being asked today to eliminate any of the four that have been put forward. We're simply being asked to rank them. And as Winnipeg grows to a population of a million residents strong, we have to take into account how our infrastructure projects connect and improve our community through BRT, AT and traffic flow. I look forward to the discussion and once again I can assure Council that once we provide those priorities, that the next job is getting the announcements from the other levels of government and working with our Provincial and Federal partners. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. We have motion five in front of us regarding the same item. Councillor Orlikow would you introduce it please?

Councillor Orlikow: Yes thank you Madam Chair. This motion at number five is just an add on to the Building Canada funding regarding how we're going to pay for it, and I think Council should note we've had some concerns and this has never been done before, the Plessis or other project that I know of, where we're going to take that Building Canada fund but we still, Council will have the final authority on approving. We still know, as mentioned by a number of Councillors that there's still some unknowns here, if it's a P3 funded model or if it's not. These will all effect but again will happen in negotiations on Building Canada so we've made sure that, unlike in the previous times again moving the ball forward, instead of just having it all done through the CAO's office or through the CFO's office, we've made sure but once we get it down to that line and we try to figure out how much it will actually cost in the end, all these, whichever project is chosen, will come back to Council for approval.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow was there also a correction?

Councillor Orlikow: Oh yes. Absolutely. So there's another point. Yeah just introduce the motion so that...I think I can do that right? Number 5, just take a point of Number 5, there's a correction from Chief Peguis Trail again showing that we do believe in the project. There was an error. It only went up to McPhillips but again the key is to get it into Centreport. So we changed the Chief Peguis Trail, Main to Route 90.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll get into the debate now. Is there someone that would like to start first? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. Again, I am not as well versed as other members of Council here. I'm speaking off the top of my head. I've got a lot of priorities. There are a lot of points I want to make here.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, just a moment. I just wanted to clarify as well that you would speak to the item and the motion in front of us all concurrently. Councillor Orlikow do you have anything to add there? Okay. Thank you. Just so everyone's clear.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. Thank you. So Madam Chair, I think that we can all, that all members of this Council can agree that we've basically been going flat out since we've been elected. We…many members of us were part of forming the budget, passing the budget. We dealt with the boil water advisory. We had many discussions on racism. We've been hiring a new CAO. We've had Convention Centre, CentreVenture challenges. We've been all going at a very fast pace, and we've really not had any time to, as a Council, to meet and work together and to collaborate really on our big picture goals for our priorities in our term on any priority, really. And we all campaigned on priorities. And in all honesty I really haven't had the chance to learn everyone's priority yet. I barely had a chance to read all the Mayor's priorities but a lot of them I was on the same page with. It's hard on the campaign trail as we all know. So now we're facing the decision to prioritize a transportation infrastructure project for the Building Canada fund. In my opinion, this is a tremendous priority that we must act on, and then we must decide on how we're going to go forward. So in all this rush of the activities that we've been involved in, you know, I'd really like to thank Mayor Bowman for Council seminars for the discussion on these particular priorities in front of us today on the Building Canada priorities. We've had great discussions. I understand Council seminars were never held before. I can only imagine how transportation projects were selected before. I'm very fortunate to have spent the last 15 years focused on transportation, and during these past 15 years Madam Chair, I was asked to sit on the City's Active Transportation Advisory Committee for 15 years. I was asked to sit on the Advisory Committee, Phase One for Rapid Transit, and I was asked by the Province of Manitoba to chair the first ever report on how to move active transportation forward in the Province of Manitoba. I was the Executive Director for the Winnipeg Trails Association for 7 plus years. Yes it felt like 70 but…and I chaired the Winnipeg West, the West Winnipeg Coalition to ensure active transportation was included in Centreport's secondary plan. The draft is out and I'm

very pleased to see that we were successful in our advocating to have the Centreport footprint include active transportation. So all these roles and activities over the past 15 years have given me a very, very privileged insight into the understanding of the significant role transportation plays in the development of our city and our province, and I would like to speak to the big picture on transportation and how it is a key enabler to economic prosperity. Every single government recognizes trade and transportation are significant economic enablers. Again, I've been very privileged, being on Council here, to be part of EPC and to peel back the many layers of this budget that we just passed, to really, really be surprised, dismayed and overwhelmed at what the future holds for the City and the decisions that we'll have to make and wondering where these new revenue streams will be coming from. I am sort of…you know I'm supportive of a new deal of course with the Province in any way that we can get. I'm challenged to think that we can get part of the PST when they have a challenge balancing their own budget. So, I am look to other revenue streams and opportunities. Since 2005, Ottawa and the Province have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to establish and work towards establishing Winnipeg as a major multimodal global transportation hub in the name of Centreport, and I just want people to listen to these numbers: Federal, Provincial, Municipal support, since 2005 of $500 million, chipping away at this big vision; 212 million for Centreport Canada Way; 150 million for the Headingley by-pass; 43 million for the water treatment plant and infrastructure, which was really critical and really a defining moment in this because it was at that point in 2013 that we lost Facebook's data farm, which would've been…which was estimated at 1.2 billion over ten years. We have put $8 million in water and waste servicing. Council here approved an $8 million interceptor pipe and such. The Province of Manitoba is also investing another 700 million in key trade corridors; 215 million to flood proof and improve Highway 75. Just last night I heard how they were going to be raising the bridge through Morris and enabling transportation to continue from the U.S. into Manitoba. 200 million to upgrade the Perimeter Highway; 320 million for major improvements to the TransCanada Highway, and in Winnipeg, I haven't got all the exact numbers from administration. We've had 69 million for the Waverley West, Kenaston extension; 77 million for the Plessis underpass; 120 million for phase one of Chief Peguis; 69 million for Waverley arterial. All these projects are chipping away at trade corridors within the city. When the city was developed, we didn't have a freeway system. It wasn't developed with a freeway system, so now it's a retrofit. We have to go back. It's costly, but this is the goal of the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and the City, and I challenge anyone to say that this is not the big picture that we're working towards because this will enable us, in the next 20 to 30 years, to use this revenue stream of becoming a multimodal global transportation hub to work towards building a sustainable city. We see the $35 million in Transcona rail training centre that was put in. The Winnipeg airport is a 24 by seven airport which many airports aren't, but when the Winnipeg airport was redeveloped, it was developed to really enable cargo shipments. This is positioning us for the future so that we can pay for a sustainable city, so that we can pay for all these new rapid transit corridors that I know was one of the Mayor's priorities that we're working towards and mine, and to repair for our aging infrastructure. Madam Chair, this is a city that we are building for our children. We are building it and we need to keep chipping away and building it now, for the city that Mayor Bowman was speaking of at the dinner last week. So over the last seven years, if you look at the math I gave to all of you in your mail boxes there and sent you electronically, there's a lot of…this is from the Mayor's Advisory Trade Council report…there's a lot of dotted lines that have been filled in on this, and we can see that this is becoming closer and closer to reality. Centreport's actively pursuing new investment with companies. They're globally pursuing it. I encourage you all to come on April 7 to understand how the capital region is working with Centreport and the City of Winnipeg because we're part of the capital region, to become more regionalized and to become a global player and not be competing against each other, and the City of Edmonton has done this and they, when they do infrastructure projects they work with their capital region to help determine which infrastructure projects are going forward. Just last night I was speaking at the Heavy Equipment and Aggregate Truckers' Association AGM, which was a very interesting event. The Provincial Acting Deputy Minister from MIT also attended and spoke about Provincial priorities, and it was very affirming to hear him speak about the Provincial focus on continuing to develop these trade corridors and positioning us, and I hazard to say many Councillors are really not aware of the details of Centreport and the big picture. This is all a challenge, and this is a bit of a challenge we're seeing here, is that we know we haven't had that chance to really learn more about Centreport. Thank you, and I invite Council to come …

Madam Speaker: … moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Lukes: I'm going to invite Council to come on a tour of Centreport to understand the big picture, to learn the history and the transportation priorities and the millions we've put in to date. But today we've got four projects before us. Would this be the list of priorities that this Council would've put forward now, today? I hazard to say not. Would the Arlington Street Bridge have been on this list? Would there have been more active transportation on this list? Maybe. The point that I'm making is, of the projects we have in front of us today, only two support the big picture vision of supporting these trade corridors and new revenue streams; Kenaston and Chief Peguis. Kenaston is in the courts. Chief Peguis can be built and administration told us it could be built in stages. We need to send a message to the Province and the Federal Government that this Council continues to support the big picture. We need to prioritize and we need to continue chipping away. The current motion before us in the priorities that are listed do not support that big picture vision, in the priorities listed.

And let me say, CN understands the tremendous enabler transportation, functional transportation is to economic prosperity. They're new regulations support faster rail, car movement. They need to move goods faster across the country because it's very economical and this is why these regulations have come forth. I have a hard time understanding how cities all across Canada are going to be building underpasses and overpasses. I say how can we get a $3 million transportation management system to assist us in monitoring train arrivals to the City, and how can we get it to assist us encouraging drivers to go on the new multimillion dollars Kenaston roadway or the Pembina Highway roadway, and how can we leverage our brand new leg, our dog leg, of rapid transit to help shift our transportation culture. If I was being parochial, I'd be accepting this motion whole heartedly. I was elected to think big picture and to fundamentally change the way we think about transportation in this city and to challenge the status quo. And because of this, I'm unable to support this motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing the time, is it the will of Council to break? And adjourn to 1:30? There's a few…there's several speakers on my list right now.

Councillor Gerbasi: Madam Speaker, why don't we finish this particular debate, then take lunch and then come back.to the rest of the debate. Or is it going to be too long?

Madam Speaker: Okay. It will last at least…it will last at least an hour long. Need a suspension of the rules.

Councillor Gerbasi: Or we can just break.

Councillor Eadie: I move we call lunch.

Madam Speaker: Council will adjourn until 1:30. Thank you.

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

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to bring the meeting back to order. We are on the Executive Policy Committee report dated March 24th on Item No. 2.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I have a motion that we follow Councillor Wyatt's lead here, if we feel that it's warm to remove our jackets.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you very much. I'm just glad it's the top half of their clothes. I'm seeing green today. It's sadly not dollars flowing in to the City of Winnipeg as much as the green that we all enjoy from Bernice Pontanilla. We've just learned on Twitter that she will be leaving City Hall, leaving her work with Metro, and some of you may not know Bernice. You may just know her as "Metro B", and if you are on social media, you've had the pleasure to speak with her in person. You know that she does great work. She does very objective writing, reporting the news, not making it, and I want to wish her all the very best on behalf of City Council for your work and let you know you're always welcome back here at City Hall.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. She is very touched we can see. Councillor Orlikow, I believe you'd like to speak to Motion 5. Would you rise please?

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Orlikow,
Seconded by Councillor Morantz,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that "Building Canada Fund Applications" be amended to add the following recommendations:

2. That the City be authorized to enter into funding agreements with the Government of Canada and the Province of Manitoba that set out the terms and conditions of the federal and provincial funding contributions to approved Building Canada Fund projects;

3. That the Chief Financial Officer be authorized to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of such funding agreements in accordance with the foregoing, and such other terms and conditions deemed necessary by the City Solicitor / Director of Legal Services to protect the interests of the City;

4. That final approval of City funding be contingent upon Council approval;

5. That "Chief Peguis Trail - Main to McPhillips" be amended to "Chief Peguis Trail - Main to Route 90".

Councillor Orlikow: Yes. Just trying to find it. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to withdraw Motion No. 5 please.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Is that with the concurrence of your seconder?

Councillor Orlikow: …with concurrence of my seconder.

Madam Speaker: Okay, and I'll need the permission of Council to do so. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. That motion will be replaced with another. Mr. Mayor to introduce.

Motion No. 7
Moved by His Worship Mayor Bowman,
Seconded by Councillor Lukes,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that "Building Canada Fund Applications" be amended to add the following recommendations:

2. That the City be authorized to enter into funding agreements with the Government of Canada and the Province of Manitoba that set out the terms and conditions of the federal and provincial funding contributions to approved Building Canada Fund projects; and

3. That the Chief Financial Officer be authorized to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of such funding agreements in accordance with the foregoing, and such other terms and conditions deemed necessary by the City Solicitor / Director of Legal Services to protect the interests of the City.

4. That final approval of City funding for project(s) and overall scope be contingent upon Council approval.

5. That "Chief Peguis Trail - Main to McPhillips" be amended to "Chief Peguis Trail - Main to Route 90."

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to introduce Motion No. 7. The reason for this motion is to allow, among other things, Council to have as much say in how we proceed on a go forward basis. As I've mentioned before, the point in prioritization isn't to say yea or nay to any of the projects. These are all very worthy projects and I will be fighting to get the funds so that we can proceed with each and every one of these very important projects for the City of Winnipeg. That being said, the final approval of City funding for projects and the overall scope should be contingent upon Council approval. We should have a say as we proceed on a go-forward basis and we should have the flexibility to hopefully be able to fund each of these projects with the flexibility that is so required when dealing with other levels of government. And so I introduced the motion and I ask that members of Council see fit to approve it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Seconding this motion, I see the significance of submitting something, Madam Chair. I realize that we don't want to be in jeopardy of losing the funding. I like the modification to the motion here because it enables us increased scrutiny and the ability to modify the scope if need be, and that it comes back to Council and that we ultimately have a say in our future. It's great that the other levels of government can select what they're wanting but ultimately, by allowing a broader scope and having it come back to Council, it gives us that ability, so I'm pleased to collaborate on this and I still look forward to challenging the status quo when it does come back to Council and really working hard on looking at how we're doing our transportation planning in the City of Winnipeg from the standpoint of big picture to all our neighbourhood issues. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Any further speakers? On this Motion 7 and the item at large. Yes.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of Order. So that motion has now been introduced. Is it again like basically an amendment to the main clause so we're now debating the main clause and the amendment that has now been changed?

Madam Speaker: That is correct Councillor Gerbasi. Yes.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay. Thank you, and I believe I was on the list next.

Madam Speaker: You may…you have the floor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you very much everybody and I'm glad to see that there is support of the amendment. It's certainly good to have more oversight, more ability and more control over process that in a lot of ways we haven't had a lot of control over because we're talking about other levels of government. There's a lot of different agendas at play and I think…I just…the Mayor outlined very well in his opening comments basically the place that we are, the point in time we are in this discussion. We're in the middle of a process. The previous Council put forward four applications. You know, not everybody is happy about that. Maybe there's other things we would have liked to see, other things we would have liked to see happen, but that's where we are and we have been asked to do something that I think is reasonable to do. I think we have to impress upon the other levels of government that we're a mature level of government, that we behave responsibly, make our decisions based on the facts and the best interests of our city and that we can make a decision and we can come together and make a decision. So I think this collaboration today is extremely important in our intergovernmental relations that we've come together with strength. So I applaud the Mayor and all the Members of Council, you know, who found a way through this, because it hasn't been easy. I also want to comment on the process in terms of, I was here before when we did things the way we did them before, and there was no Council seminar, there was no discussion of the cost benefit analysis. There was simply a list that came forward and was voted on without really the tools or the information to make those decisions. It was very difficult and frustrating to be part of that. I remember one list that had 11 on it and then it came back with 10, and the one that was removed, by the way, was BRT off our Building Canada list. So you know, there's been a lot of incarnations of this process and it hasn't been…those things were not necessarily based. You just didn't know what they were based on and that's a problem. So when we had the first Council seminar, I think Councillor Lukes and I both pushed and said, "Let's have cost benefit analysis." And there was pressure, there was pressure from certain elected officials at other levels saying, "Hurry up and make a decision", and the Mayor said, "Listen to us" and Council agreed, and we said, "Let's get the administration to put together some information for us," and they did. And, so, I walked into that meeting, you know, in my usual, I don't want the Waverley underpass. I don't want…you know, I had my ideas of what I thought we should do when I walked in there. But since I asked for the information, I felt it was incumbent on me to listen to the information that I got when it was put forward. And the analysis from the Public Service, beyond the cost benefit analysis, there were some issues. The federal government has changed the rules about railway crossings. There's regulations. We as a city actually have to follow the law. We can't just sort of say, "No, we're going to ignore that." It's kind of like waste water. You know, we get new regulations and believe me, I hear a lot in my role as FCM about how municipalities are squeezed by new regulations without the ability to pay for them and that's very true. But, that doesn't make the regulations go away. It only further harkens to the need to get that understanding and get more support on a bigger share of the pie from municipalities to deal with these challenges, but this is another one. And we were told that Waverley is the worst one when you look at the 40 trains and all that. It's a little more compelling, 40 trains a day, it's a little more compelling when you look at it in terms of safety and so on. To me, the argument was always oh, people have to wait five minutes for a train, darn it. Like that wasn't enough for me to support a project. But, if it's about safety, if it's about following the law, I think we have to consider that. And, we did have…I was also going to make a couple of comments…oh yeah, on the cost benefit analysis I was going to say, the information we were given which is posted on the web site, again, a new level of transparency I don't recall, if you look at the four projects, with the cost benefit analysis, the lowest number is the best number because that's what we want. That's the most benefit, okay? Waverley underpass 11, Kenaston 32, Marion 53, Chief Peguis 496. So, I come from a science nursing background. I think I have to pay attention to some of that. Now, some of it…I do understand the bigger and we have talked about some people raising good points about the vision of Centreport and the economics and the trucking industry and all those things and yes, those things are important. But, you can't argue that those things are about the environment. You can argue they're about the economy. I think the environment and the economy are connected, too. But, you can't say that, you know, green field, more green field development is an environmental benefit. And especially when we don't yet have the costs of growth covering the costs of growth. So, you know, I think there are some issues there, some discussion here that…that needs to be considered if we're going to talk about the big picture, we need to talk about it, and I also think we need to talk about who is responsible for it. You know, we heard a list of how much the Province has spent and yeah, they spent a lot. It's a huge priority for them and the capital region is a huge priority for them. Why? Because they have to pay for it. We…our taxpayers pay for the City of Winnipeg. So yes, we benefit if the economy is improved, but ultimately it's the provincial responsibility. And we will end up supporting that. We will build those roads that they want us to do like we have, Waverley and all these…Plessis and all these things. But what this whole exercise is about today is priorizing. It's not saying, "No, we're not going to build that." It's not either or. It's saying which order should we build them. And what we need to build them in is the order that's the most pressing for our responsibility. And the most pressing thing is public safety. The most pressing thing is to be following the laws of the City. And those other things will come in time with the new revenues we should be getting from those other levels of government to pay for it. And I also

think it was a very compelling in the information from the administration, when they said about the reason why the cost benefit was so low for the Chief Peguis Trail is not that it's never needed or that it shouldn't be built, but that it isn't needed yet. They said that very, very clearly, it isn't needed yet. There is enough capacity for the cars and the trucks. So yes, at some point, we will need it and I'm not saying there might not be, you know, it would be nice if we could have everything now, that we're going to want, and there might be some benefit if it was here now because I can hear Councillor Eadie grumbling. But I'm just saying you have to priorize. And that's we've been asked to do and so it seems to me, the other thing that I found convincing about Waverley is that this is existing, an existing infrastructure problem. And we have to deal with those. We are responsible for those. We've already built the cities that we have now and I also appreciate some of the concerns we had…I've heard from other Councillors in discussing this in the hallways, you know, about there is other things we would like to spend our money on these four things. And believe me, I'm there. If we could just step out of this and change all these priorities around, I'd be there. I can think of a lot of good projects that aren't even on the table. The Osborne Underpass is a crucial active transportation connection, and an issue with people going to work every day. And it's not even on the table here. The Arlington Bridge…actually having enough money to do the real active transportation dream we have for a commuter winter city with separated lanes throughout the city for full commuting. All those things I think I would rather see on this lit. But we are where we are today and we've just been asked to do a simple task to put them in order and the ones in front of us, I'm going to go with the administrative advice on the Kenaston thing is unfortunate that can't be resolved and that makes sense to make that change, but so with that, I appreciate the collaborative atmosphere. I appreciate that we found a way to move forward. We need to show the other levels of government that we are mature, we are ready to get things done. We're ready to work with them. We're ready to make change and they can trust us, they can trust us to work with them and build the city the way we want to build it. And we have to show them that confidence by not bickering with each other and working together like we saw a lot of in the last ten years and I don't think any of us want to give that impression. It doesn't get any of us closer to our goals and the way we're doing things now, I think we will get closer to our dreams for the city. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Schreyer and Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I guess I'll just start off making a quick comment on the new amending motion. For me, I think it's important that we do talk about scope, not just the budget, because actually, the only project on this list that actually we could proceed with a budget on is the one with the, with the level three estimate, right, class three? We don't vote on budgets when…so as long as people understand, too, when we're discussing and debating this stuff, as the Mayor said, it's simply a priority list that the other levels of government have asked us to engage in a dialogue which, you know, frankly, I think the dialogue does have to go beyond the cost benefit ratio. And I must say, Madam Speaker, this is actually the first opportunity I really have had to see our, and I believe really, the cost benefit stuff comes out of our new asset management software and so on, and we have all these different criterias and so it's interesting for me to see what's happening in here, Madam Speaker. But, I think the scope is a good thing because I want to bring out some issues here because and, you know, frankly, you know, you have to decide, are you going to a seminar and ask questions or are you going to go for Police Board training because you're on the Police Board and so on? So, but, as Councillor Lukes mentioned, the original list wasn't necessarily considered from that broader economic development picture, and Madam Speaker, how Winnipeg ultimately is responsible for economic development within Winnipeg and to work with their capital region partners as in it's called Economic Winnipeg. We fund it. We provide the funding towards Yes Winnipeg as well. So economic development is ultimately very important part of what we have to deal with because, frankly, we are in competition with Calgary. If you go to the NASCO conferences, they have one in Calgary. Calgary wants to be the intermodal connection to Canada. We want to be that. Somebody's got to move faster and I know they're spending a heck of a pile of money, Madam Speaker, in Calgary, to reach that intermodal connection. So while we are all Canadian cities, we do compete. So that's the economic perspective, but you know, really for me, what I'm finding in here is kind of interesting is that Kenaston has gone down and yeah, it…we don't know the timing, timing is an issue because we don't know when the whole Kapyong Barracks thing is going to be settled. Hopefully, it's in with a year or two. I don't think it's going to go beyond ten years. The Building Canada program that we're talking about and it's Building Canada, I don't know why they…you know, like. It should be called repairing Canada. We need to repair Waverly. We need to repair our modified and existing stuff and that's…when I want to say cost benefit. You know, the thing about Chief Peguis Trail is that there are no motor vehicles riding on it not because it doesn't exist, but I bet you and I could be corrected, I'm not totally made base in my decision on this, but I can tell you that I know for a fact that there's traffic issues happening in my ward, the Mynarski Ward and frankly, Madam Speaker, in yours as well, as we share a main street out towards Chief Peguis Trail and Main Street where we have…we do have real traffic problems, sorry to say. And at 70 miles an hour I know that there is another person who works for the city here, takes his life in jeopardy every time he takes the bus home, trying to get across Main Street. So, there are issues and there is traffic issues on Leila, Salter, McGregor, we have all kinds of issues. So I just want to…I don't know that that was factored in because really, you have a road that doesn't exist. So that I don't see how that, how we…if we factored in the broader thing in terms of the factoring in, Waverley, Waverley West, you know, how much money did we already invest in roads for Waverley West and now I hear that the Waverley underpass is needed, we've got to supply because

of the huge traffic that's going to come from, again, Waverley West. Well, they told us that it was going to pay for itself. We're not getting that money to pay for it. I think Councillor Gerbasi is right in that, but so timing. Now, we have the Pembina underpass coming here. I don't know that we factored in this list with what our project is on Phase 2. Because we're talking about a detour with Waverley and these are all timing issues and scope. So these are my concerns because the detour at Waverley, we were told that those 40 trains, it's inevitable we're going to have a bad accident, really. It's a high level. That gave it a big weight. I'm sorry I didn't get to ask the question, but is the detour going to come at grade and are we still going to see an accident with a train while the construction continues? I think that we really need to consider that we have to close down that intersection, build what you have to. Is it going to be timed with when the widening of the Pembina Highway happens? These are all timing issues that I would like cleared up and it won't be today, but rest assured, I think that when you start talking about scope and we will have to talk about timing. They told us to give a list. I don't really appreciate the pushing to decide things because there's a number of issues, but anyway, I'm just making these timing points. Kenaston, we moved it to the bottom because of a timing issue. Like what is the timing issue with all of this stuff? And, also, to mitigate, why do we have to do a detour? I think the estimate is 40 to 50 million for a detour depending on whether we go on the west or the east side of Waverley. Why don't we provide some extra buses and better bus service through there so that those people will ride a bus? Let's get them riding buses because those suburbs if they are costing us this kind of money now, and they're not even built out, there's still two-thirds to go in Waverley West, like so, these are the issues that we need to consider when we're doing stuff, the bigger, broader economic issues with Councillor Lukes, thank goodness, brought a very, very a good speech and good explanation about what we're dealing with. So those are the issues that I had with the list. Very concerning, and I think we need to look at our asset, have our administration look at our asset management system and figure out how we deal with this. Again, Marion Archibald rate is high because we already have existing roads. There's already an existing commercial industrial area there. There is all kinds of traffic issues right in the immediate area. So I don't know how we measure all this stuff, I'll be inquiring more, but so I'll leave it at this. It's a priority list. But I don't…I think I heard a quote from Councillor Wyatt or the Mayor, actually, and from the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, bold, bold. It would've been nice to say, you know what, these three projects we need, Building Canada is there, we want a decent share. The estimates, you know I heard there was an estimate, it could be as high as $250 million that we could get from Building Canada over ten years. And Madam Speaker, it's all a timing issue. So I will vote along with my fellow Councillors. It sounds like we're just going to move this ahead. There is scope, final budgets, those decisions will be made. I want to have those dialogues though about the detour, the timing and all those kind of issues that I think factor in quite highly. And I'm not even sure if timing does factor into cost benefit. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next is Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, I'm pleased we've come to this point as we evolved as we do things rather quickly these days, within hours, coming to a greater agreement through Council doing its job working together and that we can present our priorities to the other levels of government, as the Mayor himself has said, just a few hours ago. And I quote, that this should not preclude us from trying to get all of them, as he said. Now, I agree with Councillor Lukes that, you know, this Council is responsible for the big picture. That's our job. And that there was scope for that within the discussions in the last couple of days and the last…in the last few hours as well. Now, I will frame my serious question for the sake of Bernice Pontanilla as she leaves this which I hope she finds it unquotable and that is that…I must say that my good Councillor to my right provides excellent information and insights to our Council, which actually explains and justifies his name. Thus, Wyatt Waverley but not a Plessis is the allocation for a detour which is the question. Have you? Oh, so I'm the first? I happen to sit…I have a good fortune to sit as well beside my good Councillor to my left, physically only, Councillor Pagtakhan whose name when incorporated into complete sentence structures will express wonders and profound comment on the state of our city and I assure you, Madam Speaker, that I will offer these in Council sessions to come, but I digress and I must detour and get back on track less by Waver Ley being behind my main point, Madam Speaker, but I believe we do need explanation as to the viability of a detour for the Waverley underpass construction when one of the factors raising the priority of Waverley, being safety. So I stress that we need…I would like some comment from the administration, from the planners so that safety remains an issue during the construction of the Waverley underpass. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll try to be brief. I agree with the prioritization. I think it was appropriate to prioritize things. That was the request of the Province and the Feds so I think that's appropriate that we did that. I agree with the order. It is based not on politics, but on what we got back in terms of a report from the administration and reflects the reality that the Kenaston is locked up in the courts and may be for some time to come. Pleased to see other Councillors have been able to work out their concerns and we can have a…move forward together. I'd also just like to say…as it was raised earlier, just a moment about the BRT and that is, the Mayor, to his credit ran on a flat form that would commit to extending all of the five BRT lines by the year 2031 which is only 15 year or 16 years away and one of those will be coming down to the southeast and there are some exciting opportunities at Marion and

Archibald to make that work with the future southeast line. The Vandal line is we used to call it jokingly at Riel Community Committee and maybe we will again someday, who knows. But that line can work with the Marion…Marion Archibald intersection that was quite a good presentation by Dave Wardrop on that yesterday so I can say a few words in French, Madam Speaker, don't reach for the translation because it's gone but it's my French so people don't probably understand it anyway.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, he did point that out, yeah.

Councillor Mayes: I'm about to say something nice, you Councillor Allard, you can stop me if you want.

Translation of French Spoken: I would like to thank Councillor Allard for his efforts on the Marion-Archibald project. It's very important for St. Boniface Ward as well as for traffic in St. Vital and in St. Boniface. Also, it creates possibilities for urban rapid transit. The City can do work on Marion and Archibald and perhaps start work on the Southeast Rapid Transit Corridor, so it's a great opportunity to do both at once.

Councillor Mayes: So saying it's an opportunity trying to do the work same time and thank you to Councillor Allard who's been a champion for the Marion and Archibald project, worthy successor to Councillor Vandal in that regard. So I'm glad to see we have that at number two that's going to benefit my ward as well as Councillor Allard's if that does go through. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Next is Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Just…just, you know, rereading the Transportation Master Plan which was brought to us here, we really…this is where the rubber hits the road in so many ways, Madam Speaker, with regards to the allocation of limited resources to our actual plans. And the Transportation Master Plan, back in 2011, indicated at that time that by 2031, there will be a hundred thousand new households estimated in the City of Winnipeg. This is using Conference Board of Canada statistics which so far have been…have been proven accurate. And with those households, there will be over 120,000 additional cars. This will increase then 50…an increase of 50 percent in vehicle kilometers travelled in the morning peak hours in the city alone. And they go on to say that there will be some serious issues with regards to congestion throughout the city. The choke points, in terms of travel time and the demand on the system will be particularly acute at river and railway crossing corridors. And yet they've also indicated that there are some unique opportunities to address this. The plan goes on to outline some very interesting and I think informative facts that sometimes we forget, and that is, their conclusions with regards to the assessment of land use development as it should occur in the future in the City, a mix of suburban and density is what they foresaw as necessary, and as well as transportation scenarios, Madam Speaker, that would state the following: they basically say, in order to support rapid transit, density in the mixed use corridors, mixed use centres and major redevelopment sites which were identified in Our Winnipeg, will need to be increased. This can be achieved through the application of policies and tools under Our Winnipeg and Complete Communities. We moved on some of these already. The land use scenario involving significantly higher congestion, concentration of land use, would further support rapid transit and other sustainable transportation objectives. The completion of the strategic road network is required to maintain the integrity of Winnipeg's transportation system for goods, movement of goods, and does not undermine the goals of sustainable transportation. Extremely significant in terms of this document. This was a document that we commissioned that was written by professionals and experts who studied this at length and basically said what they are saying here is we have to do both. We have to do both. We have to do what we're doing here today and then, we have to continue to build the rapid transit system that we have started to build. And we have to continue it into the other quadrants. Councillor Mayes rightly pointed out the different areas of the city and it's referred to in the plan with regards to the other quadrants, the west: Portage and Main to Century, the east: Graham Mall to Lagimodiere, the north: Graham Mall to Burrows, the southeast: which Councillor Mayes refers to, Nairn to Bishop Grandin, the northeast: Nairn to the Perimeter. These are…and as a matter of fact the transportation master plan actually added a corridor that the original Our Winnipeg did not include, which was the northern corridor. That was not part of the original Our Winnipeg vision. These folks came in and said this should be part of it based on what they have learned and studied in terms of traffic demands and the growth happening in Winnipeg. So, I am excited to be able to support the motion today because what we are doing is we are doing exactly what they envisioned. With the limited resources we have. Ideally, yes, we would be doing these, plus a rapid transit corridor or two. We would be doing all of these with that. But unfortunately, we have the resources that are available to us today. Let us do what we can to maximize those resources. Which is what your amendment today does, Councillors. It allows you to have oversight with regards to those projects in terms of scope and cost, so that we can ensure that we maximize each and every one of those projects. Because right now, at the rate we are going, it is quite concerning with regards to seeing, with the numbers that were spelt out to us only less than four years ago in this document, have surged in terms of the estimates be being provided by our public service. And I don't know if that is being driven by real cost numbers or if that is being driven by a concern in terms of public scrutiny, and all the things that have happened in the last couple of years, few years with regard to cost overruns and issues on a few high profile projects. The reality is;

believe it or not, the vast majority of the city projects actually do come in on time and in on budget. You just don't read about them and you don't hear about them. But they do. There is the few, unfortunately that don't. And those unfortunately, ironically, are now driving potentially other great projects up, potentially artificially, just to be safe, rather than sorry. And, it could become a self-fulfilling prophecy. We go to tender on projects for these types of values and next thing you know, those are the values coming back in terms of the bits and that is a real concern, Councillors and we have to, I think, have extreme…we have to ensure we have oversight with regards to this, and the implementation to ensure we are getting value for money with regards to these projects, and to ensure that the type of cost…well the costs leading to jumps of 257 percent for one project since 2011, do not actually occur. Now, some of them have occurred because of scope changes, I understand that so you can't take that number and say that's because of you know what, we're being safe rather than sorry. You know what, at the end of the day though even with scope changes that's a huge change. So let us go forward with that in mind, and know that the Federal Government will take these and the Provincial Government will take these and they will select the projects with us, and hopefully as many as possible. But unfortunately, it will be…and the challenge we have is we are the ones to deliver them and if we deliver the projects on time, on budget, great. But if we are over budget, as we all know, those costs will be borne by us. A hundred percent borne by us. Plus, there is the other issue that we as a Council in the last term, moved a motion, sent forward to FCM calling on the Federal Government to amend Building Canada, as Councillor Gerbasi is aware, to amend Building Canada, to ensure that it truly does become a true tripartite program, a third, a third, a third, because right now it is not. Right now, automatically on any project, coming through Building Canada, deducted right off the top, land assembly cost not part of the program. Engineering cost not part of the program. Other related engineering costs, not part of the program: so when the Federal Government and the Provincial Government say we will be happy to cover up to this dollar, based on our criteria, what that is code for is that they are not there for the true one third. And that is frustrating considering you can't build a project without land assembly. You can't build a project without engineering. You can't build a project without having that kind of due diligence done and so, therefore, you don't have a project. We need to get that amended. We need Building Canada and the Federal Government to realize that's unfair, and that's unfair, a third, a third. A third. No matter how challenging these issues are as I have identified in the transportation master plan and with regards to the funding available, no matter how acute they are and how difficult they are, there is no doubt in my mind that that job of solving that problem, addressing that challenge, is made so much easier and so much simpler by having the kind of communication, co-operation and listening that has taken place in the last week. I credit the Mayor for that and members of EPC who have done that and I thank them for that because that is a breath of fresh air which, no doubt, is made possible through their leadership. So thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Schreyer: Point of information.

Madam Speaker: Yes, Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: It is not necessarily one third, one third, one third because if it ends up being the term imposed public private partnership it would be one quarter from the Federal Government.

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

Councillor Orlikow: I just want to actually echo Councillor Wyatt in the fact that its…finding a consensus and working together is in the easy. I think as many people here who have not slept for a while. But it's important. I think the Mayor put it well in his State of the City speech. Change isn't easy. There will be those times when people will try to pull you back into the quagmire. But we know working together, we are not, nor should we always agree, we should have healthy debate, but again we are Council and I appreciate the Mayor and all my colleagues who are reflecting the fact that we are Council, we represent equally, which hasn't been the case before. Equally represent decision making here. We represent our wards and our City of Winnipeg. So again, in the previous times I can tell you I felt that I wasn't equal, I was less than equal. Reports were never given; projects were chosen and I had no idea why. If I asked questions, no reply. So again, this, to me, even though it has been difficult, there have been these…I call it the scarring from before but we have to work through that with each other to make sure that not just because I say trust me but I show you and we all show each other. And that trust, I believe sometimes you'll get burnt but you keep trying and eventually we'll get to the point where we can have one solid voice which will make Winnipeg that much stronger. I hear what everybody is saying. I am happy with the motion this morning was re-amended which I think is a great idea. First of all we have the financing part and the scope back. The Federal Government or the Provincial Government, whoever it was made us priorize these projects. Okay. You are throwing it at us. I like that. That gives us as control. We won't let them decide and they may. They may pick a project not on our list and they may pick Chief Peguis Trail, that's their choice. But they asked us to priorize and again is our ability to have some more control. The financing part that is never been done before. We have always delegated that off to the CAO and CFO: it will be okay. Well, maybe not. This is a time…and again, please, if you note the amendment it doesn't say "back to EPC", it says "back to Council". In the old days…now the scope changes that Councillor Wyatt talked to. The scope changes or we can do scope changes to actually decrease the cost of programs to do all three or four, that would be tough but that is…again, we are doing. And I will just

quickly go over why Waverley was priorized to make sure it's clear and again, I hope to discuss it with people I don't have all the answers but I may be more involved with the decision going on and researching it more. We do not have a choice about doing the Waverley underpass. We can ask for the one-third of our portion or pay the whole. Because the railway standards are at grade. They happen in November 2014. They went from a voluntary to a compulsory. They are not asking, they are telling us, and as they told us, that that railway intersection is four times the threshold right now with only one third of Waverley West built out. Another 25,000 homes will be built out there using that drive in. So, the idea of closing it down will completely crush both Pembina even with the expansion and Kenaston. They told us that quite clearly. Quite clearly that will crush both Pembina and BRT won't be able to pick up at all. And hopefully BRT will be successful and be full of buses but that still won't alleviate the problem. We are four times the threshold at this point. So we have to do it. And now the Federal Government has the opportunity to put their money where their regulations are and help us do it and there will be costs coming back from the rail line. So again, I think this is a good process. I was…and I can tell you right now and we have had some comments about why was Waverley moved up so far because it's like the nitrogen. We don't have a choice. It's being regulated to us. If we don't do it, two things will happen: fines will be levied, like environmental fines, millions of dollars or because it's Federal land, that rail line crosses, they will shut down the rail line or the crossing. That will happen so the idea of moving to Sterling Lyon, terrible. It's just going to crush us. It will crush the Pembina/Jubilee intersection. So this project has to go forward. So again, I want to explain why that is so but again I will be more than happy and now we have more time to discuss it more and I only found out about this when the report came forward. I didn't know there were rail line regulations in place. I was shocked when Waverley was number one. I went into this process open minded to do it for everybody. I was scared I would be number four because of the issues we heard today. The rail line regulation came up. Unaware, that moved it up. It's a regulation so you may not like it, you may want to put it into other projects and say it should be all trade driven or this driven, but we don't have a choice and similar to the Arlington Bridge. We don't have a choice. It's running out of its life cycle and Marion is a lovely project as well. But I actually…I actually have…and Chief Peguis. I have heard some people talk about the Chief Peguis and Centreport. Please go out to Centreport. It really is as Councillor Lukes is saying…is going to be, I am still very convinced even though it's taking forever to get off the ground I suggest logistics is a big hub for our future of Winnipeg. We have that advantage right now, Regina is taking us out a bit. We need to come back and start solidifying that the water will be helpful to Centreport. The sewer lines are now set up. We invested a lot of money in Centreport and I wish it see Centreport get more activity on their site and I believe that's coming. I believe that is coming. So that said the Marion, we know it's a horrible intersection. We know they are facing rail line problems. Chief Peguis Trail we talked about and Kenaston. I don't want to leave Kenaston out. Kenaston isn't serious problem for my neighbourhood. All that truck traffic is causing an enormous amount of pain. Can you imagine living on Kenaston right now for the last what, five or six years, knowing you can't sell your house? Because it's going to be expropriated. You want to move but you can't sell it and because of the wisdom of this Council we have a fund set up to buy houses now and rent them out. That again is showing compassion for Winnipeggers but we are focusing on those three projects but I will continue to work on getting Kenaston moving along. The bridge is in trouble and we need to do that trouble. How will we afford all this? Who knows. At this point we don't even know the scopes so I'm happy about this motion. I am very happy to say today this was a nice present that…not the Waverley underpass but I will be working with you all for three-and-a-half more years. And it's a privilege to work together today and let this all come together. So I thank you all and I look forward to many more positive interactions in the future.

Madam Speaker: Next is Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Wasn't it Councillor Gillingham next?

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: I'll keep my comments short today but I just want to rise in support of motion seven and thank you actual the Councillors who worked hard to come up with motion seven. It gives us a little more capacity, and includes some important wording so thank you to everybody. All four projects before us are very important. I also wanted to advise and express my appreciation through you, Madam Speaker, to Councillor Lukes, for articulating so well…really a case for…I feel a compelling case for focusing on the projects. And to me…I don't have reports to back it up but projects that really are going to promote our economy. We know we have come through a budget process and it was said over and over again that we have a revenue challenge and to me, if we can focus our projects that will perhaps pay the best economic dividends I think we are well served to do that. And from the way I see it, Chief Peguis and more specifically, completing the inner ring road is critical to that. When I got elected one of the first meetings I had with the department head for public works, one of my first questions in the room with him was tell me about the inner ring road and when will that be completed and maybe it's because of my background where I spent some time with some of the trucking industry people and some of the jobs that I had, I just think the inner ring road and anything along that is critical to a strong economy and our future. That being said, as Councillor Eadie mentioned as well. He and I were unavailable yesterday. We were sorry to be unavailable for the Council seminar but I do appreciate the documents, the powerpoint was made available to us. And when I was looking at the benefit criteria that was presented, I noticed when it comes to

growth, the area of growth and the category of growth promoting the economy, is weighed at 12 percent. And when I saw that, and then came across -- it was passed to me through Councillor Lukes. She passed to me the 2011 financial management plan I believe it's called, adopted by Council in March 2011 and the number one goal was promote economic growth. Let me read the one statement... is key to the future economic prosperity for Winnipeg and its citizens" and I agree and I see that and when I read that, to me we need the discussion…I appreciate we will have more discussion and debate on these projects but for me, it will always be trying to see… make our decision through the filter of what will help our economy and what promotes growth in the city and start to begin to address our revenue challenges as Councillor Morantz has pointed out repeatedly. So I look forward to having good discussions on the bigger picture and against my better judgment I will risk a Wayne Gretsky quote. When asked about success he said "I skate to where the puck is going to be not where it's been". And not to be too corny, but I dare say, the puck is probably somewhere…or going to be somewhere out on the ring road at some point in the future and we have to do our due diligence to position ourselves accordingly.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all I would like to thank Councillor Lukes for her conviction on doing what she thinks is right in terms of the prioritization of these projects. It's not easy to get up in front of this Council Chamber and say the project that most directly helps her residents was not necessarily the number one priority, in her mind, for our city as a whole. I like to thank her for thinking about the big picture, about our city as a whole community. I have been very consistent in this chamber over time and in the media, going back to my election back in 2006, saying that one of the most important projects in my mind is finally complete being the widening of Kenaston. That doesn't directly help my constituents in many cases but the reality is, that street is a bottle neck. We have south Winnipeg growing in leaps and bounds with Waverley West being the size of Brandon in no time. And yet, that road is 50 km/h with houses right on it and it's a big trade corridor, a big north south trade corridor going from the north end of the city, right through to the south now. Those older areas between the river and Taylor desperately need to be widened and I think we need to challenge ourselves here at City Hall. We need to challenge our friends over at the Legislature and in Ottawa, as well as our partners in the first nations community to find a way to get this done. Everyone recognizes this needs to be done. Whether it's Canada Lands Corporation selling for highest and best use or whether it's a partnership with an urban reserve. That land is going to be needed. That land will require a widening. That has to happen. So, I would encourage anybody here who has any thoughts on how we can get that to proceed, to remember that. Chief Peguis Trail is a significant piece of infrastructure for the future and success of our city. Our city was founded on transportation. Sure it was the rivers back in the day, the confluence of the Red and the Assiniboine rivers but we have continued beyond that. When the railway tracks across this country showed up, the politicians of the day fought to make sure we had the CN and CP main lines coming through our City and we benefited from that over the years in terms of trade with both lines coming through our City and when it comes to road infrastructure, we have trucking companies galore that are driving. You drive down any interstate anywhere in the United States and you see names you recognize from the Manitoba trucking companies. We punch above our weight when it comes to the trucking industry. Yet one of the big bottle necks, unfortunately is some of the roads here in the City of Winnipeg. I think the Chief Peguis Trail is a great opportunity to help alleviate that and ensure that we continue to be a successful leader Centreport Canada is a huge opportunity but still needs significant investment and further development. Regina has the global transportation hub and they have been successful securing major businesses into their new facilities there. Things we may have bid on in some cases and not been successful with. So we need to be cognizant of that going forward. We need to embrace both sides. We need to embrace, you know, …we need to embrace being a service hub for our agricultural industries we have here in Manitoba outside of the perimeter highway as well as great things like outside our doors here at Innovation Alley and all of our exciting, new tech. companies that are streaming up here and the guy who is the chief executive officer also cleans the toilets. It's exciting to see some of the neat stuff coming from these new startups here. Waverley is a problem. We all know thirty to forty trains a day, 30,000 vehicles a day right now, it's definitely an issue. But that also brings us back to the bigger question of having the two main railways coming through the heart of the city. Is that always going to be the case? We should have a bigger conversation about what role railways will have in the city going forward. I hear rumours that CP Weston yards are no longer the right size to commandeer a proper length train any more. Maybe there's an opportunity to invest better to work with the Federal partners and work with the railways to move one or two or part of the railways into Centreport Canada or away from the core of the city. We need to be thinking "big picture" on some of these issues in my mind. Marion is a great opportunity, too. Go take a look at parts of St. Boniface today. Five minutes from Portage and Main is the commercial hub of our city. We have a grain elevator and a mushroom farm in St. Boniface, literally a five minute drive away from Portage and Main, our commercial hub. And that's not about City Hall being like mushrooms. Councillor Wyatt likes that joke. I'm not going there. We have the opportunity to redevelop parts of St. Boniface to be not necessarily industrially anymore, but part of a brownfield redeveloped community. And there are parts of St. Boniface that I think are exciting opportunities and doing Marion/Archibald, and reconfiguring some of that into newer parts of St. Boniface and in Transcona, I think are very exciting. So I'll support the prioritization here before us today. I think there may be an opportunity to do more than one of these projects. I think it's important that we continue to strive to go after the other levels of government to get more money for these projects. When you look at it,

you have to remember the Provincial Government is promising that they're going to spend every penny of new PST money on roads and infrastructure. The PST from the City of Winnipeg, based on our population is almost $150 million a year. That will build these projects all quite quickly. They have a lot of new revenue and if they are going to keep up their commitment and be fair to the City of Winnipeg they have to contribute more to projects like these and our existing infrastructure that needs to be renewed. So again I'll support the motion before us here today and I thank everybody for this good debate and these comments.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Morantz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am really proud to rise and say I will be wholeheartedly supporting this motion. I want to say, I grew up in south River Heights, my house backed on to Taylor, equidistant from the Waverley underpass and the Kenaston underpass so I spent hours and hours, possibly hundreds of hours of my life waiting for trains and I could not be convinced to support anything other than Waverley that's just sort of where I'm at, but having said that, though it is…it's not in my ward, it's near my ward so it's somewhat ward eccentric, but there are other reasons to support it. Firstly when it comes to rail safety, as Councillor Gerbasi said, also I want to point out that given the number of trains, it creates a problem, for example, for fire trucks and ambulances as well and police to cross there and that's a safety issue as well. In terms of economic development since I arrived here at City Hall, the word infill is almost the second word out of everyone's mouth and I think that this is a great example of an infill capital project. And I think about the ring road, but really cities need to grow from the inside out. We need to build our city to make it stronger from an economic perspective and I think about all those years when there was no underpass at Kenaston, madam Speaker, and now there is and I look at the development that's taken place south along Route 90 since that underpass went in and it was facilitated because of that capital investment. Building an underpass at Waverley will have a similar effect and will help us strengthen our tax base; strengthen our City from the inside out. There will come a time when we will finish that ring road but I think we have to get all of the pieces of the puzzle in place first in terms of building the city from the inside out. Now as the Finance Chair I am always mindful of the operating budget and that amazes me that we haven't mentioned it here yet but that's my job, and so when we borrow money, borrowing the money isn't the hard part. The city has a very good credit rating and the Federal Government will put up money and we will borrow some of our money or most of it for these projects but every hundred million dollars affects the operating budget by six or $7 million when you take into account the interest and the sinking fund contribution. So it's important to remember that when we're adding 200 or $300 million in debt that there is a serious impact on our operating budget that we have to be mindful of and have to be planning for it. I guess the only other thing I would say is I would be remiss if I didn't get a plug in for the William R. Clement Parkway. That is certainly a major project in my ward and although it didn't make the top four this time, I will be certainly advocating for that in the future but having said all that Madam Speaker, I just wanted to make those few points and will be supporting this motion today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you. So I know some of you thought Councillor Orlikow and I might be duking it out today before Council, but I would like to acknowledge that today is his birthday and he hates it when people know that. And what a present it would be, Councillor Orlikow if we could have Waverley and Marion funded for your birthday. So, I wanted to talk mostly about Marion but also about the process and I'd like to commend Mayor Bowman and his EPC for this very transparent process that we've had. I've heard anecdotes of former chiefs of staff who would basically…the appointed member of the government at three different levels would meet in a room and nobody would really know what was going on and low and behold, they would come out together holding hands and they'd have some kind of joint announcement. Well, at least, in terms of the City of Winnipeg priorities, we have a ranked list and so I'm sure that ranked list will be advocated for and with Mayor Bowman and his staff. I also wanted to say that Waverley and Marion is about the big picture. We have heard from administration about these new rail regulations that are coming down. So the way I look at it is pay now or pay later and we know if we pay now, and especially in the context of a new Building Canada Fund Application where there is funding from other levels of government, it's a good deal for the city. So I think we are moving it in the right direction strategically on that front because we will have to pay and to have it funded by other levels of government is an ideal situation. So…as you all know, you all know my ward interest in St. Boniface. It's…I think fought hard for Marion and Archibald since the election and perhaps pretty visibly in the last couple of weeks, but I wanted to say that, you know, I read the transportation master plan and my questions to the administration in our seminar yesterday was okay well, appreciate this cost benefit analysis but can you explain why Waverley all of a sudden is number one, given the original transportation master plan which by the way cost over half a million dollars to do and had industry experts and stakeholder meetings, open houses, it was a robust process. I just want to put an emphasis on that in terms of our Council documents. And so, the administration explained that the reason in the ranking though every one of these projects is ranked close was because of this new rail safety regulation and something that we will have to be addressing. I'd also like to underline that Marion/Archibald is not only about St. Boniface. It's about Transcona. It's about Elmwood- East Kildonan. Traffic goes from downtown to those wards as well. Also the…with the new developments in south St. Boniface, a lot of those commuters go through Councillor Mayes' ward through on St.

Vital and St. Anne's Roads. Because that bottle neck is so bad people know to avoid it. I also understand the…appreciate the ranking of Kenaston and I think it's important to acknowledge its rightful place in the rankings and that if we made a decision to do Marion 2 not 3, as for the administrative reports or recommendation is that it's tied up before the courts and it simply wouldn't make sense to put it forward at this time. I'm going to talk now a bit about train safety and a little bit later on the train…the train safety motion for new development. But, train safety is becoming increasingly a safety issue in Winnipeg. We know that there are more and more trains running through our cities particularly carrying petro chemicals because the oil has to move and that's how it's moving. And so if there's safety issues and I heard the administration say it's a statistical certainty that there will be accidents at these train crossings. So not only is it a liability for the City, it's also the right thing to do for the safety of our citizens to address these crossings. I'd also like to remind everyone here of the possibly one of the biggest fires in Winnipeg since…I'm aware of but the Speedway International fire. That was right in the same area and a lot of the land around the Marion/Archibald intersection is zoned M3, heavy industrial. There are metal shredders in there or there will be; there's companies like Speedway International. So these are potentially dangerous industries and we need to have emergency services accessible to those places at all times. Now, on Marion specifically, this project has been in Plan Winnipeg since 2001. It's not something that someone dreamed up overnight. It would encourage infill development in St. Boniface. Already, with the number of cars that are going through that intersection and the numbers of new developments that are coming online, Sage Creek is still building out. We have accrued two new precincts in south St. Boniface, Precinct K and Precinct J. Precinct K is now dubbed Bonavista. And hopeful that in the near future or at some point in the near future we can develop the old Packers site which would be substantial new residential development as likely include substantial new residential redevelopment as part of that plan. And just on the transportation master plan, what's the point of having a transportation master plan if, whenever we make, we need make our funding decisions, that we sort of put it aside and start making arguments that are perhaps not directly related to the ranked priorities that we have there? I mean, in this case, I accept the change in priority based on the administrative recommendations. Just going through my notes. I want to make sure not to miss anything. You know, I'm…I think I had most of it up here. So I just like to thank Council. I know it's been…we have had a lot of discussion in the last few weeks and just wanted to thank you for coming together and putting forward these very important priorities for Winnipeg, and I do agree that we do need to move forward on all four and they are all important priorities but I do think that we do…I do think that we have master plans and cost benefit analysis from our administration for a reason. I think we should consider their expert judgment on these questions so thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further speakers? Councillor Dobson. (Inaudible) I did. Sorry.

Councillor Dobson: Well, first off, Motion No. 7 is definitely a positive step. I don't know. I just think that's a huge step, but for my speech, I feel like a kid in a candy store. All these worthwhile projects and all we have to do is prioritize them. My question is, where are we getting the money to pay for this? Did we not just two days ago have a very tough budget where we borrowed money and raided our reserve accounts; where we increased our frontage levy and took additional money out of water and sewer? I ask again, where is the money coming from? Will we have to increase taxes to pay for these projects? My proposed solution to this is rather than borrow and pay for decades on principle and interest, we instead approach the Provincial and Federal Governments and ask that they consider funding these projects on a 50/50 basis between them. As the City of Winnipeg is not in a position to participate financially at this time, the City of Winnipeg wants to participate, but needs the help of the Provincial and Federal Governments to do so. And further I would like to add that if…we won't actually know if they will do it unless we try. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker and through you, thanks to Council for…for I think the healthy discussion today. You know, process matters and I do appreciate the words from my Council colleagues, talking about the process that we followed and how it's really a change from the past. That's what Winnipeggers voted for. That's why we are all here. We're not always going to get it right, but we're going to keep working to do our best to bring in the types of changes that allow us to do our jobs more effectively but also, and more importantly help us get better results for Winnipeggers who have to drive on these streets. And you know, we as I mentioned in my opening remarks we had two Council seminars; over the last month we had many healthy and vigorous discussions and debates, both privately and publicly. What I am calling on Council to do today is to come together, to say with a decisive voice, we've got our act together; we can make decisions and we can speak very clearly to the other levels of government. Here are our priorities. We are ready. We are ready to work with you. On the issue of rail safety, like some of my Council colleagues, the discussion we had yesterday on rail safety was a bit of an eye opener. And rail safety is critical as has been noted, there is new Federal railway legislation, regulations. On January 21 of this year, there was a train derailment in downtown Winnipeg near the Forks, and thankfully didn't cause any injuries or significant damage. I have to tell you when you are serving as Mayor and you get a phone call telling you about a train derailment in downtown Winnipeg, it makes your heart pump a little bit faster, maybe even stop for a moment. And on March 12, in western Manitoba, just outside of Carberry, 13 railcars from a rail tanker derailed spilling 30,000 litres of bitumen. These are real issues and

there is a real risk. I'm pleased to see our Federal partners stepping up and trying to do their part and we have to do ours. Rail safety…it isn't just important for us to consider when we build residential or commercial residences but when we consider undertaking infrastructure improvements for roads intersect with train crossings and that's what we're doing here today. Take this opportunity to remind Winnipeggers to be very mindful and very safe around trains. A lot of our fellow citizens, you know, it's not just the two crossings we are talking about today. There is many of them in our city, and we want our citizens to be safe. Now, a lot of the discussion today centered around planning. We want to get away from the days of back of the napkin and we want to get to proper planning. We want to, and we need to in order to invest our dollars wisely. And I'm very pleased to hear the discussion about economic growth, very pleased to hear the discussion about where we're going in the future. As I have been saying for some time, we need to start thinking about our city through the lens of a million people, so we've got to start thinking about what do we need to build now for that future Winnipeg? And so Councillor Lukes' comments, Councillor Gillingham's and many others here are highlighting excellent points that we need to be looking forward and we are. That's exactly what Winnipeggers who are watching this afternoon are witnessing is a Council that is looking forward and is doing its job. The Build Winnipeg Partnership is something that is going to help us significantly move the ball forward beyond even what we are doing here today. As those of you who were at the…my State of the City remarks last week, heard Anita Stenning has kindly agreed to volunteer to lead the task force that are going to be…will provide the building blocks to actually getting the Build Winnipeg partnership up and running. And the point with the Build Winnipeg partnership is to bring parties together, provincial, federal and municipal, to get active transportation, roads and public transit better coordinated and to get many of the stakeholders working together. To using the plans that we have, consolidating where appropriate and developing a ten year plan that can help guide our deliberations and inform us about making smart, well-costed, thoughtful, forward looking plans on major infrastructure projects. That's exactly what we need. That's exactly what Winnipeggers need and I believe when I say Winnipeggers' best days have yet to come, I think you look at the discussion today, you look at how we are coming together and you look at the concrete steps that we're taking to even improve what we're doing here today to better inform us and to help us plan. It's going to be a very, very successful term and future for Winnipeg if we continue on this path. So thank you, Madam Speaker and I would urge all of Council to support the motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on Motion 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. I'll now call the question on the main item and I'd like to ask for a recorded vote. Voting on Item No. 2, Building Canada Fund. All 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

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

Madam Speaker: The vote is unanimous. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: We will now move on to Motion No. 4, moved by Mayor Bowman and Councillor Orlikow regarding FCM. It is an automatic referral to EPC. (Inaudible)

Motion No. 4
Moved by His Worship Mayor Bowman,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

WHEREAS Councillor Jenny Gerbasi has represented the City of Winnipeg, serving as a Board Member of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) since 2007;

AND WHEREAS Councillor Jenny Gerbasi advocates passionately for issues of concern to local governments, has served as the Chair of the Prairies and Territories Regional Caucus since 2011, is a member of the FCM Executive Committee as well as numerous other Standing Committees of FCM;

AND WHEREAS Councillor Jenny Gerbasi was elected to the position of 3rd Vice President for FCM for the 2014 – 2015 term;

AND WHEREAS Councillor Jenny Gerbasi has expressed strong interest in continuing to move forward as part of the executive of FCM;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Winnipeg City Council strongly supports Councillor Jenny Gerbasi with her intention to run for the following positions:

- *2nd Vice President of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities in 2015*
- *1st Vice President of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities in 2016*
- *President of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities in 2017*

Madam Speaker: To deal with the item now? All in favour of suspending the rules? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor to introduce.

Mayor Bowman: I'll just say very briefly one of the first discussions I had with Councillor Gerbasi was since being elected Mayor was in advance of being sworn in and she has and continues to speak with passion about her work with FCM. Not only does she represent Winnipeggers and this Council very well with her work with FCM, but I believe she also helps the work of FCM on a national level. I have had the pleasure of getting to know many of my counter parts from other cities including mayors of Toronto, Montreal, Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver and dare I say from rider nation, Regina and Saskatoon, and many of those mayors speak with affection about the work that Councillor Gerbasi does for FCM. And so it's with great pleasure that I move this motion forward. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Okay. I'll call the question Mr. Mayor. All in favour of Item 4? Contrary? Carried. We have Motion No. 6 before us by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Eadie.

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council amend its January 28, 2015, decision with respect to Item No. 1 of the January 26, 2015 report of the Executive Policy Committee (Minute No. 136), titled "Amendment to Council Decision – Approval of Funding Participation – Winnipeg Convention Centre Expansion Project" by deleting the following Clause in its entirety:

"3.ii. That CentreVenture and/or CCC Properties Inc. (CCC) undertake a public bid process with respect to future development of the Site;"

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, Madam Speaker, I rise to withdraw the motion.

Madam Speaker: With Council's permission, the motion will be withdrawn. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, we have Motion No. 8. Moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Browaty regarding the St. Vital Minor Hockey Association. This will be an automatic referral to EPC.

Motion No. 8
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

WHEREAS St Vital Minor Hockey has purchased a Zamboni and seeking reimbursement of $125,000 from the $400,000 already approved in capital funding by Council;

AND WHEREAS the St Vital Minor Hockey Association has stated in correspondence dated March 25, 2015 that the association may not be able to continue operations of the arena due to delay of grant approval,

AND WHEREAS having the city take over operation of the arena could incur additional operating costs of over $100,000 (when compared to operating deficits at Bertrand);

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. *That the decision of Council from March 25, 2015 in regards to Item 2 of Report "A" of Executive Policy Committee dated March 18, 2015 be rescinded.*

2. *That the original recommendations of the Executive Policy Committee on the above item be adopted.*

Councillor Mayes: Thank you to Councillor Orlikow. I would like to move to suspend the rules so we can deal with this today which is the point of the (inaudible).

Madam Speaker: Yes. With Council's permission, we'll move to suspend the rules. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thanks for the opportunity to speak to this and it is of some importance that we prove this moved on today based on some correspondence I had with the St. Vital Minor Hockey Association earlier today. I want to thank Councillor Wyatt who I paraphrased by saying something like "Mayes, when you scrape yourself off the ceiling, why don't you come and talk to me about this and we'll pull out the budgets and go over it". We went through both 2014 and 2015 budgets. It is referenced four separate times in the 2014 budgets. I won't give the page references though some of the people here voted for those budgets. Some voted against, but I would point out to you 14 of us voted in favour of the 2015 budget. If you find page 2-128 of the capital budget, you will see again reference to the St. Vital Minor Hockey. Councillor Lukes has pointed out that things in the budgets don't usually require a separate reports so I would point to that as kind of precedent here but in essence we have…this project has been approved now twice by Council both and 2014, four different references in that budget. Again referenced in the budget we voted on just two days ago, no questions were raised, no concerns were raised, to try and summarize this as clearly as possible as Councillor Eadie correctly pointed out, there are actually two that operate under management agreement, his and Councillor Dobson's but St. Vital is the only one that operates under a service agreement where actually the revenue is given back to the City for ice rental. So it's a unique arrangement, they've come forward and said "Council has now approved twice over $400,000 in capital funding". Our first priority, it is an arena, it's a 45-year-old arena which I think first skated at in year two of its operations. So I know it pretty well. They're saying that what we really need and what they have now purchased is a Zamboni and their concern expressed to me over lunch was, look we paid for it, we have yet to get any of the 400,000 that was approved in December 2013. We do need the money. We have been charging our players more. They actually expressed concern about even being able to operate and continue to operate the arena if they don't get some reimbursement here out of the $400,000 that was already previously approved. So they met with me repeatedly and talked about doing plumbing work and none of this is terribly grand and exciting. It's repairing old infrastructure. It's plumbing. It's doorways. It's trying to convert…the hope is to try to convert one of the changing rooms into a girls' change facility because they don't have that right now because it's a 45 year old arena. So in short, we have approved funding for the St. Vital Arena capital project. Their number one capital need is the Zamboni. Why is this here? Because under the terms of the agreement they have for regular arenas type funding, their annual grant, they weren't allowed to use some of that for a Zamboni so this obliged to come back here. They operate it. They're a volunteer group. They indicated in the correspondence to me over the lunch hour how tired they were and how much they need this to continue operating. They don't want to pass the cost on to the players and the public and it seemed to me that they were at the stage of sort of saying, "Well if we can't get some of the money, why doesn't City just take it over?" As I point out in the motion, the funds, you know, we operate…the 2010 report on arenas indicated our average loss on arenas was $122,000, April 2010 report…Bertrand which I cite is 100, 000, it's actually 99,000, so my memory is pretty good on that. Probably the closest arena is Bertrand or Maginot. They each operate at a loss of over 100,000 and I foresee that we'll have another Allard versus Orlikow debate over what the next new arena should be because (inaudible) Maginot, anyway, predicting the future, yes. In any event, this one isn't on the list for replacement. This one's on the list to be upgraded with the 400,000 in capital. I don't know how much more I should say here, Madam Speaker. I've tried to be as clear as possible. Councillor Eadie said to me downstairs, "Well look, if it's a community incentive grant for a Zamboni, you need kind of a report", maybe so, probably so, but this isn't a community incentive grant. To reiterate it's $300,000 from arenas funding that we just approved two days ago as well as $100,000 from my ward's parks and recreation fund that I approved last year which was a condition written into the budget last year. So some of it from my ward allocation, some of it approved by Council as a whole for arenas capital funding. I don't really know what we would gain from a report, Madam Speaker because it will be going to the very people who operate the arena to say, "Hey, what are your capital needs?" and they would say, "Well, a Zamboni. We've already spent the money on the thing." So, that's our number one capital. So perhaps I wasn't clear enough earlier in explaining it but they purchased it, they are incurring losses because they have to finance it. This isn't new funding. This isn't funding from Community Incentive Grants, which might require a report, it's really pursuant to the budget where we don't generally require reports. I don't want to belabour the point but it's certainly an important community run organization in my ward. You know, they are not planning gold-plated taps and fixtures in the place. They're like replacing 45-year-old plumbing and doorways and a Zamboni. It is, after all, an ice…indoor ice arena. So I don't think a Zamboni is a particularly griseous use of capital

doorways. So again why is this here? Mike McGinn, Mike Ruta, City Finance people said they felt it was within the confines of what we passed, it needed a motion. So I don't think a report would add anything other than at least a month more of frustration for the people who operate the arena, possibly jeopardize their willingness to continue to operate the arena, handing us the keys and a bill probably for a subsidy of $100,000 a year. So I don't want to belabour the point, Madam Speaker, it's an important project. That's why I…don't know if I've ever asked for reconsideration on something before. I want to get this approved today. I'd appreciate Council's support on that. We have approved funding. No one's ever asked any questions about it. I would certainly welcome anyone who wants to come and meet with these folks, to come and meet with me if you do have further questions. But for today, they bought it, it's a priority. We've already approved the funding and I really don't see what more we would gain from a report. I thank Councillor Wyatt for flagging this and walking through about the 14 and 15 budgets with me to confirm. We did just vote two days ago to reconfirm the funding for St. Vital Arena. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie you have the floor.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. Madam Speaker, its unfortunate that the kind of detail that I heard spoken here from my respectful hopefully colleague, the whole explanation, it's apparent to me, Madam Speaker, the Zamboni is already purchased. He explained why and forwarded me some emails about the real detail of the situation. You read the "whereases", Madam Speaker, in whereases, it talks about that there was an allocation of a hundred thousand from a fund that is basically, decisions are made through the Councillor in that particular ward and then there is this Arena Capital Account. To me, I don't know what that is. It's…I don't think anything that we've utilized capital out of for the West Kildonan rink, where we've had to utilize CIG money quite often to help manage their things. So you know, it isn't a full explanation in here as to what the purpose is, but…so, I'll leave it at that but, Madam Speaker, and I'll vote for it. Actually, I have no problem. It's…and in terms of speaking to a fellow Councillor about the question, I do believe I left him a message to call me some time ago and I never got a return call there, so, Madam Speaker, I think that it's a mis…unfortunate that an account that has been referred to other Councillors as a possibility of finding money to deal with some programs in their ward, you just want to know what's going on, Madam Speaker. So I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on the item? I'll call the question then on Motion 8. 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 move the following By-laws be read for the first time. By-law 30/2015, 31/2015, 39/2015 and 40/2015.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 30/2015, By-law No. 31/2015, By-law No. 39/2015 and By-law 40/2015.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that By-laws No. 30/2015, 31/2015, 39/2015 and 40/2015 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 30/2015, 31/2015, 39/2015 and 40/2015.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that the rules be suspended and By-laws numbered 30/2015, 31/2015, 39/2015 and 40/2015 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. Addendum By-laws at this time, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rules be…sorry, the rules be suspended and By-law 42/2015 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 42/2015.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that By-law 42/2015 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 42/2015.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 42/2015 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. Finally, we are at Question Period for the Mayor. Councillor Wyatt.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: Finally we're at Question Period for the Mayor. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Madam Speaker. I rise just further to the discussion we had on Building Canada. Back in February I had an opportunity to make some inquiries with the Directors, Dave Wardrop, Brad Sacher and our Acting CAO at the time, Michael Jack, specifically regarding the Louise Bridge project with the understanding that Louise was not, at that point…that bridge project had not been filed with Building Canada, and in terms of the inquiries that I made, I did receive response from Mr. Wardrop, the Director of Transit, who indicated that…and I forwarded the email on to you, to the Mayor…"that based on the Transit application, that Transit input for the application is limited to the eastern quarter alignment, however, the larger issue is the need for a secondary land use plan for the Point Douglas which would be required to refine the application details of the proposed bridge. Although the Eastern Corridor Alignment Study will be completed relatively quickly, the secondary land use plan is expected to be the critical scheduling factor." So in other words, what's being referred to here is that in terms of the work being done by Public Works, in terms of the work being done by Winnipeg Transit, their work is moving along. Where the concern lies has to do with the secondary land use planning in South Point Douglas. I'm just wondering if the Mayor would be able to look into this so that we can move this along. There's some great opportunities with regards to what could be done to renew South Point Douglas tied into this project in the future.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker and through you, I thank the Councillor from Transcona. Absolutely I'd be more than happy to follow up. I know our interim, or Acting CAO, Michael Jack, is looking for things to do this week, but if we're not able to have the benefit of his time on this issue this week, I look forward to being given the opportunity thanks to this Council's support for our incoming CAO, Mr. Doug McNeil, to get to work with him on this and many other matters very soon. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: Yes thank you. On a totally different matter, I'm just wondering if the Mayor would be able to let Council know in terms of where we stand right now with the strategy/plan for redevelopment, renewal of the old PSB in light of the police moving out of it and the parkade site.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. Through you I thank Councillor Wyatt for the question. I will have to get back to him with some more detailed information. We…from memory, my recollection is that the public service is providing and doing ongoing work to look at different options for us, but I haven't received a report that actually provides those options, so I'll be more than happy to bring that forward in due course. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Third question Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: Yes thank you and finally, also in terms of the last year the Brownfield Strategy requested by this Council of the public service, would the Mayor be able to look into the status of where the Brownfield Strategy is and let us know when that report may be forthcoming?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Yes.

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

Councillor Gilroy: It's my understanding that the Mayor visited Arlington Bridge and I was wondering if he could give us an update and share his experience of what he saw on Arlington Bridge.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, and I thank Councillor for the question. Yeah that was a bit of an eye-opener. This is a bridge that's well over a hundred years old. I think it's a hundred and there years old if my memory is correct, and I never walked on it before. I've been over it many times before and it's showing its age, and I want to thank Councillor Pagtakhan as well as you Councillor Gilroy for your advocacy for the renewal or replacement of that bridge. Its days are numbered, and while it's safe right now for Winnipeggers to use, you know, it is just showing its age. So it is something, you know, today we're talking about four key priorities in terms of the Build Canada applications that shouldn't in any way detract us from many of the ongoing efforts that were dealt with in the Capital Budget and that we're going to have to make some key decisions on in the near future, and I believe Arlington Bridge is one of those key decisions that is going to have to be made. It's a key intersection that connects north and south and while we're trying to bring our community together in more ways than just infrastructure, we still have to make sure that those linkages are there. One of the things that was a big eye opener for me was the fact that it's, you know, when you're going up is that wood. So we went underneath and we took a look at it and you could see kind of the wood planks and then of course the asphalt over top, and you know, it was an eye opener. I know many of us had the pleasure of going out on two separate occasions a few weeks ago, and again I just want to thank Councillor Pagtakhan for getting us out there on a weekend or on the Monday in some of your cases and I think it was the more that we can do those types of things. You know, Centreport is another area where we need to go out and we need to visit. We need to meet with officials, we need to see first-hand and we're going to be doing a lot more of that in the coming weeks and months. Thank you.

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

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes thanks Madam Speaker. I just wanted to build up on my question from last month to the Mayor regarding the well water advisory and I understand, from the Mayor's response last time that there was an audit that was going to take place from our Water and Waste folks and I wanted to know if the Mayor could provide us, the Council and the public with an update on where things are at relative to the audit results.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: I'm not…unfortunately I'm not able to provide any such information at this time, but as soon as we receive it we will obviously forward it to Council as soon as possible. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further at this time? Okay, seeing none we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, the report dated March 16. Councillor Lukes.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED MARCH 16, 2015

Councillor Lukes: Okay, I'd like to introduce this report from the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 4.

Madam Speaker: We'll call the question on Items 2, 3 and 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 - Costs of Implementing a Universal Transit Pass (UPass) for Post-Secondary Students at the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes to introduce the item.

Councillor Lukes: I'd like to welcome my colleagues to speak on this.

Madam Speaker: It was stood down by Councillor Gillingham. A few of you, okay. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: I am happy to make some opening remarks on this one. It's…I thought in my comments today. I might sort of tell a little bit of the story of how we got here today because I think it's interesting and it is going to be as…Zach Fleischer from the Canadian Federation of Students spoke earlier, this is an historic moment for this Council. This is a significant decision and I think we need to mark these times with acknowledging that. As long as I have been elected to Council, there's been kind of a hope in my mind, there's always been that we could do this, but a number of factors have to come together. You have to have the students on board; you have to have an agreement of what the terms are; you have to have referendums at another level of student politics and all of those things that we started working on it again as a latest attempt, three years ago, and I got together with the students from the two universities and the Canadian Federation of Students, and we met…we got together with Winnipeg Transit and we came up with something that everybody could agree with as a way to go forward that was fair and acceptable and that they were comfortable bringing back to their student executives. And we took it to the Mayor and Council and we were able to get that support. So it was quite a journey to get to that point and, I wanted to speak to the…on a personal note, I'm a mother and I have to brag about my children, but I do want to mention a "shout out" to my daughter, Sarah, who is a student at the University of Manitoba, and she has grown up with a transit obsessed mother, and so when this came forward to the university, without my doing, I promise you, she was approached by some students and she took on the role of organizing the "Yes" side on the referendum and they were successful. So way to go Sarah, love you, kid. And anyway, I just want to say that some of the benefits that need to be mentioned with a program like the UPass, which is best practices across the country. It's very common across the country. This isn't a ground breaking thing that Winnipeg is doing. This is something that most cities have and most cities should have and one of the benefits of this is the lifetime habits riding transit and taking transit that come from the university students. They show that students continue to use transit throughout their lifespan when they get into the habit of taking…they see the benefits, the convenience, the comfort of having someone else do the driving, and the financial costs, too, even without a subsidy later in life, you save a lot of money, not taking transit. And I would also remind you of the environmental benefits of increasing ridership. Each bus full of 60 people, you're taking 60 cars off our road. That's a lot of congestion. That's a lot of greenhouse gas emissions and that's a lot of improved quality of life and health for our citizens. It's universal and I know that's kind of a philosophy that everyone is paying for something that not everyone is using, but I mean that's what we do with health care. That's what we do with education. That's what we do because it's for the greater good and it's necessary to make it work, and it works and we do many things like that in this society. So some people object to that, but the majority of students had a democratic choice and they mad that choice to vote for that so I think we should respect the students' choice. Winnipeg's rate that was agreed on by the students to take back to their student bodies was in line and consistent and reasonable with other cities and it results in a savings of more than half the cost of a transit pass for a student. So imagine being a struggling student and that kind of a savings is really significant for affordability for students. I want to speak briefly to the addition of new student groups because that comes up. There are other universities, Red river and other educational institutions that once this program is established, they can certainly come forward, they can have a referendum and approach the City and work with Transit to negotiate something. I want to point out that each situation is unique because of the massive ridership increase we're going to see at the U of M, we have to actually ramp up and purchase 8 new buses and staff them with drivers. That's how many more students we're going to have taking transit and because of the each institution and the transportation of each place is different, so that's one of the reasons why the costs are high in initiating the program, but other institutions that come on may or may not have that same kind of impact so that's something that Transit would look at at that time. So I just want to thank, you know, it started with the Public Works Committee a few years ago, it's gone through Council and all of you that were here and all of you now that will be supporting it and considering it at least even if you don't want to support it, you know, I thank you because this really is historic. This is bringing us in league with other cities of what they are doing. It's standard. It's practice…it's the best practice, and it makes sense. We have to take a number of steps to start changing the culture in Winnipeg about transit. And I can tell you, you know, you go to a lot of cities and it's not scruffy people on the bus, it's everybody on the bus, all people in your suit and with your briefcase and it really is a great relaxing experience to come in on the bus. I actually took the bus a couple of times this week because my daughter's always taking my car, and just going through Osborne Village and downtown on this beautiful snowy morning and sitting back listening to the music and watching people come and go, it's a really relaxing way. So I encourage everybody to use transit and everybody to support this report. Thanks so much for all of your support over the last few years and today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I realize just being elected that I am kind of coming late to this conversation that has been ongoing for a while and I don't want to kind of rain on my colleague, Councillor Gerbasi's parade here, but I'm going to. I can't resist. She doesn't have to answer obviously...I'm just wondering if the daughter that is taking the car is the one that facilitated the bus pass?

Councillor Gerbasi: No, it's the other one.

Councillor Gillingham: Okay, all right. I couldn't resist. It was sitting right there. So I understand that the $260.00 fee would be applied to all students full time or part time as part of the registration. I'm more…prefer that we have choice. I think a lot of levels of government take a lot of our choices away. Health care was referenced and education and that's fine. But when it comes to a bus pass for students, I think that should be a choice that you opt in or you opt out and so I don't see that it really is fair to those students who don't want to or won't use the transit. I don't see that it's fair to part time students. I know one of the delegations this morning referenced looking at possibly applying it to graduate students. You may or may not know I'm halfway through a graduate degree, this little thing called an election interrupted everything and so that's on hold right now, but I was working away at it part time and not at the two universities in question here, but have this or if this is applied to the school that I'm attending, it will be a hard pill to swallow as a part-time student when I go back to it. I am wondering, what in the long term this subsidy will cost over the coming years? Again, I guess if I read through all the documents leading up to this, perhaps I'd find that they're…I'm wondering what this will cost taxpayers in the city. And anecdotally, I've heard from people in my own constituency in St. James that have expressed just some frustration. They attend University of Manitoba and they've said for example for them transit from St. James to the University of Manitoba is not an easy thing to get to school. And so, to ask students that feel that they need to drive a vehicle to a university…maybe they live in one end of the city, they have to drive to the other end because it's easier and quicker and more convenient than transit, to ask them to pay…or insist that they pay $260, again I don't think that that is…that's fair. I am wondering if there will be some sort of way that the impact measure…we will be measuring indeed if ridership is up and how we're going to measure that when this plan is implemented. And I'd be interested to know the numbers in two to three years of what impact if it has indeed had an impact and students who used to drive are now taking transit, it'll be a fascinating study and I hope that we are doing a study, we're following up this investment if this is where it's going to be with studies to support that it has been a good investment and at the end of the day, we can turn to the taxpayers and say it's been money well spent. So thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to oppose this and it's the end of our kumbaya session of holding hands, folks. Anyway, I rise to oppose this, Madam Speaker, and I do so reluctantly, but I do so nonetheless. I did support the study and looking into it. I have supported it in previous budgets, but I have never had the opportunity to vote on it now like I do at this point. And now, having seen the…and clearly seeing what the costs are going to be to our future budgets, it does cause me concern and great concern. I cite the fact that you know, it would be wonderful, Madam Speaker, if we could all ride the transit service for a fraction of the price of what it costs us today. It would be wonderful if we could ride it for free and have it fully subsidized like health care is right now, however, that's not realistic. And at this point in time, the cost to us in 2016 is going to be over half a million dollars and then rising in 2017 to over $1.3 million after the provincial cost sharing. And I ask myself, what would be more advantageous to the City and also advantageous to the students that we could build rapid transit faster, make it more convenient and efficient for them to get to school via rapid transit, because as it stands right now my constituents, my students in my end of town have the same challenge as students in Councillor Gillingham's end of town have and that is if they're studying at the U of M, they're taking either two buses minimum or they're taking a bus that's a cow's path kind of like around the city and you finally get there in an hour and a half anyways. So the challenges that the students have today is the fact that we don't have the rapid transit system that where they could get on one leg and then get off at a central station downtown to the next leg and then at the U of M, which is what we're doing now with the first southwest rapid transit corridor which is great, but we need those other legs built, and should we instead of subsidizing the students to the tune of 1.3 million actually when you add in the provincial subsidy, it's 2.1 million. Instead of that money going to that, wouldn't it better off, wouldn't we be better off for that same amount of money, would be going into the newly established rapid transit reserve that this Mayor has, with the foresight established to build the fund, the money available to build the next phase of rapid transit? I would say it's the latter, Madam Speaker. Let's build rapid transit and get that done first. Ironically, the majority of the students right now at the University of Winnipeg already use transit, 70, 80 percent, I already use transit, so we're actually…the U of M students are subsidizing now the U of W students by this decision and ironically by us building the southwest rapid transit corridor, okay, which will be open in 2019, more students than ever before will be using the transit service to get to the U of M thanks to this huge investment that we are making. This, I think, is a wonderful thing to be able to do, if we have money everywhere to build and allocate the fruits, you know, if we have these wonderful options, but we don't. And I've now heard a number of speeches by my good friend and getting to know him, Councillor Dobson and I hear his message in terms of being fiscally cautious in terms of the outlook of where we are going, and I see the importance of

showing some caution here and I don't think this is necessarily the right decision. It is ideal, there's no doubt about it and Councillor Gerbasi is correct. Do other cities do it? They absolutely do. They absolutely do. But the reality is, other cities also have a far broader and larger rapid transit system than the City of Winnipeg. Other cities have subways, other cities have LRT, other cities have an extensive BRT system and we're getting things moving here. And so I would prefer to see this type of funding if we were going to do it, to go towards the capital expenditures that we need to make to invest and make the system better. As it stands right now, adding more transit buses to the fleet is always a very positive, but again, Madam Speaker, there is a cost with that. It's called debt and we now have to service that debt. So there is a cost to do and that cost by the way, Madam Speaker, is a hundred percent our cost. That's not an operating cost, that's 100 percent City of Winnipeg cost and the Province is not sharing in that at all. So I reluctantly as I said at the beginning stand to oppose this and I wish we…if we have this kind of funding that we should be putting this type of funding if not more so, into the reserve instead of subsidizing fares, when, you know, we would all love to have subsidized fares at the end of the day, and the fares are actually subsidized, Madam Speaker. We know that. So we're just subsidizing these further. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Mayes.
Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I can understand the difficulty, a couple of speakers have spoken Madam Speaker about the…well, about choice or about affordability and why one group verses another group putting money into better transportation, Madam Speaker. I wanted to first make a point about university students or Red River students who live in North Kildonan who would have to hop on one of those cross town buses that Councillor Wyatt is talking about in terms of…how come they wind…they end up winding into neighbourhood suburbs because they have to do the add on to provide some bus service into these areas as these suburbs come up. And so they end up making them longer and longer roots when, you know, coming out of Transcona, the fastest way to the university is straight down Lagimodiere, Bishop Grandin, hang a left on Pembina Highway, boom, bang, you're there, right? That would be a nice bus route fast. You know, there needs to be a rationalization, but the trouble with our Transit system is we're trying to keep up to…with dealing in the suburbs where people say they don't need to use transit, but then Sage Creek needs transit like all these suburbs need transit. So, you know, there are strains on our mass transportation bus system but let me reflect more on the UPass. What the full cost, as expressed in this $1.3 million, that's just for people…what that means is that's a mill rate supported so what that would mean is it's .265 percent increase on your property taxes to handle that mill rate. So, we're…for rapid transit we are doing .33 I believe it was because we threw a five cent extra on to the users of the Transit system who go to that transportation system. And I'm supportive of the UPass, but the reason I'm mostly in support of it is there's something missing, like we need to build ridership. People need to learn to take the bus, Madam Speaker. Once they start to use it, as long as it's convenient I think that Councillor Wyatt makes a very good thing. It's not that convenient if you're sitting on the bus for an hour and a half, but if it's not that packed, at least you can study your stuff before you get to the university to take your test which is what I used to do on the bus on my way to college when I went to Red River out to Notre Dame campus, walking over the Arlington Bridge actually to get my bus many years ago. But anyway, Madam Speaker, I digress. This is…what we don't have, I think, is very important that we need to consider, is that we want to provide affordable bus service to everybody we can. Now, the thing is, if you compare us to other cities, our transit prices are pretty good. I would be more in favour, but it's not possible, nobody wants to consider, Madam Speaker, but the best thing to do, I think, for…because building the case for students, it's about…part of it is about their ability to pay and this would be cheaper, it's on their tuition. It's a pretty good price, $260. As I understand, the U of M…many students, I believe, any student who is coming from East St. Paul or somewhere though is not having to pay that, as far as I understand. But it's too bad we can't get those people who use our streets in Winnipeg to actually pay more to use our streets, but anyway that's besides the point. With the UPass, it would be great if we had instead of just a plain old seniors discount and just a plain old student discount and a plain old this discount, if we could actually…for the people…because there's two reasons we want rapid transit, one is to lessen the load on our roads from motor vehicle traffic and the second is to provide transportation for those who can't afford it and need to get to work or need to get to different places. And so, what we should have is just one cheap rate for anybody who has an income that doesn't…that it's more difficult for them to pay. It would be something that would be valuable to have I think. And I've had that discussion with the students at universities, and they actually promote that, the low income bus pass or whatever it is. But the reality is that's not going to get done because look at how we are dealing with the university one. So that would be my best thing, but you know, I think that this kind of investment, building transit users I think is really important, getting people to use the bus because if they're paying for it, they're going to use it. That's just the way it goes. And hopefully, we'll see a report that…and I'm sure we will get reports about how it is working as Councillor Gillingham has asked for. But you know, the thing is, are we taking choice away? Are we trying to build a mass transportation system that lessens the load on all of the city because the more people take the transit, we wouldn't have to deal with 30,000 cars at Waverley. You know, Kenaston needs widening. How many more…you know, if you get just buses running down there, way less cars, that's an efficient, effective way of moving people around so they can do their work a day and do their business and provide that transit system. So thank you, Madam Speaker. I will definitely be supporting this and it is interesting that we are getting to actually have a serious debate about it, but I'm hoping that we all understand that what we're also doing with these students are building future users of transit and no mass transportation is good unless you can get lots of people on to it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yeah, this is a historic day in some ways approving this project. And Councillor Gerbasi has certainly been the leader on this and I want to commend Zack Fleischer and someone who isn't here, Rory McLeod-Arnold who's also put a lot of work on this and I really appreciate the way they've done it. It's been dogged. It's been three years. It's been professional. It's been persistent. I had many doubts about this. I remember meeting Rory one day out on the street. I think he was actually on a date and it probably didn't impress his companion that he then spent about 20 minutes trying to convince me to vote for the UPass and he did actually very effective job of it and I answered all my questions. So I want to thank Zack and Rory, they were remarkably able to bring together Sam Katz and Jenny Gerbasi to back this. They compromised. We had different groups from the previous Council compromise to come up with a plan that was voted on not just by us but by the students at U of M and U of W. It's a very democratic process. So I'm pleased to support this item.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next, Mr. Mayor.
Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would first like to just thank the previous Council. There were members of the previous Council, including Councillor Gerbasi, who I think has done a great job in not only advocating for this but also educating Winnipeggers about the benefits of public transit and the benefits of working with the valued members of the students at these two respected universities. I respect the opinions of all members of Council and those that are not in support of this, but I think we should keep in mind the fact that there have been referendums at the two universities. Students have had a choice and Winnipeggers had a choice as well. On Election day many of us ran on platforms of increasing public transit and what I don't want to see happen is when the second phase of rapid transit comes in line, members of this Council or Winnipeggers saying there aren't enough people riding the bus. Well, it's going to take some time to develop the culture, to grow the culture of public transit in our city, and that takes time and it takes an investment. I drive a truck and I live in the suburbs. I support this. I do plan on taking the bus soon, probably not as frequently as Councillor Gerbasi, but I recognize the public good in public transit and I recognize the fact that by encouraging public transit there are environmental benefits. There are also benefits of getting more cars and trucks off the road. And the overall costs of doing so is less wear and tear on our infrastructure. That costs money as well. I also want to send a signal today, and we have the opportunity to do that, to send a signal to the student leaders and the students at the two universities who are watching what's going on right now. Some of them are supposed to probably be in class, but they're watching this right now. And they are wondering if their City Council has listened to them. Well, we can answer that today. We can say we've heard, we've worked with you, and we now have a concrete plan costed out on how we can actually move this forward. And I think it's a tremendous opportunity and I recognize there's differing views on subsidizing public transit and as Councillor Wyatt has quite ably stated, we do already subsidize public transit. I've had…some of my…the best discussions that I had during the campaign when I was running for this chair were with the student leaders, University of Winnipeg, University of Manitoba as well as Red River and there was a I believe a former EA of Councillor Wyatt, Jeremiah who I had a very good chat with, about the benefits of exactly the UPass. So would I urge you to listen to him, and he could be texting you right now. Listen to him and hopefully his wisdom will rub off on all of Council. But I urge you to support this. This is a good thing to vote for and I do also respect the views that are being viewed here on the contrary. You know, these are costs that, you know, we do have to manage, but this is well costed. We are going to be studying the usage and I hope when we actually see it get rolling in 2016, that we can all hop on a bus that day with some of the students and let them know City Council has listened and we're with them. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Morantz followed by Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Morantz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I also rise in support of this motion and I have to say when I first had a look at the program I was a little surprised by the degree of subsidization as well. But I think it's an important thing to remember that this isn't just about getting more people to ride buses. There are very few tools that we have at our disposal here on City Council and in the city to support post-secondary education. If these measures in any way help even one more student choose to go to university and get a post-secondary education, that is huge. And one of the things and I can't believe I am actually saying these words, but I really appreciate about Premier Selinger is that every time he stands up, he talks about the importance of investing in post-secondary education and I could not agree with him more. And this is a relatively small thing in the whole scheme of things that this Council can do to support kids who are going to university who want to better themselves, who want to have a better life and to expand their knowledge and view of the world. And if we can help them get there through a relatively small subsidy and it encourages them to do that, I think it's money well spent, Madam Speaker. So thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: So many people have said so many wonderful words and I won't go…that was beautiful and that's exactly what we should be doing here today. And I also wanted to talk about a lot of my community, they take the bus or

active transportation and we need to increase bus ridership because we need to get more buses on the road, and there's no doubt about that. What they've said is that they subsidize the other infrastructure that we have for cars. So you know, we've got to make sure that when we're thinking about this, there are a lot of people out there that are also subsidizing other things that maybe aren't their priorities. So I do hope that we support this and, I mean, Councillor Morantz, you said it most eloquently. We support the university students getting education. Thanks.

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

Councillor Schreyer: I might as well put in my two cents worth. There's wonderful things said. I do have a few comments. Now, I apologize this morning I said I may be the second most frequent bus user on City Council, I was guessing, I never said it was true, perhaps there are others and I stand to be challenged on that and we'll see how things go and sure, I will challenge Councillor Allard to a bus tour of the city and we will visit each other's wards that way. Excellent.

Councillor Eadie: Do you know what bus numbers to take?
Councillor Schreyer: Twenty, 11, 44, 47 of Transcona if you wish, all right across the street at the Centennial Concert Hall. There you go. (Inaudible) Through the Marion underpass. Comments have been made to Councillor Morantz that said he's surprised that he agrees with Premier Selinger. Councillor Morantz, don't be that surprised. These things happen. It has been mentioned that the strains on our mass transit system…but we all recognize I believe that there will always be strains. There has always, at least in my life time, strains on our public transit system and we need to deal with this. We need to deal with this now. We all agree, basically, that we need to build a bus-using culture or enhance our bus-using culture, buses, public transportation has always been part of the culture of the City of Winnipeg. It has had its trough and we are coming out of that. But, we need to be proactive in this term, in this Council, to do something about that. But having said that, that just puts more strain on our public transportation system in the short and medium term, despite the projected bus rapid transit routes which will take years to develop. Mayor Bowman has a point. He says you know once that the second phase is developed, he wouldn't want to hear all of a sudden right once it's completed, well people aren't taking it. Well, I understand that, and that's important so we need to continue being proactive in terms of building up our bus-using culture. But what's frustrating to me is for the mass majority…the massive majority of the bus routes in our city, we need to sustain and enhance their frequency, their reliability and we need more buses. Part and parcel of all that is trying things, trying things that yes, cost money, but I believe in the long run are cost effective. I sympathize, more than sympathize, you know, I understand many people relate to Councillor Gillingham's concerns, and Councillor Wyatt's of course. What I'm saying is and there are other cities that have tried this, and (inaudible) cities we can learn from, but we need to try here in Winnipeg, so I would like to try this and I'd like to see what happens over the course of a few years to see what has happened in terms of building up the…enhancing the bus-using sub culture of our city and that is one reason why I'm willing to support this conditionally, I'm looking at this as an experiment, which I think is worth the money, because we are only talking millions and again, not the billions of a bus rapid transit system. I'll leave it at that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This is a great program and I rise to support the UPass here that we're going to be voting on here at City Council. You know, we're joining other municipalities, Madam Speaker, and other provinces and cities, they're doing this, British Columbia, Edmonton, Calgary, Saskatoon and now Winnipeg. This is an awesome thing. It's going to benefit a lot of folks within the inner city and the North End and Councillor Sharma, this is going to benefit a lot of folks living in your end of town as well who are going to the University of Manitoba and University of Winnipeg and other post-secondary institutions. So you know, I really want to thank Zack Fleischer, one of the student leaders and all the student leaders for that matter, who have been really instrumental to bring this here today. I had a great opportunity to speak with Mr. Fleischer during the election campaign and this is one of the promises I made and I want to make good on that commitment and I also want to thank Councillor Gerbasi for the wonderful leadership that she's shown on Council and the previous Councils as well with regards to shepherding this process through and again to thank the Mayor and EPC for the good work to bring it here today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I really wasn't intending to speak on this but I'm going to make a few quick comments here for the record. I have consistently voted against this and will continue to do so today. Our transit service is already heavily subsidized but again people are going to make the argument that our public roads aren't user pay either. So I don't have an issue there. The problem is; how do we determine that students are more worthwhile group of individuals to be subsidized verses other people that have trouble paying for their transit passes today, people on social assistance, people making minimum wage? Choosing one group over another isn't necessarily fair. There are many students that have means far above and beyond that of some of the less abled population out there today. It's also inequitable as

Councillor Gillingham pointed out. Students who are never intending to use this are now having to pay for it. I've got residents on one side of a street that are in arm of East St. Paul. They cannot opt out of the program instead on the other side of the street there in the City of Winnipeg. They are equal distance to a Winnipeg transit bus in almost every respect. In my mind, it doesn't make sense. So again, I do commend the active lobbying of many of the young student activists including Zack Fleischer, and the UWSA and UMSU, but I will be in fact voting against this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on the item? Councillor Lukes do you wish to close?

Councillor Lukes: I think everyone has said their pros and cons to this. We talked about it quite a bit in our Public Works Committee. I think that this really challenges the status quo. I think this is a great initiative. It's for four years we are going to come back and look at it in four years. We're going to see the results. We're going to be studying it for four years, but I think it is a fundamental change in the way we approach transportation in this city and move towards a sustainable form of transportation and basically encouraging people to use this and encouraging youth. I think probably one of the most changing factors a lot of these student leaders have found is or recognized is that they really, really can make a difference. And this activism and this lobbying effort that they've done over the three years, they've…if we all, you know, move forward and approve this today, they've reached a great goal. They've made it come forward and I know that they've…I know they've learned a lot about the process and probably we've inspired them to continue going forward and making an effort to make change because people, small groups, individuals can make dramatic changes and I think this is a representative of a really good movement in change that we're seeing and I want to commend the student leaders for taking this over a three year process which could be very grueling; trying to make change as we all know sitting here. So with that if there's no other comments, I'd like to move this forward, please. Number, Item No. 4, no one, it's Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: Yes. A recorded vote has been called.

Councillor Lukes: Recorded vote? All right.

Madam Speaker: All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Gillingham and Councillor Wyatt

Madam Speaker: Item No. 1 has passed. Okay, and moving on, we have Motion No. 3 before us. It's a motion moved by Councillor Browaty seconded by Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Browaty,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS the province of Manitoba (Manitoba Infrastructure and Transportation, "MIT") requested that the Municipality of East St. Paul provide a statement of agreement in principle for the concept of an Active Transportation (AT) through-pass, Emergency Vehicle corridor and a two (2) lane vehicular through pass (collectively the "through pass") to be located in the vicinity of Raleigh Street (approximately 500 metres north of the City limit) and constructed as part of the PTH 59 and PTH 101 interchange project ("Project");

AND WHEREAS the council of East St. Paul adopted a motion on November 25, 2014 in support of said agreement in principle;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg was not consulted regarding the adding of a 2 lane vehicular through pass to this project or the ability of City streets to handle the additional traffic entering the City at this location;

AND WHEREAS there was no consideration of this location being a new regional connection between the municipalities in the City of Winnipeg's Transportation Master Plan or the Capital Regional Transportation Plan, completed in March 2014 for MIT with consultation with the region.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg Public Service prepare a report on the potential vehicular implications of this development to the April 7, 2015 meeting of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works and on to Council.

Councillor Browaty: Madam Speaker, I'd like to suspend the rules just to introduce this.

Madam Speaker: All in favour to deal with the item today? Contrary? Carried. Yes, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Just a point of privilege. Can I just get this one, the "be it resolved" read?

Madam Speaker: Yes. Mr. Clerk.

Clerk: Therefore be it resolved that the Winnipeg Public Service prepare a report on the potential vehicular implications of this development to the April 7, 2015 meeting of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works and on to Council.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty to introduce the motion.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. I just…I've been informed that the meeting scheduled for April 7th has been rescheduled to April 14th. So as a friendly amendment, I would just like to amend the motion in front of you to from April 7th to April 14th. The Province of Manitoba is proceeding with an active transportation amenity along the Raleigh corridor that was proposed back during the 2011 Election. The most recent versions of this plan include a potential vehicular, a two lane vehicular connection which East St. Paul Council has adopted at the request of Manitoba Infrastructure Transportation. The ramifications of this could be significant for North Kildonan and I would like to have the Public Service…they've already provided some preliminary information on this, but I'd like have an opportunity to hear from our Public Service on this. They've indicated that it's a stretch what they'd be able to provide something for April 14th. Again, I'm not asking in this motion to cancel the active transportation project which I've stated previously, separately that I don't think is warranted. That's not what I am asking here all today, I'm just asking for our Public Service to report back on the ramifications of the transportation impacts.

Madam Speaker: Okay, any further speakers? Councillor Browaty do you wish to close?

Councillor Browaty: No.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on Motion 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move on to By-laws for Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Lukes.

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

Councillor Lukes: Okay. I'd like to move that By-law No. 10/2015 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 10/2015.

Councillor Lukes: I'd like to move that By-law No. 10/2015 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 10/2015.

Councillor Lukes: I'd like to move that the rule be suspended and By-law No.10/2015 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period for the chairwoman. Any questions for Councillor Lukes? Seeing none we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. We have no reports, no motions or no By-laws for Finance. Question period, any questions for Councillor Morantz? Okay, Mr. Mayor.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Mayor Bowman: I would like to ask if he has begun working on the 2016 operating and capital budgets.

Councillor Morantz: I did. I was jotting down a few numbers on the back of a napkin about 2:00 o'clock this morning and I've got it almost balanced. I'm going to have to pacify Mr. Ruta of course, but it's very, very close. Thank you for the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Okay. We will move on seeing none to the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management. Councillor Mayes on the report dated March 2.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
DATED MARCH 2, 2015

Councillor Mayes: I move the report dated March 2. There was only the one item.

Madam Speaker: One item. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And there is no motions. We'll now have the By-laws. Councillor Mayes.

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

Councillor Mayes: I will move…trying to get the number here. I will move By-law No. 9/2015 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 9/2015.

Councillor Mayes: I move that By-law No. 9/2015 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 9/2015.

Councillor Mayes: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 9/2015 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period. Any questions for Councillor Mayes? Seeing none we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED MARCH 10, 2015**

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, I would like to declare conflict on this item and recuse myself.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so noted.

Councillor Allard: I'd like to pull Item 17. I don't know if you have to move Consent Agenda first.

Madam Speaker: Okay, we'll stand down Item 17, Councillor Schreyer.
Councillor Schreyer: I wish to stand down Item 6 and recuse myself.

Madam Speaker: Pardon me.

Councillor Schreyer: …and recuse myself from Item 6.
Madam Speaker: Item 6? So noted.

Councillor Orlikow: You can't recuse yourself yet.

Councillor Schreyer: I'm sorry?

Madam Speaker: Okay, you could go now if you like. Councillor Morantz?

Councillor Morantz: I will stand down Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: Okay. So, Councillor Orlikow, would you like to move the report and then we'll deal with the folks that need to recuse themselves and others that have stood down items.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Speaker: Just…

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah, go ahead, please.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Orlikow: There'd been…

Madam Speaker: Just one moment here.

Councillor Orlikow: Yes, we have another…Councillor Gillingham would also like to stand down.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so Councillor Orlikow, did you move the consent…could you do that first?

Councillor Orlikow: To be honest with you. I'm not sure. I think Councillor Gillingham would like to stand down Item 20. Is it a Polo Park?

Madam Speaker: Okay. So…okay, we're just getting some clarification on process here. There's some confusion, Mr. Clerk.

Councillor Orlikow: I'm unsure if I'm standing down or not or forwarding it. We have 1, 6, 17 and 20.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Schreyer. Did you want to recuse yourself at this time? Yeah, you may go now. Thank you. Councillor Orlikow could you move consent, please?

Councillor Orlikow: Consent of a…to get us clarified, Madam Speaker, am I…

Madam Speaker: You could move them all and then we'll hear from folks that want to stand them down.

Councillor Orlikow: Okay, yes. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. That I'll move for…I'll move items 1 through 21.

Madam Speaker: And, Councillor Gillingham, which number? Twenty? And did someone stand down 17? Okay, Councillor Morantz?

Councillor Morantz: Number one.

Madam Speaker: Number one. Right. And No. 6 was a recusal, Mr. Clerk. Councillor Orlikow, could you please clarify for everyone that Item 1 and 18 we are not dealing with today, they're actually being laid over, are they not?
Councillor Orlikow: Again…yes. So Item No. 1 is a lay over, but…I'm not sure.

Madam Speaker: So we wouldn't be speaking to it today or dealing with the item.

Councillor Orlikow: If that's the will of the chair. I'm not sure why we would, but again, it was called down from the Councillor.
Madam Speaker: It's been laid over by EPC. Why does it show up on the agenda, Mr. Clerk, if you just want to clarify?

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Orlikow: So Madam Chair, if we get some clarification on why Item No 1 is here for the record.

Madam Speaker: It's just to advise Council. So for the record, we won't be dealing with Items 1 or 18 today, but you have moved Consent Agenda items otherwise.

Councillor Orlikow: Okay, so.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Now back to the standing down. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Orlikow: So I have Councillor. We have so far standing down Item No. 17 and Item No. 20. That's correct?

Madam Speaker: Item 17, Councillor Allard? That is yours? Okay and Councillor Gillingham, what number is it? Twenty, right. Okay. Great. I will call the question on Items 2 through 5, 7 through 16, 19 and 21. Six has been stood down. Six was a recusal so we'll add that one as well. Item No. 6. So all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Orlikow: So 17, 6 and 20?

Madam Speaker: Just 17 and 20, correct Mr. Clerk? That's what I have. Good. Mr. Clerk, Item No. 17.

Item 17 – Rail Safety

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, would you like to introduce Item 17?

Councillor Orlikow: No, I actually, I'm actually very supportive of this motion so again I'd like to hear Councillor Allard with his...he'd be quite critical again this moving forward and I leave the floor to him.

Councillor Allard: We've had a very long day so I'll be very brief. This motion calls to essentially implement the Federation of Canadian Municipalities guidelines on new developments for rail safety. This includes guidelines on how far from rail, houses should be built in the event that they're too close to the rails that there should be physical barriers such as berms or other physical barriers, this issue became very hot after the terrible tragedy of Lac Mégantic, and rail safety just keeps becoming more and more important as more and more trains are running through our city. So, I would urge every one of you to support this. This is just asking the administration to look at how we can make this a real city policy. I understand that right now our planning department is aware, but there are moments where there are, perhaps…there is perhaps discussion when we're looking at new development agreements, in terms of how far houses should or should not be from rails, this would sort of lay things out very specifically on how new development should happen using the best practice already outlined in the FCM document. So I urge all of you to support this motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further speakers on Item 17, rail safety? Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes, thank you. Just briefly, first I wanted to thank Councillor Allard for bringing this forward. It's an excellent initiative. There is a really good document that FCM produced that our City planning staff are basically using to

guide them, but I think it's important that this go through the proper process of going through the planning department being looked at and adopted and viewed by Council as our official policy. And I think this is also something that's happening across the country, Montreal is working on this and other cities and this is a huge issue across the country especially for cities like Winnipeg that have so much rail and places like Montreal. I think that the one key point I wanted to bring to you that FCM is emphasizing in working with City on this across the country in communities is that this planning is not just for new development. It's not just for new development. It's not just cherry picking out parts of this, this planning should be for all development, you know, and adapted so we're talking about greenfield new development design in a way that takes these rail safety proximity into consideration, as well as infill and just looking at ways that things can be planned to minimize the risk so it's for both infill and green fill, and I just wanted to make that clear and our planning department is very keen to see this. We discussed it at the committee and I thank again Councillor Allard for bringing it forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker is Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I am supporting the motion, Madam Speaker. I guess just some cautionary notes or thoughts I guess in terms of this. It's common. I think it's a fair comment to say that the idea that we should ensure that there is safety in terms of proximity to railway, I think that's kind of motherhood apple pie and everyone would agree. Where I guess the concern lies is the fact that because of the operations of the third party of railway, running through communities, that we are, because of their operation, we will directly impact the rights and ownership of the private property owners that own land, not the railway land but adjacent land to that railway. And so in other words, what we're doing here is we have to be careful not…and there is a reason why FCM adopted these ideas as guidelines. They are guidelines. They are not regulations and they're not meant to be, but you know, otherwise we go and we run the risk and I'm sure our planning department is aware of this that we are really expropriating without compensation in terms of a private properties, an owner's rights to be able to redevelop or adapt or adapt reuse of one's land near a railway. And we have to be very cognizant of this because this is Winnipeg unlike many other cities, has multiple railway vines running through out city and in all directions. It's the…one of the historical facts of our city being right in the centre of the country, we have rail lines all over the place and so you know I think there has to…I hear what…I know the intent of the mover, I understand what is being suggested, I just think we have to be somewhat cautious and reasonable here in terms of what we do and if there…if it's seen that there is a great need from a societal benefit to take steps that are even more drastic then I think it's a question of having to sit down with the other levels of government, then those who do, actually do regulate the railways, which is Transportation Canada, Transport Canada, and to start talking in terms of a formula or some sort of system in place to compensate private property owners who have been directly impacted by the operations of another third party, being the railway. So that's just something that I think has to be acknowledged in this discussion that it's not just simply saying you shall not do this or not do that. That's my question of waving a magic wand though. In the ideal world, we'd like to be able to do that maybe in terms of safety, but we also have to have the balance here in terms of private property rights adjacent to railways throughout our city, not to mention the fact that we are building a rapid transit line in, right along the rail line corridor that will be carrying thousands of people every day. We don't want to also be contradicting ourselves in terms of some of the policy initiatives we're undertaking right now in terms of this that could be held against or challenged in terms of what we decide to bring forward. Thanks very much, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. There is absolutely no question about the fact that we have to really be focusing on rail line safety. We've done that today a fair bit, but we also know we don't want to wait for it to happen. We need to be protecting our citizens as much as we can with the tools that we do have which are limited. As many, many meetings with the rail lines, we are here first. And they are that we've already found out that many of our issues with the rail lines is for example, we…FCM did some great work at least having some idea of what's being transported through our city. Again, there's some idea, but we don't know exactly when and where. So there's some real serious issues that we have to address. There's also some other policy issues that come into the development so I can tell Council today, that the property planning development committee in general has already struck up the rail line rationalization committee. We actually have started identifying spur lines that we want to try to relocate out of mostly residential neighbourhoods where we can find it, but again, that has been co-operation with the rail lines. Again, they don't have to move. We need to find ways to give them an option and again to Centreport's credit, Centreport is that option. Many of the rail lines right now that presently operate in the city are operating on lands that they'd rather not, but that's what they have available. They would rather be at Centreport. So again, Centreport opens up a whole bunch of operations for us to be able to rationalize some of these spur lines and move the traffic around or through in some cases if we stay on the main lines to get to Centreport. So again, rail line as we mentioned quite a few times today will be a huge issue for us going forward on that planning side and how does that maximize or benefit for our development or not minimize our opportunities so it's not an easy solution, any of them, for this is the motion today is a great one piece of the puzzle. We're going to put some other pieces to the puzzle. We're going to be having regular meetings of the rail lines going forward. That includes…there's about four right now in the City including the small short haulers. To try to

figure out a way that we can work together, rail lines like I say would be very happy not have to go through our great crosses. They'd be very happy not to put transloading stations in the middle of the City of Winnipeg. They'd be very happy to do other, but we have to be able to help us out to take them in that process. So we are presently working on the BNSF/CP spur line that goes through River Heights and I am happy to report it's going quite well, and again that is thanks to Diane Grey over at Centreport who's been helping spearhead this one through to get it to happen. Again, there's still negotiations. We will be meeting with BNSF and CP. The meetings are scheduled so we're quite excited about it, but that's just one of many. There is also another spur line that we're focusing on which is at the Marion. We talked about that today. So the spur line that's separating two neighbourhoods, can they find a…they would rather be at Centreport as well. They really just unload cars. So can we find them an opportunity to be at Centreport or in a better location? So again as our city grows we have to work in partnership with our rail lines. So I'm very happy to support this motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. Call the question on Item 17. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move on to Item 20, expropriation of lands - Polo Park infrastructure improvements.

Item 20 - Expropriation of Lands – Polo Park Infrastructure Improvements Project – Westside of St. James Street

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow to introduce.

Councillor Orlikow: I will listen to my colleague to see what he has to say and reply after that.

Madam Speaker: And that was stood down by yourself. Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is in the ward, my ward obviously, St. James-Brooklands-Weston and I did read through the inquiry officer's report that was commissioned by the City or asked for by the City, and it did indicate that particularly the two properties specifically would be adversely affected and recommended that the City do a full expropriation of them. Now I can appreciate, again, still learning all that I need to learn around here. I can appreciate that a total expropriation would be very costly for taxpayers. I'm trying to weigh that obviously against what I believe is important is regarding supporting the property owners and the business in that area. And so I cannot and will not be supporting this motion as it is now, as independent inquiry has found it. The expropriation of this, these properties specifically I'm thinking of particularly is the one at 1688 St. Matthews. It may jeopardize the viability of the business in question and so certainly concerned about the potentially detrimental impact that a partial expropriation would have on that business in particular. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on the item? Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Mayes: Just very briefly, if you Google "audit in Winnipeg carwash", you'll find the results of the Real Estate Audit which were heavily critical of our staff back a few years ago, I think 2009, prior to even the previous election for "overshooting". For expropriating a whole business when it turned out the business was still able to operate on its reduced footprint. So, I can see why our staff might in this case say "Well, we're not going to make that same error again". There was a lot of criticism of the politicians of the people who did that work, so are they potentially undershooting here by saying we only need part of it? Perhaps, but that's the land value of appraisal commission can address that, but I understand what Councillor Gillingham is saying. It's his ward. I'm just cautious, though. We have learned some things from those audits and one was criticism of the City for basically overestimating what its needs were in prior expropriations. So in this case, our staff I think have made the choice to proceed without overshooting, maybe they're undershooting, and that will be determined at the land value appraisal commission, but I'm going to support the staff recommendations on this, obviously Councillor Gillingham's ward. He knows it best, but I do think that given the recent history on this, I'm going to support the recommendation.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Excuse me. Madam Speaker, you know we had a discussion about small business at our Budget and how small business struggles and so on, but in terms of expropriating the land, yes, I remember reading and hearing about the car wash and it was a difficult circumstance that the City had to deal with. But in terms of this expropriation where they're only expropriating a certain piece of the property, my concern, Madam Speaker, on this is I can understand the expropriation, but I don't know that I read anything in this expropriation report that when we take away the piece of land that's required…is there anything and maybe there should be a dialogue with that business owner…is there something as we do our construction through there that would assist the flow of their potential customers for these, I think there's two businesses as a matter fact that are having some impact of some sort.

If there is something that they could do to help facilitate this small business person to continue to make a living for himself and his family, so I'm going to be voting for it because I know that overall in this particular part of the city, the traffic flow…it was so bad and we are spending, I can't remember the total, but I seem to recall at least $48 million in this whole area, improving traffic flow where traffic is really, really bad and the condition of, I hope that St. James doesn't become the worst street in Winnipeg in their CAA thing. But anyway, I leave with that. Expropriation is never easy on a business, so hopefully there is something that can be done. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers on the item? Mr. Mayor. Yes.

Mayor Bowman: Any time you're dealing with expropriation, it's a difficult matter, especially for the parties involved and as you may have heard at our EPC meeting we commented that we obviously want to ensure that property owners are being respectfully dealt with. That being said, the City strives to be as fiscally responsible as possible and also to consider the citizens that are directly affected, but also the City has to take into account the transportation safety and financial interests of the community as a whole. And that is our responsibility here today.Phase 2 of the Polo Park expansion is a very important project that will improve traffic flows in the area and for that reason, I'll be supporting the motion. Thank you.
Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any further speakers? Okay, seeing none, Councillor Orlikow to close.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Most of the comments have been said. Expropriations are not a pleasant thing to do. We'd like never to have to do them. But the public good does sometimes override the private interest. So…but people should be rest assured that negotiations because I can't get into, are still continuing with the property owners that are going to be affected. There is another recourse, as Councillor Mayes has said, the land evaluation process. However, I hope we don't have to get there. I hope we can negotiate with them so that we can actually come to resolution. But this is a negotiation process. We are trying to both protect the City's interests, but we also respect the businesses of our neighbourhoods and homeowners. You know, we have to sometimes expropriate homes. And Councillor Wyatt had that horrible experience with the Plessis where some people really did not want to lose their home. It was awful. But we needed that strip. No one likes to do this. There's been some comments that we're being spiteful and mean. Again, we just don't agree with the Inquiry Officer. The Inquiry Officer is there to give an opinion. We don't agree with the opinion. So, we'll move forward for the City's best interests, but also in the interests of the business to try to make sure that we can really resolve the parking and the access issues which is really key right now. But really I believe it would be financially irresponsible of us…while we're looking at just a little piece of a property to take the whole property. Again, but we'll allow the process to unfold and I do hope that we can come to some type of resolution before we get to the expropriation land process formal. So I just want to put that on the record.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question on Item 20. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now, moving on to the report dated March, pardon me? Yes, noted. We'll move onto the report of Property and Development dated March 13th. Councillor Orlikow, there is one item I believe.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED MARCH 13, 2015

Councillor Orlikow: So moved.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. I now want to draw Council's attention to two motions on your desk. Motions No. 1 and 2. We've already just dealt with these items but because they are expropriations, Council must vote on them twice as per the Expropriations Act. No suspensions of the rules is necessary. So we'll vote on the motions now. Councillor Orlikow? If you could introduce motion 1.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Orlikow,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

WHEREAS

(a) Pursuant to its By-law No. 22/2014, The City of Winnipeg ("the City") authorized the expropriation of the lands described therein for the purpose of acquiring the land occupied by the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Station No. 12 at 1780 Taylor Avenue, in the City of Winnipeg, in Manitoba and executed a Declaration of Expropriation dated April 30, 2014;

(b) Notice of the intended expropriation was served by the City upon all owners of the lands intended to be expropriated, and was published in a newspaper having general circulation in the locality in which the said lands are situate, pursuant to section 1 of Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act;

(c) Notices of objection to the intended expropriation were served upon the City by some of the said owners, pursuant to section 3 of Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act;

(d) The City requested the Minister of Justice to appoint an inquiry officer;

(e) The Minister of Justice on October 28, 2014 appointed an inquiry officer pursuant to section 4(2) of Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act, and an inquiry was conducted on December 15 and 16, 2014; and

(f) The inquiry officer obtained an Order dated November 21, 2014 from The Honorable Mister Justice Clearwater of the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench that the time for the Confirming Authority to make an order with respect to the Declaration of Expropriation is extended to March 30, 2015.

AND WHEREAS the inquiry officer submitted his report to the City on January 30, 2015, wherein he stated that in his opinion the intended expropriation is fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the objectives of the City, subject to the following recommendations:

- *that the eastern boundary of the land to be expropriated should be established approximately five feet to the west of the existing property line. The five foot strip should extend southerly from the triangle piece (i.e. from parcel B). The existing easement rights should remain in place and should not be expropriated.*

AND WHEREAS The Expropriation Act provides that Council of the City shall consider the report of the inquiry officer, and where Council makes an order confirming the intended expropriation which is not in accordance with the opinion of the inquiry officer, Council shall state its reasons for making the order.

AND WHEREAS it is advantageous that the City proceed with the expropriation of the lands described in By-law No. 22/2014, without any changes.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation dated April 30, 2014, made pursuant to By-law No. 22/2014 and expropriating the following lands:

The lands taken for Works and shown as Parcel A on Plan Deposit 397/2014 WLTO, prepared by Kelly Wayne Mantik, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

is hereby confirmed.

The lands described above are expropriated subject only to the following existing interest:

- *Caveat (Instrument No. 2478832/1) registered by 3177751 Manitoba Ltd. on April 13, 2000.*

The aforesaid lands except:

a) mines, minerals and named substances which are excepted from or not included in the Certificate of Title of the registered owner of the surface under The Real Property Act or are not owned by the owner of the surface under The Registry Act; and

b) reservations in favour of the Crown as excepted from the Title of the owner of the surface, or to which Title is subject by implication under the provisions of The Real Property Act.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Council's reasons for proceeding with the expropriation of the property located at 1780 Taylor Avenue as described in By-law No. 22/2014, rather than:

- *that the eastern boundary of the land to be expropriated should be established approximately five feet to the west of the existing property line. The five foot strip should extend southerly from the triangle piece (i.e. from parcel B). The existing easement rights should remain in place and should not be expropriated;*

which in the opinion of the Inquiry Officer is fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the City's objectives, are as follows:

- *Endorsing the recommendation creates a potential liability, in which the City is required to service and maintain the Fire Hall by encroaching upon private property (i.e. the five feet retained by the expropriated party).*
- *The intent of the recommendation can be accommodated through an easement agreement with the adjacent property owners.*
- *If the expropriation plan is confirmed, the Public Service would consider an easement agreement with the adjacent property owners at their request, which would give the City ownership over the disputed laneway (approximately the most westerly five feet of the laneway) while still providing access to the laneway to the adjacent owners.*
- *It is uncertain whether the City could secure an easement on the disputed laneway if ownership of the laneway resides with the expropriated party.*
- *Furthermore, the cost and terms of an easement with the expropriated property are also uncertain.*
- *Therefore, it is in the City's best interests to make and confirm the Amended Declaration of Expropriation.*

Councillor Orlikow: So moved.

Madam Speaker: Any speakers?

Councillor Eadie: Motion 1 is which property?

Madam Speaker: It is the Taylor property.

Councillor Eadie: Taylor property?

Madam Speaker: Yes, 1780 Taylor. Okay, any further speakers? Councillor Orlikow, I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, we now have Motion 2 before us. Councillor Orlikow, do you wish to introduce it?

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

WHEREAS

(a) Pursuant to its By-law No. 47/2014, The City of Winnipeg ("the City") authorized the expropriation of the lands described therein for the purpose of extending and widening St. Matthews Avenue and widening St. James Street for Polo Park Area Infrastructure Improvements, and executed a Declaration of Expropriation dated May 27, 2014;

(b) Notice of the intended expropriation was served by the City upon all owners of the lands intended to be expropriated, and was published in a newspaper having general circulation in the locality in which the said lands are situate, pursuant to section 1 of Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act;

(c) Notices of objection to the intended expropriation were served upon the City by some of the said owners, pursuant to section 3 of Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act;

(d) The City requested the Minister of Justice to appoint an inquiry officer;

(e) The Minister of Justice on September 29, 2014 appointed an inquiry officer pursuant to section 4(2) of Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act, and an inquiry was conducted on October 1, 2, 3, and November 17, 2014; and

(f) The inquiry officer obtained an Order dated October 21, 2014 from The Honorable Mister Justice Clearwater of the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench that the time for the Confirming Authority to make an order with respect to the Declaration of Expropriation is extended to March 30, 2015.

AND WHEREAS the inquiry officer submitted his report to the City on January 30, 2015, wherein he stated that in his opinion the intended expropriation is fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the objectives of the City, subject to the following recommendations:

1) to increase the amount of land being expropriated from the property located at 1688 St. Matthews Avenue from a partial taking to a full taking;

2) to increase the amount of land being expropriated from the property located at 890 St. James Street from a partial taking to a full taking;

3) with regard to 496 and 500 Madison Avenue:

a) that a median cut be allowed off of St. Matthews Avenue onto the property to allow continued access;

b) that traffic signals be installed at the Madison Street and St. Matthews intersection or on Kensington Street if the City would allow reconstruction and access off of St. Matthews Avenue;

c) that the Kensington Street intersection at St. Matthews Avenue be a four-way intersection in the same manner as the Silver Avenue and Kensington Street intersection was developed; and

d) that access to 496 and 500 Madison Avenue be at right angles to Kensington Street off of St. Matthews Avenue.

AND WHEREAS The Expropriation Act provides that Council of the City shall consider the report of the inquiry officer, and where Council makes an order confirming the intended expropriation which is not in accordance with the opinion of the inquiry officer, Council shall state its reasons for making the order.

AND WHEREAS under The Expropriation Act the City cannot expropriate land from a Crown Agency unless the Crown Agency gives its prior consent. The Public Service had intended to obtain the consent of Manitoba Hydro to include 1649 St. Matthews Avenue (identified as Parcels F, G and M in the Declaration of Expropriation dated May 27, 2014) in the expropriation; however, it has been unable to finalize an agreement for this purpose at present time due to a Hydro

plant in the vicinity that must be resolved first. The Public Service intends to finalize the acquisition of 1649 St. Matthews Avenue separately from the expropriation so as not to postpone confirmation of the entire expropriation proceeding.

AND WHEREAS under The Expropriation Act Council of the City may confirm the Declaration with such modification thereof as it considers proper;

AND WHEREAS it is advantageous that the City proceed with the expropriation of the lands described in By-law No. 47/2014 with the following exceptions:

- *to delete Manitoba Hydro properties identified as Parcels F, G and M from the lands to be expropriated.*

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation made May 27, 2014, executed pursuant to By-law No. 47/2014 and expropriating the following lands:

The lands taken for Works and shown as Parcels A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, J, K, M, N and P on Plan Deposit 522/2014 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

The lands described above are expropriated free of encumbrances, except for Parcel H on (amended) Plan Deposit 522/2014 WLTO which is expropriated subject to Canadian National Railway Company Easement Declaration No. 2587830/1, registered in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office on April 18, 2001 and Canadian National Railway Company Caveat No. 3267550/1, registered in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office on March 23, 2006.

The lands described above except:

a) mines, minerals and named substances which are excepted from or not included in the Certificate of Title of the registered owner of the surface under The Real Property Act or are not owned by the owner of the surface under The Registry Act; and

b) reservations in favour of the Crown as excepted from the Title of the owner of the surface, or to which Title is subject by implication under the provisions of The Real Property Act.

BE AMENDED to provide that the lands described are as follows:

The lands taken for Works and shown as Parcels A, B, C, D, E, H, J, K, N and P on Plan Deposit 522/2014 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

AND BE AMENDED to replace the original Plan Deposit 522/2014 WLTO with a revised version which:

- *deletes Parcels F, G and M from the lands to be expropriated.*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation dated May 27, 2014, as amended herein and thereby replaced by an Amended Declaration of Expropriation dated March 25, 2015, is hereby confirmed.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Council's reasons for proceeding with the partial expropriation of the property located at 1688 St. Matthews Avenue, rather than a full taking which in the opinion of the Inquiry Officer is fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the City's objectives, are as follows:

- *There was no evidence (i.e. financial data) provided at the hearing to prove the affected property was no longer commercially viable as a result of the taking.*

- *The affected owner has the ability to forward their position at the Land Value Appraisal Commission (LVAC) for the purposes of compensation.*

- *A full taking would increase land acquisition costs and create a liability for the City due to the maintenance of an existing building on the property.*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Council's reasons for proceeding with the partial expropriation of the property located at 890 St. James Street, rather than a full taking which in the opinion of the Inquiry Officer is fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the City's objectives, are as follows:

- *There was no evidence (i.e. financial data) provided at the hearing to prove the affected property was no longer commercially viable as a result of the taking.*

- *The affected owner has the ability to forward their position at the Land Value Appraisal Commission (LVAC) for the purposes of compensation.*

- *A full taking would increase land acquisition costs and create a liability for the City due to the maintenance of an existing building.*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Council's reasons for proceeding with the expropriation of the property located at 496 and 500 Madison Avenue, without implementing the installation of traffic controls and a median cut, which in the opinion of the Inquiry Officer is fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the City's objectives, are as follows:

- *Creating a median cut would disrupt eastbound traffic on St. Matthews Avenue and increase the risk of rear end collisions, since an eastbound storage lane cannot be accommodated due to the presence of a westbound left turn lane at this location.*

- *The median cut would also require eastbound traffic on St. Matthews Avenue to navigate through the westbound storage lane which could create collisions; the median cut would not align with Kensington Street, which could generate improper turning movements.*

- *Installing traffic controls at St. Matthews Avenue and Kensington Street would not meet City guidelines for signal control and would create safety issues, queuing issues and vehicle delay.*

- *Installing traffic controls at St. Matthews Avenue and Madison Street would not meet City guidelines, would unduly delay vehicle movements and could create safety issues.*

- *Installing pedestrian traffic control is deemed unnecessary since the St. Matthews Avenue extension will include creating sidewalks within the right-of-way (none existed before) and the site is within close proximity to an existing crossing (Route 90 and St. Matthews Avenue).*

- *Therefore, it is in the City's best interests to make and confirm the Amended Declaration of Expropriation.*

Councillor Orlikow: So moved.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Gillingham, you're noted in opposition to that. Thank you. Okay, we'll now move on to By-laws from Property and Development. Councillor Orlikow?

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

Councillor Orlikow: I'll move that the following By-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 13/2015, 32/2015, 33/2015, 41/2015.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 13/2015, 32/2015, 33/2015 and 41/2015.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Orlikow: I move that By-laws No. 13/2015, 32/2015, 33/2015 and 41/2015 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law 31/2015, 32/2015, 33/2015 and 41/2015.

Madam Speaker: Okay, now we'll move on to question period for the Chair.

Councillor Orlikow: Nope. I have one more. One more time.

Madam Speaker: Do you have one more?

Councillor Orlikow: I move that rules be suspended and By-laws numbered 13/2015, 32/2015, 33/2015 and 41/2015 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period. Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Madam Speaker. Just more of a question for information. I'm aware the department staff are working on a policy with regards to multiple-family housing grants in terms of encouraging this and I think this is extremely welcome news. The last time we had a mixed-use multiple family housing grant program or a multiple-family housing grant program, it's been expired for some time. There used to be a targeted program in different parts of the City that targeted older neighbourhoods, neighbourhoods that need renewal that just need that extra help sometimes in terms of cost of land assembly, sometimes in costs associated with servicing, but it did make a difference in certain areas of our City to allow for density and the type of density that is positive and helping to renew older neighbourhoods. How far are we away from seeing the newest or the latest program come forward in terms of that program?

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. I'll have to get back to you with that information. I'll do so forthwith.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. To the Chairperson of Property, Planning and Development, we heard today discussion about the Louise Bridge and a requirement that there's a secondary plan for South Point Douglas. I'm not sure if he's aware of all that study but South Point Douglas is kind of the CP Rail main line, is a split from there, and the Louise Bridge, which happens to be in my ward which is basically North Point Douglas. I'm just wondering if he knows of whether or not, when they're looking at the secondary plan for South Point Douglas, which is kind of between the river and Waterfront Drive, I believe it is. I'm wondering if there is any consideration in terms of secondary plans related to just on the east…on the north side of the CP Rail mainline around where the Louise Bridge is.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Than you Councillor Eadie. Secondary Plans, Planned Development Overlays, Area Plans, and Precinct Plans…I'll have to get back to him specifics about the South Point Douglas Secondary Plan, but I think I should take this opportunity to forewarn all Council, we will be allowing the Administration to come forward with their recommendations on what plans that they feel has the most value at one time, because we have so many requests in

the queue right now for secondary plans and the budget that we did support, and I'll give a shout-out to the PP&D fellows, there isn't funds in there to do all the secondary plans we want to do right now, so we will be coming by with a full listing for Council's consideration and I'll find out…I think it's in a month or two but I'll get confirmation on that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Yes next question?

Councillor Eadie: Just a follow up, my question is still part of the same question. I guess my question should have been more, what is the actual scope of the South Point Douglas Secondary Plan, because we know they are going to be working on it if we're proceeding with…we put millions of dollars into studying Louise Bridge and BRT's.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Orlikow: No problem Councillor Eadie, that I'll get that information for you. I don't have any specifics on either of the plans in the works now, with the specifics as far as the scope I'm not too sure about as well, but I'll get that information to you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Chair? Okay seeing none, we will move onto the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. We have no report, no motions, no by-laws. Question Period for the Chair. Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Madam Speaker. Just a question through to the Chair, in light of the budget passing on Monday and the motion that we had in terms of the amendment to pools and the marketing of pools, would the Chair be able to let us know how soon we will get an idea from the Public Service in terms of the marketing of pools and also any kind of impact on services based on the budget?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker. I'd like to thank my learned colleague from Transcona for the question. I don't have any updates on that right now but I will certainly endeavour to get back to you.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Seeing none, Councillor Pagtakhan will move that we adjourn for today. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Roll call, Mr. 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 Councillor Wyatt.

Council adjourned at 4:36 p.m.