COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, January 27, 2016

The Council met at 9:50 a.m.

The clerk advised the speaker that a quorum was present.

The speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Browaty.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: I would like to take this opportunity to introduce our page for today's meeting, someone that is very familiar to us, Katrina Chanas of Miles Macdonell Collegiate and she resides in the North Kildonan Ward. Thank you so much for being here today, Katrina. Before I recognize the Mayor to make his announcements today, I will note that Council will be recessing at noon and it is my pleasure to host a tour today during that time, of an exhibit that the Manitoba Museum currently has featured. It is called, 'Nice Women Don't Want the Vote'. It is very timely that City Council will take in this tour today as tomorrow is the anniversary celebrating an important human rights milestone. It is the 100th anniversary of Manitoba women given the right to vote. Mr. Mayor

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker and thank you for your words on that very important milestone. I do have a few remarks to share with Council today. I first want to start by welcoming all those in the gallery as well as those watching on television and Livestream. Today is our first Council meeting of 2016 and I hope that all Councillors and all those watching had a happy and a safe holiday season, I really look forward to the coming year and all the work that we have ahead of us. I want to begin my remarks by acknowledging the passing earlier this month of former City of Winnipeg, Anne Jorowski. Ms Jorowski was first elected to City Council in 1974 and was a dedicated advocate for East Kildonan residents and for our City for 15 years. She worked tirelessly to better and brighten the community through her work as a councillor, as Deputy Mayor, as a social activist and as a volunteer. And our thoughts and our prayers go out to the countless friends, relatives and colleagues who were touched by her generous spirit and for all the work that she undertook for our community. As you pointed out, Madam Speaker, exactly 100 years ago tomorrow, on January 28th, 1916, some Manitoba women were the first in Canada to be granted the right to vote. After many years of pressure by savvy political pioneers, most notably, Nellie McClung, the Manitoba Government under the leadership of Premier T.C. Norris granted some women in Manitoba full suffrage. This was an undeniable Canadian human rights milestone. Manitoba is home to an outstanding number of strong, successful women who are role models and leaders in their communities. And I note the many community leaders who are women in this Council Chamber today, making a difference for our community. And yet, 100 years ago women were only just being awarded the very basic right to vote. I'm proud Manitoba led the way in this monumental development which is now regarded as the first in a series of important changes allowing women to take their rightful place in our democratic society. We have come a long way over the last century but it is sobering to remind ourselves that Canada's journey towards universal suffrage took many decades. It's important to remember Canada's First Nations only obtained the right to vote in Provincial elections in Manitoba in 1952 and were not permitted to vote in Federal elections without giving up treaty rights and registered status until 1960. I participated in two announcements earlier this month with the Province of Manitoba. Earlier this month, former Premier Jean Charest was announced as the Chair of the task force to study the issue of rail rationalization in Winnipeg and I'm very pleased that Mr. Charest has agreed to lead this effort. I continue to be encouraged by the Province's renewed focus on rail rationalization and I want the City to be continuing to work as an involved partner. Moving forward, it's essential that decisions are based on accurate information and analysis and this task force will play an important role in this regard. Equally important is to ensure appropriate levels of engagement and consultation with those affected. As such, I have asked Councillor Allard to assume an active role in the task force and I want to thank him for stepping up to assist. I do feel Councillor Allard will make an important contribution to the task force efforts particularly as it relates to the principles of inclusivity as well as identifying key societal and economic impacts moving forward. True North Square was another one from this past month that represents a major redevelopment for our downtown, has the potential to truly be transformative. Together with the Province of Manitoba, we announced earlier this month that an investment of $17.6 million through tax increment financing and under the existing Shed Agreement would go towards public spaces within the True North Square Project. A further investment of up to $9 million, again

financed through tax increment financing as well, has been identified to fund additional public amenities within the Shed District. This further investment, however, does require review and approval by City Council and administration will be bringing forward a full report and recommendation for Council's review. January 22nd marked the one year anniversary following the Macleans article that we've talked about a lot in this chamber and in our community. Over the last year we have been working hard at building bridges, strengthening relationships and better embracing diversity. As I reflect on the events of the last year I believe our community responded to the Macleans article with honesty and with humility and we knew that we could not and we cannot mend the profound wrongs and injustices of generations and centuries in one year with a single summit or single press conference. But, I, and I know all of you remain committed to the journey. Over the last year and at the event last Friday, it was heartwarming to see the number of people and organizations both private sector and public sector who are working every day in our community to better embrace diversity, empathy and dignity for all of our citizens. I was pleased last Friday to declare 2006 as the year of reconciliation for Winnipeg. And it's my hope that this will build on the years of important work by the Truth and Reconciliation and all of our grass roots organizations. And I look forward to working with this Council over the coming year to continue collaborating on how we can implement the calls to action that are directed at municipalities in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's final report. I also want to take a moment today to acknowledge that we have recently learned that Rolly Fox has been diagnosed with lung cancer. Rolly Fox is the father of Terry Fox, and I have to say, one of the most touching moments that I have had since beginning serving as Winnipeg's Mayor was to be able introduce my son to Terry Fox's dad. And I want to wish him all the very best and I want to wish all those the very best that are battling cancer and other ailments and diseases. I wish Rolly, as well as others in our community the strength and the courage that Terry Fox demonstrated to the world in his battle with cancer. On a lighter note, I want to acknowledge the Red River Creative Communications class, instructors Joanne Kelly and James Turner and I believe 60 students that are in the gallery, we want to welcome you here today and ask you to be kind in your coverage of our deliberations, of course. Lastly, I want to recognize the United Way which is celebrating its 50th anniversary here in Winnipeg this year. Fifty years of caring, compassion and kindness in our City and that really is amazing. Winnipeggers are the most charitable people in Canada and many Winnipeggers go that extra mile each and every day to demonstrate compassion and commitment to making a difference in our City. There is no doubting the tremendous impact that the United Way has had over the last 50 years on the lives of families in every corner of our City, and every ward. I want to wish them all the very best. Thank you very much, merci and megwich.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. On to Councillor Lukes for her announcement.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I would just like to say a few words commemorating a momentous Canadian human rights milestone that occurred 100 years ago tomorrow on January 28th, 1916. One hundred years ago tomorrow the Manitoba Legislature amended the Manitoba Elections Act. For the first time in our province's history, some, not all women could vote in Provincial elections. Our indigenous sisters federal right to vote followed some 45 years later. I have a profound sense of pride, respect and gratitude for the many women and supporting men who pioneered forward organizing, collaborating and leading the charge in securing a legitimate democracy. I've done some pioneering myself in a few fields and understand the passion and know what they would have had to possess to move forward on this issue. Equal participation is essential to building and sustaining democracy and we know it has a profoundly positive impact on our communities and citizens' lives. Our friends in the City Archives Department assisted in summarizing some interesting women at City Hall. In 1921, Jessie Kirk was the first woman elected to City Council. Jessie strongly believed women can render great service to the community. By all accounts, Lillian Hallonquist was an agent of change in the early 50s holding chair positions on many committees such as Finance, Health, Urban Renewal and Public Works. And in 1992, Susan Thompson was elected, and as to date, as Winnipeg's only female Mayor. Since 1921, 32 women have held office at City Hall bringing forward positive developments in our city and helping make democracy deliver a fair and balanced approach. Winning the vote was a significant first step in a movement seeking fundamental and political and social change but it's far from over. Women remain under-represented both civically, provincially and nationally and we have come a long way but have a long way to go. I am very thankful for the amazing work done over 100 years ago and know that I and others have a responsibility to all women to continue supporting our involvement in the political environment. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. On to Councillor Wyatt for his announcement today

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you very much Madam Speaker. To everybody out there who are watching on television as well to our leaders in the public...in the media, if they could take note of this and send the message out it would be greatly appreciated. There is a young woman in Transcona, I'll just read this short write up here, Madam Speaker if I may. Sam Dubas is a brave young 18-year-old woman whose biggest wish in life is just to be normal. She shares the dreams and hopes of every person her age; education, employment, relationships, hobbies and passions. While others her age look forward to getting out with friends and family, celebrating, having fun and planning for the future, Sam's concerns are more moment-to-moment. Sure, she has dreams and aspirations. Right now it's a good day if she is not at the doctor or being rushed by ambulance to the hospital. Her days are mostly filled with unexplained pain, unwanted

medication and at times the inability to even get out of bed. Doctors and specialists have been working with Sam but there are so many unknowns. This is frustrating for Sam and her loved ones but she continues to fight to finance her treatments and a way to feel normal once again. She hasn't felt this way for a number of years now. Although she has been blessed with times of normalcy to accomplish more in her hobbies, it has been touch work even where she was not able to continue doing it. A year ago, Sam was tested and diagnosed with a seizure disorder which has made everyday tasks difficult and sometimes impossible. Along with other medical conditions, this has taken a huge toll on her quality of life. A few months ago she was diagnosed with severe anxiety panic disorder, PTSD and depression, and now being left alone has not been possible. Fear of being alone, to leave the house or having seizures, even in front of her own family and friends has crippled her. But there is hope. While the service dog doesn't answer all Sam's issues, and I just want to clarify, the community is raising money right now to purchase for her a dog, and this dog is a special dog that's bred that actually is trained to sense when the seizure is coming on, and it allows her to lay down and prepare for the seizure. And she is actually having right now to wear a hockey helmet because of the seizures happening where she falls and can injure herself. The community on the weekend had a fundraising bud, spud and steak night, they raised $4,000. The community has raised so far slightly over $10,000. If anyone out there wishes to donate I would be definitely welcome. She was involved with horsing so the Manitoba Equine Expo is involved with her to raise these funds. If there is anybody out there who wishes to donate, they can contact my office at rwyatt@winnipeg.ca or (204) 986-8087, or they can contact directly the Manitoba Equine Society as well on their website at Manitoba Equine Expo on their website to assist and anything that can be done by anybody would be greatly appreciated at this time. Thank you, Madam Speaker

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further?

Councillor Wyatt: Just on another note, I just want to…I wasn't at the press conference on Friday and there was conference and the event held here at the City Hall by the Mayor with regards to racism and the need for greater inclusion and reconciliation, I just want to thank the Mayor for leading that process. I believe that it's a crucial process for our City that this year as he is identified as a year of reconciliation, I think our hopes are high and our expectations are high that we can achieve some great things here and the idea of that in December, we will have an accord of some sort or some sort or some sort of policy piece to go forward to address the great inequalities and to change our City dramatically in terms of the divide that exists, and in many ways exists today more than it did even a hundred years ago in 1919. Where there was based on class and now it's race and class and I want to thank the Mayor for leading the effort. I think it's an honourable effort, I think it's a noble effort, and I think all of us should assist in this effort together because it's going to be the future of our City. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. The next speaker is Councillor Allard

Councillor Allard: Thank you Speaker Sharma. Just to warn my colleagues that I plan to speak la langue de Moliere to commemorate the Festival du Voyageur. I just want to invite everybody to come out February 12th to 21, 2016 but I have a bit of a write up on the Festival I would like to read.

Translation of French spoken:

Councillor Allard: Every winter since 1970, Saint-Boniface, Winnipeg's French quarter, is transformed into a winter paradise and becomes host to the largest winter festival in Western Canada. Voyageur, Métis and First Nations histories are brought back to life, not only through the historical interpretation offered inside reconstructed Fort Gibraltar, but also through the many attractions inside Voyageur Park and at the festival's various official sites. Music of old, traditional cuisine, sensational snow sculptures and captivating shows are but a few examples of the entertainment you can expect to witness during this convivial gathering. Offering a vast array of historical, recreational and educational activities, Festival du Voyageur has something for all tastes and all ages! So, from February 12th to February 21st, 2016, come visit Voyageur Park and our various official sites to bask in the joviality of French Canadian culture. Surrounded by great music and amazing foods, in a spirited atmosphere, you will have no choice but to reembody the spirit of the Voyageurs!

Councillor Allard: I would also like to thank Mayor Bowman for coming out last year, I know he was out with his family, I saw it on Twitter. Very good and I invite you to come out this year again if you are available. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Next is we will hear from Councillor Cindy Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: It's an honour for me to stand up in this chamber remembering the work of Nellie McClung and the many women that came before me here today. My area is the home of Nellie McClung, there is a little plaque outside of the house and we actually have a park in the area that recognizes the work that she has done. And we still have lots of work to do and I know that there's lots of young people here in the crowd today and I know that they can take on some of those challenges. We have a little group of activists in the Spence Neighbourhood that are looking at activist issues

and they'll be joining me tomorrow celebrating the 100 years of activism and the women's right to vote. So, thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. Speaking of women in democracy, it was an honour for me to represent defacto the City of Winnipeg at the funeral of former City Councillor, Ann Jorowski who represented East Kildonan in a couple of ways; once representing in the first 50-seat chamber of City Council, a portion of East Kildonan from 1974 on and in the 1980s, Mrs. Jorowski succeeded in bridging to the expanded wards when we reduced the number of wards from 50 to 29. I also saw at the funeral previous Councillor Mark Lubosch and just to think of the history that Councillor Jorowski represents and her successors given her riding as it flowed over existing boundaries, such as Don Mitchelson and actually 1989 when she retired, she was directly succeeded, I believe, by Terry Duguid who is now a member of Parliament for Winnipeg South. But Terry Duguid got his start as a City Councillor in East Kildonan. As well, being succeeded by our current Councillor for North Kildonan, Jeff Browaty, as well as a later woman City Councillor, my successor for whom I was campaign manager, Lillian Thomas as well as previous Councillor Thomas Steen. I am pleased and challenged to be a successor of Ann Jorowski of East Kildonan because it's been obvious to me over the decades as I have been following her since a child. The standards of community involvement that the people of East Kildonan have accepted from their political representatives. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. If I could now ask the Clerk to read the Condolence Motion into the record, please.

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Browaty,
Seconded by Councillor Schreyer,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of former Councillor Anne Jorowski, which occurred on January 8, 2016.

Anne Jorowski served the citizens of Winnipeg as Councillor for the Leighton and Miles MacDonnell Wards, in the East Kildonan Community, from 1974 to 1989.

This Council extends to her family, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Madam Speaker: Will everyone please rise for a moment of silence?

(Moment of Silence)

MINUTES

Councillor Allard moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on December 9, 2015 be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Madam Speaker: We will now move on to delegations. This morning, we have Cindy Tugwell with us, she is the Executive Director of Heritage Winnipeg. She is in support of Items No. 12 and 13 of the report on the Standing Policy Committee on Property Development, Heritage and Downtown Development, the report dated January 12th, 2016. She is speaking regarding the additions to the list of historical resources; the Winnipeg Hotel, 214 Main Street and the McDonald Building which is 226 Main Street. And also, the list of historical resources; the Fortune Block, which is 232 Main Street. Welcome Ms Tugwell.

DELEGATIONS

Cindy Tugwell: Good morning, good morning Mayor, good morning Councillors, happy 2016. I am here as…in my capacity as Executive Director of Heritage Winnipeg, a position that I've held for almost 25 years, to have you…to urge you this morning to support the recommendation from the Historical Building and Resources Committee, the administrative report that was also recommended by the Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development on January 12th. The list of these three historical buildings on south Main Street, the Fortune Building, the McDonald Block and the Winnipeg Hotel are a rare set of buildings that go back to the 19th century, 1882. Historically significant, we've gone out to the community, I think the historical report speaks for itself as to the breath of historical value that these buildings have not only architecturally, but socially and culturally. Currently in the Fortune Building, there is Times Change, which has been there for 30 years. As far as I know, that is the only active business in the Fortune Block currently, but again, it speaks to the cultural value of some of the things that go in the rehabilitation of these heritage buildings. So we support…Heritage Winnipeg would like you to support these designations, without these designations this morning, these buildings will surely be demolished. So we have urged the developers that have come forward to look at possibly, still developing in Winnipeg, we think that there is value for them to invest in our great City, we would like them to look elsewhere so that we can protect these buildings. And recently at the Standing Committee for Property and Development, Mr. Pollard came forward, we're in a very good position, in this particular case, where he is prepared to invest in our downtown, invest in our City, not unlike the original owners, Mark Fortune and Alexander McDonald who were visionaries who believed our history was…it told a story about who we are as Winnipeggers, the tenacity and the visionaries that we really are. And he would like to come forward, if in fact these buildings are designated and the current owners of those two buildings, there's two individuals that own those three buildings, are prepared to sell them to rehabilitate them and Heritage Winnipeg along with Centreventure Development Corp., the Forks Renewal Corporation would also be partners in this journey to help and rehabilitate these buildings to have the synergy back into them, multiuse, to have street level activity again on south Main which would augment the already significant heritage projects like the Upper Fort Garry, the recent rehabilitation of Union Station and many other heritage buildings that have contributed, not only architecturally, socially, culturally, but immensely economically to this city from a tourism perspective, from an employment perspective. It makes good economic sense and environmentally, it certainly is sound to protect our buildings and not have them raised and go have the materials in the landfill. So, from all levels it's a win/win situation and I just wanted to add to this as a footnote, that we have been for many years, in discussions, we did a...in 2006, so ten years now, we did a buildings at risk data base with a…at that point, a cutting edge UK company. We brought them in, we funded it and the engineer came in from the UK to Winnipeg and we created a data base with over 600 heritage buildings that were all evaluated as to their risk. Obviously, we have a concern that these buildings bring forward...we can have them rehabilitated but it still doesn't address the concern of demolition by neglect and we would like to work with the City and have a maintenance By-law and some kind of tax credits and grants in place to continue to work with people like Mr. Pollard. We don't have many of them but to continue with incentives so that heritage rehabilitation makes great sense and it's a win/win for the City of Winnipeg. So I urge you today to support this recommendation. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms Tugwell. Are there any questions for our delegation today? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Since Ms Tugwell is here and presumably the best informed person in this building right now on these issues. When it comes to that area that we are discussing right now, because these buildings are 1800s, late 1800s, that's pre-asbestos era. And I would just be curious to know, given what we are going through right here at City Hall, if renovations since then have made asbestos an issue? Or just given its era of construction, whether we are able to bypass that whole era if asbestos is an issue at all?

Cindy Tugwell: Well, to my knowledge, there is not an asbestos issue. But we have a structural engineer's report just on the Fortune Building that was done on the main floor and the basement. The difficulty when these buildings are owned by someone else is we can't…we have to have owner's permission to do a thorough engineers report and inspection and that's what we hope to do now that hopefully there will be designated to do a thorough inspection and that will also include a perform-all on the cost to rehabilitate.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, you have a question?

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Briefly you mentioned Union Station and you've got an important event coming up at Union Station and talking about the rehabilitation there and I wonder if you could just...there is a project that I think eleven Councillors backed that's going to be unveiled on February 15th. I just wonder if you could speak in no great detail but just about…I think it's to the credit of the Council that we are able to cooperate, Councillor Dobson in particular put in a lot of work, I want to commend him, on this project commemorating World War One. The Province has done some projects, we're now doing one. I wonder if you can talk a bit about Union Station and the event on the 15th.

Cindy Tugwell: I think it's important when we talk about Union Station using it again as an example, we preserve these buildings and I love Winnipeg more than anyone and we preserve these buildings because of their unique architecture and certainly for their viable uses but, we have to remember it's about the people and Union Station certainly played a huge role in the first World War One with moving people, veterans in and out of the city for war. But, I think this is an opportunity to commemorate. So this World War One digital project will be housed, fittingly, in the rotunda of the former Union Station on Main Street, until November 2018 and it will recognize each month the veterans that lost their lives in Canada for our country. And again, to bring people to this building, so again, this building becomes important now because it's the link now between the Forks and Broadway. So now you have again, this clustering of people coming to the Forks for...as a national historic site with immense history and the meeting place certainly goes back to 6,000 years ago, you've got the Union Station and then bridging it to Upper Fort Garry and the history and certainly the birth place of Manitoba. So we are proud and I'd like to thank you again, Councillor Mayes, for leading the charge to get...and other Councillors, for funding this project for Heritage Winnipeg to undertake. We will be unveiling it fittingly on National Heritage Day, Louis Riel Day on Monday, February 15th and again, it's a free public event.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thanks Madam and I want to thank Heritage Winnipeg for their advocacy on this. I just wanted...it's a bit more of an, 'are you aware?' questions just because of your comments. I just wanted...you referred to the Heritage Tax Credits and I'm sure you're aware we…you in fact continue to have a Heritage Tax Credit Program that we have had for close to 30 years and is still there and it's a matter of continuing to fund it which is something that can be done and will be done. And then I guess the other thing, I just want to make sure you are aware that we are working on...when the new heritage By-law was passed, there was a commitment to work further on the issue of demolition by neglect and that is well under way. So I'm assuming you're aware of that?

Cindy Tugwell: Yes, I just wanted to add that we have these resources in our organization to work with you, the Historical Buildings Resources Committee and PP&D. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for our delegation today? Okay seeing none, thank you so much, Ms Tugwell for appearing today. Okay, we will now move on to the committee reports. First, we will deal with the Executive Policy Committee report of January 6th, 2016, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 6, 2016

Mayor Bowman: Thanks, Madam Speaker, I introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 4.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated January 13th, 2016.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 13, 2016

Mayor Bowman: Thanks, Madam Speaker, I introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 7.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on Item 1 through 4, 6 and 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 5 – Memorandum of Understanding between the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the City of Winnipeg - Manitoba Integrated High Risk Offender Unit

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks, I will wait to hear from the Councillor please.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie you have the floor.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I actually am in support of this particular motion. These contracts are essential for the Winnipeg Police Service to continue its work. However, I rise to speak on the issue because I have some concern and I'm not understanding why, but these particular...and actually, there was another...I stand it…No. 5 down but there are other contractual agreements that went through the EPC process and my concerns are simply...and I'm wondering why I don't understand. I sit on the Protection and Community Service and Parks Committee and standard process up until I think these contracts, has been that they come to Protection and Community Services Parks before they go on to EPC and then on to Council, Madam Speaker. So I am just wondering why these particular contracts, this one and the other ones that were on the agenda that we already passed, why they just went directly to EPC. And really, I'm curious, has something changed? I have been sitting on Protection and Community Services now ever since I was elected as City Councillor in 2010, and I am just wondering if things are changing with that standing committee and I would like to know if that is the case, that things are changing and things related to Police Service contracts, union negotiations...well actually, that's EPC, but other police matters that are really within the City's domain, Madam Speaker. Because we all know that the Winnipeg Police Board has a certain role, but its role is not one of entering into contractual agreements, it's a role of policy, ensuring appropriate budgets and so on. So I'm just wondering if somehow things have changed for Protection and Community Services which I have sat on and have not missed a single meeting since 2010 of Protection Community Services and now Parks. So I just leave it at that.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am truly grateful for Councillor Eadie's comments and concerns and his admission of lack of uncertainty. I have to share the same lack of certainty and thus concern. I as well sit on the Standing Committee for Protection, Community Services and Parks, which means I sit on the Standing Committee for Protection. It happens to be, Madam Speaker, that a few years ago, not long ago, we created the Winnipeg Police Board and that did change the relationship of the Standing Committee responsible for Protection and its relationship to the Winnipeg Police Services. That's true. And it may very well be, Madam Speaker, that in the few years that we have had the Winnipeg Police Service, maybe not all aspects have been completely ironed out or understood by all those involved. I'm not saying that there's been a problem exactly, seems to me that things work themselves out. Nonetheless, as we go forward, Madam Speaker, I have noticed that I have to be conscious of this. Now it happens to be in this case, Madam Speaker, that we are not dealing about the City...the Winnipeg Police Services, we are dealing about the Canadian Mounted Police and the City of Winnipeg. So on that basis it has nothing to do from what I understand in terms of any changing relationship between this Council and any Standing Committee and Police Services because we are not dealing with the Winnipeg Police Services. We are not dealing with the Winnipeg Police Board, we are dealing with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and thus it is an issue of protection as it states here. An understanding between the RCMP and the City of Winnipeg. So I too, have to express my concern about why this didn't go through the Standing Committee for Protection, Community Services and Parks.

Madam Speaker: Are there any further speakers on the Item? Okay, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks very much. I want to thank my colleagues for their comments and their questions. This...this contract is a negotiation between two levels of government. It has always been a matter of intergovernmental affairs when entering these types of contracts and that's why, process wise, it went through EPC. There are different roles that many of the relevant bodies have with respect to policing matters, of course, the Winnipeg Police Board as an example, does not have the authority to enter contracts on behalf of the City of Winnipeg. EPC, given its roles and responsibility is the appropriate forum to move it forward to this venue so ultimately all members of Council, regardless of committees, they may also serve on...ultimately have a say in moving it forward. This particular report and this memorandum of understanding is to outline the roles and responsibility of participants in the...in the Manitoba Integrated High Risk Offender Unit and so obviously it's something we want to support and would ask for Council's support to proceed as per the motion. Thank you. I'll call the question on Item No. 5, Memorandum of Understanding between the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the City of Winnipeg. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor on the report of EPC dated January 20th, 2016.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 20, 2016**

Madam Speaker: We will deal with...if you wanted to move consent for Item Nos. 2 to 9 because there are amending Motions for 1 and 10. So 6 is stood down by Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Eadie? Just a moment. I would like the Mayor to move Consent first.

Mayor Bowman: I would like to move Consent Agenda Items 1 through 10.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Seven, Councillor Gillingham? Eight, Councillor Eadie? Is that six? Six is already stood down, right. Okay, pardon me? (Inaudible) Yes. So I will call the question Mr. Clerk if you want to double-check this on Item Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

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

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce.

Mayor Bowman: I'll wait to hear from colleagues. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham if you would like to introduce your motion…amending motion.

Councillor Gillingham: Yes, thank you Madam Clerk. Motion No. 4 simply says, "Whereas January 20th, EPC recommended to Council that Ken Matchett be reappointed to the Winnipeg Police Board for a term of one year expiring on December 31st, 2016 and whereas Ken Matchett has since advised that he would be unable to fulfill his duties on the board, be it resolved that recommendation 18a of Item No. 1 on the report of EPC dated January 20th be amended to delete…by deleting the name 'Ken Matchett', that is the motion.

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

WHEREAS on January 20, 2016 the Executive Policy Committee recommended to Council that Ken Matchett be reappointed to the Winnipeg Police Board for a term of one year expiring on December 31, 2016.

AND WHEREAS Ken Matchett has since advised that he would be unable to continue to fulfill his duties on the Board.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that recommendation 18. A. of item 1 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated January 20, 2016 be amended by deleting the name "Ken Matchett".

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers on the motion or the main item? Councillor Gillingham, would you like to close on the motion?

Councillor Gillingham: I'll wait for the question.

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

Mayor Bowman: No, I have nothing to add, thanks.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: Excuse me Madam Speaker, if I may, I just wanted to address No. 15 and the reassignment of the members of the Winnipeg Committee for Safety.

Madam Speaker: Sorry, No.15? I don't believe we are on that report yet.

Councillor Schreyer: No, it's just 15 of the report.

Madam Speaker: I'm sorry, I'm not following you.

Councillor Schreyer: No. 15 within that report, within Report No. 1 of the citizen member appointments.

Madam Speaker: The Mayor has already closed on the item.

Councillor Schreyer: Fair enough.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie? Yes, I'll call the question on Item No. 1 and the amending motion. On the amending motion first. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Call the question on the item as amended. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 6 – Text Amendment – Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 100/2004 – DAZ 226/2015

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I'll wait to hear from colleagues, thanks.

Madam Speaker: This was stood down by yourself, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, Madam Speaker, I rise...this was dealt with at the committee but it's come to my attention that there is some important material facts that need to be addressed by the committee and specifically, page four where indicating that there was extensive consultation before the adoption of the By-law and that this was generally a housekeeping matter. These are the notes made in terms of the decision made by the committee and it's come to my attention that this is not just a housekeeping matter and that indeed, that consultation may have happened but there was also communication very much at the 11th hour in terms of this with the industry and others. So I just want to move a motion, Madam Speaker to refer back to the committee.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Mayes? The motion to refer…so with no specific instructions I think I need to call the question on that. Is that correct, Mr. Clerk? It's a motion to refer.

Councillor Gerbasi: Can you speak to something and then refer it after you've spoken? Is that…

Madam Speaker: I wasn't sure

Councillor Gerbasi: I was just checking on the point of order.

Madam Speaker: Referral has been requested, so I'll call the question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Oh, by who?

(Inaudible)

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Orlikow: Is there any discussion about referral? Or can we just say yea or nay to it?

Madam Speaker: Yah, I don't think we can do that at this time because…it is a referral motion so we're going to need to vote on that, the Mayor can rebut if he likes for three minutes. No? So, I'll call the question. It was asked to refer this back to where, Councillor Wyatt? To the Property and Development Committee to have some proper consultation with the industry.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order and maybe we can just confirm this with the Clerk, but I…isn't it...oh, you declined to speak against referral?

Madam Speaker: So, I'll call the question on the referral. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi: Could we have a recorded vote on that?

Madam Speaker: I think the question was called and...

Councillor Gerbasi: It's clear? Because it wasn't that clear what the...

Madam Speaker: Call for recorded vote is granted. All in favour of the referral back to the Committee, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Mayes, Schreyer, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Madam Speaker: All opposed, please rise.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Gerbasi, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Morantz, Orlikow and Pagtakhan

Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, yea six, nays ten.

Madam Speaker: Referral motion is lost. Councillor Mayes, do you have a point of order?

Councillor Mayes: I wanted to speak to the matter.

Madam Speaker: I don't believe we can do that in our procedure...oh yes, the item...the Mayor needs to...did the Mayor introduce the item already? So the referral motion was denied. Councillor Mayes, you now have the floor.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, and I think my question is probably more to, I know it's not a question...my comments, I guess, might be more something that the very capable Chair of Downtown, Councillor Orlikow could probably speak to, perhaps, rather than the Mayor…just, there are concerns that have been expressed to me by...the issue around the signage. We certainly have the very important Canada Summer Games coming up in 2017. As you'll know from the World Cup when people had to place stickers over every cup holder in the stadium, there's a certain requirement around making sure things don't have corporate names and I know that we have some downtown venues; Support for Life Centre, Convention Centre I believe is hosting Canada Games, Shaw Park is hosting Canada Games baseball so I just would like to get some clarity that people may have to remove signs, change the character of signs to play ball basically with the Canada Games and I don't want them to then have to have some difficulty or sort of be caught out procedurally. So it's a very technical point and I look forward to hearing, perhaps, from Councillor Orlikow who might be able to clarify some of the intent of the By-law. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next is Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I was at the Standing Committee and we had a very, very thorough discussion on this matter. And most of what is...if not all of what is being brought are some tweaks to the By-law that went through all the proper processes. In terms of the consultation, we did have some advocates from the sign industry at the meeting but there was a significant consultation on the sign aspect of this prior, very, very recently, within the last period of time, where a lot of work was done with the sign industry and they were...that was all done very, very thoroughly. And so, in this last iteration, essentially, I mean obviously, there is some resistance to some of the planning changes that were brought in prior and as part of going forward from a specific industry. So, I kind of think that it's a bit confusing to say that there wasn't proper consultation because...and maybe Councillor Orlikow can clarify that further if I missed something. But my understanding was that there was a very, very thorough consultation on our sign policy that in the downtown that went through all the processes and went through these, went through here and through the committee process. And that people have been heard. If that's the issue, if that's the reason why this would be sent back, we worked really hard on this for a number of years and now, at on the signage issues and now this particular thing, I mean, it could be sent back but I just believe that would be a waste of time. So I would just urge Council to support it. There's some really good…the By-law has some good impacts on the downtown. I don't think anyone's going to be making people take signage down that already exists. It only affects things as new people bring signage in and it's a very well thought out policy. A lot of work and public consultation went into so I think that's the main point I am trying to make which is why I'm pleased that it's moving forward. Thank you. Hopefully.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thank you. I just rise to speak to that and pardon me, I wasn't listening to my colleague, but...who was on the committee. But I just wanted to say though, I think that what's important to note about this is that the goals of this amendment to the zoning By-laws downtown is to establish a less commercialized more...might you say, a more friendlier area to the vision around the legislature, around the Forks and one other signature area. I understand the goals there in terms of attaining what kind of signage is up and all that kind of stuff, Madam Speaker. But I do have some concerns that are very reflective of Councillor Mayes, who makes some significant points. And I would

also like to just say though, that you know, many of the so-called grandfathered signs that exist today are there because they made things viable for whatever was established in the area. And yeah, I understand things change and move into the future like consideration of removing the walls at Portage and Main. But the reality is that a lot of the...and the signage industry is about an economic viability and being able to do things and I think that we should be concerned and really give a serious consideration to what already exists and whether or not it's appropriate to get rid of them. So, because really, Madam Speaker, we don't want to lose things that are already established. Viability is important for private industry and we shouldn't really get in the way unless new signs are being established and the rules under the zoning By-law, new signage is subject to new things. But I just have a real serious concern about having an effect on things that have been established and have been part of these particular areas, signature areas for a very long time. So, I actually will be...as it was not referred back, I will be voting against this particular report. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next is Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The motion before us today comes after a lot of work, there was a lot of compromise, a lot of back and forth from both sides on this issue. The new urbanists aren't necessarily happy with where it landed and some of the businesses aren't happy with where it landed, I think this is a good middle ground. My bigger concern is I hope that when it comes to anything to do with electronic message centres that the industry actually is policed. I find that after the one that is outside of the downtown zoning By-law, the rules in terms of the operation of the signs is not being enforced anywhere close to where it's supposed to be. Long transitions, animations that are all done on...almost all the signs that I pass every day on Henderson Highway and are contrary to the guidelines. So, where...when you talk about grandfathering, the actual usage of them is in fact new regulation and is being...does apply to the existing signs. In terms of new signs…and time limits and stuff, that of course would be under the new rules...or new signs would be under new rules but the old signs are still under the operational rules as well. So again, it's quite disappointing that we don't have the tools yet and we aren't enforcing this very well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, kind of ad-hoc-y, because it's really not mine as I'm just on the EPC agenda but I'll try to answer some questions here and go forward. Regarding Councillor Mayes' comments regarding the impact that it may have on Canada Games signage, if you look at Attachment Schedule B, there is nothing about signs being removed. Councillor Eadie also spoke about that. There is nothing about removing signs that presently exist, forcing owners to get rid of their signs. The one that is in there is that if you actually do remove that sign you are not grandfathered in to have a new sign. You have come down by with the conditional…go for a conditional use to get a new sign put in if you want that same sign that doesn't meet our existing By-law. So the grandfathering provision that's kind of shortened down so again, they would remove the sign…and we are not forcing them to but if they choose to remove the sign because of building configuration, when they put up a new sign up, it needs to conform to our existing By-law. It also talks a little bit...again, I recommend everybody goes to Schedule B, for example, part of our existing sign By-law is you can't use illuminated signs to do way finding. So you had to use a placard, we don't want buildings having these little shots of light coming out of it. There is some talk about in here as well clarifying kind of where do we think parking at grade parking should be going and orientation to the streetscaping beside or behind, not in front, so a little bit of clarification in that. But again...so that's all there in Schedule B. So again, we are not trying to take signs away from people presently that they have or not have and there is still that opportunity for the industry to come forward to ask for a variance or a change. On the matter of consultation with the neighbourhood, well again, Councillor Wyatt in our committee, when we met about this prior, the issue was raised that the industry said we still haven't had time to look at this, ok, so we saw no harm in postponing this motion at the committee level for a month to allow the industry the opportunity to actually to have…to do their job and look it through and let us know what they thought. And they came and they presented so there was consultation, both on the overall sign By-law and then also, on this piece as well with the industry, so...and so I think that is done. So, the merits of referring it back to PP&D, I don't see a lot of merits in that. We have had consultations, it is tweaking in regards to, we're not taking…no punitive things here of taking signs down, it's just letting some of the grandfathering and clarifying some of the at grade parking.

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

Councillor Wyatt: I just want to rise to thank Councillor Orlikow for clarifying. The previous speaker on the floor of Council did say something which was material.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order. I believe Councillor Wyatt already spoke to the clause.

Madam Speaker: That was a referral motion, he did not speak to the clause.

Councillor Gerbasi: Oh, it was a referral motion, I'm sorry. Thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: In the name of transparency and openness I now have an opportunity to speak. I just wanted to thank Councillor Orlikow for raising and clarifying the fact that what was said by the previous speaker, wasn't going to name the member of Council, but now I will, Councillor Gerbasi, who admits to let Council in terms of the information, namely the fact that anybody who has an existing sign will be grandfathered in the event the sign is taken down and a new one is put up of a similar nature that as Councillor Orlikow rightly pointed out, with the change of this by-law will require a public hearing conditional use, which before it was permitted, but I want to clarify that. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Mayor Bowman: I have nothing further to add, thanks.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Nay. Carried. Now moving on, Mr. Clerk, to the next Item.

Item 7 – Kinsmen Club of Winnipeg – Revised Naming Right Sponsorship

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks, Madam Speaker. This is a revision to the sponsorship agreement for Sherbrook Pool. This revision is being made so that the naming will begin to coincide with the opening of the pool later this year after extensive renovations. I have to add, I spent a lot time at Sherbrook Pool over the years, I used to lifeguard, teach swimming lessons there when I was much younger and in much better shape than I am now. I remember at that time, it was in the early 90s, many of the lifeguards and instructors, myself included, were urging our supervisors and the City to invest in infrastructure improvements to the facility. Sadly, those didn't occur to the extent that they should have and I'm very pleased that previous Council moved forward, working with the community, to restore a very valuable facility in that part of the community which it goes a long way in terms of recreation needs of the community. So I'm sure like all members of Council and the community, very anxious to see it finally opened. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Gillingham, I believe you stood this down.

Councillor Gillingham: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. I rise to support this motion but it just gives an opportunity, I think, to really highlight the sponsorship opportunities. And I commend previous Council. I believe the 2007 Council approved City of Winnipeg sponsorship policy the report says...what I would like I think...given that this is an investment by the Kinsmen Club of...a total of a million dollars, first of all, to commend the Kinsmen Club for their partnership with the City of Winnipeg in this regard. But just like to highlight also, that I think that these sponsorship opportunities stand as a real...in many ways a revenue opportunity for the City of Winnipeg and as we go from year to year talking about the need for revenue where we can find it, I wonder if we could see this expanded, the sponsorship opportunities, some clarity around, some focus around and really some highlight around this program and to be quite frank I'm not sure which...to which Standing Policy Committee or EPC, this sponsorship program reports. But I just think there may be opportunity here and I just rise to kind of flag that and for all members of Council. And again, to commend the Kinsmen Club for their partnership. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I rise in support of this motion. The Sherbrook Pool is in my ward and I know that Councillor Gerbasi, too and Councillor Orlikow has residents that use the facility and I want to thank Kinsmen Club and the Provincial Government for their support and getting Sherbrook Pool reopened and we are looking forward to it this spring, actually. So thank you very much.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Sherbrook Pool has a long history and that sometimes controversial, that we are now at this stage of reinvestment and renovation. I think it is apt as we look upon our history and recent history, to thank those who have been fighting to keep the pool open, such as previous Councillor Harvey Smith, community activists such as Marianne Cerilli. I'd also like to point out that the Mayor said that back when he swam in the pool, that he was in much better shape than he is now, I'd just like to mention, Madam Speaker, that now that he is Mayor I understand that he can run marathons. And on that basis, I should recommend to the Mayor that he not underestimate his political endurance.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers on the Item? Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Bowman: Sorry, I need a minute to compose myself. I have never run a marathon. Political marathons is another thing that I know we all know too well. I have nothing further to add. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, I will call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 8 – Results of Downtown Taxicab Strategy Pilot Project – Taxi Stand and Loading Zones

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madame Speaker, I will wait to hear from Council colleagues first.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So I had another meeting when this came to EPC so I missed the verbal discussion about the report on the outcomes of the pilot project for utilizing some of the areas in downtown for taxicab stands. And I note in here that EPC's recommendation is that we receive the report as information, so what I'm trying to determine and maybe this can be explained upon close. But as a Councillor who sits on the Taxicab Board and as a Councillor who utilizes taxi services quite extensively in this city, I am just concerned as to...if we are receiving this report as information, there was a discussion that there would be a reduction in the amount of money collected in certain parking areas that would be utilized as taxicab stands and I am very concerned though, that in order to be part of a good transportation system in the City of Winnipeg and as many of you may have heard, that there is an industry study going on, starting...a lot of the underlying research will be done and there will be big community consultations, Madam Speaker, after the next provincial election and the public will be discussed as to what kind of changes or what are the needs and what are the uses of taxicab stands. But as I understand it, in talking to the drivers, these taxi stands are essential. They work really well. The drivers find that they can provide a better service for the people who may need a taxi at certain hours or certain times and they are able to load and unload easily and I think that it's really essential that we, as the City of Winnipeg contribute to the betterment and the improvement of the service of the existing taxi industry as it stands. So Madam Speaker, upon close, I just want to understand, there is some budget implications as I can see and there is a reading of 2015-2019. I just want to, before I vote on just receiving this report as information, this sounds like it may have budget implications and I'd like to know if this is being considered in the budget and will continue to allow what was a pilot project, to let it continue into the future for our taxi industry. So I'll leave it at that. I'm not voting either way until I understand what the decision is in regards to continuing this plan in the downtown area for taxicab stands.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thanks very much, Madam Speaker. The results of the downtown taxicab strategy pilot project result after a successful pilot was used, using specific zones at taxi stands that the Parking Authority will make those stands permanent, my understanding is there was representation at EPC and the industry from what we understand is supportive of these changes. The lost revenue is being taken into account...into consideration in the Winnipeg Parking Authority's business plans.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on the item. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 10 – CN Rail Cost Apportionment and Capital Budget Amendment – Plessis Road Twinning and Grade Separation at CN Rail, & Southwest Transitway (Stage 2) and Pembina Highway Underpass

Madam Speaker: Motion No. 7 goes with this item. Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a cost sharing agreement between the City of Winnipeg and CN Rail for the Plessis Road twinning and grade separation. I'll wait to hear from Council colleagues. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt to introduce Motion No. 7 regarding this item.

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

WHEREAS the Plessis Road Underpass twinning and grade separation and the Pembina Highway/Southwest BRT Underpass is subject to the Canadian Transportation Agency cost apportionment for grade separations;

AND WHEREAS in the past, it has been recognized that said cost apportionment, per a rail authority, was based on 15% of the costs related to the construction of a grade separation, when the project has been initiated by the local roads authority, and that in the event an agreement cannot be arrived at between the railroad authority and the local road authority, a mediation process exists as well as an arbitration process through the Canadian Transportation Agency;

AND WHEREAS the report named "Report of the Executive Policy Committee, January 20 2016, Item No.10. CN Rail Cost Apportionment & Capital Budget Amendment-Plessis Road Twinning and Grade Separation at CN Rail at Southwest TransitWay (Stage 2) and Pembina Highway Underpass" is a title which is neither transparent nor descriptive of the report, where, in its Executive Summary Discussion of said report, alludes to an agreement where the City will grant repayment of CN grade separation costs for both said projects in the event the rail corridors are relocated, between now and 2035;

AND WHEREAS the costs associated with said repayments are not minor in nature, as indicated on page 5 of the Executive Summary Discussion, final paragraph, that "Should the City determine that the rail lines be relocated such that there is no physical rail crossing in service: (i)At Pembina Highway before 2035, the City will reimburse CN $280,000 for every year before 2035 that the rail crossing is physically closed; and that (ii)At Plessis Road before 2035, the City will reimburse CN $375,000 for every year before 2035 that the rail crossing is physically closed";

AND WHEREAS the Report Recommendations do not outline any said repayments required to CN in the event of railway relocation;

AND WHEREAS the recommendations in question, grant delegated authority to the Chief Administrative Officer of the City of Winnipeg to "negotiate and approve the conditions of such funding agreements in accordance with this report…" (As stated in clause # 5 of the recommendation of the report)and the "The CAO be authorized to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of such amending agreement…" (As found in clause # 6 of the recommendations of the report), therefore failing to inform Council of the implications of this delegated authority in said recommendations and title;

AND WHEREAS the adoption of a policy by the City of Winnipeg to repay any railway authority for their traditional and legal costs associated for grade separations, will directly act as a disincentive for the City to relocate rail lines within the City of Winnipeg in the future;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that "Report of the Executive Policy Committee, January 20 2016, Item No.10. CN Rail Cost Apportionment & Capital Budget Amendment-Plessis Road Twinning and Grade Separation at CN Rail at Southwest TransitWay (Stage 2) and Pembina Highway Underpass" be amended so that the recommendations 1 through to 7 and "A" through "G" as stated in the body of the report remove any and all delegated authority to the CAO or any other administrator of the City of Winnipeg in order to ensure be no agreement can be signed with CN Rail or any other rail authority, that involved said repayments of their costs associated with grade separations.;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Winnipeg City Council request the Public Service, in the future of any requests for delegated authorities of any officer or staff member of the City of Winnipeg, be required to recommend and explicitly outline in any recommendation to Council, what that authority will mean in terms of the powers being granted for said authority, with the full powers of authority being outlined within any future report.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to amend the report. I want to make it clear of what this amendment is saying and doing. The report is not as clear as it could be in terms of its recommendations from the way it reads as it stands right now. And I will read the motion to amend so that it's clearly understood. Whereas the Plessis road underpass twinning and grade separation and the Pembina Highway southwest BRT underpass is subject to the Canadian transportation agency cost appropriation, apportionment for grade separations and whereas in the past has been recognized at said cost apportionment per Rail Authority was based on 15 percent of the cost related to the construction of a grade separation when the project has been initiated by the Local Roads Authority and that in the event an a agreement cannot be arrived at between the Rail Authority and the Local Road Authority, a mediation process exists as well as an arbitration process exists through the Canadian Transportation Agency. And whereas the report named...report of the Executive Policy Committee January 20, 2016, Item No. 10, CN Rail cost apportionment and capital budget amendment – Plessis Road twinning and grade separation at CN Rail at Southwest Transitway (stage 2) and Pembina Highway Underpass is a title which is neither transparent nor descriptive of the report where in its executive summary of the report, and this is the key, alludes to an agreement where the City has…will grant repayment of CN grade separations for both said projects in the event the rail quarters are relocated between now and 2035, repayment to the railway. And whereas the cost associated with said repayments are not minor in nature as indicated on page five of the executive summary discussion, final paragraph; that should the City determine that the rail lines be relocated such that there is no physical rail crossing in service there anymore, 1) a Pembina Highway before 2035, the City will reimburse CN $280,000 for every year before 2035 that the rail crossing is physically closed and 2) at Plessis

Road before 2035, CN will reimburse…the City will reimburse CN $375,000 for every year before 2035 that the rail crossing is physically closed. And whereas the report recommendations do not outline any of the said repayments required to CN in the event of the railway relocation, in the report recommendations...I like that and whereas the recommendation in question grant delegated authority to the CAO of the City of Winnipeg negotiate and approved the conditions, and this is from the report, negotiate and approve the conditions of the said funding agreements in accordance with this report. As stated in clause number five of the recommendation of the report and again further in clause six, the CAO will be authorized to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of such amending agreement. And therefore failing to approve inform Council of the implications of this delegated authority in the said recommendations and title. And whereas the adoption of the policy by the City of Winnipeg to repay any railway authority for their traditional and legal cost associated with grade separation will directly act as a disincentive for the City to relocate rail lines within the City of Winnipeg in the future. Therefore be it resolved that, and this is crucial, be it resolved that the report, and I won't read the title again, be amended so that recommendations one through to seven...and specifying A through to G, because this is something which is odd as well, that recommendations are numbered but in the body of the report they are lettered. Confusing but nonetheless, I want to make it very clear that they are both the same. As stated in the body of the report; remove any and all delegated authority to CAO or any other administrator of the City of Winnipeg in order to ensure, no agreement can be signed with CN Rail or any other rail authority that involved said repayments of their costs associated with grade separations. And be it further resolved that Winnipeg City Council requests the public service, in the future, of any request for delegated authority of any officer or staff member of the City of Winnipeg be required to recommend and explicitly outline, in any recommendation at Council, what that authority will mean in terms of the powers being granted for said authority with the full powers of the authority being outlined with any future report. So I want to make it very clear, this is not a good news report by any means. Item No. 1, yes, check. The arrangement with CN, 5.6 million towards no one stopping, no one stopping the BRT with this amendment, no one is doing anything with regards to that, this is still going forward. We are settling with CN even though, probably it's not a good idea because the thing is not built yet and we don't know the final cost yet and CN knows that's why they're settling in advance with us. Okay, well here we are, we're getting 5.6 million of their share toward that grade separation at Pembina and the Southwest Transitway. Check. One, fine. Two, that a cost sharing arrangement be approved for CN repayment. The City has 7.5 million in 2016 for the Plessis Road grade separation, their share of that separation, fine, check, it's not as much as it should be but it is what it is. That an increase of 10.5 million be approved to the Plessis Road twinning and grade separation funded by the 7.5 million and 3 million from Ness Culvert and this is because, as been documented at the Finance Committee for the last year or more in terms of the fact that they have known about the costs being higher than what they knew it was going to be and not 77 million which was initially the case but 87 million. So, three, check. Four, that the CAO be delegated authority to approve contract over expenditures exceeding 5 million associated with the Plessis Road twinning and grade separation at CN Rail capital project provided monies are available within the capital budget approved by Council, check. In the event they need it. And this is where it gets murky is in five and six because we are granting authority and I'm not sure what we are granting authority to but when you read the body of the report in five and six and you jump to page five and the bottom of page five in the second and third paragraphs...sorry, the second last and last paragraph. The last paragraph the cost portion....and I read this. This is the concept of paying the railway back in the event...in the event that we abandon the lines and the chances of us abandoning the lines, who knows what the chances are, but, one that may be a greater chance than the other. But, this recommendation, this actual decision is not in the recommendation and that's a real concern. The report refers to it, says in number six, the City entered into funding agreements with CN Rail with respect to repayment of the cost sharing amounts referenced in recommendations A and B including CN's written consent and the CAO be authorized to negotiate and approve terms and conditions for funding agreements in accordance with this report and such other terms and conditions. In other words, it's referring to the report so that is where it is giving the power to the CAO to basically do this agreement. Now I can tell members of Council that I have spoken with the public service and that it is the understanding that this was a last minute, 11th hour as it was put to me, an 11th hour agreement that came from CN, a push from CN that CN said at the 11th hour...and we just agreed to it. Now you know I don't have any problem accommodating a great employer like CN. I don't have any problem working with a corporation like CN. I mean, they are an important employer in our community. I don't have any issue with that. But when it's costing taxpayers money and potentially a liability for the City taxpayers that, to me, is where we have to say no. We are now...we wear these hats. This is our hat. We are representing them and let me tell you something, CN doesn't play softball. They don't play t-ball. They play hard ball, okay. They play hard ball and they always have and that's why they are successful and that's why they are big and that's why they are one of North America's largest railways and we have to be the same way when it comes to negotiating these things. Folks, let's not give this...let's not set this precedent. The report says, and I don't know where it...the City of Winnipeg is here, we have all have agreed that these cost sharing arrangements will not set a precedent for future negotiations. I beg to differ. There is no legal opinion, independent legal opinion attached to this report. We are doing something brand new here. So I am not holding up BRT, I want to make it really clear. This is not holding up southwest rapid transit corridor, this is not holding up our ability to finish these projects even though we know that the cost overruns, it's not a good news story. And I would remind the chamber as well. Why are we...at the 11th hour CN comes to us and we're accommodating them? CN was one of the reasons why we are over our budget here! Because early on, they would not provide...and it was in the reports documented to Council, they would

not provide the flight for people, the flight workers out on the sight for us to do the work and they are one of the reasons why we went over budget plus the oil companies plus the other regions. But we are accommodating them at the 11th hour? You know, so this amendment does not change the intent of the report...this allows us to settle and make...and at the end of the day, if CN doesn't agree, there is the arbitration and as long as we are open and transparent, the federal process and you can go and you can look it up and you could talk to the federal CT officials, which I have done, and you can find the process is clear, it's there for municipalities and who use it across Canada.

Madam Speaker: Extend…all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: I beg of you, I beg of the members of EPC, I beg of the Mayor, please do not set this precedent, number one, and please do not allow a process to start developing where we are alluding to stuff in a report but not clearly outlining what kind of powers we are giving our CAO. Our CAO is a great guy, this is not about him personally, this is not about him professionally, this is about the powers that we are granting authority over to the CAO to do something which is setting a precedent, whether we like it or not. And CN knows that! CN knows that, that's why they've asked for it at the 11th hour. That's why they've asked for it…they have asked for it right at the same time you guys. The Charest Commission and all this is being announced and here is CN, saying, "Oh but, we want repayment just in case." You don't think they're going to want it on Waverley? You don't think they're going to want it…for sure they're going to want it there. You don't think that any other grade separation…and you don't think CP is watching this? Or BS...or Burlington Northern Santa Fe, BNSF, is watching this? Absolutely they are. So please let's do the right thing, and I passionately believe in this and this is something that I just don't understand why this came in this way. And if somebody wants to stand up and instead of adopting my motion, for whatever reason, and you want to refer it back, refer it back, okay. Like whatever. But let's do it right, okay? That's all I'm saying. And you know what? I for one, I want to make sure the project in my ward is done right, right? It's got to be finished. No difference then if there's cost overruns…we run into issues when Waverley or whatever the projects come forward in the future, we're going to want to make sure they're done right no matter what part of the City they are in. So, anyway, those are my words and comments and I want to thank the chamber.

Madam Speaker: Okay, the next speaker is Councillor Eadie. I'll get to you in a moment, Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise...actually, I seconded this motion because I think that Councillor Wyatt has pointed out some really important components to this and once one railway gets it, they are all going to get it. They're not going to come down to a final deal unless they get it and what I see this is, Madam Speaker, it's been very clear over the last three, maybe four years there has been a lot of build up towards a discussion about relocating railway yards and railways and there has been a task force struck, too. So as we move ahead with all these grade separation projects that we have, if we are giving a deal where we're paying back the railway's cost to help build that grade separation, in the event that the line is abandoned. And we don't know what railway rationalization and relocation means. We don't know which lines are going to be moved. Eventually, I believe the task force is going to start moving railways and...because you know what for the City of Winnipeg it's just not affordable to build all of these grade separations around our railways. You just have to visit St. Boniface to find not only the CP Emerson line, I believe it is, but there is a CN line that crosses Marion as well. These railways and they are running longer and longer trains, Madam Speaker, so, the rationalization is coming. So, this particular clause that is in this agreement where if we abandon that line and I believe Plessis is the Redditt line, going to Redditt, Ontario. If that line, for example, got abandoned, we are going to pay back the cost to the railway for their expenses. What that does is....you know what? CN is very shrewd, I think Councillor Wyatt is very true, they play hard ball. In the event that rail lines get moved, they are going to need to be able to find money in order to do their end of the project if they are responsible for any of the new line costs. And they will be getting it from the City of Winnipeg, because we're going to pay them back. But where does that help the City of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker? If we get all these agreements for all these crossings and railways and there is this repurposing and realignment to Centreport, Centreport which is becoming a very successful proposition for people, the railways, businesses and so on and Intermodal as well. Where is the City? If we are paying back the railway money, where we did grade separation, if we're paying them back, where are we getting the money to pay for our end of repurposing these rail lines? Because there will be a cost to the City of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker. This is a total disincentive to allow this thing to creep into agreements that we have with the railways is totally wrong. We have to stop it now. Because you know what? The other railways is right. If one railway gets it, why doesn't the other? And they're not going to come to a settlement and maybe we will have to go through the Canadian Transportation Agency, this whole process. However, I don't know why we just gave this stuff up, Madam Speaker. It's wrong. And we need to do something about it. So we either amend this thing before we pass it or we send it back to get a proper agreement because I am really concerned about this and I am worried about the Waverley underpass, it's the same as the Pembina. We have to be concerned about these things. What's coming up, we have other grade separations with other railways, like, you know, this is not good. And so, Madam Speaker, I am voting totally for this amendment, which I seconded, but if others on Council, Madam Speaker, feel it's right to actually refer it back to try to get this other agreement or whatever, that could work as well as Councillor Wyatt mentioned. But I have to say, I am really

disappointed because Madam Speaker, in the North End, removing rail yards and all this kind of stuff, we're building…we have to rebuild an Arlington bridge and all these things and it's going to require money from the City of Winnipeg and we have to be concerned. So to then pay back the railway for the cost for the public good, remember, Madam Speaker, these underpasses are for the public good of the City of Winnipeg and the railway should be putting in their money with no expectations of repayment. This is about the greater good for the City of Winnipeg which also needs to be prosperous in order for the railway to be prosperous. So it's just so counterintuitive to the City being able to work with railways, to look at repurposing, realigning, removing or whatever. I stand in support of the amendment and we will see what happens along the debate here, but that's all I have to say, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Actually, Madam Speaker, I am just on a point of order as opposed to speaking at this point. I would like to request that the CAO be allowed to come forward and explain to Council more about what is being recommended as opposed to…and to what impact this resolution would have on us. This is a very significant financial issue and I would like to understand and as I'm sure all of Council would hike to hear from our CAO to explain this so that we really understand what is being discussed here today because I certainly could use that.

Madam Speaker: We can do that Councillor Gerbasi, what is your specific question for the CAO.

Councillor Gerbasi: I would like him to explain what the impact of what is in front of us in terms of financially, the reasoning behind what is being proposed in the recommendations. And also, if there is any concern regarding...I don't want to put him into a political position but just to explain what the motion that we are being asked to vote on here would impact, if it would have any...

Madam Speaker: That's a very open-ended question. Do you have a specific question?

Councillor Gerbasi: I thought that was pretty specific. I don't know, can he explain the implications of the motion and the report in front of us from an administrative point of view, the impact of it? Is that clear enough?

Madam Speaker: Mr. CAO? Perhaps around the chamber here would work better?

Doug McNeil: Thank you. Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor, Council. So, rail relocation has been a very important topic for many municipalities across the country for a long time. It became heightened with the disaster in Lac Mégantic and it even became more heightened when the province declared that there would be a task force. The railways, generally, for most of these crossings were here first so it is very hard for us to deal with them when we are talking about a crossing. And they like to be whole. However, through the Canadian Transportation Act, they do allow for the railways to help pay for new structures like underpasses. The general rule is 15 percent; however there are negotiations that do occur. And through these negotiations which have been occurring for many, many months, when the announcement and when the media picked up on the rail rationalization discussion, all of a sudden the railway said we are going to contribute to your project but if rail relocation should occur, we want to be paid back. And so that's why this discussion at the last minute occurred, was included in the report. There is no guarantee that we are going to be relocating that rail line. And you can imagine that if any one of these rail lines is the subject right now were to be relocated it would be in the hundreds of millions of dollars. So this potential repayment to the railway if either one of these rail lines is relocated is huge...a huge cost but the potential, I think, and the risk of that occurring is fairly low and would likely occur many, many years from now. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further Councillor Gerbasi? Okay, the next speaker is Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Morantz: Thank you Madam Speaker. I am going to try to change the tide of events here and say in my view this report and these recommendations are a great deal. A very good deal for the taxpayers of Winnipeg, and I want to explain…take a few minutes to explain why. Firstly, I want to say that if we were to not reach agreement with the railways, we would have to go to arbitration and that could take a matter of years. And in fact, with respect to the Pembina Highway underpass, which we haven't even started to do any construction on, normally, once you get to the end of it that's when the negotiations and the arbitration occur. They are agreeing to pay $5.6 million now, well in advance...years in advance, in fact, of when we could have expected to even receive any money but it's more than that, Madam Speaker. It's not just $5.6 million, no, it's more than that. In addition to the monetary payment, CN Rail would agree to consent to the City constructing an at grade pedestrian active transportation crossing at Plaza Drive on the southwest rapid transit corridor in lieu of grade separated crossing. Those grade separations cost millions of dollars, Madam Speaker, so this is more than just $5.6 million. Now I want to add, Madam Speaker, in addition to that, that if this...if we agreed to this amendment, which I will not be supporting, this motion which I will definitely not be supporting, and I urge none of my Council colleagues to support it, we would essentially be putting this...these discussions around

the CN Rail rebates back towards arbitration. And I have to say, that there is no question in my mind that the CN representatives will be asking for the pay back in the arbitration and there is still a likelihood that they could receive that in arbitration, Madam Speaker. We may end up spending years arbitrating and coming to the same result or worse result when we have a great offer on the table right now which is very, very good for the taxpayers of Winnipeg. Now I also want to say, and much has been made about the issue of repayment but I don't think it's been put into proper context, Madam Speaker. What is it we are being asked to repay? Well, let's read the text. It says, "should the City determine that the rail lines be relocated such that there is no physical rail crossing in service at Pembina Highway before 2035 the City will reimburse CN $280,000 for every year", those are key words, Madam Speaker. For every year before 2035. So for example, and I that it's unlikely but let's say the rail was moved in 2035. Okay, so then the obligation is to repay $280,000 for five years. The obligation would not be to repay seven and a half million dollars. The obligation is for each year from the time the rail is closed. So I think that that hasn't been on the table and I would say with respect, I'm disappointed that the amending motion didn't point that out. I think that it would have been clearer and probably more transparent if the amending motion was clear on that, but clearly the rails are not going to be located next year or the year after or the year after. The task force on rail relocation is at the very beginning stages, Madam Speaker. I think we all like big ideas and we hope that these things come to fruition. But the reality of rail rationalization or changing the location of rails or any of this is likely decades away, Madam Speaker. And so when our negotiators were negotiating with CN, we have to entrust them to make the best deal they can. And I have to say, although I too was surprised to see the repayment provisions, after I really thought about it, and I assessed what the real risk is, of the City really ever having to pay any of this money, Madam Speaker, I have to say, balancing that against the time it would take to go to arbitration as opposed to getting money for Pembina Highway now, $5.6 million and not having to do the grade separation at Plaza Drive, great deal. The seven and a half million dollars, plus it's certainly the Councillor for the ward that Plessis is in should be happy that that money is coming now because this project has gone way over budget and we need to iron these things out, Madam Speaker. So those would generally be my comments. I would certainly urge all of my Council colleagues not to support any amendment and to ultimately support the passage of this report so we can get on with this Madam Speaker, thank you. Those are my comments.

Madam Speaker: Next is Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. Again, I think...I know for a business, that is putting a large investment into a project, they want some assurances that they will…if it doesn't need it, their investment is gone for not... they get repaid. That's fair…I think that's totally fair. But we have to be really clear here. The City of Winnipeg cannot force rail lines to move. We can't do that. Rail lines have prerogative over issue of they are here first. So we cannot go to the rail line and say get out. We can't do that. So people think that this task force is going to magically say CN, CP, we decided we want you to move and CN and CP will say okay, you pay for it if they say okay. If they say no that's a whole other problem but even if they say yes, which they won't, I've heard no way. Regardless of that we we're going to have to pay to relocate them including the cost of overpasses and all those infrastructure pieces. That's the City's job to pay that back or the Federal Government or the Province. CN and CP aren't paying for the relocation. They're not going to be paying for that. They...no, they are not. That's our job and we can't force them to do it. So again, to say that this is pending and that this agreement has some…well, it's going to limit our ability to look at relocation in the future, that's not true. That's absolutely not true at all. I do want to point out that the fact that we are going forward with this agreement...you know it was on EPC's agenda and to say this is getting rammed down our throats the last minute, that's a little bit ridiculous. It was on EPC's agenda, Councillors could have come and spoke to us then. They have had time to look at it, to ask questions, that's fine but again to say that somehow the nefarious has come through the system, is again, just trying to feed on some fears. The City is financially not in a strong position at this point. We know that. And part of the problem is these projects out of these huge cost overruns such as the Plessis underpass. Again, we've modified how we do capital budgets now so we don't have Class 5s going in on the last minute. I don't take into account natural gas lines and everything else but this is going to try to help us. We still have to take 3 million out of another account but this will help us try to make that project so we we're not going to have to come from taxes or from other projects that we all love. They are going to forward this money to us now and this money will disappear. If we want to go to into this arbitration process and then Council is going to be trying to find out where we find this $7.5 million to cover the Plessis one. And we'd lose the potential of, with the sugar beet lands that we all approved of getting that at grade crossing to Plaza Station. Without that at grade crossing we are limiting if not eliminating, the opportunity to do transit oriented design unless we do a really expensive either tunnel or overpass…pedestrian overpass. Again, and then we got hydro corridors, so can we go over? Probably not. Do we go under? That's pretty spooky. So again, this provides a great option of getting the sugar beet lands…to be able to get those residents on the transit oriented design to the Plaza Station. So I do believe that it's fair for CN to ask this. I don't personally believe that this is a risk for the City. It's actually a bonus for the City because we get this money now when we need it to cover off the Plessis underpass project cost overruns. So, to say that it's being…so the only issues that I have really heard today, and maybe someone can clarify if I've missed something, was that we don't really trust the administration to do this. That's really what I've heard. That's about all I've heard. Well again, the motion is quite clear and we should be very clear. This money here is not in our budget, right. So in the Plessis underpass project or the combined…the BRT/Pembina underpass...the City in their

wisdom doesn't calculate this money as part of their budget process because we don't know. So this is all actually added money into our budgets. It's not part of our existing budgets right now, so again, we are getting money earlier and I think…what Councillor used to say, “Cash is king”. We actually have money now to be able to move forward on our budgeting, to get the Plessis one done completely, to get the other projects done. So again it's not that we are risking money, they are giving us the money up front and then in 20 years or 30 years or whatever it is we may have to pay back some money, and I think that's fair. So I would not support the amendment and hope the Council will approve the recommendation as is.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow...or Councillor Wyatt, pardon me.

Councillor Wyatt: I’m good looking but not that good looking. I have a question for the CAO as well.

Madam Speaker: Specific question that was not provided earlier in the CAO’s clarification?

Councillor Wyatt: My question is, have there been discussions at the highest level of the City of Winnipeg with CN Rail pertaining to requesting CN Rail to allow the use of a rail line that British…that Burlington Northern Santa Fe would utilize over track accessing and for the purpose of benefiting Centreport? Have there been discussions with CN requesting that use of that line, and negotiations taking place or any kind of discussions at the highest level of the City with CN in the last year or two, with regards to using the Burlington Northern...with...allowing…CN to allow Burlington Northern to use their line to access and benefit Centreport and the entity around there?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. CAO.

Doug McNeil: Madam Speaker, I don't know the answer to that question but we will get an answer for the Councillor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes, you are the next speaker. Thank you.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Madam Speaker and kudos, by the way, for organizing the trip to the Museum, that’s an important display, unfortunately, I can’t make it, I am representing the City’s Egg Committee, I had a previous speaking engagement at the Keystone Egg Producers, so I’m trying to build some relations with the egg community. But, glad to hear people respect…I’m sure when I come forward the naming motion for Florence Pierce, the first woman City Councillor from the RM of St. Vital. People who remember kindly the discussion we heard earlier today. On this item, a number of good points made by all but I think Councillor Morantz summarized it well. This is CN paying us money, we’re not paying them, they’re paying us money in essence to build either across or under their rail lines, not unreasonable for them to say, well if these rail lines...relocated then we would like some form of repayment. The likelihood of the lines getting relocated in the short term is slim and it’s important…I think Councillor Wyatt makes a point, which is this could act as a disincentive. Arguably true, but it's a very small amount of money in the grand scheme of things. And people have bandied about, oh it's a billion dollars to relocate all these rail lines well that is at best a guesstimate, and I have said to people, ok, if you are moving rail, passenger rail south of the City, where is the new terminal? We're going to give up Union Station, are we going to tear that down? Are we going to move it? Are we going to have some platform out by the floodway in my ward or Councillor Lukes’ and that's going to be our new passenger rail? There is hundreds of millions of dollars here that haven't been accounted for. So it’s a huge, huge project, it’s worth looking at but it's important to say, look, this would be the disincentive that would somehow tip the balance and we wouldn't relocate rail, I think is stretching it. If you hear what Councillor Morantz is saying, if you look at it, it's a reasonable arrangement. It’s also worth pointing out, I used to do arbitrations for a living in the 1990s and I would often go in there and there would be a number of unsettled items and you talk two days before or three days before and maybe you settle all of them and then come to the members…the union members for a vote. There was always somebody at the back of the room who said, “Well if I had been in charge of those talks, I would have gotten us three Christmases a year or a hundred percent wage increase”. So there’s always someone will always someone who will second guess the results of a process where arbitration is the outcome. But here we are facing an arbitration if we don't get a settlement. Our staff recommended this as reasonable commercial settlement. I think as Councillor Morantz has said it's worth it to get this and move forward. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham, you have the floor.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to change direction a little bit and point out one thing which I do want to raise a question, and anyone that wants to take this can take it. It does indicate that to cover the shortfall or really the increase in the cost of the project...there will be a capital budget transfer…$3 million from the Ness Avenue culvert. Now, that's not in my ward, it’s in Councilor Dobson’s ward, but it's right adjacent to my ward and the project…the Ness Avenue project is happening very, very close to my ward and I just have questions around the

implications of that to the Ness project. But, just if someone could explain that, get some clarity on that portion, would be appreciated. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next speaker is Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you to all my colleagues for your comments on this issue. Thank you for Councillor Wyatt for your motion. I wanted to express my thoughts on the motion being brought forward by Councillor Wyatt and wanted to communicate that I will be voting against it. I understand that in terms of the repayment to the rail lines that if we do have to go through mediation that we may get a worse deal for taxpayers, for our tax dollars and I want to say thank you to Mayor Bowman, I've been appointed to be our Council representative for rail rationalization…as our rep on the new Provincial Government task force that will be chaired by Jean Charest and I'm very much looking forward to that work. This is a negotiated deal. If we back out now there is a very good chance that we will be on the hook for more money. We have…I have heard comments from my colleagues to that effect and thank you to CAO Doug McNeil for some clarifications on how this is a good deal for the City. I don't think that this will limit rationalization or relocation of rail for the City in the future. Let's be clear, rationalization and possible relocation is a huge project and these dollars are a drop in the bucket in terms of what the big picture rationalization and relocation would cost. With those comments, I'll be voting against this motion and I urge my colleagues to do the same. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further speakers? Yes, Councillor Wyatt, you can close on you...

Councillor Wyatt: No, I am not closing, I am speaking.

Madam Speaker: You are closing on your motion.

Councillor Wyatt: No, I am not, I am speaking.

Madam Speaker: I want to clarify that with the Clerk, I just want to be clear.

Councillor Wyatt: No, I didn't speak when I asked the CAO a question. My understanding is that, point of order Madam Speaker. My understanding is we have a process where the CAO can come forward and speak to Council and we can ask questions but that doesn't...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, you are looking for your time to speak to the item?

Councillor Wyatt: I want...I am saying that as a member of Council, I have a right to speak to the clause and then I have a right to close on the motion that I have amended and I have moved.

Madam Speaker: And I will grant that.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. You know, I guess I have heard some of the comments here and I think the way to look at this clause and to look at what we are doing here, we have to have the discipline and the objectiveness and the hard-nosed discipline in terms of dealing with a company like CN, a major multinational corporation, as they have when they approach us and they negotiate with us. And maybe that's something which is new for members of Council. Maybe that's something which may not...some folks may not be used to or have never had a role in, but that is something which we have to be cognizant of, that this existing initiative fails to do. The fact that we are accepting this with the 11th hour add-on and just accommodating the railway causes me great concern. The fact I am hearing members of Council saying, well it's not a lot of money. Well, you know what? To a lot of Winnipeggers, $280,000 a year, for every year until 2035 and then $375,000 a year until 2035 is a lot of money. That is a lot of money. And the fact to say that, you know what, we don't know if rationalization is going to happen, we don't know if it's real. You know what, I'm not having that discussion here and now and debate, but it's been put on the table not by myself, but by our own...by EPC and by the administration by bringing this forward now. It's made it an issue and it's made it a very interesting discussion because it makes we wonder whether the Charest Commission, the Charest Task Force, is it the Charest Task Force…is it a Charest, or is it a charade? It appears…it sounds like it's a bit of a charade because it doesn't sound real. Everyone's saying, well it's going to be years before anything happens and it's big dreams and all this sort of stuff and it's not real. Then why do we have this announcement on the 14th? What was that all about? What are we trying to do here as a City? Are we really like…I thought we are not wasting taxpayers money, this is a real initiative, we are trying to make this happen, you know. I ask the question of the CAO, Madam Speaker, because I know there's many issues and that was the point. There's many issues that I know the City of Winnipeg is dealing with CN on across the City. And there's many issues that CN is dealing with the City on across the City. And one cannot just look at things in isolation. And I'm not saying anything is untoward or anything is wrong, but all I'm saying is that there seems to be at the 11th hour, we add this in just because they have requested it, that's outrageous. Madam Speaker, the report itself, no one has really

spoken about it and I just want to take a moment to speak to that as well. The fact that a major new policy piece was not spelled out in the recommendation before us today is a major, a major slap in the face to this Council because it is not open or transparent and is not clear. And this should be spelled out clearly in any recommendation as in any report. And that is the second be it resolved part of the clause. I would like to think that if we had such confidence and such passion that there is nothing untoward and this is fine and we don't have any liability and there is no issue here with regards to this matter, that it would be stated clearly in the clauses and of the recommendation, that it would be spelled out extremely clear for us to understand what we are doing, rather than just a global clause of granting authority, delegated authority. And as I said before, Madam Speaker and I want to say it again, this is nothing saying that there is something...that we don't trust our public service, this is about us granting authority. Granting authority away from this Council is a major decision that any Councillor should not take lightly, or Mayor. Because, once that authority is granted, unless this Council votes on it again, it is gone that authority is gone. And it's there. And you won't have an opportunity to come back and have another discussion here of any way shape or form regarding that because the authorities had been granted and this, right now the way it reads, right now the way it reads folks, it grants authority carte blanche in clauses five and six. I will also comment on the fact that the clauses are confusing in the sense in the recommendation there are letters A through G and the clauses are one through seven. So I...it's...I don't know if there was something not coordinated there but...anyway I'm referring to the recommendations before us that were passed by EPC. So, I would ask members of Council that...and in terms of the CTA and saying well, it's going to the arbitration and we're going to lose in the arbitration, you know what, you know, there is a mentality still in this country that the railways are next to God or above God even in some cases. Well they are not! Those days are gone. They are a corporation, a multinational. Like any other corporation. And you know, I think the day is coming, quickly, very quickly. Where the railways are going to get a wake-up call in terms of how they treat communities at times. And the fact that they are not next to God or above him or her. You know, Madam Speaker, we are dealing with another entity, a corporation. We're a corporation. We want to get the best deal for the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg. Adding something at the 11th hour is not getting the best deal for the taxpayers of the City. Vote for the amendment. Vote for the amendment so that we can move forward as a City without prejudicing ourselves on future negotiations, on future projects, without undermining ourselves and the taxpayers of the City. I want to believe that rail line relocation is real. I don't want to believe the naysayers. I want to believe those who seem defeatist the minute it was announced, that it is real, that it is it coming, that it provides a huge opportunity to this city that we've never seen before. That it provides an opportunity to build BRT or rapid transit, it provides an opportunity to build…a) active transportation across the city. That it provides an opportunity for neighbourhood renewal and redevelopment, it provides an opportunity for housing and affordable housing, that it provides an opportunity to make neighbourhoods safe that Councillor Allard has talked about. About moving rail lines out of communities…that it makes our communities safer instead of having massive oil pipelines on wheels going down through our communities. I would like to think that it's real and the fact that CN has raised it and put it here, tells you they know it's real and the fact that we are caving in at the 11th hour to do this for them scares the heck out of me. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi, you are the next speaker.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think we should just step back a little bit. I appreciate the passion of Councillor Wyatt, I'm very surprised we didn't hear Gandhi or Martin Luther King mentioned in this particular speech because usually those are things that are invoked...no, I appreciate…this is an important issue for our city, rail relocation, obviously it is something that has been worked on for years and dreamed of and whatever, but I think we have to step back a bit. We are looking at a report where a negotiation has been worked out and the question isn't…really the only question is, is this in the best interest of the City of Winnipeg? Is this in the best interest of the public? Is this a good deal for us financially? Does it cause a problem for us in the future? Is it a good deal? And that's what we have to look at this report and judge. The only thing that's 11th hour about this is the motion that was brought forward by Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Eadie which is fine, that's their right to bring forward a motion. But that's 11th hour and that's a whole bunch of things in it talking about not allowing the CAO and not allowing our administration to go off and do certain kinds of negotiations that they normally do without whatever. I'm still trying to figure out what wouldn't...that was why I actually asked the question of the CAO, I was trying to understand the implications of...of approving this motion that did come at the 11th hour, which could have been talked about when the issue came up at EPC or there could have been conversations between Councillors ahead of time so we weren't blind-sided with this rather complicated motion. So that's the only thing that's of the 11th hour, the other stuff we all knew about. Came to EPC, there was a negotiation process that our CAO is entrusted to do and I think trust is perhaps the word. We have been through a period under the previous Council and the previous CAO, where there was a lack of trust. And I am a little concerned that fear out there, like I've already...you hear from constituents and read the paper and they're like, "Oh, it's the same old City Hall". Well actually, we don't really have that any reason to think that. Our CAO has gone off and brought back this negotiation, the question you have to ask yourself is, is this a good proposal for us? And what we have heard from our Finance Chair and from the report and from what we have in front of us, I believe, the way I'm interpreting this, is this is a really good deal for us and we are getting money for projects, by the way, that have massive cost overrun because they were done with Class 5 estimates. They were pushed thorough politically, I won't even go

into some of those other reasons that the City is on the hook for a lot of money for the Plessis underpass which apparently we could give back because we don't even need overpasses anymore, but we have already paid for it and now we trying to finish paying for it. So let's take responsibility. Those were mistakes that were made before that we now have to fix but the question is, is there any harm to the public interest in accepting this deal? That's all you need to think about. And, it looks to me like we are getting some money from the rail lines now that are...and we have been advised by our CAO who we all agreed to hire, we have a lot of respect for, we have no reason not to continue that. You can't dredge up the past and get people afraid of anything that administration does, I think that's kind of wrong and undermining to our civil service which I think is unfortunate that that keeps happening because we are in the present moment now and have a report in front of us. Decide what you think about this report. Decide whether you think it's a good deal. Should we give this money back? And then how…I would like to hear where people are going to find this amount of money to finish this project in the budget or wherever when we get into the budget process. Because that's a lot of money and we are getting it from the rail lines now for a number of projects. I don't believe we are cancelling all these projects. We are going to finish the Plessis underpass, we are going to build the rapid transit and there's other benefits as was mentioned earlier from some of the other Councillors who explained it quite well about the crossing that we will get as well, so there's other benefits. So, I don't think this has much to do with the rail relocation. I think this is…it's a red herring that's been thrown in here to confuse matters and the 11th hour motion is thrown in here to confuse matters. This is a good deal for the City and I will be supporting it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers on the item? Mr. Mayor to close...just a moment we have an amendment, I believe, to the item which I have not seen yet. Is the motion now being photocopied, Mr. Clerk? No? Mr. Clerk, if you could read the new amendment into the record.

Motion No. 8
Moved by His Worship Mayor Bowman,
Seconded by Councillor Morantz,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that item 10 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated January 20 be amended to so that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to create a process to have cost certainty incorporated in future negotiations regarding rail so we prevent the potential predicament that the Councillor from Transcona rightfully has concerns about should our future plans with rail rationalization impact future discussions with the rail industry.

Councillor Wyatt: Point of order. I really appreciate the Clerk reading it into the record. Could I get a copy to read so I can read…and more of a visual?

Madam Speaker: I was just going to make that request myself. So, please circulate the motion to all members of Council. In the meantime Mr. Mayor, do you wish to introduce the amendment?

Mayor Bowman: Sure. Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is not an amendment to Councillor Wyatt's motion, just for clarity this is an amendment to report ten, so it's a friendly amendment. There are so many things that we could respond to based on the discussion today. I will just say that Councillor Gillingham raised the question about the Ness project. Unfortunately, for the City of Winnipeg, when the tenders came in to the City, they were drastically under what we had budgeted for. So it's a good news story. And that money is being leveraged to assist with the projects detailed in the report. The topic of precedent setting has been raised here today and I think obviously, there is a number of precedents in the past that the City of Winnipeg has seen that we don't want to repeat. And as has been mentioned by several of my Council colleagues, pushing through, classifies estimates, we have seen the resulting cost overruns in a number of projects, one of which has been mentioned by Council colleagues today. I am pleased that we are moving forward with the creation of the Chief Project Management Officer, capital expenditure reports, regardless of the amount are now published online on a monthly basis so that this Council, the media and the public can be better apprised of the monies that are being spent and I am also very pleased that Councillor Pagtakhan, our Deputy Mayor, has agreed to serve as Council Liaison for project management. They are a number of efforts that we are doing to learn from the mistakes of previous Council and previous administration so that we can do a better job protecting taxpayer's dollars and ensure that we all are as citizens getting value for money that is flowing through and being spent by the City of Winnipeg. I would like to thank the Councillor from Transcona for raising one of his points that he raised and that's the basis of this friendly amendment. Cost certainty could be in question if, and it's a big if, rail relocation ever becomes a reality one day. So let's ask the public service to develop a way so all negotiations with rail industry will be based on certainty demonstrated in this negotiation with CN. I would ask all members of Council to support it. I think it's a way that we can benefit from the dialogue that we have had here today to move forward to protect taxpayer's dollars while also not jeopardizing important projects that are a priority today, in the City, for our citizens, right now. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Clerk, can I ask if the motion has been circulated? It's being copied, okay. I think seeing the hour we should now recess and reconvene at 1:30, given the hour. Thank you. I don't think we'd have

enough time to get through this debate, Mr. Mayor, Councillors. Councillor Mayes does have a commitment where he's speaking, he alerted me earlier and last week. And, Council also has a tour booked at the Museum with the curator. So Council will now adjourn and we will reconvene at 1:30. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
January 27, 2016, at 1:36 p.m.

Madam Speaker: I would like to reconvene the Council meeting and of January 27, 2016. Where we left off is the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated January 20. We are on Item No. 10. We had a new amendment before us, amending Motion No. 8 that Mayor Bowman had introduced. Are there any speakers on the motion? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, I'm just curious to know…I'm glad to see this, this looks like an effort...

Madam Speaker: Would you like to speak?

Councillor Schreyer: Yes, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: You are speaking to the new motion and the...you did not speak prior to the main item so you may proceed.

Councillor Schreyer: Now I am speaking, Madam Speaker…to be clear, I am speaking to Motion 8.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Schreyer: Yes, okay. I'm glad to see that there is this effort to communicate and resolve concerns as this expresses. I guess my concern on this, perhaps this could be resolved before the end of the debate on Motion 8 is done, when it says...excuse me, Madam Speaker. To create a process to have cost certainty incorporated, in future negotiations regarding rail. I guess my concern if this could be resolved, explained, is we deal with certain different levels of cost estimates. You know, a level five down to level one, and I'm just wondering at what point we consider this within a realm of comfort, at what level estimate that we are dealing with...dealing with what we would consider a potential predicament.

Madam Speaker: Are there any other speakers on the motion of the main item? Okay, seeing none, Mayor Bowman you have an opportunity to close on Motion No. 8. Okay, we'll leave that. Councillor Wyatt you have an opportunity to close on your motion.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes. And just to add, Madam Speaker I'm going to keep it brief, I think I have said a lot already in terms of this debate. There is no need to, for the sake of being allotted time to use it all for repeating everything that has been said. However I just want to say that I want to thank Mayor Bowman and Councillor Morantz for their motion and that I will be supporting their motion. I will also be supporting the motion that I moved. I believe that in terms of the need for the report to specify exactly what type of powers we're giving to our public service is crucial. As well, I believe that in terms of the situation here, as I have said before, I have no issue with clauses A, B, C, D, E...or sorry, A, B, C, D, which clearly do exactly what the title of the report says. The title of the report, and I would point that out, which is the irony of this debate and the point that is being made. And the issue at hand is that the title speaks to the apportionment and the capital budget amendments for these projects, but it doesn't state at all that anything in the title, anything in the title with the reference to rail line relocation and future refunds of capital and dollars back to the railway, back to CN, it doesn't say that in the title and that, to me is exactly the point that is being made is that this should have been part of the report, it should have been front and centre, it was not. My motion, I believe, clarifies that and ensures that there is no liability for the future of the City. Going forward, financial liability, a new financial liability being created, we have enough financial liabilities. We have our infrastructure deficit, we have issues with regards to our existing infrastructure that we have to fix, we have issues with regards to roads. And we have issues with regards to the need for new infrastructure whether it be for rapid transit or active transportation or roads and bridges and widenings. All of these demands are liabilities, financial liabilities that exist on us, why are we adding more financial liabilities to our books? It doesn't make any sense. That's why I would encourage all members of Council to also support the second amendment as well moved by myself and I want to thank Councillor Eadie for seconding it. And yes, I would have liked to have had it earlier on the table for debate and discussion but you know, reading the reports, all the various reports you're reading them and you're reading the recommendations and then, you know, you look at the reports, the body of the reports later and then it jumps out at you. The fact that it was buried in the report, this portion of it, and not in the title and not in the

recommendations is surprising. But anyway, I just want to add that and Councillor Gerbasi, you know, it's not just Gandhi, Martin Luther King but it's also Sir Winston Churchill. You forgot that one as well. That's one of the ones I often mention to as you know. Anyway, and you know, I think when we come back from lunch we often tend to be a little bit more happier, you know, when you are fed, you are not hungry, you are happier so I would hope that that also assists in terms of the motion, and I hope that members of the Council understand and appreciate the concerns that I have raised. And I also want...I think the message also has to be that we have to send a message both to our own staff, the public service and to the private sector that we are here and we are going to get the best deal for the citizens of Winnipeg, always. And we are going to fight for them and defend them always. Because that's our role, that's our job and ultimately, we are the ones being asked to make the decision. The recommendations are being put forward but we are the ones being asked and that's the responsibility we have, a very serious one. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And seeing no further speakers…yes. We will now close on the Item that would be back to you, Mayor Bowman. I'll call the question then. I will call the question on Motion No. 8 first. That was the motion put forward by Mayor Bowman. All in favour...call for recorded vote. All in favour of Motion No. 8 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, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Vote is unanimous. Moving on to Motion No. 7 that was moved by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Eadie all in favour? All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Schreyer, Wyatt.

Madam Speaker: All opposed please rise.

Nays

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

Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 4 Nays 12

Madam Speaker: The motion is defeated. Moving on now to the main clause. All in favour of Item No. 10? Contrary? Okay, call for a recorded vote. All in favour of Item No. 10 please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: All opposed please rise.

Nays

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Schreyer, Wyatt.

Clerk: Vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 12 Nays 4.

Madam Speaker: Item No. 10 passes. We'll now move on to Motion No. 3 that is moved by Councillor Mayes seconded by Councillor Lukes. It's regarding the ward boundaries commission; it will be an automatic referral to EPC. We have

Motion No. 5 in front of us moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Eadie regarding the Build Canada fund priorities. This is a notice of motion so it will appear on the Council agenda next month.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Lukes,

WHEREAS Ward Boundary Reviews are required as part of The City of Winnipeg Charter ("Charter");

AND WHEREAS the last Ward Boundary Review took place in 2009;

AND WHEREAS Section 12 of the Charter calls for a Ward Boundary Review to be held at such times as Council may require, but at least once every 10 years after the preceding report was prepared;

AND WHEREAS Ward Boundary Reviews must use the most current Census data for the purposes of their review;

AND WHEREAS there is another Census scheduled to be performed by Statistics Canada in May of 2016;

AND WHEREAS the current Ward Boundaries are based upon the 2006 Census data;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has grown substantially since 2006, with especially high growth in some areas of Winnipeg such as the South East quadrant;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to establish a Ward Boundaries Commission in 2017;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to work with Statistics Canada to ensure that the data from the 2016 General Census be available to the Ward Boundaries Commission for their process in 2017.

Councillor Orlikow: Can we please suspend the rules so we can hear it immediately?

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Orlikow wishes to suspend the rules to debate the Item today. The mover had called for notice of motion to be heard next month. So if you are in favour of suspending the rules to debate the Item today, Mr. Clerk, we need two-thirds of Council to make sure that debate happens today. So, if you would like the debate to happen today please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Gerbasi, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Schreyer.

Madam Speaker: All opposed please rise.

Nays

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Wyatt, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, yeas 12 nays 4, 75 percent.

Madam Speaker: The motion will be debated today at this time. Councillor Wyatt will you introduce your motion.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS since Council adopted the motion of Building Canada Fund priorities on March 25, 2015, major changes have occurred with regard to the issues of Railway Relocation and with the election of a new government in Ottawa;

AND WHEREAS for the first time the Province of Manitoba has announced a new Railway Relocation Task Force to be headed by a former Premier of Quebec and a former leader of the Federal Progressive Conservative Party, the Rt. Hon. Jean Charest;

AND WHEREAS as presently contemplated, the cost for new infrastructure due to railway crossings, shall cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars and may only fix one or two crossings at the most;

AND WHEREAS the benefit of relocating railways from inside the City of Winnipeg to outside the City of Winnipeg, or by combining and sharing an existing railway Right-Of-Way, by two or more railways, has huge cost benefits to the people of Winnipeg, both in terms of lost time due to traffic congestion and pedestrian and homeowner safety, but also in terms of the long-term maintenance costs related to the new grade separations;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg is setting a dangerous precedent of agreeing to repay a railway for their share of the rail crossing/grade separation costs (RED: Canadian Transportation Agency regulations for the apportionment of costs of grade separations) in the event the railway is later relocated (Report of EPC, January 20, 2016, Item No. 10, City of Winnipeg Council Meeting, January 27, 2016) therefore creating a major new financial liability for the City of Winnipeg that never existed before;

AND WHEREAS for the first time in a generation, the opportunity now exists to make historic change with regard to railway relocation inside Winnipeg and with this new sense of optimism, it is premature to build further grade separations involving railways and hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars until the Charest Taskforce has an opportunity to conduct its work;

AND WHEREAS railway relocation also presents the City of Winnipeg with an historic opportunity, that with the acquisition of former railway Right-Of-Ways, new and exciting initiatives for Rapid Transit, Active Transportation, and Neighborhood Renewal and Revitalization, just to name a few, becomes a real possibility;

AND WHEREAS the on the day of the announcement, January 14, 2016, Jean Charest stated, "This Project has the ability to change and will change the City of Winnipeg";

AND WHEREAS the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, Brian Bowman, on January 14, 2016, the day of the announcement, in the presence of the Premier of Manitoba and Jean Charest, stated the following, "What we do need is we need to have the full picture and I for one and I think all of us here agree that there's a lot more information analysis that can and should occur once that occurs we will be in a better position to make better decisions and so the cost of proceeding with rail relocation, the cost not to, that's the type of thing we need to get these figures so we can have an informed discussion and debate".

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council Meeting of March 25th, 2015 Decision of Minute No. 245, Report of the Executive Policy Committee – March 24, 2015, be amended by deleting clause 1 and replacing it with the following:

1. *That the priorities for the Building Canada Fund applications be set as follows:*
    1) *Chief Peguis Trail – Main Street to Route 90*
    2) *Kenaston Boulevard Widening*
    3) *Waverley Street Underpass*
    4) *Marion Street Widening/Grade Separation and Improvements – Archibald Street to Lagimodiere Boulevard*

Councillor Wyatt: I would like to before I speak to it, I would like to hear the discussion first, thank you, and then speak to it and close on it thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: I would like to make a friendly amendment, I believe to be a friendly amendment.

Madam Speaker: What might that be and can you put it in writing?

Councillor Schreyer: I might need to put in writing. It is not the right Honourable Jean Charest, it's the Honourable Jean Charest. If I need to put it on writing I certainly will.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, noted. Who would like to be the first speaker for the debate that we called for today? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. It's too that bad people want to debate this when we don't have really a lot of time to think about how to proceed and consider all the implications of what's going on. So, Madam Speaker, I am left here today to speak on the issue and I understand that it's supposedly is the will of the Mayor's office and of Council. For years we've talked about it and I have heard other Councillors talk about rail relocation, it's a great idea. We have heard it through provincial campaigns; we have heard it through federal campaigns that rail relocation is an important issue for the City of Winnipeg. We just debated report 10, which is counterintuitive to a decision. So basically, Madam Speaker, for example, what we did today is we basically said we are not in favour of moving the Redditt CN Line, which is where the Plessis underpass is because basically in that contractual agreement with CN that's what we said. That's what's done. You know, when we look at the issues and we are looking forward to...and there is investments, Madam Speaker, like the Arlington bridge, we are talking about what a bridge that goes over 12 or 14 tracks when maybe it could only be four. We don't know. But, if we are really committed, Madam Speaker, to real rail relocation and I am not hearing that from our administration, I am not hearing that from our leaders on EPC, that there is a real commitment. They say, well, it's not going to happen. That's the belief. But you know, I believe what I hear in the media. I believe there is a true...and why would we engage the Honourable Jean Charest in a task force if we don't believe we can do it? Why would we do that? It's a ridiculous thing, Madam Speaker. So I have to go on faith about what we are talking about as a City. I represent a good portion of the North End and West Kildonan. There is a number of people who have a view that the CP Rail line has caused or created a separate City, a separate place where people get less. That's the impression that people have. I don't, frankly, Madam Speaker, I don't necessarily have that perception. But, that is what happened back in the early 1900s. That is really what it was, it did separate a City. But we have established many bridges and many different things in order to bring people back and forth from the North End and West Kildonan and Old Kildonan…the northwest part of the City. I never really ever heard the issue raised in regard to the...in regard to the northeast necessarily. But, what we do know is the railway did bring many jobs for the people of the North End, for people of Transcona and so on. But, you know, things do change and we want to accomplish different things within our City. And one the things...you know like if we don't have the CP Rail yards, I believe that saves us a hundred million dollars for the Arlington bridge. A hundred million dollars. These are the same tax paying workers for CP Rail, right, that are going to be paying extra. The widening of McPhillips in the future, that's in the future, yeah, that's 20 years down the road or whatever. But so, but...I am taking everything in faith that rail relocation is going to happen. Centreport is starting to have great success. It makes sense for rail relocation at this point. Because we have huge companies investing in Centreport in what will be a 700-acre rail operation for businesses because the intermodal transportation, Madam Speaker, of today, is so essential to making Centreport, Manitoba, THE place for big business to do international business. And so when we look at the reprioritization of what we would like it see in building Canada...and this is about building Winnipeg, building Manitoba, that's what this is about. And we are a part of Canada. We are building it. And we need to be cognizant of things like the Chief Peguis Trail which provides that intermodal intersection through the City to get to Centreport. Where at rail places we can move things by trucks to the rail, we can do different things, it's that intermodal thing. It's right by the airport. Intermodal International, Building Canada. And so when I hear about rail relocation...and it's building up, we heard somebody mention Lac Mégantic, I believe that was Councillor Allard. Very important, that we need to look at this stuff. It's not to say that all the rail lines are going to be moved but really, we are looking in the future and I think, and I believe and if we all truly believe that rail relocation...and remember, if you don't commit to it and believe in it now, it's never going to happen. Where is the City going to get the money if people aren't willing to vote to do these kind of things? Like really, Madam Speaker. Let's put it on the line here. I want rail relocation. I understand the Marion, Archibald issue with traffic. There's two spur lines there. Those are very important. They should move. Why should we spend, what is it, $250 million for the Archibald Marion? That's to build it, that's not to add in the financing cost and so on and so forth. So, Madam Speaker, I think it is time to consider and it would have been good for the mover and the seconder to be able to talk to their fellow Councillors and do this. But what do we have today? A two-thirds vote to debate it now and shut it down immediately. I don't think that's in good faith. I think this Council doesn't believe in rail relocation and prove it. Vote for this particular motion. It makes sense. It just makes sense. And you know what, the Minister…we don't have an agreement with the Building Canada Fund yet to build Waverley, it's not there yet, Madam Speaker. It's not there yet. We had a political announcement by the former MP, Bateman, that this project was going to happen but there's no signed agreements or anything. So, this is the opportune time. It would have been good to take a little more time to think about it but you know what, if you believe in rail relocation, you are going to vote for this. And if you don't, then you are not committed to making this City a better place and an easier place for people to get around. The opportunities that will be missed for active transportation, the opportunities missed with rail relocation, the opportunities missed for rapid transit, with rail relocation. That's what you will be voting against if you don't vote for this.

And I will leave you with that. If you believe in rail relocation, this is the way to go… it is. And we don't want to waste our taxpayer's money. We know, Councillor Morantz will tell you every time, we have no money. We have no money. So let's consider it. This is a good idea. It honestly is and that's why I supported it. That's why I seconded it. It's time to start...I am not going to use the North End language, Madam Speaker I will just say I will be voting for this particular motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next on the list is Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Madam Speaker, I would just like to give an update to members of Council here that we had a briefing, our committee had a briefing yesterday or the day before it was, in regards to this project. We do...the City does have the confirm...a letter confirming that the Federal Government is supporting this project and that the Provincial Government is supporting this project which is a commitment of just over 45 million each. This is a project that we all voted on unanimously back when we were picking priorities. We all voted on it then this was a project that the Conservative government brought forward and announced and then ultimately we have the letter now from the current government. So, this project, we sat down with the committee members, we went through all the details. We are at a Class 3 estimate. We are really ready to proceed with more detailed design. This project will serve 30,000 plus residents in South Winnipeg. The traffic volume increase will be another 10,000. There is an estimate through modeling that 10 percent or more will be using the rapid transit corridor. It is a project that is needed. There's many projects in the City that are needed. There's many projects in our City that are needed. We do have limited amounts of funding. I will be supporting this project. I...you may recall, many of you may recall, back when we were selecting the priorities, we had four priorities to pick from. This priority wasn't my priority to pick from and I stood up and I spoke very clearly on the fact that I think that we should be investing our limited amount of funding in investments that will generate a good return rather than ones that are just ready to go. I think that, looking at more...like not all infrastructure is created equally. I think finding investments that will generate a good return, that will create funding and economic results are...should be a priority when we have such limited…such limited funding. At that point in time, of course, Kenaston wasn't available and Chief Peguis wasn't as far enough along. We all agreed that this project would be our priority. It does...you know it's in an interesting situation for me… it does benefit, clearly benefits my constituents who elected me to represent them here at City Hall and it will benefit them. From a broader city-wide perspective though, it is challenging for me to...it is very challenging for me to move forward on this but we do have the funding in hand and we will have to...we will...I will be proceeding in supporting this and that's all I have to say right now. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The concerns of Councillor Eadie, and if it is...because I did vote in favour of debating this today. Certainly not my intention for this to be over and done with on this… I hope that is not the ultimate result of debating this today. Certainly not my intention. However, I must say this is part and parcel of what I consider to be…that will be an ongoing concern, an ongoing plan, ongoing debate for the City of Winnipeg, for all three levels of government as we deal with the Honourable Jean Charest's task force. Now, I guess for me, it's an honour in front of students of Communications, Madam Speaker that I may be, I believe, the first Councillor now to state specifically and clearly that the opportunity that the Charest Commission on railway rationalization will have in terms of taking a greater view, a longer term view, an energy conscious view, a greener view of our rapid transit plans for the future. That this opportunity of looking at railway...rail yard reallocation means that we are in a position to look at what is often in this country…most often, Madam Speaker, when it comes to rapid transit, that the end gain is light rail. That is where Canada goes. That is where the cities of Canada go and that being witness to this myself, Madam Speaker, as a teenager, having seen the implementation, living in Ottawa of the bus rapid transit system and see now, after generation, that they are renovating, dismantling, moving it in favour of light rail transit, well that is the nature of evolution of rapid transit in this country, Madam Speaker. And on that basis, I want to state here for the record that the Charest Commission on railway rationalization offers us that potential. And I'm pleased that this was mentioned in the Provincial government speech from the Throne and that it is happening now in a new era. Since this initiative taken by the Provincial government, a new era at City Hall and a new era of our Federal government that we might be in a position, Madam Speaker, if the political will is there, to take a look at how we can most efficiently and effectively use our rail lines to create light rail in the City as we move forward. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Morantz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to put a few things on the record. I think we need to go back in history a little bit and understand that when we decided to prioritize our capital...were asked to prioritize our capital projects for Build Canada, we didn't just pick Waverley randomly. There has been some discussion here about how it would make more sense to do Chief Peguis but the reality is, Madam Speaker, that we had our public service do a cost benefit analysis and my recollection of that analysis is that from an economic perspective, economic return, Waverley underpass was the highest priority not by a little bit but my recollection is that it was by a lot. There wasn't

even a question about it. Now, I have to say, Madam Speaker, that March 25th, those priorities were put before Council and every Councillor around this table voted for those priorities, including the Councillors that are now trying to vote against those priorities. So I guess you could say they voted for it before they intend to vote against it. But I just want to say also, we have a responsibility to manage this City and part of that responsibility has to take into account that we can't get delayed by things that may happen ten years, or twenty years or perhaps never in the future. And I want to say, like, I agree with Councillor Eadie. Rail relocation, rationalization, whatever you want to call it, it is a great idea but it's an idea that is in its infancy and the Honourable Charest task force is going to do their best to come up with ideas around it but the reality is that this project is a long term project, it's not going to happen for years, it's not going to happen next year. It may not happen ever, who knows. But, besides that, as I think the point was made in an earlier debate, it's not up to us. The Government of Canada doesn't get to decide even, it's got to be in concert with the railways. It's a very complicated and a project that will cost billions of dollars. And so we have a responsibility, Madam Speaker, to do what the people who elected us asked us to do which is manage this City. And so when we voted on that priority list, when all of us voted for Waverley to be number one even the Councillors standing up today to say they now want to vote against it, we made a decision and based on that decision, what did we do? We made an application to the Federal government and we applied for a number of different projects and they came back and said yeah we want to fund Waverley and we talked to the Province and they said yeah, we want to fund Waverley and then what did we do? And many of us were there that day. We went to the announcement. I remember being there in the parking lot of the Piazza de Nardi with a then MP Bateman and Minister Caldwell and His Worship Mayor Bowman. They were all there, making this announcement, and I didn't hear any of the Councillors then saying, oh, why are we doing this? We did our business case analysis, we voted, we went out, we got funding, we had the announcement. And now all of a sudden, because, really, the truth is, that these Councillors have decided it's not about railway rationalization, they want Chief Peguis. But they can't have it and they won't have it because we have to rely on our public service. And our public service did the analysis and told us Waverley is the best bang for your buck. It's the least expensive, best return for the taxpayers of this City and I think that's the way we have to go and...and those are my comments. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks very much, Madam Speaker. Yeah, I will repeat a little bit of what Councillor Morantz, our Finance Chair has indicated earlier. Maybe I will go even further back from what this Council did last year and I will remind Winnipeggers about what I call during the most recent municipal campaign, the gong show that we all witnessed as Winnipeggers that occurred here at City Hall by the previous Council in relation to the second phase of rapid transit. It was on, it was off. It was a moving object of whether or not second phase would actually proceed. And so it was delayed for largely a decade. As a result, I would argue, of the politics at City Hall. That being said, Winnipeggers supported second phase. This Council, I'm grateful, has supported our efforts to complete second phase and to proceed in an expeditious way. When it comes to this motion, I am reminded of the fact that there was unanimous support by this Council for the priorities. Waverley being the number one priority of this Council and it was as a result of the direction from this Council that our administration and I secured funding from other levels of government which we were able to do in the tune of $90 million. We have had ongoing dialogue with the previous Federal Government and now the current new government for the Federal Government, and we do have written commitments from both levels of government for $45 million. $90 million on $155 million project which is the number one priority of this Council from the Build Canada applications… makes sense to proceed. Now, I have heard a lot of discussion about the rail rationalization task force led by the Honourable Jean Charest. And firstly, I want to commend him and thank him for lending his talents and energies to this important endeavour. I was very proud to stand alongside Jean Charest and to work co-operatively with our provincial partners to look at something that has been talked about for decades and decades and decades. Rail rationalization is something that can and may occur. Rail relocation…if we are talking about moving rail yards is a much bigger ticket cost and throughout all the discussions that I have had at the most senior levels of our Federal government and Provincial government, I have not been provided billions of dollars of money to bring to Council to support moving the railways as much as it is a long-term objective, that I'm sure all Winnipeggers share. The first step is to get the analysis so that we actually have numbers. Many members of this Council and in the public throw hundreds of millions of dollars or billions of dollars to move rail yards out of the City. The reality is, we don't know. And that's one of the reasons why it's important that we get that information which may come in in years' time through the work of Jean Charest and Councillor Allard and others who will help out. I think, too, I think we need to allow that effort to actually begin and we can obviously add our voice to what our expectations are and hope with that task force. I for one, and in the announcement, have said that we need to get information to make informed decisions about long-term priorities. And until we have that information, we still need to make decisions based on today's priorities and today's reality. We just are in the process of finishing the underpass in Transcona, it's needed. The Waverley underpass, it's needed. Extension of Chief Peguis is one of those important priorities that does need to occur. And I know many members of Council are very passionate about seeing that happen and I support those efforts. It's a question of timing. The extension of Chief Peguis, the latest update that members of Council received in terms of cost was a Class 5 estimate in the range of $400 million. That could be as high as 800 million considering it's a Class 5, it's on the upper end of the spectrum. Nearly a billion dollars. We do not have $1 from the Federal Government or the Provincial Government for a potential $800 million

investment, that I would add, goes across two railway lines, not one as in Waverley. So, there are compelling reasons to proceed. We have negotiated in good faith and we've made, obviously announcements and secured written commitments, and I think now is the time for us to proceed. Delays, of course, will result in likely a cost escalation. Just based on inflationary pressures, if we lose a year of construction that will be in excess of $7 million. I think we need to be mindful of taxpayers and the money that is sent here that we are spending imprudently. And again, considering this was the unanimous direction from this Council, we have been proceeding on that basis. The only thing that has changed is we have a new Federal Government and they have recommitted to funding. Secondly, with regards to the Rail Task Force, well, we are going to look at it. It is worthy of looking at for the reasons I have outlined but we don't have a time line, nor do we have any money set aside for moving rail yards at this time and I think we need to be realistic about the scope and that's why it's so important that we get the numbers so we can have that discussion. I know many of us have talked a lot and Councillor Pagtakhan is very passionate about the Arlington Bridge and we are doing work right now with regards to the fact that that deferred maintenance has gone on far too long. But the reality is the railways...the rail yards...there is no plan at this stage to do so. So let's get the information that this Council needs in order to have informed discussion with or provincial and federal partners and other stakeholders, including the railways as we move forward. For those reasons, I won't be supporting this motion and would ask us to continue to move ahead with the priority as established by Council. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next is Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will not be supporting this motion. In principle, the concept is not a bad idea. I mean, why spend millions of dollars on an overpass over railway tracks if we're going to remove the railway tracks? So therefore, we should adjust our priorities accordingly. The problem with that is we have no idea if the railway tracks will ever be moved. So what this motion asks for, is it asks us as Council to take a lot of risk, and the risk is we have no idea how long the study will take. The risk is we have no sense of what the findings of the rail relocation study, what they ultimately might be. There is risk because we have no sense to what degree all of the stakeholders, any or all of the stakeholders may be willing to participate; the City, the rail companies, other municipalities, property owners, developers…we have no sense of what the environmental impact will be on rail relocation if it ever happens. We have no idea yet, the cost of rail relocation and the timing of any rail relocation. So there is so much risk involved with supporting this motion that I don't think it's prudent for us, as Council to take. So rail relocation, if it happens, as has been stated several times could be five, ten, fifteen, twenty, fifty years away, we don't know. But before us we have, on the other hand, a project, Waverley project, which I'm similar to Councillor Lukes in that it may not have been my priority but nonetheless we voted on it, we supported it. And we have a project as the Mayor has just stated and Councillor Lukes has stated and Councillor Morantz for which $45 million from both the Federal Government and $45 million from the Provincial Government towards the $155 million project has been secured and just been reaffirmed here in this meeting. So the provincial funding is secured, the federal funding is secured for this Waverley underpass construction. If we delay, the Mayor mentioned, we're subject…this project is subject to construction inflation. Year over year for every year of delay we incur that construction inflation. And so while the idea sounds nice to wait, you know, maybe the lines will move, let's not build the overpass at this point, at this moment today, but there is just too much risk involved with waiting and we can't afford to do that so I will not be supporting this motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thanks everyone for their comments. I'm going to go back a little further back even than phase one of rapid transit. The Mayor…phase two of rapid transit...go back to phase one when we faced a situation where we had a project that was funded and there was commitment from both levels of government, it was a $51 million project and a change of political will came along and it was cancelled. And the money was spent on something else. And which was recreation, which is a long complicated story, but it was kind of like a motherhood thing, instead of rapid transit you were pitted against something else. And this feels a bit similar to this in many ways. That we are being told we either don't care about rail relocation or we are going to build the Chief Peguis trail project instead of this project in a different part of the City. We are being squeezed with a kind of political spin on this. And I guess I just want to…the impact that happened with phase one of rapid transit, at that time it was eventually built, close to ten years later, perhaps, at a cost of more than three times the cost, I think it was $184 million it cost to build, it was built. It was pretty much the same project. So, when you have a project that is funded and we have letters of approval, it's in writing, we have a Class 3 estimate, our procedures have improved, we know the cost. It's very risky if you cancel it, even for one year if it's delayed that's $7 million right there. So I just think that's something to consider. I really, you know, this thing of either you don't care about railway relocation or you want to build the Chief Peguis Trail right now is not really a fair thing to say to members of Council. Many of us have cared for a long time about railway relocation, I mean, doesn't mean we don't care because we're not going to switch a $150 million Class 3 project that was approved unanimously with a 400 to 800 Class 5 that has a number of other issues. So it's...I just, I think this is being…this issue is a bit being used a bit of a red herring in a way to say we want this other project. We know many people…some members of Council wanted that other project. So I don't want the people of Winnipeg to think that

members of this Council don't care about railway relocation and I don't think that's a fair statement. So I feel like saying that. When we did that reprioritization, my choice, if I didn't have to pick from those four projects, would be none of those four projects. They are all road extensions, they're road expansions, they're overpasses, they are all for the car infrastructure. I mean, that's a lot of money, I would rather start on phase two in the eastern part of the City, by the way, Councillors in the north east…which we should be doing. Yeah. So, I mean, maybe we should have done that, but the fact is, those were the choices that were put in front of us for that funding that was available and unfortunately, that's often how things work. I wish we had been more developed and had years of leadership and support saying rapid transit was our top priority for all those years without all this back and forth and changing our mind and flipping and flopping and we would have been much further along and we would have probably been ready to do that and it's too bad we weren't but we weren't. And now we have a mayor who is beginning a lot of those processes in terms of supporting an integrated transportation system but at that point in time, we had these four projects and there were reasons...I have never really…I am not partial to any of them frankly, I would love to take that money and do other things. But, as a Council, we have the other two levels of government offering us money for one of these four things and we made a choice, 16-0 was the vote. So this rail relocation thing came along and I believe that it's genuine that we want to look at it, we want to consider it but the reality is, it is pretty long-term in terms of at least the main line, we might…some of those spur lines could move, perhaps sooner, which would affect projects like the Chief Peguis Trail, not Waverley, so…and perhaps Marion which is currently not top on our list either right now, unfortunately, I don't even think it's second or whatever. But part of the thing that I also want to point out that was driving those rail projects was new federal regulations and the Waverley...and I have always been against the Waverley project over the years, but as things have evolved and they have massively increased the amount of traffic on that line to whatever it is a day, forty, thirty trains a day. I mean, for me, I don't really mind if a car waits five minutes, that's not my biggest concern, but there are a lot of safety concerns around it at a certain level and there are more and more federal regulations and it is a real issue and if you look at all of the ones we have in the city, I think this is number one and Marion's probably number two. So that was the argument that was given to us back when we decided of the four projects to pick that one. There were some compelling reasons at least, I could tell myself it's about public safety, something. In fairness, I hope that there isn't going to be more talk of saying all of you...either vote for the Chief Peguis Trail Project, that's my favourite project, or you don't care about rail relocation, I don't think that's a fair thing to say. I don't think it's true, I just think that there is a reality that it's going to be very difficult to quickly move the main line, I mean, I think some of the spur lines, maybe there is something we can do over time perhaps we can. And I think we should try, I think we should passionately try to do this, but the province who supported the railway relocation, they also supported this project and so has both Federal Governments, the previous and this one. So and Marion…yes Councillor Allard…so, my point is that, you know, let's not keep repeating the mistake of getting to a certain point in a project and then changing our minds and that's costing millions. Because my guess would be that if we did that we would probably end up building the Waverley underpass in a couple of years for many, many more millions of dollars and we would be building it again and we would have lost that dollars which could have gone to something else. So, we have been to the movie before of cancelling projects. This isn't my project, none of these are but we are supposed to be a team. We are not representing just our own interests in our ward or even our own just view of what should happen in the City overall. We are a team and as a team, sixteen of us voted for these four projects, many of us not thrilled about having to be put in that position. But part of the reason we are in that position is because we depend on funding from other levels of government and they have made the decision that this is where it's going and we have made the decision that this was our priority. They asked us and we had to give them an answer and that's the answer we gave them. It's not fair to turn around now and say let's just build a different project that isn't ready. I mean, what would we do, would we give the money back until we have a Class 3 estimate? Would we stop the process that has already gone under way to this point? I just hope people are going to be kind to each other here. Nobody is trying to attack anybody. We are simply...people have a right, you know, they are going to advocate, I guess, for their project. And I guess I point that out too, that was the culture on the previous Council, was advocate for your project, put out a billboard, go lobby your MP or you Premier. I remember the former mayor saying that because I remember I asked Mayor Katz the question, I believe, it was about the Plessis underpass. Do you want us to do that? Do you want us to go out and put up a billboard and say, you know, I want the Osborne underpass, you know because it's important to my ward...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow moves extension. All in favour?

Councillor Gerbasi: The answer was yes, go out and do that, good for you. Well I don't think that's a good form of leadership. We can't have sixteen different transportation plans. And we have to work together and I appreciate the view of looking at the interest of the whole City. May not be my favourite or most important priority, but we have to be responsible with the taxpayers money and delaying a project that's at this point whether it's your favourite project or not is only going cost the taxpayers more because it's going to happen anyway. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Eadie: Point of privilege, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yes, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I realize that the debate is civil and we are not trying to attack each other, but Madam Speaker on a point of privilege, I would like to point out that through every meeting that we had in regards to the list, that Kenaston was the number one project, it had the Class 3 estimate, it was the cost benefit number one and I always supported the Kenaston over top of everything. It's a point of privilege. I am being accused of picking projects, Madam Speaker, and I want to make it clear that people are trying to make it sound like I somehow am only concerned about the Chief Peguis project. I will point out that Kenaston was always my number one project and it's also a fact that the Supreme Court, there is already a decision that that barracks is going away. So I would just like to make that point of privilege.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Your comments have been noted, thank you. Councillor Mayes, you are the next speaker.

Councillor Mayes: I'll try to bring in a note of positivism then Madam Speaker. Firstly, I was transported to a better place there by Councillor Gillingham's soaring oratory, which, said much of what I wanted to say, however, in terms of the risks involved if we don't proceed and we simply defer and wait until rail relocation, or as the Mayor said, think about the scope of this, consider the scope…it's a huge undertaking, it really is, it will take decades quite possibly. It's good that we are having the discussions, it's good that we have a serious person looking into it, but we could wait on all of our projects, trying to amass capital and some guesstimate of what this all might cost. So, some points well made by Councillor Gillingham. And Councillor Gerbasi mentions an important point which was, there's rail safety aspect to Waverley. That, in fact, is how it moved up the priority list ahead of Marion. But if you look at the motion we had in front of us in March, it reads, "Whereas the future Waverley Underpass Project will incorporate new railway safety standards set by the Federal Government". So, legal facts have changed and that helped move Waverley up the priority list. Those are important to note. It's become kind of an issue where people say, well, if you just didn't do this and that and you would soon have the billion dollars you need, well it may not be a billion it may be multiple billions but we had one important thing, well, somehow the second phase of BRT, at $590 million has to do with rail relocation. If you just didn't do that, if we just moved the railway line, we would save that money, well that's pretty thin. You do need a tunnel or an overpass but the fact that if we just waited until rail relocation, we still wouldn't have a BRT and somehow it would pay for itself, I don't see how you can grab different projects and say a hundred million there hundred million…590 but frankly, of that 590, a hundred million is going toward helping with the sewer backups and drainage issues and the underpass that's already there. A bit thin to start adding in the BRT cost as being avoidable if we just did rail relocation. Third point, I can tell Councillor Schreyer is somewhat younger than me because when I was in Ottawa, I was riding the newly fangled BRT to work, he was a teenager he says, so. We both have memories of when that came in in Ottawa in the mid-80s, but I just wanted to touch on something and I suspect I will have to give this little address again, over the next few years, which is, we have people coming...and Councillor Schreyer didn't say this, so I don't want to put words into his mouth...we have people coming here and saying repeatedly, Ottawa did BRT...they are tearing out the BRT, thus it's a failure, thus you should do LRT. I met with the Councillor who's responsible for transit in Ottawa last year and said that's what people say and his exact response was, "You tell them it not only worked for the City of Ottawa, but it worked spectacularly well." We always said we would look to shift LRT when we get to a million. If you take the Greater Ottawa Area, it's gotten to a million. If it didn't work, why are we still building new BRT expansions, which they are, and why would the City of Gatineau, 200 metres across the river there, why would they have just built a BRT if it was such a colossal failure in Ottawa? We get an e-mail, all of us the other day, saying how Ottawa's tearing it out, it must not have worked. I go with Stephen Blais who is a Councillor in Ottawa who said it worked and worked spectacularly well. They had bus traffic jams so now they need an LRT system. Hopefully we'll get to a million in my lifetime and yours, Madam Speaker, and we can then look at LRT conversion, that would be a great victory I think. The other point I wanted to make was the other evolution in this debate over the past six months is, well now that you have decided not to do Marion and Archibald you can put the money toward this project or sewers or that project or…the Council hasn't decided that we're not doing something, I want to be fair to Councillor Allard who I think made the right call in saying we're not going to do that which was proposed but we still need to look at Marion and Archibald. We still need to remember that's where our future BRT line is supposed to go and we need to incorporate that into our designs. So, just before people start moving that down the priority list because we're not doing it, I think they have to remember that we are still doing it, we're just looking at maybe some different approaches there. And in our new civil tone Madam Speaker, I'll say in tribute to the Festival and Councillor Allard who has arranged for the simultaneous translation here so I always try to pay homage to that but, a couple of words in French.

Translation of French spoken:

Councillor Mayes: Marion & Archibald is a major intersection in the South-East quarter of the city of Winnipeg. There are still many issues. Citizens still have needs that have to be met. Therefore, we need to find a solution. I know that Councillor Allard will keep working with the citizens of St. Boniface and St. Vital.

Councillor Mayes: So Marion Archibald hasn't fallen off the table. It's still there but I think we have to keep with the priority list we set in March. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Point of privilege in this case regarding Councillor Mayes comments about Ottawa BRT.

Madam Speaker: What is your point?

Councillor Schreyer: Merely, because he was referring to what I was saying. And I just wish to clarify, that I have heard Councillor Mayes' comments before. I am pleased with his insights on this. My point being, that LRT is an inevitability, whether the point is, whether we can afford the intermediary phase of a BRT. We are not an Ottawa, we're not a Calgary, we're not a Vancouver, we're not a Toronto. And that's why I make my comments.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order. People are allowed to say what they said unless they are asking that they withdraw their comments, it's just really continuing on with different speeches.

Madam Speaker: Yah, we've opened that can of worms earlier today. We'll move on to the next speaker now which is Councillor Browaty. Thank you.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Here is a shocker for everyone, Chief Peguis is my number one priority on that list. That said, I mean, the reality is, relocation is a long-term piece, it's not all going to happen at once. If the Chief Peguis extension went through, it would be crossing two rail lines. But, if you look at one of the reports here with us today, about rail safety, about six trains a week would use those two lines combined. The reality is that forty to fifty trains a day today going down the CN River's line, it's a very busy line and the reality is a lot of people are spending a lot of time waiting. This council has at times delayed projects, unfortunately not cancelled projects when it comes to the rapid transit. We are wasting all sorts of money on that right now. But when it comes to this project, I think unfortunately, it is needed. I don't see it in any…even in the medium to long-term that changing, as much as I would absolutely, positively love to see Chief Peguis move up and I think, you know, right now we have a really neat opportunity. We have other levels of government that are quite committed to additional infrastructure spending. I...our new member of parliament up in northeast Winnipeg…or north Winnipeg, MaryAnn Mihychuk, every time she has the microphone in front of her, she's preaching the importance of the Chief Peguis Trail extension. I have had texts while we've been sitting here from Kevin Lamoureux saying knock 'em dead over Chief Peguis. I know Premier Selinger said you know hey, maybe it won't be one-third funding, maybe the province can do more he said to me in a casual setting at one point on the Chief Peguis Trail extension. So this isn't saying that we are saying no to Chief Peguis Trail extension or any of the other wonderful projects, it's saying that, you know what, this is proceeding, this is much further along, we can't stop this train is that...no, no, never mind. Nonetheless...and it's not a crazy train…more song references, no. This is, I think a very needed project and unfortunately I will not be supporting Councillor Wyatt's motion, I think his intentions are good. I think there are some other important projects out there that aren't recognized in the current top five. I mean, look at some of our major signalized intersections that Public Works will identify as performing at a D or an F. Regent-Lagimodiere is a diamond interchange, I think is a better priority than some other stuff out there. I mean, yes, that's looking up towards my part of the City but I think that's something that we need to look at in the nearer term, too. I won't supporting this motion today, but don't take this to mean in the least that I am not absolutely enamored by the Chief Peguis Trail extension.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you to all my Council colleagues for your comments on this very important issue of our infrastructure priorities for the City of Winnipeg. And to save everyone some guess work I will be voting against this motion, I just want to explain why. You may have heard in the media regarding my thoughts on the Marion-Archibald upgrade project design. I haven't actually spoken to my Councillor colleagues yet on the option. And so, I thank you to Councillor Mayes for saying that it's still a problem even though the Councillor for the area has decided not to support the particular design that's being forwarded, or proposed by our City administration, which will be hitting our formal agenda soon. As I understand it, Councillor Lukes, though we still don't have a firm date on when that might be happening and yes, Councillor Gerbasi, Marion is still number two on our Council priority list. I also want to remind Council that Marion-Archibald still does enjoy a one-third commitment from the Province as does Waverley though we do not have the commitment from the Federal Government. Though I note that the now Prime Minister Justin Trudeau is aware of Marion-Archibald, he had mentioned Marion-Archibald in his remarks prior to being the Prime Minister so I'm sure the MP for the area, Dan Vandal and our Prime Minister is aware and it's definitely a good project and worth pursuing. So on the option itself, I feel it's the Cadillac version where another car might suffice. Decided not to support the option after much thought, many meetings, many consultations because of cost and because the option did not have the support from the community and not just the immediate community but the community in general almost no one I

spoke to who was aware of the plan was favorable to it, just in terms of rationale. And in terms of going forward, I still believe that we need a new option for that intersection. It still has 35,000 cars a day going through it and four to eight trains a day crossing the intersection. It's a major bottle neck, so I will be working with my colleagues and Councillor Janice Lukes and our administration, looking for an option that can address the northbound traffic along Archibald in the morning which is one of the big bottle necks and as well as the end of the east bound traffic which is also really significant. So my criteria for support on any option would be less cost, less expropriations. There would have been about 140 expropriations...we just lived through the rapid transit project and we know how we want to avoid expropriation if at all possible. I am going to be looking for an option that has less of an impact on the surrounding neighbourhood and an option that will enjoy at least some level of…or that will enjoy community support in a way that this proposed option did not. So, I want to thank my colleagues for hearing what I had to say on the option, I know it's nice to hear things directly at Council rather than through the media so I wanted to put my comments on the record and share my thoughts and thank you to Council as well for supporting these infrastructure priorities that has Marion Archibald still in the number two spot. So with that, merci beaucoup.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you to all my Council colleagues who have helped make my decision today. I think it's really helpful to have the debate and hear different thoughts on this important issue. I will not be supporting the motion today and even though I still have questions regarding the cost of the Waverley underpass, I still have questions regarding our upcoming budget and how that's impacted that and making sure we still have money in the budget to make sure we take care of our old infrastructure, I have questions around that. But regarding the motion here today, I think that what is important is that we as elected officials it's sometimes hard to take us away from our current area into the City as a whole and that's sometimes hard to do and even when you hear members of Parliament and probably our Manitoba Legislative Assembly people are all chiming in, we have to try to make a decision. And that's why it's important when we look at these that we look at the cost analyst benefits that our City officials have done because they are kind of looking at it through a different lens. They are trying to manage our city, our traffic flow and they are looking at it from a totally different lens. So, from that perspective, that's why I'm supporting this. That work has been done and that's why I will be...won't be supporting the motion that's in front of us today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Okay, back to you Councillor Wyatt, to close.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, I just want to thank everyone who spoke on this item. I have listened to all of your comments and your speeches. I want to thank those who are supporting it and I want to thank those who even are opposing it for your comments and your words here today. I want to thank you also for your patience and entertaining the debate because really, it's an introduction of an idea. And I know it's asking a lot, in terms of the fact that what is being proposed here is basically a massive paradigm shift. I know that's not easy, I know that doesn't happen overnight. It happens with the introduction of ideas and sometimes those ideas are not adopted immediately but the ideas begin to flow. But it is a massive paradigm shift. I wish the paradigm shift was happening five, six, seven years ago prior to the whole Plessis underpass, I wish there was a Charest Commission ten years ago…Charest Task Force, sorry, ten years ago. Because, you know, it could have saved us tens of millions of dollars there in headaches and everything else if we were relocating lines and we knew at that time. But you know, the reality is we're...Councillor Browaty used it, but we are on this train it seeMs And this train is not going to be inexpensive, we're talking 155 million at the outset for Waverley. There's already been open houses down the road for the William Clement Parkway. That's going to have a grade separation, you can be guaranteed that. Another one, on the other side of Kenaston. When in the future Wilkeslands open up to the south and Ridgewood develops to the north in Charleswood, you can be guaranteed there's going to be pressure for another grade separation probably in the vicinity of Shaftesbury running north-south and upgrading that. Never mind the hundred million we are already budgeting inside the BRT plan that's already here before us today for grade separation and everything at Pembina, that's already on the plate that we are actually approving...we have already approved and are moving forward with. That that has a direct impact on us and not to mention what has been mentioned about the yards to the north and the Arlington bridge and the state of that and another number I've heard of, 300 million potentially there. And then Marion, which we've heard is anywhere from 250 to 350, we don't know. Everybody is throwing around billions to move the yards, move rail lines, yeah, well it's billions to build these things you guys. This is the paradigm shift that needs to happen because the benefits of getting the right-of-ways, the benefits of having the lands that were once, for example, the former CPR yards. I mean, this city, the history of this city, it's a marvelous history, it's an amazing history, a beautiful history and you read of the turn of the century and you read at the end of the last century and the creation of Winnipeg and the divide of Winnipeg and those yards which are so symbolic of the divide between north and south, between those who have and those who don't, between the new Canadians and the old generation that had been here, the Anglo-Saxon decent, those yards are so symbolic and they offer such an opportunity for our City. And I know it's a big paradigm shift, I know it's huge, but it's not impossible and you what, it's happening if you...I know we kind of get isolated here, Winnipeg, because, you know, we are the largest city on the…and we get our own little bubble here sometimes with our media and everything else and we don't see

newspapers happening and debates happening in other parts of the country as easily as which we could as they do maybe in southern Ontario where they see things happening in other communities all the time or lower mainland BC, but I can tell you, I can tell you, if you go and just Google and go online the debate is happening across this country. Municipalities are moving across this country to get the railways out. They see the opportunity, they see the benefit to their municipalities and they see why they would want to do this in the long run. And especially now, I mean, the thing that is the game changer in so many ways, so many ways is the safety issue. The safety issue of these trains. There is a train, the trains go by soccer fields, the CAO spoke about that actually, passionately, when he was at the committee about trains going by soccer...he was standing there watching his son play soccer…or his child play soccer and there was a train of oil going right by the soccer field. And you know, these are the things that are facing us today and the challenges we are facing and we know in terms of the pipelines and the need to build pipelines, so I'm asking for a paradigm shift, there's no doubt about it, I know that's huge, and I know that's huge. And so I appreciate the debate and I appreciate the thoughts and I would just appreciate that we keep an open mind. And I know the pressure, political pressure that Councillor Orlikow, Councillor Morantz and other Councillors are feeling in terms of that neighbourhood around Wilkes. I know that, I have lived it. The volumes are very similar in terms of Plessis Road and Wilkes, very similar, 25,000 was the estimate at Plessis, yours is 30, I mean, it's very similar. And you know, it really is a major piece in terms of that impact in that neighbourhood. I had a good friend who, the other day, who lives in your neighbourhood, Councillor Morantz or maybe in your neighbourhood Councillor Orlikow, who said, well that's it he said, when we heard the motion, he is moving to Transcona because of the underpass. But you know...but anyway, you know, I said, well don't move quite yet, I don't think it's over. But I think we have an opportunity...and I just want to speak...note quickly, last year the motion that was before us last year and you know, I hear the fact that...I agree with Councillor Gerbasi, my thought would be BRT but we did have originally in the original Building Canada priorities we did have a BRT one that dropped off last year and it was called the Louise Bridge which actually is not Louise Bridge, it is the eastern corridor because that's how you deal with Louise. That was the project that was on the list that fell off. And if we recall, the debate was extremely divisive last year and there was a compromise that was struck and I will read the compromise to you…before you, from the Building Canada from the minutes of March 25, 2014 Council meeting. The compromise was a clause added, clause number four, "That the final approval of City funding for projects and overall scope be continued upon Council approval the final funding for projects and overall scope be a contingent upon Council approval"....I am assuming the report that came to the standing committee last week is not the final report because it has no scope. It's broken Council Policy. I see a write up. A Class 3 estimate on a budget page but that's not…can't be the scope. I don't see any detour of tens of millions that I've heard was in this budget. I don't see any railway shoe fly that has to be built. Where is the scope? That was the compromise and that is what brought Council together unanimously, I will remind everybody, okay. And I was part of that, bringing that compromise, and you know what, no it's not in the report, it's not in the report and it's missing which...so I'm going to give the benefit of the doubt that there must be another report coming. So, anyway...for approval before this project can move forward. I believe that we have an opportunity...and you know it's…you're right, it's not Chief Peguis versus this. I was working within the parameters of the four approvals and I felt to be fair, to start throwing other things on to it...well where does it end, right? But where we can look at this is re-numbering and reprioritizing the four that are there today. And saying that yes, these are all important. As I have said, we could take a map of the City of Winnipeg.

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

Councillor Wyatt: We could take a map of the City of Winnipeg and literally throw a dart at it and it will hit some sort of road project or bridge or something that we got to build. It's not a question of the amount of projects, it's the question of how much money we have. We voted last fall to increase our debt borrowing…our debt servicing costs so that we can do Waverley. And so, never mind the other stuff. We are in a position, Councillors, where we have to make tough decisions. Where we have to decide where we are putting money against the actual debt that we can carry as a City without jeopardizing our credit rating. And this is crucial when deciding the priorities. And that's why I say that if we are going to go down this road and we're going to…of looking at the rail lines and deciding the rail lines should be…and seriously...and I believe it's a sincere effort because I've read the statements made by Charest, I've read the statements made by the Mayor, I read the statements made by the Premier. And you know what, I don't believe the argument that it's decades. It can happen. I have seen things in this chamber that I've opposed but has happened…political will and others of us that have opposed…that pushed through because it's just the power behind it. If the Mayor and the Premier and the Prime Minister are in favour of moving the rail lines, it can be done. But the passion and the drive has to be there. The minute we sound about process and reports and everything, that's our friends across the way. We are about results, folks, we're about results. And that's what we need, we need results. So I would encourage you to support the motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question on Motion No. 5. All in favour? Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please rise.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Dobson, Gerbasi, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Morantz, Pagtakhan and Schreyer

Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, yeas 3, nays 13

Madam Speaker: Motion is defeated. Moving on to By-laws. By-laws for first reading only, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 1ST READING ONLY

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law No. 20 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. By-laws for all three readings, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the following be read a first time; By-law 100/2015, By-law 1 through 12/2015 inclusive.

(Inaudible)

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

Clerk: By-law No. 100/2015, By-law No. 1/2016, By-law No. 2/2016, By-law No. 3/2016, By-Law No. 4/2016, By-Law No. 9/2016, By-Law No. 10/2016, By-Law No. 1/2016, By-law No. 12/2016.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law Nos. 100/2015, 1/2016 to 4/2016 both inclusive and 9/2016 to 12/2016 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 1/2015, 1/2016 to 4/2016 both inclusive and 9/2016 to 12/2016 both inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move the rule be suspended and By-law Nos. 1/2015, 1/2016 to 4/2016 both inclusive and 9/2016 to 12/2016 both inclusive be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. So noted. We will now have question period for the Mayor. Any questions for the Mayor? Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I did have a question about railways, but I'm going to, I'll leave that alone, Madam Speaker, but in preference I think it's a legislation or federal legislation that says the railways first, the CP Rail line ploughed through a residential neighbourhood of the City of Winnipeg way back when it came through, just for historical purposes. It wasn't everywhere on the railway first. Anyway, my question, Madam Speaker, I know that the Mayor has started a process when the former Auditor decided to not continue on; and my question is, are we, have we City Auditor ready to be hired and put into place, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thanks to my Council colleague for the question. A new permanent City Auditor is obviously key to ensuring that the processes and procedures that we expect to be followed are, in fact, followed that recommended changes to improve operations here at the City of Winnipeg continue to be implemented appropriately and to ensure accountability through all future audit activities here at the City of Winnipeg. The Selection Committee is currently reviewing all applications received. The Auditor Selection Committee consists of EPC members, as well as Councillors Gilroy and Wyatt, and I want to thank them for their participation. And I'm confident that we'll be able to provide Council with a recommendation on the filling this position in the very near future. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question, Councillor Eadie? No. Councillor Wyatt, or pardon me, Councillor Gilroy, you had your hand up?

Councillor Gilroy: This is regarding the budget process. We have yet to still hear taxpayers do not know what's going on with our budget, we have yet to hear what implementations are coming from there, if there's going to be, if there's going to any cuts of services or added, and you know, even as Councillors we're having a hard time doing our job, we're talking about the Waverley Underpass, we don't know what implications that has towards our aging infrastructure. So I was just going to ask the Mayor where we are with making sure that the public can hear what's going on with our budget?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: And thanks very much to the Councillor for her question. As our Finance Chair can speak to as well, should any members have additional questions regarding the budget. The budget process did begin last year, and this year we changed things, I think we made a step in the right direction to improving the budget process. The budget working group is comprised, is actually dominated by two non-EPC members this year for the first time ever, Councillor Gerbasi as well as Councillor Gillingham. I want to thank them for their efforts. That work is ongoing and I believe 10 or 11 of the past 14 budgets have been tabled and approved in the March time period. We are anticipating that the budget will be tabled in early March. And I want to thank also those Winnipeggers and members of Council, who also participated in something that I'm very proud that we were able to undertake this year and that was the "Let's Talk" initiative, so there was a lot of excellent feedback that Winnipeggers provided as they were engaged in the process, and my understanding is that information is now public on the website, as was promised, as that information as it was received by the City, we'd share that for the discussion. And like previous years, once the budget is finalized and ready to be tabled, we will of course invite all stakeholders to continue to discuss how we can make sure that we have a budget that is focused on addressing the priorities of Winnipeggers. I think that's about it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor. The only way I can preface, reference this question is by referring to the fact that back in December, mid-December approximately to just before Christmas, there was a number of newspaper articles, which outlined the fact that the City of Winnipeg has filed a Statement of Claim with regards to the Water and Treatment Plant out Deacon's reservoir and as well has received in November a response to another Statement of Claim, why are we as members of Council having to get this information by reading it in the Winnipeg Free Press instead of receiving reports to members of Council?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Obviously we made a significant effort on trying to work with our administration to better address information flows to members of Council, as well as to the public. And I would ask that the Councillor may wish to also speak with this matter with our CAO.

Madam Speaker: New question, Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: Will we receive any reports outlining Statement of Claims that have been made, the Statement of Claim that was made, the Statement of Claim that was filled, and as well as the costs in terms of how we have paid for these losses and when we will be paying for them?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thanks very much for the question. You know what, I'm going to have to refresh my memory on the status of this matter, and I'd be more than happy to follow up with the Councillor afterwards.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Third question.

Councillor Wyatt: Final question will be, in terms of the unsuccessful Statement of Claim, specifically why was that unsuccessful and why did we not succeed at the cost to the City of Winnipeg by the failure of that Statement of Claim?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I'll just repeat what I just said, that I'd be more than happy to follow up with the Councillor. In the meantime, I would suggest that he may want to speak with our legal counsel as well as the CAO, both of whom are available to answer questions at any time from any member of this Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Mayor? Okay, seeing none, we will move on to the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. The report dated January 4, 2016. Councillor Mayes.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT DATED JANUARY 4, 2016

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to move Items 1 to 3 inclusive of the report dated January 4, 2016.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. There are no motions for this committee, no by-laws. We'll now have question period for the Chair. Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: And I know this is a sensitive matter, I know this is a sensitive matter and I don't want to, I want to preface it by saying it's a Human Resource matter, but in terms of the status of the last we've heard as members of Council, the leave of absence for the Director was December 3rd.

Madam Speaker: That line of questioning would be inappropriate, Human Resources matters on the floor of Council. Just one moment.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay, then I will say.

Madam Speaker: (Inaudible)

Councillor Wyatt: Maybe I'll use it this way, would the Chair be prepared to look in to confidentially the status with regards to leadership within the department?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Certainly, I can get back to the Councillor. I think, I will say this, we have an Acting Chair or we have an Acting Head of the Department, Moira Geer, who I think is doing a fine job certainly keeping us well-briefed, is pointed, we had a period where they were changing periodically without somebody in place for a while. But I can follow up on the Councillor's questions in regard to the permanent staff member and find out as to any details I can disclose about her leave.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, and I sit on the Water and Waste, Riverbank Management, and the Environment Committee, however, Madam Speaker, there's been a lot of discussion and I realize that because it is a new separate committee that the Chairperson will more than likely have to do some inquiries to find out and I appreciate it if he could find out. But Madam Speaker, there's been a lot of discussion about expropriation in regards to the second expropriation in regards to the Cockburn-Calrossie CSO issue and situation. And Madam Speaker, I'm trying to find out and I have done some preliminary research but I'm wondering if the Chairperson can get back to me and Council as to whether or not the options for the Cockburn-Calrossie CSO situation had ever been presented to the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Committee or any other committee for that matter in terms of which was the best option in terms of proceeding to deal with the CSOs related to those, what are they called, the CSOs districts? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I guess jurisdictionally the expropriations certainly don't come to our committee. There was a very lengthy response provided by Mr. Wardrop and some of the Water and Waste staff, Mr. Wardrop, our head of Transit, by Water and Waste staff, by the consultants from the engineering firm who have been retained on issues surrounding the pond that was the subject with the expropriation, so some of that's attached to our earlier in the agenda, you would've seen that was attached and the administration position on the expropriation. So I can talk to the Councillor, talk to the department to see if they want to clarify but it was very useful I thought to have the people there at EPC to answer some of the criticisms that were made, to talk about the decision was made to go with one pond instead of two ponds, what the advantages were, what the impact would Cockburn
be for drainage for the BRT drainage that we needed for work on the Cockburn-Calrossie area. So maybe I could ask the Councillor to take a look at what's attached to the agenda further up, if that doesn't answer the question, then we'll certainly have the head of Water and Waste at our next committee meeting on Monday talking about Combined Sewer Overflows in general and I think that would be a fair question from him at that stage if he wants to pose it on February 1St.

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

Councillor Eadie: Disregarding what's on the agenda for today Council, I want to know if EPC or anybody under the CSO and we do have a new management plant draft plan sent in to the province, was the Cockburn-Calrossie options coming from the 2010 engineer's report that was given to the Water and Waste Department, was that ever presented to Infrastructural Renewal and Public Works for consideration on decisions of past receipt? That's really what I want to find out because I don't think that that was ever done.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Councillor Lukes is advising me that she has not had that before her during her period as Chair of the Infrastructure, but I honestly, you sit on that committee, Madam Chair, I think since I've been elected but we can go back and take a look, see if there's ever a presentation made, I don't know off the top of my head.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We're all aware that the Province of Manitoba with the regulations is requiring upgrades to our Combined Sewer Systems to deal with Combined Sewer Overflows. The cost of this work is estimated right now between $1-4 billion. Could the Chair of the committee just let us know, I understand that Council got an e-mail from the CAO at the end of December, a very good e-mail detailing what the department is proposing to the province in terms of addressing it. But he mention that he felt the time had run out to provide a Council seminar. The last Council seminar on this topic was done on July 30th. I was in attendance, but attendance at that meeting was kind of

poor as it was after the final meeting of Council for the summer. Could, I think it's important that all Council gets updated on this, could the Chair work to arrange a Council seminar for all of us?
Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Would I have the power to simply arrange Council seminars, I would have certainly set up a few of them, my own preference over the years. But I can certainly continue to work with the Mayor's Office and the CAO and the Clerk's to see if we can get that, I know that is a high priority, I don't make light of it, it is an issue involving costs of somewhere between $1 and 4 billion. People have said to me, well so if you spend a billion there's no more discharge, know that isn't associated with the $1 billion option, that's associated with the more expensive option, big ticket items, big questions here. On the short-term though, certainly we will be having at the Monday meeting of the Water Waste, Riverbank Management, Environment Committee, the staff from Water and Waste will be coming to talk about Combined Sewer Overflow issues given the recent coverage of this spilling into the Red River. So in the short-term, we'll be getting a presentation on Monday that's open to all Councillors and in the medium-term, I guess we'll continue to work and I know it's one of many Council seminars that are on the, in the cue, and we'd like to get scheduled.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Yes, Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if the Chair could, if he's got any information or update on the work that the City's, that the department is doing on the Energy East, looking into Energy East Pipeline and the due diligence to protect the public health and safety, if there's any update on that at all, he could share with us.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'm happy to Madam Speaker. You know, Councillor Eadie has been very active on this and I know he was at the presentation out in St. Norbert as was Councillor Lukes and myself. Short answer is yes, the department is coming to make a presentation, a verbal presentation to us on February 29th, that's the motion that came out of Council, the last meeting was for first a committee report was requested within 60 days to hit the timelines, it's got to come to February 29th, so at this stage at least the expectation is that verbal presentation from the department on the Energy East Pipeline on at our February 29th meeting and certainly all Councillors are welcomed to attend.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if the Chair, Madam Speaker, I'm just wondering the Water and Waste I think is undertaking, has hired a consultant undertake a very detailed study of what the implications are for the City of Winnipeg. Can the Chairperson tell us what the status of that is?

Councillor Mayes: I, as far as I'm aware the consultant was not yet been hired. There is a presentation coming on February 29th, a number of legal issues arising, a number of environment issues, so our staff have been working on it. Councillor Eadie has certainly raised his concerns about the response to emergency situations that the pipeline, Energy East has put forward, so TransCanada has put forward, so we'll have the presentation on the 29th. I know the coalition group is coming in to present as well on the 29th and the 29th of February and we'll look forward to having a thorough discussion then, certainly the pipeline crosses through my ward and crosses more through Councillor Lukes' ward, so there are implications for the City of Winnipeg residents and obvious implications for the City of Winnipeg water supply, our staff are not taking it lightly. We've been working with COO, Mr. Jack, and others to try and get intervener status in the hearings that are going to be coming up. So the staff, there's money set aside, and they're taking steps to make sure we're, we'll be well represented at the hearings. But more detail to come from those more familiar with the details on February 29th.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Chair? Okay, seeing none. We now have the Standing Policy Committee on Innovation. Councillor Browaty on the report dated January 18th, 2016.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION
DATED JANUARY 18, 2016

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce the report and move Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have no motions, no by-laws. Any questions for the chair? Okay no questions for the Chair, moving on to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Okay, we have the report dated January 12th, Councillor Orlikow.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED JANUARY 12, 2016

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: And we have an amendment to Item No. 10...pardon me, hang on. Item No. 18. So if you could move consent from 1 to 17.

Councillor Orlikow: Item Nos. 1 to 17? Well, I'll just move Items 1 to 17.

Madam Speaker: Do you have nine? Just one moment. Councillor Allard, you said No. 11 as well? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Seven, twelve, fourteen and fifteen…

Madam Speaker: Fifteen, eighteen is already stood down. Any other requests? Yah, okay, so I will call the question on Items 1 through 6, Item No. 8, Item Nos. 10, 14, 16 and 17. Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 7 – Extension of Time – Subdivision and Rezoning on Land Located on South Side of Taylor Avenue between Wilton Street and 1260 Taylor Avenue – DASZ 4/2013

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow to introduce the item.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll wait to hear my colleagues' questions they may have or concerns.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I just want to vote against it.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers on Item No. 7? Councillor Orlikow do you wish to close? I'll call the question on Item No. 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. If you just give me a moment, please. Okay, Mr. Clerk.

Item 9 – Improving Safety for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations in the City of Winnipeg

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow to introduce the item.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll introduce the motion. It's improving safety for new developments in proximity to rail line operations in the City of Winnipeg. I believe this will be some great work moving this issue forward and I'll listen to what my colleagues have to say and respond at the end.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I want to commend our administration on a great report. It's very substantive and it's moving Winnipeg definitely in the right direction. I had some prepared notes but I know things are getting late. But I do want to say...I guess I want to highlight this as...it's going to be a big initiative and it's...we are going to be potentially amending Our Winnipeg and our complete community strategy to ensure that we are developing in a way that takes rail safety into account both in infill and new developments. And so some great work by our administration and thank you to the Chairperson for moving it forward and I urge my Council colleagues to vote for this so that we can move it forward. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, any further speakers on Item 9? Okay, Councillor Orlikow to close. I will call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 11 – Free WiFi in City of Winnipeg Facilities

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow to introduce the item.

Councillor Orlikow: Again, I think it's a good initiative. We know that people are using wi-fi more and more. It makes a connected city, but I'll hear the comments had to say and respond accordingly.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.
Councillor Allard: So thank you Councillor Orlikow for your comments. I just want to bring this to the attention of my Council colleagues, I know that it's coming back to the attention of Council. We're asking for a report from City administration, we had representatives of Shaw come and speak to the committee but it appears there is some potentially some great value to be had for having free wi-fi in our City of Winnipeg facilities. We have free wi-fi at some of our facilities which is great. I think there is likely some great value to be pursued. I know Shaw is saying that they want to offer free wi-fi in our facilities at little cost to the City and I think our administration needs to do its due diligence and look at the other providers because they're not only provider in our facilities. But thank you Councillor Orlikow for moving this forward and I just wanted to flag it as something that I think is a good idea that we should be pursuing.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just simply rise also to echo what Councillor Allard has said and just to commend Councillor Allard and Councillor Mayes and Councillor Orlikow. I'm looking forward also to the report that our public service will bring wi-fi across our City. It just really makes sense if it can be done, if there's a way we can find to do it, in this day and age there is wi-fi almost everywhere. If the City of Winnipeg could find a way to offer it in our facilities, it would be just very good for our City as well. Again, commend all those working on it and look forward to the results of the report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I just wanted to add one comment on this, I feel I have to represent a group of grade eight students who actively campaigned long and hard for me when they heard that the Mayor was going to commit to putting wi-fi on transit buses so I, too, look forward to the report. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie? No, okay, I thought I saw your hand up. Any further speakers? No, seeing none, Councillor Orlikow to close.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, again, wi-fi is a reality of our world. People are connected. Please, when you are walking don't look at your phone, look up. However, again, it's a way of building community and building place so wi-fi is integral to that model. I look forward to more discussions with the providers and opening up to our City facilities and as far as we can even partnering with businesses and so we have full coverage throughout the whole city.

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

Councillor Eadie: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I am just...I thought there was a motion and I don't know if it's been withdrawn, but there is a motion regarding report Item 17 which we already voted on. I just thought I would bring that to our attention because there is two motions, one for the report 17 and one for report 18.

Madam Speaker: We will be dealing with it after we finish off the Consent Agenda.

Councillor Eadie: Can you confirm, did we vote on report 17?

Madam Speaker: We did, we did. So that motion will be explained in a few minutes. Mr. Clerk.

Item 12 – Additions to the List of Historical Resources, Winnipeg Hotel (214 Main Street) and the MacDonald Block (226 Main Street)

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow to introduce the item.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Madam Speaker. What can I say? The committee heard delegations for…regarding this both on the purpose of what we are there for, is to review these buildings for the historical significance of them and the...and what is historical regarding the features of the building. And so that was the primary purpose of this report is do we believe that these buildings are heritage buildings or not. And part of that process is also looking at the committee may, which we did, consider alternative other purposes and so we had two other options that were in the queue line as well of either demolishing all three buildings and/or another proponent came forward and said not for this building specifically today, but they did express interest in all three buildings and again, primarily the McDonald…the Fortune Block but also, looking at the McDonald Block to retain them and this is a very strong proud Winnipeg family that wants

to invest in our downtown, they want to invest in heritage, they understand the value of it. So, we have those two options and the committee in their wisdom, was unanimous in support to designate these two buildings as heritage buildings.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. This was stood down, it's Item No. 12 by Councillor Wyatt.
Councillor Wyatt: Yes. I just wanted to rise and say…point out that it was a very interesting meeting because you don't often have the situation where...and I guess my comments are in a sense, for 12 and 13 because we kind of dealt with them as a bundle though I know we are dealing with just 12 now. And so the buildings in question, the three properties, it was...you don't normally get a situation where a kind of...I hate to use the term the 11th hour, somebody comes forward to save the properties in terms of making an investment in them, these older buildings…the heritage buildings as we have deemed them now, or going to deem them now and the...we heard from the Pollard family at the committee who...I think we have taken...we received nothing informal. Formally, we have taken their...the fair thing is we have taken them for their word in terms of what they're going to do. The fact they have a great reputation as leaders and business people in our City of Winnipeg and they have done a lot for the City and for the community and the fact that they came forward and they want to do something. I want to also say, though, that the private sector initiative which was before us, you know, we don't want to send the message as well that we don't welcome that investment coming from other cities to Winnipeg. I think that was something which was very positive. I think their initiative should be…they should be thanked for showing the initiative and wanting to invest in the downtown and in Winnipeg and the fact that they were going to bring a major business and opportunity for Winnipeg that would create jobs was fantastic. It's just unfortunate that unfortunately they were selecting sites which were of historic by nature and there is another issue that was touched on in committee but really hasn't got as much attention, but in many ways is just as important and that is in terms of the Winnipeg Hotel, which is there's about forty residents there who would have to be accommodated in-housing elsewhere who really are not in a position just to be thrown out into the street, and to deal with that. So that was something which we were sensitive to as well. But the fact that...I want to make it clear and send a message to the private sector that we welcome and we were…the whole idea that they had...that they shared confidentially because they had to keep it in confidence because of the nature of their contracts, was exciting and would be exciting for them to invest elsewhere in the downtown. And I hope that we don't lose that opportunity with them and that we are able to work with them with Centreventure, working with them to find a way for them to do their investment and make it happen just on other property in the downtown. There's lots of surface parking lots, there's lots of properties that do not have these heritage type buildings on them. And the fact that the Times Exchange are...thank you, thank you. It's there and it's become known across the country in terms of its music and the performances they put on and so there is a unique opportunity to do something here for south Main Street. So I just wanted to add those comments and hope that we can see in the very near future the redevelopment of those properties by renewing them and preserving the heritage value and at the same time, the housing value in terms of for the affordable housing part piece and at the same time, see the private sector that was there be accommodated elsewhere in our downtown in terms of their investment. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As Chair of Historic Buildings and Resources Committee, as well as, this is in my ward I thought I would just say a couple of comments on this. This is a significant moment that we are designating these buildings. I want to acknowledge some people concerned with this issue; Heritage Winnipeg and others interests here in the audience, so thanks for sticking around all day. Hope you have found it interesting. Our heritage assets make a place interesting, it makes it not just like any other place so I can't underestimate the importance of if there's a way to do this and to save them and to do it and I am just really pleased that the committee made the decision it made and I'm hoping that Council will support that. Just to mention a little bit of the Fortune Block was built in 1882. It's one of the oldest buildings in our downtown and it houses a really important venue, Times Change place which, anyone who enjoys the blues knows. But many places...I don't know if you are aware of this but many places in the world are losing these kind of unique venues that make their cities special. London, I think heard, was like 35 percent of those types of places are disappearing just because of the costs and everything else. So many cities are losing these types of unique cultural venues. I don't want it take too long on, I know everyone is tired, but this is really significant that we are doing something to save these buildings, it's not easy, it's a challenge. And the south Main area where these buildings are located, you know, is ripe for some really exciting redevelopment. I agree with Councillor Wyatt, we want to encourage people like the other developer that had ideas to come forward into our downtown and the one that came forward that wants to preserve these buildings as well. And we need to have heritage tax credit programs and tools to support that, which we do have, we just have to make sure we continue to have those, so that we can support keeping Winnipeg. It's what makes Winnipeg the special place that it is, is our history, it's a huge part of it and it can't be underestimated even as an economic development point about our downtown. It's not just about saving an old building or saving a blues bar. But there's a huge amount of passion around this issue we have heard from the community, not even just from heritage advocates but beyond that, who want to see venues like this protected as well as the heritage value. So, this is a really important decision and I'm really looking forward to seeing that area redeveloped. It's connected to the Parcel Four rail side, Union Station, that whole area…opening at Portage and Main, it's all

connected to a very exciting image of our downtown for the future that I can see us being part of by this decision today, creating. So thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Orlikow to close.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Quickly, again, I want to echo Councillor Wyatt's, I guess, call out to the developer that came to Winnipeg from another place, which was absolutely wonderful to see. They recognize what is happening in downtown Winnipeg. They recognize the excitement, the drive, the new sense of place that downtown is becoming. That's why they are here. They said, a little sheepishly, but, Councillor Wyatt corrected him, but we are a world class city, and that's why they are here. They are here because they see…they want to be there because of the Human Rights Museum. Again, that's absolutely understandable. It's going to have so much traffic in that area, it's wonderful. So again, Winnipeg is on that road. Our downtown is growing. We are not done yet by a long shot, we have a long way to go still but again, compared to the 80s where you could give a building away for a dollar and it would be tough for someone to take it, we now have people demanding or trying to outbid each other and try to get pieces of land. That's a really great position for the City to be in and so we need to manage our assets which are our heritage buildings, our lands and how we envision...Councillor Gerbasi mentioned on south Main, the Old Parcel Four, the Forks north Portage redevelopment plan, Portage and Main, the Fort Garry Park. All these are transforming that area in such an incredible way so I do get a real big sense of pride when I drive down that street. Pride and then a little bit of sadness, but pride to see those buildings still there. Pride to see those archways, pride to see the brick work and its trellises and all the other amazing things, it automatically brings me back to a time when Winnipeg was the Chicago of the North. Again, that is our heritage. That's our soul. So again, the developer who came, I commend them, I think they did a wonderful presentation, however, I personally just felt that the heritage value and the fact that we do have other lands available did not warrant ripping down these three buildings. It's kind of the old adage, like with green space, once you rip it down you don't get it back again, so once you pave it over you don't get it back again either. So again, we made the prudent call. Again, I don't want to disguise this from anybody, it may be a task that's too monumental for the proponent that wants to take over. We don't know that yet. They are committed to it, they have told us that, but we will, including with Centreventure, work with them to try to make this a reality sooner than later. However, I will continue following it and as we go through our due diligence, we always have the option of going back onto this issue at a later date. But at this point I am very proud of the committee, very proud of, hopefully, Council that we have taken a big step in saying that Winnipeggers support heritage and we also support development.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question on Item No. 12. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. So noted. Mr. Clerk.

Item 13 – List of Historical Resources – Fortune Block, 232 Main Street

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. I will just…I think most of the comments on my behalf have been said so I'll allow, if there are any further comments on the Fortune Block by all means, and then I will respond accordingly.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt. You've made your comments? Any further speakers? Okay. Councillor Orlikow? I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 15 – Requirement for Additional Funds and Increased Delegated Award Authority for a Single Source Contract with Manitoba Hydro for Electrical and Natural Gas Servicing in the St. Boniface Industrial Park Phase 2 Development

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow to introduce the item.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Madam Chair. Just to refresh everybody's memory what this actually is, this is the Parmalat. We had an issue that came forward when our joint venture partner was unwilling to sign an agreement and the concern from Council at that time and the Mayor especially was the concern that we would lose Parmalat to another city or another place because they needed to relocate. Right now presently, they are in a very awful spot which is in the heart of St. Boniface. So they want to relocate out of there, so we are very happy about that and they want to have the ability to grow as well. So again, this is going into what we are calling the St. Boniface industrial land and this work here is really the...it's really getting that servicing to them. We have the Manitoba Hydro and Parmalat have indicated now, once they have done a little more due diligence because again, we wish we had more time but Parmalat needed that answer. So what we have now is that Manitoba Hydro is saying well they need more gas so we'll build a bigger pipe but if we don't get that kind of return back that there is going to be some kind liability on the side. This to me...it's actually a value added. We are building an industrial park, an urban City industrial park so this is not an industrial park in the middle of rural lands. This industrial park will have connection to employees, you will have transit service to get there.

We already have the water, we have the lift station already involved, we're going to have high capacity water. So this will be…this is St. Boniface industrial park, again, this is just for this phase. The next phase about what we do after we get this park done for kind of the phase one is the rest of the park. That will come to Council short…I'm not sure when, but it will come to Council with a recommendation on how we deal with the rest of the lands. But right now, what we are trying to do is secure the Parmalat. We already have commitments from the province and Parmalat which is quite unique. We, I think, secured 3.5 total or something like that, of monies…million for this project. So moving forward, we need to get some larger pipes there and so that's why this is here for now. It's single source contract because Manitoba Hydro and the electrical, that's all done by one service provider. There is no other service provider and the single source contract is actually part of our policy. If there is only one provider to provide a service, we can single source it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, do you wish to speak?

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker. I supported this in the Committee and I was not supportive of the original decision last year but I did...when we decided not to proceed with the joint venture but I did support, in light of the fact that Council has made that decision last July. But this is, as noted in the committee, and I will support it again here today, but as noted in the committee, this is an extra cost to the City and this is now the second amendment to the report from July in an area of basically six months. And the other part of it, too, which you know, again, don't want to belabour the point but the fact that again, you know, there is a lot to a title once again in terms of clarity and in terms of transparency. This is Parmalat but nowhere in the title does it refer to Parmalat, however, if you read the executive summary, the very first bullet is Parmalat...."Parmalat Canada is pursuing expansion proposed and requires a suitable new location in Winnipeg to establish a new fluid milk processing plant." This is the exact issue and there was two other issues that were raised by Councillor Allard, which I thought was a very good point, which is the opportunity, in light of Parmalat moving, the opportunity for renewal in old St. Boniface at the old Parmalat location, needing to be addressed as well. The need for the fact that we do not have a joint venture any more on those lands, the old Olli West Lands I'll call them, because that's where Olli West was going to go. South of the St. Boniface industrial park that there needs to be a business plan, an active business plan by the public service in light of the fact that we have decided not to proceed with the joint venture and in light of the fact that we are opening up lands and providing services that are not just going to benefit Parmalat, but based on this report, benefit the servicing of those future lands and what we're hearing is, we need to see, at least the committee on behalf of Council, needs to see the business planning in terms of those lands, in terms of ensuring that there is a plan to market them will and develop them, so they don't sit as fields where you can go down today and see a jack rabbit running across the snow which is what it is right now and it has been like that forever. We want to see the value come back to us in terms of these investments and the sooner the better. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Councillor Wyatt, kind of, not stole my thunder but kind of plowed the way. So his comments are similar to what I just wanted to raise. Not being on the committee or at the committee, I just want to ensure and again perhaps, in close, if he so wishes, the Chair could speak to this but I just want to ensure there's a business plan or that there is some way of being...I understand the need for investment in infrastructure and where there needs to be expansion of investment, I appreciate that. But I just want some assurance to the rest of Council that when the time comes, the successive tenants and future tenants will assist the City in recouping the costs and everyone, kind of, I guess, in essence, paying their share and looking forward to a business plan as Councillor Wyatt has raised as well. So I just wanted raise that, just insuring that in the future, what the City is doing to pay for the investment today, in the future, we will definitely see it recouped through each tenant that comes on board.

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

Councillor Allard: Excuse me, I'm coughing, obviously. I just want to thank the Chair for the committee and Mayor Bowman, Doug McNeil. I know that this is something that's required from something that our administration, our political leadership had to get together very quickly and that was to keep jobs in St. Boniface, from St. Boniface to St. Boniface. I just want to say I will be supporting this and that...and that it's going to lead to tremendous opportunity both in development of the St. Boniface Park in St. Boniface, as well as providing an opportunity for renewal in Old St. Boniface. Once upon a time the political leadership thought it was great to have industry in proximity to your home and times have changed and there is many other issues in St. Boniface ward that would benefit from this type of initiative but I just wanted to say how it's great to be moving in this direction and to thank everyone for their work on this. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow do you wish to close?

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just to respond to some the inquiries, how we dispose of the rest of the land through us being a developer or is it, having developed it...those are all options on the table and it will be brought to committee. Again right now the focus is getting the servicing in and getting Parmalat up and running, that's a

major focus right now and it's being done...really a Yeoman's task to get this done. It's an incredible amount of work. It wasn't the City that decided not to sign the joint venture agreement. So we are very honest with that. What happened was, in my opinion, what happened was the joint venture agreement, there was school board taxes that weren't accounted for that the joint venture would have to pay and that just didn't make it viable enough for the joint venture partner so they weren't willing to sign the document. They also wished to have lower standards than the City was willing to have. But again, in the day, it was just…it didn't become a viable option for that developer when they had to pay the school board taxes and that is part of the provincial preview, but again, so it wasn't the City that didn't want to sign it but again, at the end of the day we couldn't come to a resolution, so the City, again in the interest of retaining jobs, relocating Parmalat and getting some services with some services with some incredible investment by both the province and Parmalat, we can get partial servicing into this land, the next step though, will come back, at least, to the committee but I would expect it comes all the way back to Council for disposition of the next step.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I will call the question on Item No.15. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 18 – Expropriation of Lands – Cockburn – Cockburn-Calrossie Combined Sewer Area – Drainage Upgrade Project

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow to introduce the item, following that, we do have Motion No. 10. It is a referral motion for this Item. It's a motion to refer with instructions, so we'll hear that after the opening. Councillor Orlikow to introduce the item.

Councillor Orlikow: Sorry, this is for the No. 18 only, right?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. This motion here, to be very clear, is a new step in our process. I this, you will see two motions. You will see a motion coming after this, which is our regular process but this one here is talking about a response to the Inquiry Officer's recommendations which we can discuss later on. So that's what this one is and a lot of information containing here about why the Cockburn-Calrossie deep water pond is required and it's all in that report. But we know, for example, that the Cockburn-Calrossie CSO and Basement Flood Relief Program is 90 plus percent of the pond, the other pieces are quite minor as a contributor to the pond. And those other contributors will also be paying into the pond to connect in, however, the point right now is this pond is required. It's an incredible amount of water. We know how Winnipeggers were very upset to hear and they should be on how much sewage is going into our river and the recent failure of one of our systeMs However, this will...this will really, really help protect our rivers because right now this area that we are talking about is actually on a low dip. In Winnipeg, you don't need to be on a big dip, you just need to be on a low dip. And so these basements...these people in the area, I believe it's all the way from Cambridge, Grant, Pembina, a very vast water shed area. They right now have a one in two year flood basement protection...flooding protection. We strive for one in five. The amount of raw sewage right now that is getting dumped out of these discharge because of the combined overflows is horrendous. So this is going to be…this project is geared to take a hundred percent of that flow away, which is incredible. And so that's pretty well what the project is. But again, I would love to hear the comments from my colleagues and I'll respond accordingly. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Now I'll draw your attention to Motion No. 10. It's a motion to refer the matter with instructions. It's moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Wyatt would you introduce your motion?

Motion No. 10
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Schreyer,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated January 12, 2016, Item 18 "Expropriation of Lands-Cockburn-Calrossie Combined Sewer Area-Drainage Upgrade Project" be referred back to the Standing Policy Committee with the following instructions that are consistent with the closing comments made by the Inquiry Officer, G.E. Ulyatt, dated November 23, 2015, that the City of Winnipeg be instructed to consider all other options and alternatives for the proposed project, in light of the circumstances concerning this proposed expropriation as outlined in this report;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all of these options and costs be subject to a Class 3 cost budget estimation and that they be outlined both in terms of their budget detail for scope and costs and that this be reported back via the

Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment prior to any consideration by the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development.

Councillor Wyatt: I rise, Madam Speaker, to introduce this motion. This is quite a serious matter. I don't recall...there are not many reports that we have had in this Council chamber where there are statements and wording by an Inquiry Officer of this nature and the strongly worded statements in terms of this question and this proposed expropriation. I did not support this in the committee. I believe that we need to support the report of the Inquiry Officer who made the case as stated in the be it resolve that the City being the expropriating authority ought to consider other options and alternatives in light of circumstances concerning this proposed taking. And I would remind Council that this land, believe it or not, it was actually at one time was City of Winnipeg land. We used to own this land up until July of 2009. It was in Council meeting that went to 10:30 at night and it was extremely difficult meeting is the best way to put it. Very...a lot of rancor, a lot of anger and, you know, concern. And you know, I'll just go back to the report of July 22, 2009, the proposed land exchange Fort Rouge yards, lands north of Parker Avenue. We exchanged and we sold the lands at that the time for $17,000 an acre based on what our own staff conservatively, and I say conservatively, overly conservative in terms of what was sent to the inquiry, or estimating the lands only at 50,000 an acre and that is low probably by any means. And so, just in the course of six years...now what's frustrating about this, folks, is the fact that these lands in 2009 before we declared them surplus, before we sold them for 17,000 an acre, in terms of a land swap, and this was again, a swap. One of those controversial swaps that took place, that we circulate these throughout our departments and whether or not you need this land in the future, ask department X, department Y, department Z, and all departments see the circulation and then they look at it and they say, okay, we don't need the land and then they send the message back. This land was circulated in 2009 to all to City departments, do you need this land? And they came back no, including Water and Waste. And only three years later, all of the sudden now in 2012, that we need the land. That's a remarkable change, especially since we sold it for $17,000 an acre. And I'll read that from the report, the financial impact statement in July...and this is kind of a personal note. It was a very...I think it was really...I was on EPC at the time and that was in July 22nd...and then it was good enough for the Mayor to keep me on EPC until the beginning of September when I was given the boot. And I think it was out of the debate that occurred because of the nature of it and I don't for any moment regret in any way the position that I took at the time and I still defend it today because of the statement here in the comments of the financial impact statement, "other than the land be exchanged of a nominal $1, there is no financial implications associated with the initial land swap." That's got to be now…that's going to be the greatest…if we pass this and go forward with this expropriation this has to be the greatest understatement of the century. Because, who knows at the end of the day what the expropriation is going to cost us. In the committee, we had a good discussion. Mr. Patton was there on behalf of the department, and I asked him many questions, for example, why, three years later this occurred? He was not in a leadership role at the time, he indicated, so he couldn't answer that as well, but I did ask him as well, in terms of all of the issues in terms of our combined...and you know what, I am a hundred percent behind the issue. We have these combined sewers, we must address them. How many are there in the City of Winnipeg? He said over 40, 42 or 43. We have so many of these areas in the City and we only have so many dollars. He went on to say, and I'll quote and this is from the live...I had my poor assistant type up the question and answer from the live wire or whatever it's called. I want to thank the Mayor for bringing that service in, anyway, it's very useful, it's almost like a Hansard. It said, Mr. Patton answering a question about how many other projects, "We're actively working on four areas right now. We are working in Cockburn-Calrossie area, the Alexander-Bannatyne network, the Ferry Road-Riverbend in the west part of Winnipeg and plan at work in Transcona combat combines sewer overflows in the area. Each of these projects is assigned cost benefit, which is estimation of cost to do the work, as well as potential damages." We have four other areas and we don't have enough money…I know we don't have enough money for these, I mean, I'm hearing from staff they're pushing back other projects in terms of these areas and yet, this is a rush. Now, there is one thing that we heard that this has to happen because of rapid transit and I just want you to know, that I have spoken to the department and they have indicated to me that they can accommodate the drainage because five to ten percent of the drainage in that pond, is only five percent…ten percent is coming from the rapid transit line. And the fact is, rapid transit will not be open until to 2019 and 2020. We can find accommodation. If you are looking at five to ten percent on a 20.5 acre lake, that's 2.5 acres at ten percent, we can find the land along all this land that we are acquiring for rapid transit, to put a lake...there is a plan B in place. When they saw the report the department is smart they are working on plan B, just in case Council doesn't go with the expropriation. I don't recall the last time reading in a report these words. In fact, the evidence demonstrated that the City was at least to this Inquiry Officer, secretive, uncommunicative and non-consultative to the extent that the objector only found out about the placement of the pond on his property by accident. Furthermore, when the objector, upon learning of the City's plans pursued the discussions at the highest level, the City Administration, he did not receive truthful answers. It's un-Parliamentary to say that he is calling the City a liar, so he's not saying it, but that's basically almost what he's saying and it's powerful. And I am saying Madam Speaker, that this is a well thought out motion that we should not pursue…this is one of those things, Councillors, that we can regret in the future. Let's look at other options, absolutely. The Inquiry Officer states, "There is no doubt that the proposed project must proceed in some form as it is well needed for the residents of the area in the City." He says that. That it's needed in terms of the combined sewer overflow. He is saying that. He is not arguing against it. But then he goes on though, in the same paragraph, in the next sentence, "However, the City being the expropriating authority," as I have read this before,

“ought to consider other options and alternatives in light of the circumstances considering the proposed taking." So, I guess what I’m saying is let's take a step…let’s not rush. We know we don't need this for the rapid transit...let's move, this will not jeopardize BRT, let’s move and do this right and protect the interests of the citizens of Winnipeg in terms of costs and future cost. We are right now, as you know, expropriating fire halls. We did not have any choice but to…because we built the fire halls on somebody else’s land. Ultimately, we tried to negotiate, and that fell through, and now we are expropriating and that’s…but in this case, we have options, Councillors, I believe we have options. And I will go on to say to you how many options we have, here’s a chart that’s not in your report that was presented at the inquiry on behalf of the City outlining the costs, the various costs of the various options. And below that, are thirteen qualifications to those costs. Thirteen. Now, that is dynamite because that basically means that all of these costs here, there is no way they are Class 3...nowhere close to it, if you’ve got thirteen different…and some of these are major such as the…and I will talk about the ones that are in the public realm. Utility relocation costs are based on prices provided by Manitoba Hydro on September 23rd, 2014. September 23, 2014 That's coming up to two years on those pricing. $4 million to move the hydro lines…we know from some of the presentations made in the inquiry that if we actually went to the two pond option, we could save having to move the hydro lines and turning the temporary pond on somebody else’s land into a permanent pond. A report that we just passed in terms of getting a longer period of time in terms of their development application which is on hold because of this. So we have options here, Councillors, let's not rush, let's let us allow the good work that our public service can do and they have plan B, we can move, and we can insure that the interests of the citizens are protected, that we are not rushing, that we can still do CSO improvements and look at options and see what we can do in the neighbourhood. That's really what is the heart of this and I would encourage to support this because I believe that getting Class 3, Class 3 budget estimations...

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

Councillor Wyatt: Receiving these options as recommended by the Inquiry Officer and receiving Class 3 cost estimation, which clearly, it appears we do not have. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker is Councillor Gerbasi followed by Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We did have a very, very thorough discussion at the committee and there are a couple of comments I would like to make. There was a reason that the department timed this project as it did and there is something, as you recall very well, it was done as an integrated project which enabled funding from other levels of government to help pay for some of our City’s costs, to deal with some of our combined sewer issues that we have in our neighbourhood. So it was a really good initiative on the part of the public service to put it together that way and Council approved that and it was part of funding the Integrated Transit Project...it was transit, combined sewers and the Pembina overpass. So we were actually able to get more funding from other levels of government to address existing infrastructure needs at the same time, by the way that this was done. So, to say you can just simply pull that out and not proceed with the Calrossie piece and you know, again, I’m not sure why anyone would do that, it’s desperately needed for those residents for one thing, so I kind of am a bit concerned about that kind of talk, but we’ll just do some other part of the City, again it seems a bit parochial. But this was part of this for a number of reasons and the funding was brought in to us to support the needs of the City of Winnipeg through that and I just want to make sure that that doesn't get lost. So if we were to send this back and change this around and not include the Calrossie project, we would be giving revenue back to other levels of government, I imagine, I mean, I’m not sure how you would do that. You know again, it just seems like there is a lot of efforts to try to send everything back and refer it. We had a vote on it and, unfortunately, one Councillor voted against it. It proceeded here, so the rest of us on that committee had a very, very...and Councillor Wyatt, we had a very good discussion and I would like to also add that the administration was very, very thorough in their responses. We talked with real estate. We talked with the people negotiating. We had legal, we had everybody there. We had Water and Waste there explaining all of this in immense detail. And I also know for a fact that Councillor Orlikow, with the Parker issue being in his ward, has spent countless...I don't even know how many meetings and how many hours and maps he has on his wall trying to sort out this issue and he wasn’t just buying anything he was told, he’s been pushing back on this to make sure that this was done properly. I can assure you, I have been listening to it for months in the hallway. So, I mean, this is the reality that there was a huge amount of scrutiny on this, a huge amount of work that the standing committee had done. We had a vote and we had a discussion about the Inquiry Officer and their report...and some aspects, if you look at the report of what the Inquiry Officer said, were addressed that could be, that we’re not getting in the way of the public interest. And I point out, like an Inquiry Officer is not an expert on water and waste projects. They’re supposed to be talking about the process…examining the process of, you know, the expropriation issues and, I don’t know, I think there was some commentary in there that went a bit beyond, probably, this capability and there was a lot of people that have been whipped up about this issue and it’s been a very difficult issue in terms of perception and communication, again, going back to some of the issues in the audit. Councillor Wyatt raised that meeting back in 2009, Councillor Orlikow and I both voted against that land exchange for various reasons, at the time, but we can’t go back five or six years ago, we’ve got a project that that has been audited and those issues have been dealt with in those audits. And now we have a rapid transit project that’s funded, approved,

and here we are again; refer it back, start over, go back, look at it all again. If we agree with all these motions, this city's never going to do anything. Like, we have made these decisions and it's been through a very appropriate and thorough process and I would like to thank Councillor Orlikow because he has worked his patootie off on this file trying to make sure it's right. The administration looked at a numerous options and they landed on one. I didn't hear them saying there was a plan B, I don't know where that came from, it certainly wasn't anything that was discussed at the committee. We never said there's another plan, you can just have…I don't know where that came from. We need that pond is what the administration has told us and it's been very thoroughly examined and questioned by Councillor Orlikow and others and the committee as we looked at that. So I think we have to consider again the funding agreement we have on the integrated project. We are not going to be giving money back to other levels of government if I have anything to say about it, I don't know about the rest here…I don't see why anyone would want that. We are not going to want to start all over and cancel and we have to consider the public interest to these residents that have basement flooding like you wouldn't believe and this is one of our top priorities that has been there for a long time, with others, and this one came forward in its turn, I don't know how it was decided, I didn't ask for it, it came forward because the department felt it made sense. And it's being done at the same time as the Pembina overpass and the transit corridor, it makes sense. The administration did something right by integrating projects and building them at the same time so we don't have to rip up the road for five different projects. So I actually…I am thankful the staff has the patience to listen to all this. That's the process. But they did a good job and the committee did a good job. So I urge everyone not to send this back, not to start over, to trust the standing committee, to trust our administration, our experts on sewer and on these issues...our experts who we grilled thoroughly, I assure you, for many, many, many months about these issues. We have done our job so let's move forward and stop trying to send everything back to start over. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will not be in favour of the motion. Councillor Gerbasi has given a pretty good summary of why, but the really defining comment on this came from former Councillor Vandal after one of our infrastructure meetings on this issue a couple of years ago and a reporter said to him, you seem to be in a hurry to do this and he said, yeah I'm in a hurry, because we have been talking about it for 40 years so I want to get going and build some rapid transit. Delaying it further is just a delay tactic, quite frankly. I know Councillor Wyatt didn't support this particular version of the BRT but at some point, the ship has left the port and we are going forward and the idea that transit you know...somehow transit says it's really okay. Well, read what's before you. This land is being expropriated into the Cockburn project. If an alternative design is explored that does not require expropriation then another portion of the land will need to be expropriated. More expropriation, more hearings, the next paragraph is the same, if we don't do what's in front of us, there will be a separate expropriation, more expropriations, more hearings will come back again. So, Councillor Gerbasi's right, the Inquiry Officer made certain recommendations, our experts...we at EPC had Transit there, we had the Water staff there, we had the consultants there, people spoke at great length about the reasons to proceed in this manner. If Transit had said, nah, you know, we don't really need this and we can put this aside for a few months, and Mr. Wardrop would have had every opportunity to say that, in fact he spoke quite strongly saying, no, this re-routing hydro towers here, this thing will mess up the whole timetable. We have money allocated from other levels of government. This has been a controversial project, yes. But at some point, we made a commitment to it. I voted for it. I don't regret that. I think it's a step forward for the City and to delay it further, I think is just a delay tactic. We can go forward with an expropriation, the people will get the fair market value and we can move forward from there. But again, I want to echo what my former colleague and your former colleague, Madam Speaker, Councillor Vandal said which was, at some point we are being told we shouldn't rush, we are in a hurry. We have been talking about this for decades. We have been talking about this since I was in high school and Stephen Juba was talking about building a monorail. As I am now in my 50s, I don't think we are not rushing to get this thing going. So let's go ahead, let's support…defeat the motion and move forward with the main body of the report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Next is Councillor Browaty followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am still concerned with the project overall. I'm going to support the motion for the expropriation, but again, a big qualifier here, this is not to indicate my support of rapid transit phase two. I voted against it many times on this floor of Council, it seems like it's been an ongoing circle coming back here. The reality is this project is an AP3 project, I'm optimistic that in the course of finding ingenuity and finding ways to be a more competitive bidder some of the proponents will come up with more scenarios that will involve, perhaps, taking less land or not taking this parcel of land or that parcel of land. In terms of the land drainage portion, I do question the advantages that may be providing to certain land holders in the area and not necessarily at this point, picking up the combined sewer overflow, the actual sewer network into the Cockburn-Calrossie area. My understanding is this project is to not actually put separated sewers out in those neighbourhoods. So this is basically providing for the Parker lands, the Taylor lands and a very small portion to go towards rapid transit phase two. Again, moving forward, this is what is needed to put those properties on the tax roll and I'll support the expropriation motion and not Councillor Wyatt's motion here.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I truly appreciate the debate on this. I truly appreciate the work done by Councillors, by the committees, by the administration on this issue. I think good work was done and good comments have been made both in the chamber and what is seen on paper, including the good comments done by the diligence shown with which Councillor Wyatt brings forth his concerns. It seems to me Councillor Wyatt's concerns were based on all this hard work and information being provided. Now, I just want to assure all Councillors that I am not supporting this motion because as a delay tactic, I'm not. I'm supporting it in the sense of openness, accountability, responsibility and prudence as I see it. I am not voting to send everything back, I didn't do that in this Council chamber, I didn't vote with every motion to send back. It just happens to be this time I'm doing that. I understand we're…Councillors...Council can be in a hurry to get things done and that's not wrong. I appreciate people's vigor, enthusiasm, even to a certain extent, impatience, I understand that and I can feel that myself. Having said that, there is such a thing as rushing to judgment and I will say one more time, Madam Speaker, you know when it comes to rushing to judgment we took out the Marconi rail line in north east Winnipeg much to my frustration. I feel we rushed to judgment when we took out the rail line. I'm not the only one that feels that way, Madam Speaker, but it's a case when, you know, we can make a decision too hastily. And take heed of the fact, Madam Speaker, we should take heed of the fact that it has been mentioned, not merely by Councillor Wyatt, but he is quoting or paraphrasing administration by saying that five percent of this land would be needed for BRT. So, I am not saying this as a delay tactic to delay BRT. That I do believe…who doesn't really believe in this Council, Madam Speaker, I ask the question? That they can answer to themselves and to our constituents. That five percent of that land can't be found in another way without going to this extent. I don't believe that the concerns mentioned so far that bring forth this amendment have been refuted adequately to my comfort. And not only that, I understand that we're not…we can be...any level of government can be reticent to forego and give back tax money from other levels of government. Fair enough, we're trying to get our work done, for whatever our concerns are, our responsibilities are. But having said that Madam Speaker, as a taxpayer, I don't mind if a little bit of tax money ends up going back, I don't mind if a lot of tax money ends up going back to us as taxpayers. Regardless of what level of government we are paying those taxes on, if it is in the spirit of responsible and open and accountable decision making. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker. Wow, I mean, expropriation, this is a very difficult issue, the hearings as Councillor Wyatt has pointed out, brought up a whole bunch of questions. I believe there was also questioning of whether or not a deep lake methodology was one that would meet the CSO licensing regime that we have with the Province of Manitoba. I have Councillor Gerbasi's just checking in to this right now. What came out of those hearings, was very clear that the…felt that there wasn't enough due diligence done in terms of methodology used to deal with the Cockburn-Calrossie CSO issue. In terms of cost though, Madam Speaker, I do have concerns. There was a report prepared in 2010 from private consultant provided to Water and Waste who study the Cockburn-Calrossie area, looked at all the different means and ways of dealing with it and the first I became aware of a table...now, I am not sure...I can't remember how many options, 12 or 17, but there was a bunch of options that were looked at and one option was picked which is related to this, deep water lake that requires a huge amount of land. And...but...and it was part of the history of this it was combined with a whole bunch of projects to get synergy to build BRT, widen Pembina underpass and deal with the Cockburn-Calrossie all in one. And at the time, Madam Speaker, you probably remember the debate and discussions, there were a lot of components to it and really, it was a very large project when it was combined. But what I think I determined is that Water and Waste Department never came to Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works to say that this is how they were going to deal with the CSO related to the Cockburn-Calrossie. The idea is how did they arrive at the decision, there was an engineer's report and I know that in the expropriation hearings, there was a representation from one David Sanders who said that the engineer's report was never made public and that's a decision, access to information or whatever, but this table that I became aware of just recently, I believe it was presented by the City of Winnipeg to the hearings that listed out all these options. All these options were not explained to us. We had seminars on this combined project under the previous administration and the previous Council governance and Council decision makers and frankly, what I have learned is that I have great concerns. We have this master CSO draft plan going to the province, it's based on a methodology that has not been approved by the province. We do have an existing license that relates to dealing with CSO and release but we have to come up with this master plan. I'm not sure where it is in the master plan or what component it has but if we are proceeding with this deep lake methodology, I don't know that that's going to be approved in our final plan in 2017. We have to supply that. I don't know if this particular deep water lake is related to, what is it, the 85 percent of the rain in 1992. There is a lot of details here, and, Madam Speaker, I have asked our current Chairperson to investigate as to whether or not this Cockburn-Calrossie issue was ever brought as a specific issue to there in order to make the decision. Because all we did was we looked in context, the BRT said, oh no, it's good. It is my understanding, we do not need to expropriate the Parker property for the Cockburn-Calrossie at this point. There is in need to move ahead so expediently on this without, I think, due diligence from Water and Waste presenting to us, the committee and to Council specifically as to whether or not this issue will actually deal with our CSO problem.

And so, I really don't see an issue. This should be a referral that's been asked for the motion. I'll be supporting it because I am really concerned about this. I've already voted for the expropriation to allow the BRT to go through. So I am not opposed to BRT and I'm not actually necessarily opposed to a deep water lake. But I'm hearing environmentalists who are saying this deep water lake that supposedly, is somehow going to partially purify the water before it does end up in the river, because eventually that lake will fill up and the water's got to go somewhere. And it will end up going into our rivers to flow into the Lake Winnipeg and so on and so forth. And so, I don't even know where the…and I don't know what the engineer's report or anything like that, nothing like that was shown to me in this process related to the overall project though. Pembina underpass, the BRT and the Cockburn-Calrossie CSO and I'm really concerned about CSO as you know, up in my ward. And this is a City wide issue. I am not really concerned that this is a higher cost because we know the hundred percent solution to CSO is to separate your sewer from your land drainage so that when you get rainfall, a hundred percent is only water...well actually, I shouldn't say hundred percent because it runs off grass that may be utilizing some kind of fertilizers and stuff. But ultimately, it gets rid of the…it gets rid of this raw sewage issue going into the Red River. And I think that's a real essential thing. But that's the most...really, that cost is a high cost to neighbourhoods and so, I can understand the concerns that Councillor Gerbasi would have and Councillor Orlikow for that matter as well because those neighbourhoods are the ones that are dealing with CSO and doing the sewer separation can be very devastating. So, I'm not necessarily opposed to deep water lake but I am really concerned that this is going to meet the needs, prevent the sewer backups that people are concerned about and we are talking about…everybody remembers the 1992 rain levels, I'm not opposed to anything…but I really believe we need to really understand how this is dealing with the CSO and will it actually deal with the CSO. Because yeah, it will prevent backups but, will it deal with the actual environmental issue of putting waste…raw waste or even partially raw waste into our river system which ultimately ends up in our lakes. So, I'm voting in favour of the motion. I will not vote in favour of the expropriation based on the two things I mentioned. One is, I believe that Mr. Ulyatt, who I have great respect for, this man is not a man that is going to make decisions or make recommendations because he doesn't understand the issues. He is...I have great respect for that person and if his recommendation is not to move ahead without some more due diligence to happen, I think that that's the way to go. And my colleagues as Councillor Wyatt has presented, if this doesn't stop BRT from going through. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Wyatt...or Councillor Orlikow, do you wish to close? We do have the amending motion, that's right. Any further speakers at the moment?

Councillor Gillingham: Motion to extend Councillor Eadie's time if need be.

Madam Speaker: Right, okay. Councillor Wyatt, do you wish to close on your motion at this time?

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah I just want to add, Madam Speaker, that you know the...and I don't know how many members of Council have read the report, but there's a part of the report which makes this, I think, one of the reasons...one of the key reasons why he is recommending what he is recommending to look at further study is, as it states in his report, is evident that the consultant, our consultant, did an extensive analysis of the project and that their initial choice was to develop a two pond concept. The two pond concept was initially endorsed by Water and Waste. And senior management was advised of the choice, however, the City directed the consultant's example, the single pond option and the consultants proceeded to do so with the final design for the single pond option for the Parker lands. Not suggesting any error or bad faith on the part of the consultants, the design brought forward was a single pond option as the City directed consultant examine. We have this fully endorsed, if you read it, it reads like a bad soap opera. Fully endorse the plan for a two pond option and then all of a sudden, we flip and we say, no we want to go with the single pond option. And this is the concern. Let us protect the taxpayer here. Let us do our due diligence to ensure that we mitigate and minimize the risk in terms of this expropriation. Let's not rush forward and ram this through which appears to be the case. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow to close on the main item.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker and thank you to my colleagues. Again, I just want to point out, it seems that we get to the edge of the diving board and now that we're here we're looking over the 5-meter and we go, I don't want to do this anymore. I said I would come up and jump off the 5-meter, but now it's too scary, I'm not going to do it so let's do something different. Because February 25th, the Council meeting, we confirmed its outline, its declaration of expropriation, so we had that opportunity. I am personally…and thank you for Councillor Gerbasi mentioning that, have been very, very onto this file. I was very upset to learn that land that we traded, swapped, whatever you want to do, that we're going to have to expropriate that land back. How could we as a City let that happen? I've met with the department numerous times. A lot of this stuff about, oh we don't need the pond, BRT can go ahead anyways. Well again, that's inaccurate, that's just purely inaccurate. It is...the whole thing goes together. The only way you can maybe...and again we're still going to have to expropriate something, is if you just want to cancel the CSO program. You just want to say, you know what, we're not going to do a pond, period, for that. And so Parker...Parker

lands will do their own pond, Taylor will do their own pond and so what went wrong with that option? Well again, Councillors, you have to take it upon yourselves as well and I will continue my best to try to give you the information where I think you need it. But if you have an issue, coming here at this moment to say...to bring out all these outlandish statements of, oh, we can just do this because I am now an engineer somehow, that's ludicrous. Please, come to the committee meeting. We had a very extensive…it was open to all. A very extensive meeting with the department. They explained quite clearly the two pond...the first option was actually a very large pipe. A massive pipe. And that's where I got upset, because the option that was the primary option was this massive pipe that came from a report in 2009 that said we don't need ponds, we're going to put a big pipe. Well again, after our due diligence after that fact, that Water and Waste realized quite quickly that there's some soil issues, there's actually some issues about getting through buildings where we would have to rip down some buildings to get through there and just building a pipe that large has never been done. Maybe in Fort Frances, some oil pipes or something like that but nothing that we know has been done. We'd probably have to bring that work up from the States which is incredibly risky. So we looked at the only other option was this two pond model option and again, at the committee, we asked about that. They said we looked at the valuations of both. We looked at the land on one side and two line, and so what kind of economic value will we lose and where is the best place to put it? It's not just about the pond, it's about the whole issue about value, where the City can get the best value from. Again, taking two ponds has a problem. We'd have to take out a whole bunch of land that could be developed. So they looked at what value…what land could be best used to reduce that impact. Again, this pond area, where they want to put the Parker pond, is in an area that is kind of land locked. It's off to the side. It also has a massive hydro corridor in the middle of it. So again, they did all of this, they looked at this and they explained this to us at the committee. They did, they explained it all. Again, we listened to them, and at the end of the day, the large pipe model, okay, we got ya. The two pond model, yah, that's fair enough, good comments, thank you very much. So, we ended up back here that the large pond model is the only option we really have on the table, except the other option…that's what you want to do today, is we don't want to do a combined sewer overflow for this area at all. We're just going to let them drown. We're going to keep throwing poo into the river. And that's really, well, that's what's going to happen here. To say that, oh, we can just send this back and it'll have no impact on BRT or anything else, again, that's ludicrous. How do you know? You've never asked the question before, you haven't talked to administration before, you're just making this up. So again, people, we have to be real here. To delay this project will have huge ramifications all down the line. Do I like not being able to send it back so we can all have a better idea? No, I'd like to do that. But again, we had the opportunity, Councillors, to come to committee to listen to this. You didn't come to our committee and I can't go to all the committee meetings. You can't come to all my committee meetings. We can't do all the committees, right? But if there's real special interest that you have in an issue, like this one, we'd be more than happy to again, give me a call, I'll sit down with you. You need some information from the administration? We'll make sure that they give it to you. But to come here and to put a motion by the…I know better than the administration and everybody else, so let's just send it back. Well again, that's nothing more than just a delaying tactic, which is going to cost us astronomical amounts of money in the future. So again, I urge you to support this. I don't like it. I wish we didn't do the swap, again, we are still living through our battles of the last, previous administration. We are…some decisions that were made, with these, again…one day, as I told some of my colleagues, one day we'll be past this. One day. But we can't just wipe away the past. It is the past that we have to deal with. So again, there is nothing to say that the land was…in fairness, traded with the…for the Fort Rouge yards, that's a legally binding agreement. There's nothing to say anything out towards. There is some rationale in there. But it is the fact. So we have to deal with that. So to sit here today to say, I know better, to send it back and nothing's going to be happening without any administration at the last minute, it is what it is. So again, please support the motion, I personally wish we didn't have basement flooding issues. I wish we didn't dump so much raw sewage. And we need to address that. It is a perfect opportunity to address that, as we have to deal with the hydro poles, we have to deal with the BRT issue, it is the perfect opportunity to address this all at once. So again, this is what we're doing, this has been on the books for quite a long time. So please support it.

Madam Speaker: I'll first call the question on Motion No. 10. The motion by Councillor Wyatt. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Schreyer and Wyatt

Madam Speaker: All opposed, please rise.

Nays

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

Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, yeas 4, nays 12.

Madam Speaker: Motion is lost. Moving on to the main item, Item No.10, I'll call the question. All those in favour? All those in favour please rise...pardon, yes? Pardon me, 18, yes. Thank you. It's been a long day. Item No. 18, expropriation of lands – Cockburn-Calrossie combined sewer area. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Schreyer and Wyatt

Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, yeas 12, nays 4.

Madam Speaker: Item No. 10 passes. Item No. 18. You know what I mean. Okay, on to Motion 1. So onto the Property and Development report dated January 15, 2016. Councillor Orlikow.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED JANUARY 15, 2016

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We held a special meeting for this application to come through. Again, I just want to point out to...the application had nobody in opposition to it. We have the administration that indicated that they had no concerns about it. And I...I want the community to know that our processes sometimes slow things down just before the meeting dates that can take a long time sometimes for the application to get through. Again, but if an application is not opposed by anybody, and it's properly notified that we're going to be debating it, and that the application also isn't…any concerns are not raised by the administration. We have to be partners with our development community. This is a very large investment that they wish to make in our City. So I was pleased to hold a special meeting for it to allow it to be heard and that's why it's here today.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now we need to deal with Motion No. 1.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS

(a) Pursuant to its By-law No. 33/2015, The City of Winnipeg ("the City") authorized the expropriation of the lands described therein for the purpose of construction of the Southwest Transit-Way (Stage 2) and Pembina Highway Underpass Project, in the City of Winnipeg, in Manitoba, and executed a Declaration of Expropriation dated March 25, 2015;

(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 July 30, 2015 appointed an Inquiry Officer pursuant to section 4(2) of Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act, and an inquiry was conducted on August 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 25, and September 2 and 4, 2015;

(f) The Inquiry Officer obtained an Order dated August 14, 2015 from The Honorable Justice Dewar 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 October 29, 2015; and

(g) The Inquiry Officer obtained an Order dated October 7, 2015 from The Honorable Justice Rempel 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 January 31, 2016.

AND WHEREAS the Inquiry Officer submitted his report to the City on November 16, 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. 1679 Pembina Highway (Holding 22 and 23):

"The Objector and the City have reached an agreement of principle that the new Active Transportation Path can be accommodated by an easement being granted to the City that would parallel the owner's property lines. In the circumstances, This Inquiry Officer would find that it is not fair and reasonably necessary for a fee simple taking and that the issue be resolved by an easement as outlined and such a taking would be found to be fair and reasonably necessary and would satisfy the tests of public versus private interests."

2. 850 Pembina Highway (Holding 35):

"In the present circumstances, this Inquiry Officer finds that the proposed taking of a fee simple is not fair and reasonably necessary and that the taking, by way of an easement, would be appropriate and that the City amend its Declaration of Expropriation to reduce the taking to an easement taking that would allow the City to construct and maintain the retaining walls."

3. 1833 Pembina Highway (Holding 38):

"It is this Inquiry Officer's opinion that the City has failed to examine and pursue options, failed to do due diligence concerning the taking and has not satisfied the onus that it is fair or reasonably necessary in the circumstances for the taking, and has failed to establish the taking would balance the private versus public interests. The proposed taking is denied.

This Inquiry Officer would urge the City to explore alternate sites and/or arrange a meeting with the City, the Objector, and Manitoba Hydro."

4. West of Pembina Highway (Holding 39):

"This Inquiry Officer is of the opinion that the proposed taking of a fee simple interest is not fair and reasonably necessary, but the taking of an easement upon the lands would be fair and reasonably necessary and would satisfy the City's objectives and meet the amount of the taking. There is no evidence before this Inquiry Officer that an easement would not be sufficient."

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 The City of Winnipeg has purchased all the lands contained within Certificate of Title numbers 1260308/1, 1407684/1 and 1862651/1 (Holdings 15, 16 and 17) thereby making them not required for the expropriation and said lands have been removed from Plan Deposit 2137/2014. The City of Winnipeg desires that Holdings 15 (971/973 Chancellor Drive), 16 (967/969 Chancellor Drive), and 17 (963/965 Chancellor Drive), which have already

been settled, approved by Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development and transferred into the City's name, be removed from the expropriation confirmation.

AND WHEREAS instruments Numbers 1579777/1 and 1579780/1 are registered against Certificate of Title numbers 1260308/1, 1407684/1 and 1862651/1 and are no longer appurtenant to the expropriation;

AND WHEREAS instrument 4539390/1 has been registered against Certificate of Title number 1606395/1 and said instrument is now part of the encumbrances against the expropriated lands;

AND WHEREAS The City of Winnipeg requires part only of the lands contained within Certificate of Title number 1517845/1 and said land is contained within the lands taken for Works and shown as Parcel A on Plan Deposit 0002/2015 WLTO prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor. The City of Winnipeg desires that Holdings 22 and 23 (1679 Pembina Highway) be reduced in size from the original taking sizes of 5,700sq.ft.+/- and 26,716+/- sq., respectively to 5,601sq.ft.+/- and 9,754 sq.ft.+/-, respectively as per Plan Deposit 0002/2015.

AND WHEREAS The City of Winnipeg desires that the lands taken for Pembina Highway as show on Plan Deposit 0001/2015 WLTO prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor be amended to lands taken for Works.

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. 33/2015 with the following exceptions:

a) to delete parcel B from the lands described in Section 1, Thirdly;
b) to delete instruments 1579777/1 and 1579780/1 from the encumbrances listed in section 2;
c) to add instrument 4539390/1 to the encumbrances listed in section 2;
d) to delete Section 1, Fifthly and renumbering the balance of the section accordingly;
e) to amend Section 1, Thirteenthly to replace "Pembina Highway" with "Works".

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation made March 25, 2015, executed pursuant to By-law No. 33/2015 and expropriating the following lands:

Firstly,

The lands taken for Markham Road and Southpark Drive as shown on Plan Deposit 2119/2014 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Secondly,

The lands taken for Chancellor Drive as shown on Plan Deposit 2122/2014 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Thirdly,

The lands taken for Works and shown as parcels A and B on Plan Deposit 2137/2014 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Fourthly,

The lands taken for Works and shown as parcel A on Plan Deposit 0002/2015 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Fifthly,

All of the land contained within Lot 5, Plan 22602 WLTO,

Sixthly,
The lands taken for Works and shown as parcels A and B on Plan Deposit 0144/2015 WLTO, prepared by Kenneth Max Yerex, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Seventhly,

The lands taken for Seel Avenue as shown on Plan Deposit 0142/2015 WLTO, prepared by Kenneth Max Yerex, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Eighthly,

All of the land contained within Lots 17, 18, 19 and 20 in Block 56, Plan 276 WLTO,

Ninthly,

All of the land contained within Lots 9 and 10 in Block 6, Plan 1295 WLTO,

Tenthly,

The lands taken for Works and shown as parcel A on Plan Deposit 0054/2015 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Eleventhly,

The lands taken for Works and shown as parcel A on Plan Deposit 0036/2015 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Twelfthly,

The lands taken for Works and shown as parcels A, B and C on Plan Deposit 0141/2015 WLTO, prepared by Kenneth Max Yerex, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Thirteenthly,

The lands taken for Pembina Highway as shown on Plan Deposit 0001/2015 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Fourteenthly,

The lands taken for Works and shown as parcel A on Plan Deposit 0035/2015 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Fifteenthly,

The lands taken for Works and shown as parcel A on Plan Deposit 0055/2015 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Sixteenthly,

The lands taken for Works and shown as parcel A on Plan Deposit 0143/2015 WLTO, prepared by Kenneth Max Yerex, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor.

The lands described in section 1 are expropriated free of encumbrances, except for Instrument Numbers: 1579780, 1579777, 1579772, 1877561, 221134, 187579, 187580, 194482, 195046, 229301, 256931, 207405, 2495910, 2513473, 165092, 197495, 2324928, 4321570, 175024, 175025, 179180, 1988949, 3529771, 209786, 2069730, 2198952.

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:

Firstly,
The lands taken for Markham Road and Southpark Drive as shown on Plan Deposit 2119/2014 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Secondly,
The lands taken for Chancellor Drive as shown on Plan Deposit 2122/2014 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Thirdly,
The lands taken for Works and shown as parcel A on Plan Deposit 2137/2014 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Fourthly,
The lands taken for Works and shown as parcel A on Plan Deposit 0002/2015 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Fifthly,
The lands taken for Works and shown as parcels A and B on Plan Deposit 0144/2015 WLTO, prepared by Kenneth Max Yerex, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Sixthly,
The lands taken for Seel Avenue as shown on Plan Deposit 0142/2015 WLTO, prepared by Kenneth Max Yerex, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Seventhly,
All of the land contained within Lots 17, 18, 19 and 20 in Block 56, Plan 276 WLTO,

Eighthly,
All of the land contained within Lots 9 and 10 in Block 6, Plan 1295 WLTO,

Ninthly,
The lands taken for Works and shown as parcel A on Plan Deposit 0054/2015 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Tenthly,
The lands taken for Works and shown as parcel A on Plan Deposit 0036/2015 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Eleventhly,
The lands taken for Works and shown as parcels A, B and C on Plan Deposit 0141/2015 WLTO, prepared by Kenneth Max Yerex, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Twelfthly,
The lands taken for Works as shown on Plan Deposit 0001/2015 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Thirteenthly,
The lands taken for Works and shown as parcel A on Plan Deposit 0035/2015 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Fourteenthly,
The lands taken for Works and shown as parcel A on Plan Deposit 0055/2015 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,

Fifteenthly,
The lands taken for Works and shown as parcel A on Plan Deposit 0143/2015 WLTO, prepared by Kenneth Max Yerex, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor.

The lands described in section 1 are expropriated free of encumbrances, except for Instrument Numbers: 1579772/1, 1877561/1, 221134/1, 187579/1, 187580/1, 194482/1, 195046/1, 229301/1, 256931/1, 207405/1, 2495910/1, 2513473/1, 165092/1, 197495/1, 2324928/1, 4321570/1, 175024/1, 175025/1, 179180/1, 1988949/1, 3529771/1, 209786/1, 2069730/1, 2198952/1, 4539390/1.

The lands described above except:

c) 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

d) 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.

AND BE AMENDED to replace the original Plan Deposits 2137/2014, 0002/2015 and 0001/2015 WLTO with revised versions which:

- *removes Holdings 15 (971/973 Chancellor Drive), 16 (967/969 Chancellor Drive), and 17 (963/965 Chancellor Drive) from the expropriation confirmation, as per revised Plan Deposit 2137/2014;*
- *reduces the size of the original takings of Holdings 22 and 23 (1679 Pembina Highway) from 5,700sq.ft.+/- and 26,716+/- sq., respectively to 5,601sq.ft.+/- and 9,754 sq.ft.+/-, respectively, as per revised Plan Deposit 0002/2015;*
- *changes the lands taken for "Pembina Highway", as show on Plan Deposit 0001/2015 WLTO prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor, to lands taken for "Works."*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation dated March 25, 2015, as amended herein and thereby replaced by an Amended Declaration of Expropriation dated January 27, 2016, is hereby confirmed.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Council's reasons for proceeding with the expropriation of a fee simple interest in the property located at 1679 Pembina Highway (Holding 22 and 23), rather than an easement interest, which in the opinion of the Inquiry Officer is fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the City's objectives, are as follows:

- *The Public Service does not endorse the Inquiry Officer's recommendation for 1679 Pembina Highway (Holding 22 and 23). At the inquiry hearing, the City agreed to an easement for Holdings 22 and 23 rather than a taking on condition that the easement could be negotiated in time. The parties were unable to negotiate and complete an easement agreement in time for Holdings 22 and 23 to be removed from the expropriation prior to confirmation by Council. The City did reduce the size of the takings for each Holding to a much smaller area but due to time constraints had to move forward with the reduced takings rather than an easement. Once construction of the Active Transportation Path is complete, the City intends to sell all of the land from Holdings 22 and 23 back to the property owner, subject to the City having secured an easement in perpetuity on these lands. The easement to be granted to the City by the owner of Holdings 22 and 23 will be further reduced from the areas included in the takings. The easements will be at the very minimum size possible in order to accommodate the safe utilization of the Active Transportation Path.*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Council's reasons for proceeding with the expropriation of a fee simple interest in the property located at 850 Pembina Highway (Holding 35), rather than an easement interest, which in the opinion of the Inquiry Officer is fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the City's objectives, are as follows:

- *The Public Service does not endorse the Inquiry Officer's recommendation for 850 Pembina Highway (Holding 35). Public Works advises that the expropriated land required is for construction of a retaining wall. The retaining wall will be situated within the expropriated land. The City's contractor will design the type of retaining wall that will be constructed as well as determining the area required within the expropriated land to stage the construction. As a minimum, the City must ultimately own the land that contains all components of the retaining wall and obtain a permanent easement for maintenance, rehabilitation, and reconstruction over the balance of the land. After completion of construction, a determination will be made whether some of the land can be sold back and/or an easement negotiated.*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Council's reasons for proceeding with the expropriation of the property located at 1833 Pembina Highway (Holding 38), which in the opinion of the Inquiry Officer is not fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the City's objectives, are as follows:

- *The Public Service does not endorse the Inquiry Officer's recommendation for 1833 Pembina Highway (Holding 38).The Inquiry Officer stated, "It would appear that the Objector is in fact correct in submitting that there was inadequate consultation or investigation of the placement of the proposed pumping station. At the time, there was no adequate discussion with the Objector, or it appears, any site visits. This Inquiry Officer did attend at 1833 Pembina Highway and the Capri Motel, and examined the properties. Whilst mindful that this Inquiry Officer is not a property evaluator, one can easily observe the buildings on the Capri Motel site which could be used for the placement of the pumping station, are old, run down, and do not appear to be maintained. A visit to the site may well have affected the placement of the pumping station."*

- *The table below outlines the position of the Public Service:*

1833 Pembina Highway (Holding 38)	***The Capri Hotel Location***
The affected property is an existing parking lot which impacts 6 resident parking spots.	The affected property includes a minimum of 3 and possibly 4 hotel buildings, each building housing 2 units. In total 6 to 8 hotel units would be demolished resulting in a loss of income to the business.
The affected property will require the relocation of the above parking spots. At the inquiry evidence was given by the owner that arrangements had already been made with Manitoba Hydro for parking sites within Hydro lands to accommodate both future apartment expansion and the above noted impacted parking spots.	The affected property would lose parking spots associated with the 8 units mentioned above.
The affected property has no existing utilities that are impacted.	The affected property has existing sewer, water, site lighting and power that would be impacted and removal of this infrastructure would be required.
The pump station at the affected property is located in a parking lot and therefore does not significantly impact existing residents.	The pump station at the affected property would be within 1-2 meters of adjacent motel units which could create noise disturbance for hotel clients.
The length of the required access road from Plaza Drive to the pump station and the length of the Outfall from the pump station to the Lot 16 Drain are minimal.	The length of the required access road from Plaza Drive to the pump station and the length of the Outfall from the pump station to the Lot 16 Drain would be approximately 75 meters longer than the proposed 1833 Pembina site, increasing the costs.

- *In summary, it is the position of the Public Service that the expropriation of the 1833 Pembina Highway location is less costly to the City and has less impact on the expropriated parties than expropriation of the Capri Hotel location is likely to have on its interested parties.*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Council's reasons for proceeding with the expropriation of a fee simple interest in the property located west of Pembina Highway (Holding 39), rather than an easement interest, which in the opinion of the Inquiry Officer is fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the City's objectives, are as follows:

- *The Public Service does not endorse the Inquiry Officer's recommendation for the property west of Pembina Highway (Holding 39). Public Works advises that the expropriated land required is for construction of a retaining wall, active transportation path switchback ramp, and embankment slope. The City's contractor will be designing the configuration and type of retaining wall, switchback ramp and slopes that will be constructed as well as determining the area required within the expropriated land to stage the construction. As a minimum, the City must ultimately own the land that contains the above-mentioned components for maintenance, rehabilitation, and reconstruction. After completion of construction, a determination will be made whether some of the land can be sold back to the property owner and/or an easement can be negotiated.*

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

Councillor Orlikow: Madam Speaker, if I may request that our Legal Services come down to explain why these motions are here.

Madam Speaker: Ok, that would be Ms Krista Boryskavich. Mr. Clerk, which microphone could she use?

Krista Boryskavich: Thank you. So I understand that the question is that...why on the expropriation matters, are there both a report and a motion coming before you today. I can advise that both documents are required for the expropriation to proceed. While they both do deal with the same expropriation issues, they both contain different information, which is required under legislation. In terms of the process and the way that it's traditionally proceeded, what you normally would have seen before you...for many years...would be the motion coming forward to confirm the expropriation. What has been added in recent years, and it's my understanding that it's the past few years, is the administrative report which was added at the time that the province stopped waiving the requirements for an inquiry. What the administrative report deals with is the inquiry report, and whether or not Council is going to accept the recommendations of the Inquiry Officer. It is necessary under the legislation that Councillors consider that report, the Inquiry Officer's report, and the recommendations of the administrative report go to address that. The motions go to address confirmation of the expropriation itself and the information that they contain that's required by legislation are the reasons for proceeding with the expropriation and the legislation requires this if you are proceeding not in accordance with the Inquiry Officer's report. So this motion is required under the legislation to set out Council's reasons. In addition, and specifically with respect to the expropriation for the southwest rapid transit corridor project, the motion sets out the specific technical amendments to the By-law and to the plans of expropriation. And, as you know, only Council can adopt changes to By-laws. So, that's why both of these documents are before you today. We do understand that this has caused a little confusion. We are looking at our process to see in the future if all of the necessary information required under the legislation can be combined under one document so that it would flow to you a little better and in a less confusing manner. So hopefully that addresses the issue.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, do you have anything more to add? You had…since we have Ms Boryskavich down here, if there's anything lacking or missing that we need her to clarify?

Councillor Orlikow: No, thank you, Madam Chair. Again, it just looks a little confusing. But again, the actual changes are...the nuance is actually…the other motions that we just passed, this is a standard motion that we put forward in expropriations so there you go.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Through the CAO I guess…technically I'm not able to ask the department head, but through the CAO, I guess, and if he wishes to defer it then…in terms of answering the question on his behalf. I guess the obvious question would be, in terms of the previous report that we just dealt with, why would we not have...if we're having to pass this motion as required by law, which is what I'm understanding or hearing, I think, why would we not have a similar motion pertaining to the previous matter that we dealt with, which was Item 18? That's the one...I guess what causes me to question because it's an expropriation as well.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, if I could just interrupt here. There is another motion before us. It's Motion No. 2. Which Item does that go with?

(Inaudible)

Madam Speaker: There is another motion on the table, it's labeled Motion No. 2. That's right. I just want to put on the record that I'd like to ask the Clerk's Office to work in concert with the CAO's Office to look for process improvements here because it is a little bit confusing. When we have a confirming motion, in my opinion, the information should be contained in the main report. So, Councillors have an opportunity at committee to the their due diligence and do their proper homework instead of four pages being, you know, put in front of us here on the floor of Council. So, in the future, and you alluded to that, Ms Boryskavich, that you would fix that process in the future. Councillor Orlikow, did you finish introducing the item? Ok. And would anyone like to speak to Motion No. 1? Okay. I'll call the question then. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll move on to Motion No. 2, which is pertaining to Item No. 18. Councillor Orlikow, do you wish to introduce?

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

WHEREAS

(a) Pursuant to its By-law No. 11/2015, The City of Winnipeg ("the City") authorized the expropriation of the lands described therein for the purpose of the Cockburn-Calrossie Combined Sewer Area - Drainage Upgrade Project, in the City of Winnipeg, in Manitoba and executed a Declaration of Expropriation dated February 25, 2015;

(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 22, 2015 appointed an Inquiry Officer pursuant to section 4(2) of Schedule "A" to The Expropriation Act, and an inquiry was conducted on September 24, 25 and October 2, 2015;

(f) The Inquiry Officer obtained an Order dated July 17, 2015 from The Honorable Justice McCawley 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 November 26, 2015; and

(g) The Inquiry Officer obtained a further Order dated November 12, 2015 from The Honorable Justice Dewar 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 February 29, 2016.

AND WHEREAS the Inquiry Officer submitted his report to the City on November 23, 2015, wherein he stated that in his opinion the intended expropriation is not fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the objectives of the City.

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. 11/2015, without any changes.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Declaration of Expropriation dated February 25, 2015, made pursuant to By-law No. 11/2015 and expropriating the following lands:

> *The lands taken for Works and shown as Parcel A on Plan Deposit 0053/2015 WLTO, prepared by Donald Neil Bourgeois, of the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Land Surveyor,*

is hereby confirmed.

The lands described above are expropriated free of encumbrances.

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 described in By-law No. 11/2015 are as follows:

- *Determined to be the most advantageous to The City of Winnipeg - After an extensive technical review of various options of Storm Retention Basin (SRB) locations, size, outfall piping size and combination of the above; the Department determined that the construction of single 6.7 hectare pond on the Parker Lands with a 1200mm outfall piping to the Red River was the most efficient and with the least amount of construction risk and disruption to the public during construction phases. The development of this SRB requires the expropriation of 8.3 ha of land.*

- *Provides earlier relief to the residents of Cockburn West and Southeast Jessie – The combined sewers in these neighbourhoods have a low level of service with respect to basement flooding during severe rain events.*

- *Achieves complete separation of Cockburn West and Southeast Jessie sewer districts –The planned LDS system including the 6.7 ha SRB provides sufficient capacity to completely separate the Cockburn West and Southeast Jessie Combined Sewer systeMs Total separation of these sewer districts satisfies both of the goals of the project, Basement Flood Relief (BFR) and Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) abatement. Earlier evaluations considered "no pond" options, however the size of the downstream piping associated with these options to achieve total separation was deemed not practical from the perspective of the degree of required utility relocations and the construction costs of the very large diameter pipe (3,000 –3,600mm). The largest pipe considered practical within the City R.O.W. was a 2,550 mm pipe. Given this maximum pipe size, further analysis indicated that relief would be reduced to 70 % separation. This level of separation would improve the level of service for BFR but would not achieve total separation. Furthermore, the elimination of combined sewer overflows would not be achieved with this level of separation.*

- *Reduced Construction Risk – Implementation of the current design (SRB with 1,200 mm outlet to the river) will result in a project with a lower construction risk. Over 70 SRB's exist within City of Winnipeg. Construction of SRB's is commonplace in Manitoba and familiar to local contractors. Furthermore, the 1,200 mm outlet pipes can be installed using conventional construction equipment commonly used in Winnipeg. Alternatively high risk and large potential cost overruns could be anticipated with the construction of large diameter pipes associated with a design that does not consider an SRB. There is limited construction experience and there are inherent risks associated with the use of Tunnel Boring Machines (TBM's) required for the construction of the large diameter pipes. As well, there are limited vendors with demonstrated expertise in North America to construct these large diameter pipes.*

- *Provides required Naturalized Land required under the Environmental Act License for Southwest Transitway (Stage 2) Project (SWRT) – The Environmental Review and Assessment report prepared for Manitoba Water Stewardship and Conservation lists the construction of the naturalized SRB in the Parker Lands as a mitigation measure for the loss of wet meadow and cattail stand areas. Since the SRB provides these mitigation measures, the City will need to find an alternate method of achieving these mitigation measures if it is not constructed*

- *Accommodates development timelines of the Parker Lands - The Parker Lands fall within the Cockburn West Sewer District. The lands are undeveloped and not serviced by sewers. No existing sewers in the vicinity of the Parker Lands (south of the rail lines) can accept runoff flows from the development of the Parker Lands. Any development on these lands would require an outlet to the river (that currently does not exist). This includes the private development and may include public development (SWRT). The proposed land drainage scheme permits development of the Parker Lands once completed.*

Accommodates earlier development Taylor Lands - The Taylor Lands located north of the CN lines cannot be fully developed without a connection to the river to accept the allowable runoff flows. The City permitted the initial development of the Walmart Building on the Taylor Lands with the use of temporary dry pond to restrict the rate of runoff to the existing Cockburn combined sewer district. The approval is temporary with the understanding that the allowable flows from the Taylor lands are to be connected to the future LDS connection to the river once constructed.

•Additional CSO Benefits – In addition to the total separation benefits, the construction of a naturalized SRB, as planned, provide the following additional benefits with respect to the City's Combined Sewer Abatement Program:
o SRB settle out suspended solids that would be released into the Red River
o The Naturalized plant life provide biological uptake of some nutrients
o The ultraviolet impacts of the sun on the SRB can result in the decomposition of some bacteria.
These added CSO benefits are not achieved without the construction of a SRB.

- *Provides additional storage under flood conditions – The SRB provides additional storage for rain event when the Red River is experiencing elevated river levels.*

- *Provides an aesthetically pleasing enhancement public facility – The construction of the SRB will be landscaped to enhance the area in the lands it will be constructed. There are opportunities for pathways and pleasing landscaping enhancements.*

The Public Service also advised of the additional risks of not moving forward with the current design - assuming that a future design will go forward that does not consider expropriated lands for the construction of a SRB as follows:

- *Impacts the proposed cost and schedule for the P3 Project (SWRT & Pembina Underpass Project) – The current LDS Design (SRB and downstream piping) receive development flows from the Pembina Underpass,*

the SWRT Underpasses below the CN Letellier rail lines, and the portion of the SWRT corridor within the Parker Lands. Decisions on how to deal with these flows may impact the planned construction costs and schedule of the P3 Project.

- *Additional Parker Lands owned by 6165347 Manitoba Inc. (o/a GEM Equities) will need to be expropriated for the SWRT project – The existing Manitoba Hydro lattice transmission towers located on the Parker Lands are being modified to tubular towers to allow for sufficient space to build the SWRT Corridor. The tubular towers have a shorter span length and require approximately 1.3 acres of land north of the proposed SRB (and south of the CN Rail line) for a new set of tubular towers to be installed. This land is currently being expropriated under the Cockburn Project. If an alternate design is explored that does not require expropriation of the lands for the SRB, then this portion of the land will need to be expropriated for the SWRT project. This additional expropriation process would impact the schedule of the SWRT project.*

- *Additional Parker Lands owned by 6165347 Manitoba Inc. (o/a GEM Equities) will need to be expropriated for the construction of underground Trunk Sewers – Should the requested expropriation not go forward, there will still be a requirement for Parker Lands to accommodate the construction of large Diameter Sewers as there is no other practical option for the routing of a single trunk sewer to another location.*

- *The City will need to acquire a Consent to Enter and Construct Agreement to complete work for the SWRT Project – The Hydro Transmission tower relocations associated with the SWRT project involve the relocation of two transmission towers located on portion of the Parker Lands owned by 6165347 Manitoba Inc. (o/a Gem Equities). This land was being expropriated under the Cockburn Project. The City would require a Consent to Enter and Construct Agreement to undertake this portion of the relocations, which could impact the schedule of the SWRT project. The property owner may not agree to provide its Consent to Enter to Construct thereby jeopardizing the project.*

- *Development restrictions will remain on one quarter of Parker Lands – Approximately 25% of the land being expropriated as part of the Cockburn project involves a historic Hydro Utility corridor that restricts above grade development. The corridor currently includes three Transmission towers and Manitoba Hydro anticipates requiring 3 additional towers to satisfy its future needs in providing power to Manitobans. Construction of an SRB below the grade in the vicinity of the transmission towers is acceptable (and already approved by Manitoba Hydro). Development of residential and commercial development above grade in these locations is understood to not be permitted.*

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

Councillor Orlikow: Madam Speaker, I'll just move the motion.

Madam Speaker: Ok, any speakers on Motion No. 2?

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, I'd like to move referral of the motion.

Madam Speaker: Motion No. 2?

Councillor Wyatt: Correct.

Madam Speaker: Would anyone like to speak on… so we'll vote on the referral because it has no instructions attached to it. Okay, and there is a call for a recorded vote. All in favour of referring Motion No. 2, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Schreyer and Wyatt

Madam Speaker: Those opposed to Motion No. 2, please rise.

Nays

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

Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, yeas 3, nays 13.

Madam Speaker: The referral motion is lost. Are there any...can we take speakers, Mr. Clerk, that this time on the main motion? Yes? Are there any further speakers? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I guess this motion just confirms exactly what I spoke to in the previous debate on Item No. 18 and the fact that, you know, when we're having motions of this nature and size being walked on, on such a contentious matter where we have an Inquiry Officer writing a detailed report and taking the City for task proves the point that we shouldn't be doing this right now! And that is the concern that I have!

Madam Speaker: Are there any further speakers on this item, Motion No. 2? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Well Madam Speaker, I certainly hope there is. Councillor Wyatt raised some concern. I think his passion is real. And he kind of scared me a little bit, sitting right beside him, in more ways than one. So the reality is, you Know…

Councillor Wyatt: I didn't mean to. I apologize.

Councillor Schreyer: No, no, no. He's scared me, because what if he's right? And on that basis, I would like to hear other Councillors' comments on the...on trying to calm down Mr. Wyatt with the explanation as to why, in this case, this is acceptable that this be walked on. I think Council…I think the public of Winnipeg would benefit from a response to Mr....from Councillor Wyatt's concerns.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Are there any further speakers on Motion No. 2 that is before us? Councillor Orlikow to close then.

Councillor Orlikow: Just to clarify, this wasn't walked on. This was part of your agenda. This was put on the agenda. So it is not a walk on. People did have the opportunity to see this when the agenda was posted.

Madam Speaker: And Councillor Orlikow, I would like to just put on the record that I don't believe that's the proper process, either. That things are put on the agenda, motions. And I'd like to get...No. No. I'm asking the Clerk because I myself was confused on that yesterday. So I'm just...I've never seen motions on the agenda like that before, in that manner.

Councillor Allard: Point of privilege. I'm just wondering, perhaps the Clerk can advise, but if the Chair is speaking to an issue…

Madam Speaker: Well, I'm asking for clarification.

Councillor Allard: But should the Chair be letting another Chair step in while they're speaking to the motion?

Madam Speaker: Just to bring clarity to…

Councillor Allard: I'm just, I'm just…for clarity on procedure, I'd like to know.

Madam Speaker: And where are the motions, Mr. Clerk? They are posted on there? And that was to make sure everyone had an opportunity to have a look at them. But where are they posted?

Councillor Allard: I had a question, I don't know if there is an answer to it. If the Chair is speaking to an item on the agenda…

Madam Speaker: I'm trying to clarify the process because we had Legal Services come in and questions were posed to her so it is incumbent on me to make sure everyone understands what's going on here. And that is all I'm trying to do.

Councillor Allard: But if the Chair is speaking and providing opinion on a particular motion, should the Chair be stepping aside? But I…okay, I…okay. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Are there any further speakers? Okay. I'll call the question on Item No. 2. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Schreyer and Wyatt

Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, yeas 12, nays 4.

Madam Speaker: Okay, the Motion No. 2 passes. Okay. We'll now move on to By-laws. By-laws for second and third readings. Councillor Orlikow.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Madam Chair, I move that By-law No. 81/2015 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Orlikow: By-law No. 81/2015.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor? Oh, pardon me. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I move that By-law No. 81/2015 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, what about the By-laws for third reading? Which reading did you do?

Councillor Orlikow: We just did the third reading, Madam Chair. I believe I did. Be read a third time? Yah, we just did that part. And now I'm moving on to the other By-laws.

Madam Speaker: There's more By-laws here though as I see them.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Madam Speaker, I'd like to move that the following By-laws be read a first time; By-law Nos. 5/2016, 6/2016, 7/2016, 8/2016 and 18/2016.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 5/2016, By-law 6/2016, By-law No. 7/2016, By-law No. 8/2016, By-law 18/2016.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law Nos. 5/2016 to 8/2016 both inclusive and By-laws No. 18/2016 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 5/2016 to 8/2016 and By-law No. 18/2016.

Councillor Orlikow: I move that rules be suspended and that By-law Nos. 5/2016...excuse me...to 8/2016, both inclusive and By-law No. 18/2016 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period for the Chair. Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. Just in light of the debate, I'm not absolutely sure, but just for clarification because…I guess it's my fault, I guess I missed meetings and so on and I didn't get to sit through hours and hours of hearings to hear presentations to the officer in charge. But, Madam Speaker, I just want to confirm that in this creation of a deep water lake that the Province of Manitoba's Department of Conservation responsible for the licensing of CSOs, the City of Winnipeg specifically that department approved this deep lake as an appropriate plan to deal with the CSOs related to these districts that it's dealing with?

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you for the question. It states specifically approved, I'll have to get back to you, but I know that the province is well aware of the pond. We talked about naturalization of the pond, we talked about mitigating some of the environmental impacts associated with the BRT corridor with the pond, so the province is well aware of it. They also, they are requesting that we look at 100% diversion, the City's position is we'd like to go in the 85% just to the cost, but the actual specific checkbox that they said this is the one, no problem, I'll have to get back to him.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for the Chair? Okay, seeing none, we'll move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. Councillor Pagtakhan, will you move the report dated January 11th?

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED JANUARY 11, 2016

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'd be happy to introduce the report of January 11th and move adoption of Consent Agenda Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Winnipeg Police Board – 2016 Strategic Plan Update

Madam Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan, to introduce.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll give the floor to Councillor Allard.

Madam Speaker: This was stood down by yourself, Councillor Allard followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Allard: Yes, I just wanted to stand this down and take the time to thank the Chairperson for the Winnipeg Police Board, Scott Gillingham, regarding what I see as him having heard some feedback on the strategic plan regarding safety on transit security. As some of you know, I've been advocating for the idea of having cops on buses since September of last year and I'd like to commend my colleagues; Councillor Mayes, Eadie, Councillor Gilroy, for all having spoken on the issue of transit securities. So, thank you for your support on that file. And I just wanted to communicate to Council as some of you may have heard, assault on transit drivers is up 54% this year and so I've been advocating for plain clothes and uniformed officers on our buses. So, this idea is not have a cop on every bus, but to have the chance

of a police officer on every bus. This would improve security for our transit drivers in the public as well as provide new revenue opportunities like reducing transit fare evasion and allowing police to issue other fines. I believe the police officers are the ones that we need to enforce the law on our buses. They're the only workers who have the training and the tools to do the job in the way that is safe for the public and those enforcing it themselves. So I note that the issues mentioned in the strategic plan and that's the reason I wanted to commend the Chair and clearly he's heard what some of us have been saying. So page six of the strategic plan says when they talk about how they've heard from the community and how they've changed their strategic plan in terms of feedback that they've received from the community, they say we've heard from citizens that they want improvements to safety on transit buses. The strategic plan supports this is objective by directing the service to continue to focus resources towards a downtown safety strategy, work with partners to protect vulnerable persons and enhance community relationships. The board and the service have agreed...that how the service implements these strategic directions will be determined by the Chief of Police. So on that, I want to thank the Chair once again. I understand he doesn't...he doesn't direct the police service. He does that...or that they work through the Chief, so on, so I want to thank you, Scott, again for the opportunity to present and for these changes to the strategic plan. So thank you for that.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham. First Councillor Eadie, are you ready, Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak to this. Councillor Gillingham, of course, being the Chair of the Winnipeg Police Board is appropriate. And Madam Speaker, I just wanted to say, regardless of whether I'm on Winnipeg Police Board or not, from the Protection in Community Services and now Parks Standing Committee, I would like to just say that there is a lot of work that went into the strategic plan and I think that right now, and I want to talk about the process of this report. I, of course, stand in total support of this strategic plan, Madam Speaker. The opportunity here in that the strategic plan comes through here, as we all know the Winnipeg Police Board has its formal meetings the first Friday of each month, currently is the methodology. And I think that's great. But in terms of what comes to that standing committee, or to the Police Board, this strategic plan would never end up as information at...here in this Council chamber for us to vote on and consider as a whole Council. It is essential that reports such as this continue to come through Protection and Community Services, Parks. That is the terms of reference for that committee, it means that these reports do come that way. And Madam Speaker, I believe...and especially Madam Speaker, you're the Head of Governance and it is really important to understand that this is what this reporting system benefits. Of course, the financial reports from the Winnipeg Police Service go to the Standing Committee on Finance. That's also very important because that's what brings that information to us as City Councillors on Council. That is the process that we bring these reports. Anyway, I want to...I respect the Winnipeg Police Board and all the work that its citizen members as well as Council members do. I don't want to take anything away from our Chairperson. He's very involved with the Winnipeg Police Board. I just wanted to make that statement and I might just also…I'd like to make a comment to…in terms of our transit drivers, and...also transit users get assaulted as well on buses. Sometimes when they're arguing about who gets to use the priority seating in the front. That occurs. There are policies related to that. There are policies related to the paying of fares. We actually...Winnipeg Transit does have a policy that does allow...right now it is up to the driver to decide, I think. I'm not quite sure. But we do have a policy, you know, if there's...it's - 30° below, and there's obviously somebody there who hasn't the money to take the bus. There is a policy that allows those persons to ride on the bus. How you enforce policy, though, that's policy. And I just wanted to point out that somehow the consideration that having police officers on the bus is somehow going to totally resolve the fare issue. What happens though, is we know that transit drivers when they do challenge individuals who get on who don't want to pay, have been assaulted. That is a crime. That is not appropriate. But to ensure that the policy...policies of Winnipeg Transit overall...there is a whole bunch of policy, there's an education campaign going on right now. And I think that is very important. And we should all talk to our friends who ride the bus and explain how priority seating works. How, you know, what the fare rules are and so on and so forth, Madam Speaker. We need to understand that. But that policy and the enforcement of that policy, I believe, is not police responsibility. The enforcement of that policy and the way that works on the buses, just like we have By-law policies under neighborhood livability, we have By-law enforcement people that make sure that the policies and By-law provisions under that By-law are dealt with. So, I just want to point that out and I think Winnipeg Transit can do and utilize staff that it already has to be on these buses to ensure that everybody's following policy. Not breaking crime. We do know that there are many crimes happening on buses, such as popping open alcohol. That's a crime. Open liquor in a public place is illegal. Those are real crime issues. But there are policy issue that we need Winnipeg Transit to try to make sure, continue to happen through other means other than Winnipeg Police Service officers riding those buses. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise obviously to support this motion, but I thought I would take this opportunity as well to speak to...to this strategic plan update which is before us, just a couple of items on it. I do want to express appreciation to all of my colleagues on the Police Board, including Councillor Eadie who have worked so hard, not only in the initial formation of the strategic plan, but also in its update as well. And part of that update

process we invite the board...the board consistently invites members of the public to make comments, ask questions, make suggestions and it was through that process, the process of updating the strategic plan that Councillor Allard came forward with his matter about safety on the transit buses and I appreciate his input on that. I can let you know that on February 5th, so next Friday, that is our next public Police Board meeting. The Winnipeg Police Service will be coming forward with a report on transit safety. Since Councillor Allard's question, went through the process and the Chief has advised me that Winnipeg Police Service has been working directly with Winnipeg Transit on the matter. So, a report will be coming forward next Friday. I also want to just kind of comment on the matter that Councillor Eadie raised and want to ensure my colleague, Councillor Eadie, and members of this council and yourself as well, Madam Speaker, that the board and I will certainly work with each one to ensure that…Clerks as well, to ensure that the appropriate critical path is determined for all reports, regardless of the nature. So we make sure that we are making sure that the right critical path is followed for all the reports that come from…through to the Winnipeg Police Board. Also, just one final thing. I always invite anyone who has concerns or questions or suggestions regarding the Police Board and our work to don't hesitate to contact me directly or our board and I believe everyone obviously knows how to get a hold of one another. Please if you have...as my colleagues on Council, if you have a question or concern about anything you see or hear, please contact me directly. I'd be glad to discuss the matter with you. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In the campaign for City Council, in 2014, I only quoted one person in the one pamphlet that I put out. And that was Police Chief Devon Clunis. He was the only person I quoted when he talked about raising the social consciousness of our community. I am pleased to see, Madam Speaker, on goal two of the Winnipeg Services Strategic Plan regarding engaged communities. It is so consistent, what I believe, with...what I believe Chief Clunis represents when he talks about raising the social consciousness of our community. And it is consistent, I believe, in the spirit of why I bothered quoting him and only him in the single pamphlet that I put out when I ran for City Council. With very few campaign commitments but needing…obviously the campaign commitments I had were rather dear to me and something that I'm highly accountable for in the next election. I'm pleased to see that…it says in this report, and the Councillor Pagtakhan has told me that in this case I may quote. Is that true, Madam Speaker, I may quote the report?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you. Briefly, it just says, as just one example, Madam Speaker, of things that I hold to heart in this report. "While the Winnipeg Police Service must continue to be vigilant in responding to crime and to hold offenders accountable, it is clear that simply continuing to criminalize marginalized groups is not enough to improve overall public safety outcomes. By embracing the philosophy of crime prevention through social development and engaging in partnerships with all levels of government, community organizations and families, together we can create a culture of safety for all." And Madam Speaker, that culture of safety means a culture of empowerment for these marginalized communities. I hold this dear to my heart. I support this wholeheartedly by virtue of what has gone into putting this on paper. Giving it its own subtitle, its own page. And I will work with this Council, with Councillor Gillingham and as well with Winnipeg Police Board member, Councillor Ross Eadie and all...all levels of government, community organizations and families to create that culture of safety and, in doing so Madam Speaker, creating that culture of empowerment that goes along all cultures, subcultures, ethnic and linguistic lines and that is absolutely what I stand for and why I stand in favour of the Winnipeg Police Service's strategic plan. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Are there any further speakers on this item? Ok. Councillor Pagtakhan to close.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I want to thank all my Council colleagues for their comments and discussion on the matter. I want to thank...the opportunity to thank Councillor Gillingham, the Board Chair of the Winnipeg Police Board and thank Winnipeg Police Service, Madam Speaker for really engaging with the citizens of Winnipeg and formulating this strategic plan with a number of goals. They have four goals identified with a number of strategic directions. I'm sure this Council looks forward to updates in the future in terms of the progress and implementations of these strategic directions. And Madam Speaker, the Winnipeg Police Service is one of the great services that we provide here at the City of Winnipeg for our citizens and just really want to thank everyone involved in the process. So, with that, call the question.

Madam Speaker: Okay, I'll call the question on the item. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have Motion No. 6 in front of us. It's moved by Councillor Eadie, seconded by Councillor Gerbasi regarding the enhancement of a few parks throughout the City and the Commemoration of Victoria to celebrate the 125 years of parks in Winnipeg in the year 2018. So this will be an automatic referral to the Committee on Protection and Community Services and Parks. There's no By-laws today. Any questions for the Chair, Councillor Pagtakhan? Seeing none, we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works on the report dated January 5, 2016. Councillor Lukes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS the first Winnipeg parks established in 1893 were Assiniboine Park (later renamed Fort Rouge Park in 1905), Central Park, St. John's Park, and Victoria Gardens, later renamed Victoria Park in 1894 as referenced in "A City at Leisure, An Illustrated History of Parks and Recreation Services in Winnipeg" , by Catherine Macdonald (Winnipeg Free Press), 1995;

AND WHEREAS Victoria Park was removed from Winnipeg's parks inventory in favour of development, a place Winnipeggers gathered during the 1919 strike;

AND WHEREAS 2018 will be the 125TH anniversary of these first parks in Winnipeg.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Public Service undertake a consultation with Winnipeggers in 2016 to determine what can be done to enhance these original parks and commemorate Victoria Park, in order to celebrate the 125 years of parks in Winnipeg in 2018 and report back to Council through the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services and Parks.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED JANUARY 5, 2016

Councillor Lukes: Good afternoon, it's almost evening. Good afternoon, Madam Chair. I'd like to bring forward the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated January 5th. IteMs 1, 2 and 3 for adoption and Consent Agenda.

Madam Speaker: Okay. So I'll call the question on Item No. 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 1 – Snow Clearing Cost Saving Measures – C.U.P.E. 500 Report

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes to introduce the item.

Councillor Lukes: I'd like to hear from my colleague, please.

Madam Speaker: That was stood down by? Councillor Eadie, you have the floor.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm rising to speak to this report. It's actually as a result of a motion that I moved by myself and I believe, seconded by Councillor Schreyer. And it's interesting that...I mean, there's a fairly good outcome that comes from the standing committee in regard to this motion. However, this motion itself was predicated on the belief that both the department of Public Works and CUPE 500's expert report. There is two reports, Madam Speaker. And I thought both reports were exactly, you know, they were different reports. The administration presented their report, which was appropriate. And I didn't disagree necessarily with the out...their designation because they brought forth a report that they were asked to do. CUPE 500, on the other hand, in preparing they brought a different report. But that report, Madam Speaker, indicated that there was some possibilities for savings and I'm always interested in savings as is Councillor Morantz who has the responsibility of trying to make sure the budget goes through and we're always concerned about costs and, Madam Speaker, we did have a new election in which our Mayor talked about Council working in a new and better way. Not just with each other, but Council in dealing with our finances, it is a new day to deal with our administration and to work and we should work with our collective bargaining labor unions that are...and associations that represent the workers and, you know, we're not going to resolve our financial woes by making enemies or cutting people out. You know, Madam Speaker, since I've been involved in City politics, I've seen where it's become very combative and it is hard to build trust amongst each other. Like, trust is hard to deal with and hard to earn. And, so I thought there was a great opportunity here, Madam Speaker. A great opportunity. To try to bring our administration and our labour union together to look at how they could implement potential savings in there. And what happened is the motion itself was of course, just received as information. People don't believe there is something here or something there. You know, it takes a while to build up trust, to realize each other's interests, to be able to deal

with the financial issues that we are the City of Winnipeg. And you know, I have to say I believe CUPE 500, in representing their employees, has looked at what the issues are for the City and through the collective bargaining, I'm seeing that they get collective agreements of 00 and 1% when we have financial probleMs And that's fair, because I think that they realize that and we need to earn trust. And, again, I've been...well not on Council dealing with any of this, I have been involved with the City of Winnipeg quite often, since 1991. And there was a great opportunity here. But what happened was… And I tried to say we need to corroborate… we need to work with the people. And it was an honest presentation. It wasn't a this us against them. It was a…if there's possible savings here, let's find 'em. Work together. Each side did not understand each other's report or had issues with reports. I think at this point that the resolution, there was a separate motion, I guess it might be part of this report, I don't know, for the administration to have a dialogue so they can understand each other's reports. But it doesn't give them any direction to actually look for and find savings together. And that's where I have a problem with this. It was totally political. Political posturing and whatever. When I read those two reports, there was...it was combative when the report originally came in. But you know, I'm looking at this and I'm saying, listen, I want to save money. Because I know that we have demands for money for other projects. Things that we need to find money. That Councillor Morantz continually reminds me, on us of Council that if there are projects that you want to see happen, you've got to find the money. Well, you know, we all need to be considerate of that and try to look at that then. And deal with that. I just honestly thought there was a good opportunity here. I mean there is an opportunity still. I thank the Standing Committee, Madam Speaker, for at least having administration, having a direct dialogue with CUPE 500 about their report. But I'm really hoping to find the savings. And the real issue too is, this was a very opportune time to move forward such a motion to give directive because the private snow clearing contracts are up in 2017. In order to determine and figure out if you can save money, you need to start now. Not just an immediate dialogue. It needs to start in 2016, that honest dialogue. Yeah, maybe the Innovation Committee, there was some innovative ideas from CUPE 500 from the former COO of Fleet Management, had some ideas that could work along with public taking over snow clearing. Anyway, I'll leave it at that, Madam Speaker. I just want to say, and I'm not going to...I'm voting, you know, whatever the report says. But I just had to reflect my disappointment in the whole thing that somehow this was something to be stomped on and discussed and then told, oh I don't have any confidence in the CUPE 500 report when they had an expert looking at it. Like really, Madam Speaker. So, I'll be voting for it, but I just had to express my disappointment. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: I happen to be...ahem...no, excuse me. This was the next meeting of IRPW. I happened to be present at the IRPW Standing Committee meeting, the previous one of the last one of last year when both Manitoba Heavy and CUPE 500 brought forth their reports. And I witnessed that on...in person. Given the nature of the dynamic of the last IRPW meeting which brings forth this resolution, this motion that we're now discussing on the floor, because I'm now involved, I went back and I watched it on video and watched it twice. Kept rewinding it just to make sure I was clear in terms of what I was hearing. The discussion that I was listening to amongst the Councillors that sit on that Standing Committee. So, a few aspects of the discussion that brought forth this motion, I listened to maybe a few times just to be clear because I just want to be clear in terms of how I can help. The reason I say that is as the Mayor appointed me and I accepted the appointment as Council's liaison for labor relations, happens to be that every single member of the Standing Committee mentioned this position that I have in terms of my presumed involvement with the discussion that CUPE and the administration, the Winnipeg Public Service will be having. On that basis, I feel…I guess I'm in the middle of it based on what all Councillors of the IRPW Standing Committee have said. To the extent that it seems to me, if you wish to re-watch the…watch that meeting, I believe, one Councillor even said that, in terms of creating the motion, didn't want to presume that which I would be doing or affecting in the process of being involved between CUPE 500 and Winnipeg Public Service. It happens to be, Madam Speaker, that I did second Councillor Eadie's previous motion, I guess that lead to the motion that we are discussing now. That original motion asking for a report from the administration based on discussions with CUPE 500 that is now no longer there but nonetheless, it does direct the Winnipeg Public Service to have a verbal discussion with CUPE…CUPE 500, presumably officials on that cost saving measures identified in their report. And this is called the CUPE 500 report, it is the title of this Item. And so I'm at that basis given what I have seen in the discussion as the motion has been put forth. I already have been called waiting to see how this would turn out, both the new head of Public Works, Lester Deane as well as the new President of CUPE 500, Gord Delbridge, both called me up regarding meetings. I do want you to know that based on this motion, I will be having at least...arranging meetings and I think that…at least one meeting, if not more has already been arranged in schedule with Lester Deane. I do want to let you know that I will be supporting this. I feel it is unfortunate that the original motion was not passed. But this is certainly something to work with. And I will do my best to involve myself appropriately in terms of manifesting an appropriate outcome from this motion. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks Madam Speaker. I will be supporting this motion. I think is a great idea to continue to find ways that we can have discussions with CUPE 500. It represents a significant chunk of our workforce and our valuable

employees that provide us with work each and every day on behalf of Winnipeggers, I too have been making efforts to ensure that the lines of communication are open as members of Council will know Gord Delbridge has recently taken over as President of CUPE Local 500. I met with him last week and had excellent dialogue. During the course of the conversation, we also discussed the new role that has been created for Council liaison for labour relation and I want to thank Councillor Schreyer for agreeing to step up and serve in that capacity. Thank you.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As we race through today's agenda, we didn't, under Councillor Browaty's agenda, talk about the golf services report. But that is a good example of where the City has done some good work with CUPE 500, we've kept them on as…well, they're still the bargaining agent. They had some ideas about increasing charges and putting it back into the courses that we adopted and grounds being played are certainly up. I agree what the Mayor is saying, there is a dialogue with Gord Delbridge and others from CUPE and I, and our other bargaining agents, we've done some good work with importing and…under Councillor Browaty, the power stretchers to cut down on injuries for our MGU represented ambulance officers. So I think it is a good faith effort to try and talk to CUPE to try and see what the two reports say and are we comparing apples and oranges or what. So, I do think that dialogue's important and we should keep trying to do it at the golf services, at snow clearing, on those sorts of initiatives. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Madam Speaker. Just briefly, I wanted to say that I am strongly in support of having this dialogue and I think it is really important. There are a couple of areas where garbage is another one as well as snow clearing where I'm not...I think some decisions that were made have been made somewhat ideologically, and I just think we need to have…as well as the dialogue, we also need to have the data and the base line information about what things are actually costing us, particularly with the garbage that was an issue. Why we couldn't really look at the fact it's 100% contracted out, we didn't have data to compare anything. So I am just hoping that that's also in this new focus with a new position to work with labour which I think is excellent, it's never had it before. So I think that is something to be noted, and showing some commitment. I mean it is a matter of…relationships are about trust and also action. So I mean we've seen some action here in creating that position, but that dialogue needs to be genuine and continue. Maybe there are some cost savings; some other cities have taken parts of their service back in-house. But we can't even look at that if we don't have the data to measure what things are actually costing us properly and that's part of our administration's role. We had a lot of change in the administration as well. So I hope that we can sort of start a new day on these types of issues. And I thank the Mayor and Councillor Schreyer, the Committee, Councillor Eadie and others, who advocated for this. But we need to keep having these discussions with our workforce, they are part of the team here. Thank you Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. So, to close on this Item, at the committee meeting, we did have a very good dialogue and Mr. Deane has offered to sit down and speak with them. And I do believe he will be coming back with verbal update of some kind. It is really...it is really good to hear all this ongoing dialogue in conversation with CUPE.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, I will call the question on Item No. 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item No, 3, Mr. Clerk.

Item 3 – Amendment to the City of Winnipeg Streets and Traffic By-laws – St. Matthews Avenue Extension

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, to introduce the Item.

Councillor Lukes: I would like to hear from my colleague, please, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Madam Speaker. I am supportive of the report. I rise, I think this is one area that we as a Council could...I would encourage the Committee to look at this or consider looking at this. The regional street criteria has not been revisited for 32 years. As a matter of fact, if you look at the...it is interesting, if you look at Appendix B in your report, which is attached to this report, you can actually see that it has the original typing going back to 19...February 29th, 1984. The criteria…Trudeau was Prime Minister then, but, Pierre Trudeau. It's remarkable and really...I am not against…as I said, I'm supporting the recommendation for St. Matthews being upgraded to regional. But, there are many, many other streets in our city where we probably have to revisit, regional versus collector or non-regional. There are benefits in terms of snow clearing and everything else. The downside is, when we are constructing these regional arterials, we as a…and it comes back to…and it ties in to development cost charges, our ability to require

development cost charges to be part…their costs associated with regional streets. Our ability to apply that is compromised greatly under our existing policy which doesn't make sense considering the benefits that come from having that regional street in place. So you know, I think we really do need to revisit it. It is something which...the City has grown. The idea for example, I will just give you an example of why it should be revisited. The idea that...the regional street should connect via or over the river, you know, we have now regional streets on different parts of the City that you know they're just…they won't go over a river, right. We have neighbourhoods that have grown and areas that are growing that clearly demand that attention. I would encourage the committee to look at that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Lukes to close.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you to Councillor Wyatt for bringing that point up. There are actually a few different policies too that we are looking at that have been dated far back. So I will bring that up with the Director. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay. I will call the question on Item No. 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have Motion No. 9 before us.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

Motion No. 9
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Dobson,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has an obligation to provide prompt and efficient clearing of snow on public thoroughfares, roads, sidewalks and backlanes;

AND WHEREAS the current methods of snow clearing leave Priority 3 streets and sidewalks sometimes clogged with snow for weeks due to initial focus on clearing the Priority 1 and Priority 2 routes;

AND WHEREAS windrows in the back lane have been an issue of great contention with the Winnipeg people and are not currently addressed under the current City of Winnipeg snow clearing policy;

AND WHEREAS this is not only a safety concern for residents and motorists, it is also not the best quality of service that the City of Winnipeg can provide;

AND WHEREAS the emergence of technology has allowed for the proliferation and expedition of service in many areas such as transportation and travel;

AND WHEREAS this type of app already exists within the private sphere and can be tailored to ensure that it meets the City's requirement in terms of material management and insurance;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Public Service be directed to

a) Create an app/service that allows smaller private contractors and individuals to bid on snow clearing opportunities on P3 designated streets, sidewalks and in backlanes where existing larger private contractors offer services;
b) That the app shall be tested as a pilot project in a smaller geographical area of the City and that this be targeted for the 2016/2017 winter season and;
c) That the Public Service report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works with the results of the pilot project;
d) In the event the pilot project is successful, that the City begin to expand the app services into other areas of the City for P3 snow clearing of roads, sidewalks, and back lanes where existing services are offered presently by existing contractors.

Councillor Orlikow: There's the…I do apologize. It is supposed to be notice of Motion. Not Motion.

Madam Speaker: This is not your motion yet Councillor Orlikow. We will come to that in a moment. It's Motion No. 9 is moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by the Councillor Dobson regarding an app service for snow clearing. So this will be an automatic referral to Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Now, on to Motion No. 11 that was circulated. This is moved by Councillor Orlikow, seconded by Councillor Morantz. And you were saying…

Motion No. 11
Moved by Councillor Orlikow,
Seconded by Councillor Morantz,

WHEREAS on January 18, 2016 a meeting of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works (IRPW) considered the report titled "Waverley Street at CN Mainline (River) Grade Separation", more commonly referred to as the "Waverley Street Underpass";

AND WHEREAS on March 25, 2015 Council unanimously approved the "Waverley Street Underpass" as its top capital project priority for submission to the Building Canada Fund;

AND WHEREAS the Waverley Street Underpass is a Class 3 estimate;

AND WHEREAS both the Federal and Provincial governments have confirmed funding support for the Waverley Street Underpass;

AND WHEREAS subsection 3(2) of the City Organization By-law provides that "notwithstanding the delegation of any authority or power under this by-law to Executive Policy Committee or a Standing Committee, Council may, at its discretion, review or deal with any matter which falls within the mandate of Executive Policy Committee or a Standing Committee";

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the following recommendations from the report titled "Waverley Street at CN Mainline (Rivers) Grade Separation" from the January 18, 2016 meeting of IRPW be approved by Council:

1. *That a new 2016 capital project in the amount of $155,082,000 be authorized and included in the 2016 capital Budget for "Waverley Street at CN Mainline (Rivers) Grade Separation" (hereinafter "Project") with the financing sources and description as set out in Appendix A. The related borrowing by-law will be prepared in conjunction with the 2016 Capital Budget.*

2. *That the Director of Planning, Property, and Development be authorized to negotiate the acquisition of land required for the Project.*

3. *That the City enter into, execute and deliver funding agreements with the Province of Manitoba and Government of Canada with respect to Provincial and Federal funding contributions to the Project and that the Chief Administrative Officer be authorized to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of such funding agreements in accordance with this Report and such terms and conditions deemed necessary by the City Solicitor/Director of Legal Services to protect the interests of the City.*

4. *That the City enter into, execute and deliver all agreements with Canadian National Railway Company ("CN") and Manitoba Hydro as determined necessary by the City Solicitor/Director of Legal Services with respect to the Project and that the Chief Administrative Officer be authorized to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of such agreements in accordance with this Report and such terms and conditions deemed necessary by the City Solicitor/Director of Legal Services to protect the interests of the City.*

5. *That authority be delegated to the Chief Administrative Officer to negotiate and award single source contracts not exceeding a total of $13.0 million (included in the Project budget and identified in the Class 3 estimate) with Manitoba Hydro for power distribution and street lighting works.*

6. *That the Chief Administrative Officer be delegated authority to approve the overexpenditures, if any, relating to contract(s) with Manitoba Hydro providing monies are available within the applicable capital budget as approved by Council.*

7. *That, in the interest of meeting the project timeline, authority be delegated to the Chief Administrative Officer to negotiate and award a single source contract for consulting engineering services not exceeding $12.3 million (included in the Project budget and identified in the Class 3 estimate) to Dillon Consulting Limited. to undertake detailed design, contract administration, and post construction services.*

8. *That the Chief Administrative Officer be delegated authority to approve over-expenditures, if any, relating to the Contract with Dillon Consulting Limited providing monies are available within the applicable capital budget as approved by Council.*

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

Councillor Orlikow: Just to clarify, it's a notice of motion. I apologize.

Madam Speaker: It's a notice of motion? Okay. Which means it would come back to the next Committee of Council. Councillor Gilroy you have a point of order.

Councillor Gilroy: I won't be supporting this motion. Today when we debated…

Councillor Orlikow: Point of order. It's a debate…there's no debate.

Madam Speaker: Ok, now you're saying this is not a motion for today. Just want to make sure everyone is clear. This is a notice of motion. You want this Item to be debated next month at Council, correct? Does this need to be re-circulated, Mr. Clerk? I just want to make sure things are done properly here.

Councillor Wyatt: Point of order. You know the only way that it can be discussed is if the suspension of rules is granted on a notice of motion to debate it immediately and it then could also be referred therefore to the committee which is dealing with this matter I believe, or understand.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy you....

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah I just have a point of clarification. When we were meeting with administration, we knew that there was a time line for this project. So it was important that this doesn't get delayed. So I'm thinking that this might delay it even further if we don't have our meeting to deal with this so…

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, could you clarify because this...it is a notice of motion for an Item that is already at Public Works Committee. Instructions were given there to bring it back to the committee at a later date.

Clerk: Two processes can exist in parallel at some point, one will take precedence. But at this time, this motion still is in order.

Madam Speaker: Ok, so just so everyone understands, at committee, the item is dealt with and it comes up through the process. So, if there's a chance that the item doesn't come up, does it still get dealt with next month because it's been brought up in this parallel process?

Clerk: Correct, it would still be dealt with at Council.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: I move suspension of the rules to deal with this now so it can be referred. Frankly, I think...I hear what…I know I don't...I hear...I am not trying to take away from what is being done but that the committee should have a chance to consider this and have it referred through the committee so you can have it there.

Madam Speaker: I'm sorry, you have to repeat that, Richard.

Clerk: As I hear it, the Councillor would like to suspend the rule to deal with this matter at this time and if he gets suspension of the rule, and I hear that he wants to move a further motion to refer it to IRPW? So the motion you'd have in front of you that he is moving is suspension of the rule to deliberate this motion at this time which will require a two-thirds suspension.

Councillor Eadie: Point of order.

Madam Speaker: Yes, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I seem to recall, without debating the notice of motion, I believe Councillor Swandel, in the past moved referral on the notice without it being debated.

Councillor Gerbasi: He called notice.

Madam Speaker: Yeah. We're going to have to go deep in our procedural By-law on this one. So, Councillor Wyatt, just so I'm clear, you are moving that we suspend the rules to deal with the item now? Okay, can referral…I have the Chair right now. Can the referral motion; is it in order on the notice of motion, Mr. Clerk?

Clerk: Not on a notice of motion. So you suspend the rule, a two-third suspension is required to deal with the matter at this time. And, I think at his first speaking, he would refer the matter to IRPW… if he's successful.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so currently what we have in front of us is a notice of motion and nothing more. Okay. Yes?

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, point of order. Just for clarification and for future reference, should it not say notice of motion instead of motion?

Madam Speaker: Yes. Councillor Orlikow did rise to clarify that and we accepted the fact that it is a notice of motion. Yes, Councillor?

Councillor Gilroy: Clarification, so the committee that is supposed to be handling this will no longer be able to hear this?

Madam Speaker: No, that's not the case.

Councillor Gilroy: So it will still be going to IRPW?

Madam Speaker: It's still on our agenda. Okay. Yes, it is a notice of motion. I am now moving forward on our agenda here. We will move on to By-laws. By-laws for first reading only. Councillor Lukes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 1ST READING ONLY

Councillor Lukes: I would like to move By-law No. 19/2016, a by-law of the City of the Winnipeg to authorize the borrowing of money in the amount of 5.164 million to be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, I am not sure that that was the By-law.

Clerk: Nineteen of 2016.

Madam Speaker: Yeah. Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 19/2016

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, on the by-laws for all three readings?

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

Councillor Lukes: Okay I would like to move that the following By-laws be read the first time; By-law No. 17/2016 and By-law No. 21/2016.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 17/2016, By-law No. 21/2016.

Councillor Lukes: I move that By-law Nos. 17/2016 and 21/2016 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 17/2016 and 21/2016

Councillor Lukes: I would like to move that the rule be suspended and By-law Nos. 17/2016 and 21/2016 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period for the Chair. Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: Through you Madam Speaker to the Chair, it appears that a week ago, Friday, a report was supplied to your committee where you called a meeting on, I believe it was the following Monday, a week ago and, in terms, of the Waverley Underpass. And this report was brought forward…and the committee was informed that the committee has to adopt it immediately and bring in forward. But now we have a motion, a notice of motion, where there's some very significant pieces, which that clearly were, I'm assuming, missed in the report that was before your committee and you already had a special meeting on to consider. My question is this, what kind of assurance and what can you do to assure this Council that when you consider this matter again at your committee that all due diligence, all due diligence is being done by the public service to ensure that this project is begin managed correctly? Because it's certainly not coming out of the gates that is cleanly and smoothly as everyone is claiming it to be at this point right now from what I can see.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes?

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, thank you, Madam Speaker. What we can do it we can ask the public service to bring forward all the information that they have and that is the information that they will give us. We will be also looking at this if we have other questions, we'll be asking questions, but we have to believe and trust in our public service.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you to the Chair. Most winters in our downtown core where, you know, people use the sidewalks, people park, you know, right up against the curb, snow is quite frequently hauled away. It seems this year, in our downtown that they have not been ploughing, hauling as much snow. Has there been any change in policy that you're away of?

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Chair to my colleague. There, I know there was no change in policy, I know the Downtown BIZ is also involved in snow removal downtown, but I have not been made aware of any change in policy and I've been working very closely with the department on seeing how we could improve the walking and active transportation snow removal network in the City. So there's been no changes that I've been made aware of.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Browaty?

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, if the Chair could just maybe follow up with the department to ask if there has been a practice, some differences this year, and if there's any background as to perhaps why?

Councillor Lukes: Sure, I will do that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is regarding the snow clearing, cost-saving measures. CUPE 500 report motion, which states that directs the…to quote, that regarding the snow clearing, cost-saving measures that CUPE 500 report that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed that rural discussion with CUPE officials on the cost saving measures identified in their report. Now I did mention already, Madam Speaker, that I was disappointed that the original motion brought forth to IRPW wasn't passed but we had this one instead. And I must say, Madam Speaker, in optimism that this might end up in the long run being better. I don't know, but I'm not going to rule out that possibility. So such is my preamble, Madam Speaker, which I know you always appreciate. And so I do ask of Chair Lukes, if she could explain, and I understand, I understand having sort of analyzed the meeting brought forth this week with this motion and the discussion on this motion. Not every Councillor had the same motivations or thoughts when they all vote, but they voted. Fair enough, Madam Speaker. Could Councillor Lukes, Chair Lukes, at least explain her thoughts as to why, for the sake of Council, given it's my directive, why she did not support the original motion which said that the administration would report back on that discussion regarding the CUPE 500 report? But nonetheless to..for the public service to have a verbal discussion with CUPE on their report. [Inaudible] between the two motions.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes?

Councillor Lukes: Sure. Thank you. The administration indicated that they would be more than willing to speak to CUPE about cost saving measures, and so the committee, we discussed this. And the committee felt prudent…very prudent, that the two parties go off and sit down and discuss these measures. We thought, you know, in respect to the time and investment of time and people to come up with other reports before they've sat down and talked, would be rather, you know, both parties came forward with reports, reports, reports we had reports. There seem to be a difference of opinion, so a logical first step, we felt…the committee felt would be to go back and sit down and talk with each other. And administration was very open to that and open to hearing any cost saving measures that CUPE could bring forward. So that was, that's how we based our decision.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I may not thank her in this process. But nonetheless, will our Chair of IRPW perhaps look back at the meeting which is on video record, given that my concerns are that despite the fact I'm very glad this motion passed.

Madam Speaker: What is your question, Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: Well, whether it be given some consideration that Public Works Department may not have been that willing to discuss with CUPE 500 report regarding it's snow clearing, cost-saving measures, despite the fact that this motion we put forth, which I think is great?

Councillor Lukes: I'm not really sure what the question is. So?

Councillor Schreyer: I guess….Madam Speaker, I guess my concern, I'm trying to phrase this as a question for the benefit of Councillor Lukes, because she stated that Public Works is more than willing to discuss with CUPE 500 report snow clearing, cost-saving measures…that wasn't obvious to me and perhaps I can discuss that with Councillor Lukes as we move forward on this conversation and discussion.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: Okay, seeing none, we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. There's no report before us today, no motions, and no by-laws. Are there any questions for the Chair? Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you to the Chair. I asked a question back in November, but maybe October even, in terms of I understand, we may be on the eve of the budget but the concern that I asked was specifically about a first call, I guess, this budget for the local streets and regional streets in ensuring that our contracts get out and that work can be done as quickly as possible, at least getting things moving as early as possible. Have there steps been taken with the public service to do that, or are we in a position we're going to be there February or March until we vote on the capital and therefore the risk being that we will be late getting out tenders and contracts for work in terms of those budgets?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Morantz?

Councillor Morantz: Madam Chair, I want to thank the Councillor for his question. I'm going to have to take that under advisement and go back and get a list of what matters may have been brought forward for first call. I just don't have that information at my fingertips. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for the Chair? Seeing none, Councillor Allard, will you move adjournment? Thank you. All those in favour? Contrary? Roll call Mr. Clerk.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 5:41 p.m.