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

The council met at 9:40 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 Gilroy.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: I would like to introduce our page for today's meeting, Katrina Chanas is with us again today. She attends Miles Macdonnell Collegiate and she resides in the North Kildonan Ward. Welcome. Mr. Mayor, I understand you have a few announcements this morning.

Mayor Bowman: I do. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and good morning to everyone that…of course in the chamber as well as in the gallery, those that may be watching online or via television. On April 19th, Manitobans went to the polls and elected a new provincial government. I want to congratulate Manitoba's Progressive Conservatives and, of course, our Premier Elect, Mr. Brian Pallister on their commanding and historic victory. I also want to wish all new and all returning MLAs all the very best and I want to also, on all of our behalf, thank outgoing MLAs for their work and commitment to public service. I also want to briefly recognize all 221 candidates who are willing to run in the 41st provincial election. Putting your name on the ballot, as we all know here in this chamber, takes a significant amount of courage and commitment. It also takes a significant amount of commitment and support from family and friends as well as volunteers and I look forward to working collaboratively with our new provincial government. In particular, we'll be working with them on the commitments made in response to the Fair Share Fair Say Campaign. This campaign led by the Association of Manitoba Municipalities was a significant success. It underscored how effective it can be when we work together and collaborate on common goals. With 137 mayors and reeves standing and working together, infrastructure led the campaign as a top of mind issue for voters and we know Winnipeggers overwhelmingly want us to continue investing in infrastructure and I look forward to working in partnership with our new provincial government on these and other priorities. Earlier in May, Madam Speaker, I was very pleased to be in Edmonton to participate in the Cities Reducing Poverty: When Mayors Lead Conference. It's a national event that attracted mayors from across the country and as part of this event I was thrilled to announce a new initiative called the Winnipeg Promise. As part of this initiative we established a steering committee comprising local leaders in Winnipeg dedicated to finding the best ways to remove barriers currently preventing low-income families and children from accessing the Canada Learning Bond. Now the Canada Learning Bond provides a tremendous opportunity to make a difference in the lives of low-income children. This valuable program is extremely under-utilized by low-income families largely due to a number of barriers that prevent access to the program. For example, in Point Douglas alone only about 3,300 children accessed the Canada Learning Bond out of over 12,000 eligible children. Closing this gap would allow access to an additional $17.4 million to help fund post-secondary education. The many different barriers that families experience in accessing the Canada Learning Bond includes things like not having a birth certificate, a lengthy registration process, a lack of trust or social isolation. The Winnipeg Promise and the steering committee will build on the important work already undertaken by the Winnipeg Boldness Project and other organizations in our community in finding ways to remove these and other barriers to open up access to post-secondary education funding that already exists. I look forward to the important work that this steering committee will be undertaking and I hope that it is also a model that can be followed by mayors across Canada and I have already had discussions with several of my counterparts to see what they can do in their own respective communities to allow their citizens to tap into the Canada Learning Bond. Last week, as part of my campaign pledge to showcase Winnipeg on the national and the international stage, I led a business delegation to Montreal to promote Winnipeg as a great place to live, to work and to invest. Winnipeg today is growing, it's thriving and it's a diverse city and as a former business owner, I know how vital it is for city leaders to promote Winnipeg across Canada, around the globe and to build relationships and attract businesses and investment into Winnipeg. It was great to have the leadership from Economic Development Winnipeg, now led by Dayna Spiring, Yes Winnipeg, the World Trade Centre Winnipeg and the Winnipeg Chamber Of Commerce accompany me. It was also great to have representatives from the Winnipeg Airport's

Authority, Great West Life, MTS, Sightline Innovation and Solara Data join us as well. Moving forward, I will continue to work hand-in-hand with Economic Development Winnipeg, Yes Winnipeg, the World Trade Centre Winnipeg, and of course, the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce to grow our economy and to help create more jobs and opportunities right here in Winnipeg. Tomorrow, we mark a solemn day in our civic calendar, it's the National Day of Mourning. This is a day that is set aside to remember workers who have been lost, injured or suffered illness as a result of their work. And it's a day also for remembrance. It's also a day about determination, about commitment and about hope. And it's also a day to rededicate ourselves to making every workplace safer and to foster a culture of safety. I hope every citizen in Winnipeg will join us tomorrow in remembrance and to pause and reflect on those who have been injured or those who have lost their lives as a result of their work. Tomorrow we'll be celebrating volunteers at the 33rd annual Volunteer Awards Dinner and on Friday, we'll be recognizing retiring civic employees for devoting many years of service towards many distinguished careers that have helped make Winnipeg a city we are all proud to call home. Now on Thursday, I will be kicking off my commitment to visit every high school in Winnipeg beginning with a visit to Nelson McIntyre Collegiate. And I look forward to meeting with hundreds of students and teachers over the course of these visits. It's my hope that I will be able to assist in building a greater civic engagement and pride in our city, as well as to learn more about what our young people, our young citizens expect from their city and, of course, their political leaders. On a lighter note, I want to remind and invite all councillors to participate in the ball hockey game this Friday when the City of Winnipeg takes on the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce. So I'd encourage you to come out and play, come out and watch, heckle, come out for the reception following the game. I'll remind you that with no NHL teams in Canada in the playoffs, this may be the closest any of us get to a quasi-professional game. So I would ask that you come on out and join us and meet with the staff and the board members that, that will be able to come out from the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce. Thanks very much, Madam Speaker, merci and megwich.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Gillingham, on to you to make your morning announcement. Thank you.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker and good morning to my colleagues. This past Sunday, April 24, marked the 65th anniversary of the Battle of Kapyong. The battle was an important conflict in the Korean War. On April 24, 1951, Canadian soldiers from the 2nd battalion, Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry or 2PPCLI, along with United Nation Forces from Australia and Britain, took up positions to halt the advancement of enemy troops. The approximately 700 members of 2PPCLI were dug into Hill 677 overlooking the Kapyong River Valley. Their mission was to stop the advance of the communist Chinese army whose sights were set on Seoul, Korea. The historic accounts of the battle are remarkable, they play like a movie script. Vastly outnumbered by the enemy, the soldiers of 2PPCLI were surrounded on every side. The Canadians fought valiantly successfully repelling repeated waves of attack. Many of those attacks came in the night, signaled by the spine tingling blast of a Chinese bugle call that pierced the darkness. The bugle call was followed immediately by the barrage of enemy assault. The next day, on April 25, 1951, the Chinese army withdrew. The Canadians of 2PPCLI had staved off the communist army's advance. Today, there are three veterans of the Battle of Kapyong remaining in Manitoba and I believe it's important that our community continue to remember their sacrifice and service in this historic battle. And though the old barracks of the former home of 2PPCLI along Kenaston bare the name Kapyong, that property's future development is uncertain. Therefore, in the 65th anniversary year, I have launched an initiative to rename a city park at the corner of Ness and Amherst, Kapyong Park. And I have received overwhelming support from the Korean War veterans, the Korean Society of Manitoba, the current commanding officer of 2PPCLI based in Shilo now, the Royal Military Institute of Manitoba, the Canadian Legion No. 4 of St. James, the Military Family Resource Centre, City Council colleagues and many members of the St. James community. The motion to rename the park passed unanimously through our Assiniboine Community Committee. The motion now will go before our Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks on May 9. And if supported on May 9, the park will be renamed at a ceremony in late summer, early fall and I, of course, will invite everyone to attend as details will be made public in due time. I just want to take a moment to thank my many Council colleagues that have expressed their support especially Councillors Pagtakhan and Mayes who from the outset have given good advice in the launch of this initiative. I did invite the three surviving members of the Kapyong Battle to join us today. Mr. Mike Czuboka, Mr. Doug Jones and Mr. Ron Sheppard, but Mr. Jones and Sheppard are actually in Korea right now, marking the 65th anniversary. And it was Mr. Jones who, in January, told me about the bugle call in the middle of the night. And his description nearly transported me there. It was quite remarkable. The other veteran, Mr. Czuboka, was unable to attend today and sent his regrets. But, I am very pleased that Master Cho, the President of the Korean Society of Manitoba, Mr. Martin Kwan, as well as honourary colonel, Barry Burns, of the Royal Military Institute of Manitoba have joined us in the gallery today for the opening of today's Council meeting and thank you to them for being here. These gentlemen and their organizations have been strong supporters of the project and I thank them for being here, I thank them for their partnership efforts that will ensure the memory of Canada's contribution to the victory of Kapyong is told to future generations. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. On to Councillor Gerbasi, for your morning announcement.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Friday, April 29th is International Dance Day, which was started in 1982 by the International Dance Committee of UNESCO International Theatre Institute. And I would like to acknowledge the presence in the audience of Stephanie Ballard who is the Director of the Winnipeg Dance Preservation Institute and the Manitoba representative of the Canadian Dance Assembly Advocacy Committee. Also, we have some representatives of the Drive Dance Company, so thank you for taking the time to come today. International Dance Day takes place around the globe to bring people and nations together in the common language of dance. It's important to recognize Winnipeg's unique cultural position of being home to the oldest ballet company in Canada and the oldest contemporary dance company in Canada, and as well as the Chai Folk Ensemble, Folklorama and countless professional and non-professional dance groups. Even some of us who aren't ball hockey players, we do other things like clog dancing. Dare to Clog Dancers is one of those groups, some of your councillors belong to. So this is something for all our citizens. I just wanted to also let you all know that on Friday, April 29 at 12:30, there will be a dance performance and it won't be me clogging in the public courtyard at City Hall put on to recognize this day. So I just wanted to let Council be aware of that and if you can extend a wave, look out the balcony, perhaps, when they are here. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Gillingham will you move that the minutes of the meeting held on March 22 and March 23, 2016 be taken as read and confirmed?

MINUTES

Councillor Gillingham moves that the Minutes of the meetings held on March 22 and March 23, 2016 be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: We will now move on to delegations. First up, we have Jennifer Feschuk, on behalf of the Green Action Centre, in support of Item 3, of the report from Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment Committee regarding the Garbage Recycling and Organic Waste Programs. Welcome, Ms Feschuk. You have ten minutes for your presentation.

Jennifer Feschuk: Thank you. Good morning, councillors. Again, I am here again today to talk to you about the importance of organics diversion. I am speaking on behalf of Green Action Centre in support of the implementation of a city-wide curbside organics collection program. Composting is the right thing to do. City Council is committed to a waste diversion goal of 50 percent and Green Action Centre wants you to be successful in achieving this goal. As an organization that has been work on composting initiatives in Winnipeg for over 30 years, we firmly believe that residential curbside pickup is needed to reach such a target. At Green Action Centre, our goal is that composting be accessible to all, to seniors, to apartment dwellers, to low-income citizens, to those who want to do it on their own and to those who might find it intimidating and would appreciate a curbside collection system. We are a non-profit organization that works to train Manitobans to compost onsite emphasizing that it is easy and worth it. Our composting program focuses on getting citizens to compost in their backyard, indoors with worms, at their school and in their community compost bins. We have also trained hundreds of volunteers who we call master composters to spread the word on composting. We have a compost info helpline and an extensive web-based information set up to support and guide anyone who wants to learn about composting. In the end, managing organics onsite will always be the most environmentally friendly method of dealing with compostables. We know that. However, a curbside pickup program will benefit those who don't want to do it at home and for those backyard composters who want to go to the next level of composting and responsibly dispose of their meat, dairy and other things that cannot be composted in their backyards. So investing in both onsite composting programs and a green bin program is what will divert the most amount of organic waste and allow you to achieve that 50 percent diversion goal. While backyard composting will remain important, some people won't adapt to the backyard composting because it involves such a behavioural shift. Whereas sorting your organics in a third bin has shown to be a fairly easy shift. We were pleased with the vote at the committee meeting to amend the motion that was tabled. This is a step in the right direction. The amendment clause is congruent to City Council's commitment to public engagement and this proposed broader consultation plan should include an analysis to...and discussion on alternative funding methods such as pay as you throw. This model has worked well in Toronto. Residents are charged according to their size of the cart they choose, the garbage cart they choose. The larger garbage cart costs the homeowners substantially more which allows then for residents to be rewarded in their efforts in waste reduction such as recycling and composting initiatives and then save money if they choose a smaller cart option. A

strong education component is also essential in the public consultation process in order to ensure citizens are well informed when giving their opinions and perspectives. We need Winnipeggers to be informed on the importance of composting and to understand its benefits. This will help with citizen buy-in and in turn, stimulate support for a curbside program. The message to residents needs to be inclusive for all. Highlighting that those who wish to continue to compost in their backyards or on school grounds can do so but that they can also take advantage of a program for the remaining organic materials they generate. Green Action Centre is a grassroots, nonprofit organization that understands the dynamics of composting. We train and educate residents to do it on their own. Our composting program is a team of two people. We spend most of our time out in the field doing presentations, consultations with schools, communities and residents. We have also looked at the commercial sector and have recently launched a social enterprise initiative called Compost Winnipeg which provides a pickup service for organic work places and small restaurants in the downtown core. Perhaps City Hall would like to get on board. Also, we have recently confirmed a new project which looks to get multifamily dwellings on board as well. In response to high demand from these particular residents, we will be providing direct onsite support for apartment dwellers to start composting. So as you can see councillors, we have thought about composting a lot. We have considered all pieces of the puzzle. Our recommendation for a curbside composting program comes from this kind of forethought. When it comes to managing organics from our residents, Green Action Centre knows that this is what it needed for a significant waste diversion and for Winnipeg to reach this diversion target. We need you as councillors to make this happen for Winnipeg. We urge you to use your influence to move this forward and get an organics pick-up program going for Winnipeg residents. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms Feschuk. This will be your opportunity to ask questions. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you for your presentation. And I wanted to thank Green Action Centre and the Manitoba Eco-Network. There were some people, I think at our committee meeting who thought Councillor Eadie and I were being mean to some of the speakers to use the exact term that was used so...we had a very good meeting with the Green Action Centre and the Manitoba Eco-Network. And two things, thank you for not...some speakers previously were suggesting, well the Province is going to impose the ban, well in the interim, we've got a provincial election so we'll see what the Province is going to do on Brady. But curbside is a couple of years down the road at best, but you highlighted some very good work that you are doing now and I just wanted to get...and you heard the Mayor talk about civic engagement in schools. You gave me this very good document, schools compost. If you could just...two questions I guess, can you talk a bit more about what you it is you are now doing in the schools, and the kind of budget that's going in towards that and B) I was unaware of the Compost Winnipeg Social Enterprise Group that you have got going. My understanding is Winnipeg Foundation is giving you some money in relation to that or another initiative. Can you talk a bit about that? I think, as a group, in our next budget we're going to have to take a look at some other creative things like this in terms of compost ideas. So, if you can just talk a bit about what you do at the schools and what Winnipeg Foundation is doing.

Jennifer Feschuk: Sure. Okay sure. So what we do with schools, as I mentioned, is we spend a lot of time actually visiting different schools. I'll often set up consultations with the school administration or teachers that want to spearhead an onsite composting program. So we do a lot of presentations in schools. For the time being, this has been fairly reactive so we get schools that are coming to us to ask for information about how they can set up their program. They have obtained grants from various different forMs..like education for sustainable development grants and then we go out there to support them in setting up the system. Talking to them about different places, how they can…where they can locate it, how they set up the program within the school and…yah, we get money from the City of Winnipeg to provide this type of service for the school. But, because of the limited capacity that we are, two people working on this and limited funds, it's very reactive, so based on the feedback that we get from teachers. In terms of what we are receiving from Winnipeg Foundation, so that is a new grant that is coming forward and that's for apartment dwellers. So this is an initiative that we just recently got confirmation for because we noticed that we were getting calls from a lot of people living in apartments that said, I can't do it onsite, I don't want to do it in a little worm bin in my apartment so what can I do? What can you provide for me? So then we developed a project that would support the funding that we got is for five apartment condos or apartment buildings to set up an onsite compost program for them. So we supply them with the bin, all the equipment, we would conduct surveys with all the tenants to see who is onboard in the apartment building and try and get that going for them. Of course, it's an initial set up because we don't have the capacity to maintain it for them so that idea is that you get somebody to spearhead it and then they continue it on their own. And it also engages the community, right, which is very important for Winnipeg Foundation. And then the...oh, Compost Winnipeg was the other one that you were asking about. So that's a social enterprise that we have recently launched. We did at the committee meeting have a delegate that represents Compost Winnipeg and that was in response to as well from restaurants, and cafes and workplaces that are also looking to divert their organics but have no system in place. So, again, as a reactive, we responded to that and came up with the social enterprise which, I believe, we have currently about 12...or about a dozen or so clients in the downtown core, so some cafés, some work places and some smaller sort of businesses in the downtown core. Looking to expand, of course, if we can secure funding.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further Councillor Mayes? On to Councillor Gerbasi, followed by Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker and thank you so much for coming back repeatedly to the various committees and council to help inform and educate the public who is watching as well as us because you guys really are the experts on this locally here in Winnipeg and you have brought a lot of valuable information to us in all of this process. I guess...so what I am hearing is you say you support the amended motion and I am assuming this is because, you know, to move this forward we do need to have that process of dialogue and communication and education that comes with a broad public consultation. So do you feel that that's a really important step in moving forward towards this goal of getting the program?

Jennifer Feschuk: Sure. I mean, I think the way that it all rolled out was unfortunate with the push back that we had. But a public consultation is necessary not just to actually talk to the citizens about what they want, but also to inform them so that you can get buy-in for a program, right. They need to understand why composting is a good idea, what are the benefits for everyone, right? And not just in terms of actually getting the garbage off of their property, but the bigger picture benefits of greenhouse gas reductions from the landfill. So those public consultations need to include an education component that's going to explain all of those things to them so that you can explain buy-in, right, so that people understand, yes, okay, this is something I should support.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: One of the other issues that came up a lot is, you know, there are different compost initiatives that are going on in the schools, you know, you're talking about social enterprise in apartments. These are all wonderful, wonderful things. So how do we explain to people that those are all wonderful things that should continue and will continue, but what about the City's role and what impact can that have on the goal of waste diversion and greenhouse gases in Winnipeg?

Jennifer Feschuk: Yeah, well I think the, you know, the result of all of these initiatives that we've started are reactive because people have been coming to us asking for something. So they are noticing that there is a lack in the city's initiative to make something happen in terms of organics diversion. They notice that…they know that it's an important thing that needs to happen, that all the other cities are doing it. So, if we can't get it from City Council then maybe the non-profit people are the ones that will make it happen and that's why we've come up with these different solutions. They are very small scale though because we are a small capacity. Two people, remember, composting prograMs So I think in terms of what the City can do, what the role of the councillor is really to sort of say like, you as a unit, can move this forward for residents in terms of their homes and then the rest will follow, right? I mean, if you think about a business owner who works in the downtown core who is now part of our social enterprise that is sorting the organics, now that has become more aware in their daily work, so then at home, they're going to transfer that and then vice versa. If you get folks at home starting to sort out their organics, then all of a sudden it becomes important in their business as well. I mean, it's all behavioural shifts that can transfer over.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Gerbasi: My other question is, there's been…I think part of the misunderstanding is that because there are some things are happening and some people have bins in their backyard that we don't really need to do this. But obviously...can you talk about backyard composting? I mean, obviously it's great thing but will it get us to our 50 percent target that the City voted on in 2011?

Jennifer Feschuk: Yeah, for sure. I mean, backyard composting is a wonderful thing. We have been encouraging it for 30 years, but you have to remember that it's not for everybody just like gardening is not for everybody. It involves getting out there and working with your hands in the ground, right? And so that's not for everybody. You're going to get a lot of folks that are just not interested in that or physically maybe they can't do it, so I think there is a certain population of residents that will adopt the behaviour of backyard composting, get really into it if we can educate and make it accessible with subsidized bins, et cetera, but in terms of getting the most amount of organics waste diverted from the landfill, backyard composting is not enough. You need a bigger amount of organics out of the landfill and that comes from a curbside program which is what's been shown in many other cities.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes, you now have the floor.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. Councillor Gerbasi's last question was mine so thank you. So, I guess I just wanted to say thank you very much for the work that you are doing. As the councillor for the area that is home to the Brady Landfill, the Brady Landfill, of course is a very aromatic area in our end of town and what became very clear to me

when I was receiving many calls on this topic was the sort of...the real...I had two concerns, the cost and the fact that many folks didn't really understand the benefits and how it could impact the odours that are coming from Brady and the whole garburator concept. I think people just really don't understand that the garburator isn't the answer. So I'm very appreciative of the work that you're doing and I'm really thankful for this amendment and I think that this is just a critical part in understanding why this is so important. So thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Eadie. Councillor Eadie, you have the floor now.

Councillor Eadie: I just wanted to make sure. So, I think we're all...like, I personally am very concerned about all of the greenhouse gases that the City of Winnipeg produces and the City of Winnipeg produces a lot of organic waste through business, through residential, multi-families, everybody speaks to. And I just want to confirm though that it is the perspective of Green Action and all the green people that we, the City of Winnipeg, deal with all of our greenhouse gas emissions.

Jennifer Feschuk: I'm sorry, I'm unclear of the question.

Councillor Eadie: So the City of Winnipeg, it's more than Brady Landfill. There is Rosser Landfill, the City of Winnipeg generates lots of greenhouse gas through its organic waste and I guess I'll just ask the specific question because question period is over. Who in the area is doing research about not just Brady Landfill but the responsibility we have for the organics going into Rosser? Who is studying how much greenhouse gas being produced that ends up from in those places?

Madam Speaker: Can you quickly answer that?

Jennifer Feschuk: Yeah, I don't have the answer to that. I probably ask your administration from the Waste and Water Department. They would probably know better.

Madam Speaker: That ends question period for this item. Thank you for your presentation today, Ms Feschuk. Next, we will hear from Gord Delbridge, on behalf of CUPE. He is in opposition to Item No. 1 of the report of the Innovation Committee regarding the Winnipeg Fleet Management 2016 Business Plan. Mr. Delbridge, you will have ten minutes to make your presentation. I know you are just making your way up here. Welcome.

Gord Delbridge: Good morning, Madam Speaker, Mayor and councillors. I appreciate this opportunity to take it up and say a few words on our concerns with this AVL, Automated Vehicle Tracking system. First off, you know, I've presented at a few committees now and our concerns are as that as we are in a time of tight budgets, this is going to be a costly endeavour. Estimating, the cost is going to be in the ballpark of about $2 million and there's going to be about $500,000 in monitoring costs. That's going to be outsourced to Alberta so there's jobs that are being outsourced there. So that is a concern for us. Ultimately, at the end of the day as much as we've tried, you know, looking into the practicality and the value behind the system, we have struggled with trying to find where we're going to find those savings. But at the end of the day, you know, if it's...if, you know, that's how we wish to proceed, my understanding is that there is an amendment as well to the motion to abolish the AVL system that's being implemented here. And as far as the amendment goes, we would be in support of the amendment to have a letter of understanding on how we are going to proceed. I think this would bring good morale to do the employees. It would give us a clear understanding as to what the intent is behind this system. I think it's important for us to work together and, you know, clearly outline what the intent is and you know, ensure that it's clear on both sides and it's going to respect the interests of everyone that's involved or that could be potentially affected. And the efficiencies that could potentially be used, we are always encouraged...encourage our members to operate efficiently and we want to provide the best service possible to the citizens of Winnipeg. So you know, I think it's important that we work together on this and you know, come up with some understanding as to the intent. And so we are happy that this amendment is being made to this motion and you know, chose that we can work together on some extent here to see this through. So, if there are any questions for me.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: More of a point of clarification. I believe the amendment is to the Fleet, not necessarily the other motion. The amendment is about the Fleet plan itself that's going forward. So it's asking Council to...it's not really connected to the amendment to cancel the whole thing. It's just the clause on the Fleet is under the innovation clause. The same thing you are saying, I just want…didn't want Council to be confused about that.

Gord Delbridge: Sure, thanks for that clarification**.**

Councillor Gerbasi: The project's going…you know, according to…if that report's approved, the project would go forward but then if this amendment if it's approved would be approved with that.

Gord Delbridge: And we are in support of that amendment. Once again, I think it's important that we work together and just bring some clarification to...how we proceed with this. We have to be careful at this day and age. I mean, this is kind of new technology and we have to be cautious and cognizant of everyone involved to ensure that the proper protections are in place and I think it's going to improve the morale too that we can work together and we have an agreement on behalf of our members and the city. Was there any further questions?

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? No? Seeing none, I thank you for your presentation today, Mr. Delbridge.

Gord Delbridge: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next, we have two delegations both in opposition to Item No.13 of the report of Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development Committee regarding the Public Safety Building and the Civic Centre Car Park. First up, we have Cindy Tugwell, on behalf of Heritage Winnipeg along with Les Stechesen. Following that we will hear from Sotirios Kotoulas, if you could come down as well and have a seat on the bench. Good morning.

Cindy Tugwell: Good morning Mayor, good morning councillors. I am here this morning to speak to you about the…in opposition of the recommendation from the Downtown Committee and EPC about alternative a large public space and private development. I'm sure you have heard a lot of stuff that's been going on in the news, but we have been doing research and this building is significant. It is part of a collection of five buildings. You have already designated City Hall. This building is a significant...one of the top five Brutalist buildings in Canada. We talk about sustainable development…I was listening carefully about composting that just preceded me and it's really strange to me that urbanism from the 1960s was appalled and in the 21st century in 2016 we are talking about ripping down a structurally sound building for large public space. If this was the private sector, this would not be allowed. We've had buildings as a lot of you councillors, I look around that have been on Council for many years. We have had buildings, traditional architectural buildings in this city…the Royal Bank Tower which is now the culinary school for Red River. Just recently in the news, the Fortune Block and the McDonald Block. These buildings have sat dilapidated and vacant for many years and if this was the private sector, Council would say, if in fact the recommendation from the Historical Buildings and Resources Committee was to evaluate these buildings, which the Public Safety Building was evaluated unofficially, it is a significant collection of modernist buildings. Brutalist…a fine example of Brutalist architect in Canada, it would go forward as a designated building. It is significant enough to protect sustainable development…heritage preservation is sustainable development and I think the example that you are setting to Winnipeggers not only…to Winnipeggers but to all of Canada. All eyes are watching on the significance of what you are going to do here as far as in your Deloitte report, it does state many different options that you can look at but it also indicates that there is a need for a consolidation of municipal offices. There is a need...a use for it in fact, the report even alludes to the possibility of ripping this building down and building a brand new 80,000 square foot building which I can't even comprehend why you would want to rip something structurally sound and historically and culturally significant…all buildings…I would say probably 80 percent of all the buildings in the downtown and the Exchange have been repurposed in some way from their original use. You look at bank buildings, you look at churches, there have been very many innovative ideas on how to repurpose these buildings so the fact that it was used as a police station now going forward, how we can reuse it is not a dilemma. We have a very innovative and well stocked professional industry in Winnipeg. It creates local jobs. It's great for the environment. We need that extra space and green space is urbanism in the 1960s. We do not need vacant green space. And I can tell you from being involved in the Upper Fort Garry Project, from a personal perspective, for 15 years I was involved with Upper Fort. By the time you demolish buildings, you do remedial work, you do consultation, you involve the public, the stakeholders, you are looking at millions and millions of dollars. And I think what I would like to end with before my time runs out is to say we are perplexed as to the lightning speed of this decision making. This is an amazingly important decision for generations…future generations to come. I know we all talk about the old City Hall buildings that we've lost. We are in 2016…this report just came out in December...on December 15th and in less than three months, City Hall is willing to make a major decision to eminently demolish these buildings and look at large public space and consult the public. And there has been no detailed costing. There has been different numbers thrown out for the costing of the envelope, the exterior of the building. Certainly we don't know what the costing would be for the interior…until you know what you want to use it for and how you are going to use it. And I guess the heritage community is wondering, why is this going so quickly? Why are you willing to make such a major decision so quickly without all those detailed costings and all those decision makers…those stakeholders? I'm not quite sure. I've checked the Deloitte report several times. I'm not sure who those stakeholders were in the business community and the non-profit sector. It clearly talks about Centreventure, it talks about which is an arm's length of the city. It doesn't really talk about anybody being consulted but that and certainly it does say in the report that you do have a use for it, it could be phased. I mean, it's cost prohibitive at this point with your budget, but it could be phased as many other buildings have been done or starting with the Fortune Block/McDonald Block, he's anticipating it could take up to two and a half years to rehabilitate

those two buildings. So we are not talking about making quick, hasty decisions, we are saying step back do not...we are saying we do not want this recommendation to go forward because I am telling you this will mean imminent demolition. This is a huge mistake for the City of Winnipeg and it would be very sad that we would have to revert back to 50 years ago or 40 years ago with the kinds of decisions that they made in the 60s out of ignorance. We are much more educated culture, we understand the importance of our heritage buildings and how economically viable and culturally and socially significant that they are. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms Tugwell. Will Mr. Stechesen take the remaining time?

Les Stechesen: Thank you. Mayor Bowman, Honourable Councillors, my name is Les Stechesen. As an associate architect with Libling Michener and Associates, I was a designer of the Public Safety Building. We are here to discuss the fate of a building that one of our most notable engineers has stated it is so well built, that with normal maintenance, could last 500 years. A building built so solidly that its demolition cost could equal the cost of the original building. In spite of this, you are here to vote on a motion to consider the PBS as surplus property because it is beyond repair and therefore should be demolished. Before I comment further on the structure, I would like to express my lack of confidence in past Councils' administrations actions with regards to the build requirements. Firstly, the turn of the century, in the interest of modern efficiency, Council, with representatives of that time, voted to demolish the then intact Upper Fort Garry to straighten out Main Street and make it more efficient. Fast forward to today and the enormous cost...my previous speaker has already outlined the rehabilitating that site and what of the impact that that facility would have in our image today. Secondly, when I arrived here in 1950 to attend the U of M, a major fire occurred in the Warehouse District. Council seriously debated the demolition of the entire area because they considered it a fire trap. It became dangerously close to happening. In spite of the fact that today much of these buildings, they're built of heavy timber, heavy timber is considered equal or better to steel in fire resistance. Thirdly, in the 1960s in the spirit of post-war movement of contemporary urbanism by demolition, Winnipeg followed the misguided trend of many American cities of that era and permitted the demolition of almost the entire downtown areas bounded by Portage Avenue to the north, Broadway to the south, Main Street to the east and Memorial to the west. Behind the façades of those four streets what remained was virtually one vast surface parking lot. It has taken more than 50 years and enormous expense to finally fill that in and there are still large empty gaps. And now, again, fast forward to today and we have the Public Safety Building. This structure was carefully planned as a significant part of the Civic Complex in its materiality, its composition with the other buildings and its sympathetic massing with the other elements to the Civic Square. It was designed with great care to accommodate circulation for the doomed parking lot providing underground tunnel access to the City Hall complex and the Concert Hall beyond. The four level that PBS was tied into the main level of the parking structure to provide direct pedestrian access. The report criticizes the lack of pedestrian access in spite of a major pedestrian ramp as part of the entrance court in the previously described car park accessibility for users. The façade has deteriorated largely because it is not being maintained and even as such is not a significant element of the cost analysis. Also consider this, the entire Manitoba Centennial Complex has had its façade removed and replaced, it was not demolished. The Winnipeg Art Gallery, the list goes on…the Winnipeg Art Gallery, the original Convention Centre, the entire façade was removed and replaced. The former Manufacturer's Life Building on Broadway now Worker's Compensation Building, had its entire façade removed and replaced. The MTS Tower on Main Street next to the historic Bank of Montreal has had to remove and replace much of the façade. And just recently, Artis has announced that these office towers at Portage and Main will be replaced at a cost of $20 million. None of these buildings were demolished. Report commission at a cost of $275,000 for the PBS, I suspect, was ordered to rationalize its removal and justify the colossally over budget relocation of post office to the post office site. A significant portion of the cost outlined in the report, or what normally would be called, "tenant improvements", which never figure into the cost of a private office structure. They are included to distort, not support. Lastly, in this age of green awareness, you've discussed some of it just recently or just previously, absolutely nothing has been mentioned let alone costed concerning what is a significant factor in present day building economics, namely, the element of embodied energy and carbon that is extended in the original structure then wasted in the demolition and is hauling to the land waste site and then ultimately re-expended in the reconstruction of whatever is built, no matter it be public or private. The resulting green space that is envisioned with the PBS demolition is therefore a misnomer. It is not a green space, rather, a grey space, a term more commonly attributed to heavily polluted, industrial sites. The Scottish Heritage Society has done extensive studies on this subject and I would refer you to it for your information on this topic. What should have been commissioned is not an accountant's justification for demolition, rather it should have been...one second...rather it should have sought an in depth architectural, engineering analysis on how its use can be extended and continue as an integral part of the Civic Centre. To demolish this significant building in this day and age is not only shameful but an irresponsible civic act. It is a reenactment of the post-war ethics of tear it down and they will come.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Stechesen. If I could ask both of you just to remain on the floor, we'll hear from the next speaker and then there will be an opportunity to ask questions. Mr. Kotoulas, if you can come forward, we'll have five minutes on the clock. Welcome.

Sotirios Kotoulas: Thank you. It's an honour to be here today and to speak today. I'll just give you a little background. I studied architecture at the Cooper Union Irwin S. Chanan School of Architecture in New York and I have a Masters in History and Theory of Architecture from McGill University. I am a sessional instructor at the University of Manitoba and I teach design studios in both the undergraduate and graduate departments. And I work with Alpha Masonry, a family business, and we are invested and we really believe in building culture that preserves and protects heritage and cultural artifacts in the city that are important for us, for our city going forward. I am here speaking today...and it is an honour because I believe in the guiding vision of this council and this mayor. I support the vision of the Mayor and the councillors for a more sustainable city. Investing in public transit, investing in rapid transit, arts and culture to build a knowledge based economy, densification of downtown, cycling lanes, a more pedestrian friendly city. These are all values I support. These are causes I support. But, I am here to highlight an anomaly, the possible erasure and destruction of a cultural heritage artifact, the Public Safety Building. The Winnipeg Public Safety Building is a solid structure on the western edge of the civic cultural plinth housing government, performing arts and a museum. This civic body, this ensemble of six buildings is made of concrete, steel, glass and stone and it straddles Main Street. Designed in the 60s, to celebrate a series of accessible egalitarian principals that define us as a people, it is an idea of nation building, it is…its language is modern, it's human scaled and universal. Modernism in the…post-war modernism is really reacting to war and the damages of war. And there was a project to unify universal unification through universal language and principles such as human rights and the right to free speech and free space for communication and dialogue through government and the arts. This ensemble of buildings embodied the idea of the city as open to the world, multicultural, accessible and present as a protected space for communication. City Hall, Centennial Concert Hall, Manitoba Museum, MTC Theatre, Public Safety Building are all public grounds built with care and significance as an ensemble connecting the east and west heritage exchange districts. So it is like a nucleus. The buildings formed a new datum. They are elevated from the street. They are a plinth, much like the Agora in ancient Athens, the birth place of democracy. They act like a lever and the fulcrum is Main Street where on the one side, you have law and order and government such as this building and on the other side is balanced by the arts. This is a gorgeous, beautiful and important hybrid, a united body of inter-dependent programs and heritage buildings that form the bedrock of urban cohesion, life in the health of our society. It is the core space of the communication of ideas through governance and the arts and culture. The structure of the Public Safety Building is in good condition and has a long lifespan according to some engineers. John Wells, of Crosier Kilgour Engineers who is…they were consulted by Deloitte in the report, is a specialist when it comes to these issues and I will read a quote from him, and I quote, "The structural system for the Public Safety Building consists of a cast in place, conventionally reinforced concrete frame. The deterioration in the exterior wall system will have had no measurable impact on the integrity of the structural frame for the building. The structural system for the Public Safety Building is robust and highly durable and would remain so when protected with appropriate environmental separation." So the question is, why demolish a structure that we know has a long lifespan ahead? Why is there no official structural report to articulate that in the Deloitte report? And why shouldn't we think…why shouldn't we be imaginative and start to think about how to repurpose it? The façade has epoxy Tyndall stone. This detail was quite typical at the time of these buildings. The MTS Tower has granite epoxied onto concrete. We do not tear down these buildings. We have restored the Winnipeg Art Gallery for this very reason. We have restored the Worker's Compensation Board. Wesley Hall has a new skin at the University of Winnipeg. Centennial Concert Hall is being restored right now, the MTS Tower. They have all had skin problems, but we don't throw out the body because the skin's got a problem. We fix the skin because the body can continue to operate as a building and that has value. Demolishing it will take more money and resources than I believe the City has thought through and I believe the City does not have cost estimates for its number one option, demolition. It is built like a bunker and it is going nowhere.

Madam Speaker: Could you wrap up please? Thank you.

Sotirios Kotoulas: I will just wrap up. It's very important to have a life cycle analysis. If we do demolish this building to build a green space, it will have a massive carbon foot print. This building has embodied energy. There is about a ton of carbon for every cubic yard and we are not...if we are really, truly believing in a new way of thinking about urbanism and sustainability, we have to factor in the entire life-cycle costs, including embodied energy to make a proper assessment. And so, the thing is, is it…we know this is heritage. Let's respect it as such. It is one of the best examples of Brutalism in Canada and I believe it is a barbaric act to destroy irreplaceable work of art and culture. Why choose barbarism for Brutalism?

Madam Speaker: We're going to move on to questions now, Mr. Kotoulas. Thank you. I'll call all the delegates forward please at this time. We do have questions. First is Councillor Wyatt, followed by Councillor Orlikow and then Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker and I just want to thank you for coming and speaking here today and speaking passionately about this issue. I was not aware of all of the architectural significance, not just of that building but of the entire district here that we are in. I was not aware of the Brutalist phenomenon or the style or genre. I am getting to my question, Madam Speaker, but you know there is no doubt that I guess my first question is along these lines that

beauty is in the eye of the beholder, thank God. You only have a face a mother could love. Anyway…and you know so…how do you respond to folks who say it's an ugly looking building? What is the response? Because that's the one thing that I have heard from the general public. You know so, how do you respond to that? I'll just leave it open for all of you.

Cindy Tugwell: I'll just quickly comment.

Madam Speaker: Would you move forward, please Ms Tugwell.

Cindy Tugwell: I'll just quickly comment that I do agree that it is a tough building to love but I think it's education. I think we are on the cusp of understanding modernist architecture. I think typically Winnipeg has traditional architecture that we've preserved, that we think is wonderful. I think it's about education and I certainly think it's about purpose. I think it's about getting the public to understand that these buildings were built for a purpose. And this was built and can be repurposed as a municipal building. It's something that we want to...50 years from now, 60 years from now, they may be looking back, we designated City Hall and saying, "Thank goodness in 2015, we designated City Hall and we protected it for the future generations." They'll be saying the same thing about the Public Safety Building. There will be a greater appreciation as we age as a city.

Sotirios Kotoulas: I wanted to add, in the 60s...I mean taste, we shouldn't use taste in our decision making. These are complex issues. In the 60s people thought 19th century buildings were ugly and so they bulldozed them. So if you use the same logic, we can continue to just bulldoze buildings that we think are ugly which is a waste of money and resources. We could be much more imaginative. Here we have the opportunity…we have public land that has been gifted by the Ross family, that is heritage…that has heritage value and should be protected as a gift. The question is, instead of, is it ugly, it's the use that we should be looking at. What are we going to put in there and if it's for municipal use, could we not bring in non-profit organizations that could ameliorate our society, that could help the public good? Are there not…I mean, art space down the street is looking for a lot of space. They have filled...they are up to capacity. There are a lot of organizations in the downtown that are looking for more space that are non-profits that could really be...that could move in and ameliorate public good. So I think taste is always the worst thing to go by.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further, Councillor Wyatt?

Les Stechesen: I agree. Taste is not a reason to demolish. If that were the reason, half of Winnipeg should be torn down. Anyways, I just like to…

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Wyatt**.**

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Yeah, my second question is the committee amended...you were there the committee…on April the 12, amended the recommendations coming forward. We had a lengthy discussion and we had lengthy explanations given by the Public Service at that meeting and one of the things...you can go back and watch the video, is one of the things the Public Service indicated over and over and over again was that there was going to be...they were going to include an extensive public consultation process which also included the option for the public to actually make representation and expressions for our proposals to the process. So we amended it to allow, to ensure that that wasn't originally encapsulate or covered in the recommendation, but now the recommendation says clearly that the alternative a, which they were recommending, is subject to a public engagement and upon completion of the public engagement the Winnipeg Public Service has to report back to this council. So in other words, the decision being made today is not final on any way shape or form and would you as a group…or would you potentially through others…I realize it's awkward because it's a City building and it's supposed to be for civic functions, but would there be interest do you think out there to put proposal together to...a proposal together to entertain through this process?

Cindy Tugwell: I was a little perplexed with the recommendation because I have read it several times and I did listen to what was commented and it does say that alternative a was for large public space and private development. So my understanding for large public space was based on PP and D going back and doing a costing for demolition in order to facilitate a large public space and then the consultation would be subject to what to do on that large public space. So, I don't necessarily feel like we are taking the steps from that recommendation to be able to look into what we have talked to about today getting a detailed costing of what that building would actually cost in order to protect it and to repurpose it. I think it was more skewed towards looking at Centreventure, looking at stakeholders and public, giving their input on how to use that public space. Because I know Mr. Kiernan did say they were going to go out and cost demolition for both those structures which we are not opposed to the Civic Parkade being demolished because of the fact it is structurally unsound and it is unsafe. So we feel there could be two components to this that the parkade could come down and then the feasibility or the stakeholders consultations could be done for the Public Safety Building. But, if that recommendation allows it then I'm happy for that, but I didn't get that sense during the meeting that it did.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, third question.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, as you have mentioned, we destroyed a lot of buildings over the years. There has been national commentary now made in terms of this proposal coming forth. You know, you folks...two of you are architects. You have contacts across the country. What are you hearing from across the country in terms of this? In terms of the impact, potentially, on Winnipeg and Winnipeg's reputation as a city that embraces modern architect...all types of architect?

Sotirios Kotoulas: Well, as an instructor of Architecture, I do have friends who I speak to. Also in the United States and other countries and I've shared these articles. And all of them...I spoke with one of my mentors, Kevin Bone, who is the Director of the Cooper Union Institute for Sustainable Design who thought it was a no brainer to actually keep it…he kept on saying, the greenest building is the building that's already been built. And we could fix the façade, we can think about new ways of occupying that building and maybe it's an ideas competition. Maybe we just have to be a little more innovative with how we approach these structures, structures which have a long lifespan. And I think this backwards kind of urbanism, I mean, the Deloitte report is kind of uninspiring or unimaginative, it doesn't even…it's not in the 21st century. I mean, there is no conversation about energy and lifecycle costs in there. I mean, it is really from another decade. It's urbanism from another decade. And you know, we know enough to look at this in a deeper and more complex way. And I think we should. I think going back to your other question about the public and stakeholders, if there are stakeholders that represent the public, they should be listed and then we can ask the question if those stakeholders represent the public will. So I really do think that the public should weigh in more on this so that it's not a top down decision on what happens with a public heritage building but a bottom up.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow, 50 seconds remaining, you have the floor.

Councillor Orlikow: Fifty seconds. I guess to Ms Tugwell, this building was declared surplus many, many years ago. Why are you here today and not then?

Cindy Tugwell: Why was I not here when it surplussed? Because I didn't really think that it was going to be demolished. I mean, because the building is surplussed, I think it's the caveat because it has to be used for municipal purposes, it's not for sale.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Orlikow: So again, the understanding is…so there's…it was declared surplus. You may or may not have been aware of the fact that it has to be used for exclusively civic purposes. So, okay, that's fair enough. So knowing that, do you know why the idea of why the City would come up with $60 to $80 million to repurpose this building?

Madam Speaker: There is a motion to suspend the rule to allow additional time. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Ms Tugwell, if you would like to come forward and answer.

Cindy Tugwell: Well, that…that definitely is...I don't know...I haven't had an answer for you today and I think it would be pretty short-sighted if I did have an answer for you today. These issues are very complex. And I can tell you personally from being Executive Director of Heritage Winnipeg, some of these heritage rehabilitation projects, Councillor Orlikow, take decades to come into fruition. There is no easy answer that I'm going to give you and in fact, the report stipulates that demolishing that building is the easy way out. And this city does not want to be seen across Canada as taking the easy way out because we don't have the money. There's innovative ways, I think that it was mentioned about involving stakeholders, possibly phasing the building. There's hopefully ways that we can bring those costs down to make it feasible, but I don't think the building should be demolished at the expense of just that it's too cost prohibitive at this point for the City to look at that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow, last question.

Councillor Orlikow: My last question. My last question is.

Les Stechesen: Can I just?

Councillor Orlikow: My last question is, it's okay.

Les Stechesen: I really question those costs in that report. I truly question them because they come from…

Madam Speaker: Mr. Stechesen, just a minute**.**

Les Stechesen: Justifying demolition not of how to save the building.

Councillor Orlikow: I'll just do my next question, which is…we'll answer that. So again, you are now aware after Councillor Wyatt has spoken, you are aware of the fact that...you may not be aware of how much time was spent trying to look at an alternative use for the building, but you are aware of the fact now that there is no demolition permit handy. We are hoping that…and we are leaving it wide open, including the reports that people would like to see. We will release all that information so the public can come by and assist us if they can with an alternative use for that building. But we can't…so that's a question. So you are aware of that now?

Cindy Tugwell: I am aware of that now. I think after the Downtown Committee meeting, I was under the understanding that it was initially going to be used as a large public space. So if it comes forward, then…that it's not clearly stated in that motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentations today. That concludes the question period. Thank you. We will now move on to reports of Executive Policy Committee. The report dated April 13, 2016 Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED APRIL 13, 2016

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, thank you, 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 1, 2, 5 and 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 3 – Sponsorship Agreement with Jim Gauthier Chevrolet Ltd. – Naming Right of Two Indoor Hockey Rinks at the Garden City Community Centre's Seven Oaks Sportsplex

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll wait to hear from Council colleagues.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker. And I rise because I want to vote in favour of this. I want to make it very clear. I just want to put some comments on the record. This was raised in the standing committee when it came forward...sorry, this was not in the standing committee, this was on the EPC agenda. But it came…there was discussion in the standing committee which was meeting the Monday prior to the Executive Committee and my only comments are this, I congratulate the community centre. I congratulate Jim Gauthier Chevrolet for doing this and thank them. The only thing is we should work and strive always, to ensure that if we can, when it comes to sponsorship at least, the sponsorship dollars should be upfront or as immediate as possible. Mainly because of the fact that $500,000 for two indoor arenas is great, but over 25 years, by the time year 25 rolls in, $20,000...25 years from now, is not $20,000 today. And that is something which, unfortunately...I didn't see in the report that it's indexed, I don't think it is indexed. I think it's a set rate of $500,000 at $20,000. I think it's great. I think…good for Jim Gauthier Chevrolet for striking this deal. I mean, I'm not going to be critical of them in any way shape or form. They are an amazing corporate entity that has done a lot of great stuff for the city. Jim Gauthier himself hails from Transcona, born and raised there and known him all my life. My grandfather, my father have known him all our lives. So he is an amazing guy and it's great that he is doing this, I just think in the future if we can, we should not...we should ensure this is...and we were assured at the committee, Mr. Jack was there because we had a discussion on sponsorships that day involving sponsorships in general and not specific to this. And he assured us that we were not setting a precedent by making this decision today and I was happy to hear that which is why I can support this. But, I'm just concerned that if we are going...we spent a lot of public money and community clubs spent a lot of their revenues building amazing facilities. The naming of these facilities, rooms, arenas, what have you, is…it should be treated with utmost care because it's something which is significant in terms of the investment into the public interest and to the public amenities. And we should ensure that those dollars come back as quickly as possible to us if we are doing sponsorships. Typically in the past, you know, the maximum that I have seen is ten years, typically and usually that's in the neighbourhood of a million dollars, a hundred thousand a year. Ideally you want five years or less to have those dollars because your capital costs are today, right? And you are paying interest on that capital if you have borrowed against it. And the sooner you can pay back…pay down that cost the better. Otherwise, this is simply like an advertising contract because that's really what this is, that $20,000 a year for 25 years. And I will

say though, too, that we do need to make some changes in the Sponsorship Winnipeg. I know the community club probably negotiated this themselves, I'm assuming, and made it happen and good for them. But I know of community clubs that are still waiting to get their sponsorship signed off from the City. And it seems to take forever. I don't understand why it's so complicated. I have one community club that has already got a commitment from a major financial institution to name a canteen and in a new facility and it's been months and months and months with the City. And these are dollars that could have flowed already to the community club. The financial institution was actually prepared…is prepared, from what I understand, to pay up front the entire cost of this sponsorship, six figures, now. And it's tied up where? In the bureaucracy of the City. Sponsorship, I mean, it's outrageous. And so we are, by the way, just so everybody knows, we really...we really have done a lot as a committee, of Protection Community Services and Parks. We asked a lot of questions, I think, not just in terms of our situations in our wards but on behalf of all of us. And we are having them come back, just so you know, to the next meeting to clearly explain their business plan, to clearly explain what their costs are, what their costs are in terms of the last number of years as they started in 09. What revenues they have generated. What revenues they generate of sponsorships that they initiated and made happen versus what has actually occurred in terms of the community making it happen or individual members of Council making happen with the community. You know, we want to know exactly how well this program is working. And the other part of it is really, we never set this up to, I don't think, to stop or to slow down or to hinder the ability of sponsors or individuals to be sponsors. But that, for all intents and purposes, it's the perception not just of myself or of you but of others in the community, that's what has happened, for whatever reason. I don't think it's the fault of anyone in this chamber, I just, for whatever reason, this is what has occurred and it has to end. These sponsorship dollars... it should be, okay, here is the guideline, here is the format, here is the protocol, here is the standard form. Get it done in boom, sponsorship is done. I mean, it's easier now to get sponsorship dollars for sponsors to go to other entities other than the City of Winnipeg than it is to sponsor with the City of Winnipeg right now. And that's frustrating. And so, I commend the community centre. I know the councillor for the area has been very passionate about this and her arena there and I commend her for that. I commend the community centre for making this sponsorship happen. I thank Jim Gauthier Chevrolet for making this happen. I thank them for their sponsorship. I just think it's crucial that these dollars flow from the City's perspective…from our side of things, we should try to work to ensure they flow as quickly as they can so that we have true value associated with them and we have to ensure these sponsorship agreements are signed off as quickly as possible so that we can ensure that the benefactors, the entities, the community clubs, the City of Winnipeg, whatever the institution is, in terms of the municipal world, is...receives that credit as quickly as possible. So I want…those are my comments and I will be supporting the clause. Thank you, Madam Speaker or Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Sharma, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I also want to put my comments on the record and I thank Councillor Wyatt for his support. I am extremely supportive and pleased to see this item before us. It's a good news story. The volunteer board of the Seven Oaks Sports Complex, they are an extremely dedicated individuals. They have gone out and solicited business, partnerships in the community and have been successful in building a relationship with Jim Gauthier Chevrolet. I want to commend the board for their initiative and leadership in bringing this forward. This sponsorship agreement will allow the Garden City Community Centre to pay down outstanding principal and interest owed on the original funding agreement. I believe this sponsorship arrangement is a win/win for both business involved as well as our community asset. It's a great community partnership with business and I hope to see more much these things come forward. It allows the business group to gain some prime exposure in the community and the opportunity to leave an important legacy. The Gauthier family has been an incredible corporate citizen in many other projects across our city and this is a welcomed relationship that will benefit a well-used, new facility in north Winnipeg. I ask my colleagues for their support today in moving this agreement forward. Thank you.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Councillor Schreyer, you are up now. Just in time.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I as well rise in support of the sponsorship agreement with Jim Gauthier Chevrolet Limited and the naming right of the two indoor hockey rinks at Garden City Community Centres Seven Oaks Sportsplex. I do so and congratulate all parties involved; Jim Gauthier Chevrolet as well as the board of the Garden City Community Centre. I see this benefits communities in two wards. Councillor Devi Sharma and, I would believe, Councillor Ross Eadie as well as all those who compete against the local teams from around the city. I, again, take heed of Councillor Wyatt's concerns and put on record that there is at least one other councillor, I'm sure there's others, who make the point that we are glad that it's been made, the point has been made that this is not a precedent because I do have concerns about 25 year agreements when it comes to this type of advertising agreement. Bear in mind, Madam Speaker, when we interpolate into what in fact is the costs here, we are looking at just over $800 per month per rink. So what does that mean in 25 years from now, Madam Deputy Speaker? Bear in mind within the lifetimes of all here, we have seen elements or most councillors that are here, elements of notable inflation, which has caused hardship on our economy and not only that, it changed the numbers in terms of what costs are, what values are. It comes down to costs and it comes down to value. And Madam Speaker, in 25 years from now, in 20 years from now,

what will $800 per month per rink mean? And that's why I am concerned about the fact that we're going to be having 25 year agreements orr maybe not, Madam Speaker. As it's been said, as we've been advised, this is not a precedent and that's excellent to hear. So, we will learn from this. My concern is, Madam Speaker, we know we are coming into uncertain times in the next generation. We know that. And on that basis, we don't know whether we're going to get some sort of quasi-functional inflation in which wages meet increases in costs and some sort of adjustment over a decade or so. We don't know that, Madam Speaker. We don't know if we're going to come into some sort of stag-flation era as we did in the late, in the early 80s. We know, Madam Speaker, that times of inflation create greater inequalities from which we might never come back and these inequalities are permanent. And, on this basis, I state this for the record because this is just one example. One indication of how we need to plan for the long term. We don't know, Madam Speaker, whether this will be to the disadvantage of the community centre because over the next 20 years, $800 per month isn't going to mean much. That might mean something like perhaps at the rate we are going $200 a month, at today's value. Madam Speaker, we might be in a situation where we are in a form of recession, a form of depression, of course, this is realistic conversation, Madam Speaker, in terms of what we are facing, what we're about to be facing in the decades to come…in the decade to come as we begin. And on that basis, this might be highly punitive to Jim Gauthier Chevrolet. Because if we enter into an era of recession which causes depression drives profits down which drives costs down but values up or vice versa, it might be, Madam Speaker, that this will be highly punitive on Jim Gauthier Chevrolet. Now, I believe on this issue, the City will be able to come to an agreement. But I hope it's fair in 20 years from now, we see that both sides are getting the value that they expect at this time. And I mention this, Madam Speaker, because more important than this, which I have said that I support, it is about long-range forecasting and long-range agreements and to bear in mind what that means in terms of values for both enterprise and citizens in the years to come. Again, I support this agreement and congratulate all parties involved; Councillors Devi Sharma and Ross Eadie, for supporting this on behalf of the citizens of Garden City and all citizens who will be competing against Garden City at that rink in the years to come. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham**.**

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I rise to support this motion as well. Actually, I was going to rise but Councillor Wyatt has preemptively kind of addressed many of the questions and comments I was going to make. In terms of the sponsorship program, I'm really glad to hear that there will be a report coming forward to the appropriate committee, to the standing policy committee because we do have before us, I think in 2007 this program was put in place under previous council. And there are revenue potentials for the city here, and on one side, revenue potentials for the city, on the other side, obviously, opportunity for good corporate citizens that want to both assist the City through sponsorship but also, obviously, get their name out there in doing so. I hope that the report, when it comes to the standing policy committee will address several things. I hope it will address whether this program is passive or active in its nature. Is this group passively from the city, waiting for potential sponsors to come forward with requests? Or is there an element that is actually actively going out and seeking, in essence for all intents and purposes, marketing, selling opportunities. I think to maximize the potential of this program it probably would need to be the latter or more of an active focus. I do note as well that the motion that's before us, we are asking to decide upon is a 25 year term. I am looking right now at the sponsorship guidance document on the City of Winnipeg website, page 17 says that, "For an arena rink, the evaluation is $25,000, a term of sponsorship, 15 years." So I do note that it's 10 years longer than stated in the term of sponsorship. I'm okay with that but how was that arrived at? And are there, you know, flexibilities within the current policy that will allow for that? I think those things need to be looked at and addressed as well. I'll leave my comments…my comments there, just looking forward to the report...to the appropriate committee on how this program is working and what could be done, if anything, to improve it and to maximize potential.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Lukes**.**

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I just would like to rise in support of this motion and also, to speak to the Winnipeg sponsorship policy. I think this is a...I very, very strongly support the sponsorship policy and the initiative that is underway to do a comprehensive review. Funded development is a science and it's an art. And it is a very, very big business across North America, Europe, across the world. Hospitals, foundations, universities and foundations aggressively pursue donors through relationship development. It is...I have been very involved in it for 14 years and there is great potential. And I want to tip my hat to Councillor...past Councillor Brenda Leipsic who initiated this back in...I forget the year but I remember when she brought this forward and due to her passing, I don't think it continued on as actively as it should have, and as a city we should be actively pursuing this. We should be aggressively out there looking for other sources of revenue to support these amazing public facilities that we have. You know, some people challenge that thought when you look at hospitals. Hospitals...publicly funded hospitals have foundations to generate a better level of service for their business, for their field, as do universities. And we should be no different. And I have had conversations with the Mayor and with members of Council and am very supportive of this and really look forward…there's industry best practices. It is a science. It is an art. There is facts out there and the group that we have

in the city is working on this and I'm really looking forward to the report and will be strongly encouraging us to all move forward on this sponsorship policy and growing it and building it. So, thank you.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker. And I really want to thank the members of my committee, Councillor Wyatt, Councillor Eadie and Councillor Schreyer, with their excellent discussion at the Protection Community Services and Parks on sponsorship, quite lively, excellent questions that were raised and a really great discussion ensued. This program has been around for some seven, eight years, Madam Deputy Speaker, there's a lot of data. Some great sponsorship opportunities have come out of the current program in its current iteration. The North Centennial Recreational Leisure Facility sponsorship opportunity with Progressive Waste, you know, resulted in incredible play programs and youth and senior programs at that facility. Here at the Jim Gauthier...at the Seven Oaks Arena with Jim Gauthier, there's going to be some great opportunities there as well. So, you know, I'm really happy to say that at Executive Policy Committee we moved...we took the advice of Councillor Wyatt and I want to thank him for that and members of the committee and we're going to be conducting a review in short order to look at the data, to review some of the opportunities this program presents. It's a benchmark other cities and just to come back to Council with the recommendation. So, I'm excited about that. I just…on this, you know, I stand in support of this great community initiative. Jim Gauthier Chevrolet Limited is a great community partner in Winnipeg and in northwest Winnipeg, they certainly are a huge community partner with many cultural groups, many community groups and now with the Seven Oaks Community Centre. So I applaud them and I look forward to the results of their review.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you very much. I do...likewise, I want to commend Councillor Devi Sharma, our Speaker, for her work on this file and echo the comments that have been made by members of Council, in particular, thanking Jim Gauthier for their ongoing community support. Incredible community partner and it seems like every second event I go to, there they are, and giving back to the community. So I want to commend them and say I'm very much looking forward to seeing the work on the policy as a whole move forward. It was very nice to hear former Councillor Brenda Leipsic's name in this chamber here today, somebody who left our city and our community far too early and whose legacy lives in on the community in addition to this policy. So I just want to acknowledge and thank Councillor Lukes for raising former councillor's name in the chamber here today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: On the question of that item, all those in favour? Any opposed? Carried.

Item 4 – City of Winnipeg Representative – Inland Port Special Planning Authority Board

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: I will wait to hear from Council first, please.

Madam Speaker: This was stood down by Councillor Wyatt. You have the floor.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I stood this down because this is the first time I recollect us doing this, pointing this individual. This came…this position...Councillors, this is extremely important to note what this is. If you have an opportunity to glance over this report and to read even if you have the opportunity to read the legislation in the fourth session of the 40th legislature 2014-15 the special planning authority for the inland port known as Centerport was created. And it was created by the previous government and I stand this down not to oppose it but to suggest that we look at a slight change here in the future…in the near future. In the light of the fact that some of us didn't think it was wise at the time but it happened by majority of Council to extend services into the RM of Rosser for the purpose of Centerport, they are reliant on our sanitary line, our sewer treatment. On top of that, the Provincial Government brought in...spent millions of dollars to build a separate water system for them located, I believe, in the RM of Headingley, bringing water up and into this area and then it's going to go beyond. It's going to go around Winnipeg tying into West St. Paul and East St. Paul and open up all sorts of developments in the periphery of the city. And the planning authority, the inland port, what this does, basically for all intents and purposes, it suspends the ability of this city to make planning decisions inside the City of Winnipeg in this jurisdiction. So, this authority is the equivalent now, if you like, of not just community committee but community committee, Standing Committee on Property and Development, EPC and Council. It has immense powers. So, it didn't surprise me to see that the RM of Rosser, which, it comprises probably more than 50 percent of the area, however, the most developable lands and a lot of the lands that are available for development thanks to our services, are in the south which is the City of Winnipeg. Yet, the City of Winnipeg as it stands right now according to what I'm reading in this report and according to what's the legislation that's tabled, only receives one representative on this planning authority, yet the RM of Rosser is receiving two. And the RM of Rosser is receiving...and

it specified, very clearly, one member must be a member of Council nominated by resolution of Council, at least one member of Council. So it could be two members of Council if they choose or another member of their administration. We were suggesting you appoint with this resolution here today, Mr. Smith who is very capable…Braden Smith, he is the Chief Planner of the City. I don't have any issue with that. My concern is, you know, is mainly the fact that I believe we should be equal partners. You know, Rosser, there was a push at one point to try to bring that…all of the Rosser lands into side the City in terms of an amalgamation. It didn't happen. The previous Provincial Government was not there, was not supportive but at the very least, the very least we should be equal partners at the table. I don't think that's much to ask and if you read the legislation, it's not in your report but if you read the legislation, right below the clause that quotes the composition of the inland port special planning authority of 12.9(1) which outlines who the members are. It goes on to say additional members, 12.9(2) in additional land...if additional land in the planning area the Lieutenant Governor may add. So if we expand the boundaries slightly they can turn around and add another member to this authority. I think with the new government it's something we should raise with them. I think we should put it on the table. And then the other issue that I think we should be put on the table, frankly, is I was somewhat surprised, a lot of these issues that we were dealing with here, Madam Speaker, had to do with the fact that we could not supply water because of the issues with regards to Shoal Lake and the ability for us to supply water to anybody outside of the City of Winnipeg and all the challenges and threats of challenges in terms of that. I thought in good faith we would have included a representative here of the indigenous community on this board as well. There would have been a representative of the First Nation as part of this planning authority. In light of the fact that this is separate, that's something to me that would have been...something that I thought would have happened or included, it hasn't. So I think now there is two opportunities to approach the government. One, to ensure that a First Nation indigenous representative is on this committee, who would make that appointment or where…how that would occur would have to be debated and discussed. But also, we should, as a city have equal representation in the planning authority. And I don't point any fingers at anybody on this council or anything for not….this is something that is...this planning authority and this legislation was launched before the last civic election and…but it's the first time it really comes back here to us as a council beyond the discussions that take place at higher levels. So, I would encourage us to look at this in the near future to have this legislation amended because Rosser needs us as much as we need Rosser. And you know, we provided millions of dollars, literally as a council, to service that land. We have done that. Millions of dollars extending the pipe out along Inkster into that industrial park and now the Winnipeg Airport Authority which also has a representative on this body is coming to us or has come to us requesting more support in terms of services and providing services in that area. So, you know...and there is a benefit to the city, obviously in terms of the development here. It just should be done fair, equally, and plus, as far as I'm concerned, if you have two representatives on a committee from the city, I think it ensures better representation for the city not just in terms of fairness between Rosser and ourselves but just in terms of ensuring that there is a strong level of accountability. Typically all of our planning committees…I mean community committees is made up more than…it's not just one member, you have three members on the community committee. And that ensures a level of accountability amongst your colleagues that your colleagues are providing oversight to decisions namely even if they might involve your ward, you have two other colleagues who are there reading and watching and ensuring that process is followed. And that's the benefit of having more than one member on a committee. It provides that oversight, not to say that there would be anything untowards by having one member, but you know, why not have that historic safeguard in place. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Schreyer: Point of order Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Wyatt: I'm done.

Councillor Schreyer: Councillor Wyatt had mentioned that he was making a suggestion that we might want to bring up in the near future. How near is that future? Is he recommending an amendment to this motion?

Madam Speaker: That's not a point of order, Councillor Schreyer. Are there any other speakers on the item? Councillor Schreyer, do you wish it speak to the item? Do you wish to speak to the item?

Councillor Schreyer: Well, yes I do, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: This is your opportunity to make your comments**.**

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. Well, that's a separate issue to me, Madam Speaker, and let me explain. I just wanted to know what his motivation was in explaining, making a suggestion that we might be dealing with in the near future. Aside from that, which I consider part of the format of our discussions here as a council, I want to say something else which is independent of that. Well, he raises some concerns that worry me. And, you know, I'm not here to be negative, but I…if what he is saying is true, then I am concerned. And based on that, I don't feel, personally, to be in a rush to make a

decision right now. But if he was willing to say what he said in terms of the municipality losing a sovereignty or authority of such a large parcel of land for which we are financially responsible for anyway, and for which we have been so highly involved and obliged to any way already, then I have to say, before I would be inclined to vote in favour of this, I need some sort of assurance that besides what is written here, that the City of Winnipeg isn't losing its sovereignty or its municipal charter authority in all aspects of municipal obligations in financial and otherwise within that large parcel of the City of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on the item? Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close?

Mayor Bowman: I'll just thank members of Council for their comments. I obviously support appointing Mr. Smith in this capacity.

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

Item 6 – Memorandum of Understanding between The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation and The City of Winnipeg for funding of a High Collision Intersection Signage Study

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll wait first to hear from members of Council.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. Just some brief comments on this. I just…you know, from my Council colleagues, we have these memorandums of understanding that come before us and we read through them and everything seems good and this is good and I do obviously rise to support it, but I just rise also to highlight that there's…this really speaks to something larger and on page five of the report, the second last paragraph indicates that this memorandum of understanding provides opportunities for the Winnipeg Police Service to meet several of its strategic objectives. And what may not be evident from, you know, at first blush of the read of this report is that there is a tie between this memorandum of understanding and the strategic plan that the Winnipeg Police Board and service developed and launched last year. And in the report, that is before us that we are voting on, there is mention of two of the areas that really...this memorandum of understanding helps to fulfill or targets that we're looking to pursue in the strategic plan. And the first is under the goal of less crime of victimization it says to strengthen proactive policing through the smart policing initiative which is an evidence-based policing initiative which really looks to kind of get out ahead of crime and get out ahead of the costs of crime. And the second is target is to focus efforts on improving traffic safety through enforcement and education. So, while at first read this may look like a simple agreement between the Province and the City of Winnipeg to improve, you know, intersection safety and that's certainly what it is, it goes beyond that. This is actually part of strategic initiatives that the Police Board and the Police Service are committed to. And the one positive thing...another positive thing for the City of Winnipeg is that the funding for this initiative is provided by the Province of Manitoba as well. So I just wanted to pull this item to draw my colleague's attention to this reality. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am pleased that we are working with the Provincial Government and the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation on doing a high collision intersection signage study. I...we really will benefit from the results of this. It concerns me, in particular, regarding an intersection that I think...where this could be useful as well and that is the intersection of Lagimodiere and Grassie Boulevard which basically is near the tri-section of the three wards of northeast Winnipeg, of Councillor Wyatt's ward of Transcona, Councillor Browaty's ward of North Kildonan and my ward of Elmwood-East Kildonan. There we have had a conflict where the three councillors are unanimous against the administrative, administration's recommendation to not allow for a left turn before the intersection on Grassie on the west side of the intersection. The reason why, Madam Speaker, is in consultation with people there, people that go to the Robins Donuts. Basically, their television is the big window where they observe the intersection. And Madam Speaker, speaking with the owner of the strip mall, the owner, the owners of the amenities provided at the strip mall at the corner of Grassie and Lagimodiere, Madam Speaker, what we both know anecdotally from all the witnesses who have seen the accidents there and what we do know from the statistics provided, Madam Speaker, from the administration is that there have been over…in recent years, there has been over 180 accidents. But, from the interpretation of these three councillors, it is our understanding, and from speaking with people who can attest, that the accidents are occurring by virtue of the north/south traffic on Lagimodiere. It was advised to us as well from the administration, Madam Speaker, that the safety issue wasn't really regarding Grassie's east/west flow, but that the administration, by virtue of dealing with the issue of traffic flow, thus, was suggesting even...it was actually implemented a block to the north to a left turn while travelling east towards the intersection on Plessis Road. Now, in consultation with

local customers, with local business owners and with myself and other councillors, we are able to persuade administration to actually put in an outlet for to allow for a left turn. Unfortunately, it has not been to the benefit of customers or to the business owners to our satisfaction and thus the three councillors unanimously were in favour of allowing 24 hour left turn into the parking lot of the strip mall which contains the Robins Donuts as well as other amenities. Madam Speaker, my point is, to make a long story long...it's actually a longer story than that, believe it or not, Madam Speaker, but it happens to be that what we've already understood from the statistics from our understanding, is that traffic flow could be eased to some extent at the expense of patronage of these malls but that it is not the safety which is in question. And on that basis, Madam Speaker, for the sake of those who patron the strip mall at the corner or Lagimodiere and Plessis, for the sake of those business owners and for the sake of all who wish for safety in our traffic in the City of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker, I look forward to the results of this project.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further speakers? Mr. Mayor to close. We'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move on to the report of EPC dated April 20, 2016. There are eight items, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED APRIL 20, 2016

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

Councillor Allard: Item 1, please.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, did you have your hand up? Okay. Yes, anything further? One and eight have been pulled. Okay, I'll call the question on Items 2 through 7. All in favour? Contrary. Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 1274-1288 and 1310 Archibald Street – DASZ 1/2016

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, do you wish to introduce the item? Okay, we'll hear from you, Councillor Allard. You pulled the item.

Councillor Allard: I wish to rise in support of this report. I wanted to draw attention to the fact that our planning department is now implementing that the Federation of Canadian Municipalities guidelines on development near rail and that...that is for infill and new development. And just some context in terms of what is happening today. This week is Rail Safety Week and Minister Marc Garneau will be meeting residents of Lac Mégantic where 47 people died nearly three years ago and he will be announcing what the Federal Government plans to do…improve on rail safety across Canada. And so I wanted to draw attention to the fact that I believe we are doing what we can in terms of new development and I would like to thank this council for supporting the Federation of Canadian Municipalities Guidelines that we're now applying and we can see them in two reports today. And so I urge you to support those guidelines. I also want to inform my colleagues, the public and the media that I know that there is going to be pressure to not follow through on these guidelines. I know that I have been lobbied by a developer who was hoping to look at how the report that was coming forward from our Planning Department was, well, potentially changing the development plans so I wanted to put that out there that, that there may be pressure for you to look at these guidelines and I would urge all of my colleagues to put safety first and really respect our planners' recommendations. I know this has happened to me, I would imagine this is going to be happening to some of my colleagues in the future so I wanted to put that out there as well. And I think that's essentially the essence of my remarks. I wanted to thank Council and our administration for the work that we are doing and urge you to vote for these reports that include implementation of our guidelines. Merci.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on this item? Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close?

Mayor Bowman: Nothing to add, thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: We'll call the question on Item No. 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 8 – Strategic Plan – Public Policy Priorities

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, do you wish to introduce the item?

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

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, I believe you stood this item down. You have the floor**.**

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. I noticed that it's being accepted as information in terms of not proceeding. But I wanted to talk, Madam Speaker, to the point of what, we're what, how many, we're coming into a year and a half of the new council…two years of new council coming along and in that election that went by in 2014, there were many, many campaigns. There's 15 councillor campaigns and there was a mayor campaign and the City faces many large challenges, Madam Speaker, and we know that in the previous council, Madam Speaker, you and I and a number of us were involved on that Council and without a bigger vision and strategic plan to look at that overall policy and direction to take, it becomes very difficult to even have a council of 16 voters come together and be able to proceed in a manner that assists and works for all Winnipeggers in the City of Winnipeg. I mean all Winnipeggers. And I know I heard many people say that in their campaigns about representing the needs of overall for the citizens of, and the people who live, work and play in this city with that bigger vision and Madam Speaker, it's a good process. Many other cities do this. They have an overall strategic plan with their councils, they try to get that up and going sort of at the beginning. It's not about any one person's campaign commitments, it's about the bigger need, Madam Speaker. For example, big public interest and how to go…I know a number of the people in the Mynarski Ward, didn't see how stage-two rapid transit was going to benefit them and many were talking about it, but in terms of our public policy and strategic plan to move forward and I know different people will have different agreements. For example, Madam Speaker, Councillor Schreyer and I happen to disagree about the rapid transit as it is planned to move forward, for example. But it's good to have a discussion and talk about these things and what the public interest is, Madam Speaker. And I just simply said, the City of Winnipeg is a great city and this is just one example, the rapid transit. Like, we are a great city, but, you know…and I hear this about, well everybody's got curbside organic pick-up but, you know, all the big cities have a rapid transit system. Now, we can argue about how it should work or where you start to build it but you've got to start building it somewhere, Madam Speaker. So, you know, to lead…to lead, Madam Speaker, to lead a city is to be able to listen and work towards the bigger public strategy and not only consider one's own campaign commitments but to realize the commitments of all people that campaigned and worked towards various means. And we're going to hear a number of debates today and I know strategically or whatever, sometimes, some of the debates, Madam Speaker, around here probably didn't need to happen. If we had a better…work through the difficult stuff early so that we don't have to debate about, you know, whether south Winnipeg is getting more than the north Winnipeg or east Winnipeg or west Winnipeg or my ward or her ward and so on. A strategic plan is something…we need that to happen in order to have a functional council that can work together and so I see that it's being received as information. It would be good to see a plan that moved forward to say, here is how us as councillors, including yourselves, Madam Speaker, and everybody else around the room, we all have our disagreements. But really, a strategic plan is needed in order to move forward in a more effective manner. And so I'll just leave it at that. I am going to be…I'm opposed that the report is just being received as information. I'm kind of saddened that perspective hasn't been looked at that and without a strategic plan we can continue and argue and vote against the overall city budgets and so on, Madam Speaker. It would be nice…I as one individual councillor, it would be great to be voting unanimously on some things and without a strategic plan and working with that, Madam Speaker, without coming up with that, discussing that, not in an open council meeting but you need to work together to come to a strategic plan. So I don't see any effort of that happening and I'm saddened. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I move because...rise because I am concerned that we're not going to continue with the strategic plan, Madam Chair. For me, it's really about us being proactive instead of reactive. A lot of times, we just get together as Council, we sit around the Council Chamber or we sit around our different committees that we are on, but we are not really seeing the big picture and I think that for somebody that's very new on Council, I think we need to sit around the table and see a bigger picture on how we are moving forward as a city. And, you know, it concerns me that we're not going to have that opportunity to do that because I think that hearing other people's perspectives on certain things really opens us up and adds to the level of dialogue that we're going to have. And then adds to our decision making and ability to make those decisions here at Council. So, you know, somebody that doesn't really...I don't sit on EPC so I might not have all of the inside track on things that are coming up and it's hard. We do have to listen to the different committees and what might be coming down the track. But I think if we get in front of it and we hear what's going on in our planning, I think not only does it helps us as councillors but our administration. I feel very, very sorry for our administration. They are kind of left with the mess that we create and by us being proactive instead of reactive, it gives them the ability to understand where certain councillors are coming from and maybe they are able to even deal with some of the situations before it hits the paper, right. Because they will be able to hear about some of the issues that we might have and be able to fix some of those things before, you know, before it becomes an issue. So, you know, I hope that we hear some of the discussion today, and I really do hope that we look at having a strategic plan where we all can all sit together, let's have the dialogue. Let's have the discussion that's healthy and you know, that's what our citizens want us to do. They want us to sit down. They want us to discuss these. They want us to have a healthy debate. So I hope that we consider having the strategic planning session. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, I would like to rise in, well, I guess in support of the idea of a direction that would bring this council together around strategic directions. A strategic plan would I think go a long way in terms of having us have deliberations in terms of what brought us all here and when...where would we like to go as a council. I know I ran on a number of issues in my election in 2014. I have worked on many of those issues but to have those discussions around the table with all councillors involved and the development of a document that could address all of the issues that we have been asked to work on for our communities, on behalf of our communities, I think would go a long way in terms of making sure the voices of our communities are heard. We just went through a budget process that ended up in much discussion and ended up with a split vote of ten to six. And I believe that that split was in part because the budget didn't reflect all of Council's priorities in terms of what we thought was important for our communities. So if we did have a strategic planning document, we did have a high level document that gave us high level direction in our city and if we could start linking that to processes like our budget process and it would give our administration an idea of what Council is actually thinking without having to individually survey 15 councillors. And so in that sense, I see that the report...or that the motion is being, it's been suggested we receive this as information. If we are receiving this as information today, I'd like to hear if there is some ideas in terms of how to move the idea forward of having a document that we can all agree on as a council, that we can work on together and that hopefully we can have an unanimous vote on. And going forward with some of these tougher debates that we are having be it on organic waste pick-up or when budget time comes around or water utility rates, that we have some high level direction that hopefully all if not almost all councillors agree with. I think that would go a long way in giving the public an understanding of where we are going as a united council, our administration in terms of where we are going and I think it would go a long way in terms of helping us move together in a much more collegial fashion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Allard. Next is Councillor Schreyer followed by Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is going to be a great debate. I stand in support in principle of this. We are passing this along as information and that's great, Madam Speaker. But I believe, of course, this is just the first step on this. So it looks like we have some form of consensus, in terms of the fact that this is not merely going on and being passed as information because we already see the enthusiasm for this to the extent that it's already been voiced in disappointment that this is being passed merely as information at this time. Something really big is going to happen of this, Madam Speaker. That's not my opinion, that's my prediction. I am either right or wrong. And Madam Speaker, I don't think this is going to be ambiguous. The great conversation will be filled with the complexities of debate and many issues in order for us to go forward on a some form of unified strategic plan that we all agreed to by consensus. Well, Madam Speaker, in my life of being witness to politics one way or the other, to be honest with you, I'm not exactly sure what that means. Having said that, that doesn't mean that this is not worthy at least for the discussion. In my mind, Madam Speaker, it's not the end that justifies this, it's the process which justifies this and that we move forward on this idea of this strategic plan. Madam Speaker, we are talking about the big picture it looks like and therefore, we're not talking about our individual campaign platforMs And that's fantastic. We know we all represent more than our ward. We know that Winnipeggers are...share the city. We know that Winnipeggers don't see ourselves divided by these arbitrary political borders by which we must elect their representatives. We know we all spend time outside of our wards on a regular basis. Everybody does. All citizens do. We're all part of the same city, Madam Speaker. And so I know. I know as do all councillors when they represent their point of view as they represent their ward, we know that every councillor here is also representing the point of view…the points of view of people beyond their wards. That's just how it works. And on that basis, this holds some great legitimacy because I am looking forward to this. This is what I believe the citizens want. They want this great conversation that I haven't seen has happened yet. I haven't seen it ever happen before. Madam Speaker, to be honest with you, I have never seen this before in terms of what I think we are proposing. A big grand conversation on what the consensus is of what Winnipegger's values are. What Winnipeg's priorities are. Madam Speaker, I think this is fantastic. Having said that, I can't guarantee what the result of this is. And because of what I've already heard, I'm just being straight up, Madam Speaker. I can't guarantee you that my perspective of what's going to happen is the perspective of what other councillors are expecting is going to happen. Actually, Madam Speaker, I can see that already. So, on that basis, we will all individually have a perspective on what we've heard on how we're going to vote on this great...as far as I'm concerned, Madam Speaker, first time ever grand conversation on Winnipeggers creating a city-wide strategic policy. And on that basis, I suggest to you, Madam Speaker, and I predict again, borders will sort of be broken and different Winnipeggers will be united in different ways on city-wide issues independent of where they live. And that is a great conversation. I truly look forward to that. And Madam Speaker, as an example, on these broad, great and important issues that we have to contend with for the future, we are talking about a generation long plan for rapid transit. Well, Madam Speaker, I speak with people all the time on it and I listen and I'm heartened by what I hear. I feel that I represent a significant point of view. A highly developed point of view, Madam Speaker, because people, a lot of people have a highly developed point of view on this with which I basically concur. And Madam Speaker, I know I bear the brunt, as an example, when I state that if there is any part of the bus rapid transit system that is most legitimate, it is that which we are doing right now. And just because I say it is

the most legitimate point of the two principle destinations in our city, downtown and the University of Manitoba which I have always stated from the beginning of this debate since I have been elected, right here on Council, we can look at the video records. I can't say to my ward, therefore, that I am justified in supporting VRT in my ward. I am not going to say that, Madam Speaker. And I might bear the brunt of criticism for those in my ward which…who wish me to be ward-centric or if they got it, why shouldn't we? Well, Madam Speaker, I don't think that way. And I don't think Winnipeggers do either. We are talking about a big conversation, a grand strategy for us all that if, having any relevance, resonates into the decades and, Madam Speaker, I am so there for that. This is about revenue and expenditure and how it expresses the values of Winnipeg. That is my understanding at this point. At this very inception fact it hasn't even been conceived yet…conceived yet, and yet, I look forward to this. And excuse me for my lack of converting adjectives into nouns at this point, but I think you see my point. We are all going to learn from this, Madam Speaker. And we need to have this dialogue, but Madam Speaker, it's not a dialogue. Another attempt, it's a multi-logue. And we will see what that means in years to come. This is not happening in months, let's face it, Madam Speaker. If this is going to take years but I hope that we have something to work with by the next election if that's feasible. And we will all stand in judgment of that. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. On to you, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Obviously, those of you who know me know that I am a big fan of planning, that I think we have to have plans for everything. Strategic planning is extremely important. Let's step back a little bit and look at what we are talking about. We are talking really, the underlying subtext here is how does council work together. That's one part of this. And this is one suggestion that we should have this particular type of approach right now and that's what the motion in front of us was suggesting we do that immediately. But I think we have to look at a few things. First of all, Councillor Schreyer talked about when was the last time we had a broad conversation about our city's goals and all that. Well, the last time I remember was Our Winnipeg where we spent a million and a half dollars, massive public consultation, councillors were involved as well and that was…and out of that came the document "Our Winnipeg." I also remember having a strategic planning session when I was first elected with Mayor Murray, but at that time, we were just completely redoing Plan Winnipeg. So, you know, it was time to roll into the city plan and I remember for the term of council, we did come up with five priorities at the beginning of the council. And ultimately, they found their way into the plan because the planning process was happening. That made sense. This council walked into a situation where the plan was done with the public, a massive exercise and it is up for review. So I think in that review process, there is a real opportunity to have some of those types of conversations Councillor Schreyer is talking about. But I also think, let's be honest here, you know, we are hearing a lot of words this morning; collegial, working together, you know, blah, blah, blah. Like, that of course, we all want to do that and we are all trying to do that, but that isn't actually what we have been seeing lately. Let's be honest, when we try to bring things forward like composting, curbside composting, we have a private meeting with just councillors to all talk together and what do we have? A complete blow up of running to the media with a completely negative spin on everything we're talking about by some members of Council. And I'm going to say it out loud because that's what I like to do. So the point is, let's speak the truth. There are issues of trust and we have to have processes that are going to work. I mean, that's one of the challenges with the budget process is you have sensitive information, you have something that if people wanted to, they could take some of the information before decisions are even made or we are just thinking about what to do. Some people could run off and whip the public up into a panic and a frenzy about we have a fear and misinformation. And I mean, is anyone going to say that hasn't happened ever? Like, it has, recently. You know, other examples I can think of is the active transportation. You know, it's a plan, that's one topic that's…you know, composting is one issue and this council has a private meeting to discuss that and it all blows to sky high. So you know, I think all members of Council have to take some responsibility. It's one thing to call and say the Mayor...you know, put it all on the Mayor and say the Mayor...obviously the Mayor needs to lead, but he can't lead if this council won't behave in a reasonable way when he tries to pull us together to work on things. And he has. We right now…like, council seminars are hopeless. That's one of our tools, to get councillors information. And right now, you know, now there has to be like a massive communication plan in place for us to sit down and talk about the weather or it's going to turn into a scare tactic to the public. So I'm going to say this stuff because it's…I think it's the truth and needs to be said. So, if councillors want to be...have a better process then they need to make it better. They need to start acting better. They need to start being collegial. They need to start being respectful of not just the Mayor, but all of us and this process because that's how we're going to get together if we work together in a respectful, direct, fair way and we have to have trust and the problem is when that trust is broken, which I believe has happened in some of the recent seminars, that trust that we have that we can work together in confidentiality until we actually make a decision or actually work through something together, when we can't do that. Then this type of exercise is pretty much not going to work. So yes, I believe in strategic planning, but we...each of us around this table have a responsibility if they want to see that process they have to make a commitment to make that process work and frankly, I haven't seen that kind of activity amongst some members of council. And some of them…you know, it's politics. There is ways to get your message out. There's benefit to being out there and raising a fuss and all that and that's part of the job, it's politics. But if you are going to say you want to do this, you want to do real planning that everyone's heard and you mean that, then you have to start being somebody, each of us, that can be trusted by each other. And that's not what we

have seen. And once you break a trust it takes a long time to build it back. It doesn't happen in five minutes with a friendlier attitude this week all of a sudden. You know, it's a relationship between this council and they are not very good right now in some cases and I think we have seen that. We have seen that and we have seen the public be whipped into a frenzy about active transportation and then it all worked out fine. Like, we met with the people that were whipped up and they calmed down, you know. I mean, it's just…we are putting things back together that are being blown up all the time. So why would we take our...you know, how could you do a strategic exercise in that kind of environment? So my suggestion would be, I don't think we can do this right now after what's happened and my suggestion would be that councillors think long and hard about how they want to be in relationship with the other members of this council. How they want to work together and how they want to be part of this broader discussion and when they have...maybe that's what we need to have the conversation about that. I know Calgary brought in a psychotherapist or something to their council but that didn't go too well, either. So I mean, you know, sometimes it's this group that's dysfunctional and we need to fix those problems before we can be constructive. We could have a session but how constructive would it be right now given the type of thing we've seen. We can't even have a seminar on one topic without it turning into a crisis and our phones ringing off the wall because people are having radio ads or whatever fighting something that hasn't even happened, that hasn't even been released as a report or discussed in a meeting, it's just a private conversation and suddenly we are spending months putting Humpty Dumpty back together again. You know, because it's all been blown apart and people have had…maybe they have had some fun doing that, that's fun for them. But now there is a trust issue. So you want us, Council to be collegial and work together then start doing your part folks. Because it's wasting our time that we can't do that and we can't right now. I don't think. I don't really see how it would work. Well, you know, we have had sessions before. We tried to have a strategic planning session with the councillors who were here last term and it didn't work because there wasn't trust and it wasn't genuine. So, you know, let's not waste people's time. If members of Council, want to think about this and they want to really work in a different way, they need to start talking about how they are going to behave next time we have a council seminar. Are they going to run and whip up the public's fear and, you know, create a big crisis or are they going to actually work together constructively to figure out what would be something we could all come forward with together. If you can do that on one issue, one issue, I would be a little more convinced you might be able to do it on our entire city plan that you want to do that on. So, I mean, I'm really just trying to be honest here. Trust takes time to rebuild. I think we need to face the facts and, you know, I appreciate the efforts. Strategic planning is good. It would be great. It would be fabulous if we could have 16 people doing the budget. If we could have 16 people doing…discussing composting and coming up with a plan that works great. That's what I want. But it takes 16 people for that to happen, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. Seeing the hour it is time for Council to recess during a lunch break. Councillor Lukes? Okay, Councillor Lukes has put forward a motion to suspend the rule to change the lunch hour from 12:00 to 1:30 to 12:00 to 1:00. So just one hour for lunch. We need two-thirds support for that. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
April 27, 2016, at 1:10 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene the Council meeting of April 27, 2016. We are on report of Executive Policy Committee dated April 20, Item No. 8., and our next speaker is Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Briefly, I think Councillor Allard touched on something that was worthwhile there, which was talking about the budget. I guess, the larger of debate has been about having a grand conversation and strategic plan. I think we already have that with Our Winnipeg and frankly, I think a lot of time around here the devil is in the details. You'll see that on the…we had the compost eight hour hearing last week here and you had Sel Burrows going after some detail on Councillor Gerbasi. I got into it with the Green Action Centre. Councillor Eadie was debating with the Manitoba Eco-Network. Ironically, all of us actually favoured composting, it was the details. I think on something like this rather than going through with a, sort of a separate parallel strategic planning exercise, it would be better to have us all sit in the same room at the front end of the budget process and try and talk to whatever extent we can. If the first four people all say, well my top thing is riverbank stabilization, well that's...that makes us look at things like Taché Promenade maybe a little differently and maybe try to move that up the list somehow to get that done. So I think the…I appreciate the effort to try and do more strategic planning. And I'll certainly be…you know, we are trying to do a three year water rate thing as a longer term plan. But I think rather than getting off on a side track from Our Winnipeg, let's keep focus more on the details of what we're doing in the budget because, as has been said here before, the devil is in the details and we need to sit down, I think at the front end of this budget cycle and have a little more open dialogue. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I just want to pick up on what previous speakers have said, including Councillor Mayes. I want thank Councillor Mayes for his Q and A when I went before the Executive Committee on this matter and for his feedback there amongst the other members of the Executive Committee. The concept here when moving the motion I want to thank my seconder, Councillor Dobson for seconding this motion. You know, there's no doubt, you know, we get involved in terms of the politics here, in terms of debates and every day, there's always issues and there's always issues of contention and, of course, you know there is always a microphone looking for a face and the media loves the contention, the media loves the conflict. It sells newspapers. It sells advertising. Gets people watching. But, at the end of the day, it's better if we can resolve things without having the conflict and the whole concept here is to try to be as preventive or proactive, I should say, as possible. I love the view that today, we have a debate, we have a disagreement and tomorrow is a new day. Tomorrow is a new day. And every day you wake up, you're just happy that you are waking up on the right side of the sod and you go forward with that philosophy and approach, I think is a positive thing. You know, you don't carry a black book, you don't keep a hit list, you move forward and you say, "Look it, we're all here to try to make our city better." And, I went before Executive Committee and I know Councillor Gerbasi was there at the time, I don't know if she stayed. She spoke before me, I don't know if she heard my presentation, she was there advocating against having organics…I mean, for it. And she...and you know, I spoke very frankly and I'm putting it on the record here because this is recorded in Hansard and it's not there, that I would be more than happy to enter in a process as being proposed here or something similar, if it had a gold ad result, it was timely, involved all of us. I am prepared in good faith to come forward and work towards that end and for the good of our communities in the whole city. I recognize that we have one member of Council here who is very unique. He is elected at large. There's not…or whoever the Mayor is, is elected at large...in case, Mayor Bowman. You know, everybody...he has the unique scenario of everybody in the city voting for him. We're all representatives of our own little wards or big wards in some cases and, you know, everybody has our own issues, we have our own challenges. The whole concept here would be to bring us all together to try to identify some priorities between now and the next election cycle and assist in the remaining priorities and that would, I think, assist in terms of helping with our budgets. One of the things that I just want to remark, Madam Chair, which was amazing during the budget process was meeting with the other members of council who we were working with in terms of raising a critique, a productive critique, we'd like to think, in terms of the budget and suggestions and ideas to improve it. But the other five members of Council who we worked together and six of us, I just, I was very impressed with the level of interest, the depth that these members of Council had taken to read into the budget, to understand it, to try to understand it, the questions they asked, the ideas that came forward. And I'm sure that's the case of all the members of Council here. Everybody here brings a volume of life history and experience and their own unique experiences to the table. And it's frustrating to me if we somehow miss that or don't take advantage of that, in terms of developing public policy in our city. We...I know, I have been off EPC, on EPC, off EPC, on EPC, and so I know what it's like to be on the table and not at the table and I can tell you, one of the frustrating things, I think, that I saw being at the table was the fact that quite often other voices were missed that could have been part of the discussion on some key points. And you know what, we can't all do this practically speaking, but maybe we can just simply say, "Look it, let's work together to come up with a strategy or some points, some priorities that we can go forward with." And I want to thank Councillor Gerbasi for raising the point of...she remarked way back when, it was before my time on Council with Glen Murray when he first was elected. He undertook and did a strategic planning process with the members of Council at the time and I want to thank her for mentioning that. And it was out of that process, if I'm not mistaken, that Council came up with a strategy, we're going to make downtown top priority. And, it's amazing when a council gets together and says unanimously that we agree this is a top priority and makes things happen, what can really happen, like it's amazing. And you look at downtown today, compare it to the downtown of the early 1990s or the mid-1990s, let's say, and I would suggest to you that it is night and day. The downtown...there is still lots of work to do but it has really turned a huge corner. And it was large part because of the council of the day who said, we're going to make this a top priority. Let's go forward together. And it focuses everything. It focuses your budgets, it focuses your public policy, it assists your public servants in giving them guidelines to know where they need to go and clarifies their role and responsibilities and accountability on all sides. So, I think this is something which is positive. I realize this is being received as information and I understand that. But I would be more than happy if there was any kind of initiative in the near future. And I hear Plan Winnipeg or Our Winnipeg, we've got to do a review, that's a huge process. That's massive. When I was at that committee I was suggesting something a little bit more nimble, quicker which involves the public, ourselves, to get some idea. We have now a Federal Government, Madam Speaker, which is literally throwing money at municipalities across the country. We have to make sure we have our...just in terms of that alone as an example, our ducks in a row here so that we know exactly what we need to fund and the Federal Government is waiting to hear from us through the Province, but nonetheless, from us. So, that would be great to have that kind of unanimity around this chamber and you know, at the end of the day you may not have everybody on board on a final strategic plan, there may be dissenting voices but, you know what, at least you attempted it, you tried the process and you tried to bring something together and I think that's a worthy...a very, very worthy effort. So, I realize it's to receive as information...I'm not going to support that, but I just would encourage the Executive Committee to…if there is some other thoughts or ideas or call what you like to bring something forward in the very near future, I think that would be terrific. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I firstly would like to thank every single member of Council who spoke to this issue. Certainly, I and I hope all of us who are listening to the comments that were being made, this...we've referred to in the debate or in the discussion on this issue, we've referred to Our Winnipeg. And I do note, of course, it received unanimous support of Council back in 2011 and subsequently came back…came into effect in August of 2011. This is an award-winning plan and a strategy representing a 25 year vision for the entire city and it's mandated by the Winnipeg Charter with annual reports being submitted to the Minister of Municipal Affairs through Council. Through the Speak Up Winnipeg, Winnipeggers had the opportunity to provide their feedback on Our Winnipeg which occurred over a full 12 month timeframe. And Our Winnipeg positions Winnipeg, as all members of this council chamber will know, for sustainable growth which is the key to our city's future competitiveness. As many of you know, a review of Our Winnipeg will commence later this year and what I will be looking for is to see if there are opportunities to take the spirit of the comments that have been made today, to better infuse Council's voice in that process. The one thing that I know is I know there have been numerous attempts in the past by previous councils to have strategic plans, I note those were, to my understanding, done behind closed doors just with members of Council. I don't have a desire to move back in that direction but rather, to move forward to see if we can continue to build on the collaboration that happened…has happened already over the last year and a half by this council. I appreciated Councillor Gerbasi's comments earlier primarily because she has seen and worked with numerous councils over the year and has seen what works and what doesn't work. The one thing I will say is that I actually believe this is a much more collaborative council than the one that left us before the last municipal campaign. I'm sure you would all agree. We have now a number of councillors...I believe all members of Council are making a meaningful contribution. I'm going to continue to look for ways to work with each member of Council to ensure that their voice is heard and also, that should they have an interest in a particular area whether it's rail rationalization, whether it's aboriginal affairs or the climate change working group or the budget working group or our homelessness strategy or new council liaison for military affairs or council liaison for project management for labour relations, for our age friendly committee, I mean, members of Council are stepping up and are doing extremely well with new portfolios and new opportunities to make a meaningful difference. It's true that each member of Council is elected on a ward by ward basis but when we sit around this table, we have an obligation to the entire city and I'm confident that this council is continuing to build positive momentum forward. That overall strategic plan and that blueprint that is Our Winnipeg, is seeing, as Councillor Wyatt just noted, is seeing success. And when I was out in Montreal last week, what people were talking about was the positive momentum they're seeing in Winnipeg. They are seeing the incredible investments in our downtown that are being driven by the private sector. That confidence in real hard dollars is happening. We had in the last few weeks alone we had the artist development, the new tower that's going up, we have fortress, we have True North Square among so many other very positive initiatives. Our city is growing up both in terms of our numbers and our confidence but also in terms of just actual real estate in the downtown. So that's because of the vision of Our Winnipeg and the efforts of all members of this council and previous councils. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question on Item 8. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Next we have a notice of motion to do deal with. It's from our March 23rd meeting so you will see it on the online agenda. The motion was moved by Councillor Schreyer and Councillor...seconded by Councillor Wyatt. It's regarding water and sewer rates. Councillor Schreyer to introduce the motion.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTION

Moved by Councillor Schreyer,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS the City's sewage treatment system has allowed millions of litres of raw sewage to enter into Winnipeg's rivers in recent years;

AND WHEREAS the City acknowledges that the Province has ordered the City to upgrade the North End Water Control Centre, along with other city wide upgrades to the water and waste systems;

AND WHEREAS the increase in water rates has been justified by City officials due to the necessity of the City to upgrade its North End sewage plant and to implement its entire Capital Program;

AND WHEREAS the City's water utility is proposing a substantial increase its water rates over the next three years;

AND WHEREAS the percentage rebate/dividend that is paid to the City of Winnipeg by the Water and Waste Utility of City was increased from 8 percent to 12 percent in 2015;

AND WHEREAS it is projected that $32 million, a historic high amount, will be paid to the City of Winnipeg by the City's Water and Waste Utility and their customers;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg request the Province of Manitoba to refer to the Public Utilities Board (PUB) and call public hearings on the following:

A) The proposed Water and Sewer Rate Increases of 2016, 2017, and 2018;
B) The approved 'dividend' from the Water and Waste Department to the Operating/Capital Budget of the City of Winnipeg;
C) The Capital Budget Program of Water and Waste, both 2016 Capital Budget and the 5 Year Forecast 2017 to 2021;
D) The environmental regulatory obligations on the City of Winnipeg in regard to its Water and Waste systems;
E) The Business Plans and all Capital project strategies/plans of the Water and Waste Department;
F) Options for Provincial and Federal Funding of the regulatory capital program requirements.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I consider this to be the beginning of a longer debate. I can tell by the people I speak with outside City Hall, citizens of Winnipeg for...wherever we might meet them, that they consider what's going on regarding water and sewer rates in combination with the increased percentage dividend that can be taken out of water and sewer rates to go into...go into the coffers with general taxation revenue to be not right. People have different opinions on that but I find there to be a consensus. It's not in the interest of fixing our infrastructure, specifically that which involves the maintenance and enhancement of our existing water and sewer infrastructure. And it's not an equitable approach to taxation. Bear in mind we can say, Madam Speaker, that this isn't a tax because it's a fee. But having said that, it's going to go into general taxation coffers to pay for whatever projects that we do, for which we employ taxation revenue. Bear this in mind, Madam Speaker, this is in conjunction with yet another increase on frontage levies which one may argue isn't a tax, it's a levy. But having said that, it is going into taxation revenue so how can I say to people...how can I account to people to say it's not a tax? There is a lot to say, Madam Speaker, on this. And I will not be…I don't believe I will be using my full ten minutes, but I will be using weeks and months if not years on this issue, because I consider it to be part of a fundamental conflict that I think we have with the citizens of Winnipeg in terms of how we go about incurring revenue and our expenditures. Madam Speaker, I understand that to put out a few points, that we can say that the flat rate fees that we are paying for our water and sewer, is going towards water and sewer, but it is not clear to Winnipeggers, it is not clear to me, it is not clear to the media that that is specifically what the money is going for. It's my understanding, Madam Speaker, and I have seen no contradiction yet. So if I do see one by different councillors there will be a different opinion among councillors who I assume are supporting or will be voting against my motion and will be supporting the water and sewer rate increases. And I will look forward to the conversation on that because I don't think we are all on the same page here. Madam Speaker, I do believe that property taxes being the fundamental source of taxation revenue in our city, is inadequate, but I do believe it's the fairest we have and the reason is, Madam Speaker, that while it's still based on value, if you live in a house of three quarter million, you may pay more tax than you would if you lived in a house of less than a quarter million. And there is a certain equitability based on that. Now, Madam Speaker, just as an example, if we lived in a society where we had nearly a flat rate income tax, say everyone paid 10 percent. Still, those were that had higher income and had a greater ability to pay, would pay more. We don't even have a flat rate income tax system in this country, Madam Speaker. It goes against the spirit of taxation in this country. It goes against the consensus spirit of taxation in Canada. Now, Madam Speaker, what we have here is we have a flat rate for people who are using water. And it's going into general tax revenue, and just goes against the spirit of what I understood is the general essence of Canadian taxation, property taxes being an expression of that on the municipal level. The greater the value of their property, the more you pay. Not the same as people who pay a flat rate for fee for using water, we all depend on using water. We all depend on each other for using water and our sewer system for the greater functionality and for our society for our city. And so, Madam Speaker, I could understand, Madam Speaker, if we used property taxes to enhance our water and sewer infrastructure. I would consider that to be a fair use of municipal taxation. But, Madam Speaker, to use a flat rate fee and using sort of punishing people for using water, increasing their fees beyond the rate at which the utility can recover their costs, and using that and putting it into taxation coffers, Madam Speaker, that is, against the essence of taxation in our society as we know it. The reverse is fair, Madam Speaker. Again, to use property taxes to go fix our water and sewer infrastructure. But to use our water rates on everybody who have to use water and use that to go into general tax revenue is fundamentally unfair. It is my perspective, Madam Speaker, having spoken with people over the weeks on this issue, they are coming to me on this issue, they are coming to us on this issue, they are talking to each other on this issue. And I do have the fundamental understanding that we are not in sync with Winnipeg on the issue of how we are using our water rates. But there's different questions involved, Madam Speaker and it's a better repetition here. But to what extent, do we use water rate fees and increase water rate fees to go beyond the cost recovery limit. That's a question. Another question is what do

we do with...if we are going to increase our water rates, what are we going to do with it? And then, Madam Speaker, to multiply that, to multiply that Madam Speaker, if we are increasing yet again, the percentage dividend that we can take out of that, what are we using it for? And Madam Speaker, to add to that, it is projected by this budget that we will continue to increase our water and sewer rate fees over the next few years. Why are we doing that? Madam Speaker, it is not just about my campaign pledge but at least I think we have one aspect of consensus on this that Winnipeggers did expect that we would raise property taxes to repair and enhance the existing infrastructure of our city. And I believe that's a consensus issue here and we go from there in terms of where we part. That issue has to be brought forth to the people of Winnipeg. And on this basis, I ask on the Province of Manitoba to engage the Public Utilities Board to call hearings on a variety of issues, regarding the use of increased water rates. Madam Speaker, it has come to my attention that there are some that believe the Public Utilities Board cannot do this and all I can say is, the Public Utilities Board you see does this for Manitoba. That's what they do. They can do this and be employed in all sorts of engagement on behalf of the Province of Manitoba. At this time we are not asking the Province of Manitoba to change the charter of the City of Winnipeg to get rid of our exemption. What we are asking is that the Province of Manitoba can...and we are asking that they should employ the Public Utilities Board to take advantage of their tools and machinery which they use on a regular basis, to employ here for the benefit of what is half of Manitobans on this issue of a greater understanding of Winnipeg's...of what Winnipeggers understand and on what they wish in terms of water rate increases. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Morantz, you had your hand up.

Councillor Morantz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to suggest that, given that this motion would ultimately, if adopted, amend a report we are debating and discussing here in the chamber today, I would like to move a motion to table this item to be discussed as an amending motion during consideration of the Water and Waste and Riverbank Management Report No. 1, 2016-18, Water and Sewer Rates, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Move on to By-laws under Executive Policy Committee. Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2nd AND 3rd READINGS

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the By-law No. 40/2006 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in Favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 40/2016.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that By-law 40/2016 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: Sorry, okay. I move that the following By-laws be read a first time; By-laws 32/2016, 35/2016 to 39/2016 both inclusive and 61/2016 to 62/2016 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 32/2016, 35/2016, 36/2016, 37/2016, 38/2016, 39/2016, 61/2016 and 62/2016.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor on the second reading.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. I move that By-laws numbered 32/2016, 35/2016 to 39/2016 both inclusive and 61/2016 to 62/2016 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 32/2016, 35/2016, 36/2016, 37/2016, 38/2016, 39/2016, 61/2016 and 62/2016.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor on the third reading.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 32/2016, 35/2016 to 39/2016 both inclusive and 61/2016 to 62/2016 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you to the Mayor. Over the past several years provincial environmental legislation has placed a significant burden on the City of Winnipeg, specifically on the North and South End Treatment Plants that have been required to undergo capital upgrades valued at over $1 billion dollars collectively. In a few moments, we're going to consider the Water and Sewer Rate report, and on page eight of that report, it states and I quote, "the rate increases recommended…reflects spending for required capital investment in water and sewer infrastructure where 84% is driven by direct or indirect licensing requirements." So the upgrades that were compelled to engage in are necessary to meet stringent provincial environmental regulations. My question for His Worship, Madam Speaker, is can the Mayor assure Council that he will have discussions with the new Premier in Government of Manitoba regarding the stringent environmental regulations standards and their impact on the rate payers of Winnipeg?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you through you, Madam Speaker, I thank the councillor for his question. I, too, note that the licensing obligations that were imposed on the City under the previous provincial government is something that will be discussed with our new provincial partners.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. Second question. Earlier, Councillor Wyatt noted the need to add a second representative from the City of Winnipeg to the Inland Reports Special Planning Authority Board. I'm wondering, my question, Madam Speaker, to the Mayor is, is the Mayor willing to have that discussion and discussions along that line with the new Provincial Government as well?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Yeah, I'd like to thank members of Council and Councillor Wyatt for raising that issue earlier today. I have, it's not something that I fully understand yet the history of how that was put into being under previous, during previous council's time of course. But I do intend to look into it further and I would be more than happy to have that discussion with the Premier-elect in due course.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Mayor, there's been a lot of excitement in terms of the recent federal budget, which was tabled in terms of funding and in terms of the opportunity that's there for municipalities, not just now but in the near future and in the next ten years in terms of infrastructure. I had the opportunity through NASCO to go to Ottawa and used it to kill two birds with one stone and met with a number of Minister's staff involving infrastructure. Is there anything that I can do, because I know typically intergovernmental affairs are handled by the Mayor's Office, is there anything I can do to assist you and your office and your staff on this matter?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Great question, thank you very much for that. As Members of Council and hopefully Winnipeggers know, on Monday the Federal Government released more information on the infrastructure investments made in their budget of 2016. There are two programs that will increase federal funding up to 50%, the Public Transit Infrastructure

Fund and the Clean Water Wastewater Fund and the total for Manitoba is $178 million over five years. Financial details specific to the City of Winnipeg are expected to be forthcoming and the Public Service is, in fact, engaged on next steps as we speak. I welcome this new support for the Winnipeg's infrastructure, I look forward to working with our new federal and provincial partners going forward on this important investment. I know the councillor and I, I believe are going to be meeting next week on some matters and I'd be more than happy to discuss that with you at the time and welcome the opportunity by not only Councillor Wyatt, but all Members of Council to be engaged in discussions with our federal partners. The new Federal Government has a number of representatives that have seats in the City of Winnipeg, of course, there's two Cabinet Ministers, Cabinet Minister MaryAnn Mihychuk, as well as Cabinet Minister Jim Carr. Council…or the Federal Caucus Chair for Manitoba is someone well-known by Members of this council in…Dan Vandal, and I know a number of us have ongoing discussions with the three of them, as well as many others and so. I would strongly encourage all members of this council, in fact, all Winnipeggers to have discussions with those newly elected Members of Parliament on matters relating to infrastructure in Winnipeg. We want our new federal partners, our new provincial partners to be successful and they'll be successful by working collaboratively with the big cities, including the City of Winnipeg. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. His Worship, this morning, had mentioned that on Friday that there will be a Ball Hockey game of Council of the City versus the Chamber of Commerce, I'd like to know if he could specify again please, if he mentioned then I apologize, what the time is of that game?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you for this important question. No, all jokes aside, I appreciate the question. I didn't specify time here today, a previous email has been sent out I believe a follow-up has been, but the time is 4:30 p.m. in the Courtyard. It should be just a good opportunity for team building for us to hopefully destroy on the hockey rink, the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce staff and board members and just to have some fun. I'm hopeful we'll be able to get some hair metal being played in the courtyard and we can just have some good fun. So it's 4:30 p.m. till 5:30 p.m. that will include a very light reception in the foyer upstairs, so probably playing Ball Hockey from 4:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., or shortly afterwards if folks don't want to actually play and they just want to come out and heckle, I would encourage you to do so as well. There's no Hansard at the time, but I would encourage you to just come out and have some fun on a late Friday afternoon. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Second question?

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker and I will be mere take it under advisement as Councillor Gerbasi said on the same day, it is International Dance Day and that there will be an event taking place here just after noon. Will the Mayor take it under advisement that I intend to play hockey and dance on the same day and that I will reserve the cross-checking to Council?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Through you, Madam Speaker, I thank the Councillor for, not only his question but his outstanding dance moves. I have seen him dance, he's a much better dancer than I believe any Member of this Council. I may have lost a few votes there, but as a representative for the City of Winnipeg, I will refrain from dancing in my best attempts to best represent the City of Winnipeg.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. We all recognized Councillor Schreyer as the fairer representative of the constituents of Elmwood-East Kildonan, would the Mayor consider perhaps a very short trade for the purpose of this hockey game for former Councillor Steen?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I would take it under advisement. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Okay, seeing none, we'll move on in our agenda to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. There's no report. We do have Motion No. 3 in front of us. It's moved by Councillor Eadie and seconded by Councillor Lukes regarding rooming houses. This is as an automatic referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS affordable housing is very difficult to find in Winnipeg, making rooming houses an important amenity for people with low incomes;

AND WHEREAS there are many rooming houses kept in liveable condition by the owners;

AND WHEREAS some rooming houses do not meet the liveability criteria under the Neighbourhood Liveability By-law;

AND WHEREAS due to the lack of affordable housing options, many rooming house residents are afraid to make complaints about unliveable conditions in their rooming houses because they do not want to get kicked out on to the street;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg Public Service undertake whatever it must do to have existing building inspectors conduct annual inspections of rooming houses to ensure all Neighbourhood Liveability by-law dwelling provisions are met in "Part 1" and "Part 2".

Madam Speaker: There's no by-laws. We will now have Question Period for the Chair. Any questions for Councillor Pagtakhan? Seeing none, we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Lukes on the report dated April 5.

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

Councillor Lukes: Yes, thank you very much. I would like to bring forward the report of April 5, the Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, we have no motions, no by-laws. Question period for the Chair. Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you, just a follow-up to the item, Madam Speaker, that we just dealt with. Just reading the report and one of the reports received, so I didn't want to make any issue of that. It's a positive work that has to be done, both on St. James Street reconstruction, as well as work on Pembina. I was just curious though reading the report trying to look at the report versus the capital, there is a difference in the right direction in terms of the work, it's estimated that the work on Pembina, Grant to Osborne is now in the neighbourhood of $9 million when it was projected in the Capital Budget at $11.7 million. I'm just wondering now, in terms of that, the $2.7 million was not identified, or I couldn't see it in the report if it is identifiable in terms of where those funds will go. Is there been a plan to reallocate those funds in terms of hopefully we'll stay with regional streets and there's just so many other regional street projects, will there be a clarification on that to the committee or has there been already? Thank you.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. To answer Councillor Wyatt's question actually, at the next committee meeting which is on the 2nd I believe, we should…we've asked for a verbal update on them to come back and see where the actual tender has come in. So we will have a verbal update and hear what they're going to be doing at that point.

Madam Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Wyatt: Okay, so is that in terms of the specific project and the excess funds that has to be reallocated, the $2.7 million or is it a verbal update in terms of the entire program?

Councillor Lukes: The entire program.

Madam Speaker: Third question?

Councillor Wyatt: Sure, and will the update include exactly where they are in terms of the tendering with the capital street program, the local street program, the regional street program, the local street program, including all of…all the other works associated with both?

Councillor Lukes: The regional and local street programs, I can give you a bit of an update now on that, but that's the intent, is that they'll come back and they'll give us a complete update. This was just a very quick foreboded update. But that's the intent on the upcoming meeting on Tuesday.

Madam Speaker: Okay, any further questions for the Chair? Okay, seeing none, that will end our question period for that committee. Moving on to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. We have no report. No motions and no by-laws. Any questions for the Chair, for Councillor Morantz? Seeing none, we'll move on to the next Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. Councillor Mayes, on the report dated April 14.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT DATED APRIL 14, 2016

Councillor Mayes: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. I will move the report dated April 14, Items 1 through 3 inclusive.

Madam Speaker: We do have an amending motion on Item 1 and 2. Should we call the question on 3? Okay, so they're all stood down. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – 2016 to 2018 Water and Sewer Rates

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer had an opportunity already to introduce his amending motion so at this time, Councillor Mayes will introduce the main item and then we will have a chance to speak to the amending motion and the main item concurrently. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll start with a bit of history on the water rates. We're doing a three year proposal here, this is not the first time that's come before Council. The first time was back in December of 2012. Interestingly, no one even pulled it off the agenda. It was passed unanimously on a voiced vote. So there is some history of setting a three year plan. It hasn't always been done in concert with budgets, that question has come forward from the public. Clearly December, 2012 was not a budget meeting. The budget meeting was actually the last day of January in 2013. So, we are following with the history here of going with a three year plan. We heard some talk earlier today about the importance of strategic planning, that's part of why we do a three year plan here to give our own utility a little bit more guidance, a bit more certainty as it goes forward with billion dollars...a billion dollars' worth of capital programs for water and sewer. It's...Councillor Eadie and Councillor Dobson, I think rightly stood this item down at the start of March when it first came forward to say they wanted more time to look at it and more time for the public to look at it. So we've now had a period of almost eight weeks…seven weeks for the public to come forward with their comments, councillors to look at the budget as well, to see if there are any items they thought should be removed from the budget and thus lowering the water rates. I haven't heard of anyone coming forward saying any items should be taken out of our expenditure side. In fact, people at this chamber said let's spend more, let's spend more, let's not have so much vacancy management in water so, I haven't really heard anybody suggest less expenditure on the water and sewer side so we are faced then with an expenditure and we have to find the revenue to match that. The...one item that has come forward from people and from the media in recent weeks is this idea, well, there is a dividend. There is a $32 million dividend that's taken out of the water utility and moved over into the operating side of the City budget and that's an accurate statement. That was first introduced in 2011, the budget of mid 2011 put forward by then Councillor Fielding, who was the Finance Chair at the time and I'll have some comments on that when I close. But the idea of the dividend has been around for some years and it's certainly something that's used in other cities as well. And there is some cross subsidization, some cross billing that occurs between the water utility, water/sewer utility and the City of Winnipeg accounts. There are things like...and Councillor Eadie asked a very good question on this at committee which was, if we're putting a billion dollars into the north end and south end sewage treatment plants and it's been said previously, much of that is required by provincial regulation, not all of it, some of the south end plant is due to the growth of the city,

but if we are putting a billion dollars in, isn't that going to increase the property values and thus you're going to be paying higher property taxes coming out of the utility to the City of Winnipeg. And the answer was yes, that's correct. So, there is a certain built-in expense there that we should be taking a look at. Councillor Dobson asked a very good question as well but I will come back to that in a moment. But the…so the idea is, well there seems to be this suggestion out there or belief, well, if we got rid of the dividend, then there'd be a 0 percent water hike and you're just doing this is as some sort of tax cash grab. Well, let's be clear, if you took away the dividend that leaves a $32 million hole in our operating budget. We'd need more revenue. That's a 6 percent...math on that is solid because the base is about 500 million from property tax revenue. It's about a 6 percent property tax increase. So, I appreciate some of what Councillor Schreyer is saying was, well, that would be a more progressive way to pay for it if you put it on the property tax, not the whole water bill. I don't think he is saying that. I don't think he's saying, "If you have a pool, let's put it on property tax and we'll all just pay the same amount for water." I think what he's saying is, "Look, on the dividend slice, that that should be on the property tax." Well, that's probably a debate we should have in this chamber at the time of the next budget. But to be clear, you can't say, well, we'll get rid of the dividend and then there will be no property tax implications. There certainly will be, it would be about a 6 percent increase and I really haven't heard anyone make that case or be forthright about that. Councillor Eadie had a proposal on our budget pertaining to the police budget and to his credit, it didn't pass, but he said look, I will support more expenditures, it's a 2 percent property tax increase above what we're doing, I support that. So that's a fair position. If you want more expenditure, you have to say…you'll have to tax more to get there and he did that. So just to be clear, if you take out the dividend, it leaves a big hole on the revenue side…that's the equivalent of a 6 percent property tax increase. The other item that's come forward is the outgoing government had pledged...Minister Caldwell had pledged $100 million toward our water sewer projects. That would obviously help, that would obviously help defray the increases that we're looking at. The incoming government hasn't addressed that yet. We don't know if they are going to adopt that, cut it, reduce it somewhat, we don't know and they haven't yet been sworn in so I wouldn't expect the position yet. But that is a potential benefit to us where if we do get the $100 million, we could look at lower rates. Here is the question Councillor Dobson asked, a very good question that I referenced earlier, which was, we should make sure that if that $100 million is coming from the Province, that goes against the water rates, that that somehow doesn't get funneled back as a property tax reduction. That's a very fair point from Councillor Dobson that he made which was if we get some relief, water and sewer money from the Province or the Federal Government that should go against the water rates, not against property tax increases. Very fair point and that's something we will need to hopefully address in the future. Hopefully, we will get some money bark from the Province. The other option as stated by many people here, a lot of, I think it's 84 percent was the number…a lot of these billion dollar upgrades we are doing are due to provincial regulatory requirements. Is that good? Well, it will help the situation in Lake Winnipeg. Is it the right way to do that? Councillor Browaty will probably give his nitrogen speech in short order saying, "No, no, there's different ways of doing this." Maybe he is right I don't know but the Provincial Government's going to have to look at that. And they may choose to go a different path so perhaps our expenditures will be less than a billion, maybe it'll be 800 million, we don't know. That also would help with the water rates down the line. So, overall the other item that came up at committee which seems like a long time ago, but came up at committee was well, in a previous round you had a projected increase and you came in lower, so, surely we must be able to do that here. And I looked into that and if you look at the December 2012 report, page seven, December 2012 water report that was voted for here, they say, yes…the staff say, well, yes we are coming in at 4.3 percent instead of the 6 percent projected increase because there is deferred work on the south and north end sewage treatment plant upgrades. Well we've hit the end, we can't keep deferring that. So, back in 2012 some work was deferred, now we have to pay the piper, we have to find the money because the deadline is 2018. Could the incoming Provincial Government change that? Absolutely, Councillor Gillingham has raised this. Could they defer...could they set a later date? Absolutely. Could they change the scope of work? Yes. So, all of these variables are in play but we don't…we have to go ahead at some point here and set the rate, get the money coming in to help pay for the billion dollars that we have budgeted. So a number of items in play here, Madam Speaker, that are in the…under the control of the Provincial Government in terms of the $100 million, in terms of the requirements for the upgrades to the plant and in terms of Councillor Gillingham's point, how quickly does this need to be done. But let's not pretend we can defer this any further. Right now we are facing a 2018 deadline to get this work done. So it's…somebody said…well, basically would we all like to see more expenditure and less taxation? Hell, yes. Of could we would, we would love to see that. Unfortunately, that's not really before us here. We are facing a billion dollar bill and we have to find the revenue to pay for that. That's the situation we face today. People have not come forward with suggestions on how to cut the budget…I think it's responsible to go on a three year timeframe, I think it's responsible to say look, this is the hand we have now, perhaps...and Councillor Dobson's point was a good one, perhaps we can come back in a few years or a year and say we've got some money back from another level of government, we'll reduce the projected water increase. That would be a good news story, certainly, but unfortunately, this is the financial burden we are now facing and therefore we have to find the revenue to pay for that. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am speaking both to the water rates and the motion, the notice of motion here. And I do want to express some concern about the implications of the motion. When we've heard about the

motion the talk was about the dividend being reviewed by the PUB, but if you actually look at the motion and read it there's actually six different items here that would be...and the motion reads that it would request the Province to refer the PUB...to call public hearings on all of the following. And it includes the capital budget program of Water and Waste that we just passed in the budget meeting this year. It includes a whole bunch of stuff about environmental obligations, business plans and all capital project strategies of the Water and Waste Department, options for provincial and federal funding for capital prograMs So there's…and the water rate increases this year that we are just discussing now. So I am a little concerned about the mechanics of this. I mean, we are asking for a review of a bunch of decisions that either about to probably be approved or have already been approved at previous meetings and a third-party that's, you know, unelected, like they definitely have a role out there, but they are unelected, they are a third-party, controlled under the Provincial Government would decide basically every aspect of running our own City department from the budget to funding options to business plans, basically saying like…this motion basically says, that there is like, no need for our department to do anything. Like, everything has to be reviewed by this third-party. And not only is that quite onerous, my understanding is that it would cost a significant amount of money and time for our department to go and prepare for all these public hearings even if they did make sense to have them do all of that, it would basically take all of their time, or I guess they would have to hire a number of staff to actually physically do this, and it would probably cost a huge amount of money to do this and I guess I'm wondering why would we do that? And from what I read in the paper, I was really disappointed this morning with the attack on our department that I read in the paper this morning, I'm not going to repeat any of it because it's appalling because our public service doesn't get to come up here and defend their department. Our public service was...horrible things were said when in fact my experience…and I have been on the Water and Waste Committee now, I have been on Public Works Committee for years and so I have heard their budget presentations, I've heard their reports on projects they have done and many others of you have heard that, too and you know that this is a competent, capable department. And like, this is politics being played with people's reputations and their lives. And I find it very concerning and I hope that people are going to take those comments with a big grain of salt because they are dedicated, diligent and thorough department. And I challenge anyone to disagree with that statement. Yet, there is a motion which is...I mean, I'm sure it's not just about saying whether or not having a dividend is a good policy. It's about all of these things. Should we as a level of government be able to decide what our capital budget is for a department? Should we be allowed to decide anything about what happens in policy or funding agreements with other levels of government? No, let's have a third-party decide absolutely everything for us. That's what you are voting on people. So maybe that's not the intention…if that's not the intention of the mover of the motion then I think you should withdraw the motion. But, that's what I am reading and that's what we are voting on and I just hope everybody's reading this really carefully. Don't just read the paper, read what you are voting on because what you are voting on is to basically…why bother being here as a municipal level of government because we certainly can't manage our department at all and they can't manage anything if we should have this third-party managing absolutely everything for us which is insulting and wrong and I don't know, I think we got elected to make these tough decisions and to deal with this and we have already dealt with it. We have already decided what our budget is for 2016 so if that has to be reviewed by a third-party, this were to pass, if you don't defeat this, you know, we would have to basically tell the department to put everything on a standstill while we have all these hearings, I mean, if they agree to have them. We don't know whether...we're basically giving up our ability to have any control over one of our most expensive departments in terms of capital, it's probably our biggest area as a city and we are basically handing over control to another level of government. I'm just amazed that this...no one is talking about that, they are talking about a dividend is a bad policy. So, okay, on to the clause itself, the dividend, yeah, like nobody wants to have to have the dividend. I don't think anybody finds it fun to stand up and say we are taking some money out of our utility to help fund our operating budget. Nobody's being dishonest or not transparent about it, it's in the budget documents, it's what we have been doing, it's what we've always done to varying degrees in different forms, we've taken money out of our asset, our utility to help balance our operating budget which is what most major cities do. I also find it bizarre to compare Winnipeg, as was done today earlier in the media to the rest...we are the only municipality in Manitoba that does whatever. Well, we are the only big city in Manitoba. Like Brandon is 60,000 people. That's the next biggest city. Yeah, they don't have a billion dollar budget and complex cities that have the assets like massive utilities like the Province which has Manitoba Hydro or other cities like Edmonton, Calgary and all the major cities, most of them take some money out of their assets such as a utility, in various different forms, to help pay the operating cost of their city. Look, this isn't like we're the only people doing this. I'm not saying it's great, like, I don't think any of us like that we're doing it but it is something that cities do and one of the reasons cities do it and the Province does it with Manitoba Hydro is that they, you know, they need funds to run their operations and there's only so many tools, especially at the municipal level that we have. So, as Councillor Mayes explained quite well, we would have to find $30 million right now if the PUB had a hearing and decided that we weren't going to be able to do this anymore. We would have to raise property taxes at least 6…6 to 8 percent, I would think just to cover that and then where would our flexibility be going forward? We're already at a wall. We know that the budget is really, really tight. I mean, do people want to reduce what we are spending on roads by 30 million? Do they want to reduce what we're spending on recreation facilities by 30 million? I didn't hear those questions being asked in the media. I didn't hear anyone talking about the solution. I think we would all love to have one. If someone has one please speak now and I mean, if you think your constituents who aren't happy with...yeah, I am sure you will get to your chance to speak Councillor Wyatt and you'll have an answer, but if it's just a property tax increase of 6 to 8 percent, which some people might say they want, that

that's a better way to raise the money, you know, I don't expect your constituents that are complaining right now are going to be a whole lot happier with that. None of these forms of taxation are...nobody wants to pay…have to pay for this and we are the decision makers here today and so we have to make hard decisions. Like if we weren't elected, we wouldn't have to. We could just say we don't like this. Like and…but we have to try to come up with solutions. So the budget is a balance of different solutions, we're required by law to balance it. We are required by regulations to build these plants and deal with our environmental responsibilities with water and water sewage treatment. We have been able to find a way to do that and still spend a lot of money on roads and sidewalks and active transportation and transit and also, not cut our services beyond, you know, the vacancy management. There are some concerns, but we are doing our best to try to make this work because we have to. That's what we're elected to do.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: So, you know, to just say, let's get this third-party to take away our ability to use funds from our utility will really tie our hands and force…you know, maybe some people think we should have a 6 to 8 percent tax increase right now, tomorrow. Yeah, if you…I don't think our citizens would be happy with that tax shock and that would just be the first one because we'd have less flexibility going forward. And next year we have a 50 million shortfall to start with in terms of filling that hole with our structural deficit as Councillor Morantz speaks of. So, and it's true. So, we…you know, I think we have to look at what people are doing across the country. It's reasonable. It's unfortunate that we don't have more sources of revenue that can address all these concerns. A lot of this comes from our history. We have a history of freezing the taxes. If we had an inflationary increase, for the last 15 years, we'd have an extra 150 million right now. But those were decisions that started back in the 90s and so we only have limited sources of revenue and should we go to our citizens and say, well we're not going to take a surplus from our utility, our asset, we're going to take it from a massive tax shock if that's the...I don't see a motion in front of here that says that. All I see is a motion that says, let's get a third-party to do our jobs for us because…and also, that's a real assault and an insult to a very competent department. I mean, if you have ever actually listened to them do a detailed budget presentation or talk about their capital projects, like, I am always impressed and the people on the committees who have heard the department…Moira and the other staff, come and speak to us and over the years that I've been here, they are always very impressive and they're dealing probably with the most complex projects we deal with. They are dealing with water treatment...like, it's very complex. And they do a good job and I don't think we should be using…dumping on people...I don't think we should be…you know, I just think that's wrong they way to treat our staff that way. We should be respectful of the work they do while we're making our political points and if we're going to...I'll just wrap up. If we are going to make a decision that affects another decision, then how are you going to deal with that? It's more complicated than just saying, we got to stop taking this $30 million. So what are you going to do? Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Morantz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wanted to just clarify something for Council and for the public as well, just because a lot of things have been said about the propriety of taking...and again I agree with everyone here. It's not great policy. It's something that we inherited. It is real though. It's over $30 million in our operating budget and I agree completely with all the comments that have been said. If we stop the dividend, where would we…how would we fill that hole? Perhaps, those bringing the motion could also bring recommendations around what services they want to see cut or what tax increases they want to be made. I also think it's important to go back to the beginning and where I start and maybe it's just the lawyer in me, I apologize, Madam Speaker, but I like to go back to the legislation. So the Winnipeg Charter Act which is the piece of legislation under which we exist has a section that deals with this. And the section doesn't just say, Madam Speaker, the City of Winnipeg is exempt from the Public Utilities Board, it doesn't just say that. There is more to the section than that. And I'm assuming that everybody here also did the same research and looked up the section, read it before the Council meeting. But just in case you didn't, I will read it to you, it's section 210(5), it says, "Despite the Public Utilities Board the City may, as provided in this act, establish prices, rates, fees, deposits or other charges for any commodity or service that the city supplies and for that purpose, the city need not obtain any approval from the Public Utilities Board. The intention being that the City may establish such amounts", and this is key, Madam Speaker, it says, "and use the revenues therefrom for the general purposes of the city." Let me repeat that. It says, it's right in the legislation. It was thought out by the people who negotiated and discussed this act at the time it was an act, and they put it in here and they said, "And use the revenues therefrom for the general purposes of the city." And they go further than that, Madam Speaker. So it's not just we are exempt, it's that we can charge these fees, we can use the revenues for general purposes but they go further than that, Madam Speaker. It goes on to say, "And not solely for the purposes of offsetting any costs related to the supplying of a commodity or service." In other words, we don't have to use it in the utility. We have complete latitude. Now, Madam Speaker, I again, I'm not defending the policy. It's something we inherited and I would love to have a discussion as to how we can maybe move towards a rationalizing the policy somewhere. And you know, that's, as Councillor Mayes pointed out, a debate for another day. But I do want to address the motion because the motion says, "Be it resolved that the City of Winnipeg request the Province of Manitoba to refer to the Public Utilities Board and hold public hearings on the following." Well, the reality is

that, you know, we…certainly it's an order for us to pass this motion. But the reality is, as the legislation stands today the Province doesn't have authority to make that referral. It would be in contravention of its own legislation. So, Madam Speaker, with the greatest of respect, even if this motion were to pass, nothing would happen with it. Now, in addition to that, it's not just my opinion, it's actually the opinion of the Public Utilities Board itself who did do a review a few years ago of this and in the recommendations they said that, you know, there is nothing we can do because of section 210(5). So I would urge all councillors if you haven't really read it yet to read the section and understand the reason why this takes place. And frankly, I agree with Councillor Gerbasi's comments which is that, you know, the City of Winnipeg is a pretty big operation. We need to have control of our assets. And we are elected as a…by the citizens to make decisions as to where those revenues are allocated so that we can support the levels of service that people expect us to provide. I also want to say, you know…and someone touched on this earlier, Manitoba Hydro has been at the PUB for many, many, many years. I did look this up also, I'm sure every councillor did before the meeting today, but actually, last year the Province of Manitoba drew $291 million out of Hydro and I didn't hear the Public Utilities Board saying they shouldn't be doing that. I haven't heard any of the councillors who brought forward this motion today ever say that, in fact. I'm just wondering why it would be okay in that case and not in this case. Perhaps it's not okay in either case. I'm not sure. Now...those are essentially the thrust of my comments, Madam Speaker and I think I will leave it there. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thanks, Madam Speaker. What we are seeing here is the outcome of...I think we've heard a lot about the dividend. The dividend...you read the report…the dividend is cited as one part of the rate increase. But as part of it and it's definitely one of the reasons for the rate increase but it's only one part of it. The biggest impact is having that the...with regards to the rate increase on the city's citizens are being proposed here today is directly related to the capital program. And it's related to the capital program based on environmental regulations. Environmental regulations which have been legislated against the city and I use the word against purposely, against the city with the license requirements that we have of our water treatment facilities. Our waste water treatment facilities namely. And these waste water treatment facilities are subject to the provincial environmental regulations and they are a licensing jurisdiction and their licensing regimes. They, the Provincial Government, in the last decade and a half or more has brought down some very aggressive licensing requirements on the City of Winnipeg. And our department and others, political and otherwise have argued over the years that no one disagrees that Winnipeg should do its share to clean up Lake Winnipeg. That Winnipeg should do its share to stop raw sewage from going into the river. That Winnipeg should do its share for the environment. Everybody agrees with that. What we have disagreed with though is the rate of requirement in terms of the rate of change and the impact on us with regards to those capital requirements. We have argued over and over and over again that the problem was not created in a generation to solve it in less than a generation and to put this huge cost on the citizens in less than a generation, a fraction of a generation, it's completely unreasonable and unfair. And we have argued that over and over and over again with the previous government. And it fell on deaf ears. So we can now only hope that with the new government, there will be a breath of fresh air and it won't fall on deaf ears any longer. Everyone agrees raw sewage going into the rivers is wrong. Everyone agrees that we need to make a better system than we have now. No one disagrees with that, Madam Speaker. What we are saying though is look at, we want to make the changes here. We want to make the improvements, but don't do it with a gun to our head. Legislate us, license us and legislate us without compensation because that is what has exactly has been happening and that's what's been happening for the last decade and a half. And I would cite the Clean Environment Commission, the hallmark report by Dogood and the early…over a decade and a half ago that came out and at the time, he made a whole bunch of recommendations that this is what's still impacting us today that are working its way through the system so to speak. These recommendations were massive, but what are the things that he recommended which the government...previous government completely ignored? As a matter of fact, when I heard through my…they were furious that he actually put it in the report, was that there should be three levels of government participating in the funding of this…they realized that this was completely onerous on the citizens of Winnipeg, that these were massive changes and that all three levels of government should be here to fund it. That has never occurred. The Province whenever there was opportunity to get the Federal Government on board, they're the leader, the feds can never come to us, right, they go to the Province, they fund the money with all different sorts of federal programs to other projects. Because why? Let's be frank, you're not going to have a ribbon cutting when you're building a sewer pipe. You're not going to have a sod turning, it's very rare. Well, Mayor Ivanson in Edmonton does but I mean, I don't know it's…you know, Councillor Schreyer will be there. If the pipe is going from Transcona to Elmwood, I will be there too. It actually does go that direction, but anyway…to the North End so you know, the reality is...the reality is, Madam Speaker, nobody lines up to get the funding when the time…and then all of a sudden now we have this report coming forward and we're saying, holy moly, we've got this massive cost and we've got all these charges. And so, you know, we are trying to deal with this and going to the PUB is not a question of relinquishing our responsibilities and our powers which I heard a previous speaker say. If anything, it's to add an extra set of eyes that we need. Because I have been in the budget process and I know how crammed it is and I know how jammed it is to get things done. And I don't think anything's radically changed in that sense and what really worries me or concerns me, and I don't point any fingers or anything else, is just the level of oversight that we need. And yes, it's going to cost us more to have to go to PUB, there's no doubt. You know, I heard the number way back, a few number of years ago, half a million

dollars for sure to have to go to PUB. But you know what, in terms of the program spending that's being proposed now in the tens of millions and the hundreds of millions, that is a drop in the bucket to ensure we are doing our due diligence. Nobody's saying anybody's not doing their job, we're just saying let's make sure we're doing it right and having that oversight. And I can tell you, there's a lot of municipalities around this province who do not like having the oversight of the PUB. They do not like it. And, you know, is that such a bad thing, you know, to ensure that there is a bit of oversight, a bit more oversight on a program that is as massive as being proposed now? No. So, you know, I guess I come back to and I reach out through this chamber…through this chamber across the downtown right to Broadway and Memorial to the new government, help! Help! We need help because we can't go forward with what is being proposed. Either we need the funding or we need a practical or both a practical plan to be able to implement this. We know we need to get from point A to point B, but we're not going to do it overnight. And if we do, at the rate we're going, for a modestly assessed house in this city, we will see in our lifetimes where they will be paying more for water and sewer services than they will be for property taxes. And that's a scary thought but that's where we are heading very quickly here. And I don't think anybody wants that. Nobody in my mind wants that in this chamber and nobody out there wants that. But we know we have to find ways to make these things work. Let's just take a step back and allow the transition that's happening…we have a premier elect…allow things to happen…allow us to get our minds and our program wrapped around the fact that there is a new government in town and hopefully one which will look at this in a practical way, keeping the environment front and centre but in a practical way about affordability and at the end of the day, there is only one taxpayer. One ratepayer in this city.

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

Councillor Wyatt: And that ratepayer is being asked to do a lot of stuff. And we have to understand that. We have to understand we want to do the right thing. We also want to know, too, Madam Speaker, keep in the back of our mind, we know how much the City of Winnipeg contributes to the problem here in terms of the overall issue with Lake Winnipeg. And we know that we are a very small percentage of the overall issue. And so let us...but we are a good target. We're an easy target. We could be legislated against, we can be hit. Let's ensure that everybody here in this water shed, whether it be in the United States or the farmers outside of the city or everyone, are part of the solution as well. And that we can all go forward together solving this challenge that we face. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: This is a really good debate that we're having. I think that we do have to start talking about our taxes. We have a level…you know, 20 years of freezing. Now we are keeping up with the rate of inflation but of course that means we are not even keeping up with the work that we need to be doing. So, it's a great discussion to have, but today I have to ask myself, you know, what is my role here as a councillor? I have been asked from the citizens of Daniel Mac and obviously, thanks to Councillor Morantz, we have been given the authority to make a decision today and you know what, it would be easier for me to actually give it to the Public Utilities Board because then if there was an increase I could say, you know, it was the Public Utilities Board, that would be a lot easier for me. But you know what, this is a hard decision to make and I have to look at, okay, I was somebody who stood up here at Council during the budget discussions and said I need my roads fixed. I need more transit on the streets. We need to be doing stuff in the city so I can't then go back and say, I have to look for $30 million out of the dividends because quite frankly, I think we need to be doing more than we are doing. So, you know what, I have to go back and tell the citizens that I don't support finding 30 million because I don't think there is anything more to take. We have been doing that over and over and over again. So I have to stand up, and as Jenny Gerbasi would say, put on my big girl panties and say that we need to do this increase: You know, we are talking about the rate increase and we see that go towards water treatment facilities. We see that going towards our sewer and those are important things and I know they are not exciting things, they are not the new bridges and they are not the community centres but they're very important things for our families and they're also important for future generations. So, you know what, I know that it's a tough decision to make and I hope that we can get the public to really understand the constraint that we are in, and talk about why we need to do this increase. And hopefully that they're going to understand that but finding 30 million of efficiencies, taking $30 million out of our budgets when I ask any of you to go down one of my back lanes. Talk to people that use public transit. Talk to people…like, they can see management, how is that impacting our city. We are feeling the crunch already. So taking $30 million out of something that we are already kind of crunching is not good management, I think, for our city. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Next is Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. What is a dividend, Madam Speaker? If I am a corporation business entity, I am selling a product that I might only need a little bit myself. Water and Waste…the services and products that they provide, we need those as a City of Winnipeg. This is not a business. So the whole concept of utilizing a word called a dividend is inappropriate as…because what happens in business, you take your revenues, you sold a bunch of product, not to yourself, but you sold a bunch of product to people outside and you made way more revenue than your

costs, goes into a surplus account, and then the board makes a decision and says, you know, we're going to give a dividend to our shareholders, Madam Speaker. That's actually how Manitoba Hydro works. Manitoba Hydro generates enough electricity and the service that it provides, it is allowed and it does sell much electricity to the United States, it's looking at selling it all over the place. And that's outside and so the revenues that they bring in are a vast amount from outside. And so they end up with a surplus at the end of the year. And there is this reserve account and they say okay, then we can take a dividend. Now, if we look at the water service, water and sewer service here in Winnipeg, everybody who is in Winnipeg, we don't sell...well, we are selling our sewer services outside of West St. Paul now. That's great. We should take a dividend from that. That's good. We are providing a service from them. We bring in more revenue than it costs us to deliver it and we make some money from it, Madam Speaker. That's good, that's good. That is achieving a dividend. What we are doing here is we are saying we're going to use the water thing here and we're going to add that to our revenue and then we're going to put it out into general revenue through the expenditure side and then if you really look at this rate proposal and then the budget and everything that came along with it last month, you will note that we still end up with 3 million or so dollars of profit which goes into retained earnings, not specified to go anywhere, Madam Speaker. And so even though we put this so-called dividend...it's not a dividend, it's just another…it's a tax. It's just a tax. It's not a dividend. We're not making money. If we were smart and we made a deal with the bands around Shoal Lake and said, hey listen, we'll pay you a couple cents a cubic meter for the water we sell to Rosser and West St. Paul or East St. Paul or anywhere we wanted to try to do that…made a deal, could have tried to do that. But we got shut down because people don't understand that the Indigenous People are part of everything here. So, we missed that opportunity. There's no surplus for dividend. So I just wanted to point that out for people and Manitoba's Hydro's dividend comes from…it's because they're selling electricity outside of where we need it. Like, it's a real business, that's what it is. MPI actually can provide dividends. They make money in the private sector selling to tractor trailer business and stuff like that. Not our mandatory system, but outside of that system, they're actually making money. They make lots of money. It's good. Anyway, that's not what our water and waste utility does. Now I wanted to say, we spent eight hours, Councillor Gerbasi was doing FCM business, was out of town on some important business dealing with many issues that we deal with in the city, but she wasn't there for our eight to nine hour meeting. And I want to know…I want to just let her know, Madam Speaker, that we had a very cordial and really frank discussion, an honest discussion with our administration who answered all the questions we had to ask. And we found out about the, you know, the idea that the north end sewage plant will have an anabolic digester to make whatever bio-solids come out of it inert plus produce methane gas that possibly we could sell back to the grid. Hey! There's some money we can take a dividend from. What a grand idea. Excellent. Smart. I know it's going to cost millions and millions of dollars, Councillor Wyatt has a good rationale for it, it should be three ways, help us out and it sounds like the Federal Government wants to be part of that solution. So that's good…the new Federal Government, that's good. So Madam Speaker, this whole idea about that money, that's one thing. You know, fair taxation…like, let's be true, that 32 million we are collecting from whatever it is this year, and I think it's 32 actually, somewhere around there, when we collect that money, it's going to help us pay for our expanding operating costs. We haven't added a lot of services. Our services are actually declining so Councillor Morantz is charged with a very difficult situation, Speaker Sharma. In that, he says he inherited…he did. We inherited a problem but, you know what, just because we promised not to increase property taxes doesn't mean we have to seriously look at the reality. It is more progressive in a way and it's more direct because now you know what your money is paying for. Whereas the 32 million comes, you could say it's fixing roads or I could say it's actually to help offset...we had a big debate. There was an increase in some of the positions for public engagement, for example, some of that money is probably paying for that. Some of that money's paying for the expansion in operating costs for the Police Service because, really, we didn't increase property taxes to cover that expansion off. So, you know, it's not…you can't, just say it's for roads. It's general revenue, it helps balance the situation and when we talk about a structural deficit here in this city, it's not quite a deficit situation that the Feds and the Province face because they can run deficits. We can't. So, what it is, is our structural deficit is actually the services that we now provide cost more and more and more every year and we need to find the revenue to pay for it or as some say, cut it, right? That's what it is Madam Speaker. So, I just want to be clear on all that. So, now I wanted to speak something...you know, going to the Public Utilities Board, there's…you know, they can make recommendations. You can say, if we, the City ask them to do a pay it, they can't tell us what to do with the rates, but they can make recommendations. And I'll tell you right now, they would make a recommendation, Madam Speaker. I made a recommendation. There is $3 million that goes into retained earnings. We don't know what it's used for, it's on the balance sheet and when budget time comes along. We can't follow it because it's not put into a reserve, Madam Speaker. And our wise leadership here at City Council chose to ignore the idea and our excellent staff said, yes it is prudent to put any surpluses into a reserve for fiscal stabilization or whatever it is for the utility. You never know, we might get a frozen pipe problem again. It's important to have that there but if it's in a reserve rather than in retained earnings, we get to see how much that is every year. How much is accumulating, whatever's in there. It's a sound financial thing to do and EPC chose to ignore the motion from the Water and Waste Committee, a prudent financial decision. Like, I don't understand it, Madam Speaker. So, all's I want to say is...and we tried to move...only pass one year's rates. What's the problem with that? I don't get it. You have a budget problem this year, you have to make sure that gap is filled, Madam Speaker, and but you don't have to pass two more years yet.

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

Councillor Eadie: You don't have to pass two more years yet. You can pass this year because we are at the point, and Councillor Morantz…absolutely…and our administration will tell us. We're at the point where we need to now meet those revenue and expenditure projections. And the reality is we are stuck with this. But that's not what we are doing, try to make a prudent recommendation. Yes the rates can be changed next year, maybe if we are getting more money. I don't know. But, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to say that I appreciate the work that our Water and Waste do and one of the other things they told me, Madam Speaker, is that they actually pay property tax on their facilities. The only property tax I could see in our assessment roll when I looked at it is land drainage, something to do with land drainage but the amount they were talking about. So I don't know if they are paying some kind of in lieu of property taxes, but you're charging 12 percent on top of property tax that Water and Waste is paying, Madam Speaker. Like, these are the kinds of things the Public Utilities Board could point out for you and say, you know, that's not a good idea. Like, doesn't make sense, Madam Speaker. So, I don't understand why you would be opposed to letting public…or maybe instead of them having public hearings...whatever it is, we can do that, yes, because of what the charter says, they can't tell Water and Waste what to do, but, after having public hearings, they can make recommendations to us, City Council, and we can pass those along because the reserve…the reserves…the Public Utility Board would recommend any surpluses you have go into reserves. It's prudent. It's a way to track things, Madam Speaker. I will leave it at that. I'm not voting for…I'll vote for the motion but…the motion to go to the Province but I'm not voting to increase these rates. There's too much craziness in there. Let's be responsible. Tax fairness is match up the tax with what it's supposed to pay for. Water and Waste shouldn't be paying for roads if that's where he's saying the money's going.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker is Councillor Orlikow followed by Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Orlikow: Well, thank you Madam Speaker. I rise today to support the rate increase and definitely not supporting the idea of going to the public so I'll get that off the plate. Reasons why, well, first of all the reality is that $33 million in the dividend. There are components of that money for land drainage, Councillor Eadie had talked about. There are other costs that the City incur that are related to the utility that aren't paid by the utility so it offsets some of those cost. There's also the argument that when the utility took over it became a being. You know the assets that we paid for as citizens over the last X years, this is a recoup back on our initial investment. So there's all those arguments but again that's really neither here nor there at this point. You may not like the budget, you may have voted against the budget. We didn't increase the dividend this year at all, this is two years ago. However, that boat has sailed. So now we are here today to talk about the water rate increases. So the reason why these increases are required, it's quite simple, it's regulatory, real regulatory issues, most of them with the treatment plants. Some people suggest, oh let's go to the PUB and they'll fix it for us somehow. Well, they will. We actually have underfunded our responsibility to have this reserve fund set up so we can pay this astronomical amount of money that's being dictated by us by the Province without the financial support that they should be providing. That is true. The PUB could say you've got to support…you have to put more money into the reserves. So you need to jack your prices up. There is definitely no reason why they wouldn't. They definitely could. The regulatory body said you must do this, we need to see the funding in place to do this, you're not fulfilling your obligations, so we need a rate increase even higher. That's definitely possible, so be careful of what you ask for. Again, so, I think Council should retain the control of that. So that's why the PUB idea…besides the millions of dollars that would take just to go through the process to a body that's not accountable, I'm accountable to the public. I'm up here saying today, I don't want to tax anything. I don't want to tax anymore. I believe there's huge fatigue going on. And I consider any money we take from the pocket of the general population a tax. We call it…whatever, I don't care what we call it. But again, the public is having difficulty and I respect that. And if there was another way, that we didn't have to do this, I'd be very happy not to. But again, the implication of not doing this takes our $50 million structural deficit this year, thank goodness that Councillor Morantz and the rest of Council for battling that structural deficit down to half that we could have been facing and adding $30 million onto our structural deficit. So when we get up to budget time, which we all want to be a part of, we're going to have to find some way to either make $80 million in revenue or cut $80 million in services or some combination in between. Again, the challenge we have already, and it's a reality challenge, that at this present point the next budget process, again, thank you Councillor Morantz for not making us do the big, big number, but we still have to find $50 million. Again, we talked about service cuts, we don't want to…you know, Councillor Eadier was very articulate about the concerns about having service cuts regarding the Police Service. We all shared those concerns. Councillor Gilroy and many of us talk about concerns about our infrastructure. We all have these concerns. Some of us are concerned very much about treats. We all have different concerns. Again, but saying today that because I don't believe in how you define what a dividend is and I'm not exactly sure where it's going to go and why is it there. Well, that's a little…that's to me is irresponsible. We have a reality. We have a reality in front of us. And you have a choice today. You can say no to the rate increase. You know, there's probably the votes here to get it so I'm just going to say no and so when those people call me I will say, hey, I voted against it, because no one wants to pay any more money. And I understand that. But again, if you can say that, then I hope you'll be able to say, oh and I also agree that we should cut the police budget down $20 million. Or we should take 30 million out of roads or 30 million out of communication or whatever it is. Please have the argument for both sides. Because just to say that I don't want to increase taxes and however the Mayor or EPC decides how to deal with that, that's their problem. Well no, as we just talked about it before, it's all our probleMs And we're going to try to work on these problems together. So again, I…the

PUB idea to me, it's a risky, really risky play. I don't believe that they're going to come down and say, oh, you should actually decrease your rates. I believe they'll say, increase your rates to make your…because you have a commitment that the Province has dictated to you. I do hope we are very successful with the Province and I do hope we're very successful with the Federal Government but that's all maybes. We have the reality here today. That's the reality here today. The budget has passed, we are moving past it. Now, we are here with the rate increases. So again, we could say no to the rate increases and again I talked to the department numerous times about what would happen if we did that. Well, we would have a huge shortfall in our budget. That would happen. And if we say no to this rate increase today, they're not going to be able to provide the dividend and other things, we're going have a shortfall. How much it will be, they're not too yet, they haven't worked those numbers out, but it will have…if we don't do the increases today, the rate increases, there'll be a two pronged approach will be a problem or three. One is that the…there will be an impact on our operating budget. The dividend will not be coming flowing back as we expect it to, it will be less. So there will be an impact there. More importantly though, things such as preparing land drainage for new developments in our transformative areas will cease because they don't have the money to do the land drainage, they don't have the money in the capital projects. We won't be able to remotely put any money into our north end treatment plants and getting that ready no matter how it works out. We're going to have a real…even a greater deficit there. The other areas that they told me that would have…pretty well 85 percent of their money right now on the capital side goes into regulatory fix. The regulatory, 85 percent. The other 15 is just trying to keep up with our pump stations and the other one. All the other money's operating. So really, we are talking 15 percent is just…and that's where it will have to come from. Because the regulatory...even if we don't like it, it's real. And it's coming down at us so we have to get ready for that. And I really do hope the Mayor and whoever is successful in trying to re-negotiate that. We've tried for years and it hasn't been too successful yet. Again, so we have to be able to you know, do some of those hard calls and this is the one if anybody can tell me a way out of this…we're not going to have to go cut services or have this huge structural deficit increase, if they can tell me some other way that's great. And we've heard one, just increase the property tax. Do it fairly, increase your property tax up. Sure, I don't agree with that philosophy. I believe we did our 2.33 percent increase in property tax, we did our frontage levy, this is another part of that whole basket. So again, I believe we found a balanced approach to be able to deal with our structural deficit and we have to continue to try to work at this. So again, the idea of just saying, I can put my head in the sand and forget about this and let someone else deal with the problem, again, that's everyone's prerogative. However, I'm going to stand up here and going to say, we do have a structural deficit problem. We do have some regulatory, real serious regulatory issues, I don't believe we are up to speed in our cash reserves to be able to pay for the north end treatment plants. So again, this is a responsible decision to make today. You may not like the dividend. You may not like the rate increase. I don't believe anybody really does. But again, I don't like property tax increases. I don't like frontage levies. But I don't like service cuts as well. So again, us as a council.

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

Councillor Orlikow: You can have your polar views, it's my way or the highway or we have to find a way somewhere to be able to do a balanced approach to be able to address our serious, serious budget issues…our serious infrastructure problems that we have, so we can make Winnipeg great not only today, but for tomorrow.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Next is Councillor Gillingham followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise…I will not be supporting the amending motion. In question period to the Mayor, I did ask the Mayor about his willingness to speak to the Premier Elect and the new government in regards to this matter around the environmental regulatory licensing and kind of the impact that that is having as we hear consistently from speaker after speaker. And I appreciate the Mayor's commitment to have that conversation in due course. We will at least let the new Premier get sworn into office, we'll give him that. But Councillor Wyatt raised something that I want to pick up on and he commented about, you know, the cities need to do our fair share in regards to cleaning up Lake Winnipeg through treating our sewage to a certain environmental level and I agree with that. I think we would all say that the City…we are compelled to do our fair share. I'm wondering if perhaps Councillor Mayes would be willing to address this in his closing comments, but my question is, what assurance does this new council have that we are doing our fair share and not disproportionately beyond our fair share? And…since I've got here, we keeps, you know…I've served on Finance Committee with Councillor Morantz and time and time again, we have the Water and Waste Department coming forward, you know, giving updates on both their south end or north end treatment plants and these astronomical numbers. There are huge capital projects. You know, I often tell people, you know, in the public when they ask me what it's like, I said, what people don't talk about often is how much it costs to treat sewage in this city. It's the big ticket item. It really, really is. And so my question is, again, you know, half of us are still relatively new, we're in our first term of Council and I would like assurance that we are not doing a disproportionate amount to cleaning up Lake Winnipeg. And if we are, then I think that needs to be...even if it's been addressed by previous council, I think that's something that needs to come to the…you know, beyond the table again. Again, willing to do our fair share, absolutely, I'm committed to doing our fair share to clean up the environment, but if the City of Winnipeg, if the cost benefit analysis really is out of balance and the City of Winnipeg is being called upon to do far above what really, you

know, we are doing as far as contribution to Lake Winnipeg, I think that discussion needs to be brought back to the floor, we need to continue to have that discussion as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Browaty followed by Mayor Bowman.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't really like dividends, plain and simple. Contrary to Councillor Gerbasi's comments earlier, you know, this means the six percent increase in property taxes, I mean, the alternative and I think Councillor Orlikow said it well is, you could also find, you know, $30 million in reduction in spending. I think that would be my preference on the way to go, but none the less, we have difference of opinions. I think we do…I'll recognize that the dividend is a $30-32 million hit to the operating budget. And, no to the Public Utilities Board. I mean, look at Hydro. They have oversight and the Provincial Government, the last Provincial Government at least has used them as their piggy bank. Water flow rental rates, all sorts of dividends and stuff. It hasn't been stopped under the PUB so I don't think that's going to…it's not going to achieve the ends that perhaps the movers of the motion are looking for exactly. Again, we are ultimately elected and we are responsible for these things but as it is, the water rates that are being proposed are in large part, because of required, provincially mandated upgrades to our sewage plants. I think it's important to notice in the name Winnipeg is right in the name of Lake Winnipeg. We don't want it to become Sewage Lagoon Winnipeg. We have to do the right thing here to clean up Lake Winnipeg. The key point in my mind though is back in, it was around 2010, it was estimated that the extra requirements to remove nitrogen, this was the speech that Councillor Mayes was waiting for, the extra…the additional costs in doing the full biological process to remove nitrogen and phosphorus, it was costing somewhere to the tune of $350 million additional, and that was back in 2009-2010 numbers. At that point Dr. Schindler, who was at the University of Alberta, also is very involved in the Experimental Lakes as well as 63 other scientists that know about water, these aren't politicians, these are people who whose livelihood is around the science of the healthiness…or the health of bodies of water. Their recommendation was go for phosphorous. In fact, the process to remove nitrogen could have even proved detrimental to the health of Lake Winnipeg. And we are still like maybe 1 percent of the way there in terms of the upgrades to the north end plant. I think there is still an opportunity to do what science says is the right thing to do, which also in this case happens to be the right thing for tax payers in Winnipeg. So, I still think there's an opportunity. That said, let's say there is a huge reduction in some of the capital stuff going forward…our capital program going forward. What hasn't been said today, and I…scary and it's a lot of money, the sewage rate increases that we have before us today are to upgrade the plants. They don't take into account dollars towards our CSO removal program. So, Councillor Wyatt talked about raw sewage going into the rivers during bigger events, the program before us today, besides some little, small projects on the side, doesn't address the city's CSO program. Back in December of last year, we were required to file with the Province a proposal to deal with CSOs. Our older neighbourhoods, in major rain events, diluted sewage along with rain water goes directly into the river during major rain events. There's different ways of addressing it. Tearing up every neighbourhood…old neighbourhood and putting in a whole separate land draining sewage system is one option. Finding ways to meet different levels of storm events, you know, as once an average of zero occurrences in one year, is that acceptable standard? I don't know. The department put forward a proposal and that requires almost a billion dollars of additional work. So, if all of a sudden we find that some of our changes...some of the upgrades are no longer required, we still have a deficit. We still have a problem. We still have additional need for sewage upgrades for CSOs in our water utility. So the unfortunate and tough reality is, water and sewer rates, sewage rates in particular, are going to be on a trajectory like this and currently do not even include the CSO component. So, I mean, Lake Winnipeg is a…it's a huge industry for Manitoba, whether it's for a commercial fishery, whether it's for cottagers who use it for recreational purposes, it's also one of the largest natural bodies of water in North America. We need to make sure that it's handed down to the next generations. We need to be responsible stewards of it. As the city's rep for the Red River Basin, I hear about projects throughout the basin that are being…sorry, Councillor Mayes is technically the rep, I'm working with him and I've been working with Red River Basin Commission over the years hearing about all the projects throughout the entire basin that are looking at water quality issues and it's significant and other people are doing their parts as well and agriculture. We still need to find…I mean, they're still one of the larger contributors towards phosphorus and nutrients getting into the Lake Winnipeg water shed. We need to do our part. Again, Winnipeg is the name of the lake. And again, the majority of these increases that we see before us today are not for roads and sewers, they are for water quality issues, for our sewage plant upgrades and for the quality of Lake Winnipeg. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Mayor Bowman followed by Councillor Dobson.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The discussion on this issue today is certainly elevated to some of the macro revenue challenges that we have as a city. I appreciated a number of the comments made by members of Council, in particular, Councillor Orlikow talking about the need to also look at value for money. And while the governments do increase revenues as need be, we too have an obligation to make sure that taxpayers are getting value for money and that we are spending that money as wisely as possible. I was pleased to see our new provincial partners have a one percent efficiencies target, we have a two percent efficiencies target that is being implemented. That money of course is being directed solely at roads. We have created the new Innovation Committee that Councillor Browaty is

leading. And of course we have other initiatives such as the Council liaison for project management, Councillor Pagtakhan, our Deputy Mayor has been serving in that capacity, a new position for Chief Project Management Officer. There's a lot of initiatives at play to make sure that as revenues are coming in here, we are doing a better job than in the past at making sure we are watching taxpayer dollars in a vigilant way. That's going to be the discussion when we get to matters relating to the Public Safety Building among others is value for tax payers. These rates increases reflect cost pressures as has been noted for a variety of reasons; inflation, decreased water consumption, which is a good thing, infrastructure renewal and replacement, annual spending of approximately 30 million for combined sewer overflow and basement flooding mitigation prograMs The increases also reflect, as has been noted, the need to meet provincial legislation and licensing requirements including the north end sewage treatment plant upgrades and expansions of approximately $795 million. The south end sewage treatment plant upgrades and expansions of approximately 335.6 million, and, of course, bio-solids management of approximately 40 million. The dividend from the utility represents the City's return on investment in water and sewer utilities. The monies from the dividend are used to pay for other public services as has been noted. I will note as I believe Councillor Gerbasi indicated in her comments, that other cities use the dividends including Calgary, Edmonton and Regina, and it's important to note that the public service will be reporting back annually on the utilities current and projected financial status given the proposed rate increases. If there is a significant change to assumptions used in the ten year financial plan, Madam Speaker, an adjustment to utility rates may be recommended. As well, we will be working with the new Provincial Government as has been noted by Councillor Gillingham to discuss whether licensing requirements currently in place will in fact be continuing. Our assumptions right now are that these requirements will continue but make no mistake about it, we will certainly work with the new Provincial Government going forward. I will be supporting the report. I won't be supporting the amending motion to refer numerous matters to the Public Utility Board. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I just want to draw Council's attention to the revised Motion No. 4 that was just circulated. It's moved by Councillor Schreyer, seconded by Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Schreyer will describe the revisions in his closing shortly, but the next speaker at the moment is Councillor Dobson followed by Councillor Lukes. Yes?

Councillor Orlikow: This motion was referred...not this motion, but the other motion was referred to this combo deal and now this is actually a new motion.

Madam Speaker: This is revising the notice of motion that was before us from last meeting. Councillor Morantz had moved that we…it be tabled and we deal with it at this moment. This is revising the notice of motion and that is in order.

Councillor Orlikow: So, just for my clarity, so we're not going to be debating the PUB motion anymore? It's just an automatic referral?

Madam Speaker: No, we are continuing to debate it concurrently, so we're just going to finish with the few speakers we have and Councillor Schreyer then will have an opportunity…

Councillor Orlikow: I guess my point of order is that this motion is not the same motion that was referred from Councillor Morantz to the discussion. It's a new motion.

Madam Speaker: It's revised.

Councillor Orlikow: Sure. There's only I think six words are the same that remain. So, it's pretty revised to the point where it's…

Madam Speaker: That's why it's a friendly…that's why it's a friendly sort of amendment and we're going to give him the opportunity…

Councillor Orlikow: Well, the friendly…if we do a friendly…

Madam Speaker: And we're going to give him the opportunity to describe it in the closure…yeah, opposed to…

Councillor Orlikow: So there's a friendly amendment that needs…from the seconder and…it's not a friendly amendment?

Madam Speaker: I see the Clerk shaking his head here.

Councillor Orlikow: No? Okay. Well, I guess if you're telling me the Clerk is…this is fine.

Madam Speaker: Richard? It's…

City Clerk: The motion that he has there is a separate motion and you will be voting on this as a distinct motion. You'll be voting on this motion, the new motion, which is Motion 4. And suppose Motion 4 doesn't pass, but the old Motion 4 does pass, right? They are separate and distinct. He is proposing an amendment to his original motion. And an amendment to an amendment is always in order.

Madam Speaker: So it's not revising the original motion?

Clerk: So, it is confusing when you're thinking about speaking to it because you are speaking to a number of different scenarios. And in the case of people who have already spoken, you are allowed to speak to this new motion.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, do you wish to withdraw your original motion and replace it with this revised motion? Because that's how I was understanding it initially.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, on that basis what are the options here? If I withdraw the original motion then what happens if we then have both?

Madam Speaker: You wouldn't have both then if you withdraw your original motion. So Councillor Schreyer, what you could do is you could leave both motions on the table, you can introduce your new motion now and it would give everyone an opportunity to speak again to the item. Do you wish to do that?

Councillor Schreyer: Yes, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Wyatt: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Wyatt: Just a clarification, and if I could…maybe the clerk could stay…don't want to lose him. So, the benefit of removing the other motion, correct me if I'm wrong, and just having the original motion is then you would have one motion to amend, members of Council could speak to the new motion since it's changed substantially again, however it would allow for another amending motion if so desired to be tabled as well because only two amendments are allowed on a clause at one time.

City Clerk: That's correct.

Madam Speaker: So we will leave the two motions on the table. Councillor Schreyer, you can introduce your Motion No. 4, the one we just circulated, and then everyone would have a chance to speak to the revised motion only. Okay? So, if you choose to speak again it would be only to the new motion on the table.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, on that basis I may speak again to this original…to the new motion?

Madam Speaker: You're going to be introducing it to Council. Now, would he introduce it at this time Mr. Clerk? Just for clarification. Then we will go back to the order that we had for the speaker's list. Okay.

Councillor Gerbasi: Do we get to vote on that? Or he could just pull off a motion? I guess he can just withdraw a motion. Okay

Madam Speaker: No. We are allowed two motions on each item on the floor at one time. Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: Sorry Madam Speaker, just a matter of clarity. It's my understanding as a seconder from talking to Councillor Schreyer that he is alright withdrawing to allow anybody else to move an amendment so they desire at this point to draw the original one and allow this one stand so there's only be one amendment on the floor. Just for clarification.

Madam Speaker: I didn't hear that from him. So, you were introducing the new motion that we just circulated. You have the floor, thank you.

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Schreyer,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

THAT the resolution of the Notice of Motion being considered as an amendment to Item No. 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment be replaced by the following:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg request the Province of Manitoba to refer to the Public Utilities Board (PUB) and call public hearings on the following:

A) The proposed Water and Sewer Rate Increases of 2016, 2017, and 2018 and all associated budgets.
~~*B) The approved 'dividend' from the Water and Waste Department to the Operating/Capital Budget of the City of Winnipeg;*~~
~~*C) The Capital Budget Program of Water and Waste, both 2016 Capital Budget and the 5 Year Forecast 2017 to 2021;*~~
~~*D) The environmental regulatory obligations on the City of Winnipeg in regard to its Water and Waste systems;*~~
~~*E) The Business Plans and all Capital project strategies/plans of the Water and Waste Department;*~~
~~*F) Options for Provincial and Federal Funding of the regulatory capital program requirements.*~~

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And you know, in all respect to Council, the point of this is not to over complicate this today. It is in fact to streamline an understanding. But these things happen on this council floor. We have amendments, we have some amendments and thus we have…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, just to clarify, you are speaking to the new motion that was just circulated only.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. And in that spirit, Madam Speaker, the reason I did this is for the sake of clarity, for simplicity and for the real intent of why I am doing this in the first place, Madam Speaker. The reason I am doing this is to have dialogue and on that basis, the difference between this one and the previous one is, it just simply…it takes out references to 2016. So, you can vote for this and vote for the budget, no contradiction. Because this one does not put the 2016 budget into question, that's not really why I brought this forward, but bear in mind, we have brought this forward because of what was already being intended back in the fall of 2015. So with all…I mean, bear in mind that's why I was doing it because we already were told last year that it was coming to this vote now. And so it was in 2015 we added 2016. So of course, take out 2016, this budget is not threatened or the extra funding coming from having to do a vote today, retroactively justifying a vote from last month, is not threatened and we can go about having the debate, having the conversation with Winnipeggers on the nature of how we're utilizing water utility rates in the City of Winnipeg. I have eight and a half minutes to speak about this. So Madam Speaker, do I get to speak in closing as well? Okay, so I have another ten minutes after this. So bear in mind Madam Speaker, you know, to me this is apple pie. I'm not trying to complicate this budget process of this year. I understand, as an example, Councillor Gilroy said she is in a conundrum because she understands sort of where we're coming from…where Winnipeggers are coming from on this, but she doesn't want to jeopardize the 2016 budget because we sort of have to retroactively justify it today. So on that basis, Madam Speaker, I am not here to try and complicate the budget. I am here to try and facilitate it. And on that basis, this is what this does. We are no longer jeopardizing this year's budget. This is not a threat. It is not an amendment to the motion regarding increasing the water rates this year. You can vote for both. And for those who stated that their concern is that we need the money now, fair enough. This resolves that without any further confusion. Now, you can vote for the water rate increase and this does not jeopardize this. You can vote for this as well. So, the concern that we need the money right now and we need it retroactively to justify last month's budget, that's...you can vote for that no problem and there is no...this does not jeopardize that. Councillor Gilroy is now in a position, as she stated, to vote for both motions. Now, Madam Speaker, I do this for the same reasons. I do this because it's about the great debate. It's about the conversation. This, Madam Speaker, I would say, is a form of conversation as a precursor to what we are calling the public strategy, this grand public strategy that we are about to embark on over the years to come for the rest of the term. Well, Madam Speaker, this is a precursor to this. And on that basis, it was never the intention of the...this amendment, really, to jeopardize people's need now to retroactively justify last month's budget by voting for today. And so I say it again in her presence that Councillor Gilroy, among others, who have mentioned their concern being that this jeopardizes needing the $30 million this year, it is no longer in jeopardy. You can vote for both. This is about the future, not about the 26 budget ma'am. And so, for those that are concerned that things weigh in the balance, if you go upon calling on the Provincial Government to engage the Public Utilities Board in consultations, and weighing that with the need to pass or to justify the 2016 budget by passing the water increases today, you can. And of course, I'm not trying to create any confusion here, I'm trying to add clarity and openness. And this is why I have done that. It's unfortunate that there is this confusion about this. Of course that's what happens in this council. It's not the first time. It's a friendly amendment. And I just think we need the debate. So for here, obviously, Madam Speaker, it's about the engagement of

the public, that which is paramount. Now, I'm not sure at this point, Madam Speaker, that I am in a position with five minutes left to sort of talk about that which has already been said about the water rates. Am I in a position now to speak on what other councillors have said so far?

Madam Speaker: You're only speak to Motion 4 at this time.

Councillor Schreyer: It is related because of the comments they have made, absolutely. And so…I mean, fantastic debate, fantastic conversation has taken place this afternoon but I have some concerns because really, I mean, Councillor Gerbasi had said some things that she read in the media this morning. Well first of all, personally, I take responsibility for every word I have ever said. And I am not sure what she is referring to but I surely do want to know because I am here for just openness and accountable conversation and debate in the media as well. Having said that, you know, there is frustration involved and frustration will be...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, I want to remind you to speak to the motion in front of us. Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Okay. Fair enough, Madam Speaker and I will certainly do so. On that basis with only, you know, three and a half minutes left, I think I have made my point. This is apple pie as Councillor Wyatt would suggest as the seconder of this friendly amendment which makes it actually a new motion. This is simply to engage the Public Utilities Board because it's the tool in our province that has the greatest capability to do so. Now, in mentioning this, comments have been made regarding the previous motion which is related to this. By no means, Madam Speaker, that's the whole point of this motion. By no means and believe me, there was pressure on me to call on the Provincial Government to change the charter to put this…to put the Winnipeg's water utilities under the purview of the PUB. Well you see, that's exactly what this is not saying, Madam Speaker. This is not about giving up control of our water utility board to the Public Utilities Board. That's not what this is about. And I'm pleased to say that so I can allay all fears about that. This is about allowing people to have an understanding and have their say as to what we do with our water rates and if that's control, that's controlled by the people of Winnipeg. It does not mention, nor do I imply, nor is it my intent and I doubt the Public Utilities Board would say that they infer from this that it's their job to tell us what to do. What we're asking them is to tell us what Winnipeggers have said. Of course we all know already, because we will be watching, we will be a part of it. They just have the great instrument to allow for this to happen because this is what they do within the Province of Manitoba. In terms of implications of the Public Utilities Board as applies because there is confusion as to why this would have merit, Manitoba Hydro was mentioned and as Councillor Morantz says, perhaps it's not right that either government raises their utility rates either hydro or utility. And as Councillor Mayes…this is the conversation, it's a legitimate conversation that we should be having. I'm saying that the conversation should take place through this mechanism but Madam Speaker look, I have an open mind on this, simply an open mind on this. And the point of all this, the positioning of all this, to be straight up about it, Madam Speaker, is to let Winnipeggers know that we...you know, there are some councillors, we'll see how many, are in conflict with what we are proposing…what we are projecting and what Winnipeggers expect because…well, I didn't use the term, I didn't bring it up, but I mean the term has been expressed, tax shock. And of course, there will be none for 2016 because it's not in this. But the tax shock already happened because people had their water rates increase. So, if tax shock is an applicable term, it has happened. This is about mitigating that form of tax shock because it's not about 2016, Madam Speaker. Not my intention to bring about tax shock or surprising forms of taxation or increases. Of course we are all responsible to what we say to our constituents on that. Madam Speaker, the difference with hydro as it applies to the Public Utilities Board as has been mentioned, is that Manitoba Hydro exports internationally, at times exports approaching almost $100 million a day to outside the country. Madam Speaker, Winnipeg is half the size of Manitoba and if Winnipeg were to be exporting anything around a half a million dollars.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Your time is up. Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next speaker is Councillor Dobson who has been waiting patiently followed by Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Dobson: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We have had quite a discussion here. The water increases as far as I'm concerned are fine provided they go to sewer and water rates, or sewer and water projects. Dividends, however, I have a problem with. They are wrong. They are a tax. But I don't believe that we can instantly get rid of them. It's going to take a number of years for that to happen. These water rate increases, I think that's the main issue today. With…or in conjunction with possible assistance from the Federal and Provincial Governments and, of course, maybe our obligations might change if they change the rules a wee bit and make them a little more lax, it may be possible in the next few years for the city to take a rather…or a larger dividend amount. And that, unfortunately, worries me. I have no assurances that this will not happen and that's something that we should be very aware of. Again, my main concern is the three years. If it was only a one year increase, I wouldn't have any concern with it. As for the Motion No. 4, it's

another level of accountability as far as I'm concerned. And even though it does cost money, it would only provide recommendations and I could probably support that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Well, this is a very interesting debate today. There are so many valid points that have been brought forward and I am just concerned that the actual taxpayer is not going to be able to comprehend all the variables that are in play here. Because really it boils down to, you know, what hits the person in their pocketbook. And to understand the complexity involved with…I mean, there is the mandated legislation that we have to do these requirements, the structural deficit that we have, we have to balance the budget, the billion dollar upgrades, the deadlines, the timelines, our 8 percent on every PST dollar that we receive from the Province. You know, you look on page 13 of the report and you see, you know, in 2034 we've got 1.78 billion for this project and we've got a commitment from the Province and the Feds at this point of 267 million over time with interest and such. It's...it really, really reiterates that we need our provincial and federal partners. We need them in this. Sixty one percent of the population lives in Winnipeg. We must be doing this to protect our water. We must be doing this to protect Lake Winnipeg. And we are here to make very difficult, very hard decisions and decisions that I am very worried about that, you know, the public sometimes doesn't understand clearly. I look to the media to really help portray the many variables in this. The media have an awful lot of power in portraying a situation, hopefully will portray it in a manner that is balanced, but I…we have…and this doesn't even consider the combined sewer overflows. So we, you know, water and waste, every city in North America, around the world, is facing these exact same challenges and these are huge challenges. And it's very difficult. No one wants to have more taxes. No one wants to pay more but we are entering a time where we must go forward with these investments. And you know, if this doesn't say, to every single councillor here and to hopefully every resident, to talk to their provincial and federal representatives and we must work together to try and come together and figure out a fair way. There still is only one taxpayer but it's working together to identify these priorities and make very difficult decisions and move forward on that. So, I will be supporting the water rate increase…water and sewer rate increase. I won't be supporting No. 4 before the Public Utility Board. We have had a review once already. We went through it in reference to Councillor Morantz's remarks I think that we are here to make these difficult decisions. We have that tool that we have the ability to use how we see fit and therefore I won't be supporting No. 4. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: So I rise in support of this amended motion four the statement regarding hearings of the PUB regarding our water utility. I do this while I'm being informed by our city administration that there are quite a few complaints regarding....

Councillor Orlikow: Which No. 4 is he referring to?

Councillor Allard: The amended motion, the one that says we should do hearings for 17-18.

Councillor Orlikow: Well, that's actually No. 5, isn't it? Did we amend that? Do we have four and five?

Madam Speaker: Number four is the one that was just recently circulated. The other one was the notice of motion, the original one from last month. I don't believe that had…

Councillor Orlikow: We are debating that notice of motion then, before? We're not supposed to debate notice of motions. I'm sorry to be so confused.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, we take…Councillor Morantz had asked that it be tabled to…at this time in the agenda so we could speak to everything concurrently.

Councillor Orlikow: But again, it was a notice of motion to Council, so we had to speak to it at this meeting and that was No. 4, previously.

City Clerk: It was No. 4 in the month of March and today's No. 4, and t's called a notice of motion so it's a little confusing.

Councillor Orlikow: So just to clarify right now, Councillor Allard is speaking to No. 4 which is the new amended one or the other one that we have, not the notice of motion? This is why we shouldn't do this.

Madam Speaker: Are you speaking to the notice of motion, Councillor Allard? Or the No. 4 that was just circulated?

Councillor Allard: Perhaps, I can have this clarified. So I have Motion No. 4 SPC, it's amended, it's from the original motion, it's amended the proposal water and sewer rate increases of 17-18 and all associated budgets.

Madam Speaker: But Councillor Allard...

Councillor Allard: Do I get to speak to that right now?

Madam Speaker: I was just going to say, you can speak to any of the items under this umbrella because you have not spoken yet. This is your first time rising, right? So continue, you have the floor.

Councillor Allard: So we will be voting on this.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Allard: Yes. Okay. Today. Okay. Thank you very much for the clarification. So, as many of you know, water and sewer rates and the dividend has been a topic of much discussions through the media and in many communications in terms of my office with residents, including also our consultation that we had in the context of the budget. Just a few points on the idea of hearings and/or possible regulation of the public...of our water utility. So, as many of you know, Winnipeg is the only municipality in Manitoba that is not regulated by the PUB. Regulations would not necessarily mean an end to a dividend. We know that the PUB regulates Manitoba Hydro and that Manitoba Hydro takes a dividend, but there is a new oversight with the PUB looking at their rate increases. There is plenty of work that needs to be done by our water utility as many of you have said today. Water treatment upgrades, CSO upgrades, some of which is not even part of the plans yet that we have in our budgets. And citizens want to know what their tax dollars are being used for. A regulation by the utility or oversight by the utility would provide the public with greater assurance in that respect. Just in terms of accountability and transparency which I think many of us are favourable to, oversight by the PUB would give that much more transparency and oversight for our citizens. And just in terms of the question of whether or not we need to be increasing rates at the rate that we are increasing them, when I first presented a couple of months ago when this report came forward to the Water and Environment Committee, referred to a Council minute in December of 2012 which I understand is the last time that we raised utility rates and what came out of that is that, and I am quoting straight from the report, so quote, "the three year increases of 4.3 percent each year recommended in the 2013 rate report is less than the 66 and 6.5 percent projected last year. Improvements to the 2013 rate model were accomplished by establishment of formal practices on capital reserve fund balances", and I am not going to read the rest of that citation, the point there being the Water and Waste Department came in asking for a 66, 6.5 percent increase and what was eventually approved was 4.3 percent. So it's also been suggested today that somehow oversight by the utility means we're handing over the keys to the Province. I disagree. This would be a new level of oversight to one of our biggest departments. And just in terms of noting the amendment, we know that the 2016 budget deliberations have been concluded. Councillor Gerbasi raised that there may be some issues if we were asked the PUB to look at this year's budget that that might create confusion and uncertainty so for that reason I prefer this Motion 4 which I believe addresses those issues. And regarding the dividend, I would like to address the elephant in the room which has been the property tax freeze that Winnipeg has had since 1998. And so since then, we don't have property tax freeze but we do have a property tax increase that ends up being sort of a defacto freeze because the property tax increase is tied to specific projects like roads and now like our rapid transit. So our property tax is not increasing with inflation in terms of how we can support our operating budgets. And I just wanted to mention that in terms of…I understand that there is a $30 million issue that we need to address in our budget deliberations but that I believe that that 30 million is due to many, many years of property tax freezes. And we are not...we are increasing property taxes, but we are not increasing property taxes in a way that allows us to grow our operating budgets with inflation. On the water rate increase, I would support raising the rates for one year as Council has done in the past. I do understand that at this point in the budget process we do need that $30 million. We have already debated the budget's capital operating and I would like to move forward, we need to move forward. And so with that being said, I understand that there is this $30 million that we need to replace in terms of what would be missing if we did not increase the rates at the level that we are suggesting today. Also, in terms of rushing to approve three years versus going for a one year increase, it's been mentioned today by many of my colleagues that we are dealing with new governments both at the Provincial and the Federal level. In terms of the Provincial Government, there may be changes in terms of environmental licensing requirements, maybe new funding. There is a lot of question marks there. In terms of the Federal Government, I understand that there will be money specifically for these...for water and waste projects coming up from the Federal Government, so potentially some new dollars there. In terms of...I'm just going to skip some of my notes here so give everybody a bit of time. So I…in terms of this increase, I did speak out at the Water and Waste Committee on the three years and there has been suggestions that this could be brought down to one year. I think that would be a reasonable approach given all the question marks that we have going forward with our government partners. And I understand that things have to happen and how we've got into this situation and in a way our backs are against the wall. We need to pass some sort of increase, of course. And in terms of the budget process, I mean, I think this is another question that we have to address

that's flowing out of that budget process. Just in closing, given the budget needs to be funded, I would support a one year increase if there was some willingness to make that amendment. I do understand that that motion has already been considered.

Councillor Gerbasi: There's two amendments already. You can't make an amendment.

Councillor Allard: I am not proposing making an amendment. I said the word amendment, but I didn't…

Councillor Gerbasi: Oh, you said the word amendment, so I thought you were talking about an amendment.

Councillor Allard: Yeah. Okay. All right. So I understand that in the past at another committee meeting that there was a motion to look at doing one year worth of increases, which has been defeated. And I would be willing to vote for one year of increases given some of my statements today, if there was some willingness to do that, I would support that given I understand that we need to move forward. And otherwise I will be voting against…I'll be voting for Motion No. 4 and against the water rate increase being proposed.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm rising to encourage all members of Council to support the revised amendment before us today. I think...I want to thank Councillor Schreyer for bringing it forward and clearly, he is trying to reach across the aisle, extend an olive branch. I think this is now the equivalent of…voting against this amendment is the equivalent of voting against motherhood and apple pie. I mean this is now pretty straightforward, folks. It's a positive request to say look, go ahead with the 16 rate but send a hearing...request the Province to have the PUB look at the sewer rate increases being proposed in 17 and18. And doesn't even…if you read the wording of this, it actually doesn't even make subject to. It's not even subject to anything coming out of the Public Utility Board. It's actually having a public hearing. So it's equivalent to a public consultation. So, you are voting against public consultation, you're voting against something that is very non-inflammatory, actually trying to say, look, there should be some transparency and openness in terms of the program, the capital program being linked to the water rates and the water rates being linked back to the capital program. There is nothing wrong. There is nothing wrong with asking the department to go that extra mile to be able to explain the entire capital program going forward beyond 16, in 17 and 18. Absolutely nothing wrong with that. As a matter of fact, one of the largest increases has come in in 16. It doesn't impact their ability to provide the capital program, it does not prevent you from voting in favour of the report which is tied to this, it does not in any way shape or form prevent that report from going forward. It calls for a public hearing through the PUB into the rates which would allow...which would trigger and allow other members of the public to come forward and to have input, intervener status that is provided through the PUB. That would be part of this as well, but the report and the recommendation of the PUB in and of itself would not be binding unless the Provincial Government were to change the legislation. I mean, is there something that…is there something hidden here? Is there…are we saying no to this because there is something more to this that's clearly not...we don't want the public to know? If there is nothing untoward this rate increase and the capital program, there should be absolute…this motion should pass unanimously. Unanimously, Madam Speaker. There is absolutely nothing untowards now…this motion. I mean, Councillor Schreyer has gone beyond raising...reaching out and extending an olive branch in terms of wanting to ensure that nothing can stop the rate increase…there's nothing that will affect the capital program. Everything goes forward, other than the fact that for 17 and 18, we will allow some due diligence to be done which I frankly think is long overdue. There was arguments made that we were…some of us were critical, absolutely. You know, I was at the water treatment plant, I took a tour of that councillor over in the RM of Springfield and when I see...thank you, Madam Speaker, when I see, you know, concrete crumbling in tanks that we only built this facility and opened in 2009 that should have a 50 or 75 year life and we are now suing over this, you know, these are concerns...this is oversight, it's a project…a program that previous councils had saved for decades. Decades to build that facility and now the facility is crumbling far before any crumbling should actually be occurring. It causes me great concern. I think the oversight would be welcomed as well by the department. Because it would ensure and demonstrate and educate the public in terms of the challenges we are facing and the needs we are facing and the legislation that is on us. This…in the name of transparency and openness, this motion should be adopted unanimously. It is simple, it is straightforward, it is direct and there is nothing untowards with regards to it. If this is not approved, then clearly, there is something going on that we are not supposed to know about and I would like to know what that is. No, really, because ultimately, there has to be...there has to be...there is something going on between the rates and the capital program. And I'm hoping that's not the case. The rates should be clearly transparent, stating, this is the money needed for the capital program, and that's it. That's what's driving this. You read the report, that's what's driving the rates, okay. And let's ensure that's the case. And that's what this will drive at. Anybody who wants to stand on the side of the ratepayer who have spoken on the side of rate payers in the past and also wants to ensure that the program goes forward as put forward by our administration can support both and you will not be doing anyone a disservice. As a matter of fact you will doing everyone a service by ensuring that extra due diligence is done. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi, this is your opportunity to speak to Motion 4.

Councillor Gerbasi: Well, I would like to congratulate Councillor Schreyer on his procedurally brilliant change to this motion, however, I'm still going to be voting against it. And I think that people should really be a bit careful when it looks a little more...I mean, the way Councillor Wyatt just described it, it sounds completely benign but it still has many of the concerns that I talked about previously with my concern and I will let you know why I am still concerned about supporting this motion. First of all, three little words in the clause that remains are "all associated budgets." So again, we are not just referring the rates and having a discussion about rates, the implications of our rates go well beyond our rates. They go beyond a number of the items listed below here that are supposedly taken out. Yes, it's not this immediate year, but whether it's this year or next year, it's the same in that we are asking a third body to tell us what we should do in terms of our capital budget program, our business plans and capital project strategies and our budget, our budgeting. So, and to say, well it's next year, don't worry about it, we usually start working on our budgets early. Like, you know, we have to maybe even pass our budget by December. I mean, this is a very onerous process that is being overlaid over a budget even if it is for next year, it's not nothing. The department would be spending a massive amount of time going through this additional process which I'm sure doesn't happen swiftly and without massive costs and preparation before we've even had a chance to decide what we want to put in our budget or again, we will be in the same position next year where we're trying to pass a budget and then we'll have to answer to this process that might take months and months of time. We can't control the process. So it really could have financial implications for next year too and the year after as we are tied to this additional layer, it's already difficult enough, as those of you know, to get our budgets through in a timely manner and have proper public discussion through our processes. Now, to say that, you know, this is completely democratic, I guess it is, it's just that it's a different level of government than us carrying out the democracy. I mean, I guess I think that our level of government should govern the things that we have jurisdiction over. That's what our charter, the City of Winnipeg charter, tells us that we should be governing. So it's not as benign…it sounds benign to say, well, let's just have public hearings but that doesn't happen without significant expense, significant time and significant energy from our staff answering to this whole process we can't control the timing of. You know, so you can say, oh it's next year, don't worry about it. And then we could get a little relief. You know, why wouldn't we have a unanimous vote? We could get a little relief from the e-mails we might be getting from concerned…we are getting from constituents. People don't want their rates increased. So it's a way to say we are doing something today, but it's really short-term thinking. Because if this is approved, all the same arguments that we've heard today will apply that we are asking an unelected body to hold public hearings into our budget, our processes, our plans as a city and how we're going to address our responsibilities and our jurisdiction. So, you know, if the PUB decided…if the Province decided they wanted to ask the PUB, I guess they could but I'm not sure why we would be asking someone to do that to us to take away that level of our control over our processes, including budgeting next year, because they could be holding the hearings right in the middle of that and could delay us for months at a time which costs us money. And if anyone is wondering, I believe it was $1.6 million was the cost to us in this delay over the rates. Like, nobody has really said that yet but you know, I'm glad people have had enough time to read all the reports now and I understand they need more time. I'm not sure they couldn't have used the time between then and the three or four weeks from when it was tabled to when we voted on it then. So I'm disappointed that we lost $1.6 million in revenue just from that, just from our own internal motions and debates and people laying things over. We lost 1.6 million in revenue already because of delays we've had so imagine we have, you know, a PUB Board that's planning their hearings and taking months at a time and then are we wait for a report before we carry on with our budget that's currently being reviewed. Everyone's just going to use it next year, anyone who wants to slow everything down. I know that's hard to believe that councillors would do that, but they might try to slow our budget down to get some more traction on things that are unpopular because the public doesn't like to have to pay for things. You know so, they might decide to use that process as an excuse to delay everything and say, that's being reviewed, there's public hearings going on, we can't proceed with anything. I mean, to say…it's not as straightforward and "apple pie" as it sounds and I don't see it as apple pie. I see it as...I'm trying to think of a Shakespearean food that he might talk about in some of his plays, but I mean seriously, this is not apple pie. This is a convoluted, I would agree, procedurally brilliant, tactically brilliant, you know, great way to keep the populace masses angry and frustrated at us as we try to tackle our financial challenges so kudos to you on that, but to those who came up with this idea. But, it's still the same issue and I am not denying that people genuinely have concerns about having to charge these rates and having to work with our constituents and having to deal with our regulations and having to face all the challenges we face. But, this is just really an obstacle that does not need to be created to our governing…our things that we are responsible for. So I really hope you will not see this as a piece of apple pie and you will reject this motion today and let us…you know, we just have to do our own job and deal with the challenges we face which are difficult. And you know, I'm not saying…I'm certainly…I don't find it easy, I'm sure none of you find it easy to talk about these complex issues with your constituents and explain that, you know, we have these regulations that cost this amount. We have operating costs, we have all these challenges and we want to improve our processes and our transparency and the budget process is really the place to make this decisions. And that process, I agree, needs to be improved. And we have seen improvements. We obviously…everyone agrees we need more improvements. But that's where this belongs, with us, not to give it to someone else. And to give away our control over the own decisions that people elect us to do. I mean, that's why we are here. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gerbasi. Next is Councillor Orlikow followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Accountability and transparency starts here, ends here. That's our job. If there is a problem that some councillors feel that they need to have much more public engagement, some review, that's our job, that's not the PUB's job. So again, I'll just state transparency and accountability start here, end here. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Eadie. Again Councillor Eadie, it's your opportunity to speak to Motion 4.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So I have been listening to the debate. I, you know, I am not an expert, Madam Speaker, on a lot of this stuff. Our administration is and I ask lots of questions and they put a lot of time, Madam Speaker, into creating these rates and they prepared everything. So given the motion that's now before us, this new Motion 4…April 27, I don't see the big issue with trying to shut it down. It's been very clear to me, Madam Speaker, that some councillors don't even understand that retained earnings holds millions of dollars. I don't know how much it is, it's in retained earnings. I didn't see the balance sheet as presented in the budget because the only thing we get to see, Madam Speaker, are reserves and the budget. The retained earnings, apparently, has some millions of dollars because besides the dividend tax, I'm going to call it a dividend tax because it's not a pure dividend, it's a dividend tax. It's a mark-up on the cost to deliver the services of 12 percent. That's a mark-up, Madam Speaker, on the assets that are needing to be upgraded so that we take responsibility as all Winnipeggers for pollution and how we might affect the environment. But, so, the 1.6 million, Madam Speaker, if, you know, people were experts in it, they would know that the time that we missed, the $1.6 million, I believe, is available in retained earnings and that's how that budget was balanced when it was voted in, in March. So, given that we as councillors aren't necessarily the experts…like, I mean, I did a lot of studying, I have to admit, you know, every few years we set these rates and then you have to study and it's a billion dollar operation, Madam Speaker, the whole city and Water and Waste we this…and yes, Council does make decisions. But, you know, it would be great to actually have the Public Utilities Board, Madam Speaker, is expert. They actually have hearings in regards to other water and waste operations all around the province, Madam Speaker. And that so they have expertise and we have expertise. I have great faith...you know, the level of preparation that our department and our excellent staff did, to be able to go into a hearing, it's not going to be a big stretch for them, Madam Speaker, to go and look at 17 and 18 in regards to a number of these things, Madam Speaker. Yeah, it would cost some money. I'm not saying it wouldn't cost any money. But what it is is, you are putting it...it's a transparent, accountable system, different than Council because Public Utilities Board are experts and so are our staff but they are experts as well as looking at value for money. They are good at that when it comes to water and waste systems, they can do that. I don't see the problem here. I don't think it would be a big stretch. Again, we had an eight to nine hour meeting, Madam Speaker, at Water and Waste on March 4, 24 hours after this thing was passed. And Councillor Dobson, Councillor Eadie, Councillor Mayes asked lots of really good questions but to understand the whole implications of all of it were difficult because again, none of the three of us are experts, Madam Speaker. This here, I got no problem with voting for this. It's not going to cause a problem for your budget. As I said, there is a retained earning, that's why the Public Utility actually has a surplus every year and then sometimes there is fiscal issues that come up, trouble is, it sits in retained earnings. I bet you the Public Utilities Board will tell you almost every Water and Waste Department utility across the country keeps their fiscal stabilization in a reserve. That's what our expert staff told us. And I get questioned, Madam Speaker, that do I know what I am talking about, Madam Speaker. But we heard from our experts. That's a good accountable thing. So, you know, let's have this subjected to Public Utilities Board, the experts, so we can just clarify and do that because as Councillor Lukes mentioned, Madam Speaker, try to explain this to our residents, the people who are paying the water bills. It's very difficult. And yeah, nobody wants to pay any taxes, I get that. But, they do demand, all Winnipeggers demand and the people who come into Winnipeg demand certain services and quality water to drink and so on and so forth. So, I'll leave it at that. I will be voting for this motion and I'm glad it's made better. Whether it was a procedural coup or not, I don't know, we've lived with the rules that says, two amendments per motion. One was moved, it changed it for the better. I will be voting for it. It's not some trick. This is about accountability and transparency and it's about having some experts look at it. I don't think any individual councillor here is necessarily an expert in all the operations of Water and Waste. So, you know…but we do have a lot of staff who are but if you look at the vacancy management, Madam Speaker, I don't know if that would be part of the consideration to the Public Utilities Board, but there are certain expert positions that are hard to fill and you need to have in place. So these are things that none of us are qualified to understand. So let's put it to the Public Utilities Board. I'm voting for the motion and because the main report itself, again, I'll just mention, I'll be voting against it because it doesn't say to move one year's rates.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Schreyer, you will now close on Motion 4.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I fear that ten minutes won't do it.

Madam Speaker: It's eight minutes you get.

Councillor Schreyer: Eight minutes, oh my goodness. So much has been said and I have so much to assure people on at least in terms of my intentions, let alone the wording of this which is very specific. People have concerns, Councillors have concerns. My goodness, Madam Speaker, it didn't even occur to me, but I am flattered, the idea that this was procedurally brilliant. Am I blushing? Honestly, I mean, for goodness sakes, I'm trying to simplify this for all. I understand there is mistrust in Council and to whatever extent which has been told to me specifically…recently or something, look, I am here to do my part and work with Council. That doesn't mean we're all supposed to agree, for goodness sakes, that's not our job. I cannot foresee it. I have never seen it. But consider this an aspect which will have public support, I guarantee you, to go ahead with what we call our strategic plan, which is going to cost some money. But let's engage some experts on this and who, by the way, Madam Speaker, for the most part, are Winnipeggers. And some are not. I excuse that those that live in Rosser and other places, Madam Speaker. I'm sure they would do their best for us as we do for them in our relationship with surrounding municipalities. I don't know what I can say, Madam Speaker, to assuage one's concerns in terms of at least my intentions. What I want is another body who has the experience to...and has the tools and has the expertise, to help us and that includes, by the way, not just those in this room and those at City Hall, help Winnipeggers express themselves for our benefit so that we have a better idea of what we are doing for Winnipeggers. It's not a contradiction to Winnipeggers to Council and City Hall having power over our decision making process. It facilitates it. Is it unique? Well, only in the extent, Madam Speaker, that the PUB, you know, doesn't have the same purview here, but has been involved with the past and conventions are set in terms of the Public Utilities Board having been involved. So I've heard…we've heard one councillor say, but the Public Utilities Board has already done that and then we've heard it in this circle as well being said today, but they shouldn't be doing that. Well, the reality is ma'am, they have and they can and if it is our will, they will. And we could work with the Provincial Government on that. I don't see...I can see why it might not happen, ma'am…Madam Speaker, but having said that I believe that this is part of the great conversation on these things as I feel that we may be getting out of step with Winnipeggers in terms of how we tax and how we spend at the City of Winnipeg. We do this at the City of Winnipeg, we do put some certain controls in the hands of un-elected agencies when it comes to further development of the cycling and pedestrian strategy of which I was a critical supporter for which I voted…of which I added to by my research and understandings. But in this case, that's not what's happening, Madam Speaker. In this case, all the power remains with us at City Hall. This facilitates a communication process which is to our benefit. Can you imagine, Madam Speaker, first of all, I've heard that terrible things were said of our administration this morning. Well, we know it's frustrating for all of us here as it is for the administration to work with us. We know that. That's part of our jobs. But I am on record, Madam Speaker, in virtually every meeting I have of the great work and the great minds of the administration, the public service that serve this city and help us make decisions. Can you imagine, Madam Speaker, what the administration would have at their disposal after the Public Utility Board hearings, after public consultation on these issues? Well, Madam Speaker, I am not going to pre-judge. I would look forward to what the administration can use after these hearings and what council can say in confidence in terms of the decision making after the fact. We would still have differences of opinion, but we will definitely have something to learn. Councillor Morantz said that it is in order to pass this. However, we don't know about the ramifications, what takes place after we do this. We do know that Public Utilities Board has made a report and given recommendations in the past and Councillor Morantz has also said that maybe it's not okay that either level of government uses rate fees to go into general coffers. Well, he just said that and it's a good point. I can't deny that that's part of the debate and on that basis I would have to say in the spirit of Councillor Morantz, perhaps I'm putting words in his mouth, but let the debate happen. Let the conversation happen and people can make a decision on this. Oh my goodness, Madam Speaker, there is a lot to talk about and there's a lot to react to here. But remember, Madam Speaker, this is not about being subject to the findings, it's about being empowered by the findings and if they're…another way of making this, which would perhaps take some procedural brilliance on behalf of us all to come to a consensus on how the Public Utilities Board can use their expertise and tools and experience to help us on the same day that we have talked about the new strategic plan for the City of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker, I am there. And in that same spirit, that's why I changed the motion, based on what we said here. So, if there is any procedural brilliance to be congratulated, I share it with all...at least to those who had stated that their concerns…well stated their concerns that influence the change. Bear in mind, Madam Speaker, as I've explained, the changes made to the motion were based on what I heard here. That's council, Madam Speaker, that's what we are here for. I did my job, I listened to my fellow councillors and on that basis, made a motion or an amendment that I believed to be better because of the debate that we had today. Madam Speaker, today, I can't do any better than that. Perhaps I could have, but I'm not at that level of procedural brilliance, Madam Speaker. But I did try and I did so with the help of my councillors here to come to some sort of a consensus, Madam Speaker, and to be at least specific. Not to say that we've all agreed or that that should ever happen, but at least to those who had respect for the intent but explained their concerns and I have reacted to that for a better motion, for a better Winnipeg, for a better Winnipeg strategic plan of which this is the onset. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Mayes, you are up for closing?

Councillor Mayes: Already? There has been a lot said. I'll turn first to the motion. I am against the motion. There is something…strong term, there's something Orwellian to get up and say, I'm for more accountability and openness, let's

give it to an unelected board and to present there you need to get intervener status. Let's look at what we've done; we've got a new committee, the Water and Waste Committee, we had an eight hour hearing, Eadie asked tons of questions, Dobson asked tons of questions, I asked tons of questions. It's livestreamed. You could come down there and speak. We then deferred another six weeks so you could come down and speak again if you're a member of the public. Then we had it at EPC, you could come down again and speak. We had it at Council, you could come a fourth time and speak if you were concerned about the water rates. All livestreamed, we're presumably livestreaming right now, so completely open if you're concerned, come on down and talk. I've gotten dozens of e-mails, others have as well. We got them during lunch hour, we were getting them saying vote against this, vote for it. So, the idea that somehow it is more open and transparent to turn it over to the un-elected PUB, I'm just not buying it as Councillor Orlikow said some hours ago, we are the elected body and we are responsible for it. And as Councillor Gilroy very accurately said, look, if I wanted to evade this I would say, oh let's give it to somebody else. There, I haven't voted for the increase, they made me do it, the third-party made me do it. But to her credit, as Councillor Gilroy said, no, sometimes you have to say, look, this is on us. We're the elected body, we have to make this call. Would we like the rate to be lower? Of course we would. Is there some provincial relief coming? Well, Councillor Gillingham asked a question about…do we do a disproportionate share…is the Provincial Government requiring us to do a disproportionate share? I can tell you as Councillor Morantz and I are the self-appointed Ag caucus here, when you talk to the Ag community, they say, yeah you're doing a disproportionate share, disproportionately small share to help Lake Winnipeg. They think the Ag community is bearing the brunt. We need to sit down with the Ag community and the new government and talk about what can we do to help Lake Winnipeg, what's fair for different jurisdictions. Councillor Browaty's done some good work in the Red River Basin, you know, it's not all a Winnipeg problem, it's not all an Ag problem, it's an international problem. So, we do need to sit down and look at what's the appropriate role. What signals could we glean then, Madam Speaker, from previous comments by elected members of the new government? Well, I noticed that a media outlet in town called…our friend, former Councillor Fielding, perhaps the competent member of City Council during his two terms in office. Two days later, they denounce the idea of the dividend that was brought in in 2011 which was actually his budget that he wrote that brought in the dividend. But if you go back to the Hansard of March 22, 2011 to look at Councillor Gillingham's remarks when that dividend was brought in, It's like a greatest hits of Councillor Fielding…did I say Gillinham? Councillor Fielding…it's like a greatest hits, he's talking about the job-killing business tax, he's talking about opposition councillors, he talks about Councillor Browaty, memory extremely good on this, Councillor Fielding said in 2011, we're not interested in doing ill conceive nitrogen removal process with anywhere between $365 million of money that is going to be wasted by the taxpayers. Essentially, dead on the number that Councillor Browaty remembered, so perhaps that's a signal of where the Provincial Government is going. We don't know for sure, we just know that that was Councillor Fielding's view at the time. So, Councillor Fielding, also in introducing the dividend, talked about the reasons behind that, others jurisdictions that the use for that, and what he also said was, we need to look at rates, you need to look at expenditures, you need to look at revenues, you look at retained earnings, you look at what capital projects can be done and also provincial requirements. So ironically here we are five years later, Councillor Fielding is now in a position to do something about those provincial requirements and I'm sure we can talk to him and the newly elected government about what they're going to require of the City of Winnipeg in terms of the sewage treatment plant upgrades, in terms of perhaps that $100 million to previous government pledge. So, I want to be clear, I'm against the motion to refer to Public Utilities Board. We've had an open and transparent process here. We are the elected officials, it's on us to make these sorts of decisions. No one in the four different meetings has come forward and said, I want this particular item removed from the capital budget, and it's not just capital that the rates support, it's operating capital and reserves and the dividend to be fair. But no one has come forward and said, we want to cut that. In fact, we have heard people saying we want more spending, we want to get rid of the vacancy management. So no one has come forward and said, this is how you reduce the expenditure side, so we are faced with a revenue hole here, we have to find a revenue. Now, Councillor Morantz and others have already said, look, if you get rid of the dividend, you are facing a six percent property tax hike on the other side. So, that's something I guess we're going to have to come back and discuss at some later point if we ever decide to get rid of the dividend. But just to be fair, this is not an easy solution where we'll just get rid of the dividend, water rate hike zero, that's it. There would be a huge hole on the other side of the budget. The other thing to mention is. I think in closing, the…Councillor Morantz makes a point, look, the statute clearly allows us to do this without review of the Public Utility Board. But there was one review in visits that I don't think we've done and which I think would be in order to talk about in our next budget cycle and that is to return to my friend Councillor Fielding's remarks back in 2011, when that was brought in in the budget, there was a provision in Appendix 3 that said, "City Council will review this policy," and this is utility dividend policy so, not a term we invented…2011 budget, "City Council will review this policy every four years within three months of each new term of Council." I may have missed that. It's certainly possible Madam Speaker, but if not, we should talk about this policy as part of our next budget process. It does raise difficult questions in terms of if we don't do a dividend, we will have a hole on the other side of the budget. But I think to be fair, we can't stand here and try to evade the question. We can't say, well someone can decide the Public Utilities Board, we've got a decision in front of us here. We have gone with the three-year plan in previous budget…three years ago we started on this three-year cycle. So, I think it's incumbent on us to say, look, we would like the increase to be less. We certainly all would. There are opportunities for it to be less if we get the $100 million, if the government follows Councillor Browaty's advice and changes perhaps the nitrogen removal process. If there are some other requirements on the south

end north end plant that are reduced. All of this may mean we're able to deliver lower water rates and go back and revise. That would be great. I'm sure we would all favour that. But the hand that we're dealt right now is that we need to get the revenue in order to meet the billion dollars that the Province has dictated we spend on these upgrades. So, unfortunately, we are faced with that dilemma and we therefore have to go forward and I will be supporting the increases that you have before us. And as I said, obviously, we've got a friend in Councillor Fielding who is now elected who certainly recognizes that the provincial requirements are part of this puzzle. We'll see what he has to say now that he's down on Broadway. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now be voting on Motion 4. We'll vote in reverse order. First is…I'll call the question on Motion 4. All in favour? Recorded vote has been called for. All in favour of Motion 4, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Dobson, Eadie, Schreyer and Wyatt

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

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

Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, yeas 5, nays 11.

Madam Speaker: Motion 4 is defeated. We'll now move onto the notice of motion. All in favour? Contrary? No one is saying anything. What's that? Pardon me? The notice of motion that was posted from last Council meeting that was brought forward. Okay, but it's obvious...I'll call the question. All in favour? This is the…Mr. Clerk, if you could clarify, it's a notice of motion.

City Clerk: We're now voting...

Madam Speaker: Well, we still had it on the table so we still need to vote on it. It was still...pardon me?

Councillor Schreyer: But I'm to withdraw it, am I not?

City Clerk: Not at this point**.**

Councillor Schreyer: I didn't mean to overcomplicate this Madam Speaker, not at all.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, shall I call the question on it or can we withdraw it at this point?

City Clerk: Yes, and for clarity, we're voting on the notice of motion that was referred and treated as an amendment to this item. Are we good?

Madam Speaker: So we're going to proceed with the vote on the notice of motion. It was not withdrawn earlier. So it does not make sense to do that at this time. So we'll call the question on the notice of motion that's not posted on the agenda today. All in favour? We'll call a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

NOTICE OF MOTION (Referred from Executive Policy Committee – Notice of Motion)
Moved by Councillor Schreyer,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS the City's sewage treatment system has allowed millions of litres of raw sewage to enter into Winnipeg's rivers in recent years;

AND WHEREAS the City acknowledges that the Province has ordered the City to upgrade the North End Water Control Centre, along with other city wide upgrades to the water and waste systems;

AND WHEREAS the increase in water rates has been justified by City officials due to the necessity of the City to upgrade its North End sewage plant and to implement its entire Capital Program;

AND WHEREAS the City's water utility is proposing a substantial increase its water rates over the next three years;

AND WHEREAS the percentage rebate/dividend that is paid to the City of Winnipeg by the Water and Waste Utility of City was increased from 8 percent to 12 percent in 2015;

AND WHEREAS it is projected that $32 million, a historic high amount, will be paid to the City of Winnipeg by the City's Water and Waste Utility and their customers;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Winnipeg request the Province of Manitoba to refer to the Public Utilities Board (PUB) and call public hearings on the following:

A) The proposed Water and Sewer Rate Increases of 2016, 2017, and 2018;
B) The approved 'dividend' from the Water and Waste Department to the Operating/Capital Budget of the City of Winnipeg;
C) The Capital Budget Program of Water and Waste, both 2016 Capital Budget and the 5 Year Forecast 2017 to 2021;
D) The environmental regulatory obligations on the City of Winnipeg in regard to its Water and Waste systems;
E) The Business Plans and all Capital project strategies/plans of the Water and Waste Department;
F) Options for Provincial and Federal Funding of the regulatory capital program requirements.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Schreyer and Wyatt

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

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

Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, yeas, 2, nays 14.

Madam Speaker: Notice of motion is defeated. We will now vote on the main item. All in favour? Call for recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Allard, Dobson, Eadie, Schreyer and Wyatt

Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, yeas, 11, nays 5.

Madam Speaker: Motion 1 for your water and sewer rate passes. Still on the Water and Waste agenda, Madam Clerk.

Item 2 – Waste Collection

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Okay, Councillor Mayes to introduce. We also have an amending motion before us. It's your motion.

Councillor Mayes: I think there is an amending motion, is that what would we speak to that first?

Madam Speaker: I think you can introduce the item. Mr. Clerk, could he speak to his short amendment at the same time? Okay.

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

THAT Item No. 2 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment dated April 14, 2016, be amended by deleting recommendation 1 and replacing it with the following:

1. *That the Council motion of February 24, 2016 be received as information.*

Councillor Mayes: I'm not sure who pulled Item No. 2, in essence we're just, I think we're receiving as information anticipating shortly from the administration some work, some plan for how we're going to deal with the fact that the waste and recycling collection contract is going to be expiring next year and we have to turn our mind to the issue of if we want to go to market, if we want to go to tender, so I think the motion is pretty straight forward.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers on the item? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I rise…I'm saddened that there is a motion now to just make…refer…accepted as information. The concept behind the motion moved by Councillor Browaty is a really good one. And whether you go with four or three sections of the City of Winnipeg, four sections approximately, the population of those four sections is probably around, like we're talking a lot of houses, a lot of residential properties. I think there's 221,000 or something homes in this city that would have this collection. And if you divided that up into four, you're talking about approximately 60,000 residential properties per section of the city by quarter. If you went with the three districts with east, south and north, you have even bigger. They're all substantially larger than the size of Brandon, Manitoba. Brandon, Manitoba, of course, has a collection service and different things that it does. It doesn't quite do the way things we do, but you divide up the city, and there is still utilizing, Madam Speaker, they'd still be utilizing the same landfill, Brady Landfill. They'd still be utilizing the same recycling plant. It's just a matter of having smaller sections, so that things could be a little more competitive. Because what we have, Madam, Speaker, as I have heard from Councillor Wyatt in the past, and he's right, basically in this country you have an oligarchy. I don't know if y'all know what an oligarchy is, I'm sure you all took some business education and understand that when you have a certain number of large firms, well, you may or may not think there is federal legislation in regards to collusion on prices and stuff, but…and we don't know, I mean, in the past it's been found to happen. Maybe not, Madam Speaker, whether it does or it doesn't, but the reality is, we only had, I believe, five bidders the last time…four or five bidders, Madam Speaker, in the…for the 2012 contract. I'm not sure that they need that massive size of scale, but my concern, Madam Speaker, is…and if you only have one or two, you can be kind of trapped into and stuck with bad service. And while we've seen some, you know, I wouldn't say tiptop results in regards to our recycle and so on, I would say we've gotten decent results. But we continue to see collection problems all across the city. So, I just, you know, I get really concerned about that. And you know, we do seek our advice from our experts in solid waste and okay, that's fine, but you know, sometimes other cities do split up different kinds of work so that there is a way to benchmark and make sure that they're all staying competitive and delivering a good service. So I am sad to see that this is going and I'm going to have to vote against it, because I believe in the principle of splitting this city up and you know, you'd still need the same number of trucks, doesn't matter whether you go one for the whole city, two for the whole city, three for the whole city, four, or five, whatever. It's the same amount of equipment and everything to pick it up. And yeah, I know, the margins, you know, on the scale, the margin could be 1% if you got the whole city. That's a lot of cash. That's true. I understand that. But you know, something has to inspire good competitiveness, and I like the idea of contracts ending at different times. You know, we're going to debate next, the whole thing about source separated organic curbside collection. You know, Madam Speaker, maybe the best way to implement it is in different sections of the city, because as you're going to hear in that speech, Madam Speaker, there are certain parts of our city that are not ready at all for curbside organic waste pickup. So I'll leave it at that. I'm going to be…I'm opposed to it. We'll see what...and I know my colleagues who are moving this motion, Madam Speaker, both sit on EPC, so they know it's coming down the pipe. I happen to sit on Water and Waste and I haven't the foggiest idea what's coming down the pipe. Isn't that great, Mayor Bowman? I don't even know. Madam Speaker, I sit on the Water and Waste Committee and there is something coming down the pipe. That's why this motion is on the table. You know? It just amazes me how things work down here at City Hall, hasn't changed. That's the same way it worked from 2010 to 2014, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My original motion was not so much to with there being a poor level of service, but rather what I have been told back when I started on Council. Back on my first term of Council, I made a point of touring all sorts of different City facilities and operations, whether it was sewage treatment plants, the landfill, as well as our contracted recycling facility. One of the things I was told at that point by our then manager of solid waste was that they felt that they got the best pricing and the best level of service by having contracts expiring at different intervals, but contracts being approximately seven years, which was again, about the lifespan of the equipment of a garbage truck. In consultation with the department, my understanding now is after extensive consultation with industry, and not just you know the mega…large providers, but also the smaller ones, not just the incumbent providers, but also ones that are not currently doing business with the City of Winnipeg, is that there has been some change in terms of the optimal size of the contract and the expiry of the contracts. My understanding is there is a report forthcoming and as a result, the motion here before us today is to receive this as information, but the debate still regarding this is still certainly coming up in the coming days and weeks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on this item? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Could we...I'd like to move referral of this matter, maybe that would be a way of dealing with this, in light of the fact there is a report coming. And then in a month from now, it will be back here.

Madam Speaker: Moving referral to committee? Referral without instructions, Mr. Clerk? We'd have to vote on that. Does Councillor Mayes have an opportunity to rebut? Would you like to rebut for three minutes or we can vote on the referral?

Councillor Mayes: I'm fine with it being referred.
Madam Speaker: Okay. So we'll call the question for the item to be referred to committee. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 3 – Garbage, Recycling and Organic Waste Programs

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes to introduce the item.

Councillor Mayes: It used to be at my committee would have three items and Councillor Lukes' would have 17, but now the balance has shifted. On we go! This is the item on...I mean, colloquially everyone just refers to this as the compost item. We had a separate eight-hour meeting on this one in this chamber last week. The week before? The week before, perhaps, with the Water Committee…the Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and Environment Committee. Very good discussion. I think some people thought Councillor Eadie was against composting and he went out of his way to say, "I'm not against composting, I'm against the flat tax proposal." It was actually kind of an interesting meeting in which everyone repeatedly had to clarify their position. But it was actually a lot of…I think 26 delegates, something like that. It was actually a very good debate. It caused me to go back and deal with the Green Action Centre and the Eco Network afterwards to try and clarify my position, try and clarify their position. So by and large, this is the motion originally put forward, only clause B amended, I believe and that is where the main focus is. Certainly to reiterate some of what I said last week, our…Moira Geer, our acting Head of Water and Waste has been very clear saying if you gave me go tomorrow on the curbside composting, I would be at your curb in four years. I would need to build the building, we would need to get the carts, we would need to distribute the carts, we would need to hire someone. So nothing is coming quickly in terms of a curbside program. That said, there are certainly other options we can look at in this coming budget or in the other budgets, you heard some ideas this morning. Compost Winnipeg is a social enterprise, I think that's exciting. Schools have some ideas. Councillor Eadie was very generous in describing my proposal in schools, he praised that. I wanted to note that. Also, we have a new translator here so let's have a few words, let's put her to work. We're at the eight-hour mark here. So we'll shift into French.

Translation of French Spoken: ...composting...I believe the City of Winnipeg can work with school division trustees to support their efforts. The Seven Oaks School Division now has many composting programs in its schools. The Green Centre…the Green Action Centre works in schools and with social enterprises. I would like to study the possibilities during the process of moving it for next year.

Councillor Mayes: So basically, I think while we're not going to be at anybody's curb for another several years at best, there are items we can look at in the interim. This isn't saying no to compost. Perhaps those who would like to do that, but I think what we're looking here is a debate on Councillor Gerbasi's motion which said look, let's restart this, let's have a bigger, broader public consultation. It's not necessarily going to be curbside, it may be something else. It may be an expanded backyard program with more subsidies for that. Something with the school, something with social enterprises, there are a lot of opportunities here. But we do need to restart. I think the earliest we could do that would be in the fall. Restart a public debate about this. It clearly got off on the wrong foot back at the start of February. So I think the

amended motion makes sense. Clearly we aren't proceeding with the plan the administration put forward. Three different options ranging from $55 to $100 and I do note that back in 2011 when that question went out to the public, there was a dollar figure given and the actual program that came in was at the absolute top of that dollar range. So when we're saying 55-100, let's not pretend that it's going to be for sure $55, it's, I think frankly, more likely to be at a higher range. That's if we were to go to the flat fee. Councillor Eadie has spoken pretty eloquently about this last week saying look, I'm not against compost, I'm against the compost program that would come down through flat rate per household. And if you did what the administration was talking about, it would also…it would have that problem. Number two, it would have the problem of it would overlook all the multi-family, the 100,000 doors that are in apartments and condo buildings. So we need to go back and take a look at our model and see what else we can do. I know all of us have heard repeatedly from people in our wards saying, I already compost, I do this already, I use it in my backyard, I use the bin from the City, why would you propose making me pay an additional $100? And that's a fair complaint. And I'll just end by saying, I was running a little after 6:00 in the morning the other day on the AT pathway, and those commuting to work on his bike, so, friend of the environment stops and I wasn't sure what he was going to start about, started talking to me about compost saying, I already do this in my backyard. So I said, look, I'm going to mention this at Council because this is not somebody…this guy was against the staff proposal. Doesn't make him anti-environment, the guy already composts, the guy is biking to work. So, if we can kind of cool down the rhetoric on this and say, look, we need to take a bigger, broader look at this. If we did do it on the property tax, this would be a bigger…the amount required to pay for this would exceed the 2.3% we've done on property taxes this year. This would be a big increase relative to what we're already doing. Maybe it's worthwhile. We need to have a better explanation from staff about why we need to do this, rather than just saying, well, in 2011, you said 50% diversion and therefore we thought, you know, we were obligated to do this which is what we heard from staff today. So we need to have a bigger debate about what kind of diversion target we want, what kind of expense we want to go to, what the real necessity or the real rational is for this, rather than just saying if you're against it, you're somehow against the environment, if you're for it, you're for the environment. I think it's much more complicated than that. But I also think if even…we don't need to wait several years, we can do things in this coming budget cycle to look at some smaller measures that will help with our composting efforts. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I do hope that you will support the amended motion, although I think the interpretation on my motion is a little bit broader than perhaps Councillor Mayes has just described it. So maybe I need to explain what he said is true, but there's also more...there is truth to what he said, but there is more truth that should be said. So, yes the motion does press the reset button on this whole issue. It does have us look at a broader consultation, it has staff come back with that consultation plan to the Water and Waste Committee. But it certainly isn't saying, we're not looking at curbside organics in the future. And I think it's really important that we don't give that message so I just want to clarify that. Like, yes, obviously it's going to take some time to build a plant, to have the consultation first, to have the discussions and if we do build…do proceed to build the plant and just set the system in place. So it is going to take time and these other…some of these other measures could be very helpful too. But what was really clear if you've been listening to the Green Action Centre's presentations and other information that we know, is that we really can't make that impact of the 50%. There is a reason we set that target. I haven't really heard anyone saying we should be lowering our target. If that's something that people in Council want to do is do less going forward in the future as a plan, I think that is kind of a strange idea given the recent climate change agreement, our government just signed this week. And just the implications and the seriousness of the threat of climate change. So to even consider that we reduce our target, you know, is maybe the timeframe, because we can't do it now for a little longer. But I just was a little baffled with that. So, anyway, as you know...excuse me, it's a little distracting, talking right there. Thank you. So, for a variety of reasons, you know, we're resetting this, we all know what happened before and I'm not going to go into it, but the motion that was there before basically cancelled all…any and all plans for public consultation, so this is resetting and starting again with a broader consultation. One of the good things about all of this that has happened is that, you know, people have been able to have a conversation about this, to think about it. The unfortunate thing is I don't think that a lot of really accurate information...some did come out in our, we had…as Councillor Mayes mentioned, we had an eight hour meeting, we had 21 delegations, we heard a lot of really good information. But I'm not really convinced that Council, let alone the public, really has enough information. There is no report in front of us. There is no information about the City's…the actual numbers, like, some of that information is well known and we heard about a lot of it at the committees, but I'm just saying, I don't think people realize how important curbside composting is. It's not just one of many things we can do, it's really the thing we can do that will get us to that 50% diversion target. And all those other things are great things that we should continue to do, but the amount of impact they're going to have is relatively small compared to a curbside program. So I just don't want to lose that threat of the importance of that one initiative. So, and also the amendment also talks about looking at funding partnerships and opportunities that could be coming along and it refers to the climate change working group which is also looking at that. So, you know, if we are going to be building a plant, and there is a new program announced the details we don't know, but the principle of 50% of green infrastructure programs costs being covered by the Federal Government, then we could significantly reduce our costs, because we know that the cost of building a plant would be part of the overall cost. Now whether it's paid with whatever fee

mechanism, it has to be paid. So it's either a tax increase, it's a flat fee, or it's fees of some sort, whether we charge for something else and not for this. Somewhere money has to come to operate it. It's not going to pay for itself. We know that. So, we also know a lot about best practices across the country. I was going to say a few things. This issue has been inaccurately framed in the way it rolled out as being about an individual fee for service that people who are paying for something and those who are already composting don't need this service. It's not about the individual…there are people riding their bikes, there's people doing various good things for climate change, but what we're saying is, you have to have a system that removes that compost from being buried in the landfill. And no matter…backyard compost is good, but people don't do it in the winter mostly. There's some really extreme composters who have five or six bins and worms and everything. There's a small number of people who are going do that and there's a small number of people who compost…there is a number of people who compost maybe over the summer, but they don't compost a lot of their materials and we know that those numbers are very high going into the landfill and that composting material in the landfill produces massive greenhouse gas emissions, massive methane as Councillor Lukes can attest you, the smell in her community. But it's seriously a big emitter. The Brady Landfill is the second largest emitter of greenhouse gases in the City of Winnipeg and it's something that we are in control of. We are putting…we collect residential waste and we put that waste there. So, you know, there's other measures we can take, social enterprises and different things. And eventually, maybe we'll start picking up other people's streams of garbage. But right now, we pick up this stream of garbage and we put it in our landfill. It's a problem that we are responsible for and we can do something about. And as I said, we cannot get to that 50% diversion rate, which Council approved in 2011. We approved a strategy to get us there. Well, we're certainly not going to get there in the timeframe we thought. There was no pilot project. The previous council deferred that. It continued to be deferred and now it's deferred again, but maybe it's good to have this broader, I think it is good to have a broader look at it and make sure we do it right, but I don't want it to wait forever. Also, there is a lot of misinformation, like recapturing gas…flaring gas from Brady is great, but when you look at the numbers, there's still going to be those composts rotting in there and creating GHGs, even with the flaring. So we need to get those answers and have that discussion and inform the public so they understand that this is really, curbside composting is a really crucial and important thing to do, regardless of all these other excellent measures that we're doing. The City of Winnipeg has done some good things. I think it's important to point out. We used to be at 18% diversion of residential garbage and that's what we're talking about. We went up to 30% by diverting the yard waste and the recycling bins and all those other measures we've taken, which is pretty good, but that's still, we're stuck at 30 and we're never going to get to 50 without picking up that third stream. And we would be picking up more than just the carrot peels like meat and other things…or even pet waste, it depends on how far we go with that. It makes a big difference and it's really the only way we can do it. Right now, we are winning the race to the bottom which is a little bit embarrassing. We have FCM coming in six weeks here and we have to, you know…these are the things we're going to be talk about. What is your diversion rate? Well ours is 30. Really, yours is 80? It's not just about comparing, but it is…we are behind and if anyone thinks we're just fine the way we are, we're at the bottom. If you're content with being at the bottom on the environment, I don't think you are. I doubt any of you are. Brandon is already doing a program, but they don't have to build a plant, because they're a small community. So they could quickly implement this. But we aren't in that same position, we are in a big city with 700,000 people, if we pick up all that stuff, we need a plant. So, you know, there is no way around that. We need that plant to do this. And if I could have…

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

Councillor Gerbasi: And, you know, I've heard a lot of arguments in the last month or two since this whole thing happened. We had eight hours of it at standing committee, we've had lots of things said in the media, but I don't think climate change is…some people just think we just don't have to deal with this and it's not even just...it's more than climate change, it's other things in our environment. But I really think that with climate change, we've got extreme weather, flooding, economic impacts across the globe and we have an obligation to do our part as a city. This is something we can control, is our landfill. We can do something about it and if we just said, well, it's only this much of a percentage of it so we shouldn't do anything, you know, if everybody did that, no one would be doing anything across the country to adjust climate change. I went to Paris with FCM for the Climate Change Talks. And they were talking about how the only way we can actually reach these targets and save our planet from serious problems, or minimize those problems, is if everybody does the little bit they can do. So, you know, that really is something we can't just ignore ethically in my opinion. And it is hard when you live on the prairies and you have endless space. You know, you can just keep doing what you did. You've got this big landfill with lots of room, but it's not just about room in the landfill. It's about forward-thinking and protecting the environment for our kids and our future. And you know, there is a lot of momentum for this. I know there was a climate change plan that…we got a new government so maybe they'll toss it out, but they were going to prohibit organics in the landfill by 2020. I think we should be preparing for that because we don't know who the government's going to be in 2020. We don't even know what this government's going to do. Maybe this government cares about the environment, too, I actually wouldn't put it past them. I've heard rumours that they also care about the environment even though they're Conservatives. I'm just kidding. No, they do. I mean, I've heard that there is people working there who are very much involved in this issue and care about it and people that were elected. So I'm

sure they're going to want to work with us on this. Okay. I'm done. Help support the amendment and let's at least have a conversation. That's all we're really asking.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor...Mayor Bowman followed by Councillor Browaty.

Mayor Bowman: There is so many places to take that discussion now. I'll just note that as Councillor Gerbasi just noted the comprehensive integrated waste management plan that was approved by Council in 2011, includes that 50% waste…that includes that 50% of waste needed to be diverted by landfills by 2020. Without a broadened organics program, City Council will not reach the 50% diversion target. I'm very pleased that we're finally at the stage for developing a public engagement plan so that Winnipeggers can have their say. As we've seen over the last couple of months, this issue has generated a very strong debate from many perspectives and I think that is great. It would be good to engage the public with an actual plan now, instead of the rumour and the conjecture that we've endured up until this point. And as you all know, I support the collection of kitchen organics in principle as an important part of the waste diversion and environmental sustainability efforts here in the City of Winnipeg. I've been clear from the start that I've been looking forward to hearing what Winnipeggers have to say on what form this may take. So I look forward to seeing what, subject to the will of Council, of course, I look forward to seeing what the public service comes up with within the next 120 days. I would also like to just conclude by saying that, I understand there was...this amended motion that is coming before us today, for consideration, had the benefit of a significant number of councillors' input and a tremendous amount of compromise from a variety of perspectives on this issue. And it may have been a bumpy road to get to where we are here today as a council, but I do want to acknowledge and compliment each of the members who contributed their input into a very difficult issue and one that, quite frankly, I don't believe has been adequately addressed in previous years. And so we're having a very important discussion and debate about how to move forward. So I obviously will be supporting the motion or the report.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We've seen large increases to water and sewer rates. Frontage fees continue to go up. Property taxes 2.33% per year. Garbage fees were introduced a number of years ago and who knows where they're going. At the end of the day, there is one taxpayer, and there is extreme fatigue out there. They've had enough. So what are we proposing now? We're talking about a new, feel good green program to do curbside composting. The cost of this program, no matter how you slice it, if you're going to do curbside compost program where you're picking it up at the end of your driveway, it's going to cost between $55-100 per household per year. You could set it up so that it's based on property taxes. So you know what, people who have more valuable properties pay more, people with less valuable properties pay less. If there is grants from the Federal Government, it's still taxpayer dollars that's going to bring in this ridiculous program. Go ask your constituents, perhaps Councillor Gerbasi, you're different, but everybody else, ask your constituents, they don't want this expensive program. I don't see it. Go talk to your residents, stop at the grocery store on the way home, the coffee shop. You have to listen to your colleagues. We have an opportunity now to put a bullet through this program today and end it. Instead, we're going to spend how many months debating an absolute ridiculous scheme, it's a scheme, to get more money out of people for a program they don't want. Why? Brandon's program is much more affordable. It's not year round. That's great. I'm really disappointed with the Water and Waste Committee for the amendment that was brought forward. This is going to waste so many more hours of everyone's time and energy. You know, we had the Green Action Centre come out. You know what, if we're actually going to get meaningful improvements, we need to encourage people to consume less. This will do none of that. I think the idea of pursuing a program that perhaps deals with the actual amount of material landfill, could actually bring savings to those smaller families and people who do the right thing. You know, pay to throw type program. And make it open and make it transparent. We're going to take the $58 off your bill. We're to take the $85 off your property taxes and you're going to see a reduction in the mill rate. You're going to see a reduction in your taxes. Make it open, make it transparent, no hocus pocus. And then people who throw away more, are charged more. It's a pure user-pay system. And still, we don't…I mean, yeah, there would be a huge cost if we introduced a third channel to it. Forget that. But I mean, just reduce the volume significantly, the amount of material going in the landfill. I mean, you go to the grocery store today, I mean, how much produce in your home gets thrown out? How much produce from the grocery store gets thrown out? It's huge. The amount of produce that actually gets consumed at the end of the day, you know, makes its way to our city or is grown here? Very, very small. So again, I think there are far better ways to do this. I would support perhaps, encouraging more backyard composting. If we continue a program to offer backyard composting bins at a subsidized price that is covered by the taxpayers in Winnipeg, again, there is no such thing as a free compost bin or a reduced price compost bin, it's being paid for. But I could support something along those lines, but any curbside compost program is a huge cost to taxpayers and in my opinion, from the people I've spoken to and my reading of my constituents, nobody wants this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Schreyer followed by Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Look, I know what my constituents are saying and I know what Winnipeggers are saying about this. Having said that, this is a future-oriented issue that we can't deny. I also know that as well, Madam Speaker, because we are talking about...well, we're talking about our environment. We're talking about the sustainability of our environment, of our economy, of our society. But Madam Speaker, I want to vote for this, I want to, because basically we have to look at solutions. And because it talks about broad public consultation, of course, we all know today that I'm in favour of broad public consultation on those issues that are important to us. Today, I offered such a proposition. Now, doing so, one might consider unusual. Unlike other municipalities, we're exempted, but nonetheless, to engage the Public Utilities Board on broad public consultation, that didn't pass. But I'm in favour of broad public consultation and in fact, Madam Speaker, in this case, we talk about broad public consultation, including dealing with develop a city-wide program to reduce organic waste from commercial, industrial and institutional waste and report back to Council in 180 days. Well, I think that's important, Madam Speaker, if we're going to have an equitable and sustainable solution here. In fact, I think it's ridiculous to go ahead and have curbside if we're not going to include industrial and institutional waste and the reason for that, Madam Speaker is because it's more feasible. We know it's more feasible to have organized industrial and institutional organic waste. We know that. It's more efficient, it's more cost efficient. And it allays peoples' fears justifiably, in terms of putting the onus on the backs of private citizens for owning a home, for living in a house. Madam Speaker, we have mentioned priorities today. And you know, in terms of effect to go from 30% to 50%, the issue is at what cost? And we would learn from the broad public consultation at what cost, do we go from 30% to 50%? Now, Madam Speaker, we're talking about our obligation to our environment and to our resources. And on a grander perspective in terms of what we need to do, in order to sustain ourselves through, into less of a fossil fuel-using society, and in that respect reducing fossil fuels, reducing pollutants into the air and into our system, Madam Speaker, there is more important things. There really are. And they're not actually in here. Madam Speaker, we're talking right now about rail line rationalization. Fantastic conversation we should be having. Madam Speaker, this is…we're at an era now of talking about rail line rationalization Winnipeg due to that Charet task force. You know, among other things we need to deal with, Madam Speaker, in terms of ethical obligations to our society and to our future, when it comes to getting out of the fossil fuel age, when it comes to pollution, Madam Speaker, the incredible burden on pollution and fossil fuels in our society has to come with, unfortunately, the inter-city transportation industry and how we've evolved away from the natural efficiencies of rail line transportation. And, Madam Speaker, including the fact that we've never had a discussion in our society on this side of the ocean about electrifying our rail system, Madam Speaker, we're doing the opposite in this country. When it comes to our obligations to our environment, we are in fact dividing up and conquering to our detriment. We're actually getting rid of spur lines to communities throughout this country when we're within a generation of needing them yet again because of the prohibitive cost of oil based transportation and oil based highway maintenance. Madam Speaker, the effects of which are actually scary to our environment, and our sustainability, Madam Speaker, this is a priority. But I feel we're missing the point. I'm telling you what, Madam Speaker, to let's show our position to the people of Winnipeg. One day, we're not…one day, any day call a special meeting, Madam Speaker, and I'll be there. I will vote for this broader public consultation because I approve of it, but I know, Madam Speaker, that if we call broad public consultation on our taxation revenue and expenditure, we'd have a great conversation with Winnipeggers Manitoba…Madam Speaker. And, it's more important to Winnipeggers. It's more important to our governance. And on that basis, I feel if we do this first, we're not really dealing. First of all, Madam Speaker, I don't know who else has talked about these other environmental issues that are priorities as well. I don't know where we are in terms of public consultation that I've been asking for today. I've put out an amendment to make it work, Madam Speaker. I put out, as Councillor Wyatt said, I put out an olive branch. Now, I don't know Madam Speaker, as far as I'm concerned, I always hold the olive branch. Why wouldn't I? Just happens to be, Madam Speaker, sometimes I just have to defend myself with it and it looks like, you know, we're on the attack, but in fact, Madam Speaker, I have to explain myself. And on that basis, I think we've got our priorities crossed. This is my understanding by talking to Winnipeggers. This is important, I actually would like this public consultation to see where we're at in terms of what I think is being misrepresented, underrepresented in terms of peoples' concerns and priorities and the discussion that can take place regarding prioritizing the industrial and institutional waste and how that is prioritized chronologically. Madam Speaker, let us have a broad public consultation on taxation revenue, on expenditures as it applies to flat rates and water rate hikes and percentage dividend increases. Let's have that broad public consultation, let's start that first. And then, with my olive branch, as said, or my willingness to compromise today, I'm willing to support this as well. Let's see where we're at Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Next is Councillor Allard and then we'll go on to Councillor Gillinham.

Councillor Allard: I'm going to make my remarks in French.

Translation of French Spoken: First of all, I see that our audience has left. I suppose this has been a long meeting, but I wanted to speak to you regarding this proposal.

I would first like to thank the Environmental Committee, who amended the original motion, which I couldn't have supported. The original motion would have meant immediately cancelling the consultations regarding the need for

curbside composting in Winnipeg. From the start, once the Administration's plan was made public, I expressed my position regarding the delivery of home services based on a fixed charge. The public spoke out almost entirely against the plan that had been proposed by the municipal administration.

I'm happy that the Environmental Committee has seen the value in broadening the consultation process in order to look at other options. Specifically, my office has done a lot of research regarding the way composting is done in other municipalities. We particularly like the model that is in place in Toronto. It's a system where you pay for what you throw out, essentially. So, there is the concept of charging people for waste, as well as of promoting recycling and composting as means of reducing waste. This new proposal puts forward a broader consultation process, integrated to discussions with school divisions, and is now a proposal I could support.

To be crystal clear, I would like to express my position by stating that I believe composting must be done in Winnipeg, but in a way that works for our residents. Particularly, it would be ideal to find a system that takes into account people's specific situations, such as whether someone has a fixed income, or already composts at home – which, from what I understand, is the best way to compost, if people are willing. Although this type of composting always has its limitations. For instance, those who have chosen to do home composting cannot compost meat and bones.

Thank you to all of those who contributed to the discussion. I think that, generally speaking, I see support from Council regarding the need to go forward with some type of composting program. But I believe that now, with a broader consultation process, and with many having expressed their reservations regarding the plan that was put forward by the Administration in a private conversation with Council members... Now, I believe that we are going forward in the right direction. So, thank you... Almost 4:55, this has been a long Council meeting, but I think this is an important issue. On that note, I intend to support this amended proposal.

Councillor Allard: So just…in short, I intend to support this amended motion thanks to all who have contributed to the discussion, and let's move together with the public and Council in finding a solution that works for everybody. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Gillingham followed by Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to support this motion, only because it is not a decision to implement a program that will impose a $55-100 fee on every rate payer. I raise…I kid you not, last night as I was turning over my compost in my backyard black bin that I received from the City years ago, at a subsidized price, I was thinking about this motion that is before us. And it reminded me how I heard overwhelmingly and a lot of other colleagues said the same thing, from residents in my ward, that do already compost in their backyards, their strong opposition to a program that...the original program or the program that was being talked about previously. At our last Council meeting, I stood and I raised this point and I want to reiterate again and I think we really…if I could take it to the higher level. I think part of the discussion that has to take place is to determine whether or not, not is this something that we feel we should do or ethically we should do for the sake of the environment, is this a core service that the City of Winnipeg should be obliged to provide for its citizens? Because what the City often…if you look at the history of the City and you find that there is good programs that come along, but sometimes it's mission creep. And mission creep costs. It costs the City, taxpayers dearly in the long run. And so all of this has to be…all that is looked at has to be...what also has to be included is the associated costs, not only of implementing the program, but of the lifetime costs of a program as well. But I think we have to go back and I hope the discussion somehow, you know is determined and maybe it comes to our Provincial Government as well. Sometimes the Provincial Government in their legislation, through the Winnipeg charter really kind of lays out what some of the core services of the City…municipality, must provide. I still want to know that question…the answer to that question, is this a core service that the City of Winnipeg must provide? At present, when I look at a list that was put together years ago, I didn't see it there, so it will be interesting to have that discussion. I think that's an important part of the discussion. Some of the...I'm not in favour of everything that this motion offers, but there are some things that I do appreciate about the idea of improving the existing program of subsidized organic bins for Winnipeg residents. I'm happy to see Councillor Mayes his involvement here as the City School Board Liaison and working with the city schools to determine the potential organics program that they could participate in as well. So I will be supporting the motion because we're going to have a chance to have more discussion on this, and this will come back to committees and Council as well. But we really do need to have an understanding, not of what will the program cost to implement, but beyond that, what will the program cost over the lifetime and fundamentally, is this a core service or is this really mission creep, because of what is the environmental pressures that we're facing today?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: In support of the amendment, I want to congratulate the standing committee. I know there was a lot of debate on this, but I think that they came up with a solution and we are going to be able to talk about…have greater discussions regarding composting. And I think even us as councillors will be able to learn and ask questions. I think

that's important. Because I do believe it is a core service. We are taking that stuff right now, hauling it away to our Brady Landfill. So, I believe it is a very core service of what the City of Winnipeg should be doing. And I want to talk, this was the first time I'd ever seen a bunch of children and youth come to a committee to talk about their future. And about what they'd like to see in our city. And I think that that's very important. I'm glad the standing committee heard what they had to say and valued their opinions on this issue. Because we know that the composting that we're doing in our backyard and I'm one of those people that compost, it is not going to get the levels of greenhouse gases that we need to reduce. That's not going to do it. We need to be able to compost the meat, the dairy, the chicken bones and all those things to be able to really get to the issue that we're dealing with at hand. So I think we're going to have tough conversations. I think we're going to learn a lot. We're also going to be able to go and learn, Matt Allard talked about Toronto's model and in some cases some of these citizens actually have seen a reduction in the cost because of the way that the structuring works. So there could be, you know, I don't know, but we're going to look into that if there is opportunity for even reduction for some citizens that are on fixed income or seniors that have very little garbage, so we'll be able to see if we can do that. We're also now going to be able to go and see what the regulations of the Federal Government is going to mean for us. And we all know we have a different Provincial Government, but it really is going to boil down to the Federal Government and what regulations are going to come down to the Provincial Government and of course, us municipally. So I think that that's a key, important part to this. But I also believe that every level of government has a responsibility to deal with their greenhouse gas emissions and this is one way that we need to look at this. If this is the second largest contributor to greenhouse gasses in the province, this is definitely part of the solution. So I want to commend the committee for doing this work, and I know we're going to have some tough discussions, but I also think that we're going to learn a lot, we're going to learn from other cities and see what they're doing and also going to be able to learn what is going on with the Federal Government, so this gives us the ability to do that. So thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: I'll just rise briefly on this. I'm in support of this amendment. I'm very much in support of this amendment. I do believe that how we deal with our waste is a core service that the City must provide. How we deal with it and what manner we deal with it, you know, there's options and that's what we're looking at. But I also know that, you know, if there is any way we could reduce the size of Brady Landfill by 40%, you know, that would be a very positive, very positive step forward in how we're managing our waste. And again, like sewer and water, dealing with our waste is again another problem that every city, municipality, is facing around the globe. We are creatures that produce waste and we need to, as the world and population fills up, and as we talk about density and increasing and our growing city, we must deal with it in an effective way. I'm very much looking forward to seeing how these plans, or these consultations result in what sort of options are available. So this is a core service and we have to look at ways of dealing with it. Cost effectively, but for the long-term and for the future. So I'm very supportive of this motion. Thanks for the changes and the hard work the committee did on it.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Morantz, you have the floor.

Councillor Morantz: Again, just briefly, Madam Speaker, I do want to say that this particular issue brought to my office as well as to many others, probably more feedback or just as much feedback as any other issue we've had. And most of the feedback I received was from people who already compost in their yards and didn't want to have to pay for it or buy earth that they were already producing themselves, and I think it's important just to acknowledge that we've listened to those people and that's why we're doing this today. So I will be supporting the motion. And the concern really was in my mind, was that the very people who believe in composting, who do it themselves already, were the people who are complaining about the ideas that were being put forward. So I'm really glad and I do applaud the work of the committee for coming back with a reasoned path to keep this idea alive as to how we can better deal with our composting. But again, I think it's important for all of our constituents who were so really upset by what they had heard, to know that we have listened and we're going back to the drawing board. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I now want to draw your attention to Motion No. 5 that's being circulated at this moment. It's a motion by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Eadie. And Councillor Wyatt will be introducing his motion at this time. If anyone wishes to speak to the motion following that can do so. He's introducing the motion right now. Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Wyatt, you have the floor.

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

THAT Item No. 3 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment dated April 14, 2016, be amended by adding a bullet iv. to Recommendation 1.B as follows:

1. B. iv. That any introduction / implementation of a Curbside SSO (Kitchen Waste) program, which is not optional for homeowners, not derive its funding source in any way from a user fee or flat tax.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And it's been a very interesting debate. I welcome the amendment that Councillor Gerbasi moved. This is a further amendment to improve the amendment to the amendment. And I have to admit, Councillor Gerbasi has indicated a number of times in a number of speeches about how the debate got off to the wrong start, and information was given out of the council seminar and information was given to the media and that got everybody all worked up and everything. Well, guilty as charged. I was the one. I was the one who handed it to the...I hate to say it. But…no, actually I don't hate to say it. I'm glad the public got the information so that we could actually have the debate and discussion rather than kind of receiving it through a bill in the mail and finding out that way, which is where we were heading. And I think this is something which clearly has struck a chord. Folks out there I think are feeling pressure in terms of everything that they have to pay for, and this is another cost. We've heard overwhelmingly from residents across our communities and across the city who felt strongly that they're participating already in organic curbside…organic diversion away from the garbage at the curb. And that they were going to be penalized by the very fact that a program was going be rolled out and they were going to be charged from anywhere from $55-100. You know, we as a council voted to start the new program back in 11, and at the time, we also called for annual reviews or reviews periodically which did not occur, which this motion is clarifying. As well, Madam Speaker, we knew that we would have to revisit this question in terms of the fees and the charges and therefore, this debate would come back. The fact of the matter is, we are charging...we've increased our taxes on the property bill, we're increasing taxes on the water and sewer rates, we're increasing taxes and charges right across the board. This is one extra hit. This is another tax. This is another charge. And it just is another cost of living in the home and living inside the City of Winnipeg. And you know, I think it's just too easy, it's too easy for us to introduce another tax, to introduce another charge on homeowners, on residents. Just too easy. So easy that at that seminar it was made very clear that this is…you know, you have option A, option B and basically option C. One was $55, and then there was another one a little bit higher and then there was the $100 option, the gold plate one, which included, we were told pet waste. And that was the road we were going down. And it appears that Councillor Gerbasi wants to put us back on to that road. Well, I don't want to go back on to that road, I don't want to get on that train. I want to say that the people of this city are getting taxed harder and harder to pay for all the roads and infrastructure that's crumbling and they understand that, but now to put another tax on top of them for organics? And to tell them the tax is coming, and just pick which one you like? This is the concern, Madam Speaker. This will clarify the debate once and for all. There will be no extra flat tax. There will be no fee for this service. If the department can find a way, through the existing tax that they already have and through efficiencies and through the contracts that we're going to be issuing through the tendering process to provide an extra level of service, wonderful. That's terrific. And there is nothing wrong with that. Private sector is out there to bid and they may be able to respond. But for us to turn around and to say we're going to add another charge and another level of service that we're going to have to pay for, there is only one rate payer, I said it earlier today, I'm saying it again Madam Speaker, is absolutely unacceptable and we heard that over and over and over again from the homeowners and the rate payers of this city in the last two months. We are going to have a lot of challenges as we go forward, Madam Speaker as a city. We know that. We know we have challenges with regards to our roads and our infrastructure. We know we have challenges with regards to the sewers. And we know we have challenges in terms of the growth that is impacting us, the new strategic infrastructure demands that are being placed on us. Whether it be for Chief Peguis Trail in the north, or you know, build William Clement Parkway in the west or what have you, the demands are going to be there because of the growth of this city. The demands are there, others who are pushing for and arguing for rapid transit and more rapid transit, like some of us have been arguing for, that is going to be a cost. These are going to be huge challenges for our city in terms of where we're going to find the funding. We're struggling right now. We're struggling right now to find funding sources, whether it be rapid transit, all the environmentally good things we want to do. We have to make choices. We have to make choices. To go down this road now and to say we're going to slap the homeowners with another $55-100 charge on their bill, is something, Madam Speaker, which I think folks have said is enough. We want to build a city, we want to fund solutions to infrastructure, we want to find funding for sewers, we want to stop the waste from going to the river, but in terms of priorities, this has been noted by many and many across the city as one of the lower priorities. It would be wonderful. It would be wonderful if we could do this. And it would be wonderful if we could do it without having a negative impact on the rate payers. It would be terrific. But the reality is there is going to be a cost associated with this program. Now, if you also go back to the report, Madam Speaker, from 2011, it talked also extensively about some of the other challenges in terms of waste diversion which seems to be…seems to have kind of fallen off to the side. Why? I guess it's just harder to tackle those issues. It's harder to tackle the industrial and the commercial waste. We're partly…partly it's because we're not in that business. The City of Winnipeg is not in the collection business. We're 80-90% of that is collected by the private sector. So that means we have to find some solutions here to start addressing that. Other cities have. Other cities across this country go to other communities and when you have a recycling bin in a restaurant, or in a fast food shop or what have you, it's truly a recycling bin, it just doesn't go into the same waste receptacle at the bottom below the surface, which is the case now in the city. Because there's really…unless the corporate sector wants to go down the road of recycling, there is no incentive, there's no stick, there's no carrot. And we task the public service to start to look at those options. And what have we seen back regarding that? Nothing. When we

asked it in the seminar, well, we were told, you know, 80-90% is collected by the private sector councillors, it doesn't involve us. What? They drive on our roads. They access our roads. They access our right of ways. They move waste. They require provincial licensing to operate. They require all sorts of requirements and licensing levels on them, surely to goodness, we can find a way to divert that waste first and foremost from the landfill. That's waste that is right now going into the landfill, whether it be our landfill or the one outside the city in Rosser. Also there was another section of waste they spoke of, 240…340,000 tons of waste, Madam Speaker, at that point, going into the landfill, that they targeted that could be diverted. Also from contractors and demolition as well. We know we've had lots of work going across the city. Lots of renewal work and a lot of demolition work. Right now, we have a city where we have a couple contractors who do recycle road material, but we don't require it in our contracts, ironically. We're getting…we don't require crushed aggregate which is recycled. Quite often they're out getting new aggregate. Fresh aggregate, versus recycled aggregate. There is all sorts of things we could do as a city to ensure that that waste is not going into the landfill which is indeed the case right now. Our own water and waste department issues a tender every year, or every couple of years, to acquire aggregate, fresh clean aggregate, to pour into the landfill to layer it. Why aren't we using recycled aggregate or formerly used aggregate, crushed? No, we're actually taking from gravel pits outside of the city and then dumping it in the landfill to be able to layer the landfill. Well, that's great. Those are little things that we can do, Madam Speaker, that the children that were spoken about here, and we all love children, right? They all would say the same thing. Why are you doing that City of Winnipeg? Why are you doing that? Why are we doing it? Why aren't we pursuing the private sector? Why aren't we going after the industrial users? Why aren't we saying to the business community, you're part of the solution with us? It's just too easy to go after mom and pop. It's just too easy. This motion puts an end to that. This motion says let's go down the road, let's figure out how we can do the organics, but don't tax the homeowner. If this is so important to the city, maybe we shouldn't be freezing the business tax like we've been doing all along or reducing the rate if this is so important. Everybody else is paying. So these are the challenges. We're going to have to find some creative solutions to make this happen. I'm 100% there. But don't do the cheap and easy thing to do, which is to hit the homeowner once again. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Gerbasi, your opportunity to speak to Motion 5.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I guess we're getting served some more apple pie right now, but I again, do not see it as apple pie. I see this as more procedural cleverness to distract us from what came through a proper process of eight hours, at least, of that committee, another day spent at EPC with delegations, a motion well thought out and discussed with members of Council. You know to go forward with a broader consultation plan, which it seemed like most of Council, we're almost at the end of the debate here and most of Council supportive of moving forward with this broader consultation plan, part of which would discuss the funding options broadly. But what this does is sort of…you know, it limits any options and you know, obviously right now it's unpopular to charge a new fee. We don't even know what this is going to look like. So this sounds good and I'm sure there will be tweaks that will make this sound good, whatever. But I urge you as councillors to understand the complexity of this. This really undermines the public consultation process too because first of all, the staff is only coming back to us with this motion with a plan for public consultation so we can have further discussion at that time. Why do we need in the 11th hour at 5:30, when everyone's tired and wants to go home, we're suddenly going to limit all the funding sources and make a complex decision about a program that no one's even agreed to do yet, or maybe won't. You know, it's just…it's crazy to me to say that the funding source could not be from certain things. Like, let's let the discussion happen. That's what the motion which the committee agreed to, which EPC has agreed to, which is here in front of us now, is let's have a discussion, let's have the staff come forward with the plan of a broad discussion. Why pull different things out and say you can only talk about this or you can only look at that way? We're not…the staff understand they're not bringing forward the exact plan they had before. That was made clear. So really, this is another diversion and I'm hearing mixed messages from this as well. You know, in Councillor Wyatt's speech we just heard, you know, we should focus on all these other things. We shouldn't…the fact is, this is a core reason, the core reason for this type of program is that it's our responsibility because we pick up residential waste now. Yes, we should look at other things going forward in the future and we already are doing things in partnership with communities and groups and small things, but this is what we do is we pick up your garbage right now. Do we want to pick it up and keep bearing the compost? Or do we want to consider if we want to expand that to something that diverts more waste? That's what we need to be discussing. Not pulling things out and limiting and saying, you know, you can only do this. You know, this is going make a great tweet. And depending on if the media is still awake, how they're going to frame this. Councillor Wyatt is going to look like he's the populous guy that he is, which is great. But like we have a responsibility to have a proper public consultation process. This will appeal to people who want to kill this, who want to see curbside composting not happen. Those people might support this motion. I know how Councillor Wyatt and I have worked together a long time so I understand his thinking. And it's smart, but it's not necessarily right because we should have a broader consultation first. We should come back with that plan before we start taking things out that we're allowed to do at the last minute of 5:30. So please do not vote for this motion. If you have any brain cells left, just remember that one line, do not vote for this motion. Let's not limit ourselves. Let's wait till they come back with their consultation plan. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Earlier today, I think I heard most of my colleagues bring up the fact that they didn't like the idea of a dividend out of the water and sewer utility because it's not open and transparent. Well, you know what? Don't fool Winnipeggers, the cost of the curbside organic program, no matter how you deliver it, is $55-100 per household. The Chair of the committee thinks it's probably closer to the higher end. He's probably right. Don't vote for this. Don't try to sneak it and force it down Winnipeggers necks or down their…force it down Winnipeggers…because again, this is not open. This is not transparent. The cost is the cost. I mean, if there are efficiencies to be found within the water and waste utility, those should be used, those should be found, those should be done tomorrow and those should be used to decrease the current garbage and recycling fee that we have at the moment. I actually sent an e-mail earlier today to the department. A good chunk of the $55-58 fee now over the first seven years was to cover some of the capital cost of acquiring the bins in the first place. We own those bins now. People have those bins. There should be some savings in the next contract, potentially, for homeowners. I would like to get that information out and again, I did contact the department just this afternoon so I'm not expecting a reply yet. Don't vote for this. I'm agreeing with Councillor Gerbasi, yes...I don't think this makes sense.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, so, I'm starting to think Councillor Gerbasi doesn't like apple pie. Anyway. So, and just one more, I'm going to be voting against Motion 5 because I believe it's putting the cart before the horse and that's pun intended. Composting cart before the horse. So anyhow, no, I just think it's…this motion is premature. I believe the report coming up from the committee from the environment addresses the issue of financing, which we will be looking into. I think everyone has heard loud and clear the feedback coming from Council and the public. And I believe that the motion coming up from committee addresses peoples' concerns in a way where we're going to have a consultation, it's going to be broader, it's going to consider many of the things that we've heard in the public and the media. So I urge you to vote against Motion 5 and I urge you to vote for the motion coming up from the committee on the environment. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Eadie. Councillor Eadie, you can speak to the main item and Motion 5 as you have not spoken yet.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I actually waited. I just wanted to hear others speak, Madam Speaker. Somebody is going to have to suspend the rules to allow me to speak a bit longer. I wanted to, Madam Speaker, first of all, I just want, you know, I wrote this motion, the original one. And what I did was, Madam Speaker, is I was listening to not just my residents, but I was listening to all the different perspectives from all the councillors. As the Mayor said, there has been a lot of work to try to balance out things. Now, the motion that I originally wrote, the clause B section, Madam Speaker, clause B was referring to stopping it as it was going. If you read the clause and actually understood it, it wasn't changing the garbage master plan. It wasn't changing it. As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, one of the reasons I called for the review, that's A, clause A was actually really important, because clause A is to have a serious review. Not just a statistical report at the end of the year, Madam Speaker, to actually have a serious review because there are parts of this city where this current plan is a failure. A failure. Yes, we are picking up more recycle from the areas I'm going to be talking about in a moment, but there needs to be a serious review as to how we can fix the issues that we currently have with just our garbage and recycle plan first. So I just want to make that clear. So clause B, when it was written, it was stopping as it was going to roll out, the consultation, to put an end to it, but it didn't say, that we would change the policy. There was no amendment to our policy from 2011 passed, Madam Speaker. So, in there it does call for some kind of organics program related to curbside. To look at it. There was actually a call for a pilot. Hasn't happened yet. There was a call for four R depots. They're behind a couple of years, a couple of few years. We're behind in that policy plan. There was an action plan, and then things are supposed to go forward, but the policy is there. People didn't get…they totally lost it, Madam Speaker. And then C, D and E were written to say, hey, listen, we need to continue to move forward because we have to take responsibility, Madam Speaker. This is what I was hearing from people. I see this in business. You know, just because we own Brady doesn't mean the city, the people who pay taxes in this city, that's businesses, that's industry, that's residents, apartment dwellers, condo dwellers, that's everybody in Winnipeg. We create an organic waste in this city and what goes to Rosser is also our responsibility as Councillor Wyatt eloquently mentioned. We do need to take responsibility for that methane gas going into the atmosphere. So that is not the issue. The issue is, that was there and we had those things in there. So I just want people to understand. I appreciate public engagement, a much broader perspective, and a, you know…but there was just a misunderstanding of what that motion was trying to balance everybody's concerns around the table that I hear, so that we could all sort of move forward. I tried. Tried. So Councillor Gerbasi put an amendment on there, we have what she calls a last-minute amendment. My biggest concern is a flat fee that penalizes people on low income. Some of those…lots of those people on low income are composting. Why do we need to have to tax them more? I don't know. They're taking responsibility for their footprint in this city, in this country, this world. And that's lots of seniors on fixed income. We heard from a woman who got a 67 cent a month raise on her old age security, Madam Speaker. Wow. She's composting. So, you know, and that's all over the place. So, I'm

glad there is a broader view, but I want to make it clear, I seconded this amendment with Councillor Wyatt because you know what? I can afford...you know what, I would optionally buy into an organic curbside pickup. I'd pay for it. I can afford it. There are many people in Winnipeg who will do that if it's an option, but this motion is saying if it's not optional, we're going to force everybody to pay a flat fee, user fee. User fees, let's talk about that. User fees in Toronto. Now here's the thing, right, so I have families, four, five, six-kid families, living in houses. How much garbage are they creating? Lots man. How many diapers? Wow. There are young families all over the inner city and you're going to start charging them. They're not even going to pay. I'll tell you what they're going to do. They're going to throw the garbage in the back lane, Madam Speaker. That's what they're going to do. We need to ensure that if we're going to move ahead with a plan, that it somehow sustainable and works for the whole city. And that's my biggest concern. There are ways to fund it and to not to say you don't want to go with a not flat fee. You know, we heard from Saul Burrows, totally wants do it, but he gets it, the flat fee, a more progressive perspective, pay what you can afford. And like I said, we got people all over this city, we heard from some of them who work for a lot of these green organizations, they're making good money. They're willing to pay. They would pay a little extra for an optional program, I'm sure they would. Because one of the things they say, Madam Speaker is, you know, the system is bigger. If you make everybody pay into it, makes it sustainable. Well, you know, maybe some people have to pay a little more money to move to a curbside. I know that voluntarily in the business sector, we have a company that was doing it, they didn't like the stink, but I mean there was a composter, a private business, maybe with a new provincial government, they'll get a license, but there is nothing making commercial, industrial, there is nothing making it mandatory. We should be moving down that road. And I think we should and could have the ability to do so, Madam Speaker. So I don't know what to say...I'm part of this amending movement. I just want everybody to know I tried to balance everybody's concerns. There is actually nothing in this motion that changes our policy established in 2011, which I voted against because they went with the flat fee only on residential because they didn't want to put it on the property taxes because those poor commercial business operations pay property taxes, too, and heaven forbid, that they should pay for it. They're selling us this organic material, Madam Speaker. Business and industry selling it to us. So, I mean I'll leave it. I just wanted to end with something though because you look at the future, Madam Speaker...

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

Councillor Eadie: I don't know if you all recall the movie, Phantom of the Paradise, but Madam Speaker, garburators. That's what life is all about, garburators. Now, make that statement. I make that statement, let me say something. The north end sewage plant, we just debated the water. We just debated the water, okay. They are proposing an anabolic digestive system at the north end sewage plant. If I put organic vegetable waste down my drain and throw my dog poop in my toilet when I bring it back and picked it up, because I'll tell you, there is a lot of dog poop that just lays out there anyway, it just goes into the grass and on the sidewalks, on my shoes. But, Madam Speaker, that could be the future, too. Who knows what the future is? Don't laugh at the garburator idea if you got anabolic digestive systems in your sewage plants. South end plant, I don't think they were proposing that. But what happens is, you bio solids at the end are inert. There's no gerMs It's easier to deal with, you could use it for landfill. Really, you could. So, you know, there's all these ideas. The last thing I want to leave you with, my assistant Aaron has a van, he can take five councillors, or anybody you want and he will drive you up and down the back lanes of my ward and you drive down there and you tell me, fellow councillors, Mayor, you tell me, are we ready to do a curbside pickup out of those back lanes given the way it looks right now? Please tell me. I invite you. Anytime he will get the van, he will drive you. You should go with him. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Schreyer, your opportunity to address Motion 5.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The amendment is worthy of debate because it gives context to what some councillors would like to see. Bear in mind, Madam Speaker, we shouldn't be surprised by that, because you know, whether we know it or not, and I think we understand that during the course of the debate on this issue, various councillors have sort of been projecting their priorities, their preferences for outcome. Councillor Gerbasi as an example had said, you know, it's about the consultation will be about how we implement curbside recycling. I don't believe I'm putting words in her mouth, there's nothing offensive about that. That is a priority for many people who are supporting this motion in general both in Council and outside of Council. So having said that, Madam Speaker, that's not my priority. And I'm willing to project my preferential outcome and that being that we have a really good analysis and discussion on how we will be involving industrial waste in the process and how that will take part in the cost-sharing, also, the type of financing, the format for financing, intrinsic to the whole thing. And that is why the motion is worthy. Not only that, Madam Speaker, my preferred outcome at least in terms of priority of discussion lends itself to an amazing efficiency. Bear in mind, Madam Speaker, if we concentrate as we move forward on this, on industrial waste, we do not have to overhaul our entire recycling transportation system in this city. Bear that in mind. We don't have to do that. And Councillor Browaty gets his way. And so do many others in terms of going forward on recycling. The expense, Madam Speaker, of overhauling our entire truck system, transportation system for the composting is going to be, well, to some people prohibitive, but it's still worthy of the debate. Now speaking of the debate, Madam Speaker, I want to know how

much this broad consultation process will cost. I'm not saying it's...I'm not prejudging this process, Madam Speaker. Not really. I mean I have some...we all have some trepidation, skepticism, we all have our own preferences or assumptions as to what is going to take place. But Madam Speaker, how much will this broad consultation cost? Not because it cost something, but in relation to the realities and our wishes by us and by Winnipeggers for broad consultation on priority issues of Winnipeggers, Madam Speaker. Well, that's a concern for councillors when it comes to a broad consultation on taxation and expenditure, on flat fees, on water rates, on dividends. Very good question. It's a concern of councillors how much broad consultation can cost. Having said that, Madam Speaker, that is not going to deter me from making a decision on broad consultation on these issues. I do like the amendment because it does give context to the program and gives confidence to many Winnipeggers in terms of what we're going to do. Bear in mind, Madam Speaker, if we don't talk about how we're going pay for it, we're going to have a myriad of systems, if this, then what? If that, then this. And let that be the case, then Madam Speaker. I haven't decided yet what I'm going to do on this amendment and on the motion. What I do know, Madam Speaker, is that it's about broad public consultation on issues that at least this council feel are important. I know Madam Speaker, that issues of taxation and revenue and flat fees and water rates and sewage, important on environmental issues, very important to Winnipeggers, Madam Speaker, and on that basis, the issue here we're discussing regarding these future oriented and environmental oriented issues regarding broad public consultation, well they hold sway with me. Madam Speaker, if I had known this morning that all I had to do was amend my motion and talk about say, instead of saying the provincial PUB, and all I had to say was the Winnipeg Public Service and I would have gotten it passed in terms of broad public consultation, that's how I would have done it. But I went for what I honestly thought would be the best way to do it. But if we wish for Winnipeggers for the Winnipeg public administration to hold the broad public consultation, well, Madam Speaker, let this be a notice to an upcoming notice of motion, then that's what I tend to do. So on that basis, I will say, well, I first of all, I hope we can regain a level of trust in this council. So that no matter what time of day that we're obliged to discuss these issues, no matter at what time, that when we bring forth amendments that the amendment itself is not considered suspect, and it isn't questioned for its motivations, but for its context. And on that basis, you can question its motivations, but Madam Speaker, I understand that there is...well perhaps a certain lack of trust and I'm not to say to what extent it's not justified on what side. Part of that is beyond me, Madam Speaker, but having said that, when I see an amendment, I am going to take it at face value and I'm allowed, you know, my prerogative by virtue of its content to make my suspicions. But having said that, I'm going to debate it at face value and that's what I'm going to do. So, Madam Speaker, no matter what happens, the fact is today's the day that we mentioned a Winnipeg strategic plan. Today is the day that we talk about broad public strategy on composting and consultation, broad public consultation. Well, Madam Speaker, it is still the day in which we've talked about broad public consultation on future oriented issues, environmentally involved, including water and sewer rates and how we use that revenue and where it goes and people's understanding and priorities. And on that basis, Madam Speaker, I just want you to know that regardless of what happens to the amendment, in the spirit of debate of prioritizing broad public consultation, on those priorities to the City of Winnipeg and to the citizens of Winnipeg, I'm going to vote in favour of the broad public consultation when it comes to composting and let it be broad. And on that basis, Madam Speaker, I hope in the spirit of consistency for us all, that we all support...support the intent at least and have respect for that of an upcoming motion on broad public consultation, implemented by Winnipeg's Public Service on our taxation revenue, flat fees and expenditures. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers on the item? Okay, seeing none, Councillor Wyatt, you have an opportunity to close on Motion 5.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thanks Madam Speaker. I just want to make it known that I don't think there was anything untowards this amendment. This amendment coming forward…it was when it came forward, I worked with the clerks on writing it up now, taking in consideration the time and the debate, trying to get it to the floor as quickly as possible. So I think if we cast dispersions on the amendment, I think it's not fair or productive and I want to thank Councillor Schreyer for the comments on that. So, the amendment before us is very clear. It's just simply…the biggest thing that we have heard from our constituents over and over and over again is the issue of this new fee. That's what we've heard over and over and over again. And I think it's fair to say that if the amendment is defeated, there is a good chance we are now going down the road of having this fee introduced in the future with an organic program. The very fact that somebody argued against this amendment, that it was shortchanged the potential for the accounting program, I think proves that point. You can't have it...you can't stand up and say that the organic program will not happen if you do not...if the fee does not go forward. I believe that there can be a way to do it in terms of our existing program and through the contracts that we have coming forward in 17. We can challenge the private sector and look at options of doing it. If there is anybody out there who doesn't think that, then we shouldn't be starting this entire process all together. Because that's really what we're doing, if you're voting for…against the amendment and you're voting for the clause or the motion that has now been amended from the previous notice of motion from Councillor Eadie and myself, that is why we're here today, is simply fooling themselves because they're really heading down the road of introducing the program that the administration initially sought out. Now, you could argue that the consultation will come back and say absolutely no, but I have a feeling that the voices that we've heard around the table today are intent in implementing in this new tax, intent on implementing this new program, come what may, no matter what it costs, whatever it takes to get this tax put in and

this program created, they're going to do it. And there is no doubt that this is a victory for those today, if that motion passes as it is now without amended. It's a victory for those who don't believe in fiscal responsibility and those who would prefer just simply to pass on the cost, another cost to the rate payers of the city. It's a defeat to the rate payers and the taxpayers that are trying to stay in their homes. Those are my comments. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes to close on the main item.

Councillor Mayes: I can speak to the amendment as well though, right? Speak to the motion? I shall try to be brief and eloquent. The motion is wanting. The motion is unclear as to what it is trying to accomplish. The motion Councillor Wyatt has said it shouldn't hit the homeowners. That isn't what this says. This just says, it shouldn't be a user fee.

Councillor Schreyer: Point of order. What is he referring to? What motion or what amendment?

Councillor Mayes: Motion…the very motion which we have just spent several hours discussing is the very motion I'm speaking to, Motion No. 5.

Councillor Schreyer: It was called a motion before, and I just wish clarification, I'm sorry.

Councillor Mayes: Perhaps I was unclear as to which motion I was speaking to. The motion which amends the very item we have been discussing for the past several hours. The motion that pertains…the motion that Councillor Wyatt just spoke to is the very motion I'm speaking to, Motion 5. The motion is wanting in that it says there cannot be a flat tax and yet we've just heard Councillor Wyatt say, well it shouldn't affect mom and pop at all, it shouldn't affect the rate payers. Well, you can certainly have a non-flat tax that would affect the rate payers. It's confusing as to what the goal…if the goal here is don't hit the homeowners, phrase it that way. The property tax is itself a flat tax. There's no doubt of that. It's a percentage, it's .13 and then several more decimal places. It's a mill rate, it's a flat tax. When you say we should have a flat income tax, doesn't mean we should all pay the same amount. No, it's a percentage. We should all pay X percent. That would be a flat tax. Well, the property is a flat tax. You pay more if your house is worth more, but it is undoubtedly a flat tax in its application. Not so much in its incidence. So in short, the motion is unclear as to even what it seeks to accomplish and therefore should be defeated. As to the main item before us, the amended composting motion, one is reminded of the final pages of the great novelist Somerset Maugham's Razor's Edge, in which she discusses how all of the characters of the book have essentially got what they wanted. Here we have somewhat similar with Councillor Eadie has accomplished what he has wanted, he's killed off the flat fee. Councillor Gerbasi has accomplished what she wanted, we haven't killed off the possibility of a curbside program. And Councillor Browaty has been able to give his bullet to the head speech again, which is what he always wanted this debate. So, it's a skilled, amended motion in that sense, various people get what they want out of it and no one gets everything that they want out of it. We'll go forward, we'll have a comprehensive public debate. What this debate has caused me to think about a bit more though, is when we were talking about global issues, we talked about Paris, we talked about China, it does…and I talked to Councillor Morantz for a moment about this, this really makes me appreciate this initiative, what the Mayor has started, the Year of Reconciliation. It's a local thing. It's in our powers. We can do it. It's not an international treaty, it's not global, it's local. It's in our powers to do some reconciliation. The more I sat here, the more I thought I should really say this. The Mayor has stepped up on this and said, okay, let's do something, it's on us, it's not global, it's a local issue, the Year of Reconciliation. So I just wanted to put that in that, you know, as one sits here over the hours you begin to get appreciation for certain other initiatives so I wanted to commend the Mayor on that. I will be against the motion. I will be voting in favour of the compromised position that came through at the committee.

Madam Speaker: Time for the vote. I will call the question on Motion 5. Recorded vote has been asked for. All in favour of Motion 5, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie and Wyatt

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 5 is lost. Now onto the main item, Item No. 3.

Councillor Wyatt: The vote to be broken down by clause, please. We should have the ability to vote by clause.

Madam Speaker: Is there a vote on that Mr. Clerk? We do not do that. It's not past practice.

Councillor Wyatt: Well, there's some…point of order Madam Speaker. There are some areas…some things in the motion that...I was the seconder of the original motion that seemed benign and there are members of Council would like to vote for and others they would not. It's not a budget item.

Madam Speaker: Similar to the budget, you know, we could vote on two recommendations, but I wouldn't be breaking it down further clause by clause.

Councillor Wyatt: It's not a budget. It's not a budget.

Madam Speaker: I'm just saying, similar to how we've dealt with...

Councillor Wyatt: No, I know, but the reason we do that, point of order, the reason we do that, Madam Speaker, with the budget is because of the fact that it could have financial implications, revenue or expense. This is not the case here. And we have in the past voted clause by clause.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, I see you shaking your head.

City Clerk: I don't remember an instance where we voted clause by clause, we vote by recommendation and it's your right to ask for each recommendation to be voted on separately. In this case, there are two recommendations in front of you.

Madam Speaker: Do we need a vote on voting on them separately, Mr. Clerk, or we can go ahead and do that? Okay. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Just on a point of order, at budget time we voted clause by clause on a Winnipeg Police Board motion, which really wasn't the budget. Okay. So we did that and I might also point out, even though I think it was at a special meeting regarding...we have...sorry I can't cite it, we have voted clause by clause on non-budget items as well in the past.

Madam Speaker: I don't recall that as being past practice, so I'm going to call the question on the two clauses unless someone would like to challenge the Chair.

Councillor Wyatt: I'll challenge the Chair.

Madam Speaker: Okay. There is a challenge to the Chair to vote. If you agree with voting clause by clause, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Schreyer and Wyatt

Madam Speaker: It was a challenge to the Chair, Mr. Clerk, to vote clause by clause. It's not something I believe has been past practice. Yeah. Just to clarify what you're voting on for challenging the Chair. If you agree with the Chair's recommendation, please rise. Sustain the ruling of the Chair. Please rise. That we are not voting clause by clause, we're voting with the two recommendations before us. Clear? Thank you. Please rise if you're in support.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Schreyer and Wyatt

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The Chair's recommendation is sustained. We will now vote on the two iteMs I'll call the question on recommendation one, all in favour? There is two recommendations before you. It is Item No. 3. If you want to pull it up on your screen. Well, they wanted it separately. Would you still like a vote separately on the two recommendations?

Councillor Wyatt: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Yes. That's what I thought. Okay. It's recorded vote. Mr. Clerk, can you clarify the two recommendations before us?

City Clerk: So a recorded vote has been called for and the first item that you're voting on is that the Winnipeg Police Service be directed to...sorry, that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to A, B, C, D, E and F. Clear? And...

Madam Speaker: It was amended at committee. So there is no amendment before us. The report's come forward amended. Okay, I will call the question on recommendation number one. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Eadie and Wyatt

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

Madam Speaker: Recommendation number one passes. We'll move on to recommendation number two. All in favour? Please...Contrary? Carried. Thank you. Okay, we have…

Councillor Gerbasi: I know everybody wants to go home, but also people might be hungry. How long do you think we'll be here? I don't know think that's very predictable today.

Madam Speaker: I can't predict. keep going.

Councillor Gerbasi: So I don't know what people think about the issue of food. We could just keep going, but there's a long agenda left here so I'm just mentioning it.

Madam Speaker: What is the will of Council? Keep going? Okay. Would you like a five minute recess?

Councillor Gerbasi: I know…I just…we could be here another three or four hours.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: Hopefully enough time to get a bag of chips. Because I'm going to get real…

Madam Speaker: We'll take a 10-minute recess and reconvene at 6:00.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
April 27, 2016, at 6:00 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Good evening. I'd like to bring our council meeting back to order. Council meeting of April 27, 2016. We have no further motions, no by-laws. We'll now have question period for the Chair, Councillor Mayes. Are there any questions for the Chair? Seeing none, we'll move on. Next is our Standing Policy Committee on Innovation. There is one item on the agenda; The Winnipeg Fleet Management, 2016 business plan. This item, if you remember, was laid over from our March 23, 2016 Council meeting. We also have an amending motion from Councillor Schreyer and Eadie. And the motion you'll see is posted online, it's not on your desks. And we also have amending Motion No. 2 which is on your desks. That was moved by Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Gilroy. Councillor Browaty to introduce the item.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION
DATED FEBRUARY 22, 2016**

Item 1 - Winnipeg Fleet Management – Special Operating Agency – 2016 Business Plan (Selection Report)

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is the business plan for the Fleet Management Agency before us here today. I know there are a couple of amending motions that are before us today as well. I'll just say that the AVL program is an important piece that was funded at least in part through the innovation fund. This report comes to this committee as well as being…it's the successor to the former Alternate Service Delivery Committee where the special operating agencies report. The AVL program provides an opportunity to provide safety to our workers in terms of the ability to allow people who are working alone to be better kept tracked because of the technology in the vehicles and it also provides an opportunity for employees and management to properly understand their roles and responsibilities and to properly monitor our employees. So I think this is a very good piece. I won't be supporting Councillor Schreyer's motion, but I will in fact be supporting Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Gilroy's motion. I think having a protocol to properly understand the expectations of management as well as employees is important and I think this is actually a productive piece. So I'll certainly respond to anything that's said at the end.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer, you'll have an opportunity now to introduce your Motion No. 4.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure, well, you know, look, in the spirit as I continue all day, of listening to council, looking at other options, I continue to do so all day. And I…I hope it isn't considered a brilliant tactic on my part to withdraw my amendment based on an understanding of an enhanced protocol as brought forth by Councillors Gerbasi and Gilroy. I believe that what I'm about to do right now is consistent with what I've done all day and as I try to do all the time that I'm here at Council. On that basis, given what has transpired since the last Council meeting that has brought forth this motion, that's fine with me, Madam Speaker. And on that basis, at the last minute, at the end of the day, I withdraw my motion. I hope it is understood, Madam Speaker, that what I'm doing now is consistent with what I always try to do.

Madam Speaker: You are withdrawing you motion, Councillor Schreyer? Do you have concurrence from Councillor Eadie? Do you give concurrence, Councillor Eadie, as the seconder?

Councillor Eadie: I concur, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: And it's the will of Council? We'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Gerbasi, your opportunity to introduce Motion 2.

**Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,**

THAT Item No. 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Innovation dated February 22, 2016, be amended by adding the following recommendation:

"That the City administration meet with CUPE representatives and make all reasonable efforts to negotiate a letter of Understanding regarding the Automatic Vehicle Location System (AVL) to ensure the interests of both the City and its employees are appropriately safeguarded."

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be fairly brief on this given the hour and given that I did speak to a number of you, not all of you, that this sort of came together yesterday or the last few days. So apologize if I didn't get a chance to talk to you personally before, but I tried to talk to as many of you as I could. Basically, this is simply calling on the civic administration to meet with CUPE representatives and make all reasonable efforts to negotiate a letter of understanding regarding the AVL system to ensure both the interests of the City and its employees are appropriately safeguarded. It's really just showing…I think it's sending a message that we want to have an open dialogue with CUPE that we want to work together in a cooperative manner, that we want to sit down at the table and talk about how we do things. And you know, we're not prescripting…you know, it really is up to the administration and the negotiating team and this is not…I really hope this isn't interpreted as interfering with those processes. It's a very difficult thing to wade into these things and we probably shouldn't in a lot of cases, but I think this time, and I hope this isn't a precedent on this type of thing, I'm just saying let's send a political message that we want to have this kind of dialogue, we want to have a conversation that we're open to hearing these concerns and we're open to coming as a solution, which could be some sort of protocol or whatever. So that's all I'm going to say. I hope people will support it. It's intended to just bring us together and move forward with something that's good. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: We will now have debate on the main item and Motion 2 concurrently. Does anyone wish to speak? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again, in the spirit of trust, building trust, in the spirit of doing our best to make Council work, in the spirit of trying to bring forth consensus when that is possible and not trying to pretend it is always possible, but to deal with our disagreements and our agreements to the best of our abilities and to try and enhance openness and accountability in the process. As I was appointed and accepted the position of Council Liaison for Labour Relations, I again, as I have already indicated and already have begun in terms of conversation with CUPE 500 and with the administration, again on this issue, willing to serve in any capacity that they see fit. And on that basis I concur with the motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. This is just for closing here, right?

Madam Speaker: Okay, just a moment, are there any further speakers on the item? No? Okay, Councillor Gerbasi, you have an opportunity to close if you wish.

Councillor Gerbasi: The only thing I just wanted to add is I do want to thank Councillor Schreyer. I meant to acknowledge that in my comments, I'm getting kind of tired here at this point in the day. I wanted to appreciate that he withdrew the motion with the intent to work together on this. We came up with something that hopefully will address the concerns that initiated the motion, so I just wanted to say that. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty to close.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a couple of points of clarification; there was some suggestion that the cost of the program was $2 million, as per page 22 of the business plan. The estimated cost for the initial installation is around $719,000 and monitoring in the neighbourhood of $462,000. So that's just a clarification. The notion of there being jobs outsourced out of province, the technology and equipment does come from out of province and there would be some outsourcing for the initial installation of the equipment, but in the future when new vehicles are required, that work will be done in-house by the Fleet Management Agency. It's just that it's a one-time surge of work that would need to be done and practically they can't continue doing the regular work at Fleet and do the incremental work from this as well. There is some suggestion that the City already has a monitoring system on its vehicles. With the exception of the Parking Authority, Animal Services, Police and Transit, they do not typically have AVL technology in place so this is not a duplication. In the future when the Parking Authority and Animal Services current AVL contracts expire, the intention is this would be monitored to this system which is a city standard. The police have their own separate systems and for security, they're a completely separate operation. Transit is quite operationally different and they have their own technology and that will stay separate from what we have here. In the future, it's looking like Winnipeg Fire and Paramedic Service will actually be migrating to this system as well and will be tied in to the Public Works Traffic Management System for green light priority. So the system is apparently capable of that and when Fire and Paramedic Service has its implementation, it will be tied into the Traffic Management Centre and the green light system that will help get to emergency calls all that much faster and I think it's a good safety initiative. So there's a little bit of background information. I thank Councillor Gerbasi. I think…you know, this isn't supposed to be...we're not trying to scary or anything, and I think having expectations from both labour and management understood as we go forward is important, so I thank her.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I will call the question on the Motion No. 2 first. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Calling the question on the main item, No. 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, we have no other motions. No by-laws. We'll now have Question Period for the Chair. Any questions for Councillor Browaty? Okay, we'll now move onto the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Orlikow on the report dated April 12.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Well, thank you Madam Chair. I move the report...oh sorry…okay, we're not there yet. I would like to move…introduce report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 13.

Madam Speaker: Number 10? Okay. Thirteen is not stood down, do you wish for it to be? Councillor Eadie? Yes. We want that stood down? Okay, 10 and 13? Okay, we'll call the question on 1 through 9, 11 and 12. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 10 – Lease Agreement - 220 Antrim Road

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Orlikow to introduce the item.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. I look forward to hearing what my colleague has to say and I'll respond accordingly.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't have much to say on the issue, except to say that it's a new agreement, it's a new process is what I get the impression in that the board of directors of Valley Gardens Community Centre, and or their delegated agent, will be the agent on behalf of the City for a lease agreement. So I'm not sure to what extent this has happened before, Madam Speaker, but having said that, I just wish to make note of this because at least I, for one councillor, will be watching this and see how it goes. We've had an unfortunate frustration regarding Valley Gardens Community Centre and the administration in terms of coming to a legal agreement on other issues, which I won't bother to get into today, but it took nine months since passed by Council. Two other Councillors, Councillors Browaty and Wyatt as well are involved as representatives of the catchment area for Valley Gardens Community Centre. It's in all three wards. The centre itself happens to be in mine, but we share concern on this, and all I wish to do is to say that I wish Valley Gardens Community Centre and the proposed daycare agreement and the administration well on this endeavour. Having said that, I do have concerns given what has transpired over the last nine months. But, let's give this a go, Madam Speaker, and let's see how it goes, and I, again, along with Councillors Browaty and Wyatt who are willing to assist, you know, to whatever extent that they might need our assistance as I see, Madam Speaker, has been the past, in fact, in the last nine months. I'm pleased to have offered information regarding other agreements and other ongoing concerns between Valley Gardens Community Centre and the administration. I am pleased to be there as I am right now on other issues. I can see that they've needed my help, and willing to do so again on this issue. Having said that, that's hopefully not the case, Madam Speaker, and thank you.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to state that I think this is a very good program. It's an agreement between many parties; school division, City and Valley Gardens Community Centre. And just for Council knowledge in the general sense, we are going through all our leases. There are going to be lot of leases that you're going to see coming through the agenda, going forward, because we're doing our due diligence to all of them, making sure that they're all equal, they're all protect the city, so you'll be seeing a number of leases that will be coming forward mostly under the same template. So just an FYI.

Madam Speaker: Okay. I'll call the question on Item 10. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 13 – Public Safety Building and Civic Centre Car Park: Evaluation of Strategic Alternatives and Associated Implications for the Former Canada Post Tower Located at 266 Graham Avenue

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow to introduce the item.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. This item has been discussed a number of times, laid over at the standing committee to gather some more information about some of the historical heritage value. That was received. The committee unanimously supported the recommendation by the administration to go forward with our preferred choice. I just want to clarify that does not mean that's the only choice. We have to start getting some costing done. We have to start looking at certain iteMs We have to start giving some visioning. However, it wasn't done lately, and as Councillor Wyatt has said, and we tried to repeatedly say this morning and other times, if there are great ideas that come forward that are applicable and viable, we will continue to listen to those. There is no imminent demolition of the building happening. We…that will not happen until there is a plan. The parkade, I'll be honest, may have to go earlier just due to some safety concerns that we're just evaluating. But again, we do know that we have a few incredibly constraining issues involved on that land, specifically that it must be used for municipal purposes only. And then removing that caveat is very, very difficult if not impossible. So again, that's the situation we're left with. So again, otherwise, I'd be more than happy to hear my colleague's comments and respond accordingly.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, do you wish to speak to the item?

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I've listened to the debate and issues around this. I guess this is an amendment happened at standing committee, Madam Speaker that, to me, seems like it's not necessarily committed to plan a which was to tear down the building, and have some sort of public space park. But I just wanted to speak to all of this. I still worried about how to vote for this, because you know, I read through a report, Madam Speaker, and actually, you know, I've been around since 2010. There was a report that was prepared about the PSD building, past councils, where there was a decision, you know, by the Canada Post building and move the headquarters over there rather than going with, I think at the time it was considered to be a $65 million project to stay at PSP, but you'd have to move the Police Service out while you renovate it and then move them back in. And under that plan at that time, Councillor Gillingham is quite aware, we've become quite aware of what a police headquarters needs to have and there's much higher standards required if you're going to have a police headquarters in a building and Madam Speaker, those...much higher standards, and design in how you deal with lockup, you know, the upper floors there, there's lockup and all these different things. And so as I understand it, that report when it came up with costing to renovate and do all this stuff, that $65 million, which is what…that's eight…going on eight years ago when the report was completed, I'm sure a lot of the stuff they were looking in was 2008. I can't remember when the big debate happened around that and discussions, Madam Speaker. There was an idea that, you know, buying the Canada Post building was going to cost too much, but I'm not going to get into that history, Madam Speaker. But there was a…you know, that report was used as a comparison to make a decision. I haven't really read any, and I understand somebody said it's $7 million, the director said it's $7 million to fix the exterior tyndall stone. I don't know if that code is coming from having to use tyndall stone required to meet the standards of a police headquarters nowadays because that PSP building sounds pretty solid, Madam Speaker, very solid. The structure, as I understand it, is not going anywhere. We heard from the architect who designed the thing and so on. And anyway, so for me, Madam Speaker, I'm quite concerned that we're going to say, well, we're going to rip this building down. It's going to be a very expensive building to demolish. I'll tell you that right now. I don't know what…we gave up the carnation building down the street. I know one of the councillors was very sad about that. I was opposed to that because that was a heritage building and it was structurally sound. You know, certain areas, they built buildings to last a very long time. And while they do need ongoing maintenance and that is always on issue, Madam Speaker...anyway, I'm just concerned, when I hear these numbers, as I understand it, part of that $65 million as I said, was probably a substantial chunk of change to move the police in and out of that building. So I don't know if that's part of that. What are the costings. Depending on what you want to use that building for today, Madam Speaker, I don't think the renovation costs could meet whatever needs or whatever, it's very different and much less expensive than it would be for that…to meet the kind of standards a police headquarters needs. So, I don't know what the real cost is. I'm not seeing a real...I mean they threw out a whole bunch of different ideas. I understand, yes, there is...the systems are complicated, related to the overall property with the parking lot and that sort of thing, Madam Speaker. But you know, I'm not even ready to, like, this thing, it says…I don't know that I'm ready to vote and say that, because you know, the other thing I hear from P and D and…are very concerning to me because we had this whole aspect again, we're going to talk about utilities and dividends again, municipal accommodations. I heard the director talk about and they always measure, what is the best balance of city-owned versus lease from the private sector and I heard them say 60-40. Is that why we're making the decision to rip down the PSB, Madam Speaker? Is that really what was behind it? Because right now, we're at a…I think they said about 70-30 or 80-20, where we have our people in 80% of our own owned assets, versus 20% that we rend from the private sector, for example, a bad lease deal we made over at the Confederation Building from my perspective. Fort Garry Place, which I understand is a great leasing deal at $12 a square foot, that's great. Then we've got this whole complicated matter that somehow municipal accommodations has to be profit and it's about private sector and competing against the private sector. Well, you know what? I don't agree with any of that stuff. Like you know, the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce might agree with that kind of thing, but I don't. Like really, it's…you know, I sort of been watching politics around the City for a long time. You know, it is cheaper for us to do it ourselves, really, in the end. But anyway, that said, Madam Speaker, I thought there was some great ideas we

could have that. And it sounds like there is a consultation, but I don't have the resources to actually go in there and figure out what the renovation costs are going to be and so on and so on, and determine what the value is and say, well, maybe, we are better off moving into that building instead of having a $12 a square foot Fort Garry Place operation, bring it into a central campus. We actually have a number of people who work for P and D who are into the whole economic, the Mayor's excellent initiative, we do need to have good commerce, we need jobs, we need economic growth, we need all that stuff. And you know, you can have a one-stop shop in that building because there is probably enough space to handle P and D and have some sort of business opportunity entities, leasing some space there. I don't know but so we're voting here today. There is a public engagement about it. Hopefully, the heritage community comes across. But you know, I don't even know that we need that Tyndall to hold up but anyway, Madam Speaker, all is I can say is I don't agree with Option A because the other problem is, is we don't even have enough money to invest in our own parks and open spaces now. You want to have one now? Like really? And you want to get away from the caveat, yeah you can work with the family and try to get away with the caveat, but you know, the whole concept is we are at the civic centre of city. This is City Hall, admin building, concert hall, like museum, like all these things were supposed to be like a central place to bring Winnipeg to. So Madam Speaker, I don't know if anyone else wants to speak, but I haven't decided how to vote on this yet.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Our next speaker is Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I know everyone is tired, but we have a long agenda and this is a very important issue and I have been Chair of the Historical Buildings Resources Committee for 17 years. And…so I feel I need to weigh in on this one. Apologies. Because I know you all want to go home. I feel very saddened at the thought of losing a modern architectural heritage asset such as the PSB and anytime any heritage building is lost, it is a real meaningful and actual loss for people. It hurts. And we heard that when we heard from a community that came here today, from others. That is what it is. And we have to be sensitive to that in any circumstance. There is no question in my mind that this building has significant heritage value. No one is questioning that. We at the committee talked about it. We've seen the review that HBRC did, we were briefed on it. They did an informal review. Whether they did a full-out review or an informal review, the report was written, the building was…they did their evaluation and, yes, it would…they would be recommending designation. But having said that, the next step in our designation process is to come to Council, through the Property Committee, and with a full report, with the Heritage recommendation and then all the other aspects of the decision, together, and then we vote on that. So, yes, no one is saying it doesn't have heritage value, but our role here, and I say this as a heritage advocate, our role here is to make a really tough decision about what to do here. So, I just want to say that the question is, is what are the reasons, why this building is in trouble right now. In a perfect world, every heritage asset would just simply be saved, that would be it. We can just save it and that would be it. And I'd like to live in that world. And there are other issues. Money, but many other considerations and I'm just going to talk a bit about this specific case. There are real limitations to what can be done with the building. It was built for a single purpose. It was built for a jail and a police station. And to repurpose it, and there is information, there was…I just wanted to mention, there was a significant study done that is very thick, that's…that we reviewed as well as an administrative report, so there is a lot of information to review. There is stuff, if you read the other committee agendas, you will have that information and it talked about a class 4 I believe estimate, which is still quite rough, of 66 million, so that's like up or down 50, another 50 million or more. Like it's a…this and so that estimate, and if it was an older estimate, which I'm not sure off the top of my head, Councillor Eadie, but if it's an older estimate, then it's even higher now. And just to do the interior and we also know that the value of the building is the exterior. And I think seven is really low, I mean we don't know. We have a…assume, you know, judging on other buildings, it'll be higher than that. So we're probably looking at least $100 million, just…but we don't have the numbers in more details than that. But we know it's a lot. We know it's probably at least 100 million, could be a lot more. But I just want to point out other modern buildings that were referred to that have been reclad, the art gallery, you know, there's a number of them that have been mentioned, the U of W, the workmen's comp building, all these buildings that have been reclad are being used for the same purpose they were. So they didn't have to spend the 150 million rebuilding the art gallery. They built the outside of the art gallery and then it kept being an art gallery and it allowed the art gallery to go on for another hopefully, another 100 years or 50 to 100 years before they have to that again. So that's an…much easier, obviously easy to do. Has a clear purpose. The decision to move the police to the post office building really made this life of this building in jeopardy, basically. Also, the caveat or the legal thing or whatever you want to call it, we have an agreement that this has to be used for a municipal purpose. I've never come across this. Like this is, this isn't like we can just have a private sector person come in, and partner with them or bring in different things. All we can do with this building if we were to keep it is to put our employees in there pretty much and that would be a $100 million minimum, maybe 150 or 200, maybe another police headquarters to do something that the audit in the police headquarters told us not to do. Told us do not put any, build any, no more buildings you own to put your City staff in. That's what the audit told us to do. So I'm not sure if everyone is aware of that. But the audit told us that we should be leasing and renting space for new City staff moving them around. Plus we have the old tower attached to the police headquarters that needs people put in it. So if we're going to put people somewhere, we should probably be putting in there first if that's affordable which probably is, but that's another matter. So we have a big, we have a lot of problems that beyond the heritage issue. The other thing is, under...unfortunately the

parkade was allowed to crumble, so it's useless, like it has to be torn down which is really unfortunate that that was allowed to happen to get to that point. And it has to be done fairly quickly, because it's going to actually like crumble, literally. And then so the process that's just, you know, Councillor Eadie...sorry, it's just distracting, thank you. Perhaps, also the process going forward, excuse me, is that there is going to be a public consultation process. We're not…there is no demolition order, no demolition could even happen until this public consultation process goes through. Ideas come forward, plans come forward, a plan would have to approved. So we're not approving demolition today. We are going down the path that does look at other options that would ultimately, could ultimately result in that. So it's not happening today, but I mean we're really going to need a rabbit in a hat to pop up to be able to save this building. And I have…we haven't seen it. We'd love to see it. And my understanding is that there will be a very rigorous review of all the possibilities for the site. And some of those options, excuse me, some of those options could be extremely positive for the downtown. If you can set aside the heritage piece and look at what could be there, if it was done well, it could be amazing and Brent Bellamy and CentreVenture, Chair of CentreVenture and others are going to be working very, very closely, perhaps leading this process of design. I don't know. But there is going to be a rigorous process of coming up with a really good design that could have a really positive impact on our City Hall campus. However, there is no way around that this is a sad loss, and I know I may sound repetitive, but that is how I feel that so many people, I'm sure many around this table would rather not make any decision like to jeopardize any heritage building ever. I'm actually really excited about the progress we made on modern buildings lately. We've designated City Hall, we're looking at a whole range of designating buildings. This has only been possible in the last year or two. Now we're starting that process and I think we'll be designating many, many of them. This one is going to be a big challenge and I just don't want anyone to think that this decision would be taken lightly by anybody. The committee was actually unanimous, Councillor Wyatt, Councillor Orlikow...sorry, Councillor Allard, of course, and we had a lengthy, lengthy discussion, we reviewed the extensive reports, we talked with their staff. Did we lay it over, too and talk about it again, and hear delegations again? So I just want to put that out there, but nothing is being done lightly. Nothing is a done deal. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor, followed by Councillor Wyatt.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to talk a little bit about…about the money side of this discussion, but I want to lead my comments in order of priority in terms of what is the motivating factor towards, certainly my position on the PSB. The main reason I support the direction that I hope this council will take is that it represents a tremendous opportunity for redevelopment to refine and renew our Exchange District and to better connect the west and the east exchanges. We need to look forward. We need to look at what is possible with this area of our city, such an incredibly important part of our city. And the opportunity that is before us is something that doesn't come along very often in the life of a council or arguably in the life of a city. And so, any redevelopment of this site will require comprehensive community engagement and a very thoughtful plan. And it will be essential that any redevelopment ensures that the area remains an acceptable civic and public use. Now administrative report and a review by Deloitte identifies the PSB as having certain architectural and historical significance. And I want to acknowledge that and I also want to thank our speakers that we heard in delegation today and all the voices in our community that have been speaking about the heritage value. We are listening. I will echo Councillor Gerbasi's comments, heritage is incredibly important. And unfortunately, there is still the reality of making case by case decisions as this council is obligated to do. The current state of the PSB as well as the structural limitations on the structure and the exterior cladding make it unsuitable and a costly restoration project. I'll note of course November 29, 2009, there was a unanimous vote at this council to declare the PSB surplus. The current numbers that we have before us I believe are class 4 estimate, which could mean that the cost based on that classification could be well in excess of $100 million, I think in the range of $105 million at the upper end. Now, those numbers could grow over time as well. And if there is one file that this council and certainly I inherited in this role as your mayor, that bothers me to no end, it's how taxpayers have been taking it on the chin since the decision was made by previous council to move the police into the new headquarters. Now, decisions were made that were not fiscally responsible and taxpayers are still paying for those decisions. It would be I think a much more fiscally responsible bookend to a sorry legacy that we inherited to think about taxpayers, to think about how much that would cost to repurpose that building. I for one have been very clear on what I'd like to see happen to the building. I think the main reason, while I of course am making my arguments why I believe it's in the best interest of taxpayers, to pursue that the option here, the main reason for my support in proceeding and supporting this is the tremendous opportunity that is presented. And I look forward to the opportunity that we could have to engage the community, to work with CentreVenture to hear what is possible. This…this community, this downtown in particular, is growing up very quickly. If you look at the artists announcement recently, the fortress, if you look at True North Square, there are so many positive investments being made in our downtown and I'm confident that given the opportunity, this community will respond with visionary and inspiring ideas on what we could do to better leverage that space for civic and public use. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next is Councillor Wyatt, followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know the meeting has gone on way too long when I rise up in agreement with Councillor Gerbasi. But I am going to agree with a lot of things she said. Well, you've got to have some sense of ha, ha, this time at night. So, I just want to say, that, you know, it's often, I think there has been some articles and commentary around this issue. The Mayor, I wanted to say that I...it was a unique announcement in terms of his...of your state-of-the-city address in announcing that. I think…I think it's decisive, actually. So you know, to say, look, we've got to do something here with this building and we've got to resolve it and we've got to resolve it and we've got to get on with it, I think is something that we should welcome. So I want to thank the Mayor for that leadership. And to say that the committee worked in terms of taking the considerations and the delegations that we heard into consideration, we adopted a lot of the thoughts that they had. But we also as Councillor Orlikow rightly pointed out, you know, we kind of threw the gauntlet down, too. We challenge them. Look, if you are here and if you are serious and you have alternatives for this building, you know, bring them forward. And so, if you look at the original motion that went to the standing committee with this report, and you can pull that up on your agenda April 12, 2016, Item 23, the original motion that went to the standing committee is extremely...is completely changed by the standing committee on the 12th of April. And it changed it to…significantly. Previously, the report was worded to be…to state that the alternative a, was going to be selected. And it was the recommendation, and to be implemented without any further report back to Council. Now, based on both what we heard from the public, but also importantly, Madam Speaker, what we heard from the public sector at that meeting, the public service, the fact they explained to us what they foresaw as the process, what they required as the process. And there is no doubt that that process was…is well thought out and they have some very good ideas on what they want to do in the coming months in terms of that building. There…it wasn't really captured in the recommendation. And the standing committee actually made that part of it in terms of the public engagement subject to public engagement as the recommendation now reads which was something, which was brand new to the recommendation. We also noted, and it was pointed out by…rightly by the Mayor just now, that, you know, when this was recommended to Council to purchase 266 Graham in November of 2009, you can go back and read the reports. Nowhere in the reports did it state anywhere that we could not sell the Public Safety Building. Nowhere. As a matter of fact, if you read the reports, it actually said the opposite. It said that it would dispose upon completion of the purchase of 266 Graham, the Canada Post Tower Building, that the public service would then proceed with the sale, the deposition, the disposal of the PSB building. And…and it's very clear. That was the intent of the report and that was the impression...not just the impression...that was the language and the concept Council was voting on. Council had the clear understanding that it could sell that building, and it was only months later when we found out as a council...and the decision wasn't even controversial at the time. It was actually voted on unanimously by Council. And it was only months later when the public service came back and said, well, no, there is a reversionary clause that this was passed onto the City for municipal or public use or what have you and it cannot be disposed of in terms of that. So, here we were, owning a building that we thought was going to be the new home and headquarters for the police, and disposing of this building. It was...and never, never since that point, and this is something else we cited back on April 12, never since then has there been anything to Council, previous council or this council, until now, acknowledging...well, not even acknowledging that, never has it been formally been acknowledged in any form or any kind of report. The report here today does not acknowledge that, it de facto acknowledges it by the fact of where it's going in terms of its recommendation, but it never acknowledged all the chaos, and audits, and hell that that created. And that's extremely frustrating because as an elected official, we heard about that. And some people aren't here today because of that. And so...and there was accountability when it came to the elected officials. But when it…but the challenge is always in terms of what happened back then. And I'm not going to relive it and dig it up in terms of the public service, but it's still there and it's still something which causes one some concern. And today, we're going to see if we can move down a process here. Now I've heard…we've heard all the arguments made in terms of the architecture. And as I pointed out this morning, it was interesting to learn that genre of brutalist architecture and how this building is important and part of a overall architectural community in terms of, you know, nationwide but also in terms of this vicinity of downtown Winnipeg specifically. Well, that's great but it is millions no matter what we do. It will be millions to renovate, it will be millions to maintain, it will be millions to go forward. We have a tower now at 266 Graham, we've got to figure out, we have now learned informally or formally that there's safety and security issues there that the Winnipeg Police Service has. We now know we have issues here with this building. We have to reduce our losses, and potentially reduce the liabilities as well on the city. And so if there is interest in the private sector, if there is interest out there to, to come forward and to assist us, I hope that happens. But, at the same time, if there is not a lot of interest, if there is not a grassroots response, in terms of preserving this piece of heritage, as Councillor Gerbasi referred to it, it's heritage, it's got value in terms of its architectural style, then that's telling as well. It's not as if we're knocking this down tomorrow. We're giving a lot of time, we're giving the community time to respond and I hope that there will be interest in terms of doing something unique with this building if, if it's truly, if there is a truly strong grassroots movement in the name of this architectural style. And if not, then I think the idea of looking at other options, whether it be a plaza or a centre or other uses for this site, that would still be in the public realm and the public good have to be considered. None of us, none of us I think foresaw that day on November…okay, thank you, I didn't know if my extension was over.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. Okay. Next speaker is Councillor Schreyer followed by Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't have too much to say on this. I look forward to, you know, the consultation process. I don't presume that the public consultation on this will be as large as the broad consultation process that Winnipeggers would expect, you know, on composting or on water rate fees, but we'll see. I don't wish to prejudge these types of public consultations, just my impression of things. Having said that, it's important as we've seen by the delegations that were brought forth this morning, Madam Speaker. I did learn a lesson and in the process, that we're about to undertake regarding, you know, the consultation and people making their points on the issue of what we're going to do with the building, the buildings and the space, we are dealing...one thing that we cannot forget, to whatever extent it's relevant, but nonetheless, it has a relevance and that is revealing here and there, with across the street, with post-modernistic architecture. And I understand as a parallel, Madam Speaker, and this is why I'm making my point, as we go about the process of the discussion on this, just to bear in mind something, what I've learned while we're going about dealing with that issue of sustaining post-modernistic architecture, and to make that point, Madam Speaker, because we haven't made a decision yet for the building across the street. And on that basis, we do need to deal with its form of architecture, its post-modernistic design. And what I've noticed, Madam Speaker, I've learned a lesson, is that in the process of dealing with that in this building and as we move forward and wishing to adhere and I think we all do, wishing to adhere to the design of this building, as we move forward, this building, throughout the time of my life, goes through different incarnations in the general spirit of people's…of Winnipeggers perception of this architecture. It was mentioned this morning, Madam Speaker, that in the 60s, you know, 100-year-old buildings were considered well, ugly or something like that, of course, we…many of us rue the fact that we got rid of the gingerbread architecture of our previous city hall. Having said that, now this form of architecture is revered to certain extent, given credibility by virtue of the fact that it is within a limited era. This is a limited era of architecture and thus has some historical value regardless of what we think of the taste as was mentioned this morning, and I think we all have certain understanding of what was meant. Having said that Madam Speaker, my point being, as we move forward on this; would I have noticed, in this building, in terms of adherence and fidelity to the issue of consistency of design and I have made my point before in a governance meeting and I wish this point be made for the record, is that I did notice that we blurred the line between what is adherence to consistency of design and what is uniformity. We've blurred the line to the point of confusion, is what I saw, to the extent that we confused uniformity, with consistency of design. Madam Speaker, and I say this because we are making decisions on this right here in this building. Same discussion could be…could be taking place and other post-modernistic buildings as we are dealing with the Public Safety Building. And that is ma'am, could you imagine the time in the past when all rooms were supposed to look the same. Never happened, Madam Speaker. We look at sci-fi movies and we see everybody dresses the same like on Star Trek, they all use, wear the same uniform, all things look the same, Madam Speaker. Yeah perhaps, you know, the post-modernistic art design of the era in which this building and that building were built, so we perhaps influenced by science fiction…futuristic science fiction and vice-a-versa. But I make the point, Madam Speaker, because I saw the confusion here by different people. I don't need to get into it any further than that. But the lesson was learned by me so I make the point. Let's not confuse uniformity with striving for adherence to consistency of design. That's not life, that's not architecture, that's not design, that's not an expression of who we are. And I'll leave it at that. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to turn the page a little bit and draw our attention to a different part of the report, page nine of the report that talks about the Canada Post tower, disposition alternatives. The second bullet point there says that Winnipeg Police Service, the WPS, accommodation adjacency requirements, warrant WPS compliance with any proposed terms and conditions for civic re-use, lease, sale, disposition. This week, an expression of interest did go out was issued on the Canada Post tower and I was pleased to see that really this bullet point in essence is the phrase, the clause here is built into the expression of interest, where there needs to be conversation with the WPS. Last week, I know at the end of last week, it came out, I think through a media, FIPPA…a redacted report that went to the Police Board, a confidential police…a confidential report that went to the Police Board last June. I was asked why I didn't share that, well, through confidentiality precludes me or any other board member from sharing a confidential report from the board. But I can tell you that following that report, just a very general conversation was had with the administration, that the service has some concerns over the office tower. This should be discussion between administration and the Winnipeg Police Service. Obviously in some capacity according to this report there is acknowledgment that the service does have some concerns and some risk. I'm not going to go too far back to a time when most of us, or half of us weren't here, but when it comes to the office tower, I just, you know, raised that issues, risks, any concerns that were around the office tower and the potential of sharing the tower and the new police headquarters being adjacent to one another. Those really should have been identified and a plan should have been put forward as far as how those risks would be dealt with and mitigated in the process, in the discussion around the purchase of that building a long time ago certainly prior to this council. But all in all, glad to see that again, that this clause is here, that the service be dialogued with before anything happens with the office tower. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Some very pertinent points made by, oddly in agreement, Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Wyatt. As Councillor Gerbasi said, to some extent, the die was cast back in 2009 when the move was made to relocate the police headquarters and Councillor Wyatt was right in pointing out that that was 2009. There's talk here of the previous council, I've always been a bit defensive on this item open because we've got audits, we've had a number of studies, this relocation started even before your election, Madam Speaker, before Councillor Eadie in 2010. This started in 2009, there were two separate cost overrun reports; one before I was elected, one after I was elected. It's been a long saga. The Mayor's quite right in saying to have inherited this is to say the least, upsetting and we are still working through it. But I guess the positive side is we've had the audits, we have Councillor Pagtakhan doing the major capital projects portfolio, we have the disclosure on the website about our major capital projects. We have, I know at least I know on the water and waste ones, we're seeing some at my committee, they're also going to Councillor Morantz's Finance Committee. We are, I think, doing a better job now trying to track these major capital projects so that we don't have a repeat of the whole Police Safety Building and the cost overruns there. I will leave it at that. I think to echo Councillor Gerbasi, it's certainly not, and if any…none of us are pleased to be making this decision, but, once that decision was made back in 09 and Councillor Wyatt's right in saying there was less than perfect information at that time this is how things have played out.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to start by saying that I will be supporting the recommendation before us here today. And I do share the Mayor's excitement about the opportunities to redevelop this site and I think it could be a really good and important piece for our Exchange District and our downtown area and the Civic Centre Complex. I guess my frustration really is, again, I've been on Council now since 2006. I've been on EPC since the fall of 2010. As a regular councillor back when that first, that original decision was made in 2009, the project with the information we were provided made a lot of sense. And we made the decision based on information, we've seen there's been audits and RCMP investigations and the story hasn't been fully written even yet and it's utterly frustrating. The one part though that I'm particularly…I mean it's not…dollar-wise, it's a lot smaller, but the one piece that I'm really angry about and I'm not disappointed with the public service about is the condition of the current Public Safety Building. I was led to believe…we were lead to believe that the bones of the building were good, it's absolutely, positively going to be reused for some purpose. A couple years ago, not that many years ago, but after the 2009 decision to move out of there was made, a report came along that the chiller units in that building were not serviceable anymore and we had to immediately spend, I think it was well into the six-figures, money on a new chilling unit for the PSB Building. So we've got almost a brand new chiller unit, in that building and what are we doing with the building? We're going to be bulldozing it. Councillor Eadie says 2012. Public service looked me in the eye and they said we absolutely have to do this. I spoke to people with the mechanical branch over at the Province, no, not on the record, but people talked…were telling me, we could have, you know, given you a, you know, permit, you know for ban-aids and bubble gum and we could have held that thing together for a couple of more years and still have been having it work. And so I'm really upset and angry at the public service for being misled on that whole chiller purchase. I asked time and time again, we absolutely, positively have to do this? And they said yes if we're going to use this building going forward. So, anyways, I'm really disappointed. I'm looking forward to the opportunities on this site. It's just another chapter in this new police headquarters. I'm going to leave it there.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Okay. Seeing none, it would be Councillor Orlikow to close.

Councillor Orlikow: Well, thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you everybody for your comments. Winnipeggers, one of our core…our core things is history. Winnipeg is blessed by an incredible stock of historical buildings. We have movies coming here all the time. We have tourism. It's something that tourism always talks about. How we have this incredible historical stock of buildings that other cities don't have. And I'm not going to take credit for that. I will take credit for the slow, steady growth of Winnipeg. So we haven't had to face this in the past, this kind of pressure, but now Winnipeg is growing and there is pressure. These buildings that were deemed derelict years ago are having some value to it, maybe not the building but the land. So the committee…it's going to begin kind of like the leases, we're going to be facing a lot more of these coming forward in the near future and the far future as we actually get through our old historical list and start bringing those items forward. So we're…there's a lot, I think there's 1500 on the list right now pending and we're going to keep just chunking away at them. The most…the highest need ones first that the committee, the Historical Committee will identify and then we'll bring those forward as they come. So again, we have a huge stock, so again, this isn't taken lightly at all. And I'll just share one little story, before I learned that it isn't municipal or public, I read the email wrong that I got. It did say, and, not or. I thought there was an option that we could repurpose this building for public use. That opened up tons of opportunities; housing, a whole bunch of creative ideas could pop up from that. And I went down that brook and, you know, it wasn't going well. I talked to different government groups, talked to different organizations…everybody's going meh, maybe not. Again, but then it all came crashing when I got the explanation, no, it's municipal and public use. So again, our options get limited so far down. And like any process, when we go through

our historical designation process, in that process, there is the what can you do with the building going forward. What is the economic viability of that building? Is it too far gone to actually repair? Is there an alternate use for it? So it goes through all that, and we did all that. Really, the only thing we came forward with that the City could, and again that's why we really want to stress out to the public, if you have other ideas, still has to be municipal use, but if you have other ideas. And again, to come…and I totally appreciate the architectural community and the people that have that real strong sentiment. I'm not one of those believers that it has to be pretty to be historical. That's irrelevant to me. It's all in the eye of the beholder kind of model. But there are some historical, significant features to it which would be all gone with the redevelopment of the building. The only thing that maybe could stay which will be more like $15 million is a recladding. But again, the lobby area, it's raised. That will be a problem. Some of the roof tiling is being cited as historical significance in the Chiefs office, well, that will be gone. The access into the building is very difficult from a streetscaping model, so we'd have to really modify that. But again, it would be very difficult to do that within the existing structure. And you are right, I've never…no one's ever said that this building, besides the cladding, yeah there's problems there, the building is structurally unsound. So there's some…presentations this morning said, well, the building's structurally sound. Oh yeah, it's structurally sound, that's why it's going to cost us so much to redevelop it and to repurpose it. It is a single purpose building. I think in the future, I guess it's a police headquarters, it really had…what other building purpose could you have at that time? But we are limited by the fact that it was designed for a police headquarters; gun range in the basements and all that around. So there's significant pieces in there that have to be modified. Very difficult, very expensive. However, that report that we do have regarding the condition of the building, it will be redacted people, but it will be available to the public. I've read it and if people want to read it, it's open. Again, we're not trying to hide anything here. We have an option here to move forward and I do concur with the Mayor. After we looked at the options and what we could do with that building and I don't agree with moving the campus model here. I don't see the economic viability of that. I think it's a nice idea, but I don't concur with it. I think what we have now suits Winnipeg's needs better. We have to go forward. And this really is an incredible opportunity to redesign a whole block. The parkade is gone, there's no way around that. But this is an incredible opportunity to take that urban campus model from Red River. One thing I'm personally looking forward to is I'll take my own pitch into the consultation before it starts, I want to have an opening that you could see the Red River College from Main Street that over the day of the old that you had this kind of corridor that again, as the Mayor said, connects the east and the west side of the Exchange and it corridors in, has this big, kind of view line that comes from Main Street where the parkade is right now. So again, we have some incredible opportunities; store front shops, we could do that, the piazza or the park or whatever the green space will be, we don't exactly know yet. Again, that's part of the consultation. It could integrate with the Red River College, it could integrate for us, there's a whole bunch of options there. So this is a time where Winnipeggers need to put on their hat, the creative hat, and really take this transformative opportunity to say, what do we want as Winnipeggers that will help build our Exchange to even greater heights. So, I do concur. This was not an easy decision. I share Councillor Gerbasi's sentiment, I would like to retain, regardless of any condition, my personal belief, all historical buildings. Again, that's my personal belief, but as a councillor, I have to weigh all the options including the astronomical cost it will to redevelop a building that I don't believe the City has a need for. So again fiscally, really to me I just can't get my head around that. So again, I hope the public can, again, I think it's unlikely, but again, I remain open. That's why Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Allard and Councillor Gerbasi and I, we've made it open. We opened it up because we all believe in historical buildings. We want some good idea to come forward. Again, I fail trying to find one previously. I'm one person. But maybe Winnipeggers are very creative people, we are one of the biggest arts community in the world, I think. Let's have them come in. And maybe there is an option. But they're coming in to say, Council, we want to have this building, you redevelop for $100 million and we'll give you and we just want a lease of a dollar a year. Well, that's fiscally not going to be sustainable and viable for us. So we have to have some real options coming forward. However, pending that, we have to move forward. So this process will move forward. I hope to conclude it within a year, minimum…maximum I mean. I hope to get it done sooner than later so we can move forward. There is a lot of history with this building itself. Not all of it is positive. And I think it would be a transformable moment for also Council as well to be able to move past this, transform the area, get past this one and learn from our mistakes in the past. I think the real estate odds have done that. They have helped us quite a bit. And I'm equally dismayed by the fact that we found out about the caveat after we made the vote. That's ridiculous. We should have known that before we made the vote. But again, that's the past. The chiller, I think Councillor Browaty makes mention of that. Well again, maybe we need to talk to the Province and get an official document from that, not just, I talked to some guys at the Leg. My understanding still was that no, that's it. We already got extensions on the…maintaining the chiller that was leaking Freon. So we got the extensions and there was no more extensions. That was from the Province. Again, Councillor Browaty believes there was a different opinion. That's not what I heard from my sources. So, I thank you all. It's a hard decision but we have to move forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, I will call the question on Item 13. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have no motions. Moving onto by-laws, Councillor Orlikow? On the first reading.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-laws numbered 56/2016 to 57/2016 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 56/2016 and 57/2016.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow on the second reading.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to move that By-law No. 25/16 to 27…57/2016 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 56/2016 and 57/2016

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow on the third reading.

Councillor Orlikow: On the third reading. May the rules be suspended and By-laws No. 56/2016 and 57/2016 be read a third time and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed. Okay.

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

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. So noted. We will now have question period for the Chair. Questions for Councillor Orlikow? Councillor Gilroy?

Councillor Gilroy: As we all know there was a horrific fire that happened in Wolseley this weekend, where it left two women homeless and a lot of neighbouring properties affected, and was I just wondering if the Chair can give us a response on what maybe the role the City can play? This property was under construction at the time of the fire, and is there a role that the City can play or maybe you can come back to me in some discussions that you're having with the administration?

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you for the question. Our hearts do go out to the neighbours that were horrified by that huge fire that happened on Westminster. The only saving grace is the Church wasn't damaged just a little and those stain glasses weren't blown out. There is requirements for the developer to secure their site, in this case they did have some cameras, they did have security going around to make sure that the site was being monitored. That can't be done 24/7, however, that said, I believe it is an opportune time to follow up with the by-law department to see if there's some more enhancements we could do, and I'll get back to you.

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

Councillor Mayes: I'll try to end on a positive note, that is a very serious and legitimate concern raised by Councillor Gilroy. But are you aware, Councillor Orlikow, that there's some good work here in the by-law we just passed by former Councillor Vandal, and that is in this recent Chamber such in Councillor Allard's Ward, there's a long, thin park here, which Councillor, then Councillor Vandal named for Jennifer Jones, World Curling Champion, resident of Windsor Park, right opposite of where this park is going to be? So we do a pretty good job, I think here recognizing some of our heroes from the City of Winnipeg. So that was not why they publicized it at the time, but to give some credit to Councillor Vandal, former Councillor Vandal, I can see now we've created the park's reserve and we'll have a park for former, well, Olympic Champion Jennifer Jones.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I was not aware. I am aware and fully support.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Chair? Okay, seeing none. Councillor Lukes will you move adjournment? Okay, roll call, Madam Clerk.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 7:21 p.m.