COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, June 15, 2016

The Council met at 9:39 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 Lukes.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: I would like to acknowledge our page for today's meeting, with us is Katrina Chanas, if you could please come forward. She is from Miles Macdonell Collegiate and she resides in the North Kildonan Ward. She must be at the photocopier getting our documents ready. Thank you, Katrina, for being here. Mr. Mayor, I understand you have a few announcements

Mayor Bowman: I do. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and good morning to everyone. I want to welcome our viewing public whether you are here in the gallery, whether you're watching on television, social media or Livestream. And I want to begin my remarks this morning on a somber note. All of us watched the tragic events unfold in Orlando earlier this week. My heart and I'm sure yours sank when we learned what had happened. Just a week ago, I was joined by many mayors from across Canada as we marched together in Winnipeg's Pride Parade and celebrated our diversity. And earlier in the month I marched with over 70 different schools and over 1800 students from across Winnipeg in celebrating diversity…in the Celebrating Diversity March that's aimed at celebrating our differences and building empathy and understanding. What happened in Orlando stands in such stark contrast and immediate contrast to what we experienced here in recent weeks. It also underscores how essential it is that we not lose our resolve in building a community and a city and a nation committed to acceptance, equality, safety and inclusiveness for everyone. I was pleased on Monday night to have stood in solidarity with many Winnipeggers and I want to thank my council colleagues who were able to attend as well. We stood with fellow Winnipeggers, Manitobans, together with and in support of Winnipeg's LGBTTQ community to honour the victims as well as support family and friends. Winnipeg put its best foot forward in hosting over 1500 mayors and municipal officials at the Big City Mayor's Caucus and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities Meeting and Tradeshow last week. It was great to host everyone at the newly expanded RBC Convention Centre. And I want to thank all of the volunteers who helped make the event a tremendous success, in particular, I want to thank Lisa Blake as well as Destiny Watt for the countless hours and preparation and work leading up to the conference. I also want to thank our Council colleagues for their work as well. I understand Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Browaty were helpful in a lot of the planning for hosting as well. Municipalities and Canada's big cities are claiming our rightful place within the Canadian Federation and we are closest to the people and the work that we are doing together through the Big City Mayor's Caucus and FCM is important for all of our residents. There is no shortage of issues facing Canadian cities and municipalities; infrastructure, housing, climate change, environmental, economic matters, of course, and growth. And we were particularly pleased to hear how committed the Federal Government is to listening to municipalities and flexibility that they have indicated they are going to be providing to municipalities. And I look forward to working with our Federal and Provincial Government partners on issues of shared and common interest and working together for all of the residents that we serve. We are also able to further showcase Winnipeg to the world when over 600 business people from over 30 countries around the world descended on Winnipeg recently for Centralia. I'd like to thank the World Trade Centre Winnipeg and all of their partners for organizing a third, very successful event. And again, thank you for doing such a great job showcasing our beautiful city to the world. Earlier this month together with the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, we presented the Firefighters Burn Fund with a cheque representing partial proceeds from this year's state of the city address. It's become a tradition for the Mayor to identify a charity of their choice to benefit a community organization. This year as you may know I asked Maria Mitousis to help me identify the charity and she was very appropriately identified the Firefighters Burn Fund. Together with the $10,000 contribution from the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, local businessman Albert Eltassi also made his own personal contribution. And I want to thank both the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, of course, as well as Mr. Eltassi for their contributions as well as their continued commitment to this tradition. I also want to just acknowledge that today is World Elder Abuse Awareness Day. To recognize this day, I appreciate that we are all wearing purple ribbons. This day involves many

activities to recognize the mistreatment of older adults, wherever they live, throughout the world, and to highlight the need for appropriate action. Abuse of the elderly used to remain a private matter, well hidden from public view. Today, because of the awareness and education, it's increasingly being seen as an important problem and one that is likely to grow as many countries experience rapidly aging populations. Through building greater awareness, like we are doing today, this day is intended to give abuse and neglect of older adults a global relevance that helps sustain and move prevention efforts forward throughout the year and to create a better understanding of what elder abuse is and how it can be prevented. Today, outside of City Hall, we are flying the Métis flag. This is to mark the bi-centennial of the Battle of Seven Oaks, an important event in Manitoba's history. The battle is regarded as one of the worst of several disputes between the Hudson Bay Company and the North West Company to rival fur trading companies in western Canada as they competed for control over the fur trade. On June 19th, 1816, in an area today that is known as West Kildonan, a number of Métis men with the North West Company were travelling to a meeting with other traders when a battle broke out with rivals from the Hudson Bay Company. In a matter of minutes, the battle was over and 24 men had lost their lives. At the intersection of Main Street and Rupertsland, a plaque commemorates the battle and here with us today to speak more about the bi-centennial is Will Goodon, Minister of Tripartite Self-Government Negotiations. Mr. Goodon, would you please come forward. Thanks very much. Merci and megwich.

Will Goodon: Thank you very much, Your Worship. It's an honour to be here. I have the privilege of representing my President, David Chartrand, who unfortunately isn't feeling well this morning and asked me to step in for him. These are...if you…I'm sure most of you know of or know President Chartrand personally, and I don't think I'm overstating things when I say those are big shoes to fill, so you will have to forgive me if I am not quite as eloquent as President Chartrand. Your Worship, Madam Speaker, Council members, visitors, friends, Métis citizens, this is an important week for the Métis nation as we celebrate the 200 years of raising of the Métis infinity flag. It is fitting that we raise the infinity flag here at City Hall in Winnipeg, which we know was formerly called the Red River Settlement. But we as the Métis people know it as the birth place of the Métis Nation and the heart of the Métis Nation homeland and territory. This week, the Métis National Council is also commemorating the Battle of Seven Oaks. Métis National Council General Assembly is being held here in Winnipeg at the Hotel Fort Garry on Thursday, Friday and Saturday. But we are also here to commemorate the role played by Métis leader Cuthbert Grant Jr. Just coincidentally, I am the four times great grand-nephew of Cuthbert Grant Jr., and I had a couple of comments this morning on the sash that I am wearing. I just wanted to explain a little bit about the sash. This particular sash, it's one of a kind. I had it custom made for this week. It carries the colours of the Grant tartan as well as the infinity flag, the blue infinity flag. This coming Sunday will mark 200 years, exactly, on June 19th when the Métis at the Battle of Seven Oaks were forced to defend ourselves, our rights and our way of life. I thank the Mayor for explaining exactly what happened on that day. This is a day that we look on as important in the recognizing of who we are as a people, not only to outsiders, but to ourselves as well. As part of our commemoration activities, we will be displaying the Coltman Report on the Battle of Seven Oaks. The Coltman Report was like a commission to look into the fault-finding or what happened, exactly, at the Battle of Seven Oaks. And even back in the day when there may have been some...how do you say it, racist leanings at the time, Cuthbert Grant Jr. and his Métis men were found to not be at fault during the battle. The Colten Report will be on display at the Canadian Museum for Human Rights in its Protecting Rights in Canada Gallery from June 16 to June 23. This document is on loan from the library and Archives Canada and its public showing is a partnership between the Manitoba Métis Federation and the Government of Canada. The Métis National Council will also be hosting a symposium on the emergence of the Métis Nation. We have invited scholars and historians to present on important topics related to Métis governance, topics such as historical memory and Métis narratives of the Battle of Seven Oaks. We also will be presenting on the long journey of the Métis Nation in its struggle for recognition and rights. This symposium will take place on 2:00 p.m. on Saturday, June 18th at the Hotel Fort Garry. On June 19th on Sunday, we will begin a day long commemoration of the Battle of Seven Oaks, the Métis Nation and Cuthbert Grant Jr. At 9:00 a.m. we begin with a mass at St. Francis Xavier Roman Catholic Parish in St. Francis Xavier, a town Cuthbert Grant founded which was formally known as Grant Town. From there, we will travel to Grant's Old Mill Museum at 2777 Portage Avenue for a picnic lunch at 11:00 a.m. We will conclude our commemoration at 1:30 p.m. with the unveiling of the renewed Battle of Seven Oaks National Historic Site located at the intersection of Main Street and Rupert's Land. I invite all of you to participate in these important, commemorative events of the Métis Nation. During this Year of Reconciliation, let us work government to government to build a mutually respectful and beneficial relationship. Together we will improve the lives of all Winnipeggers including the lives of Métis citizens who live and work in Winnipeg. Again, I want to thank you very much for your time, your thoughts for our President, and we look forward to having a full week this week with Métis representatives from across the homeland. Again, thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Minister Goodon for your remarks and for taking the time to join us today during our Council meeting. The next speaker for announcements is Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I've sort of made it a tradition here to speak about the Manitoba Marathon at the Council meeting immediately before that event. That's always the Father's Day event, has been since 1979, it's become a Winnipeg tradition. We have supported that, our police service has done an excellent job supporting the marathon over the years. I have run the full, last year I ran the 10k with one of my sons, it was a very moving experience to do a 10k with my son for the first time. The important thing to note this year is it's being run backwards, which is not to say all the runners are running backwards but rather the route is being reversed from its traditional route that it's held since 1980. So this time it's starting at the university but going through St. Vital first taking advantage of the great confines of St. Vital Park for the first time for the 10k and then ending by coming down along the Wildwood/Pembina area. So, I'm sure we will all get calls, I'm sure people with wards along the route will get many calls because people have been used to the pattern for the past 35 years but needed some innovation, I think. So it's a great tradition, it's going to be slightly different this year but it's an event that attracts tens of thousands of participants, AIDS mental health treatment in the province and really it has become a tradition here. So we look forward to another marathon in all of its different distances and hope to see everybody out on Sunday.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for that Councillor Mayes. Next speaker on the list is Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today just to speak of a person who contributed so much to the City of Winnipeg and Manitoba, that is David Sanders passed away on June the 12th, Sunday at the Victoria Hospital in the evening. And it's worthwhile to mention this man, Madam Speaker, because he was a selfless person who immersed himself in the issues of the City of Winnipeg and many other places in the community, in university and so many places as a civil servant. And he was a very conscientious person who had a vision. He took on the mission, Madam Speaker, to run for Mayor in 2014, a very difficult one as I know our mayor understands, and we all, I believe, Madam Speaker, had respect for Mr. Sanders. And the detailed analysis that that man would bring to the issues of the day here at Council, standing committees, the Winnipeg Police Board, you could always...you may not have agreed with the man on every issue, but what you could rely on, Madam Speaker, is you could rely on his detailed research, educating people about some of the detail that people may never have thought of because that's the kind of person he was. He would spend hours and hours looking at legislation, making sure that we had a safe, healthy community when contributing to input when the Winnipeg Police Board was established. In the latter part of his life, I had the honour, Madam Speaker, to work with the man as the Chairperson of the Taxicab Board. And even despite his health issues, Madam Speaker, this man worked on many of the issues and very difficult issues with the taxicab industry at this point and he always had a level, balanced view in looking at these stakeholder issues in that industry, an industry in which Winnipeggers depend on. And just the man had so much to contribute and I really believe that we had to acknowledge him today here and we send...I would like to send and I think Council all feels the same, that we would send condolences to his family and pay our deep respect to him. It's my understanding that the obituary will say when his funeral is coming and one last thing to mention about David Sanders is that I don't think anybody could ever, through his whole life, ever know all the things that he contributed to make sure that we had a great, beautiful city of Winnipeg and a province that we could all count on to ensure that we all could experience a sense of well-being. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to add, I appreciate the Mayor's comments about the FCM Conference and tradeshow that was held here and I just wanted to add a couple more thank yous if you will indulge me. We first bid on this conference five or six years ago, it was a long time in the making. And I want to ensure that the planning committee was incredible. FCM was very pleased with working with the City of Winnipeg and they found everything went very well. I want to make sure that my colleagues, Matt Allard, is thanked for his work on sponsorship and Councillor Browaty for his work on the study tours. And also to thank some of our other partners, Tourism Winnipeg, the Downtown BIZ was everywhere to be seen during the weekend with the farmer's market and other things, just to make Winnipeg really pop for our visitors. And I want to thank Council, I want to thank the Mayor for his active involvement and promotion and enthusiasm of Winnipeg which people really appreciated. The reverberations across the country and the response we got were people were blown away by Winnipeg and impressed with our city and I think the promotion of the Mayor and members of Council, almost all of you were there supporting this. And I want to thank all of you for supporting me for these many years. As you know, I am now the first Vice-President of FCM and I couldn't do that without the support of Council. So I want to thank all of you for supporting me all these years and FCM is such an important organization for positioning the local level of government in a great relationship we currently have with our Federal Government. And so I thank you all for your support and for a wonderful conference. Winnipeg should be very proud and that is spreading from the people that were at that conference from across the country. Thank you Madam Speaker.

MINUTES

Councillor Gilroy moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on May 18, 2016, be taken as read and confirmed.
Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: We will now move on to delegations. Mr. David Grant followed by Mr. Joseph Kornelsen., if you could both come forward. At this time, we will hear from Mr. David Grant. He is in opposition to Item No. 9 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. The report is dated June 7th, 2016 and is regarding the acquisition and license of a portion of the Manitoba Hydro transmission corridor for the southwest rapid transit and Pembina Highway underpass project. Mr. Grant, are you here? Welcome, sir. You have ten minutes to make your presentation.

David Grant: Hi. This is my first time speaking to Council, although I know many of you and I helped some of you with your campaigns. I have been active but never been here as a speaker before and I really do appreciate this opportunity to speak to Council on this important issue. My first visit, last time I was here I recall hearing the passion with which folks spoke to a committee in this room. Some of what was said was clearly not true. Some of the printed stuff provided to Council is far-fetched if I want to be polite, and I must. I understand that there are no routine fact-checking or...and there is no penalty for anyone misleading Council. I believe Council should fix that. Provincial commissions only allow sworn testimony and the decisions here made by Council are too important to the City to base them on anything less than the whole truth. I have also witnessed the outrage felt by councillors recently that the data they need to make decisions is provided just before the vote. If you do not have time to evaluate then please postpone the vote. Ignore the urgency imposed by staff and outsiders, changes needed at City Hall and we are all counting on you to do so. If all the land for this project, BRT 2 were privately held, we would not be here. It would simply be taken from those folks. Some of whom might term the process arrogant. By law, Hydro must be treated with more respect by the city than other land owners, hence this process and the negotiation. I find it rather ironic that those elected to wisely direct the spending of billions of city dollars have not, to this point, questioned the whole phase-two project. They are wise to be alarmed at the call for an extra 10 or 20 million. Alarms should have been raised when all the claims made to justify phase-one were never proven after it was built. All of you should be asking why transit has been silent on actual ridership before and after and the speed of phase-one, and why there was no official report on phase-one. Some would say that such a report should have been required by Council before the vote for more money for phase-two. Most of my professional career I have been involved in big projects like this BRT 1. I have seen proper scrutiny applied to ideas to make sure money is not wasted. Since we the people first heard of BRT there has been no evidence of any such scrutiny. I have faith that things will improve with a senior engineer involved in managing of city operations. Doug must apply the tools of private industry or the worst will continue to happen. Properly selling a mega project involves explaining in provable ways what is intended to…it is intended to accomplish. Those goals are listed upfront. Real alternatives including doing nothing are also explained. The effective governance means that no one dare make things up. Selling a new car to someone who cannot afford it is a different matter. You wave vague ideas and dreams in front of them and promise that their life will be better in every way. The way BRT was sold to Council and the public would make the crookedest car salesman proud, maybe an exaggeration, but there are similarities. There is also no short list of hard goals, things which all that money will accomplish. The only alternatives offered are even sillier than what was built and what is proposed. Some of the best alternatives, the dog leg, were presented at public meetings to officials. But, they are not mentioned in any report to Council. The purpose for asking for input from the citizens is that ideas will come forward and that they will be included even if they are shot down. Council should begin applying skepticism. Remember, that slick salesman is not your friend. Big smiles. As a bus rider, I have measured the actual speeds both for the old express bus on Pembina and for the buses on Phase 1. Phase 1 is slower than the bus on Pembina was, off peak if you are not stuck in a traffic jam. The printed transit schedules say that it is slower if you compare the pre and post BRT 1. The Phase 1 drops riders off further from many downtown destinations than the routes to be replaced. You used to take a bus very close to the Convention Centre and now you are many blocks away. If you look at the map of Phase 2, you see more stops and sharp bends in Phase 2 per mile than Phase 1. This means that Phase 2 will be slower than Phase 1 which is slower than Pembina. Average speeds will be under 30 km/h. I've measured them in 22, 26 km/h range average for a trip or for a section of road. Don't believe those 80 km/h signs in the transit ads. Think about the latest spin about BRT, we have heard this on TV recently, we have been told that someday, transit might serve more than U of M and the stadium and it will be a rail line and it will use the old train station. This is classic spin doctoring to distract the public from what is actually being built and what is obviously wrong with BRT. Don't believe the spin. Don't spend taxpayer dollars on another report on an eastern extension, it will be full of more spin. Before you buy another report please take the time to

compare what prior reports promised and what those projects actually delivered. I spoke in this chamber long ago advocating the use of TSP, which is called transit signal priority. It's a proven technology. It's far more cost effective than the NASA style control room which we are in the process of building now. That central control room system is much more expensive than TSP and much more likely to fail. TSP can save more time than any BRT and it costs about a thousandth the price of BRT. If transit and its advocates really wanted to improve service we would have TSP in place now and all the buses we would need in that situation, we wouldn't be short of them like last year. We might even have wi-fi on our buses. With either TSP or the traffic control centre in our future, there will be absolutely no benefit to commuters if you continue funding Phase 2. TSP is proven simple technology, it works. BRT Phase 1 is a failure if you look at the numbers, if we had the numbers offered to us it would be obvious to us. Please do not waste hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars. BRT has been a monstrous waste of money. Who but the builders and engineers will benefit by expanding it? Certainly not bus riders. Why not hold a few consultation evenings to gather evidence? Please be the Winnipeg Council which called a halt to a really bad mega-project. Don't let falling for the same slick sales trick be your legacy. Better bus service is a lofty goal. I ride the bus and I want good service but BRT Phase 2 is wrong in every way. If the Phase 2 money is spent instead on roads and sewers and some of you have spoken about that to the media, all of Winnipeg will benefit and Pembina bus riders will ride directly to where they live, work and shop. If you just say no, bus riders will not be forced out of their way to roar through some of the most tranquil and beautiful streets and park land in Winnipeg. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Grant. If I could just ask you to remain on the floor, we'll hear from our next delegation and then take questions. Mr. Kornelsen, if you could please come forward. Mr. Kornelsen is representing Functional Transit Winnipeg and he is in opposition to the same item. You have five minutes for your presentation. Welcome.

Joseph Kornelsen: Hi there. First off, I just want to acknowledge the passing of David Sanders. Our group was saddened here with his loss. We found his work to be an inspiration as a city watch dog. So my name is Joseph, Functional Transit Winnipeg, and I will be speaking in opposition related to the purchasing of the Hydro corridor. The route of Phase 2 of the southwest transit way lacks justification. There is no present development along the route, there is little opportunity for development and there are few guarantees or explanations for the benefits this route will provide. Functional Transit Winnipeg urges this council to vote against paying the increased costs to Manitoba Hydro for the corridor. By not paying the substantially higher price, the City will be effectively cancelling this project and this project should be cancelled. We have reviewed the initial southwest corridor study and the business case study. We have found these reports to be severely lacking. Given the vagaries of the reports, we believe City Council should be deeply concerned about mounting surprises as the project moves along. This corridor reduces access to amenities along Pembina Highway. In order to justify moving service off Pembina, we have been promised areas along the corridor would be developed as transit oriented development or TOD. Throughout this process, it has not been made adequately clear that there are any caveats placed on these developments to ensure that they are transit oriented. So far all evidence indicates that there are no caveats on these developments at all. One-third of the Parker Lands Development, an area that was promised for TOD in its entirety is now going to be used for a pond. Along Phase 1, the TOD promised in the Fort Rouge Yards Development, will not materialize. The planning document for the yards of Fort Rouge explicitly states that it is unlikely retailers will ever succeed in that location. Without retail, this development will not meet the definition that the City has for TOD. Not only are there no guarantees that TOD will be built, only a very small part of the area around the corridor is expected to be developed at all. Along the full 7 kilometres, there are only three pockets for development. Most of the corridor is not expected to be developed leaving many stations along the corridor sitting in the middle of nowhere. Not only will these stations not be accessible to anything, being in the middle of nowhere will contribute to making the stations feel unsafe. It is also unclear how much of the improvement this corridor will have on speed given the corridor is 50 percent longer than the distance travelled by buses on Pembina Highway. The reports on this project state the corridor will be five to eight minutes faster yet there has never been an adequate explanation for how these speed projections were determined. Functional Transit created our own analysis to determine the speed improvement. Using the average speed of buses on Phase 1 of the southwest corridor in comparing to average speeds of buses using the current bus schedules, we found that super express buses would actually be slower on the corridor than on Pembina Highway. These calculations obviously do not take into account the improvements to congestion that will take place when the Jubilee Underpass is widened and when the City fully rolls out its centralized traffic signal control program. Speed could be improved on this corridor if stations are built with passing lanes, however, it is not clear how many of these stations will have passing lanes and that that could be another potential surprise for Council down the line. As someone who believes a solid and effective transit system is absolutely critical in Winnipeg, it terrifies me to stand here and tell you not to undertake the largest transit investment in Winnipeg's history. But transit riders deserve better than this route. We have all been waiting decades for decent transit investment and unfortunately, this project is not it. Plain Transit for Planners, a document put out by the Ontario Professional Planner's Institute summarizes very nicely what is needed to make transit work, "Key considerations for transit service include frequency of service, customer service, affordability and safety. The environment which incorporates street design, transit access points and neighbourhood design must be supportive of transit service. The success of transit provided is otherwise limited." The route of the southwest corridor breaks so many of these considerations and we have been encouraged to see so many

councils recognizing these flaws. We encourage you to repurpose the annual $20 million for this corridor towards effective transit investments. From our research, much of which is included in the report that we gave to Council a little over a year ago and is still available on our website, these are the options before Council that will have the biggest impact on transit. One, higher frequency transit service. This is far and away the most important and intuitive for anyone who has ever taken transit. Two, rapid transit corridors must access amenities. Because bus riders are normal people who need to run errands, get to their work places and have fun. Three, transit must be competitive. Transit is cheaper than private automobiles but it comes with steep time costs. Time cost is best dealt with by shortening waiting times and walking distances. On average, waiting and walking to the bus feels twice as long as riding the bus. Ultimately, transit service must be affordable in both time cost and financial cost. Given that there are so many unknowns to this project and given that there are far more effective ways to invest in transit, ways that actually increase ridership that are helpful to everyone in the entire city. Functional Transit Winnipeg recommends not purchasing the Manitoba Hydro corridor land for four times the original price.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentation. We will now entertain questions. Mr. Grant, if you could come forward as well. Councillor Wyatt, followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you and thank you for your comments about David Sanders. He was...many times he would come before Finance Committee when I was the Chair and he spoke very passionately and had a great love of the city. And he lived that every time he spoke, you knew he was speaking from his heart. So thank you for your comments. My question is this, you know, you are both very educated, intelligent individuals. We are all facing...we are a growing city. In the last decade, we have grown more than anybody could have ever expected. We haven't seen this kind of growth for nearly a century. They are projecting that we're going to continue to grow as a city, as we go forward in the coming years. We have always liked to brag in Winnipeg that, you know, we can get anywhere in Winnipeg in 20 minutes but that's quickly changing and the route you are talking about, I hear a lot of credit to what you are saying but at the same time, you know, Pembina Highway literally has a rush hour in both directions. You have rush hour because of the university at one end and downtown at the other, both directions. And we are going to need alternatives to the automobile than what we are doing today and we just can't keep building ourselves out of congestion because it's going to cause us to be bankrupt ultimately. So we need an alternative. We need to provide and every other modern city of a larger size as Winnipeg is becoming has that alternative. What do you foresee then?

Joseph Kornelsen: No, that's a great question. What's critical is you want people to ride transit and the way that you're going to get them to ride transit is to have its service destinations that they are going to. Increasingly what you are seeing is downtowns, while growing in importance, are not the most important part for jobs and for, you know, socializing. People go all over the city for that kind of thing. Right now the automobile provides you with that kind of service and the bus, if it were to run down the corridor, would not provide that service. So, your goal to reduce congestion is to get people to ride transit and what we are advocating for is you need to create places to go on that route. So if you just have a route that services downtown and the University of Winnipeg, the only people that that route can be used by are people that are going to the University of Winnipeg and downtown. So what will end up happening is you'll create a greater incentive to continue to use the automobile because it remains the only practical way to do the diverse things that we've mentioned in the past, going to daycares, going to schools, going to, you know, out with friends, that kind of thing. What we would advocate for is finding ways to fit rapid transit, if we're going to go the rapid transit route on Pembina Highway. It's the only way to create that access that makes buses more convenient than the automobile. Does that answer your question?

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

Councillor Wyatt: So you are arguing, again the case that was made that the dog leg is not the route to go, that it would have been better to go Letellier or Pembina…Letellier in proximity to Pembina. You are aware that we've already spent 20 to 25 million already preparing for this project ever since Council approved this in June of 2014, any thoughts on that?

Joseph Kornelsen: Yeah. What we've often argued is that…is that ultimately, this route is only going to have six express buses on it. So those bus routes are going to be useful for an hour in the evening and an hour in the morning every day. We think that the amount of money being spent is so much for basically two hours of transit service on six express bus routes that it's not worth it even after it was built it's not really particularly worth it. We've noticed that or we understand that the 160, route 160, will continue to travel down Pembina Highway and that's a positive. I think if there was one other thing...if we were to look at the whole corridor and point to something on that corridor that is positive, I would say the stretch through the Southwood Golf Course lands if you'd spent money on that part. Anecdotally, that one seems to make the most sense to me because University Crescent does get quite congested and it's fairly affordable…it seems like it would be fairly affordable to build that part of the corridor. Does that answer your question?

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Final question, Madam Speaker; one of the greatest challenges of course in determining or building any type of alternative to the automobile rapid transit corridor is the corridors themselves. It's the acquisition of the lands that makes it possible and we have a tenancy, at least here, to only acquire lands when we actually have a project, which is really unfortunate because you are not banking land in advance for future corridors. What are your concerns with regards to the fact that this proposition before us today will directly make it more expensive for us to assemble lands and corridors from any utility in the future for future rapid transit to other parts of the city?

Joseph Kornelsen: Are you asking if we purchase this land for the price Manitoba Hydro is asking, am I concerned about the price that it will…? Well, yeah. I don't know the ins and outs of purchasing property and expropriating property so I couldn't really comment, you know, knowledgeably on the subject. But my understanding is that it would have a negative impact and that does concern me.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I maintain, in essence, the same position I have held throughout my entire time, a year and a half, as a councillor, a position that was sort of developed while I was campaigning. And the advice I was getting from people that were studious on the issue was harmonious with the concerns that I was hearing at the door. And I didn't realize at the time but the advice I was receiving was indirectly coming from the gentlemen that are before us here. I had not met them at the time but the research that they were doing was reverberating and I was receiving it. And I happened as well, by chance, stumbling into a Riel Community Committee meeting, I believe, where I saw Dave Grant first give his explanation of what he terms transit signal priority. That is the first time I heard about it and these aspects of research taking place by citizens of our city, just because they've got concerns. They have ideas and they do what we are supposed to do, Madam Speaker, which we don't see enough of. Positive, activism and research and discussion and I am inspired by that as they are inspired by Mr. Sanders' work, I am inspired by their work, Madam Speaker. And on that basis, we get into some fundamentals, we get into some real brass tacks.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Yes, absolutely, Madam Speaker. And thank you for bringing me back on track. As you know I am a proponent of light rail. Now, it has been said that there is no time gain by a BRT, by the new BRT corridor linking up Phase 1 and Phase 2. I was under the impression that yes, there is no time gained during rush hour. In fact, perhaps time lost. But that during rush hour, there might be as much as a saving of six minutes between the University of Manitoba and downtown during rush hour. So I would ask either one or both whether they think a six minute gain during rush hour and perhaps a small loss during non-rush hour, if that is worth the hundreds of millions of dollars that we are putting into this corridor?

David Grant: If one wants to save time, the reason I brought forward the TSP idea which has been used in San Francisco and a bunch of US cities, it does have a good record that all the cases I could find were people have spent money on TSP, it has saved them in the order of 10 percent, sometimes more, in travel time. And the problem I see as expressed earlier, that if Phase 2 is going to be like Phase 1, but a little bit longer and a little bit slower, that's not good. And something like TSP or a signal control room will save a lot of time. For far less than Phase 2, we could have had a fourth lane down part of Pembina, parts that's easy to do, we could have had that. And there are engineering challenges to doing that but that would have been a route, giving TSP with a diamond lane would move the bus much faster than Phase 1. The other magic thing with keeping the bus, as far as fast bus, keeping it on Pembina is in the old days the fast bus went down Pembina in the middle lane. If it's express from A to B, it doesn't stop at all those little stops and that's where you pick up the big average speed. So if right now stopping every time or stopping on Phase 1 averages 22 or 23 km/h, if you are running on...down the middle of Pembina with transit signal priority, you can be heading up over 50 km/h, average.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Grant. That ends our question period. Okay, moving on with our agenda, we'll move on to the...yes, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I ask that Council recess for up to an hour so Council may hear from the administration regarding a matter that's on our agenda today.

Madam Speaker: What matter on the agenda?

Councillor Orlikow: It would be regarding the Hydro land acquisition.

Madam Speaker: Okay. There is a request put forward that Council recess for no more than one hour to hear more information from the administration on the Hydro item being heard later this afternoon. Yes? I'm going to call the question…

Councillor Wyatt: Not a point of order, just a question of clarification is that, are we requesting to go…are you requesting that the meeting be held here for clarification? Or that we are going to be going somewhere else and it won't be in the public domain? Just a clarification.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.
Councillor Orlikow: Pertaining to contractual matters so it would in-camera, it would be downstairs.

Madam Speaker: Not in-camera, but a recess I think is what you're asking for. I will call the question, it's a majority vote. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Council will now recess for no longer than one hour.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
June 15, 2016, at 11:26 a.m.

Madam Speaker: I would like to reconvene our council meeting. There is a motion by Councillor Orlikow that we can remove our jackets if we so wish. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will now move on to committee reports. First we have Executive Policy Committee, the report dated June 8, 2016, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 8, 2016

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. I move adoption of consent agenda 1 through 13.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on Items 1, 4 and 5, 7 through 9, 11, 12 and 13. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 376 Logan Avenue and 263 Fountain Street – DASZ 6/2016

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, do you wish to introduce? Councillor Pagtakhan, this was stood down by yourself, I believe. Just one moment. Thank you.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I just want to rise in support of the item of the subdivision and rezoning at 263 Fountain Street, Madam Speaker. This is occurring in the Centennial Neighbourhood. The neighbourhood is...great things are happening here, there's more artists moving into the neighbourhood, Madam Speaker, and I just want to thank Mr. Kelly Hughes for converting an old church here at the corner of Logan and Fountain to the Valiant Theatre which is going to be opening up in 2017. And it's a really great, quaint church, a great repurposing, Madam Speaker, and you know, it's just great to see this project happening and I want to congratulate him and put those comments on the record.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close or I can call the question? All in favour of Item 2? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 3.

Item 3 – Citizen Member Appointments – Committees, Boards and Commissions

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor. This was stood down by? Councillor Wyatt. Would you like to speak?

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thanks Madam Speaker. I'm rising to just say a few words on this. This was a matter where it was actually myself and Councillor Schreyer who moved that an additional member be appointed to the Board of Revision, namely Mr. Don Mitchelson. Mr. Mitchelson was a former member of this chamber. He served with distinction. He was the Deputy Mayor at a time when the Deputy Mayor was actually elected by members of Council, his peers, and he did a lot of good work in the community of North Kildonan and beyond. So, it was...he was somebody who had been serving on the Board of Revision. His institutional knowledge at that board, I think, would have been a great loss to the

board. He is somebody who takes the task extremely seriously. He researches all of the files and he ensures that the decisions that are being made are balanced and fair. And so, it was a pleasure to be able to name former councillor and former Deputy Mayor, Don Mitchelson and be able to move the motion. I want to thank EPC and the Mayor for supporting it as well. It's for another one year I see, till 2017. And, of course, Mr. Mitchelson will have the opportunity to apply again, I suspect, to be able to serve and continue to serve unless he so wishes not to. So, this is something which I think it was great to see that we were able to make this amendment. I know typically these appointments typically come from EPC and EPC planning...no, sorry, agenda management and...of EPC, iEPC and these names come forward, people apply, they get put on the list or not of serving on the Board of Revision and the fact that we were able to add Mr. Mitchelson I think speaks well to the City. So, I just wanted to put those comments on the record and thank members of EPC for supporting this appointment. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am pleased to see that see that live discussion on the floor on issues has impact and that this was referred back to EPC, I believe, Madam Speaker, and that it has come back to Council with this recommendation. I am pleased to be part of that process and bear in mind, Madam Speaker, that this is non-partisan. And to add some weight to, just I guess this good news aspect of non-partisan involvement or multiparty if you will. Bear in mind, Madam Speaker, that Mr. Mitchelson and I come from different political parties and he may not be aware, Mr. Mitchelson might not be aware but, in the election of…provincial election of 2003, I was following him around because I was running another campaign sign truck around and following him around and we...I was very much an opponent of his personally as he did his sign campaign and I did mine on behalf of the candidate running in River East. But, that aside Madam Speaker, the fact is we are talking about merit. And we are talking about public service, we are talking about contribution to a city institution and that, to which he has shown to be worthwhile. And as I said last time at the last meeting of Council here last month, Madam Speaker, that he may arguably be the most justified individual on that board to be given this specific consideration. As I said, Madam Speaker and as I say now, in terms of the names being offered up, he is a name we know, and for good reason. Former Deputy Mayor Don Mitchelson, I believe is now in position to continue to serve on the benefit...to the benefit of the City of Winnipeg and I am pleased to be supporting this motion as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor, I will call the question then. All in favour of Item 2? That was Item 3, pardon me. Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 6.

Item 6 – New Fire Paramedic Stations Construction Project – Status Report 2016 Quarter 1

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, do you wish to introduce the item? This was stood down by Councillor Gillingham. You have the floor.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, I did stand this down. To draw my colleague's attention to page number five, recommendation number nine, it's good to see on page four that 8 of 14 recommendations have been fully implemented and the remaining to be implemented very soon. Recommendation number nine states, “Legal Services should establish clear policies regarding land acquisition agreements.” If you go down to actually item number 13 which I won't pull but I’ll just include in my comments here; the audit report, on page eight of that report which is the real estate management review status of audit recommendations, recommendation number three indicates that there should be appraisal guidelines should be established. And so it's there as well. Given the agenda item we’re going to be dealing with shortly, Item No. 9, the Hydro lands transmission, I think these two reports and the recommendations within these reports which are...I think are very timely and very important. In the last hour, as I spoke to our Legal Department I’ve also spoken to the Director of Property and Development and I will be speaking with our CAO in the coming hours, suggesting, in fact, asking, that the implementation of these recommendations includes policies that deal with methodologies around determining land appraisal, land value, and that these approval agreements, if possible, where possible, be made public, they be public facing documents and where possible be signed by both parties. Now, there may be some legalities around that which don't allow certain things. My point is, we have two recommendations from two different reports that are before us that are in process right now. We have a situation that has consumed our time in the last really three days around methodology of land valuation, and I believe right now we have an opportunity to improve the process which ultimately, for the sake of Winnipeg residents, for the sake of Winnipeg taxpayers, I believe we are obligated to do to take this opportunity to improve, to make things better, to establish policies if need be and practices that will enhance future land acquisition matters. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker is Councillor Eadie

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak to this particular issue that Councillor Gillingham pointed out and I just want to refresh everybody's memory a bit, having been involved in this. But much of this appraisal

value and land acquisition policy and stuff was to establish from our auditors, to establish a much better process where we don't end up building a fire station on a piece of land we don't own on Taylor Avenue. So this is where it arises. And in terms of that, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to say that I am not necessarily sure, but appraisal guidelines and stuff when it comes to what was potentially a commercial property, I believe, Madam Speaker. I don't think it was zoned residential. I can't remember. But anyway, in terms of that kind of appraisal and guidelines, there was a big discrepancy and argument as to what was the value of that commercial property, had it been used for other purposes than a fire station. And not knowing all the details, we are, Madam Speaker, having a debate soon about where we heard about methodologies. And the methodology related to that other event may not really be of any serious consideration when you are looking at what happened with the fire hall purchases of land and appropriate appraisal guidelines. So, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to...and I am glad that there is an opportunity to speak to our Chief Operating Officer and anybody else that councillors need to talk to about this. But I just wanted to point out though that this is a substantially different issue than what we are going to be dealing with in terms of the proper evaluation of what the market value is of land. So I'll just leave it at that. And I am actually...there is a lot of real estate progress and stuff and I have to say again, not having read through all of it, but I know that our administration has been very dedicated to implement all of the recommendations that were made in regard to what's happened in the past with the city. And you know, there is, Madam Speaker, there's many rules and procedures that are different today than they were just only three or four years ago. So I think that that helps to provide guide for our administration to be...as I think the auditors always mention, accountable and appropriate wherever need be. So thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further speakers on this item? Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? I will call the question then on Item 6. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 10.

Item 10 – Fraud and Waste Hotline Performance Evaluation

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, you stood this down. We will ask if the Mayor wants introduce the item. No? Go ahead.

Councillor Allard: I just wanted to raise or pull this item to show that our Fraud and Waste Hotline is performing well. There's been significant uptake in 2015 and the program has identified places where fraud, waste or unethical behavior has been beneficial to the City so I wanted to bring attention to it. It's also a hotline that's available to the public so I understand if it's communicated more widely, the effectiveness of the hotline could further be improved. And this comes...I guess this comes in nicely with the Council motion where we ask the Province to extend whistle-blower protections currently available to workers of the Provincial Government, that they also be applied to City of Winnipeg workers and I understand we are the first municipality in Canada to have those protections extended. I understand there is one more step that needs to be, I guess...that needs to happen at the Provincial Government with Royal Assent for these protections to be granted to our City employees but just generally want to say I think we are on the right track with these types of provisions and this hotline and other measures that we have taken I think are bettering some of our accountability practices at City Hall. So I wanted to raise it for that reason. So thanks for your attention.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Okay. I will call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We now have Motion No. 1 in front of us. This is a motion moved by Councillor Gillingham. The seconder, Mr. Clerk? Councillor Eadie, I do not have the signed motion in front of me. Seconded by Councillor Eadie and this would be an automatic referral. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I ask the rules be suspended to deal with the matter today as the matter is time sensitive.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so I'll call the question. Two-thirds is required to deal with this motion today. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Gillingham to introduce Motion 1.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Gillingham,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS the Winnipeg Police Board has been invited to bid on hosting the annual meeting and conference of the Canadian Association of Police Governance ("CAPG") in 2018;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg has never before hosted the CAPG annual conference and doing so would offer an opportunity to showcase the framework for providing civilian governance of police that has been established in Winnipeg since 2013;
AND WHEREAS it is projected that hosting the CAPG annual conference in 2018 will bring an estimated $750,000 to the local economy;

AND WHEREAS CAPG requires the successful bidder to provide a minimum of $30,000 in funding to cover conference-related expenses;

AND WHEREAS Tourism Winnipeg has committed up to $15,000 to host the conference;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. *Subject to confirmation that The City of Winnipeg has been chosen as the host city for the 2018 Canadian Association of Police Governance annual conference, Council approve a grant of $15,000 to CAPG for conference-related expenses (such as facility rental fees, catering fees, speaker fees) to be paid by the City to CAPG in 2018;*

2. *The funding source for such grant be referred to the 2018 operating budget process;*

3. *The City enter into, execute and deliver a grant agreement with CAPG that sets out the terms and conditions of the City's grant, and that the Chief Financial Officer be delegated the authority to negotiate and approve such terms and conditions in accordance with this motion and such other terms and conditions deemed necessary by the City Solicitor / Director of Legal Services to protect the interests of the City;*

4. *The Proper Officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.*

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This motion is in regards to a bid opportunity. The Canadian Association of Police Governance has an annual conference and given that Manitoba has only…has had police boards for only three years, we have never had the opportunity here in Winnipeg to host the conference. We do have an opportunity. We have been working...the Police Board has been working with Tourism Winnipeg and they have worked hard to provide a bid on Winnipeg's behalf, to host the conference. You'll see in the motion that Tourism Winnipeg has committed up to $15,000 to host the conference and the Canadian Association of Police Governance requires the successful bidder to provide a guaranteed minimum $30,000 in funding to cover the conference-related expenses. So the request today of this motion is for a guarantee of $15,000 for 2018. I thank Councillor Eadie, my colleague on the Police Board, for seconding the motion and that's the essence of the motion, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to quickly mention Winnipeg is the conference city now I think. Let's try to...maybe it will be the year of Winnipeg's conference city. So this is really important. It is an interesting field, the police governance and how it works in different provinces. And Madam Speaker, I hope that we win the bid and that everybody will have a chance to participate and I'm sure Councillor Gillingham will be…if we do win the bid, we will be inviting all us councillors to come and have a good understanding because police governance is very complex, very difficult and always opportunities, Madam Speaker, to learn many things. So this is important and I hope it's unanimous that we go ahead through this on this motion because it's essential, I think, for Winnipeg to continue to be on the conference city map. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Gillingham, do you wish to close? I'll call the question on Motion No. 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move on to By-laws. Mr. Mayor, first reading.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: Do this morning's special EPC meeting and the standing policy committee, is that something we deal with now or during the committee? IRPW. Okay, thank you for the clarification. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the By-law No. 80/2016 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 80/2016.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law 80/2016 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 80/2016.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor on the third reading.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-law 80/2016 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 Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It has come to our attention that a couple of weeks ago, the administration sent out the RFP for garbage and recycling and my, I have concerns about the procedure, Madam Speaker. If we are truly serious about saving money, we all need to consider what's going on around our country in terms of garbage and recycling. We just had the Canadian Federation of Municipalities here, we had Mayor Nenshi from Calgary, who's been a rather inspiring for other cities in terms of the way they're going and it's not just them, Madam Speaker. Calgary is completely in-house when it comes to garbage and recycling, completely done by city workers and that is the trend right now across the country. Mayor Nenshi has told me, personally, what's going on. As examples, in Edmonton, Ottawa, Toronto, Vancouver, they're not going 100% in-house, they're going 50% in-house, and they're moving towards more in-house and more city worker services regarding garbage and recycling because it's cheaper, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: And your question is, Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, if we are serious about saving money, I believe we need a real good discussion on this issue with the Mayor, with the administration, and with other key players. Is the Mayor willing to have that discussion on specifically, on garbage and recycling, on cost savings, as is in comparison to what is going on across the country regarding City worker in-house services for garbage and recycling because others are very willing to have that discussion with him.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker and I thank the Councillor, through you, for the question. This…the question may be best raised with our IRPW Committee. But I can remind Members of Council that in April at our meeting of Council, Council voted to adopt the motion before them that instructed the public service to immediately conduct a comprehensive review of the existing autobin garbage/recycling program as approved by Council in the CIWMP 2011 report and report back to Council before the last Council meeting of 2016. This review shall include a full analysis of the existing program, failures to meet promised levels of service, as well as comprehensive recommendations and steps required, that are fully costed to improve the existing program and service. B. To develop a broader consultation plan for opportunities for organics program here in the City of Winnipeg. Consult with the newly created Climate Change Working Group to explore funding partnerships and opportunities and report back to the Standing Policy Committee on all of the above within 120 days. Also develop a City Wide program to reduce organics waste from commercial, industrial and institutional waste and report back to Council within 180 days. To develop a City Wide organic diversion program that would be community based and work with existing not-for-profit groups and organizations and report back to Council within 180 days. Also improve the existing program of subsidized organic bins for Winnipeg residents, by reviewing and potentially increasing the bin cost subsidy, increasing the times and locations where bins will be made available, and by increasing the options for the type of models of compost bins being made available at the subsidized rate, and report back to Council in 180 days. Finally, the motion asked and Council asked that our City's School Board

Trustee Councillor Mayes be authorized, in consultation with city staff, to discuss with Winnipeg Area School Boards a potential organics collection program. So we'll await to hear from the public service on all of those. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Second question, Councillor Schreyer.
Councillor Schreyer: Does that mean that the RFPs that were sent out a couple of weeks ago don't carry wait until after the report is due as we approach the end of the year?

Mayor Bowman: I would ask that that question, perhaps the Clerk's could provide guidance on the process. I'd be happy to work with you to get that answer with Clerk's.

Madam Speaker: Third question.

Councillor Schreyer: I'm grateful for an answer. Would His Worship be willing to have a discussion with these parties involved and with the administration, in between the RFPs apparently have been put out, but the report not being put until next year, until the end of this year?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: I'd be more than happy to meet with Councillor on this or any other subject. I think, obviously we want to support the will of Council and the direction that we provided to the public service on the motion that I read out. In the meantime, there's also additional opportunities for Members of Council to work with our relevant committees and I would encourage the councillor to do so. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I was going to ask about why we were asked to sign a non-disclosure agreement today instead of a week ago, prior to the Standing Committee on Property and Development. But my question that I want to stick to that I planned on asking was in the request for proposal for the professional consultation service for the Eastern Corridor Study, under section D4.4.5, called Stadacona Street Extension to Gateway Road. This whole report or this RFP was for the purpose of looking at the Eastern Corridor and the next phase of rapid transit, however, this reading it jumped out at my attention, and I apologize for the preamble. But it appears that a road work project has been added into this corridor pertaining to a connection that does not exist, but the public service seems to want to have it exist, which is.

Madam Speaker: Your question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay, my question is this, was there consultation with area councillors with regards to the fact that a road is being proposed or potentially purposed to connect Stadacona to Gateway, which clearly states in this RFP will benefit the areas beyond the city and link and basically turn Gateway into a major corridor going forward and traffic flowing through existing Northeast Winnipeg? Was that made clear to the Northeast Councillors before this RFP went public?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I'm happy to look into that. I think that's a question best asked of our public service and I'd be more than happy to work with the councillor to support his efforts to have that question answered. I'm not able to, you know, I'm not able to speak to it on the floor without having an opportunity to look into it further and I'm more than happy to do so.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question?

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. And are you aware that in the report, it states very clearly that they're not referring, they're referring to a multimodal line corridor, but they're very clear that the rapid transit, are you aware the rapid transit is well-beyond 2031, if anything occurs here that is specifically talking to road versus and road alignment going behind a school through a park and everything else versus rapid transit?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I'm more than happy to look into that further. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Third question.

Councillor Wyatt: And could you also look into…was there any communication going on between our staff and the Province of Manitoba and the RM of East St. Paul to include any of this, in this RFP so that their issues are being addressed versus ours. Was there…could you…can we get a clarification on what communication has taken place?
Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I would ask that the Councillor consult with the public service with regards to these questions. I think they're really best directed at the administration. I can always support those efforts to try to obtain the information that best desired and more than happy to work with Councillor Wyatt to do so.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We have three or four big items on the agenda today but we don't want to lose sight of some of the other ones, and I know we're not certainly intending to do that. My question, I should move back a little bit to the…a report that we passed already on workplace safety, a report on June 8th that appeared at EPC, and I'm just wondering perhaps the Mayor doesn't know but doesn't remember, I don't know but I was taking a look and noticing the…on page 3, figure 4, departmental lost time injury severity rates, and I noticed that Fleet Management and Fire Paramedic Service, those are the departments that have the highest lost time injury severity rates. Ironically, who'd thought it, the safest place to work in the City of Winnipeg is to be a Tax Collector, Assessment and Taxation with the lowest. But I'm just wondering when the department gave their presentation, did they give any indication as to what's being done to target and reduce the loss time injury frequency in the departments with the highest rates? Do you recall, does the Mayor recall by chance, if the department...when they did their presentation, if they indicated what measures are taken to improve things? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you for the question. I believe that information is set out in the Workplace Safety 2015 Annual Report, and I would refer the Councillor to that report and of course the authors.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: I believe it is set out though.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for the Mayor? Okay, seeing none, we will…probably a good idea to break seeing the hour, the time. Okay and we will reconvene at 1:30. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
June 15, 2016, at 1:40 p.m.

Madam Speaker: I'd like to reconvene our Council meeting of June 15th, 2006. We are on the Standing Policy Committee on Innovation. Councillor Browaty on the report dated May 24th, 2016.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION
DATED MAY 24, 2016

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to introduce the report of May 24th, 2016 and move Item 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have no motions and no by-laws under this committee. We will now have question period for the Chair. Are there any questions for Councillor Browaty? We will then move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development.

Councillor Schreyer: Excuse me I thought there was...oh excuse me, that was merely a delegation. Pardon me.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT,
HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED JUNE 7, 2016**

Madam Speaker: Okay. We are now dealing with the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Orlikow on the report dated June 7th.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, sorry Madam Chair. Not quite there. I move Items 1 through 9.

Madam Speaker: Okay, I'll call the question on Items 1 through 8. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 9 – Acquisition and License of a portion of the Manitoba Hydro transmission corridor for the Southwest Rapid Transitway (Stage 2) and Pembina Highway Underpass Project

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll explain the process. This is the complex item for today. Councillor Orlikow will introduce the item and then we have Motion No. 2...pardon me. We have Motion No. 4...pardon me, three and four? We have two motions that are going to be rescinded and it is replaced with Motion No....which we don't have circulated at this time. No. 6 will be circulated very shortly and that's a motion by Councillor Lukes and seconded by Councillor Wyatt. It's an amending motion. And we also have Motion No. 7. Do you all have that before you? It's a motion by Councillor Browaty, seconded by Councillor Dobson on rapid transit.

Councillor Eadie: Excuse me, Madam Speaker, I just…I just…when you just say a motion number, I need to know what the title of the motions are.

Madam Speaker: Sure and we will be reading them into the record if you so choose.

Councillor Eadie: So two motions are being removed…rescinded? What's the names of them? You just gave me item numbers.

Madam Speaker: Yup. I just want to clarify the ones that are being rescinded, Mr. Clerk. Motion number?

Clerk: Motions 3 and 4 are being withdrawn and it will be replaced by 6. It's the same motion with revisions done to it. And the motion is moved by Councillors Lukes and Wyatt. In addition to that, we have a new motion, Motion No. 7 moved by Browaty and Dobson. Both are amendments to Item No. 9.

**Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Lukes,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,**

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg Council and Manitoba Hydro cannot agree on the valuation of the Hydro transmission corridor lands for the Southwest Rapid Transitway (Stage 2) and Pembina Highway Underpass project;

AND WHEREAS Manitoba Hydro is a Crown Corporation and its lands cannot be expropriated;

AND WHEREAS Manitoba Hydro as a Crown Corporation has the power to acquire, take and expropriate lands;

AND WHEREAS with great power comes great responsibility to act in a fair and equitable manner and in the best interest of the public;

AND WHEREAS there should be a process of oversight at the Provincial level to ensure that with the actions of Crown Corporations, public good and the public interest is protected;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Recommendations 1 to 5 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated June 7, 2016 be deleted and replaced with the following:

1. The City of Winnipeg suspend any decision on acquiring the Hydro corridor lands and starting the Rapid Transit project and request the Province of Manitoba act in an expeditious manner to establish a binding process of mediation / arbitrations to fairly and equitably resolve the value of the transmission corridor lands;

2. That upon the establishment of said process that the City start the project and set aside $20.4M in cash or letter of credit in trust to allow the arbitration to run in parallel to the project construction.

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

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

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg Council and Manitoba Hydro cannot agree on the valuation of the Hydro transmission corridor lands for the Southwest Rapid Transitway (Stage 2) and Pembina Highway Underpass project;

AND WHEREAS Manitoba Hydro is a Crown Corporation and its lands cannot be expropriated;

AND WHEREAS Manitoba Hydro as a Crown Corporation has the power to acquire, take and expropriate lands;

AND WHEREAS with great power comes great responsibility to act in a fair and equitable manner and in the best interest of the public;

AND WHEREAS there should be a process of oversight at the Provincial level to ensure that with the actions of Crown Corporations, public good and the public interest is protected;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That Council suspend any decision on acquiring the Hydro transmission corridor lands and lay over indefinitely the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated June 7, 2016 entitled "Acquisition and License of a portion of the Manitoba Hydro transmission corridor for the Southwest Rapid Transitway (Stage 2) and Pembina Highway Underpass Project" (the "Original Report").

2. That the City request the Province of Manitoba to act in an expeditious manner to establish and commence a binding process of mediation / arbitration to fairly and equitably resolve the value of the Hydro transmission corridor lands, which process must be binding on both the City and Manitoba Hydro and must include a binding requirement for the land purchase and sale to close at the mediated / arbitrated price.

3. That upon the establishment of said process, the City proceed with the project and set aside $20.4M in cash or letter of credit in trust to allow the mediation / arbitration to run in parallel with the project construction.

4. That in the event the Province of Manitoba declines to establish a binding process of mediation / arbitration as requested, Council consider the Original Report at its next regular meeting, or any such special meeting called for this purpose.

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

Madam Speaker: Yeah. Is that motion coming before us, the new one, Mr. Clerk?

Clerk: It should be here imminently.

Madam Speaker: And we are just having a little bit of a delay because the photo copier is down further away because of the construction. So if you could just be patient. Yes?

Councillor Orlikow: On Motion No. 7, this motion is pertaining to Councillor Browaty and Councillor Dobson's wish to cancel the southwest rapid transit line. I don't believe that is what we are talking about today. We are talking about a purchase of land. This is not about a debate about routes or…so I'm not sure how...

Madam Speaker: The motion is in order. It's the purchase of land for this larger project. The motion is in order.

Councillor Orlikow: Okay. Fair enough.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, is that…just give me a moment while we circulate the new motion. Sure, in the meantime, we'll have the Clerk read the new motion that we will be considering. Motion No. 7 and will be circulated to you momentarily.

Motion No. 7
Moved by Councillor Browaty,
Seconded by Councillor Dobson,

WHEREAS the cost of Stage 2 of the SW Rapid Transit line (including the widening of Pembina Highway at Jubilee and certain land drainage improvements) is estimated to be $590 million;
AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg's infrastructure deficit of existing infrastructure is estimated in the billions of dollars;

AND WHEREAS the operational improvements and increased passenger load levels are expected to be minimal.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Recommendations 1 to 5 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated June 7, 2016 be deleted and replaced with the following:

1. *The City of Winnipeg cancel all aspects of Stage 2 of the SW Rapid Transit project (and associated works);*

2. *The Public Works Department prepare projects on existing regional and local streets, for council approval, to invest the City's portion of the project's funding;*

3. *The Public Service work with provincial and federal partners to re-allocate funding towards existing regional and local streets AND/OR Transit system improvements AND/OR Water/Sewer system improvements AND/OR other projects consistent with Council's Transportation Master Plan;*

4. *That the Proper Officials of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.*

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And you will read the....just give us a moment. We have Motion No. 6 coming and that will be read into the record and that is on the same item, Item No. 9. It's an amending motion. Again, for those watching on Livestream, we are just waiting for a motion to be photocopied and we will be resuming the meeting momentarily. Motion 6 is now being circulated. It's moved by Councillor Lukes, seconded by Councillor Wyatt. It's an amending motion to Item No. 9 before us. Mr. Clerk would you read the Motion No. 6 into the record please.

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

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg Council and Manitoba Hydro cannot agree on the valuation of the Hydro transmission corridor lands for the Southwest Rapid Transitway (Stage 2) and Pembina Highway Underpass project;

AND WHEREAS Manitoba Hydro is a Crown Corporation and its lands cannot be expropriated;

AND WHEREAS Manitoba Hydro as a Crown Corporation has the power to acquire, take and expropriate lands;

AND WHEREAS with great power comes great responsibility to act in a fair and equitable manner and in the best interest of the public;

AND WHEREAS there should be a process of oversight at the Provincial level to ensure that with the actions of Crown Corporations, public good and the public interest is protected;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That Council suspend any decision on acquiring the Hydro transmission corridor lands and lay over indefinitely the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated June 7, 2016 entitled "Acquisition and License of a portion of the Manitoba Hydro transmission corridor for the Southwest Rapid Transitway (Stage 2) and Pembina Highway Underpass Project" (the "Original Report").*

2. *That the City request the Province of Manitoba to act in an expeditious manner to establish and commence a binding process of mediation / arbitration to fairly and equitably resolve the value of the Hydro transmission corridor lands, which process must be binding on both the City and Manitoba Hydro and must include a binding requirement for the land purchase and sale to close at the mediated / arbitrated price.*

3. *That upon the establishment of said process the City proceed with the project and set aside $20.4M in cash or letter of credit on account of a maximum purchase price to allow the mediation / arbitration to run in parallel with the project construction.*

4. *That in the event the Province of Manitoba declines to establish a binding process of mediation / arbitration as requested, Council consider the Original Report at its next regular meeting, or any such special meeting called for this purpose.*

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow will introduce his item and after that Councillor Lukes will introduce Item No. 6. Motion No. 6, pardon me. Motions No. 3 and 4 are rescinded with the concurrence of Council. Councillor Orlikow to introduce Item No. 9.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. It's a little awkward as I am not the Chair of IRPW for speaking on some motions regarding cancelling BRT or not. That's the area that I was prepared to speak to is on the purchase of the Hydro corridor lands and the legacy agreement associated with that agreement. So, I guess what I will have to do right now and some of these motions are coming forward which again is every councillor's right to do that. I still am trying to read over it. Look, when we talk about blindsiding councillors before well again, it's allowable under the procedures. However, I haven't had a chance to really read it, either report. So again, I would be more than ready to listen to my colleagues. We have had opportunities to meet with administration staff about the land purchase itself and to ask questions, so...and I have heard many of the questions that people have raised and I respect you all for raising those questions. However, today is our day where we can maybe hopefully wrap up those questions and hopefully you've had the answers you can get and maybe you'll never get the answers you want or maybe it's just the answer you don't like and that's all fine so we'll listen to that today. But again, as people have always asked me, I do have supreme confidence and faith in the will of Council as a whole. So again, this is part of that process at the end part. So I look forward to the comments and I'll leave it at that for now.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes to introduce Motion No. 6.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. And we have rescinded 3 and 4.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, so Madam Speaker, firstly I would like to apologize for bringing a motion on at the last minute to the floor of Council because that's not my style. I didn't sign up for these last minute things. I operate under the theory of talking and working through and gathering information. But in this particular report, I myself, when I initially voted on it to have it moved to Council for consideration, had merely 25 to 30 minutes. It was a walk on at the end of the day on Monday. We are very busy. Councillors are very busy. All day Tuesday I was working. I caught up with it on Tuesday night, and had no briefing and then had to make a decision. I want to make it very clear that I, and I think everyone around this…in this room understands this that I am a strong supporter of rapid transit. For those of you that do not know this by now, and I am sure all of you do, I am absolutely in support of building rapid transit and continuing to build it. We are a growing city. We are moving forward towards seeing a population of over 1 million in the capital region and we must steer our urban growth in the right direction, encouraging sustainable transportation, densification and reducing pressure on our existing road infrastructure. But embarking on a massive rapid transit initiative, as we all know, is not for the faint of heart. It requires determination on the part of all political representatives, the municipal, provincial and federal and also determination on the part of the administrative leaders. So, today we have reached a milestone in that we have all the support of all levels of government for Phase 2 in rapid transit…for Phase 2 rapid transit. And I know how long and precarious the road was to confirming all these three partners, both politically and financially. Very precarious but we are here. I was asked by the City of Winnipeg to sit as advisor on rapid transit Phase 1 and I did and I became very involved. And I know very positive changes occurred because of my involvement along with others. And for those of you who were here during the Phase 1 experience, you'll remember the ups and downs, it was not a process for the faint of heart again. So again, I was asked to sit as an advisor on Phase 2 and I started but stepped down when I took on this role for the city councillor for South Winnipeg - St. Norbert. I think everyone knows that over the past 15 years I have

worked passionately to enable sustainable transportation choices, to ensure there were sidewalks and pathways connecting to the city, connecting to transit and connecting to communities. So I really want it to be clear and on the record that I know we must continue building rapid transit. We must move our city forward and work to reduce the number of vehicles on the roadways. And I do not want to jeopardize this and this motion is not about changing the route, it's about making a pause and trying to find the best value for the citizens of Winnipeg. We heard in one of our meeting briefings, Mr. Wardrop spoke to the fact that, you know, if there was a pause, he could do a pause, there would be implications but he could do a pause. And I'm basing that on the information that I heard, that I'm asking for a pause. The project will not collapse, we will not experience a dramatic increase in cost to taxpayers according to what I heard from Mr. Wardrop. Yes, he did indicate that it could cost up to $200,000 to taxpayers but I believe that this would be a wise investment enabling us the time, the time to work towards finding greater value for taxpayers. I have been elected to represent the best interests of the citizens of the South Winnipeg - St. Norbert Ward and as a member of Council, to represent the interests of all the citizens of Winnipeg. All of us have a responsibility to do what we can to ensure the best value for any project that occurs for the citizens of Winnipeg. Previous council tasked administration and gave them delegated authority to negotiate the best land deal that they could. And we have today, in front of us, the best deal that they were able to negotiate. But, I do not believe the valuation of this land deal is in the best interests of the taxpayers. The citizens of South Winnipeg - St. Norbert who have the most to gain from having a rapid transit corridor are telling me loud and clear, they do not want the City of Winnipeg to agree to the valuation of the land deal. I have many concerns about this project. First and foremost, the timeline administration has presented up with an incomprehensible window to make our decision in or for me it has been. I am very involved...and I am very involved in making internal changes about this so it doesn't occur again. But, you know...and I apologize, again, for bringing this motion forward on such short notice but the timeframe has just been, in my opinion, not acceptable. The fact that the land has little to no commercial value and is not serviced, the fact that the Hydro corridor...that Hydro corridor land has never been transacted at this value in the City of Winnipeg, which really is also potentially setting a precedent for any future land valuations, I have serious concerns about this as we move forward to further expropriations along this corridor or corridors even such in your area where we are looking at putting in an active transportation path. I have concerns that we as the city have done no other appraisals. The City have participated in one appraisal and the documentation and process of obtaining this one appraisal, the whole process, you know, I understand we are not privy to that information but we have seen comments from the Appraisal Institute of Canada questioning the valuations of the land. Manitoba Hydro is a Crown Corporation created by the Province of Manitoba. Manitoba Hydro lands cannot be expropriated, that's why we're, you know, they cannot be expropriated, that's why we are here today and Manitoba Hydro has the power to expropriate. So these are two great powers that Manitoba Hydro has and yes, you know, there is a lot of responsibility that comes with that but to act in a fair and equitable manner and in the best interests of the public and I do not believe this is happening. And I know the citizens of Winnipeg don't believe this is happening. So, I think it is on us as City Council to at least ask the Province to consider this and to look at arbitration. This is for the public good and so the public interest is protected. We need a process of appeal. We need an opportunity to establish a fair and equitable resolve to the value of the transmission corridor lands. I do believe a pause in the timeline will not result in an insurmountable negative impact on the project from everything I have heard. My motion today, seconded by Councillor Wyatt, they say politics makes for strange bed fellows, asks that the City of Winnipeg suspend any decision on acquiring the Hydro corridor lands and starting the rapid transit project and to request the Province of Manitoba to act in an expeditious manner to establish a binding process of mediation, arbitration to fairly and equitably resolve the value of the transmission corridor. And that at the same time that we set funding aside in cash or the hang up on the wording and I apologize to Legal because again for short notice, Legal had to regurgitate this motion a few times to make it…get the right wording, that funding be set aside so that we can do this project in parallel and if the Province chooses not to open it up to arbitration or look at it, then so be it, we continue with the project. But I truly believe that the Province of Manitoba has a responsibility to protect the interests of the public. And I ask that we call on them as City Council to work together and do just this. In the end…at the end of the day, both Manitoba Hydro and the City of Winnipeg want what is best for the ratepayers and taxpayers which are one in the same. And most importantly, we have to...this is a decision that respects the people that elected us. We...I seriously believe we need to take it to the next level as Council and at least ask and at least continue fighting to get better valuation on this land and that is why I've made this motion and I thank Councillor Wyatt for seconding it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Next, we will hear from Councillor Browaty who will introduce his Motion No. 7.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker. This may catch a lot of you by surprise but I actually…I support rapid transit. I believe, you know, a Winnipeg of 1.5, 2 million people would require a rapid transit system. But at this point in our future, I mean we might hit a million people in 20 or 30 years, this is not needed. This is one of these nice to have versus one of the necessities. It's like gosh darn my neighbour has a nice new truck. Well, my roof is leaking but, you know what, I'm going to get the truck anyways. You've got to deal with the basics first. Our basic infrastructure, we have billions of dollars of infrastructure deficit, yet we are spending money on this particular project which I don't think is the priority of Winnipeggers. I don't have a ton to say. I've said this many times before. I just…you have one…I think we have one less opportunity right now. It's understood that June 24th is supposed to be the commercial close for this P3

project. At that point, there really is almost no opportunity to back out. We have an opportunity to listen to our constituents, to do what is right for our neighbourhoods throughout the city. To do what is right for the vision of Winnipeg. We realize there's technology changes coming. I mean, Google is testing autonomous cars. By the time you hit a million people, there's going to be technological changes. Improvements to transportation network that may not require us to have dedicated lanes like this. We could use the existing networks with intelligent vehicles. That's something that…it sounds all scientific and really far off but I don't think it's that crazy or that far off, for that matter. And just because every other city does it, doesn't mean we have to do it. Winnipeg is a great medium-sized city. We have an NHL hockey team, we've got a great stadium. I don't think this is something that's necessary and something that we need to do right now. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Now I'll open up the floor for further debate and you will speak to the main item and the motions if you wish concurrently before we have the votes. Next speaker, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First, I want to recognize an old St. Vital friend and colleague, Harry Wahlberg who has been here many times, spoken many times in favour of rapid transit is here again today. I will be supporting the Councillor Orlikow's Item No. 9. I don't support the two amendments. A couple of things that probably haven't been said and a lot has been said on this item. The e-mails one gets on this tend to say, well, if you worked during the dog leg, you wouldn't need all this Hydro land and that's not entirely accurate. Some of the Hydro land in question is down by Plaza Drive, it's down by Bishop Grandin. Even had we gone with a different alignment, we would still need some of the Hydro lands, we'd still be in the same legal position. Hydro can't be expropriated. They would still have the upper hand in any negotiations. So for those who say it's all related to the dog leg, no it isn't. Some of this is just related to the fact that we voted and I've voted repeatedly over the years to go ahead with rapid transit. People say, well, listen to the residents. Well, last time I checked, the first place finisher in the Mayor's race advocated going forward with BRT, the second place finisher in the Mayor's race advocated going with BRT, a number of us ran on that platform who had been in the prior council and were reelected so I feel I am living up to election promises and so is the Mayor here to try and keep going ahead with second phase of BRT. We have people saying, no, no, the future is the LRT. Be like Ottawa and tear out your BRT. They realized they made a mistake I've…Councillor Schreyer could probably now pick up my speech because he knows what I'm going to say, we've debated this a number of times. Ottawa has said it wasn't a failure, in fact, the head of the transit commission, an elected person, said to me there it was a great success. It worked very well. We had bus traffic jams on our BRT. We always said after 30 years if we hit a million people, we'll start converting. That's exactly what they are doing. After 30 years of BRT, and I took it the first year, 84-85 when I worked in Ottawa. They have had it for 30 years now, they are starting to convert some of it to LRT, they are continuing to expand the BRT system. Gatineau across the river is building and has built very recently a BRT system. So for those who are fond of e-mailing us saying, look, it was a great failure in Ottawa and they are tearing it out, that's just not factually accurate. Also, the recommendation here ten years ago was to proceed with BRT. Some people have changed their minds now but certainly the recommendation of the panel that we had and the City of Winnipeg was to go forward with BRT. Hopefully someday, as Councillor Browaty has alluded, the City will hit a million people and we'll be able to then convert some of this to LRT. But for the time being, BRT remains the way to go. It is also worth pointing out that Phase 1 of BRT under Mr. Wardrop's guidance was on time and on budget. Many a things we do here aren't on time, many things we do here aren't on budget but that Phase 1 was. Phase 2 remains on budget. I will say that there was a session this morning, I was not comfortable going to a closed door session. There was one report saying I walked out because I felt I already knew how I was voting. I do continue to keep, hold the same position but also I was not comfortable in getting information I could not then publicly discuss. I ran into this problem many a times when I was a school trustee and said I would not put myself in that box again. So I was one of the people who didn't stay around in the meeting this morning. I simply wasn't comfortable getting information that we couldn't discuss publicly and discuss with our residents. A couple of final points here, this has made me rethink where we should go with the next leg of BRT and I have long been an advocate of going north. There is a line on the books that would go up Main Street. The alignment differs in a couple of different places in the master plan…the transportation master plan adopted before I was elected. I certainly think we should be looking with some priority at that line, given the magnitude of the federal support of 80 million, that's the number we are hearing, that's not enough to build the eastern leg. The cheapest line, the shortest line but the line with the most potential ridership, the line with the most potential transit-oriented development opportunity if you look at the transportation master plan, all of those things, that's the line going up Main Street. Why else am I talking about it? Because to me, it looks like we can avoid some of the implications, some of the problems we've had with expropriations and with Hydro lands. So I continue to be an advocate for going the Main Street line for BRT and I think this whole debate has strengthened my resolve in that respect. Tangential point, we also get e-mails saying go down the middle of Pembina. We've talked about it, we've debated it. We didn't ignore it, it's in the Dillon Consulting report. Look at the report that was presented to Council in March of 2013. People say these options were never put forward, they were. It wasn't politicians, it was Dillon Consulting engineering firm that ultimately made a recommendation on the alignment. A couple of, I think, concluding remarks, one of the wiser people I think I have met in my four and a half years here was former Councillor Vandal and we had one of these debates a couple of years ago and a reporter said to him, you seem to be in a rush and his response was, yeah I am in a rush. I'm in a rush because we haven't done anything for

30 years, I want to get going on this. So I continue to have a lot of sympathy for that that people will say you are in a rush. Well, it's been a 30 year process to get this far, let's keep going. Let's get this project concluded. And we also heard how Phase 1 was a failure. In honour of Councillor Vandal, I'm going to read a few words in French if I may if the translator is with me. It's on the City website about Phase 1, the supposed failure.

Translation of French Spoken:
Stage 1 of Winnipeg Southwest Rapid Transit Project continues to receive recognition.

Councillor Mayes: For Phase 1 continued to win prizes.
Translation of French Spoken:
Officials gathered today in Winnipeg to acknowledge the many awards Stage 1 of the Southwest Rapid Transit Project received since its completion in April 2012.

Councillor Mayes: So, there have been a number of prizes won by this. It's an interesting press release because it quotes from Kevin Chief and the NDP Minister. It quotes from Kevin Fletcher, then a Conservative Minister, and quotes from the then Mayor, Sam Katz.

Translation of French Spoken:
This is the fifth award for Stage 1 of the Southwest Rapid Transitway, and this project is deserving of recognition for its design and construction excellence.

Councillor Mayes: So the Mayor was pointing out, it's won several prizes. It was recognized by all levels of government, different parties as being a success in its construction, in its design and in its operation. So, for those who say it's universally recognized that Phase 1 was a failure, that's frankly just not factually true. It's the winner of many prizes, it's been a success. I think building Phase 1 without building Phase 2, frankly, would make Phase 1 much less of a success. Someone said to me when I ran in 2011, if you don't complete it, it's the merry-go-round that goes halfway around and then stops and there's some truth in that. Whereas, I think Councillor Orlikow said, it's the bridge that goes halfway. So let's get going, let's finish Phase 2. No one is happy with Hydro's intransigence here but ultimately they've got a particular bargaining position so let's move forward and get Phase 2 completed and then take a look at where we want to go next. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I want to draw your attention now to Motion No. 8 that has been circulated. Okay, it's coming? Okay. We will deal with that in a moment then. In the meantime, we will continue with our speaker's list, Councillor Schreyer. You know what, there is another one being photocopied. That's right, but I still have to bring it to council's attention for a vote. Carrying on for now with Councillor Schreyer as the next speaker.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Since I'm next, I was rushed by the way by Councillor Orlikow who is calling for the vote that's why I thought I should stick up my hand. Less no one speaks to this issue. So because of that I am stuck speaking before the other amendments are brought forward. On that basis Madam Speaker, I seek your advice on a point of order. Can I speak on the amendments to yet hit the floor?

Madam Speaker: It will be here momentarily and we will circulate it so everyone's on the same page. So let's take a pause. Motion No. 8 has been circulated. If I can ask the Clerk to read it into the record, please.

Motion No. 8
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Schreyer,

THAT Resolve 3 of Motion 7 Moved by Councillors Browaty and Dobson be replaced with the following:

3. The Public Service work with provincial and federal partners to re-allocate funding towards existing regional and local streets AND/OR Transit system improvements AND/OR Water/Sewer system improvements AND/OR to begin the funding for preliminary design required for Winnipeg's first light rail transit (LRT) corridor/system AND/OR other projects consistent with Council's Transportation Master Plan;

Madam Speaker: As Council only can look at two motions at any given time this is out of order. This would be the third motion. Yes, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate your guidance on this and I just want to say that I'm going to move for the suspension of the rules unless of course the movers of the motion that I am attempting, councillor...and I want to thank Councillor Schreyer that Councillor Schreyer attempting to amend the two movers of the motion see this

as a friendly amendment then it can be adopted as part of their amendment. And…no, they would have to change their amendment on their own. So you'd have to change their amendment…you would have to change your amendment on your own, otherwise…

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, could they rescind their motion?

Councillor Wyatt: You have to change your motion.

Madam Speaker: Okay, I've heard you. Thank you, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I would just like to say that in the event this friendly amendment does not pass or sorry, this motion to suspend the rules does not pass, I do not intend to go and tape this to the Mayor's door. I do not.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for that.

Councillor Wyatt: So I just wanted to let the Mayor know that just in advance.

Madam Speaker: Okay, You have asked for a suspension of the rule. Two-thirds vote is required to allow a third motion which would be Motion No. 8 that was just read into the record. All in favour of hearing this Motion No. 8? Contrary? We're going to have a recorded vote. All in favour of the third motion, Motion No. 8, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Schreyer, Wyatt.

Madam Speaker: So the vote is lost. It's obvious Mr. Clerk. Thank you. We will now continue with the speaking order. Councillor Schreyer, you have the floor and this is your opportunity to speak to the two motions before us and the main item.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Despite the fact I have made my point rather clear, in fact getting legal support on how we...how the Clerk is forced to interpret what I think is a misconvention of the rules here. I will continue on with the vote. And on that basis, mention a few issues that I think are important as we all make our contribution to this conversation. I have to admit, when Councillor Lukes made the point that Manitoba Hydro has the power to expropriate, I assumed that power to expropriate involved a tool of the vote from the Manitoba Legislature. I did not know that they had the power to expropriate unilaterally on…as we make a parallel to two projects as large as this. And I would like to point that out for the public record if that be the case, that people are aware. In terms of Ottawa, this will be the fourth time, I think, that Councillor Mayes and I have been discussing Ottawa BRT as we both lived in Ottawa in the mid-80s when we saw its implementation. So, I will not use the term that it was a failure, BRT. What I will mention is that over the decades, they have decided to evolve into LRT. Bear in mind that the savings in recreating an infrastructure, converting from BRT to LRT are minimal in terms of an intermediary phase of BRT is not really a cost savings. And on that basis, I have to mention the fact that we are not Ottawa. We are not Toronto. We are not a Calgary or Edmonton or Vancouver. We have a greater obligation to be...having greater scrutiny and being more scrupulous with our tax dollar in this city and I think we're pretty good at it. That's the nature of our province because we've had to be. That's the nature of our city, because we've had to be. And on that basis, in the spirit of that, I say there is no gain in having the intermediary step of a BRT but let's hold off. What I'm saying is, let's hold off until such point as we reach the threshold populations by which this level of rapid transit becomes beneficial. Councillor Mayes has mentioned 30 years. And I will not mention it as a failure, but let's learn from, and I won't say they are mistakes, let's learn from what has happened in Ottawa. They are converting to LRT. And yes, he does mention the fact that they are still enhancing their BRT lines. Well, let's take a look at Calgary. Let's take a look at Ottawa. He mentioned BRT into Gatineau. Well, that's right. So let's take a look at the Ottawa/Gatineau metropolitan area. Madam Speaker, 1.5 million people, so basically, almost twice our population. That's what they are dealing with and how they can afford an intermediary stage of building a BRT before building an LRT, that's great, good for them. So my point has been since I was elected, let's hold off and let's do it right the first time because that's all we can afford. And we are not in a rush. And as well, I sympathize with comments being made in terms of being blindsided by amendments taking place. And that happens in Council and I do sympathize. It's difficult. But that's...that in fact is what happens often in Council. It sort of happened this morning, Madam Speaker when we do have a recess for one hour to have the option of receiving information confidentially and then making a decision on that. Well, that happens in Council, Madam Speaker. In terms of not rushing to judgment to taking advantage of time, taking advantage of looking at research from across the country Sometimes we are forced to...into sort of quick decisions and it's not always right to rush to judgment. So, for those who decide that they can't

make a decision based on being offered confidential information this morning, I understand that. And I have chosen not to accept that in rushing to judgment, Madam Speaker. But Madam Speaker, in terms of not rushing to judgment and taking advantage of time, taking advantage of looking at research from across the country and around the world when it comes to rapid transit, bear in mind again, Madam Speaker, that the Provincial Government brought forth the Charest Task Force on rail line and rationalization and I want to see the results of that task force, the results of that report because I believe that that could have great implications in terms of an efficiently created rapid transit system for our city. Is this pie in the sky? Is it theoretical? No, it's the opposite, Madam Speaker, it's been done. Calgary did this. We might recall, Madam Speaker, that right now, the Eddy the Eagle movie has hit the theatres or at least cable anyway. And that took place in Calgary Olympics, 1988. And Madam Speaker, for the 1988 Winter Olympics, the City of Calgary took rail lines and they created a no frills, rather low tech approach to creating a light rapid transit system in their city in time for the global athletic event of the '88 Winter Olympics. And that proves to me, Madam Speaker that there is an absolute feasibility to these things that I think we have overlooked so far but we are in a position to take into consideration in the next few years as we go forth with the Charest Task Force on rail line rationalization. And I don't want to make the wrong decisions when it comes to a multi-billion dollar investment which will be the largest municipal tax increase, I believe, for the rest of our lives. And therefore no one will be surprised by how I vote on the main motion. However, depending on the minutiae, perhaps of anything major that comes about from the amendments that we'll see, they may have been voted down in terms of some greater potentiality on this issue and I thank Councillor Wyatt for having brought forth an option for consideration which I think is something that we just can't ignore. Nonetheless, I look forward to the comments by my fellow councillors. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Next is Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to the original motion and to Motion 6 as well. I want to express appreciation though to Councillor Lukes for her efforts in Motion 6 and I can certainly appreciate where she is coming from. But I just want to take the opportunity kind of here and now to kind of reiterate, restate what I have said publicly. And specific to the valuation of Hydro's valuation of the lands, if the independent appraiser appraised the land at $4.6 million and if that is accurate, then I stand by the statement that Hydro's appraisal is a bad deal for Winnipeg residents. Since learning of this so many of us have been trying to get as much information as we can and I requested and received from our department the value of land sales in the same area. Gem Equities land says Hydro sold the land around the Taylor Wal-Mart, this is public record I have been told, to Shindico for approximately $280,000 an acre and the CNR land beside Gem was purchased for $260,000 an acre. The Hydro corridor is somewhat different but it's adjacent to. It's land…basically the same land or right next to the same land. Hydro declares to us that the value of their land is not $280,000 or 260 but $1.2 million. This administrative report that we received and is before us raises several questions. The first and the most obvious is how can the public service agree to and recommend a deal that sees land valuation of up to $15 million more than the original independent appraiser said it's worth. I asked us on Council, do we believe…do we believe that the land is worth $1.2 million an acre? I realize that you know, there's calculations to whittle it down to…it's worth something less than that. But it still doesn't change the fact that we are starting with, agreeing to an appraisal that they say is at $1.2 million an acre. I can't support that. In this report as well and just speaking to the main report, I'll just ask you to ask behind closed doors, I'll ask it again, why did the public service not made Council aware of the fact that Hydro had rejected the appraisal and gave it to a second appraiser as soon as they knew it. We get this information late in the day, very, very late in the game here and my question again is why didn't Council know this sooner? To a large…and I would argue a fundamental question, why wasn't the price for these lands negotiated, agreed upon and formalized by the previous council prior to the decision to choose the dog leg route? Why at the eleventh hour and fifty-ninth minute are we as a new council deciding upon land valuations for a project that is so far down the road? And in fact, as Councillor Lukes alluded to, passing this motion today, agreeing to this may have an impact on the value of other properties and increase the costs to the City for other lands needed for this project. In fact, it may increase to the city the cost for other lands included for other projects. By agreeing to this price per acre, this value for the Hydro corridor, are we not in danger of driving up land values throughout the city that the city needs for other projects? What does this do to the land values…of lands that the City needs to expropriate for other projects? And again, as Councillor Lukes noted, the City cannot expropriate from Hydro. And the report says that, therefore the Planning and Property Department entered into negotiations with Hydro for the acquisition and license of a portion of their existing transmission corridor required for the project. Why did previous council choose this route is my question, that runs through Hydro lands where the City has no authority to expropriate the lands needed? We are over the proverbial barrel because we have really limited to no negotiating power ultimately. This decision has put Winnipeg taxpayers in an exposed position and at the mercy...very much at the mercy of our Provincial Crown Corporation. Last week Mr. Owen from Hydro said…and quoted as saying, "Hydro has to protect its ratepayers." Well, Council, I believe we need to protect the taxpayers of Winnipeg. In regards to Motion No. 7, it leads me to Motion No. 7 because I have heard from people who say like, if we say no to this recommendation that is before us then the provincial and federal funding may be withdrawn and the whole thing collapses. I made comments in behind closed doors about my concern over the fragility of this project where it seems we can't take a week here or a week there, you know, to think about it further or work through it further. The timelines are so tight. And I'm wondering though if Federal and Provincial

Governments who have both committed to green initiatives and funding green initiatives wouldn't work with us to look at other opportunities. The residents of St. James - Brooklands and Weston have not informed me that they want BRT. At the risk of being labeled not visionary because I won't support it. In fact, I will be supporting Motion No. 7. I want to make it clear and go on record that I am pro transit. I am pro future. I am pro investment in transit. In fact, I believe the City should make wise and significant investments in transit for the future needs of a growing city but I question as to whether that means BRT. I propose transit invest in things other than BRT, new and enhanced bus lanes on existing road ways, new routes, more buses on current routes, expanded hours of operation for routes, new and enhanced technology, more electric buses with additional charging stations, active transit signal priority that gives buses priority at green lights. There is so much that we can do, I believe, on transit alone if we would invest even greater in the system that we already do have. And so I know this is a very difficult decision and I know that it, you know, in very many ways, has divided us. But I do believe it is about the future. I also believe it's about taxpayers dollars now. And I remind us, my final comments, I remind us that all these funds, the majority of these funds that we are talking about are borrowed funds, they are debt financed funds. We don't have this money today. We are asking…we are making decisions and asking future generations to keep paying for this. And so I want us to be very cautious. I know we are all trying to be. I trust the good will of this council but I will not be supporting the original motion. I will not be supporting Motion No. 6. I will be supporting Motion No. 7. Thank you.

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

Councillor Wyatt: We found again today, Madam Speaker, that we are faced once again with the old process of the old regime that we once knew very well, instead of what we thought was going to be a different regime completely. Last minute reports, walk-ons, high pressured power meetings, information coming at the last minute, accusations being made against our public service. I want to start with that last point. I believe that the public service has been placed between a rock and a hard place on this issue. It's clear from the recent communication in the last two days that key information was provided. On March the 24th, from an e-mail from Michael Jack...sorry on June 14th, Tuesday, Michael Jack refers to a meeting of March the 24th responding to Councillor Gillingham where he states, "the first indication they ever received with regards to the second evaluation…valuation of the property by Altus", hired by Hydro, it formally, informally or otherwise was on March the 24th, 2006 and I quote again directly from Mr. Jack's e-mail, "at the time I expressed significant concern as to timing, knowing full well we already wanted a deal and a finalized report by that time." This kind of language from a senior public servant, Madam Speaker, it's clear and from past practice, that the public service has worked always to inform the top policy makers of the city. Clearly, what we don't know is what was informed to the Mayor at that time. From the tone of the e-mail, from the direction that was received at that time, from the fact they knew they had to have an agreement, he stresses in the e-mail, they are committed to having a report back no later than the first week of May. They knew they were under the gun at that time with regards to closing this key, major...the largest capital project in the history of the city. Madam Speaker, please, are we to believe that the CAO who has always been very direct, to the point, a professional public service, did not inform the Mayor and the mayor's office at that time? We were in the middle of a provincial election. This council could have, if push came to shove, made it a provincial election issue with regards to the costs of the Hydro money, but we were not given that option. And why do I speculate like this, Madam Speaker? Because of the last week and the shenanigans and the charade especially what happened this morning which causes me to think that there is no change that the old regime and the old practices of the past are just the same practices now of today. And I wanted to believe in change. I voted for it. I voted for this mayor and my family because I believe that we needed the change. I lived under the shenanigans and the garbage that went on in this council in the last term and we wanted change. But last minute reports, details unfolding like a bad, mid-day TV soap opera, a drama of an NDA, a nondisclosure agreement. Sign this and we're going to tell you some big news. Madam Speaker, where was this NDA when the Standing Committee on Property and Development met last Tuesday and had to make this decision? And in that same meeting, we were told directly by the director, oh by the way, don't worry. We can cover the 60 million because we know we are under budget. They already has that good news then. They already knew they were under budget. Under budget because of the savings Madam Speaker, because of efficiencies, because of innovation or under budget when we will find out in two weeks because they put a massive contingency in this project to make sure they weren't going to be over budget again and I don't blame the administration for probably doing that because they went through project after project previously where they were getting hammered for not staying on budget. So now we're going to get this news that we have this huge savings and it's because of innovation and no doubt there will be a part of innovation there. But let's not fool ourselves that a lot of it will have to do, Madam Speaker, when the announcement comes, it will have to do with the fact that a massive contingency was placed on this budget from the beginning. Madam Speaker, these games, these legal high pressure tactics belong in the towers of Portage and Main and not the public corridors and public hall of this place. This is...the information should be shared and should be shared early. And the fact that a member of Council of the standing council knew this information clearly to suspend the rules today to force us downstairs, calls into question what is the purpose of the other members of the standing committee? Clearly, they don't have the same information. Madam Speaker, I believe this meeting…there's not many meetings like this in the course of a term but this meeting is a Seminole meeting. This meeting sends the message. Are we going to break with the past and how things were done or are we going to go future and this is a new day? I would

like to think, Madam Speaker, that this is not going to be the same old politics of the past. And this council will rise to this challenge and send the message that no, we're not going to throw the baby out with the bath water and destroy BRT. I am not on that page at all. But that we are going to stand up for the citizens of this city. The citizens of this city want leadership, they demand leadership and they demand it from us in this chamber to stand up for them, to stand up for the ratepayers and to say we're not going to practice the politics of old. We are going to stand together. We are going to challenge the government, whether it be the old or the new, just unfortunately it's the timing it's the new that this is not fair to the ratepayers of the city, this is inherently wrong and there has to be a new deal or stick to the original deal. You know, go back and read the reports, Madam Speaker. It was clear. Council was the reported…one report after another that the dog leg was the best because the land assembly cost was ranking extremely high that we would be able to save quite a bit of money. Considerable money was the terminology. Considerable dollars and cost because of the dog leg. Well, the dog leg is now peeing on all of us because it's not coming true. It's the exact opposite. It's the exact opposite. Madam Speaker, I believe that it's not too late to do the right thing. We have commission and we have set ourselves...and I did not vote for the BRT as in 2014. I did not vote for it. I still believe in the LRT. But we have made commitments to other levels of government and we know we have to go down this road. I was prepared to support Councillor Browaty's motion if he was able to keep the vision of rapid transit alive but that clearly was not the will of Council. I believe that we should be speaking to a vision for the future of transit and rapid transit for our whole city because we are growing. Ten years ago we did not have...you know, 11 years ago actually now, 2005, the report we did not think the City was going to grow the way it has. I mean, we have been...up until then, the City of Winnipeg had been stagnating on and off for about 30, 40, 50 years, but all of a sudden we have this massive spike of growth.

Madam Speaker: Would you wrap up, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Do I get an extension?

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We had this huge spike in growth over the last 10 or 11 years that nobody could have predicted. We are well on our way to being the LRT status city. So why are we keeping…why are we building the vision that we had 11 years ago today still when we know what's occurred? Time hasn't stood still. The City has been growing leaps and bounds and is projected to continue to grow and I think it will. I'm confident about our country. I'm confident we are in the centre of this country. I'm confident we're one of the few places in the world with clean air, political stability, without war, a place where people want to come and live and raise a family that we will continue to grow for the next generation. So why are we not building a vision of a rapid transit city that's city-wide, that's integrated, that connects one end of the city with the other. I heard Councillor Mayes and he said, don't do it…maybe the eastern should be done. I know where Councillor Mayes is going, the old high pressure, parochial politics but you know, let's cut that nonsense. Let's talk about a vision for the city which is to build an integrated city-wide rapid transit system based on what we know will actually foster transit orientated development. Go look at the Fort Rouge yards how successful it is going on right now. Transit orientated development, it's not happening. Go look at inner…look at what you can do for infill and renewal and older neighbourhoods, look what you can do when it comes to connecting one key part of the city the other using existing corridors. That's what light rail can do for you. BRT, unfortunately, it does do some of that but not that great. And then the other key thing and I'm just going to finish with this, if we are going to grow, if we are going to densify, if we are going to be a city which believes in building in and up versus out, you're going to need a rapid transit system or you're going to need a freeway system and we're going to have to choose and I would choose LRT and rapid transit and LRT because it can carry the kind of ridership, the ridership that we will need for a city of the next 25 or 50 years. Madam Speaker, please, I beg of this council to stop playing the games of the past. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Further speakers? Mr. Mayor. Yes, you're on the list Councillor Gerbasi, next. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor. Thank you.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Speaking of the politics of the past, I think we've just witnessed it. You know, we're not going to build a better Winnipeg by tearing each other down. And one of the things that I have been impressed upon with this council is the fact that there has been an improved level of decorum and respect, especially when members of Council may disagree on controversial subjects such as rapid transit. I understand that the councillor is angry, he gets angry a lot. He has been angry at people on twitter during this term. He's been angry at people who drive bikes. He has been angry at me. I'm expecting in a few months he will be angry at me because I've caused winter. And so, that's his prerogative and we respect all members of this council. I appreciate that one of the questions that was raised by Councillor Gillingham was why didn't the previous council make certain decisions in the past? And that's a great question that we are trying to clean up on a number of files, including this one. Why didn't the previous council when it decided to move ahead with rapid transit, decide to fund it? That was a decision that was left to this council to make a difficult decision which we did through a respectful debate and budget. Winnipeg is a growing city and as a

growing city, rapid transit system is going to become increasingly important to manage that growth. Along with historic funding for roads, along with record spending and a now award winning 20 year, long-term plan on active transportation for pedestrian and cycling strategies, a rapid transit system is part of that integrated growth of a city that is growing. Now, rapid transit has always been controversial. This is not new to this council. It is not new to Winnipeg. It is controversial in every major centre that looks at rapid transit and in part because there are significant dollars that have to be invested well in advance in some cases of where you get the maximum benefit. And so, as a growing city, if we continue to postpone the costs will continue to go up when we need it most. And I think we owe it to learn from the past. We saw it ten years of political grand standing. We saw ten years of indecision that resulted in a ten year process to build about ten square city blocks of half a line of rapid transit. Well, the voters were clear in the last election, they want us to get the job done. They want us to move forward and show progress as quickly as possible while being respectful of taxpayer's interests and that is something that is on all of us to manage. I do respect the different views around this table on this subject, both on the Hydro deal as well as on the broader topic of rapid transit and that's our role. And I do want to just acknowledge that. Now this is the largest capital project in the city's history. And other cities, when they began their rapid transit developments, some of which were well under 500,000. We had many at Canada's Big City Mayors here recently in Winnipeg and one of the things that many of them told me is you are really late. Your city is behind. We started building our rapid transit system when we were less than 500,000 or around that range, so some were confused why it took so long to build half a line. Well, we do need to lead. We do need to make decisions and that's what's before us right now. Now, I also hear the frustration and share the frustration with members of Council who want more information sooner from our public service. I will be introducing a motion at the next EPC meeting requiring our CAO to report on a monthly basis to IRPW so that we can receive updates in a publicly accountable manner. And members of IRPW can ask questions on our behalf that they have about the status of such a significant project. That's one way and I think it's incumbent upon all members of Council to come up with their ideas on how we can continue to bring positive change here at City Hall in the processes. That being said, this deal was negotiated between Hydro and the City of Winnipeg. I believe it's an acceptable deal. Do we want to pay less? I think everybody around this Council Chamber would like to pay less. I'm sure Hydro would like the City to pay a lot more and like any good negotiation that's typically how the parties feel. The costs, we are advised, of delaying, we are advised, could range at least between 200 and 300,000 if not more. Notwithstanding other complications which we may not even be aware of. I don't believe if we were to pause now on this decision that we would likely realize any different savings. The positioning and the provincial legislation is still intact for Hydro's benefit. We would ultimately have to negotiate because we don't have the power of expropriation, and there needs to be an agreement between the parties. The Province of Manitoba, the Premier's office has been contacted, has provided public comment and what we were advised and what they have advised publicly is consistent in their remarks that they will not intervene with a Crown corporation. And so, it may be politically expedient to say, well let's let them deal with this. Let's see what they will do when we know very well, and they are on public record saying they will not be intervening, that is going to incur at least hundreds of thousands of dollars in costs. I don't think that's a responsible thing to do for taxpayers. I think Winnipeggers expect us to make progress on this important file, and I think we need to replace ten years of indecision with more action and that's what this is doing. Now, I'll relay or reaffirm the fact that all members of this council have the opportunity, in fact, the responsibility to work collaboratively with each other, with our administration and to bring forward their ideas to improve the processes. I think all of us agree that we would have liked to have received information a lot sooner. And I will be supporting the original motion that's before us. I will not be supporting the two amendments. And I would ask my Council colleagues to consider doing the same. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. On to you, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be supporting the clause and I am not supporting the motions. Not to anyone's surprise I'm sure. The Hydro decision is what it is. It's, you know, as it was just explained, you know, we would like it to be better. It could have been worse, it could have been better. But on the scale of the entire project, we've got the information in front of us that it's reasonable, it does…the project is still well within budget and will be well within budget. The decision today is supposed to be...was supposed to be about the Hydro deal and just finalizing that. And it has morphed into cancelling rapid transit for Winnipeg if these amendments were to pass. That's what it has morphed into. And that is pretty remarkable. I think one of the…you know, we haven't really…that's a surprise attack. That's out of nowhere because Council approved the project. So, you know, I know that people that support rapid transit in this city, you know, probably just woke up this morning to realize that the rapid transit was in jeopardy in Winnipeg. I'm not sure that's a great process. I know why it's here because we had the council oversight over the land deals, which we should have, but that's what has happened today. And I want people to understand the implications of not proceeding. In the 1980s, Winnipeg lost a vote 8-8. We had done a similar study that Ottawa did. We were a bigger city than Ottawa. We were a bigger city than Edmonton and Calgary. We were the fourth largest city in Canada. Ottawa proceeded. Other cities proceeded over time and we stayed the same and we are now...I don't know what we are 10th or 11th largest city, it's not all about size, but it's about developing a modern city. It's about city building and we lagged. We are behind. In 2004, I was here when rapid transit was cancelled. We had an understanding. We had funding in place. It was reallocated, the same conversation we are having today. And it happened, and it set us back ten years and when we did

get back on track with rapid transit it cost much, much more, tens to hundreds of millions more it's costing. We would have already had this route complete if that decision hadn't been made. Between our universities and our downtown and we'd be really…probably be building the eastern one right now and others. A lot of people are not talking about the fact that this is an integrated project that includes the Pembina underpass widening. It includes active...very needed and crucial active transportation links. Imagine the 40,000 university students having a bike path that could be ploughed in winter as well as a rapid transit route to the universities from all parts of the city. And the thing about BRT is that you can connect from all parts of the city too without having to change vehicles. We aren't the only city that cancels major projects. I met…once met the engineer of a project, who had been responsible for digging a subway tunnel in Ontario and when Mike Harris was elected, they ended up filling in five kilometres of tunnel because the government changed. That's not good government. Okay? That's not good government. It has already happened here. It happened in Ottawa too. They had to give back millions and millions of federal money. We have obtained provincial funding, significant, it's a good deal for us, it was 50/50 with them of our part of it. It was a good deal. And if you think we can go back and renegotiate that and mess around with that, you are taking a really big risk with the taxpayers money. War is not peace, I know that's what they said in 1984 in the novel. You can't say you support rapid transit and then make a decision that stops rapid transit from being constructed and delays it for decades or costs millions more. You may want to support it, you may believe in it but this is how we're going to build it in Winnipeg. We have an approved project that's funded and happening and these motions if they pass, it seems close like it's scary, it could happen. If you support that, you are putting a bullet in it as Councillor Browaty so often says he would like to and you know what, I respect Councillor Browaty for at least being honest. He doesn't believe we should invest in rapid transit. And okay, I disagree with him and that's fine, we are all entitled to our vote and our opinion but you can't say in one sentence that you support it but you think it should be a different plan than the one we are in the middle of building and we've got funded and is ready to go and not be part of something that's setting us back. So you are really taking that risk if you don't support this at this point in time, at this point that we have reached after all these years. This is in the best interests of our taxpayers to proceed. You know, we keep talking about delaying and waiting and we're being rushed and everything. Councillor Vandal was right, we're not being rushed. This has been like…it's not 30 years it's more like 40 or 50. We've been studying the same thing. And we've got to get going. It's just going to cost us more and more and more. And I can't believe that in 2016, we actually have to have a discussion about whether Winnipeg needs to have a rapid transit system as a city. I mean, I don't even want to start having this debate. I mean, it's embarrassing. It's embarrassing. I understand that there might be people who don't understand that but we are the leaders. We were just at a conference with the rest of Canada. We were just hanging around with Naheed Nenshi and Don Iveson and everybody. If we can't figure out that a city should have a rapid transit system, I think we should all just go home right now because it's just so basic to city building. And I'm sorry if I sound a bit frustrated, but when you've got double speak going on, we've got wars peace going on here, like, come on people, you can't have it both ways. You have to support the program we have all…that the majority of Council supported and here is a last minute chance to kill it. Like, nice going, you know, it's a nice political maneuver, but is that really the right thing? You know, I really want to go home at the end of this council meeting and tell my children, "Yeah, you're going to have a city with rapid transit. You know, we're going to have a city with the u-pass. We're going to have a city with smart cards." There's a lot of people who want this and yes, you get the e-mails from the people who are upset and are caught up in the conspiracies that we have heard about before. You know, I was on the front lines in the last 10 years fighting for transparency, fighting for honesty, but this isn't about that. This…those fears and that lack of trust that we saw in those times is being exploited by people that are trying to kill this project because this isn't about that. The process, Councillor Wyatt talked about it earlier, I'm trying to understand what was so wrong with the process on this Hydro deal. I'm on the standing committee. We get a couple days, we got the report, that's pretty normal, they used to be walked on. We got the report, we had as long as we wanted to ask questions. We asked every meeting is…video on everyone can watch it, everyone can hear the questions. And then we have time for it to go through the other committee process. We had two seminars. We had complete access to the administration answer any questions. Really, what are these questions that haven't been answered? That's not the real issue. The real issue is people want…there is some people who don't want this to proceed and frankly I don't understand some of the other reasoning why people are standing in the way of this. Do I have an extension? So…

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

Councillor Gerbasi: I honestly don't believe that Winnipeggers really understand the risk that we are taking if we don't proceed with building rapid transit. And that's what we're doing. Dave Wardrop was very, very clear. If we go past our deadlines on this, the project will be wound up, that will be it. We will have 3.4 kilometres built and then we will stop and have half a corridor and then we'll sit here, we will be the embarrassment of Canada. And I remember when it was cancelled in 2004. And the day after, you know, we were, the public was upset. They don't want us to set Winnipeg into the…backwards into the 1970s. And they may…not everybody's going to agree. And these are controversial projects and there is always a lot of resistance when you are building big projects that involve a lot of investment as the Mayor mentioned earlier. I remind you of the floodway. When that was built those politicians that built it all lost their seats. Would I want to be one of those politicians and go home to my kids and say, "You know what? I didn't want to lose my seat so I didn't vote for the floodway. Sorry you're city's washed away." No, I'm not going to do that today and I hope that

none of you are going to do that today because this is about city building and we are building it slowly but we are finally starting to build it because we have some leadership that recognizes what it takes to build a city and that is investment in alternative transportation as well as all the other things downtown and all the other things we need to invest in to make our city fabulous, which it will be. But we have to move forward into the future. And I'm not even going to revisit some of those arguments that we have been revisiting over and over again. We could talk forever about this but please, don't derail this. Don't kid yourself that you are not derailing this. Don't kid yourself that you can be for rapid transit and kill rapid transit in the same vote. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Very difficult issue. Where to start? I am going to start with Madam Speaker, just make a comment. Yes, this is the largest capital project the City of Winnipeg has ever done. Approximately $590 million, ongoing lease payments because it's a P3. If it was to go to LRT it would be even higher, Madam Speaker, it would be even at the biggest, massive amount, and you know, there are advantages to LRT, there are advantages to BRT. They operate somewhat differently, Madam Speaker. But what I'm hearing and Madam Speaker I'm going to mention to the general public, the people who are saying shut down this report and tell Hydro to take a hike on the price. But most of the people who are complaining that are upset, Madam Speaker, and you know, we have working people who don't make a lot of money living in my ward, Madam Speaker. And we have to make decisions that consider them as well. But generally, you have to start somewhere with rapid transit. And I know that a lot of people that I hear from, especially up in my area, well, the BRT is not in my area so you know what, why are we wasting the money, Madam Speaker, is what I hear. This city is a great, beautiful city. We talked about David Sanders. You know, in this whole process and I am changing speeds here, it is a lot of money and it's money that we should be spending. I just want to change something, a little bit of the discussion, the process under the past council and this council. I don't think it's fair to, you know, accuse somebody of being part of what happened before or now. I was a councillor in the last term. And you know, there was a lot of problems. I have to say, all the people...many of the people have changed in our administration and all over the place, Madam Speaker. But you know, to go down that road and talk about that, I don't think it's necessarily fair. We did make a decision, 2013, we decided on a route. There was a lot of cost. It was all presented. Why didn't we decide to go and purchase the Hydro land then? You know, all the rules and practices that both the City of Winnipeg follow, Manitoba Hydro follow, Madam Speaker, they all have different rules, practices and procedures and they have to follow. And yeah, you get into negotiations and, you know, it would be nice to get a piece of land for a dollar all this debate that I hear, but you know it's not there. But for the people in my area, I just want to...you know, I have been a bus user all my life. Even when I could see I took the bus and rode a bike. I have seen this transit system, you know, I remember when transit was winning...Winnipeg transit was winning awards in the 70s and early 80s because we had the most efficient, effective transit service across the country. I remember those words, Madam Speaker. And yeah, we need to progress along because other cities improved and we improved. We need to have rapid transit. We are the great City of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker. And yes, there's going to have to be big capital expenditures but we can do many different things at one time, Madam Speaker. I think that we can. And yes, this deal...I am not happy with the Manitoba Hydro's position on this. It may be the 20 or we can get down to 16 million. You know, it's still a high price to pay for the land. It will have some effect in the future about how much they will have to pay in lieu of taxes to the City of Winnipeg. What effect that will have, Madam Speaker, I don't know. It may and it probably will provide us some kind of extra revenue source to come through. So, well, I mean, you know, it's a very complex calculation. It's its own sort of science…methodology anyway, I digress, Madam Speaker. So, I just wanted to say, the way this has been shoved down our throats, it's happening that way…politically, this is not good. It's very difficult. People are saying they want to tank rapid transit but I voted for rapid transit because we need to have a better system. We can make our system better in north Winnipeg. We have a good express bus system, maybe we can tweak that. We can do that outside of rapid transit. Transit, we need to get convenience and users. I would point out something else about bus rapid transit. Nobody has talked about this, Madam Speaker, but I want to mention that there is a lot of transit drivers who lived in my ward and your ward, Madam Speaker, in Councillor Pagtakhan's ward. They're…and all over the city. And you know what's great about bus rapid transit? I always say, to be a transit driver is a harder job than flying a jet airplane because you have to deal with the automobile traffic on the roads there, you have to deal with the customer, you have to deal with all these issues. With bus rapid transit, you're going to get on that corridor and you don't have to worry about those other automobiles. You still got to drive the bus in a safe, appropriate manner but what you are doing is, and nobody's ever calculated this and maybe we should ask Mr. Wardrop to tell us what they say in Calgary where they are developing more bus rapid transit. I bet you the accidents and the damage to buses, the injuries to workers, the whole thing, I am sure, is much better than driving down...yeah, Pembina Highway's going to be widened and I understand. It's…you know, but it's a balance. A transportation system has to have all these different aspects. Is City of Winnipeg ready for LRT? I can tell you the same people who are complaining about spending 590 million if the LRT wasn't built down their thing, they would be against it too, Madam Speaker and that's what it is. But, you know, we need to ensure that this project does move along. And, you know, we voted on the budget in June of 2014. Proceeding...I would point out to those who are talking, Madam Speaker, about why didn't we buy the land then? Well, why did we expropriate the land now and report number eight of property and development? Why did we expropriate the land now?

We decided a long time ago, right? Over a year ago that we were moving ahead with the Waverley underpass. Why didn't we do it then? Why did we wait to expropriate and then appraise land values in today's dollars? Why didn't we do it then, Madam Speaker? Why? There's all kinds of projects you're going to see going into the future. There are certain times when you can proceed to make purchases, Madam Speaker or, you know, expropriate as well. And David Sanders, I will point out, said that the whole process and it hasn't been a pretty process. I agree with him, there has been a lot of unfair treatment of different things related to Calrossie, the widening of Pembina Highway and the moving through of rapid transit. That is the difficulty of these large projects and it will be the same. It's the same in any other major city, these problems. So, Madam Speaker, there's a couple of amendments here. I wanted to speak to them. Number six, I won't be supporting that because the Manitoba Government isn't going to do nothing. Like really? They have their rules and practices, they are subject to the Public Utilities Board, I'm sure that's who made them change the rules of practice.

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

Councillor Eadie: For those who would move Motion No. 7, Madam Speaker, you know...or vote for it, what I didn't hear in there was utilize the money to improve the Winnipeg Transit system. What I see here is move it in to fix roads, move it to do this. We heard from Mr. Grant who talked about TSP, which we do utilize to some degree in the City of Winnipeg. Maybe we could do that more. This report number seven, it basically says ignore...it's not saying to spend all that money to improve our transit system. It's…what does it talk…anyway, it's got all these things listed but you know Madam Speaker, I'm not going to be voting for that. And Madam Speaker, in the end, there's going to be a lot of people who are not happy with me in my ward, but you know, Madam Speaker, we are a great city of Winnipeg. There is a lot of problems that have happened in regards to the amount we're going to be paying for this but as part of a $590 million project, this is minor. They have negotiated really good deals for other land acquisition along this, Madam Speaker. This is just one that has brought forth again the people who are opposed to decisions that were made and you know, it's nice to say, well, it would have been cheaper to go down the middle of Pembina Highway or down Letellier, when we debated the route and I know that some people who have been supporting rapid transit and are still today who didn't like the route, preferred a better route. But ultimately, there was high costs associated with land values. Yeah, you can expropriate but when you expropriate land you have to pay fair land deal and I'll ask people to remember the Gem Equity negotiation on expropriation for Calrossie. How much do you think we're going to have to pay for that? Like that is the reality of obtaining land. Expropriate or negotiate a deal, it's going to end up costing a lot of money because the City has high market value. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yes. I will be supporting the main clause but I will not be supporting the motions that are put forward today. And I guess a lot of stuff has been said already so I'll try not to go over what has already been said. A lot of people have already said what I would like to say. But I just…I believe that this is a vision for our city and it's hard because we have to look beyond. We have speakers here that talked about how the timing of the route but for me, I am not looking at the day after the rapid transit is built, I am looking in the future when it's really going to take a lot longer to get down Pembina Highway than the 20 minutes it takes now. And we know that. The largest...the first route to our downtown is the largest and we know that the second largest is to the University of Manitoba. So, to make an impact in climate change, in moving people throughout our city, to get more people on board with transit, this is a very, very vital route for the city and for our future. So I just want to talk about that. In terms of the motion, I guess for me, you know, it's with my understanding that if we delayed it just a couple of weeks, it would be 200,000. But, if we were to go into arbitration and that means you need both parties, and from what I understand, there you know, both parties need to go into arbitration and that's not what I am hearing, that if they were to go to arbitration, that could take a lot longer and you are losing a construction season and I think it's going to go over the cost of the 200,000 that's been originally quoted. And even if we were to go into arbitration that doesn't even mean that we were going to get, you know, what we are asking. So I think a lot of the comments made here today about...you know, is that the deal we want? Did we want that price? No, but at the end of the day that's what's in front of us and that's what we've got to vote on. This is a large, large project. I am expecting that we're going to have some good things happen on the project and some not so good things happen and this is one of them. But this is something I really think that we need to move on and I am just, I'm always afraid of keep delaying things and delaying things and I just, what I heard is that there is not a willingness to arbitrate and I just think that the cost value of delaying this is going to exceed that so those are my concerns so I will be supporting the main clause.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Any further speakers on the item? Okay, seeing none, we will have Councillor Browaty close on Motion No. 7, followed by Councillor Lukes who will close on Motion 6 and then we will hear from Councillor Orlikow. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Five hundred ninety million dollars is an awful lot of money. It could pave piles of streets. It could knock off a couple items on our transportation master plan. Instead, we're going to cut a couple of minutes off of a ride out to the University of Manitoba. We're going to take a couple of vehicles off the streets, Pembina Highway, primarily. We have heard…Transit's numbers for the increased ridership they are predicting from this is minimal. The number of people that are planning to get out of their cars, they expect to get out of their cars to take the bus, very low. I seem to recall I worked it out, it was like $50,000 per incremental rider is what it would cost. That's wild. That's insane. This is our last chance, folks. Vote against this or vote for my motion, but vote against rapid transit.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Next, Councillor Lukes to close on Motion No. 6.

Councillor Lukes: Well, the motion we are voting on here is the price of the land and both the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba are obligated to act in the best interests of the public and to protect the public interests of the taxpayers. I am not voting against Transit. I do realize there are all kinds of implications. Every vote has implications but I just, I cannot support this report today as it stands. Thank you.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Okay. Okay, well thank you all for your comments. Some comments I believe were a little reflective of our days of old. But majority of comments are reflective of our days forward so I thank you all for that, those comments you brought forward. We…I came today not to have a debate about BRT. That is what is actually what I have been pretty well forced into with the e-mails and calls I have received, because we have decided on BRT. We have chosen the route. Council did. You may not like it. There are always decisions that we go through but can you imagine if we make a decision and then because I didn't like it I want to change it right away or change it later on. Again, we'll never…that's just dysfunctional. Sometimes you get what you like, you get the votes that you like and sometimes you don't. But again we act in the good faith of all of Council. So again, we have the budgets already approved, we have the routes already approved. People still may not agree with us on it, however, we have made the vote. So I'm going to be focusing on the Hydro land purchase as well. And actually, there are a little bit of days of old in this one as well, where I am going to use the highest and worst number I can and completely ignore the rest of the agreement because that will get play for my ultimate goal which is, I believe, to kill rapid transit. People have been saying it's $20 million. Well, the report's quite clear, it can go down to $11 million. So the report is quite clear, we just have to do some easements and some lands that we don't need any more we've got to transfer around, that's very clear, but no one's mentioning that, they are all sticking on this $20 million number. Okay? Again, it validates my initial position so I'm going to keep going on that and I'm going to ignore all of that. I'm also going to ignore the licensing agreement. The licensing agreement which is, again, I am going to thank Hydro for waving their criteria on charging us a market rate for the licensing part. I've asked…when we do a negotiated settlement you have to look at the whole settlement, not just a part, the one little piece you don't like, which I don't like. I don't like the purchase price. I believe I've been told through the again, thank you, the administration for allowing us to ask questions and having two seminars and I'm sorry that some people feel that our attempts to provide information to you in a confidential manner were somehow nefarious. Again, it's a new way of doing business and we're trying to give you that information without getting the City sued at the same time. Again, so it's unfortunate that people are using that to say that something underhanded and nefarious was going. But again, we're here today with the whole package so again, we already know that we have two different assessments that went through. Hydro had their assessment which we don't believe is that good of a tool to use but they have every right to use it. We wanted the best used model. Again, we thought we had an agreement with that. Again, Hydro has a right as a land owner to do their assessment as they feel fit and we have to decide from there. So today, we have been hearing a lot of comments about destroying BRT or not for about the equivalent of about less than one percent of the budget…of the whole budget. That's what we are talking about today, about less than one percent of this budget is in this transaction. I looked at the licensing agreement, I looked at the whole deal. And you're going to say, well they paid for that over there, they paid for…did they also get this huge licensing agreement for 46 acres of land? No. So when you look at the whole totalitarian of the actual agreement…I sent you out the e-mail this morning, Michael Jack sent it out to everybody, so we all have it. It's…at the high end, we want to stick with the high number, because that's again, we're going to be fear mongering a bit so we can say of course it has to be $20 million even though the report says it won't be. We are looking at about $300,000 an acre on the value of the whole thing. Again, that is a...and then it will be less once we actually decrease the amount that we are charging for that land. So actually, as we stated with Gem and other people around the area, this is in line, this is actually quite in line with that price. Again, I think our problem had come from...so again, I have no problem supporting this. I know people who have called me who, after I say okay before you go and just start telling me, do you support BRT or not? Well, 95 percent are the same people that didn't support BRT for me before. And I understand where they are coming from. I respect that. The five percent that did call me or e-mailed me and I returned back calls, you know, once we explained it to them…oh, did you know about the licensing agreement? Well, the press never reported about that. I go, well, you know what, please just give us a call and we'll tell you the whole scenario. So again, Hydro, I wish there was some way, some magical way that we could wave a wand and force the seller of a property to give it to us at the price that we wanted them to give it to, but that's again…we are

here in the world of reality. They are able to ask, they didn't ask for the 30 million which I think is even…well, it's just ridiculous. The $20 million is pretty ridiculous as well but it's not going to be $20 million, it will probably end up around $15 million. So we're talking about a $10 million difference again on a budget of $587 million because we have already found a way to drop it down previously. So again, we can sit here and say the sky is falling. Councillors knew stuff and didn't tell me. This is just corruption going forward again. Again, we can feed that angry sentiment that's out there or we can take a step forward and be honest with them. And I'm more than happy to say yes, I believe Hydro should not be charging us this much money, however, I also respect the fact that Hydro has waived their criteria on the licensing agreement which is very favourable for the City. So again, I look at the whole...the whole...the whole agreement and it is okay. It's not so bad that we should now decide to either delay it and increase costs…we have already put $25 million of sunk cost into this. We risk losing provincial and federal funding. We have already been told by the mayor, quite clearly, that the Province is not stepping in to help arbitrate. There is no obligation from Manitoba Hydro to do so, they've already clearly stated that as well. We're done. Hydro is done. So again, it may appease the people out there a bit to say, you know what, we're going to kill BRT because of this and they will be very happy, the people who are opposed to BRT. And again, I respect their position. But Council has made a choice to move forward. And for less than one percent of its full budget and without…and that's again, I must stress, the licensing agreement is very favourable to the City. The value of that contract we have equals about $300,000 an acre. That is actually…was stated by the administration, they dug the numbers for us, so again, this is not the greatest deal but it's definitely not the worst deal. So again, it does not warrant incurring more costs, risking the project even further, like you say, the people elected the Mayor, overwhelmingly. The Mayor has committed to getting the BRT project done. People knew that when they elected him and again, that's what we are doing today. So again, I urge you to support. I won't be supporting the two other motions but I urge you to support this one. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Just one moment. There's a call for recorded vote. I'll call the question on Motion 7 that was moved by Councillor Browaty and seconded by Councillor Dobson. All in favour of the Motion 7, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Dobson, Gillingham and Schreyer

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 7 is lost. Moving on to Motion 6, moved by Councillor Lukes and seconded by Councillor Wyatt. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Dobson, Lukes, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Eadie, Gerbasi, Gillingham, Gilroy, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan and Councillor Schreyer

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 6 is lost. Now on to the main item, Item No. 9, clause nine. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Dobson, Gillingham, Lukes, Schreyer and Councillor Wyatt

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

Madam Speaker: Item 9 passes. There are no motions. Now, moving on to by-laws. Councillor Orlikow.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd like to move By-laws items 73 to 76/2016 all inclusive.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 73/2016, 74/2016, 75/2016 and 76/2016.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow on the second reading.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, sorry, Madam Speaker I just moved off my list here. I move for the second reading Item 73…By-laws No. Items 73 to 76 inclusive be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 73/2016 to 76/2016 both inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow on the third reading.

Councillor Orlikow: Okay, I cannot find what I have…I'll muddle through this one, I don't have the right wording. I move that By-laws Nos....sorry about that, 73 to 76 be read a third time and the wordage is…I can't find it…and that same be passed and signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

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

Madam Speaker: We'll now have question period for the Chair. Any questions? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, last Council meeting Mr. Chairman, you may recall, there was a by-law that was stood down because the planning, the Real Estate Department of the City of Winnipeg had not done the land assembly. My understanding is the line assembly has been done but it was not at this Council meeting. I did enquire to it and I do not, I hope it will not affect the construction project which is directly tied to it. So would you be able to look into that to ensure the by-law gets on to the agenda for the July meeting, so that it can be read? Thanks.

Councillor Orlikow: I will definitely follow up with you to get some more information and let you know whether, where it's at.

Councillor Wyatt: As well, there was a by-law here that we just read By-law No. 75/2016 to amend, By-law 23/2016 in order to correct certain errors. Everybody voted and but there it's very, it's quite unclear what we were just correcting. There's no attachment, there's nothing to it, there's no detail and I'm just wondering if this is something that normally we would have some detail in the by-law to tell to us what we are correcting. But in this case, there's nothing into in it and I'm just concerned that we all voted on this and we're not sure. So could he look into that?

Madam Speaker: Which number is that, Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: It's the third by-law on the list.

Madam Speaker: Seventy five.

Councillor Wyatt: By-law 75/2016. Yeah.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Mr. Clerk, do you have any insight into it?

Councillor Wyatt: It's to correct 23/2016. I just don't know what that By-law 23/2016. I'm sorry I don't memorize by-law numbers.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, could you clarify the question?

City Clerk: We are aware of the by-law and we're looking into it. I have a calendar for looking into for the July meeting.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay, it's just, you know, I think it's crucial that Members of Council know by-law is being amended here, not amended. So that we know what we're voting on and maybe, I know we just…you did the first reading, I believe and did you do the third as well? So we don't know what this by-law meant. If you read the by-law, it's very vague. Certain errors are going to be corrected but it doesn't really say what those errors were, be deleted and replaced with "4865". Four eight six five, what's that?

City Clerk: It really is a question that you would have to ask Legal Services on, sorry.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay, what would be, I beg forgiveness Madam Speaker, but I'll defer to you in terms of what we should with this, in terms of process, because when you're voting on by-laws in this chamber, everybody should know what they're voting on as a material fact in terms of what they're speaking to and, you know, it speaks to Code of Conduct, it speaks to ethics, it speaks to confidential conflicts, all those sorts of stuff. If we don't know what this is, how do we know what we're voting on?

Madam Speaker: Richard? All right. Councillor Wyatt, thank you for pointing that out. I think we'll get you your answers from Legal Services offline. Thank you. Moving on, any questions for the Chair? No. Okay, we'll now entertain the Standing Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. Councillor Pagtakhan on the report dated June 6th.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED JUNE 6, 2016

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to move Consent Agenda Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. No motions for this committee and no by-laws. Any questions for the Chair? Councillor Wyatt.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, I just, again a question of clarification. This is not a question pertaining to the Chair, but I know in the past we have been able to ask questions of Councillors who are appointed to committees or in capacities appointed by the Mayor. And I just wanted to ask Councillor Pagtakhan a question pertaining to one of those capacities. Would I be able to do that at this point?

Madam Speaker: I don't recall that happening at this juncture when we're dealing with Standing Committees. What committee are you referring to?

Councillor Wyatt: I'm referring to the capacity of Councillor Pagtakhan's appointment as the Councillor for Liaison for the purposes of Capital Project Management.

Madam Speaker: Would that not be a question during EPC?

Councillor Wyatt: I don't know. That's why I'm asking for direction.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, I think that would be the appropriate place.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay, then I will defer that into the July meeting. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Schreyer: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Schreyer: At least for my clarification, is the position which Councillor Wyatt referred to, which I believe we just heard is appropriate to be asked during EPC question period, is that because the position he holds that referred to by Councillor Wyatt is an EPC position or otherwise?

Madam Speaker: No, it's because the question has nothing to do with the Standing Committee portfolio. That is the reason.

Councillor Schreyer: And what does it have to do with EPC?

Madam Speaker: Those are general questions you're able to ask at that time of the Mayor.

Councillor Schreyer: Okay. Alright.

Madam Speaker: And if it's appropriate to be directed to a standing committee, he will let us know at that time. Moving on, are there any questions for Councillor Pagtakhan? Okay, seeing none. We will now deal with the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works.

Councillor Mayes: I did actually have a question for Councillor Pagtakhan, I'm sorry Madam Clerk, I got distracted.

Madam Speaker: Okay, let's go back to that. Councillor Mayes, you have the floor.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, the question pertains to an important part of the often over-looked part of that portfolio, which is the ambulance service, we run a first grade ambulance service here. The Provincial Government has talked about reducing fees for ambulances. I'm just wondering if we've heard anything more on that or if there's any progress on that file. I wonder if Councillor Pagtakhan could clarify that for us.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Mayes for the question. I'm actually setting up a meeting with Chief Lane to discuss that item and if it pleases our members of Protection and Community Services, we can certainly bring forth the Chief to ask for an update on that matter.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Okay, moving on to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Lukes on the Report dated May 31st.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED MAY 31, 2016

Councillor Lukes: Yes, I would like to bring Item No. 1 forward and move adoption.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all in favour? This is not the walk-on item, this is Ducharme Avenue item. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Lukes.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED JUNE 13, 2016

Councillor Lukes: All right, I'd like to move that the rule be suspended and that Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated June 13th be considered.

Madam Speaker: Now just drawing your attention to the paper copy on your desks. It is not on your computer, so there will be a two-thirds majority that…two-thirds vote that's required to hear this item today. Okay, so all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Lukes to introduce Item No. 1. Mr. Clerk, I think you need to read it into the record first.

Item 1 – General Capital Fund – Downtown Streets – Amendment of Approved 2016 Capital Budget to Include Funding from the Exchange Waterfront Neighbourhood Development Program

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

Councillor Lukes: Who is speaking to it? Did you have a question? All right, I'll wait to hear the question from my colleague.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. Not really a question just I wanted to say I had an opportunity, I was not at the meeting but I had an opportunity to listen to your audio and was happy to see that this work is under way, happy to see the fact that we are thinking outside of the box when it comes to delivering this type of work. This is a report and extra work in the neighbourhood, in the area under this project that had not previously received Council budget approval in the last budget of March this year. It's an additional approval of funds but the public service, nonetheless, because for whatever reason a report as was stated in the meeting, the report was held up from getting to the committee for about six to eight weeks. The public service, clearly, looking at this as trying to find solutions and get the job done, still, went to tender on this work clearly stating in the tender documents that it was subject to this report passing here at Council and so not suspending or undermining Council but very happy to hear that. And happy to see the fact that we can still proceed to tender with projects even if funding issues are still outstanding. What that does is it doesn't tie our hands of our public servants who know that we are looking to get things still done but at the same time, if we tie things up and we hold things up, we ourselves are shooting ourselves, literally, in the foot, if not both feet because of the fact that we are then pushing ourselves into pricing escalation by having projects moving from one construction season into the next. So I want to compliment the committee for the questions that were asked and for the work done and I want to thank the public service for being proactive on this and showing that, you know, we can do this. And indeed, indeed, by the very fact that they did tender, at the time they did, in the last month, they secured pricing well below the budget of this project here. Pricing a million dollars less than what was projected potentially up to 6 million, less than 5 million was the close on the tender. So I must say I am impressed, impressed by the proactiveness and by the leadership from the committee on this and the fact that this shows that there is a huge demand out there to get work out. Supply is not the issue. The issue is we have tons of work that we need to do. There is industries out there, there's companies that are actually right now laying off construction crews, laying off concrete workers, laying off asphalt because there is not enough work and we are getting good rate pricing. So anyway, I want to thank the Chair and the committee and I will be wholeheartedly supporting this report. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I wanted to sort of echo Councillor Wyatt's comments a bit. Just, I really…this is very demonstrative of being able to get stuff done, get that tender out. I'm hoping that, Madam Speaker, moving into the future when we run into very difficult issues in terms of, you know, re-jigging the budget and working towards and getting out there and we did tender it earlier, if we waited till we passed the budget and you tender it, who knows what the market is doing at that point. So I like this. So I'm hoping that we can see a lot more of this into the future, Madam Speaker. It's good. There is a lot of really great improvements that are going to be made into this particular neighbourhood. One of which I think many Winnipeggers actually get to partake in there. It is in the theatre district. It's an excellent place to upgrade and make facilities better, and I'm glad that we can actually move ahead to do this and re-jig budgets because I know, Madam Speaker, in the past it's been difficult with some capital budget schedules in my own ward and different things and you know, I'm sure some construction inflation has gotten into some of the projects in my ward and you know, it's great to be able to say, yeah, well let's go out and tender and let's get a good, solid price so that when the budget sheets do get put together, Madam Speaker, and the appropriate money is provided, we can actually build what the expectation was when we originally listed out that capital project. So, I appreciate that and I'll be voting for the report. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. To reiterate some of what I said at EPC this morning on this item, this is an important part of the Canada Games initiative that we are doing, the Sport for Life Centre is, in fact, the Legacy Project from the Canada Games, this is…you know, the Mayor, part of his platform was to run on sports tourism and this is going to be a big sports tourism opportunity for the city, thousands of athletes, thousands of family members, national media, all going to be coming to Winnipeg. We have the One Year Out thing July 28th of this year, so mathematically that means July 28th of next year, 2017, we're going to have the Canada Games first. This is the biggest city ever to host the Canada Games. It's the 50th anniversary of the Canada Games, 150th of the country, if you are wondering why I'm rambling on about this, I am the City rep now on the board of directors for the Jeux Canada Canada games. It's a great opportunity for this city to recapture some of what we had here in the '99 Pan Am Games. And this is part of it, the Sports for Life Centre has private money, it has provincial, federal, city support. I know we've talked about heritage tax credits for the building next door and that issue is still to be resolved and we will resolve it in due course. But the main thing is that building if you look out on Main Street, you see it going up, it will be a big, positive step forward for our downtown area. We do need to do some of this work in relation to that to make sure we've got it ready to go for July of next year. So just...I think people are getting some familiarity with the Canada Games now. It's going to be a big tourism draw. We've got a number of private sponsors on board. Just yesterday Great West Life came on board so I think this is going to be a great event for the city. The Mayor has certainly been supportive. I have seen him out to various events, and along with Councillor Lukes, doing some work at the U of M track stadium as well so I think it will be a big tourism attraction for the City of Winnipeg and this is part of making sure we are ready for that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Any further speakers? Seeing none, I will ask Councillor Lukes to close if you wish to make any closing comments. I will ask the question then. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move on to by-laws, or pardon me, there is a motion here. So, now if I can draw your attention to Motion 2 and Motion 5. Motion 2 is withdrawn, it's replaced with Motion 5 and that is moved by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Eadie. Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS Winnipeg is now experiencing an unprecedented 'soft' market in its roads repair / reconstruction works, leading to competitive pricing on road tenders in 2016, with tenders coming in millions of dollars under budget;

AND WHEREAS it is recognized that leading factors in the good market is the combined effect of new firms arriving in the market, late provincial road tendering, and a slower private residential street construction activity, and is therefore a limited window of opportunity for the City;

AND WHEREAS a total of $60.46 million is budgeted in 2017 for the Local Street Renewal Program;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Public Service issue an additional $30 million of work for Residential Street (Local Street) Renewals immediately, and that funding sources be determined by the Public Service, from a combination of the savings in bids in the 2016 tendered roads works, and/ or on a first call on a portion of the 2017 Local Street Renewal Program.

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

WHEREAS Winnipeg is now experiencing an unprecedented 'soft' market in its roads repair / reconstruction works, leading to competitive pricing on road tenders in 2016, with tenders coming in millions of dollars under budget;

AND WHEREAS it is recognized that leading factors in the good market is the combined effect of new firms arriving in the market, late provincial road tendering, and a slower private residential street construction activity, and is therefore a limited window of opportunity for the City;

AND WHEREAS a total of $60.46 million is budgeted in 2017 for the Local Street Renewal Program;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Public Service issue an additional $30 million of work for Residential Street (Local Street) Renewals immediately, amending the 2016 Capital Budget and any internal financing up to and including the limit of the same $30 million, if required, and that funding sources be determined by the Public Service, from a combination of the savings in bids in the 2016 tendered roads works, and/ or on a first call on a portion of the 2017 Local Street Renewal Program;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker. Normally this is a motion to…a referral to the committee but I'd like to stand to move that the rules be suspended to allow discussion and debate and vote now.

Madam Speaker: Okay. This is the motion related to the local street renewal program. Okay, so all in favour of debating the motion today, that's Motion No. 5, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Browaty, Dobson, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Schreyer and Councillor Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please rise.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Gerbasi, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow and Councillor Pagtakhan

Madam Speaker: The two thirds was not achieved, Mr. Clerk. Okay, so there is no suspension of the rules granted. This will be an automatic referral to Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Okay, we will now move on to by-laws. Councillor Lukes. Councillor Lukes on by-laws.

Councillor Lukes: No by-laws. Okay, I think it's to the rule be suspended. Is that correct, Mr. Clerk? No. Okay, there must an error in my document, excuse me. Right, no by-laws. We're now on to question period. Questions for the Chair? Councillor Allard followed by Councillor Browaty.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Allard: Ms. Speaker, this question is for the Chairperson of Public Works. I basically, I'd like an update on the Marion and Archibald project. I've had numerous conversations with administration. I understand that the report is forthcoming. I have had that understanding now for several months now and I do not see the report. So my question to the Chair is does she know when the report is coming?

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I've been working with Councillor Allard on this report and the department. My understanding, it was going to be coming forward in February or March. We haven't seen it yet, I haven't had an update. I can assume that they're very busy with the record amount of spending that we're investing in roads this year and the work associated with that. But I will take it back and find out again from the department and get back to Councillor Allard next week.

Madam Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Allard: I just, thank you very much for the answer and I do appreciate the follow up and I have heard that sort of response for the last several months. So I wonder if the Chairperson might be able to be more specific in terms if there might be a timeline on this report. I know I have a resident's meeting next week. People are still anxious though they've heard that I will be opposing the plan, they still haven't seen the official report and people are getting quite anxious. So I'm wondering if there might be a more of a timeline than what we've already heard?

Councillor Lukes: Chair, well I can't speak to exactly when I'll have the report. I will definitely bring it up with the CAO and the COO and have some kind of answer with a more definitive timeline for Councillor Allard by next Wednesday.

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

Councillor Allard: I just wanted to say thank you. But that's not a question. So are you aware, Chairperson, that I am thankful for the response?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty, you have the floor.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you to the Chair. Has there been any change in the policy or the level of service in regards to street cleaning in the spring…for the Spring Street Cleaning Program?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. At this point, there hasn't been any change in the spring street cleaning. We have asked the department to come back. It will be at the end of June, this next meeting on the 28th. We asked them to find within their budget, funding for street cleaning because we're finding that what happens is we don't put signs out on every street that we do. And some streets don't get swept to the degree that they should and after the program is done, we

have calls coming back in. So the department said they would get back to me by June 28th, I believe is when our next meeting is to report back on that so.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Chair or Madam Speaker. Empirically, actually I think they did a better job this year at signing streets and warning people that crews were coming. But arguably, driving through my ward and even more so in Councillor Wyatt's ward, it appears they did not do a very good job getting right to the curbs, whole areas missed, islands, paved islands completely missed, bus stops, areas that in the past have been cleaned much better, have not been cleaned as well. Do we know if there's, and these are areas that are cleaned by City forces as well as done by private contractor. Will the Chairwoman ask the department if there, in fact, has been some change?

Madam Speaker: Want to clarify the question?

Councillor Lukes: Yes, just clarify the question.

Councillor Browaty: Will the Chairwoman ask the department if there has been a change in the standard?

Councillor Lukes: Oh, changes in the standard. Well, there's no changes that I have been made aware of in the standard. I do know that we very extensively spoke to the department and to the CAO, to Mr. Deane and to the CAO this year on some of the challenges that we had last year with signing for the street cleaning program, and so that's probably why you did see improvement in signing. But in regards to the street sweeping, I've been working with the Mr. Brosowsky in regards to more on the inspectors and the supervision of how it's being done because that seems to be where the challenge is lying in this particular situation this year.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. Last question through you to the Chair. How long would the Chairwoman expect deficiencies to take to be corrected? I went through my ward quite thoroughly in the days, that window, seven day window, only when you can report any street cleaning deficiency. Many of the areas that I reported are still, in my mind, not even close to meeting what I think the City speck is. How long would the Chairwoman think that deficiencies be corrected?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Madam Speaker, I will report back to Councillor Browaty on that after I speak to Mr. Brosowsky to get an exact timeline for him.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. My question to the Chair, let me just…I wanted to talk about the issue, Madam Speaker, is regarding our street renewal programs and we know that there's supposed to be a report coming back to IRPW in terms of whether or not there's surpluses from bidding and so on and some research by Councillor Wyatt actually has shown that we're getting some really good bids on regional streets. The local street projects are very much more difficult to determine, Madam Speaker, so and you know, I don't know what the turnaround time is going to be, but I'm wondering if the Chairperson can tell me, you know, what's the possibility of using surpluses and doing first calls on budgets given that it'll be July…mid-July before Council decides on budget issues regarding getting some good prices. What do you think the possibility is getting tenders out then in a timely fashion to take advantage of the market?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, thank you. So in a couple of the past committee meetings, we've had quite in-depth discussions with Mr. Lester, Mr. Deane, regarding the projects coming in under budget. So what he has committed to do for the committee is to come back to this next June meeting, which is on the 28th with a list of streets, sidewalks that if projects come under budget that we could consider to move forward on. At this point in time, while some definitely have come under budget from the standpoint of bidding on the construction of it, there are aspects that have not been decided yet, such as, you know, the contingencies, there is a contingency, how much of it are we going to need? We don't always see what work has been done, we don't see the value, the dollar amount for the consultant's report when we see these tenders come back because they're just bidding on the projects. So Mr. Deane has committed to us, he keeps a running tally, he's committed to bringing it forward to the next committee meeting on June 28th, where we will go

through a list of recommendations he's going to be making on streets and sidewalks that we can proceed with this year and these are projects that require minimal design so that they can be done this year, if there is a surplus. So I encourage you to come to the next Public Works meeting.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, does the Chairperson think that making a first call would help to enhance our 2016 street renewal program?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: You know, I'm not one for doing things on the fly, nor planning the budget on the fly and I'm at this point not comfortable with that, with moving forward on doing a first call for next year's budget. I'd have to speak more in consultation with the Chair of Finance.

Madam Speaker: Okay, on to you, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker, and through you to the Chair, thank you for your support on the motion by the way. It's to note that in the motion that we just voted on that's now been referred to your committee, I have a question on that. Councillors Gerbasi, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, and Mayor Bowman voted against more money for residential streets and taking action to get that it. What are we going to do to make that a top priority? Because I can tell you right now, we're getting calls from our constituents, there are roads cracked all over the place, we're not getting responses.

Councillor Mayes: Madam Speaker, I've got a point of order. I voted for the budget, which calls for more money for residential streets. Councillor Wyatt voted against the budget. That vote was about referring something to the committee. I didn't vote, I did not vote against, I did not vote.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Madam Speaker: Order please. Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, I want to clarify the, we were voting just a few minutes ago on suspending the rules only. We did not have full debate.

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Wyatt: (Inaudible) spending money on residential streets. My question is to the Chair before I was rudely interrupted, my question is the Chair, what steps is she going to take to try to get this back on track? We have an opportunity right now in the market that's historic, where we're getting great pricing. We're hearing from members of the industry that's telling us that they're actually laying off crews.

Madam Speaker: Your question, Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: They're actually laying off crews, there's capacity. What are we going to do as a city so we can some dollars out there, fix the roads and get good pricing now, not wait?

Councillor Lukes: Like I've been doing every week, I've been sitting down with the Manitoba Heavy Construction Association and Mr. Deane and we've been going through where we're at in this year's budget on what amount of excess funding we have and we aren't at the point yet to say, due to contingencies, due to funding that we're spending on property and acquisitions, we're not at the point yet to say, we have X-amount of excess funding. We are preparing a list, we will have it at this next committee meeting that will clearly state if we have excess funding in this year's budget, which we're spending a record amount of funding that if we have excess, we will be doing these streets and sidewalks. I will also commit to sitting down with the Chair of Finance, either this week or next week and report back to Councillor Wyatt on Wednesday on moving forward or what the Chair of Finance thinks on first calls on the budget. He is the Chair of Finance, and I respect his opinion on that.

Madam Speaker: Your question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, my second question is, you know in light of the fact that we're up against time and the public service will use that as an argument ultimately, potentially, (inaudible).

Madam Speaker: Your question, Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: That there's not enough time. Will we endeavour immediately and yourself, working with your committee to do everything possible, leading up to your meeting which I believe is June the 28th, to have as much material and information ready at that meeting so that we as a Council may be prepared to act upon this in the July Council meeting and to get more work out there now?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Yes, I can assure Councillor Wyatt that we will have as much information as possible at this next Council meeting so, at this next committee meeting so that we can move forward if need be, if we have funding for this year, excess funding, so that we can move forward and at to the July Council meeting and that we can get more work done.

Madam Speaker: Final question?

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, so in terms of that in leading up to your meeting on the July 28th, would it be possible if all Members of Council could be kept informed in terms of your progress with the meetings with Councillor Morantz, with your meetings and discussions with the administration, and that there be a real effort made between now and that two weeks to do everything possible to get funds available, to get it to our residential streets, because you know, we're hearing it everywhere, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Yes, absolutely I'll commit to that. I think you've seen just recently we received a series of meetings requests to understand from an active transportation process that I'm working with the department on so that we can get dialogue and conversation going for the budget. But I will absolutely commit to that and keep you posted. I don't think I will be able to present to you, the list of streets that are being recommended until we have our committee meeting. But I will keep you all up to date. I think you all are aware that I try and keep my constituents up to date and I will keep you up to date on the progress I'm making.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. On to you, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, Mrs. Speaker, I just want to ask about the park maintenance. We've had quite a few complaints as I think usually happens this time of year. But we have information from the administration that the park's budget hasn't been increased for the last 20 years, in fact, staffing levels have decreased.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, you're asking a parks question?

Councillor Allard: Yes.

Madam Speaker: So it would be…

Councillor Allard: Oh sorry, I've got the wrong the committee.

Madam Speaker:…under a different committee.

Councillor Allard: Oh, that will be for next Council meeting, Councillor Pagtakhan. Thank you. You know, it's in two departments, right? In my defence, yeah. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any other questions for the Chair? Okay, seeing none, we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. There's no report today, no motions, and no by-laws. Are there any questions for Councillor Morantz, the Chair? Okay, we'll now move on to Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. Also no report, no motions, and no by-laws.

Councillor Mayes: Due to factual correction that City Clerk's have advised me to make at this point which is far back right at the start of today's proceedings, we had a communication which included an attachment. The City of Winnipeg annual financial report, page 61 of that report there is some ambiguous wording that some in the media understandably have taken to read that the Brady Landfill is 93 percent full and 7 percent empty and that's been reported, it's actually the other way around, it's 7 percent full and 93 percent empty and the Brady Landfill still has over a hundred years left. So, I think that's thanks to friends in the media for bringing that to our attention. The wording…it's an understandable misunderstanding based on the way that this was worded and I should also…another factual matter Councillor Lukes

has pointed out to me that the largest capital project in the city's history will actually be the north end sewage treatment plant found in this year's budget so we can all stop referring to the south end rapid transit project as the largest capital project and will be moving on to…referring that way to the north end sewage treatment plant.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you for that Councillor Mayes, and for reading the agenda so thoroughly. Councillor Lukes?

Councillor Lukes: Can I? I just wanted to ask a question of the Chair, if he was aware of the absolutely spectacular article that The Sou'wester did on the Brady Landfill and the details talking about the innovation that's going on out there and the unique projects, and it was just such a good, comprehensive article? I'm just wondering if he's aware of it.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: No, I'm not aware of that. I'll have to, being a faithful reader of The Lance, which is a St. Vital paper, a St. Vital circulation, but I'll have to try and track down The Sou'wester. I should mention also, and you'll rule me out of order shortly, the finance issue, which is the City Clerk's Department, though it deserves some kudos, we run School Board By-elections and we pay for them, we get nothing for it, again the City Clerk's Department ran three very successful by-elections, vote anywhere technology, I voted at the "wrong" place with my wife, seemless. It all worked out. Turn out, lamentably low, but no fault to our staff, who I think they did everything they could to get turn up at numerous roving polls, vote anywhere technology, so we are barring the cost of this, and I think they did a good job.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for that. Are there, thank you for that, are there any further questions for the Chair? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, I was advised regarding a question that I asked previously to His Worship, on garbage and waste RFP that the Chair from the Standing Committee would be able to, was willing to answer, whether he's able to or not, we will see, Madam Speaker. And the RFP, request for proposals for garbage and recycling collection, which will now be a seven year contract to my understanding has gone out. And according to the request for proposal, subsection B25.2.1(c) regarding award of contract, "Without limiting the generality of B25.2, the City will have no obligation to award a Contract…where the prices are materially in excess of the City's cost to perform the Work or a significant portion thereof."

Madam Speaker: What is your question?

Councillor Schreyer: "with its own forces." Therefore, Madam Speaker, based on that, I guess there has been a recent report on in-house costing before the RFP was sent out. Could we get an indication of that process and what is the finality of that investigation, that serious analysis, Madam Speaker, given what is happening across the country on every major city that I'm aware of, bring it back in-house?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, it's a very fair question from Councillor Schreyer and that had been brought to my attention as well, that that provision is in the RFP. So I have taken the step of asking the head of the department to clarify that, it's a fair comment, if the City reserves certain rights of cost only at a certain threshold, what's the threshold to cost? That's a very valid observation by Councillor Schreyer. So I've asked that information myself, and when I get it, I'll share it in whatever there may be some limits in terms of the RFP process. Additionally, Councillor Schreyer touched on what other cities are doing also, a fair question, I was in contact with the Chair of the Environment Committee, City of Ottawa, Councillor Chernushenko coming out of some conversations I had at the FCM meetings, talking about what they do. They have five zones, two of them are delivered in-house. So I'm trying to get an email encounter Chernushenko for my son's baseball game last night actually, one of the advantages of baseball, you get some down time where you don't have to be always focussed. So I was emailing him last night in Ottawa saying, can he provide some information, how does Ottawa do this, what are the legal limitations, how do they apply too instead of more? So it's an issue that has been coming up about the way other cities are doing it, so hope to get some answers from the City of Ottawa. I may have to go out there as I did on the Rapid Transit file for a day and get some in-person answers. But Councillor Schreyer's right, in that there will be a vote here of Council is supreme, how we wish to proceed on the garbage and

recycle contract will ultimately be up to Council in a vote and we should have all that information before us. That's a fair question.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, will the Chair of the Standing Committee take into consideration that as he mentions, zones deliberately put in-house in Ottawa, zones deliberately put in-house in Toronto, and other cities, if not 100% in-house that this is the way it's going. Madam Speaker, that in the process of creating this analysis within for the City of Winnipeg before we can move forward and award based on the merits according to this report that I will be, I'm obliged by virtue of accepting the Mayor's position as Councillor Liaison for Labour Relations that I'm obliged to make sure that.

Madam Speaker: Your question, Councillor Wyatt, Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: Will the Chair be taken into consideration the fact that I'm obliged to be cognisant, if not a participant, on that very process that we've just spoken about?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'm not sure of the question. I know what Councillor Schreyer's saying he's the Liaison for Labour Relations or words to that affect. All I can say is he's asked an appropriate question in terms of what, if we set a threshold about city costs, what's the number, that's a fair question. Secondly, we should be looking at what other cities are doing. There's no magic to what Ottawa is doing, I suppose, but that's the city I've chosen to look at, in terms of a city that has chosen to deliver certain zones in-house as opposed to contracting it out. Again, no decisions have been made yet. Council will ultimately have a vote on where we want to go on garbage and recycling.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, this is a present, usually people are confused by my question. In this case, I'm not certain about the answer. So in this case, I have to ask it this way, we have sent out the RFP and now we're going to have the process of analyzing the City's in-house cost to perform that work or a significant portion thereof within its own forces, that will now that process will now take place?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'm trying to bring myself up to speed as much as I can in preparation for that vote. I'm not, you know, this is not a, not everyone, everyone on Council has the right to do the research they wish to do. There will be a number of issues, some of which were brought forward by Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Lukes when we first discussed this at the committee, they came in delegation talking about issues like the compost, like the seven year time frame, like the Toronto system that Councillor Allard has talked about in the past. Different people have different concerns about the future of garbage and recycling. It's a major issue, it's a major undertaking for the city, so I guess I'm trying to reassure Councillor Schreyer there's nothing hidden here. I'm trying to bring myself up to speed, I'm trying to respond to some of what I've heard from FCM, some of what I've heard from some of our bargaining agents, and so that I feel I'm fully informed when we come to the decision point in September. And I will share with him whatever information I get unless there's some legal limit on it, certainly be happy to share with Councillor Schreyer.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, you're next. Followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you very much Madam Speaker. Back in February, we had a seminar with regards to the, it was actually going to be a seminar on two issues, it was the organics issue and combined sewer overflows, CSO. But the organics consumed the seminar and we never got the briefing on the CSO. The CAO did commit to us last year, before the end of last year that the Council would have a seminar on combined sewer overflows to give us a briefing on what the program's at, where we're going, all the issues in terms of provincial regulations and our commitment there. Could we bring that back, that seminar? Because clearly it was scheduled, but we ran out of time because of the other issue and there was just too much to cover in that short period of time.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, we can try. I mean I don't set the schedule for council seminars, but that one, that's an accurate characterization there were two items on the list, we got the one understandably given what transpired that day. The CSO matter though is with, would be a very detailed ward that Geoff Patton and Moira Geer and Tim Shanks

and others in the department did that presentation on CSOs remains with the province. Unfortunately, the Bio-solids Master Plan, which was sent to the province prior to the 2014 municipal elections still sits with the Province awaiting their response. So we've got at least two pretty big items on this in the Water Waste portfolio where we're waiting on the regulator to tell us where they want to go. So CSOs, we can certainly try and arrange something. We did get a very detailed report prepared by our staff that went to the province several months ago, I think December, I think December, but frankly, we can go ahead, but we still really do need a response from the province.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker, this Friday is scheduled a tour of the Water Treatment Plant out in the RM of Springfield and it's the tour that I've taken and would encourage all councillors to. But right now, the invitation is only extended to councillors and it's couched in the fact that it was security protocols. However, would it possible to open this up so that we can have our option for our executive assistants who get calls from constituents all the time to be able to attend? Plus members of the Fifth Estate, who are, I think this is a big facility and they have been there before, but of course, this is to have a tour in terms of what is happening there now.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Well, everyone would have to sign a non-disclosure agreement.

(Laughter in the gallery)

Councillor Mayes: I don't, I haven't been signed up for the tour, I didn't organize it, I don't know what capacity issues there may be. I don't know what security issues there may be. I can ask staff what arrangements could be made. I think there was a tour for the media when it was first open, but that was before my election. I can ask the staff what, it probably would be helpful to have to the EAs as part of the tour as well.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, that would be terrific, appreciate that very much. And more are you aware in terms of the tour, that there are some major issues going on there right now in terms of the state of the infrastructure of that plant and the lawsuits that are underway now?

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, Councillor Lukes, when she was head of the committee and myself, I think we're both been briefed on some of the activities, the litigation was launched by the City, it may take a decade to resolve; numerous defendants, numerous potential cross-frames, numerous potential third-party claims bringing in other defendants. So very complex litigation underway and yeah, there are some issues there but I guess part of the reason to take the tour is to see what the situation is right at the plant.

Madam Speaker: On to you, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Councillor Schreyer was asking questions about the RP on the garbage, recycle and new contracts. Madam Speaker, I simply want to ask this question and I'm okay with the Chairperson, Madam Speaker, to bring back an answer at the next Council meeting or whatever. But so my question is simply, at what point are councillors going to be involved in understanding in decisions being made about who the proposal, who which proponent's going to win and or is the Winnipeg Public Service going to make all the decisions regarding who the final proponents are for the two districts that are defined?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: It's a good question. The contract with Emterra runs out in October of 2018. The…this may seem early to be going out to look at potential replacements, but the advice we've got is it requires so much staffing and so much capital investment to get the new trucks in place, if it's a new bidder, that you need to basically do this a year out. So the goal certainly is to have a report before Council September/October of this year. It would come through, I would presume it would come through the Water, Waste, Riverbank Management and Environment Committee. I'm not certain of that. I can look into that answer for Councillor Eadie. But it's the time to make the decision will be the Fall and Council will be supreme, so I guess the blunt answer to Councillor Eadie is no, the staff won't merely make the award that will be coming back before Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. That brings our Council meeting to an end. Councillor Mayes will you move adjournment?

Councillor Mayes: Yes.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, roll call, please.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 4:22 p.m.