

## COUNCIL MEETING NOTES

February 5, 2019 - 6:30 p.m.

### WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Once again, I wish to apologize for the length of these notes but I think they are worth reading in their entirety. I have only included items I think merit attention. The recording of the meeting minus the missing section is posted on the RM Website. The agenda is 2 pages long but the meeting was only 2 hours in duration because most of the items on it are either "2019 Membership Requests" as they are now being called (requests for financial support etc.) or subjects that were discussed at the previous Committee of the Whole meeting and Council's decision is more or less a foregone conclusion. It is my observation that any suggestion of deferral or opinion other than that expressed by the "Mayor" is discouraged. Note: At this evening meeting, Santokh Randawa Singh, Engineer, Lynn Lemire, Human Resource Manager, and Sara Monkman, Springfield Police Service were in attendance for no apparent reason. ?Are they being compensated? You may recall the rationale for having Committee of the Whole meetings in the afternoon was so staff could attend and provide information on items being discussed during regular working hours. The reason becomes apparent on Page 3 - 5.2 Department Reports below.

**2. Changes to the Agenda** - Added was 10-14 Regional Economic Development Restructuring (in regards to School Division RFP for Clinician Space). Deferred was 10.2 Scope Change - Dugald Water Treatment Plant Upgrades and 10-10 re road closure. Subsequently during the meeting she deferred 10-9 Archive Committee and added the passing of a resolution to allow for the change to the snowmobile trail covered by the second delegation.

### 4. Question Period

Heather Erickson - 1) Why are the duties of the CAO included in the Organizational By-law? They are not in the current by-law and there is no such requirement in the Municipal Act. The duties and responsibilities of a CAO would be covered in their contract with the RM. The organizational by-law is a by-law of Council and Administration should not be included. 2) Why, despite the protestations of the public and suggestions as to other ways to compensate council for the loss in the tax free benefit that would not cost taxpayers in terms of increased municipal taxation, are you still proceeding to grant yourselves a 20% increase to compensate for an approximate 12% loss in net revenue. In the Indemnity By-law is included "Cost of living increase will be applied annually by Resolution of Council." I thought Councillor Ralke at the C.O.W. meeting stated she would be willing to eliminate the cost of living increase and this received agreement from Councillor Fuhl. 3) Could you please read out the changes to the agenda again as you said them so fast, no one can clearly understand what you are saying.

Mayor Fell - 1) The former CAO suggested it be included. Just because not in Municipal Act does not mean it is not prudent to include it. Then she read out changes to the agenda and Colleen Draper corrected her that 10.2 was deferred, not added. 2) It was added back in. Council discussed. Most municipalities have a provision for an increase every year. They felt it was prudent to leave it in so that future councils do not have to address the issue of increasing their indemnities, it is already in the by-law and it is exactly the same increase as all other employees in the organization. She believes Ritchot, East St. Paul, and West St. Paul and lots others all have that in their indemnity by-laws. She said she appreciated my comments.

Darryl Speer - Requested deferral of 10.1 purchase of 686 Main St. so that a professional independent evaluation of this building as a shell building be done which is contrary to what was received. We also request an independent building and site inspection report which will identify the life of the roof, parking areas, furnace and air conditioning unit and what the anticipated costs of bringing in municipal water are. He then asked for a tax revenue review which he requested at the public hearing as the figures don't appear to square with other properties on the same parking lot. As an example Family Foods has \$13,000. as their annual tax allotment whereas the Credit Union only has \$7,505. total based on figures you gave me. Colleen Draper interjected and said that was municipal only, \$13,000. included school. Mr. Speer then asked about business tax. Ms. Draper thought that was included but could confirm. He would like to have those figures as he felt they should be factoring in whatever revenue we realize from that property over a 10 to 20 year period and that could be used to defray a lease or rental option.

Karen Lalonde - Looking at the actual Indemnity Report, the actual legislative cost for Springfield of \$205,727. but that is actually only half of the total cost so figures don't tell the whole story when comparisons being made and Hanover at 15,000 population is \$290,000. but 8 on council, not 6. Brandon at \$280,000. but population 50,000. Feels without providing the whole picture, it is like comparing apples and oranges. To be transparent and accountable, the taxpayer should know the end cost of governance. Recommends coming up with a flat raise and state same and wait until Federal Government comes up with its new tax rulings to find out what changes are. Asked Council to consider. Reeve Fell said they would.

Allan Ciekiewicz - In 2018 while campaigning candidates should have been aware of the upcoming changes to the tax laws and the amount of their indemnity if elected or re-elected and should have come to an acceptable solution of their "indemnity woes" before January 2019. The "indemnity woes" we are now experiencing remind him of what happened in 2011 when Council caused a mind boggling 22% increase in the mill rate and that is why there has been no raise in 8 years as mentioned in the paper. He commented that if the pay has been constant for 8 years, why do they want a raise. The 2011 hike to the mill rate and the current Council's move to give itself a 20% pay hike are equally as mind boggling. It is due to the removal of a Federal tax perk that only Council had the benefit of, not the residents of Springfield. Mayor Fell said he had about 30 seconds left. He wants the 20% pay hike eliminated and a more acceptable path followed as per his letter.

Janet Nysten - If you want CAO included in Organizational By-law, suggests including additional wording because entire section under the Municipal Act not included. There is another part about administrative duties. Her suggested wording would be to not limit the CAO's

responsibilities nor conflict with any other that may be set out by legislation or contract, policy or job description. Mayor Fell asked if she had that in writing and Ms. Nysten said yes and would give her a copy. Ms. Nysten then addressed the indemnity issue and said the report was misleading as it isn't a 66% increase in meetings it is more like a 25%, only one extra meeting is being added and the length of said meetings is not being considered and therefore should not be used as a rationale in her opinion. Mayor Fell answered that the existing by-law only required 2 council and one planning meetings and no specification as to Committee of the Whole meetings but Ms. Nysten responded that past practice was to have the 3 required meetings and a Committee of the Whole meeting in the intervening week. She also said the report referred to several indemnity by-laws but she felt there were others in between that were not mentioned and referred to By-Law 16-19 where some additional health care benefits and mileage increase were provided. She felt if they were basing their decisions on the reports given them, she hoped they would contain more complete and accurate information. At this juncture **Mayor Fell** cut in and thanked her but said there were others wanting to speak and she had only one minute left. **Ms. Nysten** then addressed the issue of the purchase of 686 Main Street and the lost tax revenue and regretted minutes of the public hearing were not available because some really good points were made at that meeting and hoped Council would take them into consideration before making their decision. **Mayor Fell said there was one minute left.**

Stacey Bartel - On 20th of January between 4:30 and 6:30 he sent out e-mails to Council and the executives with a series of 5 questions regarding indemnities. To date he has received a response from 2 of the members which he thanked although responses were not on target. He then asked the 4 that did not respond their reason to a constituent of the municipality. **Mayor Fell** said they are drafting a letter and he would be getting a response. Council has asked their CAO to do that. **Mr. Bartel** - In regard to the tables being discussed tonight, how is that response going to have any bearing on the situation? **Mayor Fell** - We have your questions and took them under consideration. **Mr. Bartel** - On a monthly basis activity reports are posted on the agenda, example tonight's where yours contains 2 months of information and two others have submitted and we are missing two. Do these contain all the work you do? **Fell** - No. **Bartel** - So what would be the use of them? **Fell** - So if you look at the bottom of mine, it lists out what she does but does not specify the time consumed. She says it does not go into the 367 pages of reading required to prepare for this meeting. **Bartel** - If not complete, why waste time doing it when being a councillor is so overburdening. The time he spends in his office is accountable. How is Council accountable for their time? **Fell** - By seeing results and value for tax dollars. And we are out of time. **Bartel** - One last thing - during a campaign forum there was a comment made by yourself about how you wanted to be more open and more communication and input from the community. How is limiting residents to 15 minutes at the beginning of the meeting better communication? **Fell** said they have a bylaw specifying that and are bound by law to follow it. If residents want more time, they can request to appear as a delegation or call or meet with her or his councillor.

**Note:** Further to Mr. Bartel's last comment, the by-law to which she refers was just crafted by the new Council and passed at the last Council meeting. The Council prior to this allowed members of the audience to have input on specific issues during the council meeting, as did the Police Board, and their input was considered at the time discussion was taking place by Council and perhaps had some influence on the decisions made by Council.

## 6. DELEGATIONS

**6.1 Vince Bennici regarding Council Indemnities** - Prior to his commencing, **Mayor Fell** stated he had had an e-mail a couple of weeks before advising him that any paperwork he had with respect to the delegation was to be submitted prior to the meeting so Council cannot accept anything he has to hand in. **The following is posted on the RM web site: "Delegates will be required to submit presentation material to the administration office the Friday prior to the meeting date for inclusion in Council's agenda packages. If information is not available prior, 8 copies of all written materials will need to be provided at the meeting." This confirms that Mr. Bennici was well within his rights to request that his materials be entered into the records of the meeting.** **Mr. Bennici** asked if that pertained to letters and petition and for what reason? **Fell** - That's how delegations work. **Bennici** - Show me the bylaw that states that. **Fell** - Mr. Bennici, I am speaking. I have the e-mail here and I'll read it out to the gallery. "We can accommodate you on **Friday**, February 5th. I will be finalizing the agenda later next week and will provide your delegation time once finalized. Please note you are required to submit all documentation, paper or electronic format is fine, by noon on Friday February 1st. to be included on the agenda. This should include a brief summary of your presentation and any documents to be submitted to council." So if you had anything that you wanted to submit it would have had to be done by the deadline given to you by e-mail. **Bennici** - Ok, so what you are saying is that 226 people, 86 letters, 140 signatures does not matter. **Fell** - It matters but you had a deadline. **Bennici** - Show me the bylaw that says that because I have gone through the bylaws and nowhere is that stated or I would have complied. **Fell** - You were sent an e-mail. **Ralke** - Are we here to argue the bylaw or to hear the delegation?

**Note:** The first mention of a change in indemnities to compensate for the loss of the tax free portion of elected officials salaries in 2019 was mentioned at the January 8, 2019 COW Meeting. The draft by-law and a report were presented at the January 15, 2019 Council Meeting. Delegations are required to register with the CAO at least 120 hours before the meeting at which they will appear and to provide a copy of their presentation material to the CAO according to 10.1 of the new Procedural By-Law which was passed at the January 15, 2019 Council Meeting, during the Question Period at which there was strong protest against the new Indemnity By-law proposals and where the public was advised this was their only opportunity to speak to the issue. By the way, in the new Procedural By-law which is not yet posted on the web site and therefore could be concluded to not yet be publicly issued as very few attend council meetings, 10.4 states "The Chair may allow non-scheduled delegations while a meeting is in progress as deemed appropriate and if approved by a majority of the members present. To appear at the February 5th. Council meeting as a delegation, one would have to register by the end of the working day January 28, 2019. In actual fact, Mr. Bennici phoned in his request on January 22nd. and followed it up with an e-mail on January 23rd. Mr. Bennici would have had only 8 working days to prepare his materials and submit them by February 1st. for the February 5, 2019 meeting which is a very small window of opportunity to apprise a municipality of some 15,000 residents, some of whom do not receive the Clipper or the Winnipeg Free Press or have the Internet to check the municipal web site of an issue that potentially could have a very large impact on their lives down the road. A council that is open, transparent, inviting of comment from the public, and who ran just to serve their constituents (their words) and not for the money would definitely, in my opinion, have heeded the words of those that did speak and deferred the matter until further information from the Federal

Government regarding changes to the tax laws was available and other options that did not involve increased taxation for residents were available.

**Bennici** - I am here to present a petition on behalf of 226 residents, 86 letters and 140 signatures requesting that the indemnity bylaw be postponed until the Federal Government announces their compromise to withdraw the one third tax free portion from a politician's income and is due sometime in February, I think it is February 18th. We all ran on a platform of transparency and accountability and fiscal responsibility. To honour this commitment, all facts should be available prior to making a decision, especially a monetary one. Contrary to the report provided that there was no monetary increases since 2010 I stand to differ because December 9, 2014 3 of this council from the previous council put themselves into the benefit package and just working out the numbers of the benefit package for Ward 5 and the other Reeve at the time it works out to 8.6% increase that as a taxpayer we have paid you. That does not include in 2017 when you put the extra on kilometers going back and forth to the meetings. That is also considered coming out of the taxpayers dollar. It was also in the 2000 budgeted costs as being \$205,000. when in fact it was reported the costs were \$336,198. Also the cost should show for elected officials broken down per capita. We have approximately 15,000 people in the RM of Springfield. I think we only have 52 or 5300 taxpayers so really when you break it down its not per capita, its per taxpayer so triple that what you are asking for from the taxpayer. I am requesting on behalf of these signatures and those others who did not have an opportunity to sign to delay the passing of this bylaw until all the factual information is gathered to make an informed decision which from my understanding is what we elected you for was to make a complete and informed decision. I look at some of the councillor's reasons for the increases. They say that they are spending a lot of time in meetings and so forth. I agree but we were told when I went to Lac du Bonnet with yourself, Val, and he told us the amount of time and effort that was going to be involved. It's a lot. We all knew before we ran what the amount was that we were supposed to be making. We all knew...I knew in August that the 1/3 tax free credit was being taken away. Anybody who is political, whose interested in any kind of politics, would have known that the bill was coming down being passed January 1st. So we all ran on the same idea and the same principles. That is why I asked you last time, did you run for the community or did you run for the money and you all answered community. I don't know if you knew this or not but the school divisions are also considering raising their percentage which is doing to be a double bill for taxpayers on top of what you're asking for. One final question. Would you revisit the indemnity bylaw 16-19 and adjust your salaries accordingly to the new federal guidelines and make it retroactive? Individual answers, please. If you pass this bylaw and gives you that salary raise, are you willing and prepared to look at the opportunity of what those new tax benefits will be and take that off what your raise is? I'd like individual answers. **Fuhl** said he would agree to that and **Fell** interjected and said no they had already discussed that and need to be looking at that as a Council. **Bennici** - all in agreement? **Bredin** and **Wilson** appeared to agree but **Ralke** said she didn't know what that would be, she would first have to look at it. **Bennici** said he would still like to present the letters and add them into the minutes and the signatures because he thinks they are valid and important to show that people are interested in this matter. It's not going to be swept under the rug like December 9, 2014 when you put yourselves in the benefit package and nobody knew. **Fell** - um again we won't be accepting those. **Bennici** - You can pass a resolution right now accepting.....**Fell** - Actually we cannot pass a resolution right now. It's not on the agenda. Um, you were sent an e-mail ...**Bennici** tried to say something.....**Fell** - Vince, I am not here to argue with you but I will end this delegation now because....**Bennici** tried to speak....**Fell** - This delegation is over. **Fell** - Thank you for your time. **Ralke** - Can he submit them another time? **Fell** - He can send it to Colleen. As a Council, we are not accepting it. **Bennici** - Asked that it be put in the minutes...that it reflects in the minutes that there was opposition to this raise. **Bunch of voices at the same time.** **Colleen Draper** - You can submit them at the front counter and I will review them afterwards. **Fell** - There is actually a legal way to do a petition if it does not fit the criteria. Legally Colleen will send it to you. You are welcome to drop them off at the front desk. She will verify that it's a legal petition. Thank you for your time.

**Note:** Mr. Bennici wanted the letters and petition included in the Minutes to indicate to all referring to the records that there was many opposed to the decision of Council to increase their own indemnities by 20%. Mayor Fell does not want this in the Minutes. Minutes do not contain any details, merely the subject matter and resolution thereof. The matters brought up in question period are likewise not recorded in the minutes. Therefore to an outside reader of the minutes, the residents of Springfield were not in opposition to the increase. It is doubtful the local weekly will reflect the level of opposition demonstrated both at this meeting and the public hearing that preceded it, just as they did not report the aggressive behaviour of Mayor Fell's husband toward Vince Bennici at a meeting in December that occurred in the presence of their reporter.

**6.2 Glen El, Springfield Pathfinders re Use of Municipal Lands for Club Trail.** - Draper put up a map. **Mayor Fell** asked Colleen Draper, the Acting CAO, how this could be done ...if a resolution was required and Ms. Draper responded yes. **Odd because 10 lines above this Mayor Fell said, Actually we cannot pass a resolution right now. It's not on the agenda.** **Fell** asked if it could be added to today's agenda and Acting CAO Draper responded Yes.

**5.2 Department Reports - Note:** While dealing with Department Reports, **Mayor Fell** explained that not all Staff were able to be present to respond to the questions Council has on the various Department reports and those that were not would be pulled out and responded to at the next meeting. While **Chief Kane** was not present, his **Sergeant Sara Monkman** was at the meeting and I feel should have been able to respond to **Wilson's** question about whether we are being paid to patrol Birds Hill Park, not being part of the RM of Springfield, as she is Deputy Chief when he is absent which according to **Fell** he is. Kane was absent most of December and the first week of January and it is now February and he is once again absent. As he just commenced employment in May, I believe, of 2018, a question could be asked as to how much leave is available to him during the first year of his employment and is he on paid or unpaid leave? **Chief Hudson** responded to a question from **Wilson** about false security system alarms by saying that few are repeats (while he was speaking, a phone rings at the Council table) and **Santokh Singh** responded to the Request for Service comment by **Fuhl**. Staff were present through two delegations because the scheduling of the meeting did not allow sufficient time for reports to be addressed before the delegations were scheduled to commence. **Is this responsible use of taxpayer dollars?** Could not any questions be tabled to the next meeting pending obtaining responses from the appropriate source and read at the next meeting without having staff drawing overtime for being present? **Williams** brought up Service Requests and mentioned the new system on line for tracking requests to which **Fuhl** responded that he tried to enter one on behalf of a resident without e-mail and it would not let him do it because they did not have an e-mail address which evidently was mandatory in order to complete the request.

**7.1 North Eastman Regional Municipal Lobby Committee Membership - Acting CAO Draper** said she had contacted the Lobby Committee who sent her their Constitution and last update for information and mentioned **Councillor Williams** had attended two meetings and may have something to add. He did not other than to say it is nice group of municipalities in an ongoing once a month meeting to discuss issues common to members and he is just getting his feet under him insofar as issues. **Resolution carried to pay for membership.**

**9.1 19-01 Organizational By-law (2nd and 3rd Reading) - Ms. Nysten** got up and gave her wording suggestion to **Draper** and this was incorporated. **Wilson** pointed out the change in names of the various areas of municipal business and shift in responsibilities and wondered if that might be an issue. **Fell** is ok with changing 6.2 to Environmental Services and asked for concurrence from Council. **Resolution carried 6-0.**

**9.2 19-02 Council Indemnity By-law (2nd and 3rd Reading) - Acting CAO Draper** reiterated the report from Financial Manager including **Williams** spreadsheet indicating Springfield the lowest paid. **Mayor Fell** pointed out there is a \$1,700. loss for the Mayor in spite of the 20% increase as per the table provided. Cost of living is not actually that, it is the negotiated rate of increase awarded to staff. This will prevent having to explain request for future increases by Councils. **Councillor Wilson** expressed his concerns regarding the amount and not waiting to hear what Revenue Canada is bringing forward and made a motion to have it deferred. **Bredin and Fuhl** concurred that deferring for a couple of weeks would not be a problem but **Williams** brought up other municipalities had already passed their raise and did not get this amount of pushback from residents. **Ralke** read from a prepared statement about the responsibilities of the position, the inability to renege from attending everything required, the time involved, and did not appreciate being quoted as saying she only ran for the money as she has a family to provide for. What councillors do is important. **Mayor Fell** said they did look into having a home office exemption and consulted a professional tax accountant and were advised there is no opportunity for other avenues and she went on record that if there is a tax credit available, she would roll back her indemnity to cover that. She felt they should go forward and vote on the matter. Asked for consensus of Council. Point of order by **Jan Nysten** about a motion made to defer but Mayor Fell said it was not a motion while **Councillor Wilson** responded he did make a motion but no one on Council would second it at this point. Someone asked if **Councillor Fuhl** had not agreed to it initially and he said yes but he is willing to roll back retroactively. **Mayor Fell** said there was no time for questions or commentary from the gallery as per their bylaw. **Councillor Bredin** suggested amending the resolution to state that if a ruling comes down from CRA, they will amend it. Be it resolved that ..... and be it further resolved that if any federal tax credits options are made available Council will discuss amending the indemnity bylaw in the future. Audience responded en masse that that was not what was said. She delegated Stacey Bartel and he said the correct wording was that we would roll back the changes accordingly, not review or discuss. **Mayor Fell** asked if the federal reference was correct and he replied yes and then in a whisper was heard to say "would be adjusted and put lowered in brackets". The CAO will read it again. **Draper** read "be it resolved that if any federal tax credit options are made available Council will adjust (lower) the indemnity bylaw accordingly." **Resolution carried 5-1, Wilson opposed.**

**Note:** Councillor Wilson made a very reasonable request of Council to defer the matter a few weeks until Revenue Canada presents its rulings regarding tax filing for 2019, which was the theme of the majority of speakers during this Question Period and Mr. Bennici's delegation on behalf of 286 residents to await the federal government's ruling and consider options then.

**There was a 5 minute break and then there is information missing from the recording regarding the discussion around the Springfield Development Plan. It was noted by several in the audience that the recorder at the Council table was inadvertently not turned on immediately after the break.**

**9.3 18-09 Springfield Development Plan (3rd Reading) - Minister Wharton's** letter of approval of the revisions can be viewed on the attachment to the Agenda for this meeting on the RM Web Site. Changes requested subsequent to October 23, 2018 were not accepted by the Minister and will have to be pursued through a separate Planning Process. **Resolution carried 6-0**

**Note:** Below is an excerpt from my November 20 Council Notes in regards to the changes mentioned that were not accepted by Minister Wharton. It would appear that the concerned constituents who took the time to register their strong objections to these changes had the desired effect. The move was initiated by the Planning Officer, Dan Doucet, and the CAO Russ Phillips as a "hail Mary" to circumvent the normal public process regarding development plans and request previously denied changes. The resolution was carried by Williams, Fuhl, Fell, and Bredin with Ralke and Wilson opposing it.

Development Plan Amendment Considerations - The Development Officer read into the meeting his report affording Council two options and proposing an amending resolution. Councillor Wilson rigorously opposed this action, insisting that the two significant changes in the report had been denied by consensus previously and as such, this was a last ditch attempt to circumvent the Development Plan deadline and thereby compromise the integrity of the process, probably requiring the Municipal Board to intervene with a public hearing. The CAO stated that a formal change is not being requested and further information is being provided for consideration.

*10.4 Development Plan Amendment Considerations Resolution No: 18-482 Moved By: Glen Fuhl Seconded By: Howard Bredin BE IT RESOLVED THAT changes proposed to By-law No. 18-09, with respect to some of the general public's concerns for those who have filed a second objection related to the Development Plan, are accepted by Council and that Schedule "A" be amended as follows for ministerial consideration and approval: 1. Requested Amendment to Land-Use Map 1 - Part of the SE 6-12-5E, 34 acres shown within the solid black line, from the current Designation "Aggregate" to the proposed designation "Employment". 2. Request Amendment to Land-Use Map 1 - Part of the N 1/2 of 27-11-4E shown within the solid black line from the current designation "Agricultural Preserve Area" to the proposed designation "Rural Residential". Carried (4-2)*

**10.1 Purchase of 686 Main Street - Administration** has reviewed the three options in detail and recommend purchase of 686 Main Street. An appraisal of 686 Main Street, Oakbank, was completed and determined to be valued at \$1,377,900.00. With an offer of \$1,150,000.00, the Municipality could purchase the building, including all office furnishings, closed circuit television security system, and asphalted parking lot. A minor renovation would have to take place to separate departments. We estimate a renovation to the building and required IT infrastructure to

be \$150,000.00. The purchase of 686 Main Street, Oakbank at a cost of \$1,150,000.00, and renovations in the amount of \$150,000.00, would be paid for using funds from special purpose reserves. \$820,000.00 from the Public Buildings Reserve, \$65,000.00 from General Reserve, and \$415,000.00 from the Capital Requirements Reserve. There would be an annual loss of tax revenue in the amount of \$6,500.00 if the Municipality was to obtain ownership. Business tax is an additional \$1,105. **Note: At the January 22, 2019 public hearing, of which notes were provided to the recipients of Council Notes, there was opposition to the purchase. Councillor Wilson felt this was an excellent deal and provides a saleable asset in 10 years or so and he supports the purchase. Mayor Fell hastened to add that selling the building is not in the current plan. Councillor Fuhl agreed and praised the work of Doug Murray. Councillor Bredin said he had had a lot of positive feedback from the community, particularly businesses, and felt it was a good thing. Resolution carried 6-0**

**Note:** In the Facilities Manager's report provided at the public meeting held to discuss the purchase, Sunova's original asking price and the appraisal were identical. A copy of the appraisal could not be provided as it is the property of Sunova Credit Union. In other words, the Municipality did not have an independent appraisal of the property done. In the interests of due diligence and fiscal prudence, the municipality should have engaged their own appraiser to conduct an independent and in depth evaluation of the building and infrastructure and not merely accepted the appraisal provided by the seller.

**10.4 March Council Meeting Schedule** - March 5 and 19 Council Meetings at 6:30 p.m, March 28 Planning Meeting 6:00 p.m., Committee of the Whole Meetings at 1:00 p.m. March 12 and 26.

**10.5 John Q Fibre Optics Project** - Council sat down with Colleen Sklar of the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region. **Mayor Fell** explained to council that the scope has changed and there potentially could be funding available so this initial portion is just a buy in for the actual feasibility study and then the project afterwards we would at how it would be funded and the large scale grants for the entire capital region so right now we are just discussing. They have extended the opportunity to us because they would like to have a complete capital region buy in so we are doing this as a group so we are bringing it back. We have a total of \$20,000. for the feasibility study and I wanted to open it up to Council for comments and discussion. **Councillor Fuhl** wanted it to be understood that for rural people it would still involve towers for the high speed, that it just does not go underground and provide everyone with high speed. **Mayor Fell** said that the study would cover all that and be made available to the public once they received it. **Councillor Wilson** said there are now private entities interested in participating in this. Even from a tower it is going to be 100 plus. **Councillor Ralke** said her understanding was that if we miss out on this, we may miss out entirely even if it doesn't come out to rural Manitoba as efficiently and effectively as it could to our outskirts of Springfield which are closer to Winnipeg. **Resolution carried 6-0.**

**10.13 Dugald Estates** - Requested council presence on feasibility committee regarding Phase 2 of project. Mayor Fell and Councillor Williams as alternate appointed by resolution. There was no discussion.

**10.14 School Division Clinician Space in Beausejour** - Mayor Fell feels they should be looking in Springfield and wants a letter sent. Letter was sent previously requesting that consideration be given to Springfield as a location for a vocational school and clinician space and to date there has been no response. Mayor Fell wants another letter sent. **Councillor Ralke** felt the wording should be more forceful and **Councillor Fuhl** felt it should be sent Registered Mail and a response requested. **Councillor Wilson** felt it should be pointed out that having Clinicians located in Springfield where the majority of students are located would be cost effective as it would reduce travel.

A resolution was then passed to change the trail location of the Springfield Pathfinders as requested in the delegation above, but Mr. Bennici in the previous delegation requested a resolution be passed to accept his petition and letters and he was denied on the grounds that resolutions cannot be added to the agenda as per Mayor Fell's ruling.

The balance of the meeting was Closed to the Public.