

Unanswered questions from the public attending meeting at the Unitarian Church, Winnipeg July13,2009

Why was the consultation process driven only by a P3 model without other community voices?

How much was spent on research?

If there were a change in the party governing the province, could the utility be sold to private shareholders?
What would prevent the utility from moving along the same path as MTS?

What was the trigger for this report or business plan? Did it come from councillors or from public servants?

By how much would water and waste rates increase to pay for the Utility managers?

One of the slides shown at the forum mentioned revenue opportunities. What does this mean? Please give examples.

What are the assets that the private strategic partner would own, if all the physical assets belong to the city?
What incentive is there for a private firm to become a partner to such an agreement?
Could you please define stake? Is that equal to a share on the stock market?

If the city owns the facilities, who will be responsible for costs, operation, salaries etc? Will the city inherit the facilities when they are worn out?

What recourse will Winnipeggers have if they disagree with the decision to provide water and waste to exurban communities?

Will Canadian jobs be protected?

Given the Utility governance structure outlines in pg 48-49 section 82, the EPC and Council can do little more than oppose the Utility's plan. How can you assert that the accountability and control of the utility is ensured to the public through their elected representatives. Does freedom from political interference mean freedom from public scrutiny?

No reasons were put forward for a new management model once the new facility is built. What would be the advantages of such a model?

What are the long-term implications?

What are the alternatives?

What are the NAFTA implications of this agreement? Both the FTA and NAFTA, which govern both goods and services (including management) explicitly dictate that when any public good or service moves to the private sector, no government can discriminate against a company from any other country. Directing this to a Canadian supplier only could trigger a court challenge under Chapter 11 of NAFTA. Has a legal opinion been obtained by the city. If so, who provided that opinion?

In the past, the city has used profits from the water and waste department to subsidize city revenues, but city tax rates have not increased in the last five years. What will the city do once Water and Waste are not part of the revenue structure?

Will this proposed Partnership include sales to USA?

If a cost savings analysis has been done on implementing a Strategic Partnership, where will those cost savings come from?

To incur a cost savings of \$6.2M, how much money will be spent? i.e. what proportion of the total budget does \$6.2M represent?

For all the research, investigation and analysis that the project team conducted, can you cite specific examples of how water and waste service privatization has failed in other Canadian cities, and how your MUBP will avoid these pitfalls and errors in judgment made by other municipalities?

Has City Council studied information from other Provinces? (eg. Alberta) What experiences with arms - length management models does the city have?

Carolyn offered the opinion that the arrangements with private partners would be proprietary information. I think that Brian dealt with that when he said that the PUB would have the power to demand that information. Who is right?

How will we know that this process will save us money? They privatized garbage pick-up for the so- called same reason, but failed to tell us how much they are saving each year.

Through what means will the Utility establish and communicate its corporate identity to stakeholders? What benefit will accrue to water rate payers and city of Winnipeg tax payers with regard to having their municipally owned water and waste utility establish its corporate identity?

Why would a P3 be needed after construction is completed?

How would the proposed Utility Corporation affect the ability of the city to set sustainability, fair trade or social justice criteria for its procurement policies or worker contracts?

If the city owns 100% of the assets, who is responsible for costs of repairs once the design, construction and optimization aspect is completed?

Apart from physical assets ownership, which is not considered important in modern business theory, will there be major long- term operating contracts for foreign corporations as happened in Jersey City, NJ?

Who will own our water?

How many Public Service jobs can be lost if a Private Partner is brought in to manage water and waste services? How many people are presently employed in water and waste services and construction management? What assurance do we have that all of these people will retain their jobs?

If this Utility has a partner, what is the benefit to the partner if the city retains 100% ownership?

I still don't get the difference between an arms- length corporation and a private partner. Is the difference 100% city ownership or 50% +/- 1?

Given that MUBP states clearly that jobs will not be lost and wages / benefits will remain unchanged, how will the operational cost savings be achieved? Additionally, how exactly will savings be realized through strategic partner procurement?

Does one call the city or the manager if a citizen notices a sewer pipe break?

How many managers may be needed for the project?

What guarantee is there of never/ever having foreign ownership of any kind?

What models were looked at that have failed? London? England?

Why is water rate not under the PUB now? Will it be in the future?

Could you show by a simple diagram where the money to be paid to the private company comes from?

How can we hold a private sector strategic partner accountable for cost overruns if we apparently can't hold the city accountable?

Why cannot all of these improvements and opportunities be done under the current model?

If city hall processes are cumbersome and limit staff ability to do their jobs, why can't we change the processes instead of engaging a strategic potentially profit-sharing partner? Let's fix what's really broken.

What plans have been made to control undesirable side-effects of extending water and sewer services outside the perimeter? eg. land speculation, pressures for urban sprawl and withdrawal of land from agricultural use?

If water consumption is falling, why do we need a private partner?

Please clarify how the city can be the sole shareholder and still offer shares to the Strategic partners.

Governments cannot be held accountable, technically or financially. Why does not the city contract out the construction and operation of WWTPS to competent private companies that can be held accountable in every way? The US and others have done this well.

In all your research and work in developing this proposal for city council, is the future really as rosy and perfect as you have described it to us tonight?

I recall reading an article about US cities that have returned to city-run services like water after they found that privatization didn't work out well financially and otherwise. Has our city government checked into this and spoken to these city governments?

Did the research for the proposal include the World Bank guidelines for Privatization of water systems?

How have Winnipeggers been consulted? We all own this Utility and it appears that we are not being given the opportunity.

Are you saying the managers we now have cannot control costs of projects? You have said that a lot of money was collected by the utility and used in general funds. Is this why we have a billion dollar bill now? Where does the \$6.12 M saving come from?

How much rate increase do you foresee in the next 5 years?

In the early 1900s city utilities were developed due to excessive charges by private utilities. Bottom line profit is still the operative word for private companies. We wish to retain our public utilities. It is my understanding that under NAFTA, any privatization of a public utility will provide an opening for other countries to purchase our water for golf courses and other private and corporate interests. Could we lose control of our own water.

Please clarify why spending \$1B to save \$6M over 5 years is necessary and how these numbers were estimated. Give examples of cities where this structure has been successful.

How is this a better proposal than what was offered to Toronto and North Battleford? Both cities shut down talks of privatization quickly.

Savings have been touted-\$13 million last week and \$6 million today. Thats chump change. Were talking about a \$1.2 billion project (2003).