COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, October 26, 2016

The Council met at 9:45 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 Schreyer.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, now onto you for the morning announcements.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do have a few remarks to share with Council today. Firstly, I want to welcome all those in attendance and viewing online and via television. I do want to just start by congratulating all the participants who have helped organize the 5th annual Winnipeg Fire and Paramedic Service Half Marathon. This is an important fundraiser for the Heart and Stroke Foundation. They have raised $175,000.00 over the last four years and this year was another sold out event with 3200 runners registered. Earlier this month, I was in New York, I was joined by our Finance Chair, Councillor Marty Morantz as well as our Chief Administrative Officer and Chief Financial Officer. Every year as councillors will know, the City of Winnipeg schedules meetings with bond raters and these meetings are very important. It's time for us to...it's a time for us in these meetings to demonstrate our fiscal prudence and describe our commitment to managing our budgets in a responsible and a balanced way. It's also an important opportunity to reinforce that Winnipeg's economy and population are both projected to grow steadily over the next 25 years. As everyone in this Chamber should know, Winnipeg's a growing city and investors, both here and across the country and internationally, are increasingly recognizing it as a great place to invest in and that was reiterated in our meetings in New York. In addition to meeting with the bond raters, I was also able to meet with the Phyllis Yaffe, she's the Consul General for Canada in New York. Tim Tompkins from the Time Square Alliance, we met with officials from the Traffic Management Centre at New York's Department of Finance, and New York City Police Department Chief, Joanne Jaffe. She is the most senior ranking female officer in NYPD history. We had an excellent discussion about community policing and reconciliation. Winnipeg is a great place to live, work, invest and to build a career in. I'll continue to use these trips and other similar meetings to be a relentless, positive champion for the City of Winnipeg. I was pleased, Madam Speaker, to have also awarded recently my first two keys to the city to two individuals who made important contributions to our city and who have been a great ambassadors and promoters of our city and its people. I was pleased to award Mr. David Foster and Mr. Teemu Selanne keys to the city. Mr. Foster launched the David Foster Foundation back in 1986 which supports families and children who are undergoing lifesaving organ transplants while also promoting organ awareness and registration across Canada and the United States. And I would encourage all those listening to sign up for life at signupforlife.ca. Many of those who are benefiting from the work of this foundation are right here in Winnipeg and awarding the key to the city to Teemu Selanne was also a tremendous honour for me. This recognizes his achievements both on and off the ice. His dedication to the sport of hockey and the legacy he left in the hearts of Winnipeg and our hockey fans. Teemu is certainly an ambassador for the game of hockey and a hero to many Winnipeg Jets fans. I was also very pleased to honour him during the Heritage Classic this last weekend where Winnipeggers were once again able to put forward their best foot and showcase our wonderful city to the world. I was pleased, Madam Speaker, to have attended and spoken with three business audiences this month where I was able to challenge our business community and our corporate leaders to find ways to increase the ways in which they can honour and implement the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's calls to action. I was pleased to have had the opportunity to speak to over 200 business leaders recently as part of Deloitte's 360 event. I was also pleased to have had the opportunity to speak to hundreds of small business owners as part of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce's second Annual Small Business Summit and I want to thank them for that partnership. I was also pleased to meet again with members of the Business Council of Manitoba. Madam Speaker, I use these opportunities to speak about how treaties, many years ago were meant to be and felt to be the opening chapter of an ongoing story; a story of partnership between First Nations and newcomers. Both indigenous and non-indigenous peoples saw the treaties as a foundation of mutual peace and security and for many different reasons the story of partnership that the treaties opened was interrupted and the mutual trust was lost. I challenge business leaders to find and recover their piece of this Canadian story, the story of peace and partnership that the treaties began to tell. During this Year of Reconciliation and beyond,

we all need to do our part to reconcile for the future. And businesses as problem solvers and leaders, they can be instrumental in building partnerships and rebuilding the mutual trust we have lost over the years. I was pleased, Madam Speaker, to have participated in the swearing in ceremony for the new Chair of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Wadood Ibrahim. As past Chair, I know the pressures of that post and I believe Wadood is very well placed to bring fresh ideas and perspectives on...for the benefit of that role. And I would also like to thank Priti Mehta-Shah for her service over the last year as Chair of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce. I was pleased, Madam Speaker, to have participated in an important announcement this last week together with Manitoba's new Premier at the Old James Street Pump House, we announced the recipients of the Live Downtown Rental Development Grant program. Through this provincial, municipal program, five new rental unit properties received support from the Manitoba Government and the City of Winnipeg through tax increment financing. As many of you know, I remain a big proponent of finding ways to encourage more people to live downtown and making investments like this towards the future of our downtown will benefit our entire city and help foster a growing, thriving, more modern City of Winnipeg. And I am very pleased with the strong partnership and the commitment from the Province and the Premier for this important program. I was also pleased to take part yesterday in an announcement by the University of Manitoba of the new Municipal Infrastructure Chair, Dr. Ahmed Shalaby, professor and head of Civil Engineering, has been selected as the new Municipal Infrastructure Chair holder. My commitment to help establish a Municipal Infrastructure Chair with the University of Manitoba was to support and help further the leading edge research and technology developments that have been undertaken for many years. I look forward to building on our many years of research partnerships with the U of M and our quest to find more efficient, cost effective solutions to our infrastructure challenges that will benefit our entire city right now but also into the future. I was also pleased to participate in the Manitoba Islamic Association Annual Banquet as well as the Diwali celebrations this past weekend. These events like so many others that take place each and every day across our city underscore how our cultural, rich and diverse community we are and I do want to quickly recognize that at the end of September the mosque on Hazelwood celebrated its 40th anniversary. This is Winnipeg and Manitoba's oldest mosque. I want to thank Councillor Mayes as the local ward councillor for helping recognize this milestone and for providing financial assistance to help with roof repairs and renovations to a facility that's a very important part of our city's history. In a similar vein, I want to thank and recognize Councillor Lukes who I believe recently provided financial assistance to help with upgrades to the Grand Mosque on Waverley. I want to take this opportunity to remind all councillors and the public of the budget consultations that are undergoing right now and they will resume tomorrow evening. Tomorrow's community consultation begins at 6:00 p.m. at the St. James Civic Centre. This will be the third of five public consultation meetings planned as part of this year's budget engagement process and I encourage the viewing public to visit letstalkwpg.ca to find more times and locations of the remaining meetings and also to provide important input and feedback into this year's budget. Thanks very much, Madam Speaker, merci and megwich.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Chief of Police is one of the most important roles in our city and Monday it was my privilege to be joined by many members of the board including Councillor Eadie, to announce that the recruitment committee of the Winnipeg Police Board is recommending Deputy Chief Danny Smyth to be appointed the next Chief of the Winnipeg Police Service. The Board under took a national search for a new Chief. A number of highly qualified candidates from across the country participated in the process and Deputy Chief Smyth emerged as a successful candidate after an exhaustive search. Just a couple of comments about the Deputy Chief; he has more than 30 years' experience with the Winnipeg Police Service. He currently serves as Deputy Chief of Investigative Services. He has worked in a number of areas within the service over his years, he's achieved a Master's degree in Organizational Management in 2006 and he also served on the faculty at the University of Winnipeg until 2014 where he was lecturing in Criminal Justice. His policing record reveals that Deputy Chief Smyth is a thoughtful, analytical, pragmatic leader who makes informed decisions. And the Recruitment Committee strongly believes that Deputy Chief Smyth is the right leader for the Winnipeg Police Service and for our city at this time. The Police Board will receive the Recruitment Committee's recommendation and make the formal appointment coming up next Friday, November the 4th. The new chief officially takes his oath of office upon being sworn in at a public ceremony planned for November the 8th and I invite all of my colleagues in the Chamber here to attend, if possible. And I know that my colleagues will certainly want to congratulate Deputy Chief Smyth on his appointment. I also want to take a couple of moments at this time with that announcement to express some words of appreciation. First of all, on behalf of all of us, I think really, to Deputy Chief Art Stannard who has served as Acting Chief since July...since Chief Clunis' last day. Chief Stannard has provided the service and the citizens of the city with the confidence and professionalism necessary for the demanding role during this interim period. Also want to acknowledge the members of the Winnipeg Police Board who have taken on the task of recruiting a new Chief with the seriousness, effort and attention that it merits. I want to thank the Board staff, particularly, our Executive Director, Don Norquay for his excellent work and I also…finally, I just want to express appreciation to our Mayor, I expressed it the other day, but the Mayor has respected the Board's role and supported the Board's legislative role to recruit the Chief of Police. At the outset of the recruitment process, the Board solicited the Mayor's input as to what qualities and competencies that he as the Mayor of Winnipeg would like to see in

the next Chief of Police. We took his input which very much mirrored the qualities and competencies the Board was looking for and then the Mayor left us to do our task and I believe that his approach, Madam Speaker, has ensured the integrity of the recruitment process. My second announcement has to do with Veterans Week and as Council Liaison for Veterans and Military Affairs, it's my honour to stand before you today and to let everybody know that November the 5th to the 11th is National Veterans Week. Of course, the week culminates on Remembrance Day when I'm sure each of us around this Chamber will attend a ceremony to remember the sacrifice that Canadian men and women have made for our values of freedom and liberty, values that we cherish as a nation. This past Sunday, I joined Councillor Schreyer and his lovely wife at the Hong Kong Veterans Luncheon. It is an annual event to remember the Canadians who fought in that Second World War battle. Most of the Canadians, in fact, were captured in that battle and spent the remaining years of the war in prison camps. The most distinguished guest of honour was no stranger to this council, he has appeared before us before, none other than Hong Kong battle veteran and 95 years young, Mr. George Peterson. Or as I think Councillor Mayes once aptly called him the unstoppable George Peterson or something to that effect. I think Councillor Schreyer would agree that sitting in the presence of Mr. Peterson and sitting in the presence of five widows of members who were in the Hong Kong Battle, was…really left me with a deep sense of indebtedness and admiration and it reminded me of the importance of Veterans Week and certainly the importance of Remembrance Day. Our nations, our city, our respective communities within our city owe our veterans and their memories the attention and respect that they deserve. And so, Madam Speaker, I'm calling upon the members in this Chamber, in fact, the guests in this Chamber as well, to ensure that we each observe Veterans Week from November 5th to the 11th and certainly attend a Remembrance Day ceremony on November 11th. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Gilroy you now have the floor for your morning announcement.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, thank you. It's an honour, Madam Chair, to rise in the Chamber to let my fellow colleagues know that Winnipeg Know Your Neighbours Guide was within our global UNESCO report. So we have been recognized internationally for the work that we're doing here in Winnipeg. The City of Winnipeg cultural resource, Winnipeg Know Your Neighbours Guide has been included in the UNESCO Global Report on Culture in Sustainable Cities, Culture, Urban Future. This local book has been included as a successful initiative that combats discrimination, promotes the value of cultural diversity and ensures the full enjoyment of all rights of citizens. It is a resource depicting the city's cultural diversity and compiles information that each community provides about the history, etiquette and customs of their cultural group. The resource aims to promote open dialogue and greater cultural awareness by empowering citizens to start a conversation with a neighbour in Winnipeg's multi-cultural tapestry. This third edition has been greatly revamped to recognize the Indigenous people who have called their land home for hundreds and thousands of years and to address the changing needs of our community and the relationships we share. Thank you.

MINUTES

Councillor Pagtakhan moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on September 28, 2016 be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: We will now move on to delegations. First up, we have delegations for Item No. 5 of the report of EPC dated October 19th, 2016 regarding Impact Fees. In support of the report, we have Ms Stephanie Voyce and Mr. Sachit Mehra from the Downtown BIZ. If I could ask you to come forward please, you will have ten minutes to make your presentation. Following that, we will hear from Mr. Garth Steek and Mr. Eric Vogan, if you could please come down at this time as well.

Madam Speaker: Good morning, Sachit. Are you speaking together?

Sachit Mehra: We…I will be doing the speaking.

Madam Speaker: Okay, great. And you have ten minutes to make your presentation today.

Sachit Mehra: Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Welcome.

Sachit Mehra: Bonjour tout le monde, vraiment c'est un plaisir d'être ici aujourd'hui. Good morning Mayor Brian Bowman, Madam Speaker, councillors, colleagues. I am very thankful and honoured to be here today to have the opportunity to present to you. I would like to thank all the delegations that are here as well today, they will be presenting on the same topic. I am happy to bring greetings on behalf the Winnipeg Downtown BIZ, Stefano Grande, our CAO of the Downtown BIZ. And I am here to affirm the support of the Winnipeg Downtown BIZ with respect to the proposed impact fees. The Downtown BIZ feels that the proposed impact fees are significant and welcomed turning point for our city to better manage growth and infrastructure costs which Winnipeg taxpayers can no longer sustain. The adoption of impact fees will reduce pressure on City Hall to raise taxes and fees on local residents and our business community with new developments paying for a fair share of infrastructure needs moving forward. Research tells us if implemented correctly, growth, in particular multi-family, office and commercial infill, can be directed inwards. This results in slowing of multi-family and office dwelling growth in areas of the city that are costing taxpayers because of the cost of new infrastructure. This leads to investment in other areas, costing taxpayers less where infrastructure already exists. This results in increasing surrounding property values and assessments and over time, this leads to less market gap subsidies by government to stimulate real estate market in areas like the downtown and inner-city. And lastly, this leads to the quickening of the regeneration of older neighbourhoods as well as business districts in and around our downtown. An important piece to note today is that the Winnipeg Downtown BIZ is extremely appreciative of the Mayor and EPC's recommended exemption that three years to downtown and infill housing surrounding neighbourhoods for the next three years with respect to the impact fees. Not only is this exemption in sync with the City's OurWinnipeg policy framework, but it supports the principal that smart growth should be encouraged in order to expedite renewal and revitalization of our city's downtown which, among many things, will quicken residential growth in our downtown, keep the downtown as the employment centre of Winnipeg as it should be and help point investment in strategic areas such as density, affordability, mixed use buildings, transit-oriented developments, pedestrian-oriented developments and more. And there still exists market failure in the downtown today. In our opinion, adding costs to the equation today via impact fees will bring development downtown to a halt. I would also like to express that the Mayor and Council members' commitment to ongoing community dialogue related to impact fees over the next years is quite significant. This dialogue concerning smart growth in our city has been ongoing for years and we certainly don't feel that this process is rushed from our end. We have felt we have been listened to and sincerely appreciated the opportunity to present of our thoughts to Councillor Orlikow over the past month. Finally I'd like to affirm the Downtown BIZ considers the proposed Impact Fee Working Group as truly important and a great example of community oversight and applauds the Mayor. In closing, I would like to acknowledge the City's support and vision and incredible growth in revitalization of our downtown over the last years with over $2 billion invested for vibrant, prosperous downtown since 2005 and even more planned for the next five years. There is certainly great momentum towards a rejuvenated downtown. The impact fees will support a positive energy of our downtown of which all of Winnipeg has ownership of. Thank you, merci, megwich.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mehra. That concludes your presentation. We will have…take questions if there are any. Councillor Wyatt, please bring your questions forward through the Chair. Thank you. Would you like to come forward to the podium, please?

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Madam Speaker, and thank you Mr. Mehra for your presentation. Just to clarify, you are in favour of the report before us today and you are aware the report outlines...has a number of recommendations on Clause and speaks also in Clause 4 of the report stating that the balance of the City will be phased in, starting in November the 1st, 2018…no earlier than November the 1st, 2018. The other uses that are not specifically office, commercial, industrial, public and institutional would be phased into the areas that have been identified in the mapping, namely the new and emerging communities and that also, on November...no earlier than November the 1st, 2019, that the all uses and all other areas of the city, which would include the downtown, will be phased in as well. You are in support of that?

Sachit Mehra: Yes, we like the process that's been outlined and put in place already. Certainly, we understand through the Advisory Committee that there will be ongoing discussions, we support that as well. Certainly what is true today is not true three years from now as this advisory fills in and processes get phased in, we would certainly support that.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So you are not against impact fees or growth fees in the downtown then based on that comment?

Sachit Mehra: So, yes.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for our delegations? Councillor Gillingham.
Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you to Mr. Mehra, thank you for your presentation. I just want to try to further to my colleague's question, just to try to maybe ask you to square the circle. So, you state that you appreciate that there's no fees going into the downtown now so as not to slow growth but you are in favour of them coming in in a couple of years. I am just wondering, will that not slow growth?

Sachit Mehra: So, we do not support fees coming into downtown. That is the position of the BIZ and clearly always has been. We have seen excellent tools. We have seen excellent tools used in downtown like TIF financing. If we look at TIF financing over the last 8 to 10 years, it was a phenomenal tool that was used not only for downtown development and we are starting to see the benefits of that TIF financing coming into play today. Buildings like the Avenue Building and other infrastructure or other building renewal in downtown, that's a fantastic thing and that benefits all Winnipeggers. Putting in fees only limits growth in some of our higher tax areas which is our downtown.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Just...thank you, Madam Speaker, straight to the question, so Mr. Mehra is in favour of the process which has no fees now in the downtown but fees in two to three years downtown. Just, are you in favour...is Mr. Mehra in favour of fees in the downtown or not in favour of fees? It's kind of a yes or no question.

Sachit Mehra: No fees downtown.

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

Councillor Lukes: Mr. Mehra, thank you for your presentation. I recently came back from Vancouver and really appreciated the density that has occurred in downtown Vancouver. I'm sure that we would like to see a higher level of density downtown Winnipeg. Do you feel that the current existing infrastructure, let's say pipes for example, are adequate to support the type of density that we see in Vancouver? Is that...the downtown pipes here, do you feel that they can support that type of density and if they don't, who should pay for that?

Sachit Mehra: Councillor Lukes, I can't speak to Vancouver pipes, and certainly, I don't have a camera on Winnipeg pipes. I can certainly tell you that downtown density is improving not only at the residential level but certainly at the business level and at the business tourism level in downtown. Certain great infrastructure projects that we have had downtown, least of which are things like the expanded Convention Centre, the MTS Centre, the Human Rights Museum have all been phenomenal pieces of a puzzle that have contributed towards a really revitalized downtown over the last ten years. I pointed to, again, the $2 billion worth of investment that has been made downtown. It has been a fantastic one that really does pay dividends back to the entire city and not just downtown.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Mr. Mehra, I will help you understand a little bit about the City of Winnipeg's pipes downtown. The City of Winnipeg is a very old city and the pipes downtown are very old. And they have to be upgraded. They...some of them are barely handling the capacity already. So I'm just asking you again, who do you think should pay for the underground pipes that are very old, to increase the density downtown?

Sachit Mehra: I thought we were talking about impact fees and I certainly appreciate your insight into pipes. Certainly, I realize that revenue generation for the City of Winnipeg is a constant challenge and battle. Certainly if we are in a position and we are looking for new revenue streams, it strikes me that impact fees moving forward placed in a strategic manner will be a positive thing for the City's coffers.

Madam Speaker: Third question, Councillor Lukes, your final question.

Councillor Lukes: So my last question, Councillor Mehra…councillor...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, could you bring your questions through the Chair? I think it would be more appropriate.

Councillor Lukes: Yes, my last question is, this is I think a flaw in the process in that the public doesn't really understand what impact fees go towards. An impact fee, one of the items that impact fees in their true form goes towards is pipes. So, I think this just absolutely highlights one of the flaws in our public consultation process in creating an awareness so people can understand what they're speaking about.

Madam Speaker: Do you have a question or?
Councillor Lukes: No question. Are you aware of that Councillor…are you aware of that Mr. Mehra? That impact fees…

Sachit Mehra: I am not aware of the question so far.

Madam Speaker: Would you like to clarify?

Councillor Lukes: The question is, are you aware that impact fees can be attributed...can be put towards repairing and upgrading pipes?

Sachit Mehra: I am aware that Council has the power to make direction as it sees fit moving forward.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi, you have a question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you…thanks very much and it's great to have you here today. And the BIZ…I want to thank the BIZ for their leadership on many different issues in the city but this being one of them. I guess there is a bit of confusion being raised here about the process. Today, we are approving impact fees in certain parts of the city and then there would be a process going forward over the next few years of discussion about what makes sense if, you know, there may be different degrees of fees in some, not necessarily all of the areas of the city, although all of that is open for discussion. Does that jive with your understanding of this? You have talked about working with the city in future discussions.

Sachit Mehra: So Councillor, if I understand your question correctly, you are...I mean, it would lead me to the proposed Advisory Committee that the Mayor is proposing and that is before us and I think that's a fantastic idea. As I mentioned prior to Councillor Wyatt's comments my understanding of course is that continuous feedback from the community into such a committee as variables change continuously for the city is a good thing. As far as that input goes, again I alluded to the TIF financing program which we are now starting to see the dividends of over the last 8 to 10 years was fantastic. I think what Council has in front of itself now as proposed is a powerful, powerful tool that it can really use to...use in a strategic manner to encourage growth around the city especially around infill and other areas.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you and I don't normally stand up for a second round but I just need a clarification if possible on my question which is...and thanks again Mr. Mehra for coming here and speaking on behalf of the Downtown BIZ. So is the Downtown BIZ's position in favour of impact fees in the downtown, ultimately, based on the report that is before us today which basically says quite clearly, that Council, with recommendations from the working group, may consider rates, may consider the rates for implementation for the following areas, so it's not a question of the uses being applied, it's the question of the rates and that they will be coming in the future. Are you in favour of that recommendation in the report in establishing the impact fee in the downtown which this report clearly calls for in the future or are you against it? Because if you are against it, then you'd be against the report.

Sachit Mehra: The Downtown BIZ has appreciated the process that has undertaken. We felt that we have been listened to, we've felt that the Mayor and members of Council have really taken our voices and concerns and our 1400 downtown business members into consideration and we are confident that the Advisory Committee that will be put in place by the Mayor will continue to be sympathetic and open to concerns of our capital region and its centre.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: So you are in support of the rates? You're in support of applying an impact fee in downtown Winnipeg?

Sachit Mehra: Do I need to repeat my last statement since the question was exactly the same?

Madam Speaker: He's asking for clarification.

Sachit Mehra: As the report stands, there is an exemption for three years for downtown. That is good, there is an Advisory Committee that is in place by the Mayor, that is excellent, and we will continue to feed into that Advisory Committee as we move forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes our question period. Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: I have a question for Mr. Mehra.

Madam Speaker: That would require a suspension of the rules. Are you moving suspension of the rules for additional questions?

Councillor Schreyer: Sure if I may, I will try.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of suspending the rules for an extra two minutes on the clock, please rise. Contrary? Carried.

Sachit Mehra: I'm honoured. Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker, thank you Council. My question is you said...Mr. Mehra said that it's a good thing that we wait three years before we make a decision on impact fees for the inner-city. And I ask why he believes that's a good thing that we wait three years for that part of the motion to be completed?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mehra.

Sachit Mehra: Certainly. So, as we can all appreciate, downtown, our capital region, the centre of our city, generates massive amounts of revenue, magnitudes level, for the entire city. However, it can also face challenges in terms of housing, deterioration, et cetera. As I mentioned previously, what Council has in front of it is a tool. A tool to direct growth, a tool to direct renewal and we feel that having an exemption in the infill areas will really allow us to direct that growth and that renewal there.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Why should these tools being utilized in the next three years not be applied to the motion at hand, in terms of actualizing the rates for next year for development in new and developing communities?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mehra.

Sachit Mehra: So, what we are looking at is a tool to address crumbling infrastructure and issues around our city moving forward. So you are being asked to use the tool in a manner that's intended and that is the renewal of our city, the renewal of our infill areas and generating revenue for the city as we're moving forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes our additional time for questions for the delegation. Thank you for your appearance. We will now hear from Mr. Garth Steek and Mr. Eric Vogan. There will be ten minutes on the clock for your presentation. Are you here, gentlemen?

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, what I would like to have the opportunity to do in discussions with the Clerk, Mr. Vogan representing UDI, I think it's very important that he have the opportunity to speak to Council and have the opportunity for questions so I will step aside and if there is time thereafter I will be pleased to speak. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Certainly, share your time. Mr. Vogan.

Eric Vogan: Thank you very much. Thank you for the opportunity to speak here today. We are here to talk about the question does growth pay for growth? It's a very simple, vague concept and perhaps suitable for Twitter but to have a fruitful discussion on this topic, we need to consider more detailed questions. Does new development contribute its financial fair share? Well, your taxpayers sure do. In budget packages your CFO states that Winnipeg's taxes are the lowest in the country but to choose this to avoid an issue unique to Winnipeg and that is the great disparities in assessments among the city's neighbourhoods. The fact is that new development provides huge assessment per household compared to the city average. As a result, pretty well any new home taxpayer will pay twice as much and perhaps more than the average taxpayer in Winnipeg. For example, taxes on new homes in Winnipeg are about 21 percent higher than a similar home in Calgary despite Calgary's average taxes being just slightly higher. Cost benefit studies also repeatedly show that these huge tax premiums provide benefits of significant scale to the city. And you will recall in Waverley West that number is in the neighbourhood of a quarter of a billion dollars present value, billions over the eight years. Despite these facts some councillors refuse to accept the reality of this tax benefit. The disturbing implication of that statement, growth does not pay for growth. It is the elected officials that voice it. Apparently dismiss

the high taxes paid by owners of newer homes. To the contrary, these revenues are certainly relevant and important to keeping all of Winnipeggers taxes lower. I think to move forward in a proper way, a statement from the city stating that taxes from new development are very high relative to the average and therefore provide significant revenue to the city, would be considered an important contribution to an open and transparent discussion on growth. Does new development contribute to offsite infrastructure? Yes, it does. The City requires contributions to offsite infrastructure through development agreements, documents signed by the City and the developer. These contributions to offsite impacts are generally within sight of new development. Attempts to address impacts beyond that are frustrated by a lack of plans and process. Nonetheless, major new developments have made contributions in the tens of millions of dollars to the arterial road system and the strategic network of roads beyond that. Despite these agreements and the value of these contributions, this impact scheme completely ignores these contributions. What is the appropriate contribution to offsite infrastructure? How can we measure appropriately? The most easily measured impacts are local, and then on to the community and to the regional level, each more distant impact being tougher to identify and measure. It's important to note that this applies to all development whether it's infill, green field, commercial or residential. In the cities in regions that have advanced regional plans and cost sharing mechanisms, the imposition of a city-wide charge is limited by legislative authority, agreements with industry and the municipality's interest in affordability of housing. Without the provisions of plans and the work that follows, high level, city-wide charges must be considered punitive. They displace funds that would be more properly spent on identifiable, more local impacts. For example, there is no sense paying for the replacement of the Arlington Bridge through a city-wide fee if people in St. Vital want to get east to Highway 59 by Ward Avenue Bridge that nobody knows about at City Hall. Why would the development community commit to working on a plan-based model for determining cost sharing in offsite mechanisms? Any contributions? Firstly, plans for land use and infrastructure beyond the neighbourhood level can ensure that we are capable of drawing. Secondly, plans provide a basis for fair attribution of cost and responsibility for infrastructure and services. These plans are very necessary to make sure we can move forward as a city. Collaborative planning and attribution of costs will lead to the efficient use of scarce resources to build a better Winnipeg offering greater certainty and efficiency for all, reducing the speculation and second guessing that's typical of current Winnipeg practice. As our charter states, UDI is committed to well planned communities by encouraging the reasonable and unselfish use of land for residential, public, commercial and industrial purposes. We strongly urge that the City Council vote down this ill-conceived, compact scheme and enter into a new process to properly address the impacts of new development. Finally I would like to say that I believe that this process is contrary to the goals of OurWinnipeg and new complete communities within that. This scheme would pervert the goals of complete communities and we believe that that is definitely wrong. Thank you for your time.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Steek, would you like to continue?

Garth Steek: Yes, I would. Thank you very much. Mr. Mayor, members of Council, Madam Speaker, the enormity and complexity of this particular issue cannot be overstated. The Mayor believes that growth does not pay for growth. I think the facts refute that. I've handed out to you through the clerk three important exhibits. These are reports that many of you have never seen nor read. They are unequivocal. Growth does pay for growth. The 71 million attributed to new growth for Waverley West came from your own administration. Now, I read the administrative review on this whole process, there is no reference to anything historical. You know what's fascinating about this is that when you so much as ask for a conditional use or a variance, you get a history that goes back to the Norman Conquest, but in this particular case, in this particular case, you got absolutely nothing in the way of historic data. Have a look at the report that also came down from ND Lee showing a net present value of 217 million and it moves up to 250 million. These are reports that I dare say nobody here has seen or read. Why not? This supports the fact that growth pays for growth. There's no explanation for why there is nothing about this in your reports. Now, I noticed that the Mayor in his introduction here talked about the Deloitte 360 form. You'll notice that these reports come from Deloitte. When I look around this table, there is a lot of lawyers, but I don't see any accountants. I had one councillor, when I spoke to him about this simply say to me, you know what, it's good old economics. Don't believe it. Well, if you don't believe Deloitte's, who do you believe? When Hemson came down September the 1st, there was simply no empirical evidence, there's no data, there's no analysis that supports growth does not support growth. It's the report you wanted, you pay 225,000 for it. How many of you know that the MHB and its memberships offered to co-fund that with you? And the City, for whatever reason said no we will do it alone. The question that you have to ask yourself, why did you not get these reports? Why did you not get these reports? I would suggest it's because of the fact that they run contrary to what is being advocated here. Had they have supported your position, rest assured, you would have heard them. You know, something else that's really concerning when you read Hemson, there are two major premises in Hemson; one, population growth and, the capital projections. Take a look at them. And you're going to hear from Mr. Moore, how many times in the last 20 years have you built 4,000 new houses? That's what the City said you'll do. Answer? Twice. If you take a look at the report from Canadian Mortgage and Housing, it says not in Winnipeg, in the CMA, for 17 and 18, projected growth is 3600 units. Okay. Mr. Vogan is absolutely correct. When it comes to municipal taxes in Winnipeg, we pay an average of 2,000. Outside of the city, you pay 1300. There doesn't seem to be any concern about these deficiencies in these reports. Frankly, when Hemson comes out and says there's going to be 4200 new homes built for ten years that's not supported

by history. You've got the lowest mortgage rates ever right now and you've also had the Federal Government come in and, say point blank, we're going to be nailing you to the cross with a higher tax. Capital costs, anybody take a look at it? It's stunning. Let me give you just one example, Councillor Orlikow noted this, you have got Kenaston widening it at 120 million, it was previously in its 60 million. You've got the City's water treatment plant in which was completed in 2006.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Steek, I will have to ask you to wrap-up. Who has moved extension?

Garth Steek: Thank you.

Councillor Orlikow: Councillor Eadie.

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

Garth Steek: The report is flawed, badly flawed. So it's incumbent on you to stop the process, to slow it down and make intelligent decisions. Something else that I have to ask you about, it just absolutely stuns me, I spoke to a number of councillors, I said have you seen the legal report? Have you seen the legal analysis from your own Legal Department that says you are on solid ground and guess what I heard? We have to sign a confidentiality agreement. Really? You are members of Council, who are you going to tell? I spoke to numerous ministers, this council you haven't seen the report. How can you proceed on something as important as this without having seen a legal report? Do you want to see your names on the statement of claim when there is a move to quash this by-law? It's great to say, you know what, we know we are right. Don't you owe it to the citizens of Winnipeg to find out what that legal opinion says? And did you go for outside legal opinion or did you just do it in-house? Hugely concerning issues. How many industry members are going to be laid off here as a result of this? How many small builders will go down? Do you have any concern about that? I don't see any risk assessment about that in your report. You know, I found it very interesting that Councillor Schreyer here opened up with a chant of hope. And thank you. You know what, I'll remember something my dad said to me, you never take away somebody's hope because it may be the only thing they have. Well, the truth of the matter is, for the vast majority of people, Mr. Mayor, the opportunity to have a new home is not just a hope, it's a dream and you're going to expunge it. Right now, the tax that you're going to latch them with is 9,000. It will be 12,000, it will be 15,000 sure as we are sitting here. And isn't it miraculous that the downtown where we see a $400 million office tower going up didn't have to fall under this. This is profoundly wrong. A motion to refer is always in order. Don't jump to conclusions. You owe an intelligent, reasoned decision to every one of the taxpayers in Winnipeg, every one of the citizens.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Steek. I would like to move on with the meeting if you could please be seated, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Steek. That concludes your presentation here today. I would like to call Mr. Micheal…

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, I am kind of hoping there's some questions here after that.

Madam Speaker: We will get to that in a moment. Yes. We are going to take the next delegation first so I'll just ask you to stay on the bench.

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order, Madam Speaker. Could you explain to the crowd our process in terms of noise in the gallery because this meeting could really get out of order?

Madam Speaker: I was just going to get into that, thank you very much. There are no presentations to be made from the gallery and that I'm making a caution to all of you now going forward at today's meeting, there will be no further presentations from the gallery, thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Mr. Steek, if I may…

Madam Speaker: We will get to that in a moment, thank you. Mr. Michael Carruthers, if you could please come forward. He is in opposition to the same item. You will have five minutes, sir, to make your presentation today. Thank you.

Michael Carruthers: Thank you. I am Michael Carruthers. I'm Manager of land development at Ladco, Director of UDI and a member of the Canadian Institute of Planners. I'm here today to talk to you about planning, specifically what's gone into this proposal. I would have thought that something this big that will affect growth for years to come would have gone through the Planning Department. That's not what's happened. Apparently, it's being run by the CFO with planning on the side lines. The one exception is the map which determines how this will all work, how it will all be phased in. We are very concerned about this map. Some development is in, some is out. It appears that arbitrary

distinctions were made within in an area in somebody's opinion, fits within the definition of an emerging community. New communities and recent communities are clearly defined in OurWinnipeg. But emerging communities are only loosely defined as primarily residential areas recently planned under development. But the administration seems to have taken a loose definition and said that the key is whether or not the developer had to go to the time, trouble and expense to prepare a secondary plan. We are not sure if this is correct. We believe it's arbitrary. We don't think it's fair. We don't think it's consistent with Hemson's report and we don't think it's legal. In the end, it looks like an arbitrary attempt to phase something in that's very unpopular but the results will be terrible. So let me ask you, what exactly is the difference between our last hundred or so last lots in South Pointe in Waverley West and the last hundred or so lots in your joint venture in south St. Vital? We opened up South Pointe in 2008, serviced our last stage in 2013, so as far as we can tell, there is little or no difference. Both developments contain suburban lots, both were serviced at about the same time, both are recent communities, both fit the loose definition of an emerging community so there really is no difference except that going forward our customers will have to come up with another ten grand. And there's lots of other examples. There is land right across the street to Waverley West, anything they bring on will be exempt. And then there is like the Ikea area which was planned and serviced after South Pointe but they, too, will be exempt. In the end, we believe that this was rushed and the result is arbitrary and unfair. I would like to also comment on the cost benefit studies. Alan Borger spoke about the cost benefits last Wednesday and I don't want to repeat everything except that it's interesting that neither the Hemson report nor the City deal with this or even acknowledge these reports. All of the studies for Waverley West, even your own, confirm that beyond a shadow of doubt that Waverley West is sustainable and in fact, very profitable for the city. Back in 2003, I worked with Paul McNeil at NDLEA on these cost benefit studies. We spent almost two years putting that report together. It was prepared in collaboration with the City and based on sound data, research, engineering and finance. Well, assumptions were made, they were conservative…or where assumptions were made, they were conservative. Contrary to what you hear allocations were made for operations, recreation, police, fire, transit, infrastructure, I could go on, but they were all accounted for. For example, we allowed 35 million for a rec centre and an annual 5.8 million for transit. To summarize, Waverley West produces a net return of 892 million over 80 years. Brought back to the present, it's 247 million plus levies worth another 24 million. Even if we throw in all six lanes of Kenaston, Waverley West still produces a net present value of 231 million, a great investment for the city, not a drain on resources. We don't understand why the City refuses to acknowledge these reports and we believe, based on your refusal and your map that an inference could be made. So in conclusion councillors, please slow this down, please take a step back. More work needs to be done before you can reject the cost benefit studies, before you can rely in good faith on Hemson's report and we take issue with your scheme to phase in the fees. We believe it's based on an arbitrary but meaningless distinction that does not follow from the definition and is probably illegal. One last thought after reviewing Hemson's report our industry commissioned a report by MMP which you have and which identifies some very serious if not fatal problems. For something this important, would it make sense…would it not make sense for Hemson to at least respond to this? We are not talking delayed for delay's sakes. All we are talking about and all we are asking for is prudence. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Carruthers. This will be Council's opportunity to ask questions. Councillor Gillingham followed by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Gillingham: Just confirming Madam Speaker…

Madam Speaker: Just a moment, I'll just ask Mr. Steek to come forward as well.

Councillor Gillingham: That was who my question is to Madam Speaker. Maybe I will direct this to Mr. Vogan if he's still here, through you, Madam Speaker. I have several questions, I will just ask…start with this one; through you, Madam Speaker, how likely is it that the implementation of this fee will drive development into the adjacent municipalities and thus the City will lose out on potential revenue, the development will happen outside the perimeter. How likely is this to be the result?

Eric Vogan: The market has already reacted to the likelihood of this scheme being approved. We have seen a flurry of activities in Winnipeg neighbourhoods looking to find out how much time it will take before they can get a permit. I can also say that the neighbourhoods outside of the city where we're also active, activity is up significantly.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm wondering about the trickle-down effect in the economy. I'm wondering what this will do to the…the impact that it will have on, for example, the trades such as plumbers, electricians, framers, foundation specialists, roofers, realtors, surveyors, landscape companies and a whole host of other men and women in our city who depend upon a healthy development community activity in Winnipeg. What kind of trickle-down effect will this have on them?

Eric Vogan: It doesn't take long to trickle down. This is probably a question that would be best addressed to Mike Moore of the Home Builders. But the immediate impact once we see that the fees are up for new apartment blocks emerging in new communities, will be very certain, there will nothing happening. Larger homes will be basically taxed out of the game in the city and they will move outside, there's no doubt about that. Whether or not they move outside or decisions are just made to stay put is really the important question.

Madam Speaker: Third question.

Councillor Gillingham: Yes, final question, Madam Speaker. I think all three of the gentlemen I've spoken with to some degree...I'm wondering about the reports, my question is; developers are required to provide a cost benefit analysis, to my understanding, any time they want to bring forward a development. To the gentlemen's knowledge, what has been done with the information that the developers have to provide in those cost benefit analysis, what has the City done with that information and has it made its way into Hemson?

Eric Vogan: We have presented these reports as part of our presentations for our secondary plans and they have been absorbed by administration but I do not see them being discussed much. Ever since the 80s, it's been pretty obvious that if new homes are more valuable and more…larger than existing ones, there is a benefit there. In Winnipeg's case, it is very significant, so it's been really a moot question.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you to Mr. Vogan as well. On September the 21st, 2016, the Executive Policy Committee laid this matter over and instructed a member of the Executive Committee to proceed with further discussions with stakeholders including members of Council, industry and the Winnipeg Public Service. Can you tell me…tell Council what took place since that time and specifically, what was the position of UDI, what were you looking to achieve before it was brought back to EPC?

Eric Vogan: We asked Councillor Orlikow to consider a process based on community and regional plans, strategic infrastructure plans so that we could properly examine attributions of responsibility for new growth and make sure that we could deliver new growth very well. We asked that a working group to consider that to be established. We were left with the understanding that that would be considered. However, it was not.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Two questions left. So...and I think this is very important and significant...so what I hear you saying is that the official position of the industry is that you are not against a growth fee or an impact fee?

Eric Vogan: I go back to a certain Councillor Wyatt about three years ago who was pushing for a development charge type process. And he quite openly stated, "I know growth pays for growth. I want more." And we understand that we pay more than our share for growth through the taxpayers, largely. The offsite contributions that developers make are really customized and we need a process so that we can make sure we do that well and we believe that if we do that better we can grow more efficiently and we can offer a greater contribution to the city.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you for reminding me of quotations when I was Chair of Finance. Anyway, I guess then the other question is this, you know, you indicated that you wanted to have a process that would arrive at a...probably at a crossroads where there would be an impact fee or a growth fee but you wanted to have a process working with the City. What happened to that between September the 21st and now?

Eric Vogan: Well, I think that the course that we think needs to be taken is drastically different from this. This is a city-wide level approach where impacts are very vague and causes are uncertain and we believe it's got to start from a community and regional level of planning and also with the view that there are City responsibilities as well. This isn't solely a story about sitting back and expecting growth to pay for everything.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question for Mr. Steek. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question. It's not meant to be sensational or naive. We have all been briefed here on Council to some extent. Anyway, but, this conversation, by…given this motion will is going to be taking place for a few years based on this motion. Now, people are watching and this is a new issue for a lot of people and it's going to take place for a lot of years…for a few years. I am not asking Mr. Steek for the final word on this but at least for some to start a conversation and I know Mr. Steek is quite able to start an argument and perhaps I'd just like to hear him speak on this. So the

question is, given the growth of this city over the generations and despite the generations and the by-laws that does not go back to the Magna Carta or even 1066 and all that, but given this, given our growth over a century, why is the city not bankrupt, given our development without this specific impact fee?
Garth Steek: You are absolutely right, I am not here to be argumentative but I think as a concerned citizen, as a taxpayer who believes that we are being lashed with a new tax at every turn, as someone who believes this process was clearly rushed to get to this point, Councillor, I think it's important that you go back and look at Hemson and you look at the reports from Deloitte wherein the development industry has contributed $630 million in the last decade in infrastructure. The reason that this city has prospered to this extent is because of the liaison between the developers, the builders and City Council. There has to be a fair and trusting relationship and I am going to tell you why I think trust is a major issue that's undermining all of this. Looking over at the CAO, you were the ones who came out with that report in 2003 and said that new growth paid for itself. Now here's something that's fascinating and you talk about bankrupt. The City refuted the NDLEA report that talked about a net present value of 217 million. Why? What was their premise? Their premise, Mr. Mayor, was straightforward. They said, "new housing was going to depreciate." Well, that was in 2003. So let me ask you sitting around this table, how many of you have seen a diminution in the value of your properties? The answer is nobody. Nobody has. So when NDLEA came up with the $217 million net present value, why did it happen? For a number of reasons; faster absorption, increased assessment and the fact that people were taking advantage of the opportunity to buy here. You are going to kill that. I'm not going to predict you're going to bankrupt this city, Councillor, but I'm going to tell you this is an ill-conceived new tax. It's a new home tax. And you know what else you are doing? You are going after the most vulnerable. You are not going after a $400 million new edifice downtown, are you? You are going after people who have to come up with another 9,000 bucks. That's going to push a new home out of a lot of people's reach. It's ill-conceived and I go back to this; have you seen a legal report?

Madam Speaker: That concludes question period.

Councillor Lukes: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask that we suspend the motions and have three more speakers come forward.

Madam Speaker: Okay, I will get to that in a moment. Thank you, Mr. Steek for your presentation today, you may return to the gallery.

Garth Steek: So, just for clarification's sake, there are no more questions?

Madam Speaker: That's right.

Garth Steek: Thank you, I assure you it's been a pleasure.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Mayes: I did…

Councillor Lukes: He had a question.

Councillor Mayes: I had a question for that speaker but if our time is up.

Madam Speaker: Well, you need….rules need to be suspended then.

Councillor Lukes: Okay. I will suspend the rules to hear the question from Councillor Mayes, please.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now, Councillor Eadie was before you Councillor Mayes, so we will have to go back to Councillor Eadie. Councillor Eadie, you have the floor.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I was just...the former councillor mentioned a whole bunch of things. He actually named inflation and this by-law that's moving forward deals with construction inflation and those kind of elements. But, Madam Speaker, I am wondering if the former councillor would agree that the new growth from 98 moving forward was not used to pay for growth, but was used to hold property taxes at a freeze. Is that true?

Garth Steek: That's an interesting question. Do I agree with it? No I don't and I'm going to tell you why. Taxes were held at ground zero for a decade plus and there was a reason for it. This city was taxing itself out of the marketplace. Now, one of the things that always fascinated and the Mayor and I had this discussion during the budget and the Mayor said to me, well you were one of the people who kept property taxes at zero and as a result the infrastructure crumbled. Not quite, not quite. The reason those taxes were held where they were was to keep housing in somewhat an

affordable status so that people would want to come and invest here, Councillor Eadie. And I think the other thing that you have to realize is we are in a situation where we're competing with other jurisdictions. Municipal taxes in Winnipeg are $2,000 on an average new home and they're $1,300 in outlying municipalities. I'm not making it up, it's just a fact, read Hemson, it's there. So to suggest that somehow, that everything happened because of a tax freeze, no. We did it to stay competitive and the truth of the matter is, is that if you lash the new home owner with this tax, which is now 9,000, that's one of the things I struggle with like so many people. The first idea that was floated out was 30,000, where it came from doesn't matter but 30,000 became 18 and miraculously overnight, 18 became 9. To give us a break?

Madam Speaker: If you could wrap up. To hear Councillor Mayes' question specifically? Okay. All in favour of adding another two minutes to the clock? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, in terms of history, you were here December 17th, 2013 saying it would be unconscionable if we did anything other than a zero percent tax increase. You also indicated earlier today that the result of our actions would be to create unemployment, to deny people employment in a number of construction trades, so is it your position that the fact that we didn't follow your advice when we increased taxes based on Councillor Wyatt's model, based on Chris Lawrence's model, I think, of having a targeted increase to go towards roads, we have gone from 30 million on roads to 105 million on road reconstruction, is it your position that that had no impact whatsoever on employment in the construction industry and that had we followed your advice, we would still somehow been able to go from 30 million to 105 million? You've made the case that we seem indifferent to employment in the construction industry, you called in 2013 for a zero percent property tax increase, at that time we began the path Councillor Wyatt led us on and that we have continued on to increase spending on roads. I think that's probably employed a lot of people in the construction industry.

Garth Steek: Councillor Mayes, you are only quoting half of what I said. I have a lot of problems with the fact that when I look what's projected for this tax, you are looking to raise $7 million this year. One of the things that you are not talking about I said was, hold the line on expenditures in City Hall. So guess what happened last year? You hired 126 new bureaucrats at a tune of seven and a half million bucks. That would have looked after this tax. That's where I come from. I come from a position of fiscal prudence. Look in this house first, you certainly see what's happening at the Provincial Government, don't you? Have you created employment? Yeah. You have gone from...you've got $105 billion on roads but you only spend 80 million a year. I said billion, I apologize for that. So it's 105 million in the capital projects and you're spending 80 of it. The truth of the matter is, and there's some bright people around this table, if you wanted to trim some fat.

Madam Speaker: If you could wrap up, please Mr. Steek.

Garth Steek: That's it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Dobson, you had suspension of the rules?

Councillor Dobson: Yes, I would like to suspend the rules so that some additional delegates may speak on this item.

Madam Speaker: Okay, and who are they?

Councillor Dobson: Garth Rogerson and John Pearson.

Madam Speaker: Okay, just a moment. Councillor Steek, that concludes your presentation and any questions for you. Thank you very much. Okay, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: I was also going to have three speakers come forward please, Lorne Remillard, Ian Shaw and Justin Swandel.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of suspension? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, just a point of order, no questions of these delegates?

Madam Speaker: That's right. Okay, so if I could please call up Mr. Garth Rogerson followed by Mr. John Pearson and then we'll hear form Mr. Lorne Remillard.

Councillor Lukes: Madam Speaker, I'm sorry, just one person and that was Mike Moore.

Madam Speaker: Marc? Mike Moore and this one's for Curtis, okay. Gentlemen, if you could…you are together? You're presenting together or separately?

Councillor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, sorry, point of order. I believe Councillor Wyatt made a motion to suspend the rules to hear two other delegates? I didn't hear you call the question on that, sorry.

Madam Speaker: Right. Okay, thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. So, if you could state your name for the record please and you have five minutes to make your presentation.

John Pearson: Sure. John Pearson. Your Worship, City Councillors, City Administration and Madam Chair, we thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to speak today. Firstly, we'd like to express our concern with the City implementing impact fees as it will have a negative impact on the competitiveness of our city across the country. We are in a very competitive environment and our city needs to expand and prosper by attracting new business. The Red River District of which West Port Festival forms a part is a 450 acre site currently owned by the Red River Exhibition which is a non-profit organization. The subject lands are located on Portage Avenue immediately west of Pointe West Auto Park and the MTS Iceplex. On the flipside of my presentation is a map identifying the location of the site. The lands are currently served by a full range of municipal services including water, sanitary, sewer, land drainage, roads and other city services including police and fire protection. The only additional infrastructure required is a boost in water pressure to help with fire suppression. The Red River Ex currently operates on the site with extensive facilities and has plans to significantly expand its existing community. The Red River District, including West Port Festival expansion will not include any single-family residential development. The development will primarily involve entertainment, agri-business, office, retail and other commercial uses. Complete communities defines new communities as large, undeveloped land areas identified for future urban development and are not currently served by a full range of municipal services. The Red River District including West Port Festival, should not be included as a new community and a map which is on the back side of the presentation, should be amended to remove the Red River District including West Port Festival from phase one and phase two implementation of the impact fee implementation plan. The balance of the presentation will be done by Garth Rogerson from the Red River Ex.

Garth Rogerson: Thank you Madam Speaker, Council.

Madam Speaker: Welcome.

Garth Rogerson: My name is Garth Rogerson, I'm representing the Red River Exhibition Association. I want to thank Council for the opportunity to speak today. The Red River Exhibition has a long history in Winnipeg as a self-sustaining community non-profit organization. Winnipeg stands alone as the only major city in Canada without an industrial trade show facility. Our plan will create this facility as an economic driver for the city bringing what is widely believed to be over $100 million in economic impact annually. In the last couple of years we have invested over $7.5 million in infrastructure upgrades for our expansion to ensure the impact on Winnipeg is kept to a minimum. Since we are located in an existing community with a full complement of City services, our expansion requires no upgrades to City services. To allow full build out of the park, the only infrastructure upgrade we need is a new water line for fire suppression. That water line will drive new property taxes and fees from water and sewer connections ensuring pay back will be swift. Red River Exhibition is investing 1.8 million to bring that water line to Portage Avenue so it can be looped to the existing line improving flow and pressure for all west Winnipeg. All other infrastructure on our property is built and maintained by our organization and even the streets surrounding our property are maintained by the Province further reducing impact to the City. The Red River Exhibition is the only federally designated Class A fair in Canada without municipal funding and we plan to remain self-sustaining. West Port Festival is a critical piece in our plan, driving revenues so community facilities can be built without cost to taxpayers. The impact fee is unfair and makes future development uncertain. The fee to expand our exhibition alone would exceed $1 million but has no impact on City services. It is our position the impact fee should not apply, but we are here today to ask that our property be removed from the new communities map because we do not fit the definition of a new community. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Our next speaker is Mr. Lorne Remillard. If you could please come forward. Following that, we will hear from Mr. Mike Moore. Welcome, if you could just state your name for the record, please.

Lorne Remillard: Lorne Remillard, Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber is not my name but. Thank you Mayor Bowman, Madam Speaker, members of City Council for the opportunity to appear before you today. On behalf of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, representing greater than 2,000 member companies, I urge you to reconsider the direction being taken today. There is still time to step back, to map out a proper engagement process and to create something that will have a positive impact on our community for decades to come. The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce is not opposed to growth development charge, impact fees or whatever we're calling it. In our recent bold Winnipeg document, we advocated loudly for an examination of the new civic revenue model and new tools. We agreed

our cities need a modern revenue model, one that relies less and less, not more on property-based taxation. As such, the issue of growth of impact fees is a true watershed moment in our city's history and I don't think that's an exaggeration, I do think that what we are going to be setting down here today if Council votes will define our city for decades to come. As such, you have an opportunity like few councils before to either set the city on a visionary path or let opportunity slip away in the name of expediency. A lot has been said about how the consultation leading up to today was comprehensive. That City Hall actively listened and responded to the needs of stakeholders. On this, the Chamber respectfully agrees to disagree. Given the importance of the issue, what should have happened was a fully scoped out engagement process with citizens, industry, City planners and more. Make no mistake about it, there are 800,000 people impacted by the decision you are going to render today. So it's not just stakeholders. It's 800,000 people. Instead, what we got was one consultant's report taken as cannon law and a few meetings. This is not how good public policy is created but we stand here today faced with the implementation of impact fees that will have an impact, just not the one the authors imagined. The Chamber recommends Council vote against the proposed by-law and send it back to the community for meaningful consultation. Not in perpetuity, set a timeline, but give Winnipeggers a chance to have their voice heard. Failing that, if it is the will of Council to proceed with the by-law today, the Chamber offers the following amendments. One, impact fees must first and foremost be designed as a planning tool, not just as a revenue tool. This can be done through permanent legislated exemptions for, and I want to be very clear, permanent for downtown Winnipeg as well, infill or brown field development within the city. Critical strategic economic zones, in particular, Centreport Canada, we have invested far too much and have achieved too much with Centreport Canada to now decide we're going to latch away to its ankle and drag it down. As well, cultural institutions, places of worship and additions to existing structures, these are all exemptions in other growth development charge impact fees in every other city. Second, impact fees must be designed and calculated using area specific pricing defined as pricing that reflects the true costs according to the type of development and density. Actually, this kind of pricing is actually recommended in OurWinnipeg master plan in the form of precinct-based cost benefit assessments. So we are really referring you back to your own document. Three, impact fees must be competitive especially within Manitoba's capital region based on whole system accounting and analysis that includes property taxes and all the existing fees and levies. Fourth, Winnipeg must provide an option for delayed or staggered payment schedules to avoid cash flow interruptions, in particular for the small developers doing infill to hit them, to ask them to pay this front that they can't…this charge that they cannot finance, upfront, will be detrimental to their efforts to create density. Fifth, impact fee revenue must be transparently segregated and pay only for evidenced growth-related costs, not growing cost. Lastly, I would urge Council moving forward to pursue expenditure control measures with equal enthusiasm that is being brought to this issue here today. In conclusion, the Chamber urges Council to seize the opportunity to do this right. Just not right now. Take the time. Winnipeggers, you are asking a lot of Winnipeggers. I don't think it's a lot to ask Council to say go back to Winnipeggers and talk to them. In doing so, Winnipeggers can benefit from a policy that aligns with what should be the only objective, a planned, sustainable and growing community. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Remillard. Next, we will hear from Mr. Mike Moore representing the Manitoba Home Builders Association. Welcome.

Mike Moore: Mr. Mayor and members of Council, thank you for the opportunity to address you today. The Manitoba Home Builders Association and the Urban Development Institute want to express the concern of many stakeholders, businesses and citizens of Winnipeg regarding the imposition of an impact fee or new neighbour tax. As has been said to members of Council numerous times before, the lack of process and consultation should be worrisome. Although presentations were made, dialogue was not encouraged. Council was largely left out of the process, industry was dictated to, not consulted and a handful of meetings were accommodated but meaningful discussion did not occur. To propose the amended by-law does not represent a fair and balanced path forward. It does not represent a compromise. A compromise, as I've said before, is a settlement of disputed differences. This is certainly not settled or we wouldn't all be here today. A compromise is an agreement to listen to two sides in a dispute. I can tell you that one side doesn't feel that it is being listened to very well. The proposed by-law in its current form is reckless and unacceptable to the industry. How can you support a motion that is based on blatantly incorrect financial information, inflated project costs and absurd attributions? The MHBA and UDI presented a plan based approach to complete the work anticipated in the OurWinnipeg document so that the impacts of growth may be properly determined and quantified and that effective, cost sharing model established. These plans are also crucial to guide and promote the positive growth desired by the city. MHBA and UDI have offered to participate in and contribute technical expertise to this process assuming all parties commit to such a process in good faith. This is in similar fashion to what is being done in other major Canadian urban centres. We offered that the working group be established and fully operational with recommendations on this approach before the presentation of any by-law. Again, your proposed working group terms of reference includes preliminary recommendations for phase one by November 2017. However, phase one fees are to be implemented in May of 2017. It's not in good faith to specify the outcome before the work is done. Terms have already been established and off-site costs negotiated for existing development agreements with the city. These agreements have included significant City required investments in infrastructure. They must be respected. To ignore these agreements is to triple charge these homes. First, under the development agreement, second as an impact fee and third, as these homeowners pay their

taxes which will be the basis for all other taxpayers in Winnipeg to contribute. These new homeowners may never see the benefit as the City has not committed to implement projects and benefit these developments. Instead, fees are to be placed in a general fund to fund...or to finance an undefined list of projects to be determined through what will undoubtedly become a negotiated process that may have nothing to do with effective planning for the city. Finally, we contend that the proposed by-law is illegal. Cities that impose development cost charges have the legislative authority to do so. The City of course has said these are not development cost charges but instead are impact fees. That's the term generally used for a fee on new or proposed development projects to pay for costs of providing public services to the new development. Putting those labels aside the approach is not like every other city and is not permitted under current legislation. Therefore, we have instructed our legal counsel to bring court proceedings to determine whether the City has legal authority to impose the impact fee by-law. The advice that we have received so far is the City does not have that authority. I feel it would be in the best interests of the city and its residents to wait until we have the courts answer before going down this road. Thank you for your time today, I look forward to the pause that was indicated last month to be extended until after meaningful, plan-based discussion has taken place at the working group level. And in my last 23 seconds, Councillor Gillingham, 16,983 jobs tied to residential construction in theCcity of Winnipeg. And Councillor Schreyer, '1066' and all that was one of my late father's favourite books. Thank you for that reference.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Moore. Next we will hear from Mr. Spencer Curtis. If you could please come forward, following that is Mr. Ian Shaw, if you could also please come forward at this time. Welcome.

Spencer Curtis: Thank you. My name is Spencer Curtis from Manitoba Home Builders Association. I would like to thank you all for your time today. Winnipeggers have faced a choice, Mayor Bowman said; either everyone pays higher property tax to pay for infrastructure or a few pay higher home prices. The fact is, everyone, not just a few will pay higher home prices. The affordability and advantage that Winnipeg has and that it uses to attract new residents, new taxpayers and to attract returning residents to come back to the City will be eroded significantly. More importantly though, I want to bring attention to the language and the rhetoric surrounding the implementation of a new growth tax or impact fee, call it what you want, I am not here to discuss the legality of this new scheme. I am here to speak for those who haven't been given a voice. The homeowners who are being told that because their home is new, that they will need to pay two or three times for providing…for paying the cost of providing services to that home. They pay once as Mr. Moore said through the price of that home and the price of that includes the price of all of the infrastructure in their community as well as upgrades and area charges around their community. Then they are being asked to pay a tax on that home, an impact fee, which is a calculation of all of the costs that living in that home, driving around the city and living in the City of Winnipeg will create over the next 25 years. And then they pay property taxes. Those property taxes will be on average twice the value of the average cost of delivering services to a home in Winnipeg. According to the City's website, it costs an average of $1836 last year to deliver all services, including repairing old infrastructure, libraries, police, et cetera. It costs $1,836 per home for the City to deliver services to one home. It seems to me, quite simply, that if a new homeowner whose tax bill exceeds $1,836 per year, that taxpayer is covering the cost associated with running the City and more and now, however, because they are new because that homeowner is being asked to pay a tax as well. I'm very uncomfortable throwing around this type of divisive, all versus some rhetoric that somehow a taxpayer in an established neighbourhood who pays tax has more rights to this city than a newcomer and that...and a new home owner. It creates a hierarchy of citizenship that I feel has no place in the City of Winnipeg. The highly flawed Hemson report itself discusses the benefits received principle. The benefits received principle states that those who benefit from the services in question should pay for them. In my Winnipeg, however, everyone benefits from the services provided by the City. I am not interested and I hope neither is this council in dividing the citizens of this city into a series of special interest groups pitting one group against another based on where they live and what…and how they got there and when they came in and when they came here. I am not interested in listening to people talk about how they don't use Assiniboine Park, so why should they pay for that? Or I don't drive downtown, why should I pay for that? Yet the rhetoric here is that you live in a specific area, you are new and you need to pay. No, in my Winnipeg, we all share the costs of running the city and we all have the same opportunities to enjoy the many amenities of this great city. If an impact fee is charged on new homes, will a special assessment be charged to older homes who need sewer upgrades for instance? That would follow from the benefits perceived model, would it not? If a growth tax is implemented in order for the City to capture the cost of adding one new house to the City's assessment base, in terms of that person's use of future police, future where on the streets, et cetera. And they're going to pay for 25 years of that privilege, are they going to be receiving a credit for the things that are non-growth related? Does the City plan to spend hundreds of thousands of additional tax dollars for a study to determine what credit those new homeowners should receive for combined sewer replacements, for example, or any of the other $7 billion infrastructure deficit that we have already? Anyone here who has questions about whether growth pays for growth needs to start by asking, have I been given the time and the material to satisfy all of my questions? And if the answer is no, I think that they need to vote today...or to suspend these...this is not delayed for delay's sake, this is delayed for the sake of getting it done right. And I ask each councillor in this room to vote today for meaningful consultation between the stakeholders and the City to engage the development agreement parameters that UDI and Manitoba Home Builders have been trying to engage in and I ask

councillors to vote for fairness and inclusiveness and not division. To remember that we are one great city and we are all part of it and we need solutions to move our city forward together. Thank you for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Curtis. Next, we'll hear from Mr. Ian Shaw. And our last delegation will be Mr. Justin Swandel.

Ian Shaw: Madam Speaker, Mayor Bowman and Councillors, I am attending today as a citizen and taxpayer with significant concerns about the process to establish the impact fee by-law. These concerns come from 25 years of experience as a planner and that experience includes representing both developers and municipalities in disputes over development cost charges. While I suspect some of you may associate my delegation with support of the development industry's position, I want to assure you, it comes from an entirely different place. For the record, I support the introduction of development impact fees as an extension of existing framework of tools to manage growth in Winnipeg. Implemented properly, they can be a very positive addition to your toolbox. Implemented poorly, however, this tool could have negative impacts that often create unintended consequences that far outstrip the revenues they were intended to generate. The proxy groups including the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and many independent researchers agree with me on that point. They would consistently advise jurisdictions to take care to ensure that impact fees are integrated with other growth management and development planning tools that there is equity in the distribution of costs, equity between existing users of infrastructure and new development, between different areas of the city and between different land uses. That the impact fees themselves would be managed in a transparent, accessible and understandable process and that there are certainties so that all stakeholders can adequately plan and anticipate costs. On each of these measures Winnipeg's process to date and the draft by-law being considered by you today would not objectively receive a passing grade. Municipalities that do not make a considerate effort to embrace these principles based on my own experience all too often find themselves on the wrong side of appeal decisions and facing a long-term negative impact on their entire development sector. Both of these circumstances is negative to a city and its citizens. My strong recommendation would be for Council to layover the introduction of the impact fee by-law until the important implementation deals…implementation details of this concept can be finalized. Council has recognized the importance of this by delaying the implementation time plan for commercial, office, industrial and institutional uses. The impact on residential difference is no…no different based on what you have been hearing today and proceeding on the current basis clearly opens the City up to a challenge on many fronts. The most logical time to introduce the impact fee would be to align with the update to the OurWinnipeg by-law that you're going to be talking about earlier today. In the event that Council is intent on proceeding today, I think that considerations should be given to making amendments to bring the draft by-law into better alignment with the accepted standards of practice. This would improve the acceptability of the by-law for most stakeholders, establish a more solid foundation for the impact fee over time and reduce the likelihood that Winnipeg will be…find itself on the wrong side of disputes and challenges going forward. The specific changes I would recommend include removing the map that was added at the last EPC meeting. OurWinnipeg community area definitions were not developed for the purpose of administering impact fees and I would wish to remind you that your Director of Planning, Property and Development is on the record at the last EPC meeting saying that there are many areas on that map that do not make sense using this approach. In its place, you should incorporate a specific definition of what you mean by development impact and the specific services and infrastructure that should be included under the by-law. And it should also stipulate that it would be for costs that are not otherwise provided for in a negotiated development agreement. I would not recommend including transit, rolling stock or police or fire and other similar services in this by-law until we gain experience with development impact fees as a community and because these provisions extend beyond the framework of current planning legislation in the province. Coupled with that, I would commit to the implementation of benefiting areas to guide the impact fee together with the necessary engineering and planning studies to support it. This approach is the gold standard for managing impact fees. You should incorporate a provision that the impact fees will not be applied retroactively to areas that haven't established development agreement. Development agreements are the covenant between the City and the developer and guide all the commitments that take place in that area. The draft by-law, by incorporating provisions to have this impact fee assessed at the time of building permit would in essence violate these existing agreements and there are many well-known examples where municipalities have passed a new legislation or new by-law like this and it's been overturned because it's violated that kind of agreement. I think you should also consider strongly to establish a public process to confirm both the projects included in the impact fee calculation and the standard guideline for assessing the benefit to existing factors that are set out in the by-law as part of the adoption and review processes.

Madam Speaker: If you could wrap up, please.

Ian Shaw: In closing, we can and need to do better than the current impact fee proposal. It will not generate the anticipated outcomes if it continues to be ad-hocked and hurried. Council today has the opportunity to set the debate on impact fees on a more positive path by focusing the discussion on a considered evaluation of the details guiding implementation. Experience from other jurisdictions clearly shows that this is the approach that is in the best interest of the City of Winnipeg and its taxpayers. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next, we will hear from Mr. Justin Swandel. Thank you. Welcome.

Justin Swandel: Thank you. Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor, Councillors, you have heard brief comments from Eric Vogan of UDI, Mike Moore of the Manitoba Home Builders and the others here in opposition today. Their words are accurate but unfortunately they seem to fall on deaf ears. Today, we are at the point where you have forced the home building and development communities to take legal action in an attempt to get you to do what is believed to be the right thing. Most cities understand the importance of growth in the development community to their sustainability, not this council it would appear. You are choosing to ignore your current regulatory regime that flows from section 224 of the City of Winnipeg Charter Act which requires, and I quote, "That Council must by by-law adopt the development plan in this part referred to as Plan Winnipeg which must set out a) the long term plans and policies respecting 1) its purposes, 2) its physical, social, environmental and economic objectives and 3) sustainable land uses and development, b) measures for implementing the plan and c) such other matters as the Minister or Council considers necessary or advisable." Plan Winnipeg, now OurWinnipeg, informs Complete Communities. The secondary plan and a by-law the City of Winnipeg requires new development to be economically, socially and environmentally sustainable, which in turn informs area structure plans, neighbourhood plans, precinct plans and on down the line to rezoning subdivisions, variances and conditional uses. To ensure you are following the direction set by OurWinnipeg and its supporting documents you need detailed plans. Without proper plans, you have a problem. Your problem starts from the basic misunderstanding. Councillor Browaty's question at EPC and I'm paraphrasing Councillor, so bear with me. How can you say you agree with a development cost charge for recreation of one EPC meeting and then say that you believe that growth pays for growth at another? It's a good framework for this misunderstanding. The statements are both accurate. In fact, they must co-exist. Growth does pay for growth. That's what the cost benefit studies tell us. But we don't have the money from growth going to pay for the needs of growth, rather that money is being used to fund the gap between the taxes paid on the average home in Winnipeg and the taxes paid by the average new home in Winnipeg. This is where plans come in and this is where you should realize that all taxpayers are going to have to pay more if you proceed the way you are going. You need to understand the principle of it not being the amount, it's how you spend the amount. Right now, you put it in general coffers to help pay for the higher cost needs of mature parts of the city. Imagine if you will, looking at the mature parts of Winnipeg through the three lenses of sustainability; social, economic and environmental. New communities pass the sustainability test because you've already measured it through your approval processes. What about the mature communities? In addition, you have now created the conundrum of exempting so many from paying that there's no way you can fund the projects identified by Hemson and the public service, but, interestingly, not set by Council one of the requirements of the charter in your development plan. Your Chair of Planning, Councillor Orlikow, says we don't need to plan. Ironic. the Chair of Planning saying plan, plan, plan. We don't need more plans. Your own OurWinnipeg review report tells you that you need to do the detailed infrastructure plans in order to properly integrate land use in infrastructure planning. A proper process and detailed planning using OurWinnipeg and accurate data could give you validation. Yet, you turn a blind eye to the obvious. It's thinking like this that has led to this crossroads. Unlike every other city, you are choosing the road of division based on a strong set of guiding principles instead of...pardon me, the road of division based on misinformation instead of a path of collaboration and planning based on a strong set of guiding principles. Unfortunately, as others have stated, we are left with no option other than legal action. You could take this as a call to battle or you could take this as an opportunity to bring some certainty to a file that has most councillors confused and some very troubled. The courts will look closely for the required detailed plans and accurate costing. You can still avenge your recommendation and do the work the courts will require. Or it may be easier to swallow given that you have gone this far down the road, lay this item over. If you don't plan on implementing until May 2017 then why don't you join the requests of the courts for clarity on the statutes in play? Now that the risk has been clearly and publicly identified, this would show a desire to eliminate risk not create it.

Madam Speaker: I'll have to ask you wrap up now.

Justin Swandel: I will leave you with this final thought; in 2017 you are planning on raising 7 million from this new charge. Is this just a $7 million trial balloon to see if the courts will go along with your interpretation? I hope not because if you are wrong, and it appears you are, all Winnipeg taxpayers will end up paying more. Thank you for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Swandel. We will now move on to other delegations we have. I'll call down Mr. Gord Delbridge. He's in opposition to Item No. 3 of the report of Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment, the report dated October 3, 2016. It's regarding the Award of Contract for Solid Waste Collection. Mr. Delbridge, welcome. You will have ten minutes to make your presentation.

Gord Delbridge: Thank you, Madam Speaker and good morning to Councillors and Mayor Bowman. And I thank you all for the opportunity to speak to you this morning on this important issue regarding Winnipeg's residential garbage collection. As I am sure you are aware of CUPE's position on this issue, since the RFP was first brought up at Council and I was here to present, since then I've sent out letters and additional information to all of Council, met with Mayor

Bowman, the Director of Water and Waste; I've had conversations with and the CAO and most of Council. We have been asking from day one for an in-house bid on garbage collection. And to this point, it hasn't been considered. I have stated I am willing and ready to negotiate costs and wages to make this happen. CUPE has long advocated for a strong and high quality municipal workforce that delivers services that meet the needs and the standards that Winnipeggers expect from their city. We have seen a concerning shift in the service quality since garbage collection has been privatized. Since the City contracted out garbage collection, Winnipeggers have experienced a notable decrease in service when it comes to the reliability and quality. Well, no fault of the worker who struggle every day to do their jobs as best they can, the private contractors failed to deliver time and time again. Additionally, the current contractor has been responsible for dozens of workplace health and safety violations resulting in numerous stop-work order fines and over 118 workplace injuries. An APTN investigates report in October 2015 found that Emterra's operations are heavily dependent on the use of subcontractors who hire predominantly Aboriginal day-laborers and exploits them with low-pay and unsafe working conditions. This type of exploitation has tarnished our city's image and is unacceptable to Winnipeggers. We know that replacing one contractor for another is not a sustainable long-term solution. As elected City Councillors, it is expected by Winnipeggers to take leadership in doing your due diligence to at the very least look at the option of bringing back this service in-house as a responsibility for the citizens of Winnipeg as City employees are responsible to the taxpayers and the citizens of Winnipeg. The City of Winnipeg requests for proposal solved waste collection indicates quite clearly in article b25.2.1 that the City will have no obligation to award a contract where the prices are material in excess of the City's cost to perform the work or a significant portion thereof with its own forces. And yet, I was told by…meetings with senior administration that when I asked for an explanation they stated that...we just put that language in the RFP. In a recent Winnipeg Sun article, it stated the City's Solid Waste Manager, Darryl Doubleday confirmed that the City didn't reach out to CUPE for negotiations on this round of waste collection contracts due to a previous council directive to contract out all pick-ups. This is in despite of the fact that there is overwhelming evidence that we provided showing significant cost savings for the taxpayers and citizens of Winnipeg. A report from the CCPA and a recent op-ed in the Free Press is one example of the…you know, I've provided councillors with a report from the Colombia Institute that was very extensive. They also did a seminar on the benefits of bringing some of this work back in-house at the past FCM that was hosted here in Winnipeg. Councillor Schreyer had mentioned at the FCM that he met with the Calgary Mayor and he presides over a city with a hundred percent city worker collection. He said he was surprised to learn that Winnipeg was a hundred percent privately contracted out. They keep it in-house there because they want to do it at a cost savings. Recently, there was a letter that was sent out by the President of CUPE Local 30 to all of Council and he gave many examples of how they are doing this work in-house at a cost savings, at a better quality of service and some of the outlining communities as well, some of the targets that we've reached and improved costs. This, once again, is, you know, despite the fact that, you know, we have been providing overwhelming evidence and we have seen nothing from administration. They provided nothing in any way shape or form to support their claim that this work should not be done in-house. We have seen independent reports from Ernst and Young, I've provided to Council, it's a firm that's often used by the City of Winnipeg. They did a study for the City of Toronto. The findings recommended not to continue with any further contracting out of garbage collection because the cost would be more than in-house collection. Councillor Mayes met with the Mayor in Ottawa, I ended up going out on that trip there too, I met up with Councillor Mayes. And where they found an impressive operational savings by bringing in a portion of this work in-house after the private contractor went bankrupt. It's my understanding that the private contractors to receive up to a 10% annual increase over the next seven years and just for clarification, CUPE has received roughly maybe 2% over the past decade on an annual basis. You know, at this point, CUPE has not been approached to discuss the City's internal costing in any way shape or form. And I want to bring some clarification here too because all too often I hear this notion that CUPE can bid on City services and CUPE cannot bid on City services. It would be a conflict of interest to be the bargaining agent and the employer. That we cannot do. But what can be done is we can work together with you to negotiate the costs. We can work out a deal, just as other major municipalities have done right across the country to provide a better quality of service and more affordable and that would be a long-term solution to some of the problems that we have seen with garbage collection. I strongly, strongly suggest before awarding a new contract on waste collection over the next seven years, this is going to go into the next term on Council, that we do a thorough, you know, cost analysis of what we…the best way to move forward for the citizens of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Delbridge. I will ask you to stay on the bench because we'll have questions after the next delegation. Mr. Dave Sauer, if you could please come forward. Mr. Sauer is in opposition to the same item and he's representing the Winnipeg Labour Council. Welcome. And you'll have five minutes on the clock.

Dave Sauer: Thank you very much. Thank you, Madam Speaker and I would thank the Mayor, I don't see him around right now, but thank you to the rest of Council as well. On behalf of the Winnipeg Labour Council, I would like to thank the members here today and Council, for taking the opportunity to hear from us. The Labour Council we represent 45,000 workers here in the City of Winnipeg and we have been involved in municipal issues since 1894. We have a very long history of working with a variety of different councillors and we are here today to express our deep concerns about the awarding of the two contracts for solid waste collection to a pair of private contractors. We believe the City did not conduct proper due diligence in awarding these contracts by not entering into discussions with CUPE Local 500.

And as President Gord Delbridge just mentioned, he is willing to sit down and talk and I think that needs to be emphasized that there is a willingness to sit down and work this out rather than going into a rushed job of handing off two contracts to private contractors for seven years. That is a very long time to be setting the City of Winnipeg up for failure. This appears to be a continuation of the previous civic government's approach in following ideological paths to finding solutions rather than concrete solutions and proper dialogue. A few examples I want to cite about other cities that do a mixed or full in-house collection, so here are just a few examples here about Ottawa. So in Ottawa, they have a mixed system, cost of delivering curbside garbage and recycling in Ottawa is one of the lowest in Canada at 83 cents per pick up while providing a high level of service. A 2009, City report on the savings from in-house collection attributed the savings in part to the productivity of dedicated and experienced staff. Price competitiveness has been driven by the public sector leadership. Having a public sector comparator in place has prevented price fixing from the private sector and continues to show year after year the competitiveness of the public model. Here's Toronto; in 2012, City of Toronto contracted out half its solid waste collection services while keeping the other half in-house. Reports by City staff and consulting firm Ernst and Young in 2015 show that the in-house collection is competitive in both cost and performance, a key finding of both reports is that the current model in which the City directly operates half the City's solid waste management delivers high value and quality of service. Overall, the public sector is doing a better job than privatized service delivery when it comes to complaints, diversion, and costs. Because of these findings, which make a solid case for in-house service, Toronto's Public Works and Infrastructure Committee decided not to move forward with a plan to contract out the remaining in-house solid waste services and I contend that they probably took a look at Winnipeg and saw how that worked and it doesn't work. Hamilton, a city that is comparable in size, in Hamilton, garbage collection has been divided evenly between public and private providers since 2002. According to the 2009 Ontario Municipal Benchmark Initiative, public collection costs $95.29 and private collection costs $96.45 per property. The City of Hamilton chose to split public/private model to ensure a competitive market while retaining the ability to provide the service and renewed this model in 2011. The positive role of the public sector in residential collection was reaffirmed in a 2012 report. City staff noted that the split system provided a long-term, best value for Hamilton taxpayers. Staff further commented that the savings from the split public/private model could add up to 60 million between 2013 and 2020. While noting the public...while noting the model would also provide increased service levels and the opportunity to increase diversion from landfill. So I really want to emphasize that, you have an opportunity, there is an option here before you to save taxpayers money. We are talking so much about how much we want to find savings and it just doesn't seem like it is being followed. It seems like this is just being rushed through, sorry, too late. You know, we didn't do our due diligence in the first place so now we have to go ahead and move forward with this on a seven year contract. During some of the discussions we had with councillors on this, I had a really interesting discussion with one councillor who talked a lot about the importance of actually talking to employees and making sure that we go to them for best practices and how we can save taxpayers money. Let's put this option on the table. Let's defeat this RFP, go back to the table and sit down and negotiate properly with CUPE and you will find tax savings. That's the end of my presentation. If you have any questions, I will be free to take them. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentation. Are there any questions at this time? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Question for Gord Delbridge…two questions. Thank you for the presentation. Thank you for pointing out something I have made a point of raising many times that CUPE does not put in a bid itself, the City puts in a bid with CUPE as its bargaining agent, that's the in-house bid you're talking about. No one…no one, there is no legal device whereby CUPE would put in a bid for any of these things. I guess my question is a two-fold. One is, you had indicated Mr. Doubleday said, look, there is a Council directive saying don't enter into discussions with CUPE. You are aware that that would change, I think historically with what we are proposing in paragraph three of the report whereby the public service would be instructed to enter into discussions including potential revisions to the collective agreement with CUPE to explore whether the City could deliver garbage and recycle collection at a cost comparable to private sector providers and that would apply to upcoming contracts such as the bulky waste and the multi-family. So you are aware…the very problem that Mr. Doubleday pointed to would be of the change, of course, with what's being proposed in recommendation three?

Gord Delbridge: Yeah, I think that, you know, we've got the opportunity here now as councillors to take responsibility. Do your due diligence. We can make a decision here on how we proceed with that. We can make that decision here and now on how we proceed with the garbage collection and this RFP. That will be decided right here, today by councillors with your vote. We have the opportunity to go back to the table, Emterra has mentioned that they would willing to extend at a cost savings and now with the recent announcement from the Federal Government on the carbon tax and the position that we are in which I think that we should be really looking at and taking some consideration on this as far as the environmental concerns, we need to do our homework here. We need to make a decision here that is going to put us in a position for the next seven years where it's not going to be costing taxpayers more, it's not going to be costing the environment more. We haven't done our homework. We have not done our homework in any way shape or form. We have provided information, administration has come back with nothing. Now, recently we have got some new information from the Federal Government with the announcement on this carbon tax. There is alternatives here.

We have the option. We can make that decision here now to go down the right path for the next seven years. That option is here now. You can make that decision.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next, Councillor Mayes, second question.

Councillor Mayes: As you raise that and you did, I just want to be clear on what the options are, if this is defeated today, our only option would be to extend Emterra for a year or two if they agree. They may not agree to a one year, they may insist on a two year. You had used some pretty strong language about Emterra earlier today about workplace health and safety violations and alleged treatment of aboriginal employees, your remarks in May were, I think, even stronger, you've indicated, it was absurd that we were even allowing Emterra to bid. So, I appreciate you're saying, look, the result of the way this played out is we are going to have to extend Emterra if we're to bring in CUPE...an in-house bid. So I mean I think that just…I just want to be clear that that's what you are suggesting. I understand the circumstances behind it but I just wanted people to be clear that if we defeat what's on the floor today, we're extending Emterra…

Councillor Wyatt: Second question.

Madam Speaker: Your question, Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Mayes: If extend today…if we defeat this today we are extending Emterra, the very agency which you said shouldn't even be allowed to bid back in May?

Gord Delbridge: And my response to that would be is before we award any contract or…we've got to make clear consideration on how we're going to proceed here, but to extend for a year with Emterra as opposed to making a commitment to the contractors which I don't think were properly vetted because I've had my staff and my researchers do some vetting on the other contractors and it concerns me that we might be going into a situation that we are just about to possibly come out...or that we would continue down the same path for the next seven years. I don't know that that's a good decision to be making. If we're going to continue down this path for the next seven years what we just came out of? We can extend it for a year and we can make a proper decision. But, you know, to not even do our homework like I said, my staff have done homework on the recommendation to the contractors and I am concerned. I think it would be better off that we extend for a year. Emterra has sent a letter out saying that they'd be willing to do so. They'd be willing to do it at a cost savings to the taxpayer and then we can do our due diligence.

Madam Speaker: Any further question, Councillor Mayes? Councillor Schreyer, on to you.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Has Mr. Delbridge...has it been explained to Mr. Delbridge why CUPE 500 is being given consideration on future contracts but not the two we are voting on today? Anything specific in terms of the rationale for what would be considered to be a gross inconsistency?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Delbridge.

Gord Delbridge: I really haven't had any explanation on that. I will tell you, I have met with most of Council, Mayor Bowman and his staff. And most of them look at me and say, well, you know what, it's too late, we don't know what to do. We are getting this recommendation and no, there hasn't been an explanation. I think in some cases maybe, you know, there might have been a possibility that, you know, it was delayed. I presented here in Council day one when this came up. No explanation. No explanation whatsoever.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, onto you.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you to Mr. Delbridge. Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Delbridge. Shortly after the Norman Invasion of 1066, a previous council actually worked with...are you aware, worked with the union...your union and actually developed innovative 311 system which could have been contracted out, which was not contracted out, which was not shipped overseas but was developed and is now provided through in-house service with issues, but issues not really related to your staff or our staff where there are more management issues, as far as I'm concerned, are you aware that that co-operative work took place and that a service is there provided that was a win/win in that sense?

Gord Delbridge: Yeah, and I have raised that with much of Council when I have met with them. Absolutely that was a win/win. We were able to come in at a clearer cost savings. We were able to keep that work in-house. We were able to keep those jobs here in Winnipeg. We were able to keep the money that as a result in Winnipeg. Ultimately, I don't know that that's going to be the case when we are awarding to multinational contractors. I don't know if there has ever

even been any research on the impact that's going to have. What kind of economic impact when we're looking at hundreds of millions leaving our economy through international garbage collection organizations when that work could be done in-house. I think that there's…you know, additionally, there is economic impacts that that could have. Yeah, no, that…you are right, that was a good success story there.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: Another 'are you aware question', are you aware that when the political will exists in this council Chamber, we have seen almost mountains moved to make things happen when the will is there and that almost anything is possible if the political will is there within the realm of the municipal world, are you aware of that?

Gord Delbridge: I am aware of that. And what I'm trying to tell you right now and here, the will is here on our end. Hopefully, I will see the will on your end.

Madam Speaker: Final question.

Councillor Wyatt: Final question. Does it have to be a zero sum gain in the sense that it has to be a defeat or preferably a referral to find solutions to find and to come back with a public policy which seems to be, there are elements of support on both sides of the table in this room?

Gord Delbridge: I think that would show a good sign that there is will on both sides not just one side.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes our question period today. Thank you for your presentation. I would like to recommend to Council that we now recess for lunch and reconvene at one o'clock.

Councillor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if we could...I even propose a motion we continue on to get through at least the report of EPC dated October 19th. I believe most of the individuals who are guests with in the gallery today are here on Report No. 5. And so, just in consideration of their time and day, I wonder if my colleagues would join me in waiting and have lunch after we are done that?

Madam Speaker: So you are suggesting that we move Item No. 5 up? Or go through the agenda?

Councillor Gillingham: We could...I guess we could…I'll move that we move Item 5 up. I think that's really the essence of what's happening. That's my motion.

Madam Speaker: And there isn't much before that. There isn't much before that either.

Councillor Gillingham: I'll leave it to your discretion, Madam Chair.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Point of order (inaudible). There is 15, 16 people around this table Madam Speaker, and at ten minutes a piece that means lunch could happen at, what, 3:00 o'clock?

Madam Speaker: It's quite possible.

Councillor Gillingham: I will put the motion on the floor, Madam Speaker, and it can be voted in favour to carry on. So my motion is that we carry on until we are complete...we complete EPC report dated October 19th, that's my motion.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Okay, it's not two-thirds, we don't know what it is. Yes. So all in favour of continuing on with the meeting, please rise. Mr. Mayor? All in favour of continuing on with the meeting.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Gillingham and Lukes

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise. Okay. I think it's pretty clear we're going to break for lunch. Can we reconvene at one o'clock? Okay, good. We'll reconvene at one o'clock, thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
October 26, 2016, at 1:09 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: I would like to reconvene our meeting our Council meeting of October 26th, 2016. We are now on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 12th, 2016. Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 12, 2016**

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 3.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on Items 2 and 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 1 – Memorandum of Understanding with YMCA-YWCA - Three Model Expansion Partnership

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce Item No. 1.

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

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, you have the floor.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. I would like just to speak briefly to this. I'd like to thank the Mayor and EPC for acting on this motion that was moved from the last Council meeting. It referred to EPC, now is back here with instructions supporting the motion to direct the public service to come back in a very short period of time with regards to the memorandum of understanding and bringing that forward. As members of Council are aware, that towards the end of the last Council, there was work done in terms of reaching out to do a strategic partnership with the YM-YWCA in building strategic, new, regional, recreational facilities. The likes of which Winnipeg has not seen but virtually almost every major city in the country has built. Either built themselves and operated or done it in strategic partnerships like this and successfully. We have of course this wonderful system of recreation. Our community club model, which has been tremendous, is probably one of the reasons why we have not built these types of recreational facilities but the reality is, as a growing city and the need to meet new growth, one of the biggest areas that I hear from constituents on over and over again is recreation is leisure which I see as a core municipal service in terms of quality of life and ensuring that we have an attractive and healthy city. The...if you look at all the studies that have been done that have been documented not just in North America but around the world, there's three factors that make a community great to live in and the three factors have come up in study after study after study. And the three factors are very…actually, pretty simple and they come down to this: first, a city has to…a community has to be safe or at least perceived to be safe. Perception is reality in that regard. So it has to be both. Secondly, there has to be great open green spaces, parks. And then the third thing that residents and citizens look for in any community are places to meet and gather to socialize, to meet their neighbours, to come together as a community. Whether it be for coffee or for sports or for family gatherings, what have you, but places where they can come together. These are the things that make a community great and these regional recreational facilities, which we have seen built in other parts of the country, and literally, built in other parts of Manitoba in community after community, will lend well to the future of our city and the growth that we are seeing right now, and we want to continue to facilitate. The reality is we know we are stretched when it comes to our operating dollars. We know we have challenges with regards to our operating dollars. A strategic partnership like this and one of the key reasons why it is proposed is because the YM-YWCA would be in the position of operating these facilities with joint use agreement ideally with the City of Winnipeg to jointly use the facility but the long-term operating costs and the impact that that could have on our operating budget would be kept to a minimum. The one-time capital cost or capital grant for this would be the biggest hurdle but bringing them to the table knowing that they know their business, they know their product, they know how to deliver. They also don't turn anybody away, Madam Speaker. We I know have made this an issue over and over again in this Chamber, and rightfully so, accessibility. The Y doesn't turn anybody...and if financially folks cannot pay, they accommodate and they go out of their way to make sure that families can always be part of a Y. And finally, Madam Speaker, we know that one of the greatest challenges we had with this file was with the last government. The last government for whatever reason was philosophically opposed to this. But we have now a new Provincial Government which I think is looking at the opportunity and seeing the

demand and we see the challenges we are facing financially and fiscally, I think that the page has turned on us in the right direction and I think we have a historic opportunity to do this type of facility. I'm not going to tie this to the growth fee debate, thought there could be a whole aspect of that that could be tied into this, because in many way this is the kind of facility that would actually...could be…a case could easily be made of why this would be a benefit to a newer community or a regional area. But I'm not going to do that. I want to stick to the file. I look forward to the report coming back...I hope the…I understand the memorandum of understanding is nearly done if not done. It is to do the three model, to go across the city is my understanding, to get the southwest Y, getting it up and operating and then work out the kinks to take it to the other parts of the city. The demand is there. Indoor aquatics, we have not built an indoor aquatic facility in this city for 30 years, 40 years. I mean, I think Margaret Grant might have been the last. And, you know, there is such a need, such a demand, you know, and we know that if you build it, they will come. People will come and enjoy these facilities. Just a couple of other things I'll add to this, is that this is not just a recreational facility, the Y is the largest provider in Manitoba of daycare. They want to see daycare spaces in these facilities, the likes that you haven't seen before. We know there is a huge demand, I know that's not a part of our core business but that would be a benefit. The other part is all the different kind of social services they network with government on already and they would continue to do that. Things that we often don't require in our own daily lives, but others do these are the kinds of things that we can't ignore. So I want to thank the Mayor and EPC for keeping this matter alive and look forward to the coming report. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do want to acknowledge Councillor Wyatt's ongoing commitment to this. Since day one arriving here at City Hall, he has made his position very clear on this as have other members of this council. My understanding from our administration is that the memorandum of understanding has been provided to the YM-YWCA that it is going to be going to their board for approval with a recommendation that they proceed and we'll look forward to hearing back from them in due course. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I will call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor on the report of EPC dated October 19th, 2016.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED OCTOBER 19, 2016

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

Madam Speaker: Item 5 is pulled. We have some motions before us. Councillor Wyatt. Okay, I'll call the question on Items 2, 4, 6 and 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Initiation of the OurWinnipeg Review Process

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This report for those watching these proceedings is to advise the public service has commenced the review of OurWinnipeg and prepared a draft work plan to guide review of activities and I look forward to hearing from Council colleagues.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. I stood this down because, you know, we have been debating a lot of things in the last number of weeks and a couple of months I guess and this item is extremely significant, extremely important in terms of doing planning and implementing a lot of the work that went on with the first OurWinnipeg version and the last Plan Winnipeg review which was very comprehensive and extensive and that this review would continue that process, refining it further and bringing in policies that are absolutely crucial to implementing the big policy areas of OurWinnipeg. And so there has been a lot of attention paid due to a lot of other items we have been debating but I thought it was important to stand this down to speak to that and to say that. A couple of things I just want to note for members of Council who maybe didn't have an opportunity to read the draft or did, is in the draft it does refer to a five phase implementation plan and one of the phases is going to be involving engagement with members of Council and regular briefings. I look forward to that, Madam Speaker. We haven't had, to my knowledge, had a briefing from the

public service yet in terms of the preparation of this draft but of course, it's never too late to start to do that. And so, regular briefings and members of Council having input, OurWinnipeg is a massive document. It has huge implications for the whole city and benefits to the city and for your wards and it's something which actually is crucial if we want to have a planned city where we can accommodate growth and at the same time meet the challenges that that growth gives us. The draft plan also refers to a concept, they are called CAG, Citizen Advisory Groups. I am interesting to learn on...but is silent in terms of the selection of the Citizen Advisory Group. The Citizen Advisory Group will consist of members representing various…very perspectives from various sectors of the community. The Citizen Advisory Group which is…it reminds me a lot of the Resident Advisory Groups which we all know about or…some of us where we still have them in our EK…in our community committees. There is a Citizen Advisory Group that will act as a community sounding board advising the project team on community-based issues throughout the plan review process. The group will also promote community involvement in the planning process. The lead on this is the Chief Planner. It sounds like an extremely important group. So, I think it would be great if there was an opportunity for members of Council to be able to participate in proposing names, nominating names to the Citizen Advisory Group since it's going to be, I think, quite a comprehensive group and maybe multi-layered. I'm not too sure how big or how small, but I think it's absolutely crucial. We have seen first-hand where advisory groups can make a huge difference on projects like this. I will give the example of the Rapid Transit Task Force where three members of Council, it was myself, Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Pagtakhan, but we had also a six member advisory group, and we worked as equals in that sense. They were advisers, they technically didn't have a vote, but we never actually made decisions in that matter. We worked through and tried to do it through consensus and I think we succeeded and the resident advisers…citizen advisors are absolutely crucial to that process because they brought a perspective that sometimes we don't see or miss that was absolutely a big part of the success of that final report which is now what we are basing our entire rapid transit system on. So, you know, I look forward to seeing that…you know, a little bit more detail, I guess, in terms of this coming forward and eager to see that, but happy to see this moving forward. I know it is subject to endorsement of another level of government. We need to get support there as well which is crucial and have their participation. One of the areas that I hope we can look at here as well and it's been raised again today but is something which I think is coming one way or another, and that is planning on the regional basis. Regional decision…I see now decisions being made in municipalities that are adjacent to mine, one in particular I guess, that has a direct impact on our community and the city. And likewise I'm sure they feel the same way that we are making decisions that have a direct impact on them. There has to be some way for us to regionally do that and make decision making. This challenge we are facing is not unique to Winnipeg. Regional planning and decision making is a challenge right across the country, more so in larger areas like Toronto, you know, like the lower mainland. But the fact of the matter is I think it's something we need to start to address. We have a lot in common with the capital region, the issues, the challenges, the challenge of meeting expectations in terms of our citizens on both sides of the border. So that's something that I hope we can work towards addressing through this OurWinnipeg initiative as well. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor? Okay, I will call the question on Item 1. Pardon me? No, he doesn't wish to close. I will call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 3 – Amendment to SHED TIF Zone By-law No. 98/2012 to remove three properties from the Sports, Hospitality and Entertainment District (SHED)

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I will wait to hear from Council.

Madam Speaker: And this was voted down by yourself, Councillor Wyatt. You have the floor.

Councillor Wyatt: You know, I didn't want to...I don't really have anything to speak to and I was hoping members of Council could be taken through our...or there could be a little bit more information maybe explained in the discussion here in terms of the rational and the decision making that has got us to this point. The SHED is very complicated. It's a huge benefit to the downtown so I'd just like to hear in terms of that. I believe…I'll be supporting the clause, I'd just like some information that way.

Madam Speaker: Are there any further speakers? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Perhaps I can just add this to the discussion and for the record. This report recommends that the SHED TIF Zone By-law No. 98/2012 be amended retroactively to remove three properties specifically 220 Carlton Street, 311 Hargrave and 207 Edmonton Street from the SHED in order for the incremental taxes generated from the new construction of these projects to be used for other purposes than to support public investments. In order to accomplish this, the base tax calculation used to determine the amount of incremental taxes over time also needs to be adjusted retroactively to the date that the SHED TIF Zone by-law came into force. The

projects at 311 Hargrave, which is the Glass House, 207 Edmonton Street, Mary Rose Place are conditionally approved under the Downtown Residential Development Grant Program and are eligible to receive grants under this program.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I will call the question on Item 3...pardon me item...yes Item 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 5 – Implementation of an Impact Fee

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to begin just by acknowledging and thanking all those who have added their voice to this report today, but also in the preceding weeks, months and over the last number of years. This is...this is a debate that has been going on with the City of Winnipeg for decades. Previous mayors have led initiatives to look for progressive funding models to ensure that growth pays for growth. Some have taken different approaches of course but I certainly campaigned to support growth but to do it in a sustainable way. So last year with the support of Council, we indicated and directed the public service to set aside some monies for a third party to study the question of whether growth pays for growth. We took time to allow for additional dialogue and discussion with stakeholders and members of Council. The Hemson report was released publicly in the interest of openness and transparency at the same time for all members of Council, myself included, as well as for the industry and the public. That report has been widely debated. The administration then tabled their...provided their administrative report on how implementing the recommendations of Hemson could be achieved. Not all of those recommendations in the administrative report were agreed to by members of EPC, myself included and our Property and Development Chair Councillor Orlikow, and EPC decided that there was a desire and a need for a pause to allow for even greater dialogue with the industry. I do want to acknowledge and thank Councillor Orlikow for his tremendous leadership on a very difficult file. We know and we acknowledge that there are very different views about the implementation of an impact fee around this council Chamber but also in the industry and in the public. And I do want to thank all those involved that have assisted with the respectful discussion on public policy. The recommendations for amendments to the administrative report I thought were thoughtful. There has been robust and ongoing dialogue with those willing to participate in collaborative discussions with Councillor Orlikow and myself and other members of Council and I do want to acknowledge and thank them. I think what we have before us now is something that has been certainly, during our term in office, studied, debated, both publicly as well as by members of Council, much more than any other matter I can think of that has come before this council Chamber over the last two years. What I take...one thing that I am very pleased to have seen is the recommendation for a working group because for those that are willing to participate the constructive way, we want to have a platform for ongoing dialogue because this will be an ongoing process for consideration and input from the industry. And so, I also just want to thank all members of Council that have participated in the discussion. I know Councillor Orlikow has been...my understanding had over 50 meetings with members of the industry, many meetings with members of Council for those that have wanted to engage with him in the development of some of the amendments that are before us today. And I believe that this is important to support, primarily because I don't think it's fair to ask existing home owners, existing taxpayers, to pay for all the costs of growth. Acknowledging that existing taxpayers still have a role to play in rebuilding our city, there is a rebalancing that the implementation of impact fees would bring. And this is in keeping with different mechanisms, in different municipalities all of which surround Winnipeg and nearly every Canadian city across our great nation. And so, not an easy debate. I have been giving thought to this topic, of course, for some time and certainly over the recent weeks I have had excellent dialogue with most members of Council and the thing that has been relayed to me is really an appreciation for the fact that we are dealing with public policy issues. This is an important...and whether or not...you know, we had delegations and I do want to thank all members in the delegations who presented today. We are listening, we have listened and that's why some of the changes are being recommended. That doesn't mean we're necessarily going to agree. There are some that feel the status quo is acceptable. Well, I don't think the status quo is acceptable. We find that in Winnipeg we spend less per capita on infrastructure than most other Canadian cities and there is a reason for that because we are an island and we are one of the few cities in Canada that has a growth mechanism in place. I do acknowledge that there are different mechanisms according to different legislation across Manitoba, but also across Canada. And so the debate that we are having is in stark contrast to some of the debates that we witnessed under the previous council. Previous council, the discussion and debate, I don't believe, was as focused on public policy as we are doing now. And I want to acknowledge and thank all members of Council that have to date, really assisted with a respectful discussion on a matter of very different views and a matter of great public policy importance. I will wait to hear from Council colleagues further. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The next speaker will be Councillor Orlikow. We have two motions before us, amending motions, Motion No. 1 and Motion No. 2. So at this time, Councillor Orlikow if you could introduce the two motions.

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

WHEREAS the Winnipeg Public Service prepared an Administrative Report entitled "Implementation of an Impact Fee" (the Report), which was presented to and considered by the Executive Policy Committee on September 21, 2016;

AND WHEREAS, at its meeting of September 21, 2016, the Executive Policy Committee laid the matter over "to allow Councillor Orlikow to proceed with further discussions with stakeholders, including Members of Council, industry, and the Winnipeg Public Service";

AND WHEREAS, at its meeting of October 19, 2016, the Executive Policy Committee passed a motion (the "Motion") that included a recommendation to Council which contemplated restricting the application of the Impact Fee for Phase One: Impact Fee Implementation Plan to "New Communities and Emerging Communities as set forth in Our Winnipeg and Complete Communities";

AND WHEREAS Emerging Communities are a subset of the Recent Communities policy plate set out in the Complete Communities Direction Strategy;

AND WHERAS Major Redevelopment Sites are not identified as being included in the Recent Communities policy plate set out in the Complete Communities Direction Strategy;

AND WHEREAS Maps 1 and 6 of Schedule "A" to By-law No. 127/2016, which appears on the Agenda for enactment at Council's meeting of October 26, 2016, include the 1500 Plessis Road Major Redevelopment Site;

AND WHEREAS none of the maps forming Schedule "A" to By-law No. 127/2016 include the area within The North Henderson Highway District Plan as approved in By-law No. 1300/76, nor the portion of the area within the Henderson Highway Corridor Secondary Plan as approved in Bylaw No. 3215/82 that falls within the Recent Communities policy plate;

AND WHEREAS, based on the stated intention of the Motion to apply to New Communities and Emerging Communities, the 1500 Plessis Road Major Redevelopment Site should not have been included in Maps 1 and 6 of Schedule "A" to By-law No. 127/2016, and the area within The North Henderson Highway District Plan and the portion of the area within the Henderson Highway Corridor Secondary Plan that falls with the Recent Communities Policy Plate should have been included;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that

1. *That the Map in Appendix D of Item No. 5 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 19, 2016 be replaced with Map 1 attached to this motion.*

2. *That Map 1 and Map 6 of Schedule "A" to By-law No. 127/2016 be replaced with the maps attached to this motion and identified as Map 1 and Map 6, respectively, and the map attached to this motion and identified as Map 11 be added as Map 11 to Schedule "A" to By-law No. 127/2016 to*
   - *exclude the 1500 Plessis Road Major Redevelopment Site; and*
   - *show the area within The North Henderson Highway District Plan as approved in By-law No. 1300/76 and the portion of the area within the Henderson Highway Corridor Secondary Plan as approved in Bylaw No. 3215/82 that falls within the Recent Communities policy plate.*

3. *Subsection 13(1) of By-law No. 127/2016 be amended by replacing "Maps 2 to 10" with "Maps 2 to 11" to reflect the addition of Map 11 to Schedule "A".*

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

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg wishes to provide certainty;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg encourages accountability;

AND WHEREAS THE City of Winnipeg has developed the Impact Fee for consistency throughout Winnipeg;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the annual fee increase by construction inflation be capped at 5% per year.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg record the fees collected by each area as outlined on the map in Appendix D, and allow Councillors access to the area information on an ongoing basis with accumulative totals.

Councillor Orlikow: Just for clarification Madam Chair, am I just introducing the motions or am I speaking to all three?

Madam Speaker: You can use your time to speak to all three as well.

Councillor Orlikow: So this is my opportunity to speak to all three?

Madam Speaker: Yes, and following that Council will have the opportunity to speak to the motions as well as the main clause.

Councillor Orlikow: Okay. So again, I have a total of ten minutes to speak to all three, that's correct?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah, that's fine. I just wanted to make a clarification of what we're doing. So quickly I will do the amendments first. The first amendment that you'll see in front of you is prepared by the Planning Department. As we have heard today there is...there is…I'm not calling them threats but I will say there is indications and there have been indications throughout our conversations I've had with the development community from day one that if we don't do it the way they want to do it, they're going to go to court. That position hasn't changed. So, it's very important to realize now that these changes in the map that were designed to give some certainty to the market and to the players is done through the guidelines of the department. This is not my motion. There is actually...I wish I could have done some things on that map, mostly for political reasons and I was shut down pretty hard. And as other councillors who tried as well, said I want to remove this precinct out of the map because I think it's not good. Again, I'd like to thank some councillors who tried and after they had the meetings with the Planning Department understood why and how that's really important that the Planning Department decides the maps and based on policy they have forward, especially…and basically for…I think it's a right policy decision. We don't want to be sort of Jerry managing this thing. We have to do it on policy and it also secures our legal position. So that's what the first one's about. And so, after discussions and we had more discussions after EPC, as I promised, two issues popped up. One was a major redevelopment site and another one was a secondary plan that should have been included. So one area out, one in, I have sent all councillors some details from the Planning Department of why. But again, stressing this is a Planning Department recommendation, not a council. The second amendment I quite liked as well and this is by Councillor Wyatt and myself. Generally, it's again, five more...certainly the market so again, it only said before to inflation…sorry, construction inflation, but it didn't have a number on it. Some people raised the concern that what, was it going to be a 25 percent increase? So we capped it at 5 percent to give the market some assurances that we're not going to be doing anything there beyond 5 percent and the other was talking about the area maps that you have. The money that's generated out of there again, for accountability's sake, it's generated out of there, it's locked in so you know where it's going. You know where the money is going to be generated from. Again, ultimately Council will decide where the projects go through the working group, through the CFO and then to Council ultimately in the reserve fund which is only dedicated for growth items and that's only to be spent on growth items. But again, I think it's important for us to know where the money is being generated as well when we reflect on what projects the Council suggests. So that's No. 1 and No. 2. Finally...whew, I've got seven minutes still, good, okay…yeah, again, I have been here for about six years I gather and this has been an incredible process for myself, I know some councillors believe that we should…we should…they believe that growth doesn't pay for growth or they believe growth pays for...and everybody's allowed their own opinion. I do strongly stress that Council is supreme so I'll only give you my opinion. We are talking about an impact fee, okay, so we're not talking about an area charge, that's pretty important to differentiate a bit. There are some people that I talked to that are quite supportive of the idea of an area charge where the direct benefit of the cost goes to the area that it's adjacent too. This impact fee looks at the benefit model in the Hemson report, those that benefit pay and secondly it's the entire network. Again, doesn't say that it could be something that's in the area but again, we have to be looking at the entire network. Again, so legal reasons and that's what's before us today. So the impact fee is based upon a benefit model and based upon the impact that…on the entire network. So yes, people do drive throughout the city. 200,000 people driving throughout the city will have an impact on our transportation network, not just right beside the network, it will be outreaching. Again, the CFO will look at the equation and prorate what it is, again, for Council's consideration. Some people today as we heard believe growth pays for growth are quite adamant on that, and that's their opinion. I don't agree, but again that's their opinion and I respect that. But it's pretty hard to have a conversation going forward when the conversation is growth pays for growth and so that's the first stumbling block because we're probably not seeing eye-to-eye on that, but again, we carried on with the conversations and we went through that. Then the other options were to…don't put a by-law in place now and move through the process of discussing what type of fee

it could be. Again, there's very different opinions and I even heard today of what the fee should be. Should it be an area charge, should it be no charge, should it be this charge? Again, we are talking about an impact fee today. So again...and I've also heard throughout our conversations and it never change that if you don't…it's my way or the highway and if you don't do it that way, we're going to go to court. Again, so it made negotiations or…discussions a little difficult. Again, I appreciate that's their opinion and they can do that, however, I think reflecting the actions, there is only one group that has put actions forward and that's from the work from myself where we amended the motion. That's the reality. We can all talk verbiage as much as we want but I do want to work with the development community, that's why I put these things in. They made some very good comments, some very good opinions, even though in regards to the vote I felt this slow, steady approach was the best way to go. Based upon the market we can provide the certainty in the market, we're doing the phase-in approach, we reduce the fee to see how that impacts the market, I was a little concerned about the 18th, there was other people who wanted to do more. Other people wanted to do a lot less. I felt this was a fair assessment to be able to see where it's at and then work through the market. So, we did that. We also phased it in over six months and again even with that six month phase-in there is even other opportunities for a further six months after that through the department. So again, allowing those projects that are in the pipeline to be completed or brought forward in time because they have already invested and they already have the performance going. So we gave that window so they could have that opportunity. Again, I listened, I heard, some people on the investment side, they wanted to have exclusive decision making on where the money goes. Well again, Winnipeggers will decide that and through us as councillors, we'll do that. No special interest group is going to have sole say on where the money's going. That will begin…we are supreme as Council and I fully believe that. So we talked about planning, again, the question is do we just wait and not put out an impact fee in now or whatever the fee…later on they decide to do until we finish all the planning that they've asked for? Again, I still have no...we do all that work, sure, but again what I do know is we are going to lead planning. This is not going to be driven by another special interest group or anybody else. This will be driven by OurWinnipeg planning which we have just approved. In there, we're talking about the infrastructure study, the transportation master plan, the residential land strategy, the employment land strategy, the corridor study. Proactively, I deem future constraints for further growth. That's all part of the OurWinnipeg plan that we're putting forward. Again, we do hope that the development community will be a part of that but again, this is our job as City Council and I am proud to go forward with that. I know there is one little shot about I don't like planning actually, this is…I fully support this and I think OurWinnipeg model going forward is exactly what we need to do but we can't do that in tandem with the impact fee. We don't have to wait until all this is done, that's my opinion. So again, I'm going back on the slow and steady model, I think Winnipeg is an island. We have to be careful what we do. But again, we sit around and do nothing, I think that's again not prudent to do. We have some major investments that we need to start make regarding…related to growth. Not related to stopping growth, but actually I still believe it's related to enabling growth. We need to be able to pay for some of these items that are actually preventing us from opening up more lands. So that's again my opinion on where I think the investment would go but again, Council will be the ultimate decider through…but it has to go to a special reserve, dedicated reserve, this is on the policy that has gone through the working committee, gone through the CFO's department and then ultimately to Council. So again, we've got some safe guards in there for how that's going to work out. So again, it is a matter of trust. That is…I heard that today and I hear this throughout society today. People don't trust each other. I tried to show through action by amending the by-law to the point where I actually wasn't…I thought we were giving away a little too much but again, I think erring on the side of caution was good. Again, it's trust is a two-way street. There's a two-way street that's required. Again, I showed my trust by putting down these changes that I trust that the development community does want to work with us even though many of them say that growth does pays for growth or have been quite clear on that. That's why the working group got set up. So even though we may have some trust issues, I think through the actions of the by-law amendments we have addressed…we have shown, not just said it, verbiage, we have actually said…we've showed it in writing that we respect what they have said, maybe not everything…they didn't get everything they want i.e. not putting an impact fee in at all. But again, it can't be my way or the highway. Councillors tried and said, you know what, unless you plan it my way, I'm not voting for this. Okay. We've all had to come together and try to find a way to the middle. Again, this is not my way or the highway, this is our way, this is OurWinnipeg way. So I'm quite proud of what we put through. I know no one wants to pay more money. I respect that. Who does? And if I pay more money...

Madam Speaker: Moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Orlikow: If I do pay more money, I want to make sure I get the benefit. Again, that's normal. Every special interest group has that, either if it's a citizen who doesn't want to pay taxes, if it's a whole developer who doesn't want to do…pay an impact fee, if it's a recreational program that doesn't want to pay increased fees in, you know, hockey registration, no one likes to pay more and this council knows that and we recognize that. But the reality is, in the end of the day, we need to be investing in more infrastructure. We need to make sure that those people who are benefiting by that infrastructure pay their fair share. This doesn't mean that the City of Winnipeg taxpayer as a whole are going to also be subsidizing growth. They will, because growth is important for us so we respect that. Again, I feel this is a compromise, it's a way in the middle. It isn't my way or the highway, it's our way. So I…if you believe that growth doesn't pay for growth then I believe you have to be able...you have to vote for this by-law. I am committed to working

with the development community. I will wait to hear what they're going to do with their legal challenge. They have been saying that from day one. That's their right, that's anybody's right, but again, that's not a reason for us to stop at this point. Let's get that legal challenge out of the way and so we can move forward. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be voting against this motion and the subsequent amendments. My prepared statements mirror a lot of what's already been said by many of our delegates this morning and I thank them for their comments and presentations. Let me be clear that I do believe that developers need to pay their share of capital costs associated with building our city. However, I believe that it is premature to introduce this by-law with its corresponding fee. I am opposed for six main reasons which I'm going to try to get through really fast. I believe, number one, the process is out of order, it's been said repeatedly. The working group made up of the appropriate stakeholders including members of the development community should be established first before any by-law or corresponding fee is put forward. That group should be given the mandate to come up with the appropriate cost sharing formula by participating in and the update of the OurWinnipeg document so as to determine where and how growth should happen in the coming years. In fact, within the last 15 to 20 minutes we just approved, as Council, we voted in favour unanimously of a process to update the OurWinnipeg plan because we believe in a comprehensive, robust stakeholder consultation before finalizing any document. I am appealing to my colleagues to do the same for this impact fee consideration. That working group further should be tasked with considering what if any charges should be applied to infill development as Hemson called for. That group should be tasked with determining what off-site capital projects should be eligible for cost sharing. The group should be required to consider the cost benefit analysis that are provided by developers on their developments. The group should also be given several months to do their work then, after OurWinnipeg has been updated, after future capital projects have been prioritized and cost sharing eligibility agreed upon, after the group has determined what, if any, infill should be subject to a charge, after cost benefit analysis have been reviewed, after the group has examined all these matters, then and not until then should a new fee or by-law be proposed if necessary and the City could lead that process. Madam Speaker, the process as it stands right now is backwards. Consultation with developers and other stakeholders has been inadequate to come up with a truly informed decision that the City of Winnipeg needs to make the decision. So the by-law and fee should come at the end, not at the beginning of the working group's efforts. Number two, and this is tied to number one, I'm opposed to the motion because there is not a clear understanding as to whether this by-law and fee is a planning tool or a revenue tool. It looks like it is primarily about revenue when it really should be about planning for future growth. And that planning can't and shouldn't happen without extensive consultation again with the stakeholders through a thorough review of OurWinnipeg. Third, the discussion about…should be, to me, should be something higher, it should be about funding availability not only about revenue generation. Whether planning tool or revenue tool the City does face a short-term or long-term funding challenges and at a higher level discussion, the discussion should be about funding that is available for future capital needs. There are two ways to ensure funding is available; one is to raise revenue which is what this is primarily about, the other way is to control expenses. And though there has been some talk and to the Mayor's credit about controlling expenses I am calling for this council to put the same time, energy and effort into controlling expenses. We had a council seminar on this implementation of this impact fee in the summer, in August. When's the last time Council was called back from the summer break to discuss plans for controlling expenses? Number four, this impact fee will likely hurt Winnipeg's economy by slowing housing starts and I mentioned that in my questions earlier to some of the delegates. As I have stated repeatedly, the introduction of this fee will likely drive development outside the City of Winnipeg into adjacent municipalities. Many of the developers that have land inside of Winnipeg also have land outside of Winnipeg and this fee in Winnipeg will be a disincentive for them to continue the developments here. The negative impacts of development moving outside of the perimeter, the negative impacts on our city are obvious; a loss of property tax revenue, a loss of frontage levy revenue, an increased burden also on the City's infrastructure from people choosing to live outside the city and commute into Winnipeg thus placing greater traffic loads and greater wear and tear demands on our infrastructure. But there is also the negative impact of the trickle-down effect in the economy which I alluded to in to my questions to our delegates. If housing and commercial starts slow because of this fee it's not just developers that will be impacted. Fewer housing and commercial starts means less work for plumbers, electricians, framers, foundation specialists, roofers, painters, surveyors, landscape companies, realtors and a whole host of other men and women in our city who are employed in and depend upon healthy development industry for their household income. Let me give a personal example, I spoke with a friend recently, just this weekend, who owns a truss manufacturing company. They make roofing trusses for housing and commercial developments. He employs 70 people and is very concerned about the potential negative impact of this fee. If there are fewer homes to build he will not have work for all his employees and it becomes very personal, Madam Speaker, because my son worked there all summer building trusses so he could put himself through university this fall. Madam Speaker, this may indeed be an impact fee, but the impact may be very negative…a very negative impact on the income of many citizens of our city, on the revenues, tax revenues of the City of Winnipeg as well. Madam Speaker, number five, this fee ultimately means that all Winnipeggers will pay. The argument has been made that this fee should be imposed so that choosing a new home…those choosing a new home should be the ones that pay for the associated costs of growth rather than making all Winnipeggers pay for growth. But,

Madam Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to consider that if this fee…impact fee does indeed slow, the number of housing starts in Winnipeg. The result will be that home buyers choosing to buy will look for an older home. That will increase pressure on the resale housing market. It will drive up the price of the resale housing market which will lead to higher assessment values which in turn will result in, yes, every homeowner paying higher property taxes. With this impact fee, everybody pays. Sixthly, and finally, the fact that we have this many amendments before us, Madam Speaker, coming to us in the last minutes before Council, even on the floor of Council, with all due respect, it proves my point, we are not ready. If issues are popping up to use the councillor's words a moment ago, it indicates that the process is not ready to be fully completed and rolled out. The process is out of order. The sequence of the process is out of order, and I apologize but the analogy is just too obvious. Introducing a by-law fee at this point in the process is like building a house and moving in in the fall and not putting the roof on until the spring. The process is out of order. The sequence is out of order. The by-law and the fee are premature. Time is needed for greater consultation for the working group to do their work with the City through a thorough process to determine what the City needs to fund future growth and so I'm asking my colleagues, Madam Speaker, to defeat this motion and to hit the reset button on the process.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will try and be uncharacteristically brief. Better process today, I think a little more respectful all the way around with the delegations and the conversation. It does pain me somewhat to see people I often agree with and have a lot use for here like Councillor Gillingham and Councillor Lukes voting on the other side but, on the other side, this is not a block vote, this is not some EPC versus non-EPC, no one is being directed here, so I think that's a good sign of the democracy around the table. Relatively brief comments, I am supportive of the motion and the amendments. Two people I wanted to mention though, Tyler Markowsky from our City staff has put in a lot of work on this, crunched a lot of numbers, been impartial, I think, tried to present us with whatever data he could, the kind of man who, if you're talking to him, will suddenly reach across and grab a paper napkin and start sketching out a supply and demand curve to answer questions about elasticity of demand. So, a genuine number cruncher, I think he has done his best here to give us a lot of useful information. And I also wanted to say the...I have been thinking a lot about my period as a school trustee because it was ten years ago yesterday I got elected as a school trustee and one of the things I did in 2009 in the cold in March was come in and volunteer for Councillor Orlikow when he was running for City Council. And I did that again in 2010, when I was no longer a trustee, I volunteered for Councillor Orlikow and there were times between 2011 and 2014 when we were both here that we had a lot of disagreements and maybe I questioned that…the volunteer time I spent and wish he had come out to help me in November of 2011 when I was a candidate. But, I have to say, Councillor Orlikow has, I think, done a great job here on this. He has consulted at some point...we used to say when we were a school trustee, at some point you're never going to get perfect information you have to make a decision. Some of these things…you can't go on forever. I remember doing the biggest consultation in Brandon history and someone got up and said you haven't consulted us and we were saying, you're at the microphone at a public consultation, you're being consulted. We can't consult forever. So, I think we've had a lengthy consultation and what's more, there is an ongoing working group element planned from this from what Councillor Orlikow has developed. So I want to say, I think we could wait forever and keep trying to get more and more information but at some point you go forward with the plan and you have a working group as Councillor Orlikow has recommended so I guess I end by saying well maybe I am feeling better now, Madam Clerk or Madam Speaker about some of the decisions I've made to volunteer for Councillor Orlikow because I think he has done a great job on this trying to bring this in and I will be supportive today. I notice I am well under time. I know my colleague here Councillor Lukes will need additional time so I am happy to cede any time I might have. I don't know if that's in our orders but I'll certainly…if she needs time I will be moving an extension.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to support the amendments and if the amendments are successful, to support the clause. This is the year of the vote. The centennial year of the vote and one is reminded at times of the famous quote by Nellie McClung, "Never explain, never retract, never apologize just get the thing done and let them howl." And I don't think Nellie McClung ever ran for office. If she had, she probably wouldn't have got re-elected with that philosophy. And I don't think that was the intent or the purpose of this discussion or debate. But I do want to recognize the fact that we heard a lot of people here today from industry, from business, from leaders of our community who don't always come to this council Chamber. Individuals who have dedicated their lives to the investment of our city, many of them, if not all of them dedicating their time beyond their work time doing things for the community, above and beyond, as citizens. In terms of what they have done, this industry has done in terms of fostering the city and growing the city in terms of charity, in terms of events, it's hard to explain because it's just so massive of what they have done and the spin-offs that they had. So when they come and they speak and they share the concerns that they have, you know, I think it would be very unwise of us not to take their concerns and recognize them. At the same time, Madam Speaker, I recognize the fact that this has been intractable debate for the last decade and a half in this body with

previous councils. It seems to be one which I don't know if there would ever be a way to come together, where everybody could be holding and holding hands and going forward and agreeing on a process or a final solution. That is the challenge and that is the problem. In the past, in 2005 and 2006, it was proposed and that went off the rails. That didn't even make the public debate, that didn't even make the floor of Council but it stopped it at the level of EPC and the mayor of the day. And then again some six, seven years later, the attempt was made again, and again, it went off the rails and it did not go forward and not come forward and then there was another attempt where we placed into our budget wording in 2014's budget, December of 13 for the 14 budget to say we must get…and then at that point we heard differently from the Provincial Government at the time. So, we have had about three false starts in terms of making this process move forward. And at every point, it wasn't as if we…okay, we stopped it and as if anybody...whether it be Council or the industry, said, okay, let's roll up our sleeves and really make this work now. It was almost as if oh, we missed the bullet on that one or to that effect. And the reality is, we know we have challenges and I do believe, frankly, I am on the page that growth does pay for growth. I agree with the speakers and Mr. Vogan was quite right, I think he quoted me and maybe I don't say, I need more of this, we need more of the...the word we…but the reality is, when you look at what government takes out of the growth, if you like, and all the activity that this industry...and I say government because at the end of the day, there is one business or one industry or one person writing cheques to pay and to pay their income taxes and property taxes and all the other activities they must pay for. The Provincial and the Federal Governments are huge benefactors as well, and that's why I believe that growth does pay for growth. The problem we are living in and the challenge we are facing is we are literally fighting over scarce resources. And we are fighting over this challenge that we have as a city, that we need to do and we need to meet so many obligations and so many demands, in terms of maintaining not just the existing infrastructure that we have, but to build a new strategic infrastructure that we know will actually facilitate more growth and ensure growth continues. But we don't know how to do it and we are frustrated and if we were actually to apply that kind of cost directly to growth as a municipality, there would be no growth. I think that was reflected over the last several months where you go from basically the fee of, if you like, from 10...it was from $20 a square foot down to $10 a square foot basically down to $5 a square foot now. You know, we know that even at that amount, the amount of money that's now going to be collected is nowhere near in terms of the challenges we face but if we were to apply, there would be no…we would…the capital region would take off there would be no growth, we would not be sustainable. You know, I was reminded, just thinking, you know, we were talking about island or some of this and I started thinking of the North of…North from Fry and his whole comparison of Canada and the garrison mentality. You know, we have this thing, the garrison mentality. We are all sort of…we are basically here on the prairies in the middle with the wilderness around us. But it's actually worked to our advantage. And it's worked to our advantage because it's forced us to work together on other sides of the fence, if we are against each other on different issues to come together. I still believe that that is possible. I still believe that no matter what happens here today, that that is possible going forward because the individuals who came here today, who are so passionate about building the city, who have done so much for our city, I believe will still care about it tomorrow and continue to do so, and I think we do want to work together and to make things happen. And I am speaking with a little bit of experience, Madam Speaker. Not a lot but just a little bit, where we have done this crazy experiment, it's called Transcona and Transcona West where we are building literally, not a…we're not just representing, we are building a new community. Go and look at it. And we have had some pretty raucous meetings, thank goodness most of them not in the public. But fights between the City and between the stakeholders, the developers on who's going to pay for what and when is it going to happen and how's it going to happen? And we have achieved great things by sorting this…and you know what, was everybody happy at the end of the day? At times not but we have facilitated the kind of growth and development now where you have more than one developer, you have numerous…we have home builders, we have activity taking place. But the implementation of this, in other words, what I'm saying, is the sky going to fall? The sky will not fall. The crucial thing in my mind is what's been referred to as the working group. As a working group goes forward, how the funding and where the money goes, and what it goes back to, what I heard and I have been in contact with these individuals over the last several weeks is they want to see value. If they know that they are actually...their customer, they are the customer are paying for this extra fee, this tax and the value is going to come back to the community specifically to the community or in about the community in terms of services, in terms of needed services, that we hear about over and over and over again. Many, frankly, said you know what, we can support that. I heard it over and over that we are not against having an impact fee, we're against how it's going to be done. I was reminded about the debates in the previous term where someone on the other side would constantly say the process is terrible, the process is terrible, vote against it because the process is terrible and now we're hearing, well to heck with the process is terrible, just vote for it, right? I mean, you can't work both ways. You know, I do believe that there is still time get this back on track. That we can ensure that the money that's collected out of these areas is going back to the needed services that…

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

Councillor Wyatt: We do need in investments in capital. Whether it be for roads, whether it be for waste water, whether it be waste water pipe, whether it be for recreation, whether it be for fire halls, these are things that we know we need in these neighbourhoods and these neighbourhoods know we need them. And if residents were buying into these

neighbourhoods, see that, that's great. I don't want to also get this into a new versus old debate. That does the City no service and I agree with some of the earlier speakers who came to delegation. You know, the reality is the vote has been rising in this city because of the economic activity of these individuals who have been driving this kind of activity and guess what's happening? Like, for the first time in years we're having applications coming forward in older neighbourhoods where entrepreneurs who want to be in 10 or 20 or 30 years, the Qualicos or the kids that will be the Qualicos of the world, but they are small and they are trying to do this and they're doing infills and they're building properties, this is…this economic activity, why is this happening? Because of all the activity that's been occurred and allowed to occur. So those…I don't think today's vote could have been if we had brought this forward with a January beginning and at $10 a square foot, I think that would have had a huge impact. I think the fact that it's $5 a square foot now has been a massive change. Now I know that may not be the case but it was no different...I can tell you right now, when we had to sort out the issues of Transcona West and it was said, well that's not a regional road, well we only pay for one lane in either direction and that's been…and it's a four lane road and the City saddled with the other two lanes, well go look in parts of the city where you see two lane roads like Leila or Dakota, which it was before only cause a member of EPC was able to stand up and get the other two lanes in. Or all these projects where we said no, you're going to come into the table, you're going to…you are building on both sides of the road. These are the challenges that we overcame. And you know…and the benefits are there. We can see what can actually happen. You know, at $5 a square foot…I just want everybody to put this into perspective in terms of the number being used. Okay. In 2005 and 6 when the debate was going on, it was about $5,000 a lot.

Madam Speaker: If you could wrap up please, Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: My wrap up is that. We are actually around where we were back then actually probably less if you take inflation in. So I would encourage members of Council to support this and move forward. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The next speaker is Councillor Dobson.

Councillor Dobson: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like, first off, to thank Councillor Orlikow for doing a great job, talking to everyone and of course, Councillor Wyatt because he has helped me out quite a bit. First off, I am a believer that growth should pay for growth. I have never been a hundred percent in favour of this motion, but with amendments I believe that I could make it acceptable. And if we go back to what Councillor Gillingham had mentioned earlier, a lot of my thoughts echo what he has said. I felt that it was critically important that individual councils have a say in where growth money is spent and that priority should be given to keeping revenue collected in the area it was collected from. The last thing I want to see is the development left wanting for growth infrastructure because the fees were diverted to another part of the city that the working group decided had a higher priority. My fear is that the working group will be the same as EPC and again, we councillors will be left in the dark and who knows where those fees will be spent and more importantly, why were they spent there. That's not acceptable to me, nor should it be. I had hoped I could put together amendments that would satisfy these issues and after working with several councillors, Councillor Wyatt mostly, over the last week, I unfortunately couldn't come up with a viable amendment that I was happy with. So in its current form I cannot and will not support this motion. Some of my concerns that I didn't cover, the first one would be we should apply growth fees for future growth not for past growth. Past growth was a missed opportunity. Accept it and move on. My second concern was include all areas of growth that Council decides....or, not the working group, decide where exemptions are applied and for how long. If an exemption is to be made then all of councillors should know the reasons why. Let us be open and transparent on this process. And my third concern was, identify growth priorities for each development. Work with the developers and establish timelines or thresholds for growth construction. And again, be open and transparent on this whole process. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I just...noting the presence of former Councillor Swandel in the audience here, I didn't want to disappoint him without the opportunity to hear me make another speech about growth fees which he heard many times over the years. That's a joke. But I would like to thank Councillor Orlikow as everyone else has done. He did do an incredible job. It's been a lot of work and just the leadership of the Mayor and everybody in having this discussion. It's not easy, it is something where people have very different views and it's good to see us come together for the most part and move forward with something. Under our existing system, growth is not paying for growth and this is something that's been pretty obvious for a long time, I think for many people. If you are involved in working on City budgets trying to address the infrastructure deficit we have and you look around the country, it's happening in other places, it's quite clear. And the Hemson report which was commissioned to confirm those findings, did that for us. We currently have development cost charges that cover the immediate infrastructure in the newer developments for the most part but what they don't cover is the offsite costs, the roads, bridges, overpasses and underpasses. And that's not even without getting into the operating and capital costs of providing a broad range of City services such as parks, police, transit, fire, paramedic services and recreation facilities. The costs of growth that are not

covered in the existing development fees are paid for by every taxpayer through everyone's property taxes including all existing residents across the city. And introducing this fee which is what virtually every other city in Canada has done makes a lot of sense. And I would like to thank the Mayor in particular for the courage it takes to bring a change like this. We have talked about the different incarnations of this over the years that have been brought forward at different times and as you can see, it creates quite a stir when we bring forward a change like this and it takes courage. I think it's important what that Council leads rather than reacts which I think is what we are doing as well, addressing the situation head on and moving forward with the decision. For too long, we have passively allowed our city to become more and more financially and otherwise unsustainable by taking little action on the problem we face. And in spite of previous attempts such as asking the Province for these powers, Winnipeg has been unable to address the problem. The development industry is a very important partner and should be consulted along the way and from what I understand of this process they have been. There has been a lot of discussions, that doesn't mean everyone's going to agree, but those discussions have taken place. We are the ones elected to lead and determine the direction the City is going in terms of our policies and by-laws and I am proud of that today. I see this fee as a first step in bringing things back into balance, in terms of the cost of growth by having the industry pay its fair share, but also for Council to have a planning tool that can be used to guide the growth and development of our city in a more sustainable way. Infill development and downtown development are key to our city becoming not only more livable, healthier and vibrant but also more fiscally and environmentally sustainable. The plan in front of us withholds fees for infill and downtown and allows time, three years, to develop better plans, tools and policies that can guide future decisions on this. Those decisions can be made on an evidence-based manner with input from the advisory working group as well as Council, the general public and stakeholders. But we are starting with fees in the new and emerging areas where it makes the most obvious sense. The plan that Councillor Orlikow has developed through the…working with Council and a broad range of stakeholders discussions will allow us to fine tune all of these mechanisms. This evolving planning tool which will support our policy goals and OurWinnipeg, our city plan, will encourage development where it has the most benefit along corridors, near transit, downtown and infill areas and have the costs of growth recovered. The reality is right now, it's harder to do infill and downtown development than it is to do greenfield, building on empty land at the fringes of the city. Not only is it more complex to do that infill, but it is more expensive and less profitable. So who can fault the industry for focusing on that development, on greenfield development in that situation. So in closing, I would like to express my support for this important step forward and I look forward to the continued work on this in the coming years. Thank you everyone for their hard work. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Homes in new suburbs at the city's edge should pay for their initial infrastructure for things like roads, water pipes, sewers, sidewalks, streetlights, et cetera. If you were listening to this debate from the outside, you might lose the fact that development is already paying for those things. When you are buying your new lot in any of those suburbs, it's not city taxpayers and old communities that are paying for these, it's included in the lot price of your new lot. In fact, these new communities in many cases are paying for some of the regional infrastructure. They are paying for lanes on…well, at least a lane on the side of the major communities. They're paying for the collector streets within the communities. However, I do believe there is some soft infrastructure that people moving into new communities expect that isn't being paid for and they want…I think there is an opportunity, there should be a mechanism whether it's through a development parameters or through an area charge to collect some of that initial infrastructure. Things like...these are things that people expect in urban environments, parks, active transportation paths, community centres, fire halls, transit buses, libraries. You know, two and a half buses are needed for Sage Creek or Waverley West or Amber Trails, the cost of that initial set of buses, for example, that should be incorporated in the area charge that goes for that area. I suspect, and I'm not the expert, we've heard from the experts this morning in delegation, I suspect those additional costs would probably add between three and $5,000 for a single family lot. Growth needs to pay for growth. How could any free marketer be against that basic premise? I think the devil really comes down to the details and how you look at it. I can hire a completely legitimate accountant working in good faith that would prove that new developments on day one don't cover their impacts for the entirety of the infrastructure network. I could also hire an equally credible, legitimate, professional chartered accountant working in good faith that could prove that based on the far, far higher property taxes paid in new communities that they are absolutely providing a net financial benefit to the city including the cost of regional infrastructure. It totally depends on how you frame the question and look at it. While I'm glad the initial proposal to have everything in on January 1, 2017 has been tempered with a phased-in approach for residential properties in new communities and other property types to be introduced later, I am more concerned that the basket of goods that are being attributed to growth are simply not fair and rather quite arbitrary. For example, the Chief Peguis Trail extension from Henderson Highway to Lagimodiere that opened in 2011, almost entirely in my ward, it's been on the City's drawing board since the 1960s, it's surrounded by reasonably mature communities, 60s, 70s, 80s, it is being attributed to 70 percent growth and 30 percent existing development. I think that's ludicrous. Unlike most municipalities, affording housing debates are rarely heard on the floor of this council. While we recognize that there are people that will never have…that will have challenges of achieving appropriate housing, we don't have the sky high prices many cities are experiencing. I do believe that a very real fare of the growth

tax is that it will make all housing less affordable. Separately, it will push even more people to choose to build outside the city but in our capital region. I am of the opinion that basic, necessary regional infrastructure should be funded by the entirety of the capital region. Outside Winnipeg but in the capital region, the Province of Manitoba builds and maintains regional roadways. In Manitoba's second largest city, the City of Brandon, the Province does all maintenance of Victoria Avenue and 18th Street right down to snow clearing. This does not happen in Winnipeg, but we pay provincial taxes and we don't see that benefit. When it comes to the City's ongoing operating costs and replacing existing infrastructure you can easily make the argument that the North End, for example, does not pay for the North End. Beyond a capital infrastructure side of the equation, a regional approach for certain costs need to be realized. In 2015, the median assessed home in Winnipeg was approximately…was assessed at approximately $283,000. With some variation for frontage fees, the municipal portion of taxes for that average house was approximately $1,800 annually. Of that, the single largest expenditure category is policing costing that household just over $500. While the police perform very important work keeping our city safe, then there's all sorts of societal challenges, the amount of service dispersal isn't equal. A new $425,000 home in Sage Creek, Waverley West, Amber Trails, any new community, isn't costing the City $750 in additional policing costs. On the operating side, we desperately need growth to occur in Winnipeg and not outside. In terms of amending Motion No. 1, this motion today is adding the north Henderson Highway secondary plan area to the areas that charges are going to be applicable to. I only heard about this revision this morning and it's certainly quite alarming and disturbing. So anyways, based on the complete community directions strategy of OurWinnipeg, this area is considered to be an emerging community which I think is dead wrong. Henderson Highway and the roadway network date back forever. Henderson Highway dates back to the Red River settlers, the cross streets of all sorts of history with farming and agricultural uses that occurred in North Kildonan long before I was around. Typically, this is from our complete community structures strategy on emergency communities, typically, they are characterized as relatively low-density, residential neighbourhoods containing single-family housing, smaller packets of multi-family and locally-oriented retail. The majority of the residential units in map 11 that you have before you in the amendment are medium to high density multi-family buildings located on Henderson Highway and Valhalla Drive. In recent years, remaining single-family homes on Henderson are more closely matching to the definition of reinvestment areas as defined on page 84 of the Complete Community Direction Strategy. Specifically, deteriorating building stock, inappropriate mix of land uses, inadequate buffering between uses and are being replaced by higher density properties based on recommendations of the City's planning staff. Almost every recommendation for amendment to the secondary plan and OurWinnipeg exception is approved by our planning staff. So again, including the north Henderson secondary plan is a problem, I have been asking for several years for a new version of that plan, or, in fact, I believe Complete Communities is adequate and that the secondary plan should be rescinded. So, this is going to encourage...or discourage the replacement of old housing stock on north Henderson Highway and that area. There is no greenfield development in this zone whatsoever so I am quite strongly against the Motion 1 before you here today. Motion 2, I think, adds a little bit of transparency and accountability and I am supportive generally of the parts of amendment two. Ultimately, what Winnipeg needs is full cost recovery of costs directly attributable to new developments including the start-up costs. A fair mechanism though is to pay for regional infrastructure is also needed and that has to include funds that come from the entirety of the capital region.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise...I am going to be supporting both the amendments and the report to move forward. But, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to start off by talking about...so, there is a housing retail selling market, reassessment of properties, and a whole host of complicated filtering down, filtering through flow of money that has to deal with the growth of Winnipeg and dealing with keeping services within the existing neighbourhoods that have become accustomed for, you know, 50, 70 years worth of assets...well, coming on 50 for a number of facilities in the west…in West Kildonan, Madam Speaker. So it's important to note and there was a presentation, but I can tell you since I have been elected and prior to being elected, I also had the belief that growth wasn't paying for growth. But you know, interestingly enough, you bring in the argument of the provincial and federal taxes and sure enough, yeah, maybe, maybe it does pay for itself but the reality is that the City of Winnipeg doesn't collect or get all of the money collected from those, that's not how it works, Madam Speaker. The way it works, Madam Speaker, is they use the money and I noticed they build some nice regional roads on the outside of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker. But, you know, I do have to say, it has been the technique to keep property taxes down, there has been a number of initiatives to do that. One of them is utilizing the growth property taxes to offset the need to raise your taxes. So what's happening is, is it did help to freeze the taxes in this city for quite some time. And in the meantime, Madam Speaker, what's also happened and continues to happen, unless we can do something to take the pressure off it, what's happening, Madam Speaker, is that we are moving services that are in our old neighbourhoods and we move them out to the suburbs, I can cite a bunch of examples we can talk about. And it's not just purchasing new buses to provide service out to new suburbs instead of taking, say, the 18 Leila bus and serving another part of West Kildonan/Old Kildonan it's more of a new suburb, but it's also having to have the garage capacity to keep that infrastructure required to keep all these additional buses. I just want to say that I am sick and tired of services being removed from our older neighbourhoods and it's not just West Kildonan…you know, I am not ward centric person. The inner city is a huge area

and when you look at the real estate market, Madam Speaker. And you know, there is this constant pressure to shut things down and not fix things all the time, Madam Speaker. What we are doing when going forth with these impact fees is really important to help take that pressure away because you know, Madam Speaker, the people in these new suburbs, they do deserve to have a community centre, a library, all those services. That's what families are looking for when they buy a house. They expect to get those services, they also expect to get a school. And you know, I know how things have rock and rolled in the past. They say, oh, there's going to be a school built here and the Province waits forever and meanwhile all the other schools are overflowing because the money that they are bringing in isn't enough to build that school when it's actually needed. They are building it years after it's needed, Madam Speaker. So, you know, I think that this...what's really important about this is we could sit and not do anything and move forward. What I like about this…actually, I'd like to thank Councillor Orlikow for his really hard work, this is not an easy thing do. But what he did is we are recognizing that there can be impacts on the economy and housing and so on. This is a phase-in approach to look at how to best do it Madam Speaker and I appreciate it. And you know, the only time I ever agreed with former Councillor Swandel, in a discussion about growth not paying for growth is...and this is the problem with listing out specific assets. I don't believe that water and waste, water and sewer projects that are even more regional, should be part of this impact fee. But you know, there is going to be a working group to look at this. But I agree with him that water and waste has a billing system that's completely different than dealing with property tax dollars, Madam Speaker. So that growth is being paid for, I think it is. Because when you bring new households consuming water they are paying money on their bill for these big infrastructure projects that need to happen. So there is already some...and there's also…you know, there is also a dividend that's collected on that that brings money into help offset our operating costs for the city. So, anyway, but that's my own personal opinion Madam Speaker. I am hoping that the working group will move forward and look forward into the future and say these are the things that growth isn't paying for, it's removing services. So I like the phase-in approach. It just works and I just wanted to say, you know, I'm supporting both amendments. I can understand the argument from Councillor Browaty, this now and there, but the wording of OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities and all this stuff, the thing is, it leads to what this is and we need to be consistent with OurWinnipeg and everything that flows from that. And so, it is there, but I would point out, Madam Speaker, that if I was the councillor for the area who has been trying to get sidewalks and the roads finished on Henderson Highway out to at least the City limits because it is about the safety of the residents that live in the area as well. You know, I have been out there, Madam Speaker, as a person who is blind, you know, you get off the bus, it's not a fun walk when you are way out there, let me tell you that. So, you know, it does need to be finished and now there is the potential to get that project done, I know the councillor has been trying to do it for years. I support that. I like the openness and transparency of the second amendment with limiting the inflation so it's not to do it...and that's not to say that it's always going to be 5 percent every year. We don't know that. Construction inflation is very complex and interesting, Madam Speaker and that you know, if you take a look now, our administration is telling us that library renovation and building is actually pretty well almost flat, whereas I am not quite sure where 2016's inflation is on roads because we had a quite debate with Councillor Wyatt trying to say we are saving money because costs are…bids are down and so on and so forth. But, you know, even the cost of a house…to build a house now, apparently Statscan is reporting in the Winnipeg market, the inflationary factor on building a new home is around just a little over 1 percent. So, you know, I don't know that you are going to achieve that and accounting for the money in a way that looks at how they are, at least we can see and find out where the money is and how it's being spent because you know, the biggest difficulty for all of us councillors and it may not be till after the next election that there's enough money to spend all of us councillors…

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

Councillor Eadie: The most difficult thing, Madam Speaker, that we're going to have to do is decide which projects are moving ahead first because under this...under this…the way this goes, Council is the one through its capital budgeting program, it's…all of us that are going to have to try to figure out which projects are moving forward and I know, even you know, you can look at competition between developer and developer, you know, there is a different developer up in Waterford Green versus, I don't know, name any other…say, Sage Creek. You know, who gets their infrastructure first…who gets it first, right? I don't know what that's going to be like, but hopefully the working group can work all this out and again, I just want to end by saying I wanted to thank Councillor Orlikow for working on this hard to be able to bring the…to be able to vote for this particular growth fee because I do have concerns about the market and what effects it might have, but with the phase-in, I think it will really work well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I as well…I want to say how impressed I am with Councillor Orlikow, His Worship, other members of Council and the administration in how much work has been done since the Hemson report was first offered to us a couple of months ago. And they didn't have much time to bring us to this point since the report was published, but I appreciate what that took and I want to say how truly impressed I am in terms of how far we have come in the last couple of months to this point, to the extent that we are even admitting that the

process is incomplete and we are going to take another two or three years, literally three years, to see what type of impact we're going to have on the rest of the city, on downtown, on the inner city, on infill, on densities. So the report is not complete. It's been said in this circle this afternoon that the working group and the tools that we are implementing to use in the next three years to come up with the next phase are going to make it better, we're going to improve the process, we are going to improve the result. I actually believe that. So for me, if that's the case, and it seems pretty obvious to me that it's the case, what is the point of delivering today, making a decision today, if we are saying that the process and the result is going to be better in three years from now? And that's not a hypothetical, Madam Speaker, because that's what we are going to be doing for the rest of the phases of developing Winnipeg's first impact fee. And Madam Speaker, it's sort of a historic day. It's sort of been dealt with here and there and I have mentioned it before but on this day, Madam Speaker, we are saying that we're bringing in a fee on new home buyers geared directly to construction inflation. It's not geared to a campaign commitment of 2 percent. It's not geared to regular consumer price index or regular inflation of about 2 percent. It's geared to construction inflation capped at 5 percent but that is about what construction inflation is at and it's been like that for a long time. So basically we are admitting today with this motion that we have given up on dealing with the primary pressure on our budgetary constraints of this era, construction inflation. So, we have had a good debate today. We have had some excellent speakers and we have talked about who should pay for the pipes. Should it be the new developments at the edge of the city? Or should it be the existing inner city where we use the pipes and the pipes are getting old. We have had the debate about who should be paying for the bridges and the new roads. Well yeah, that's a big debate because that's the question and the reason we are having this debate today is because construction inflation, after years, is bursting at the seams of budgetary constraints and now we have to do something that we haven't done before. Oh, other cities have to deal with this, and so do we. Now, we are bringing in a working group. Tools to establish what's been called a better process and a better result for three years from now for the rest of the impact fees which affects, especially, my ward of Elmwood-East Kildonan and many other wards, at least half. So why am I to think, what is there that I see? Why would I think otherwise than to think that the impact fees on density, the mantra of the new term, which I concur with and I've stuck my neck out as a councillor in Elmwood-East Kildonan in terms of the type of densities I am willing to try, and that's a fact. I don't…I'm not the only one but I'm out there and I will be judged on this, what I am willing to do for densities. But I don't know what the effect of this is going to be yet. But I do believe that the process will be better and the result will be better, how much better remains to be seen, Madam Speaker. Because in reality, who pays for the pipes, the bridges, the roads, but we are doing it in two sections, one now, one three years from now, well it's all interrelated, Madam Speaker and it's all interrelated to one thing. What is the commonality of all this that we are dealing with today and why today? Time of not dealing with the issue of construction inflation brings us to the point that all these things are about construction and how much it's going to cost in the future. I don't represent any special interest group in this. I do represent working class families, I know that, in terms of how this fee is going to affect them. But basically, it's about all Winnipeggers. Madam Speaker, when we're going ahead with a fee that's based on construction inflation, 5 percent rather than regular inflation of 2 percent, that means, Madam Speaker, that down the road their fees are going to be increasing at a rate unseen before and only on new home buyers. But if we don't deal with construction inflation and this motion proves that we are not, that means that we're going to continue as we have this term on increasing taxes, levies, fees, rates, fines, without trying to deal with the causes of this inflation. Madam Speaker, it's really important for us to understand a couple of factors here. Regular inflation, 2 percent inflation, CPI inflation, consumer price index inflation, it's based on sort of regular consumer products. Construction inflation is based on maintenance of our infrastructure and developing our infrastructure and has to do with oil. Oil has gone down by 40 percent in the last 5 years, why is construction inflation at 5 percent? Madam Speaker, I believe that we can take a slow and steady approach.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Use the next three years. Use the benefit of what is considered to be a more beneficial process in working group. To take a look at the impacts, not just on this…not just on this, but this is going to affect every single…and it has already. Basically, every single tax rate and levy every increase that we have had and it's going to continue to happen. I owe an intelligent and reasoned explanation to my constituents as to what is going on today. And what's going on today is an admission of what's going on tomorrow and we are not dealing, Madam Speaker, we're not dealing with our budgetary and financial fate. This is a sign of things to come. Watch what happens, Madam Speaker, in ten years from now, in 20 years from now. If we see this is okay, we allow impact rates based on rates of inflation of 5 percent when oil has gone down by 40, what are the factors that have caused the pressure of 5 percent per year, Madam Speaker, in the last five/ten years? We don't know. We haven't talked about it. Administration hasn't talked about it. We don't talk about it enough here on Council but we're just going ahead anyway and saying let's forget about the reasons. I'm told…it's said that we can't control it. Well, we can't do anything about it, Madam Speaker, if we don't decide to discuss it, admit it's the problem and if we don't, what we are doing today is going to take place again and again and again every single year on every single fee, tax, levy, rate and fine. Let's take a look at the root causes of why this has happened. Let's take the next three years, let's use this tool, let's use the process and administration can give a construction inflation report and now we'll understand why this is happening. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Lukes.
Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I would like to thank everyone involved in this process. It's been an interesting process to date and it's nowhere near over, I can see that. Firstly, I am not opposed to the implementation of a fee to ensure that the proper cost of growth is captured by the City of Winnipeg. I fully support that development should contribute its full financial share towards the cost of growth, what I'm not supportive of is the lack of due diligence and engagement that has occurred to date. We as Council have a real responsibility as keepers of this city. We have a fiduciary responsibility to the citizens of Winnipeg and it is our job to create policy based on facts and data, not on the promise to have meaningful conversation after policy is created or a by-law is passed. This morning you heard from Mr. Shaw, a planner, who is not affiliated but had decades of experience working in communities using growth fees. I want to commend him firstly for coming in and speaking to this. I spoke with multiple planners who are in complete agreement with what he is saying but are hesitant in speaking out because Winnipeg is a small town. But they are saying exactly the same thing Mr. Shaw is saying. The process to craft Winnipeg's by-law has not followed best practices and has not gone through any kind of due diligence in its…due diligence process in its creation. As Mr. Shaw has stated, the reality is that best practices related to growth fees are informed by a significant body of legislation. Municipalities that do not make a considered effort to follow best practices all too often find themselves on the wrong side of appeal decisions and this has contributed to increased costs for city taxpayers. I ask all of you here, do any of you really believe we have done due diligence on the development of this by-law? Have we followed industry best practices to develop this by-law? Go to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities website and see what they are saying about introducing special financing and levies. Canada usually requires municipalities a Provincial approval. The CAO and COO have stated we have not formally in any way met with the Provincial Government on what we are proposing. The FCM says there must be a higher standard of accountability and the goals must be well communicated to the public. Have we even had one public consultation on all of this? FCM uses our City of Winnipeg frontage levy as an example of a special financing tool and if we don't all know by now that in order to implement the frontage levy we are bound by legislation to clearly identify what that funding is being allocated to bound by legislation. We are in very unchartered waters. The CAO and COO have told me we do not have outside legal opinions on what we are proposing to do. You must wonder why then, we receive outside legal opinions on many other issues. Councillors, taking money and not clearly defining what it is to be used for, flings open the door…the legal doors and I dare say, rolls out the red carpet. I have spent virtually every day this last month and a half reading what processes other cities have undertaken to implement growth fees. I have met with dozens of planners and developers from across Canada who work in many different municipalities to hear what they have experienced and to discuss the process. I have met with lawyers who have implemented growth fees across Canada and have worked with CentrePort Canada and the RM of Rosser who went through a very extensive and rigorous process to determine CentrePort's cost of growth for Rosser. Every single one of them is astounded by the process we are using to create this by-law, how ill...and cannot understand how ill-informed we are. During last year's 2016 budget deliberations EPC considered the implement of growth fees but there was so many questions that could not be answered by the Planning Department that EPC determined more information was required. Articulated during these discussions, myself and others on EPC insisted that consultation with the industry needed to occur as part of the process in gathering more information. The Mayor and Councillor Orlikow met with representatives from the development industry and everyone agreed that time was required to discuss, consult and get the facts on the table. A quarter million dollars was included in the budget process. I voted for this. I had expressed my concerns during EPC that we needed more data, more information and had stressed…and everyone around that table knows that we should be engaging with shake holders during the process. An RFP was issued for a growth study. Nine days before the close of the RFP, an addendum was issued to include two consultations with stakeholders, two. No consultations with stakeholders had been included in the RFP, none. It's almost unfathomable that the initial RFP request that was prepared did not include the need for consultations. And I would like to bring to your attention that addendum 2 was added, and take note of the questioning being asked by one of the proponents. In addendum 2, the proponent asked, why was the City circumventing the usual RFP process? Why was there a short fuse on this RFP process? The proponent also questioned the quality of data the City had in particular to cost and revenues for various infrastructure to which the City replied, it did not have that level of municipally (inaudible) data. But even after the addendum was added to consult with stakeholders, not all stakeholders were invited to the initial meeting. Commercial and industrial were not invited, the public was not invited to provide input, not one single public consultation or public hearing on what will be a fundamental policy change for the City of Winnipeg. Not one councillor was even asked to provide input into the development of the report or to attend any of the meetings. Consultations were held in the middle of summer, we don't do that here at Council because we know people won't show up. The two consultations with the developers, Hemson is flown in to present the report to councillors, I was out of town, 4 were on holiday, I phoned in, we were all allowed 2 questions. I have repeatedly asked for the author of the report to return and explain the report but no further detail. That can't happen. CFO sends e-mail to Council directing us to ask him...to ask…if we had questions to ask him. It goes back and forth and back and forth and back and forth and I mean, I am running out of time here but it's unbelievable. I tried as Chair of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works to have my committee sit down with Finance, the directors of Planning and the directors of Infrastructure and that did not happen. I had a very brief meeting with Councillor Orlikow but that meeting was on the Monday following the news release. So much for consulting with the councillor for South Winnipeg - St. Norbert, Councillor representing Waverley West. So much for consulting with the

Chair of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. So much for consulting with the Acting Deputy Mayor. Do I feel any kind of meaningful discussion has occurred on this? Last week's EPC meeting another map is amended to change with only a brief explanation by planners at the meeting and I encourage you to listen to the audio recording with the Director of PP&D saying there are many areas that do not make sense using this approach. I have asked for criteria. I've asked for criteria…how will these fees be allocated? I have not heard back from the CAO, COO, Director of Planning, Asset Management, they said they would get back to me. But what I did hear last night on a local radio station for the first time in this entire debate clearly outlining what we will hear today, clearly outlining where the revenues are coming from, what areas of the city. That information will be open and accessible to City Councillors and members of the public to see. Hallelujah for radio stations. Is this the way we are doing new business at City Hall? I can't even get the CFO, I can't get the Hemson folks to sit down with me and speak to me. What did Calgary do to understand to go through this process? Internal working groups, 32 meetings, external advisory group, 12 meetings, sub-committee groups, 20 meetings, established area group...

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

Councillor Lukes: Each of the workshops include a round table to discuss the process was open and transparent. To ensure Council, industry and the general public were informed, updates were presented at five Council strategic sessions. These sessions provided Council with an opportunity to be updated on progress and to provide input and there were numerous meetings with Council…with members of Council to answer questions. You've heard the process, I've explained. We are proposing to enact a by-law crafted in less than 60 days of which we are amending weekly. I vote…if you vote to implement this by-law, what you are really saying is taxpayers, citizens of Winnipeg, we have not done our due diligence or followed best practices or sought outside legal advice on this. We've been made aware that legal action could occur because we have not done our due diligence. We have not enabled a fair, equitable and well thought out and planned process to enable sustainable growth. We have not provided meaningful conversations for a collaborative, consultative and transparent process and we are not providing the fiduciary care that we were elected to do for the City of Winnipeg. This process flies in exactly the face of what I believe all of us campaigned on or at least what I campaigned on, improving process on how we do business at City Hall. And this by-law today, in my opinion, is a get'er done, just get'er done approach. And you know what, process is important to me because when I look at process I look at a new fire hall. I look at a new police station. I look at a new stadium. I look at Plessis Underpass and most recently, the purchase of Hydro corridor land. What has changed? Process is important especially in something as pivotal as this for the City of Winnipeg. I will not be supporting this by-law. I will not be supporting these amendments and I really caution everyone to think carefully about process and how we go forward in all of this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next speaker is Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I rise in support of this motion and the amending motion. Just to my Council colleagues, I do intend to make some remarks in French, so if you want to grab your head sets I know we have translation.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: So first of all, I would like to recognize the leadership of Mayor Bowman and my colleague Councillor Orlikow on this issue, which is important for St. Boniface and for Winnipeg as a whole. In my conversations with my colleagues, one of my initial concerns when we originally began discussing these development impact fees... (I admit that I'm learning new French terms today.) So, for these development impact fees [said in English] – perhaps for the interpreter's information – my initial concern was to ensure that in adopting these fees, infill development would not be significantly impacted. In the amendments that my colleagues have brought to the motion before us today, my concerns were clearly heard, specifically in that we will not be charging for infill development. And so, mature, already-established communities will not be impacted by these fees, and I am pleased to see that a process to engage the community of developers in Winnipeg has already begun. So we will be able to have in-depth discussions with them in order to find a system that works even better in Winnipeg. I think that the data has already established that the development occurring in these new developments is where we have a large percentage, perhaps even a majority, of developments in Winnipeg. So I think that it makes sense to start there, because that's where we find that the majority of new development is occurring. And having gone through the process for many infill development applications in Winnipeg, I have seen first-hand how difficult it can be to do that kind of development here. So I think that this motion is going in the right direction, i.e. to recoup the costs for new developments, and I think the mayor explained it well in his correspondence with residents, the media and all stakeholders: either we charge for new development, or all the citizens of Winnipeg will have to pay higher property taxes. I think the mayor may have said it more succinctly, but to sum up, I think we have found a good compromise. There has been a lot of discussion, and I think it's a good start, with a good process in place to re-evaluate what the next steps should be for Winnipeg in the coming years. So, to my colleagues: I think there has already been a lot of discussion. I'm not sure I've added any new information... My perspective is perhaps unique in that it is either I or Councillor Lukes who has the largest ward in population, but additionally, St.

Boniface Ward is quite diverse – we have mature communities, we also have existing communities and many new developments, as well as an industrial park. And so, given its diversity, St. Boniface is likely one of the wards affected in the largest variety of ways. Anyway, that being said, thank you for your attention today. I ask that you please support the work accomplished by John and Mayor Bowman on this important file. And if you haven't been convinced that new developments do not pay for themselves, consider for a moment that this fact has already been recognized several times today, and that we have an infrastructure deficit of $7 billion, so we must begin to address this deficit, as it will only increase with time as we continue to approve new developments, so please, support this motion. Thank you for your attention.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Madam Chair to support this motion and the amendments and I have a very different perspective than some of the other councillors that are speaking up against this motion. And some of them I really, really do respect but I have a different perspective than they do. Winnipeg has historically supported suburban development using development fees that pay for the initial hard costs like water, sewer and roads but the incremental costs like services like widening the roads, regional roads, underpasses or even to support things like police, ambulance, firefighting, libraries, rec centres, pools and our buses. Those are costs that are supported by property taxes. All of Winnipeg has been paying for these services by failing to maintain the existing infrastructure to the point that the conditions of our residential streets, parks and bus routes and mature neighbourhoods. Anyone who wants to dispute these comments only needs to spend a few minutes driving in any inner-city neighbourhood. The population of Winnipeg is projected to increase by 28 percent, 910,000 and the number of households will increase by 35 percent to 382,000 households. At the same time our infrastructure deficit is estimated to reach 7.4 billion by 2018. How do we propose to fund these services needed by these new residents? And I'm somebody who believes that if you buy a new house in these neighbourhoods, you want these services. I would expect if I'm buying a new house that I would get these services. So, you know, I am one who believes that an increase or tax based by adding more housing is just not going to solve all our problems. We need growth but we also need a mechanism to pay for growth. Will we be like past councils that have continued using reserves and increasing our infrastructure deficit? Will we show the leadership that is needed to make some of these tough decisions? Of 8 cities surveyed, Winnipeg has the lowest per capita spending on infrastructure, a mere $327 per person while other 7 cities canvassed in the report spend an average of $876. Not surprisingly some of these cities that out spend us on infrastructure have also the highest percentage of development fees. Saskatoon which spends 1,300 per capita on infrastructure charges a frontage levy fee of 1,870 per frontage metre. In Toronto, which spends 998 per capita charges a development fee of 34,000 for detached residence. Again not surprisingly, both of these cities have raised funding more than the City of Winnipeg over the past decade. Even rural municipalities like Taché are having charges. As it is, we are proposing a modest fee which would be under $10,000 per residential unit. I believe that this is completely reasonable in the beginning and I will be supporting it. These fees will allow the City to decide how and where we grow. It also will encourage affordable housing options which will be exempt from the fees dealing with the major lack of affordable housing that are needed in this city for families who are on limited income and are most vulnerable people. These fees are critical for us to move forward as a city and to help us deal with the challenges like many modern cities. As we grow and expand the service that our city residents are expecting of us and I just…I also do want to take a minute and thank Councillor Orlikow. It's been…I know that it's been hard but I know that when I have come to you with my questions and stuff like that you've been open and willing to meet with me so I just want to thank you and thank you on your leadership on this. And Mr. Mayor, this has been a long time coming. We have been dealing with this issue for many decades and I know that, you know, in another life I was advocating for this very thing so I am very excited to see that we are now moving forward and as we grow as a city that we're going to be able to provide the citizens of Winnipeg with the money that they are needing to fund some of these infrastructure deficits that we have. So I just want to thank you for that. Thanks.

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

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise to support both the amendments and the main clause and I want to thank…have an opportunity to put a few records…few remarks on the record, starting with thanking Mayor Bowman for really starting this conversation and his leadership on the file. You know, existing taxpayers...the Hemson report has proven, Madam Speaker, that growth doesn't pay for growth. I believe that growth should pay for growth. This is a conversation the Mayor started and it's great to see so many councillors supporting this direction. I want to thank Councillor Orlikow. You know, we heard a lot of folks congratulating him. I was just asking him if he's going to be involved going forward in terms of the working group. He probably is, so congratulations to Councillor Orlikow and best of luck moving forward. And I wish you well and I want to encourage you in your leadership, the great leadership that you have shown, Councillor Orlikow on this file and wish you well and many colleagues are here behind you on this. I'm certainly looking forward to dialoguing with the working group and with Councillor Orlikow and the industry and Winnipeggers as we move forward on this file. So, here to support the clause and the amendments. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Close on the motion? The Amendments?

Madam Speaker: The motions, that's right.

Councillor Orlikow: Sorry what?

Madam Speaker: On your motions.

Councillor Orlikow: On the motions, but not the clause. No, again, I understand...I just want to reiterate the map…the amendments on the map, again, it's kind of like when the public service hears something and they are pointed it out, it's not, again, in their role and their duty is to deal with it. They can't...maybe there is no political direction to tell them not to look at it. We have legal issues that are pending. Hopefully, they are not but again we have been threatened by that. So the Planning Department has to be the sole arbitrator on the map and it stays within our policy which is new communities and emerging neighbourhoods with secondary plans. That is the policy. So when it is brought up to their attention, they have to deal with it either in a yes answer that it can be removed or a yes answer it should be included. And again, that is a part of the process. It is not…the Planning Department's responsibility because this is, as it's been alluded to by some people, this is a planning exercise. This is to look at how we grow as a city. So that…I just want to be very clear about that. Of course I would have preferred to have even less in the map but again, once we decide…once the Planning Department decided what the policy would be and how we would structure it, councillors…again, there was some councillors, I'm not going to reiterate, that tried to have precincts taken out to say, I don't want that precinct R in there, again, that's fine but then you have to get rid of all precincts. You can't just pick your own. We've had other councillors who wish to exempt certain properties. Again, if they met with the Planning Department, the Planning Department again…and really, thank you to the councillors who didn't get their way, did come out and thank me for explaining why and they actually were okay. I still wish I could have my way, but again, it's fair to all. Again, the Planning Department is the one who does that. And there will be, again, as we go through with the structure map, there may be what side a street it goes forward and again, through the working committee and the appeals process, we will be able to look at those as we work through it, but to think that we're going to get it 100 percent right off the bat, the first time, I think that's a little naïve to say the least. But again, we have processes in place. So that's on No. 1 and No. 2. I think it's self-explanatory, No. 2. Again I thank Councillor Wyatt. We told you after the EPC meeting that we continue…I would continue to listen throughout, maybe some people wish I didn't listen anymore and did not incorporate any changes because that makes it look sloppy. But again, I was committed to the fact that this is a process going forward and will continue to listen. So that's…again, came out of that listening sessions and so the motions here are really, it's trying to provide some certainty in the marketplace that….again, it's a trust issue. So we've now dealt with one issue, the 5 percent cap and then the other is and I agree when we are looking at projects, I have my issue, we all have our own ideas of where the money will go. We all probably want it for ourselves, that's just the nature of the beast. And I think the development community would want it for themselves and make sure it had the most benefit for them and citizens only want it for themselves. But again, we're not going to…we're going to have a process in place. We have three steps in that process to start getting through those project ideas, but again if we don't have an impact fee, we have no projects. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to close on the main item.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker and I do thank all members of Council for their remarks today. Madam Speaker, we need to be building Winnipeg for the future today. It's not about building our city for us or for this council. It's about making a decision today that will help us put us on track to build a city for our kids and our kids' kids. We need to ensure the critical infrastructure that they need 20 years from now when we are 1 million people strong, is there when they need it. Before us today is a plan to phase in over three years, a tool that will help us manage our growth and grow our city for the future. Over the next three years, there will be much more consultation and collaboration needed building on the consultation that has occurred over the last year. And I look forward over the next three years to further refining this tool in a way that makes it work for Winnipeg. We know delay for delay's sake only pushes the tough decisions on to others and I think that's the easy path. That only puts our city further behind other cities who already invest significantly more infrastructure per capita than we do here in the City of Winnipeg. I will be supporting this plan and I encourage other councillors to support it as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: We will now be voting on the motions first in reverse order. Yes, Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Recorded vote on all three, please.

Madam Speaker: Sure. Call for a recorded vote. We are now voting on Motion No. 2, all in favour, please rise.
A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Gillingham, Lukes and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 13, Nays 3.

Madam Speaker: Motion 2 passes. On to Motion 1 before us, call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Eadie, Gerbasi, Gilroy, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan and Wyatt

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Dobson, Gillingham, Lukes, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 6.

Madam Speaker: Motion 1 passes. I will call the question on the main item as amended. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Eadie, Gerbasi, Gilroy, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan and Wyatt

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Dobson, Gillingham, Lukes, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 6.

Madam Speaker: Item No. 5, Implementation of Impact Fee passes. We'll now deal with the Notice of Motion from Councillor Dobson and seconded by Councillor Wyatt. It was brought forward last Council meeting. Councillor Dobson, this is your opportunity to introduce your motion.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTION

Moved by Councillor Dobson,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS the principles of open and transparent government dictate that access to information must be provided in a timely manner;
AND WHEREAS members of Council often have difficulty obtaining information from the Public Service;

AND WHEREAS there is a lack of accountability for not responding to Councillor inquiries;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg Charter grants the Executive Policy Committee the jurisdiction to supervise the Chief Administrative Officer as well as recommend to Council individuals for appointment as statutory officers, and where necessary or appropriate, the suspension or dismissal of statutory officers;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg Organizational By-law No. 7100/97 be amended so as to provide for a dual reporting relationship of Department Heads to both the Chief Administrative Officer and the Standing Committees, in order to provide for better information sharing.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg Organizational By-law No. 7100/97 be further amended to grant Standing Committees the authority to recommend to Council individuals for appointment as Department Heads, and where necessary or appropriate, the suspension or dismissal of a Department Head.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Solicitor/ Director of Legal Services be directed to submit within 30 days to Council, the appropriate amendments to the City of Winnipeg Organizational By-law No. 7100/97, to reflect the intent of the above.

Councillor Dobson: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First, I would like to thank my seconder, Councillor Wyatt who understands the importance of this motion going forward. With this motion, the days of secrecy and the privileged few are over. This city and the politicians in this city have been promoting openness and transparency for the last couple of years. And yet in reality, we have restricted access to the information from the departments. Only a privileged few have that access and it is not shared with councillors until the last minute. There is no excuse for this and certainly not now in our current fiscal climate. And yet it is happening now that we would allow something like this to continue is absurd. My motion speaks to a duel reporting structure. Currently the department heads report to the CAO who reports to the Mayor. With this motion the department heads would report to the CAO and the relevant standing committees and then the CAO would report to the Mayor. In this way, the standing committees would be kept up-to-date on any issues and/or developments within each department. By doing this, each committee would have a firm grasp on what is happening in each department and would be in a position to assist on the issues and reports coming out of those departments. Our current structure that does not include the standing committees does not work. This motion I have put forward will stop this crazy process and force a steady flow of information to the councillors that oversee each department. It will remove some of the secrecy that has plagued City Hall and will result in councillors having a better understanding of each department. All councillors including those on EPC will benefit from this increased level of information that this motion proposes. Many of the long-term councillors in this room here today have complained bitterly in the past on this very same subject. For those councillors and all the new councillors as well, you now have an opportunity to set this right. My motion also speaks to giving power to recommend to Council individuals for appointment as department heads or when necessary or appropriate the suspension or dismissal of a department head. The reason I added this is quite clear. If a department head chooses to ignore the committee's request, then there should be consequences. Currently, the committee doesn't have that power. At the end of the day, the Mayor will still be the one that sets the agendas for each committee. The EPC councillors will still get to see the reports on the agendas long before regular councillors, the difference will be that all councillors will have some knowledge of the report being in the system from the department head meetings. They won't be surprised when they see it and it will be able to make more informed decisions which will benefit all of Winnipeg. Putting it another way, it will be like turning on a light in a dark room. Passing this motion will be a start in changing how we do things here at City Hall. Looking to the future, we can have regular council seminars where each standing committee presents the highlights of what was learned from their department and in this way councillors will increase their knowledge and understanding of all departments in the City and not just the ones that the committee represents. It will promote teamwork, building strong relationships within…with councillors, departments and administration, something that is sadly lacking right now. We are on the verge of something great here at City Hall. Let's not pass up this opportunity. Support the motion and be a part of it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers on the motion? Okay, seeing none. Councillor Dobson, if you wish to close.

Councillor Dobson: Please support it. That's all I can say. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: I will call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Okay, call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Schreyer and Wyatt

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: The motion is defeated. On to another notice of motion moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Eadie, it's regarding a governance and operational review. Councillor Wyatt, this is your opportunity to introduce your motion.

Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS it has nearly been 20 years since the last time the City of Winnipeg conducted a comprehensive review of its governance structure, resulting in the George B. Cuff – Organizational Review and performance Assessment Report of October, 1997;

AND WHEREAS prior to 1997, compressive reviews of City of Winnipeg Governance were undertaken in the 1976 Taraska Report and the 1986 Cherniak Report, therefore ensuring substantial reviews to affect progressive change approximately every 10 years;

AND WHEREAS since the adoption of the "Cuff Report', multiple ad hoc changes have been made to the organizational structure, including the decision to delegate extensive powers to the CAO, which has now directly facilitated changes announced by the CAO on Monday, September 26, 2016;

AND WHEREAS unlike Winnipeg, in most cities in Manitoba and in English Canada, the powers given to the office the Mayor/CAO have not been concentrated to the same extent;

AND WHEREAS the failure of the existing system has been recognized recently, namely with: the adoption by Council in June of 2014 a motion that formally requested of the Province to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter to allow for the direct election of three members of the EPC by City Council and; the 2014 election campaign promise by the present Mayor to have all of the EPC elected directly by Council and; the latest motion moved by Councillor Dobson for improved accountability at the Standing Policy Committees, just to name a few examples;

AND WHEREAS the latest announcement made by the CAO on Monday, September 26, 2016, represents a major departure from the original intent of the last review (Cuff Report), and is best illustrated when comparing the organizational chart adopted by Council in 1997 (Appendix A) to the organizational chart that now exists (Appendix B), fully recognizing that the existing chart has evolved dramatically since 1997 via many ad hoc changes implemented by more than one CAO and/or Council;

AND WHEREAS with the power of the Mayor to appoint the EPC, including his/her ability to then informally influence the election of Speaker and Deputy Speaker, this has promoted a growing sense that the existing governance system can exclude up to 50% of Council in the process of public policy development and decision making;

AND WHEREAS the Office of the Mayor, via the Report Information System, has authority to control all agenda management of the Executive Policy Committee and of every Standing Policy Committee;

AND WHEREAS democracy and accountability seems to have been negatively affected in many areas with the adoption of the Strong Mayor/Strong CAO Model that originated in 1997;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Organizational By-law be amended to allow Council to:

1) Conduct a full, comprehensive and independent civic governance and operational review and performance assessment that will set as its goal an improved civic government in terms of democratic reforms, transparency, openness, and accountability, by directly taking steps to reduce administrative red tape and costs and restore the balance of power between the Office of the Mayor, Councillors and the Public Service via structural changes that will permanently empower the elected Council and the Standing Policy Committees, including but not limited to the following process:

a) To review the adopted George B. Cuff – Organizational Review and Performance Assessment Report of October, 1997, including an analysis of its strengths and weaknesses

b) To review all revisions made to the Organization By-law, including changes to the administrative and political structures since the adoption of the George B. Cuff – Organizational Review and Performance Assessment Report of October, 1997, including an analysis of all strengths and weaknesses

c) To review the powers, roles, responsibilities, budgetary costs/resources and reporting relationships of the:

i) CAO/City Manager model and the senior management team (See Organization Chart, Appendix B), including an analysis of the advantages/strengths, disadvantages/weaknesses, and the best practices with Manitoba Cities and Canadian Cities in English Canada;
ii) Office of the Mayor/Strong Mayor Model, including an analysis of its advantages/strengths, disadvantages/weaknesses, and the best practices with Manitoba Cities and Canadian Cities in English Canada
iii) Executive Policy Committee and that of informal/planning Executive Policy Committee, its legality under existing legislation, and its ability to conduct priority setting/strategic planning and budget formulation and delivery, including an analysis of its advantages/strengths and disadvantages/weaknesses and the best practices with Manitoba Cities and Canadian Cities in English Canada
iv) Office of the City Councillor and Council in general, including an analysis of its advantages/strengths, disadvantages/weaknesses, and the best practices with Manitoba Cities and Canadian Cites in English Canada
v) Standing Policy Committees, including an analysis of its advantages/strengths, disadvantages/weaknesses, the number of Standing Policy Committees and their alignment and the best practices with Manitoba Cities and Canadian Cities in English Canada
vi) Administrative departments, including an analysis of its advantages/strengths, disadvantages/weaknesses, the number of departments and their alignment and the best practices with Manitoba Cities and Canadian Cities in English Canada

d) An analysis of the potential benefits of a Treasury Board or Board of Control within the Civic Government and how this may be applied to ensure the oversight and the effective use of resources for both operational program spending and capital budget project spending

2) Council shall oversee and approve the Terms of Reference, the tendering, hiring, public consultation and reviews of draft and final reports of the full and independent civic governance and operational review and performance assessment, with said final report being submitted to Council for consideration and approval, as outlined in clause 1), within six months as of the approval of this motion.

3) The said final report shall, as outlined in Clause 1 and Clause 2 provide comprehensive recommendations including, but not limited to, all necessary steps that will provide for the systematic structural changes required for the democratic reforms and mandate outlined in all Council By-laws, Procedures, informal or not, Council Policies, Administrative Directives and Provincial Legislation required for the democratic reform of civic governance and to be reported with the said timeline stated in Clause 2

4) A temporary suspension, effective 4:00 p.m., Friday, September 23, 2016 of the CAO's powers to reorganize the administrative structure/organization, and said suspension of said delegated powers shall be in effect until such time as determined by Council.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that resources for said independent civic governance and operational review and performance assessment shall be found from within the existing administrative budgets and that appropriate officers of the Public Service do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to rise and it's my understanding that there will be a mover to refer this matter and I just want to preface that by saying if that's correct that I would support that and welcome that. I don't think this is a up and down vote on this matter. And I want to just…but before that happens I just want to say a couple of things, I want to thank the seconder, Councillor Eadie. I also want to state that if any of the wording and the 'whereas clauses' or 'be it resolved' caused any consternation or concern either on the part of the senior public service or the existing Executive Committee and the Mayor, that was definitely not the intent. I think it's very easy for us to...because we are a level of government which is relatively small compared to the other levels of government and because of the fact that we do not have party systems, we have individuals, it's often to be attributed or taken that it's somehow a personal criticism which is definitely not the case. It's the position, it's the name, it's the office that we're trying to address and the issues therein. And so, I just want to say that if anybody has taken offence, whether it be our senior administration, the CAO, or the Mayor or EPC I apologize because that was definitely not the intent. The intent of this motion was to state that we do need to look at the issue of governance in general. We haven't revisited this in nearly 20 years and I think that's something that I think it's timely to do. And I don't want to get into prescribing...I supported Councillor Dobson, his last motion, and I think Councillor Dobson has, you know, has made some very interesting and very crucial observations. And so, I supported him last motion…in this motion, specifically attempted to prescribe solutions…stay away from attempting to prescribe solutions rather to prescribe a process that would arrive or take us to potential solutions or amendments or changes. And the only thing I would say is this, Madam Speaker, in terms of where we potentially may go or where this may take us is going back to the original City of Winnipeg Charter which was passed by the Manitoba Legislature about 15 years ago and that is referring to the executive system that we have the Executive Committee and I think the intent of the framers of the legislation, the Winnipeg charter which pre-dates...which was pre-dating that was the City of Winnipeg Act. I think the intent was clear. And why I say that is I am quoting from clause...in terms of the charter, 61(2) where it states the size of the Executive Committee. "The size of the Executive Committee, the Mayor shall determine the number of members of the Executive Policy Committee of Council, but the number of the members must be less than 50 percent of the total number of members of Council." And I think the framers of the legislation, what their intent was, was that at never any point, would there be a majority group through legislative powers that could be framed in terms of developing public policy. That I believe is the intent. Now, you could argue that and debate that I suppose, because later on it goes on about the appointment of the presiding officer and the appointment of the deputy presiding officer. But I would take a step further and say that the very fact that even when it speaks to the clauses pertaining to council seminars that council seminars, that a provision is allowing the council seminars however, immediately following the provision, it states this, "Members of Council convene as provided for under subsection 1, referring to council seminars, may not pass a by-law or resolution." In other words, everything has to still come back to an open session of a standing committee or of Council. Decisions cannot be made by a select group or the few who attend a seminar, it has to be back in this Chamber or at a standing committee. So I think the intent was there and I…you know…and the reality is I have had some great conversations and I want to thank members of Council who have come forward and talked to me about this since the motion was...I moved…we moved it as a notice of motion for the very fact to give some thought and discussion and debate. I want to thank members of Council who have come forward, I want to thank a former member of Council who reached out to me and we had a great discussion the other day, former Councillor Jae Eadie, who I have a lot of respect for, and you know, we don't always agree and we didn't agree on the telephone when we were talking but, you know, he has...you know…well, Jay is a strong believer in the strong mayor model, right? And, you know, and he said, well I remember I was there when it wasn't a strong mayor model, right and I don't have that experience. But it was a great conversation and I think this is a discussion that has to happen, because clearly no system…there is no ideal system, let's be frank, there's not an ideal system. But I think we should review the government structure, I think we should look at these issues, I think we need to have them on the table and to stay away from the issues of personality of who is in what role now and what position and what has happened before because that is what I think poisons that discussion and that effort. I want to thank all members of Council for having read their binder over the weekend and the Mayor only received his...I couldn't get into the office and I didn't want to leave it outside because I know somebody would take it because it's really demanded and want…but anyways, so. Everybody has a USB…you know, we are moving on with technology in Transcona, you got a USB chip inside so you're going to have everything. I want to thank the Clerk's office for assembling the Terasca report, the Triniac report, the Cuff report and the motion and the debate from 1997. I just want to…if I may, on a slight personal note on page...you will see in the delegations from 1997, the last delegation in 1997 was a member of this council Chamber who spoke, yours truly. So it's a long time ago and a lot more hair. But anyway, it's something which I have

been passionate about in terms of governance of how our city is run for a long time and I think…I think we can do some good work here and so I would hope that the motion to move forward in terms of the proper referral, it should go to EPC. It should be discussed and some thought given in terms of resources, in terms of process, how this will happen. Cuff of course cannot review Cuff. It's going to be hard to find somebody to do this kind of work because you know, you can get a KPMG, you can get Meyers Norris Penny but, you know, the problem with that is that, that they just don't necessarily have the knowledge or capacity on these types of governance issues. We have to look across the country, we are a big country but in many ways, we are not in terms of this field and that will be a challenge as well. So anyway, I'd like to…those are my comments and thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I would like a motion to refer to EPC, Madam Speaker, ideally so it can be considered within 120 days.

Madam Speaker: We'll vote on a referral to EPC. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: We now have Motion 3. Motion 3 before us, it is a motion from Councillor Dobson, seconded by Councillor Eadie, it's regarding bid processes. It's a notice of motion. It will appear on the next Council agenda. Councillor Dobson, I understand you would like to rescind Motion 3 and replace it with Motion 6, is this correct?

Councillor Dobson: That is correct. I'd like to…we've got the revised version so pulling No. 3 or withdrawing No. 3 would work perfectly.

Madam Speaker: Okay. We'll strike Motion 3, replacing it with Motion 6 and this is an automatic referral to EPC.

Councillor Eadie: I think it's a notice of motion, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay, just a second. Yes, right, I see that now, notice of motion. So it will appear on the agenda of our next meeting which is in November.

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

WHEREAS Council and its Committees must on occasion make decisions in regards to the awarding of Requests for Proposals;

AND WHEREAS these decisions often have critical, long term impacts to the City of Winnipeg, dealing with awarding of multi-year contracts valued at over $5 million;

AND WHEREAS Council and its Committees recently considered a report entitled Award of Contract for Integrated Solid Waste Collection in the City of Winnipeg - Request for Proposal No. 302-2016;

AND WHEREAS this report did not provide any details of what was contained in the various bids received or the unsuccessful bids compared to the recommended bids;

AND WHEREAS while it is important to protect the business information submitted by bidders, it is also important for members of Council to have access to some level of detail on bids in order to make sound, prudent decision that will best benefit citizens;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT all bid opportunity documents provide for the following:

a) That all future bid opportunities issued by the City of Winnipeg incorporate wording that states that Elected Officials may be provided access to information submitted as part of the bid;

b) That Members of Council be granted, upon request and upon having signed an appropriate non-disclosure document, access to the summary of all bids received and access to Materials Management Standard Scoring Matrix, for any bids being decided upon by Council and its Committees.

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

WHEREAS Council and its Committees must on occasion make decisions in regards to the awarding of Solicitations (such as Bid Opportunities and Requests for Proposals);

AND WHEREAS these decisions often have critical, long term impacts to the City of Winnipeg, dealing with awarding of multi-year contracts valued at over $5 million;

AND WHEREAS Council and its Committees recently considered a report entitled Award of Contract for Integrated Solid Waste Collection in the City of Winnipeg - Request for Proposal No. 302-2016;

AND WHEREAS this report did not provide any details of what was contained in the various bids received or the unsuccessful bids compared to the recommended bids;

AND WHEREAS while it is important to protect the business information submitted by bidders, when Council or one of its Committees is the Award Authority it is also important for members of Council to have access to some level of detail on bids in order to make sound, prudent decisions that will best benefit citizens;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT all future Solicitations (such as Bid Opportunities and Requests for Proposals) issued by the City of Winnipeg be amended to incorporate wording to provide for the following:

That when in the role of the Award Authority or a Committee considering an Award Report in the process of being submitted to the Award Authority, Members of Council will, upon request and upon having signed an appropriate non-disclosure document, be granted access to the summary of all bids received and access to Materials Management Standard Scoring Matrix.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Madam Speaker: We'll now move on to by-laws under Executive Policy Committee, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-laws No. 117/2017…sorry, 117/2016 to 120/2016 both inclusive and 127/2016 be read a second time as amended.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 117/2016, By-law No. 118/2016, By-law No. 119/2016, By-law No. 120/2016 and By-law No. 127/2016 as amended.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Just for clarity, can we pull a by-law or do we just vote against it because it's been a motion.

Madam Speaker: We can pull it for a recorded vote if you wish or…what are you asking?

Councillor Gillingham: Yes, please yeah. A recorded vote, please.

Madam Speaker: So that's on the third reading.

Councillor Gillingham: Sure.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks Madam Speaker. I move that By-laws numbered 117/2016 to 120/2016 both inclusive and 127/2016 as amended be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: Okay, are you on the third time, Mr. Mayor?

Councillor Gillingham: Sorry, Madam Speaker, as far as…instead of a standing recorded vote if I could just be recorded in opposition all three times, I'd appreciate that. Sorry yeah, thank you Councillor Eadie, By-law 127/2016.

Madam Speaker: Seven, for the third reading. Okay. And all three readings would like to be recorded in opposition?

Councillor Gillingham: Please.
Madam Speaker: Okay. As Councillor Browaty, Councillor Lukes and myself, Councillor Schreyer. We're going to have to do a recorded vote for each if there is more than three councillors, we do need to have a standing vote. So we will do that to…so we can be recorded in opposition. Okay. All in favour of the second reading? Yes?

Councillor Eadie: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I would like to make a point of order, Madam Speaker. I'm sorry but I just...I've done this quite a bit over my career as I followed former councillor who did it quite often if they were opposed to one particular by-law within a stretch of a number of them that you just simply ask to be recorded in opposition. So…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, if more than three...

Councillor Eadie: Rather than having a standing count.

Madam Speaker: But if more than three members of Council would like to be recorded in opposition…that's right. There is a rule around that, okay? So just so we are following process around here. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Sorry to just extend this and complicate this, but pretty soon I'll call for a motion to go through supper. No…so if we could go back then to the first time around please and so we can start fresh, first reading. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Can you give us your best advice, Mr. Clerk…Mr. Acting Clerk?

Deputy City Clerk: Yes, Madam Speaker. As per section 47(7) of the procedure by-law says when a division takes place on any occasion the votes of up to three members shall be recorded if required by one of its member. However, if more than three members wish to have their vote recorded without taking a recorded vote, the vote shall do…the Clerk shall do so. However, if there is more than three members, which after vote recorded, we do require a recorded vote. The vote has already taken place on the first reading, we have not done it on the second reading.

Madam Speaker: And now the second...the Mayor did say second reading when he got up so we are now on the suspension?

Deputy City Clerk: No, we are on the second reading, we haven't taken the vote yet so you can have a recorded vote on the second reading of the by-law.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so we'll…how about we do the recorded vote on the suspension?

Deputy City Clerk: On the second reading of the by-law.

Madam Speaker: Right, on the second reading?

Deputy City Clerk: You can have a recorded vote on the second reading at this point.

Madam Speaker: So I will call for a recorded vote on the second reading. All in favour, please rise. We're on the second reading, the first one had…the vote's already taken place. We are now on the second reading.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks. Thank you, I just wanted to clarify that.

Madam Speaker: No, just…that's the one that was asked to be pulled, 127. I'll call the question then on By-law No. 117 through 120. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And now a recorded vote on the second reading, all in favour? By-law No. 127/2016. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Eadie, Gerbasi, Gilroy, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan and Wyatt

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Dobson, Gillingham, Lukes, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma
Madam Speaker: Thank you. The vote, Mr. Clerk.

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 6.

Madam Speaker: So the second reading has not passed. We're on to the third reading, Madam Clerk. Sorry…it is, okay. Mr. Mayor, on the third reading.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 117/2000…sorry, 117/2016 to 120/2016 both inclusive and 127/2016 as amended be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all in favour of By-law 117 through to 120/2016. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 117/2016 to 120/2016 both inclusive be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: I'm sorry? Okay, all in favour of suspending the rules for By-law 127/2016 for the third reading, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: All in favour of By-law 127/2018 as amended, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Eadie, Gerbasi, Gilroy, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan and Wyatt

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Dobson, Gillingham, Lukes, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 6. Motion passes.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. On to the next committee, the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works.

Councillor Lukes: Madam Speaker, it brings me great pleasure to bring forward Reports 1 through 4 from our committee meeting on October 4th, 2016.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of Items 2 through 4? Pardon me? Yes, we're letting the Mayor off today for the question period, let's go back to that. Thought we would give you a break, Mr. Mayor. Question period for the Mayor at 2:35 p.m....3:35 p.m. Councillor Gillingham.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker and through you to the Mayor. I have just a question, a follow-up question from actually over a year ago. During the Council meeting of July 2015, I did ask the question about controlling and reducing expenses by setting the strategic targets for the sweep of the Collective Agreements that we do have. We want to ensure that all City employees are paid fairly, but on the other hand, we really have to do our best around this Council Chamber to ensure we're controlling costs for the sake of citizens and rate-payers and tax-payers. And so my question, Madam Speaker, I'll just…I'll just go back to the Council 2015, July 2015, and my comment there was that I have a comment to pose a question, further with Councillor Morantz had mentioned at that time regarding the financial projections of our city and for the tough budgets ahead, I'm wondering, given that we have eight unions and associations that we deal with and given that four of the eight Collective Agreements expire at the end of 2016, and I asked this question a year ago, I'm wondering if there's a comprehensive target set by the Mayor and EPC when it comes to those agreements that is communicated to our negotiators, a comprehensive target or set of targets that will be given well in advance as we negotiate these respective agreements that takes into account our financial projections and (inaudible). Sorry, I think everyone heard that, but the question ultimately, Madam Speaker, to His Worship, through you, is there a target or a set of targets for the Collective Agreements that will help the City control expenses through the future years? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Through you, Madam Speaker, I thank the Councillor for his question. And the one thing I will say is, he absolutely has been consistent on keeping his foot on the gas on this issue and I do want to thank him for that, as well as other Members of Council, who want to ensure that we are going into respective Collective Agreements with greater coordination and greater foresight in terms of managing the hard-earn tax dollars of Winnipeggers that we're entrusted to manage. There has been work that has been undertaken over the last year and that work continues. Executive Policy Committee, who provides the mandate to our negotiators through the CAO has tasked the public service with a long-term strategy as it relates to our collective labour relations strategy. Of course, as we enter each respective Collective Agreement, Madam Speaker, each Collective Agreement needs to be negotiated in good faith with each of our unions, whose the relationship of which is very important to us. Of course, the underlying concern for us, is that we're getting as much value for money out of our unions and making sure that we're respecting tax-payer's dollars in the process.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Through you, Madam Speaker, thank you to the Mayor for that answer. I'm just wondering, my follow-up question then, will there be opportunity for Councillors to communicate with the Mayor, provide the Mayor with some input in regards to those Collective Agreement discussions? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you, thank the Councillor. Absolutely, in fact, I would welcome and invite all Members of Council to provide input through me or directly to our CAO. I would also encourage members to work with our Council Liaison for Labour Relations, in terms of just that dialogue. But in terms of specific recommendations or thoughts of any kind with respect to our Collective Agreements, I would encourage all Members of Council to add their voice. I know, Councillor and I have had some very good and very productive discussions on this and I do want to commend him and thank him for his ongoing commitment to ensuring that we're respecting tax-payer's dollars.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gillingham, anything further? Anyone else, questions for the Mayor? None? Okay, onto the next thing, the Report of Public Works. Councillor Lukes, Infrastructure and Public Works. Councillor Lukes.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED OCTOBER 4, 2016**

Councillor Lukes: Okay, so we're going to do it again? All right. Again, more great pleasure…more great pleasure here in bringing forward four items from our October 4th committee meeting and I present them to you.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Items 1 to Councillor…Report 1. Any other reports? Then, we'll move…Councillor…Items 2, 3 and 4. All those in favour? Any opposed? Carried. Item 1.

Item 1 – Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) and Drones

Madam Deputy Speaker: Councillor Lukes to introduce.

Councillor Lukes: I would like to introduce this report and hear what my Council colleague has to say.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just stood this down because first of all I will call them remote controlled aerial vehicles and drones. I just stood this one down, I appreciate that our administration has been charged to look at regulation at a City level or...and working with the Federal Government. But shortly after the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works had some delegations and moved the report along, lo and behold we heard from the minister responsible at the federal level for this particular act and stuff and, Madam Speaker, what I was concerned about is that they are making changes, they said, where nobody under 14 years old would be allowed to fly these remote controlled aerial vehicles or drones, whatever. So my concern is we heard that you know, like for me, it should be like driving a car. 16 or 18, even we heard presenters at Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works presenters had talked about really 18 and up. I have some real concerns about where the Federal Government is going in regards to this and I hope that as our administration works through this, and…that we be clear that, you know, 16 or 18 is more appropriate if they are going to start to regulate it more, then they have been at…and to be in co-operation with the City and our concerns that we have with these what I would call tools, they can be called toys as well but anyway, I just leave it at that. I just want to say, I do support the report. I just thought it was very interesting that people should hear the differences coming from the federal level versus what we are talking at the City level. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I won't be long with my comments but just to first of all thank Councillor Mayes for seconding this motion and thank the Public Works Department. As well, Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, pardon me, committee who have asked the public service to provide a report within 120 days. And to Councillor Eadie's point, Councillor Eadie is right, since that time and we didn't know it was coming to the timing of it, but since the time of this initial motion Transport Canada has indicated they are going to be reviewing…doing a comprehensive review on the…their unmanned aerial vehicle guidelines and regulations so I think quite frankly, with the 120 day guideline which I thought first was too long, I think in fact it will work in our favour as our public service can track along with the Transport Canada regulators who are reviewing all of these regulations. So, I look forward to our administration's report in due course and thank members of Council for their support on this motion.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Any further speakers? Councillor Lukes to close.

Councillor Lukes: All right, just let me get some of my pile up here. I…yes, I have nothing more to say…I have nothing to say on this. I think this is really…it really reflects interesting times that we are in when we're having motions come forward like this to look at something and having to, you know, to see what will occur with it. And I am looking forward to hearing what we get back from the department. So, thank you.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you. I will call the question then. All those in favour? Any opposed? Carried.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS**

Councillor Lukes: So I'd like to read…

Madam Deputy Speaker: Just one moment. I have… Where is Motion 4? Thank you. Okay, we have Motion 4, which will be an automatic referral. So that will be referred back to committee and next, by-laws.

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

THAT the Public Service be directed to explore and report back by September 2017 on cost sharing options for residents living on gravel roads, based on the cost-sharing pilot project model adopted by Council in November 2013 for gravel lanes. This study will include options for concrete, asphalt and/ or chip sealing of gravel roads.

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

Councillor Lukes: I would like to move that the following By-laws be read a first time; By-law No. 105/2016 and By-law No. 112/2016.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Those in favour? Any opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 105/2016 and By-law No. 112/2016.

Councillor Lukes: I would like to move that By-laws numbered 105 and 112/2016 be read a second time.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Any opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 105/2016 and 112/2016.

Councillor Lukes: I would like to move that the rules be suspended and By-laws numbered 105/2016 and 112/2016 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Any opposed? It's carried. Question period for the Chair of Infrastructure and Public Works. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Madam Deputy Speaker, through you to the Chair, where are we at in terms of, I asked the question at the last Council meeting, in terms of getting tenders out early, in terms of our capital budget?

Councillor Lukes: As I reported last time, the report will be coming forward and my understanding is to this next IRPW Committee meeting, we had requested the department do work on it and my understanding is it will be coming forward to this next committee meeting where we will be able to talk about it and discuss it.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Second question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Is the nature of the report to get work out now or is, which would be timely, because this is November or is the nature of the report to set up a system to do that in the future?

Councillor Lukes: Well, without going into details on the nature of the report, the report is aimed to, a lot of work has been done on the report and a lot of changes have had to occur and by-laws looked at to enable this. So the nature of the report is to get work out sooner and to get it out this year, but we have to wait to see till the report comes forward on Tuesday. Tuesday's meeting, I believe.

Councillor Wyatt: Can we ensure that this report, can it we be reassured the report will be in November to get work out in the middle of the winter in terms of tendering?

Councillor Lukes: Well, that's what I'm hoping for. But like I said, the department's been doing some really detailed work on it. Things have come up that they've had to go back and check, and you know this involves an awful lot of money. We have to make sure that we are, we have the right processes in place. But yet, we have to ensure that we can allow for a little more flexibility in our current processes so there's a lot of work being done on it. I'm expecting to see it at Tuesday's meeting.

Madam Speaker: Further questions for the Chair? Councillor Wyatt, was that you're third question already?

Councillor Wyatt: Yes (inaudible).

Madam Speaker: Okay, no one else? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Recently, the Chair was speaking publicly about downtown active transportation, downtown bike paths and about fast-tracking it. And could you elaborate in terms of what you mean by that and what that means in terms of our existing capital budgets that we've already approved in terms of funding for these different projects?

Councillor Lukes: Sure, I'd love to speak on this. Calgary and Edmonton have recently gone through a process where they've looked at implementing downtown bike lanes in a more expedient manner. Edmonton, in particular, does what Winnipeg does, in that we tie our cycling infrastructure to road upgrades. What we did was we had the folks from Edmonton come out and speak to the department and to do a public open house on sharing best practices and lessons learned on how they, how Calgary in particular, Edmonton is just moving forward on it, but Calgary in particular on how they moved forward on having downtown bike lanes installed in a more rapid rate than what was projected. So what I've asked the department, what I'm going to be asking the department to do is, is can Winnipeg do something like that? We've done extensive consultation and extensive work to identify the roots that would be desirable for a downtown cycling grid. We know that improving by increasing population, people walking, biking downtown, it creates for more exciting downtown. So what we'll be discussing at the Public Works meeting coming up is, if within the existing budget that we have, what would it take to do something like that? I think it's important that we ask the department that we look at what we could or couldn't do and maybe we can't do it, but I also think it's important to have some sort of plan ready that, in case federal funding may become available that we would have a plan to do that. Because I think that many of us would agree, focusing on our downtown and improving the vitality in our downtown and the vibrancy and getting people moving and walking around is an important…important feature of improving a downtown.

Madam Speaker: Question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: And also important feature of improving the downtown, a matter of fact every community we have sidewalks all over the city that are cracked and in terrible condition and you see a lot of the interlocking brick here in the downtown, it's all over the map. We have asphalt covering parts of it because it's so terrible. Are we waiting to do these repairs because of active transportation now? Because we do need to fix these sidewalks now, we can't wait. And the funding is there for a lot of this work. Is it being held up because of the AT work?

Councillor Lukes: (Inaudible) maintenance program to maintain our sidewalks downtown. We are actively doing that. Nothing's being held up because of the active transportation work. I'd have to say, it's been actually increased, we increased funding last year to improve sidewalks so. I'd have to say, absolutely it's being increased because of the focus on active transportation to improve our safety on sidewalks.

Madam Speaker: Final question.

Councillor Wyatt: I'd share the Councillor's view in terms of speeding stuff up on…I'm all in favour of that. But at the same time, with the work being done to speed it up, if that is the intended plan, are we still going to respect the recommendations that came out of the Assiniboine Bike Path Audit, some four, five years ago that strictly spoke to public process and notification and public engagement?

Councillor Lukes: Most certainly we are, and what I will be asking the department is to give us an idea on what type of consultation would be required. I know you did, and I did, and everyone within the City at the time learned an awful lot about that process and have taken a lot from the audit. But by no means is anything going forward on this, we're just having the conversations. So I actually encourage you to come to the next Public Works meeting and offer any guidance and insight. Yes, you are always there anyways. So, correct.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, on to you.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, through you to the Chairperson of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. I…I actually, I've stated that I'm quite concerned that there is no safe path into downtown from the North End, West Kildonan, Riverbend, Rivergrove, so on. However, I am in favour of the expediting and doing the whole grid at once as it's been done in Calgary and is being implemented in Edmonton. I'm just, my question just so the public understands, Madam Speaker, but it's my understanding that when you go to look at this whole grid, you look at replacing, if you're removing parking spaces, you're looking at replacing them elsewhere around the grid so that people still have an ability to attend the businesses and event places that people like to go to. Is that correct, Madam Speaker?

Councillor Lukes: That's absolutely correct. And I want to thank you, Councillor Eadie and Councillor Gillingham for coming to the presentation that we held and for learning and listening to what Calgary did, and what Edmonton is proposing to do. And in fact, Calgary increased parking downtown by as part of this process. So…and I'm very pleased to hear, Councillor Eadie that you are supportive of this concept. So we're going to have a lot more dialogue, I hope on this conversation. It is a progressive approach to moving forward active transportation. It's progressive in the sense

that it's not permanent, it's temporary, and it allows changes to be made and it's probably, in the long run, a more cost effective approach to getting the network right.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: It's my understanding, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, the Bow River in Calgary is one of the main routes that is used to get to the downtown of Calgary and people find it better because they don't have to deal with intersections and it can be fast. Is that correct?

Councillor Lukes: I lived in Calgary many years ago, and the Bow River at that time, the pathway was really popular. But you know, I can't really comment, I haven't been to Calgary lately, so I can't really say if that's still the main route. I think that I'm trying to recall what the presenters said when they came. I know it's a main spine, but there's a lot of main spines, so I can't say if that's the main one for Calgary. But it is very popular for sure.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, in order to just clarify, I believe that cyclist safety is probably more important than opening up Portage and Main. Will you be discussing various ways of moving forward with funding, the whole grid project in the downtown area?

Councillor Lukes: Well, that's what we're going to ask the department to look at within the budget that we have, and we're also going to be speaking with federal representatives on seeing if there's opportunities there. So I have to agree with you on that, Councillor Eadie, on your comments there. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi, you have the floor.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yeah, thanks. I have a question that I wasn't able to be at the thing, and obviously I'm a strong supporter of the downtown cycling network. But I am a little concerned about a comment I heard that was made at the meeting regarding Portage and Main and linking the two issues together that it's either one or the other, was sort of the implication or that there was a, you know and I guess I'm just wondering like where is that coming from? I don't see why we have to take two positive downtown initiatives and pit them against each other and I'm just wondering where, somebody who was there told me that that was stated there and I'm just curious what that was about.

Councillor Lukes: Actually, that came from the conversation of making hard decisions and that how Councillors daily are faced with having to make very hard decisions and prioritize and sometimes it's hard and I will be the absolute very first one to say having spent 15 years as an advocate, not really understanding what happens on this side of the table when it comes to making hard decisions. So I don't think it was a matter of pitting one thing against the other, I think it was really a matter of trying to express to a group who's passionate about everything how sometimes we can't have everything and I think that's where that comment came from.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for the Chair? Okay, seeing none. We'll bring our question period to conclusion. Next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. We have no report, no motions and no by-laws. Any questions for the Chair…for Councillor Morantz? Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: Is the budget balanced?

Councillor Morantz: Madam Speaker, I'm glad my colleague from Transcona asked that question. We will, of course, be tabling a…what will be a third balanced budget that I've been involved in a row. And I think, you know, we don't say enough about that around here that we do balance our budgets unlike other levels of government that don't. Because you know, they are able to borrow to pay salaries for example and other things in their operating budgets. So I'm very excited, we've been going through public consultations, we had two meetings and I think they've been very productive. We're getting lots of good feedback from the public through those meetings. And they're three more this week, in fact. So I'm looking forward to seeing what the results of those are as well. Thank you for the question.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Okay, seeing none, we'll move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. Councillor Mayes on the report dated October 3rd.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT
DATED OCTOBER 3, 2016**

Councillor Mayes: I suspect it brings me somewhat less great pleasure than Councillor Lukes. I had to bring forward the report of standing policy committee dated October 3rd, 2016. I think I've already been advised that No. 3 is to be pulled. So I don't know if No. 1 or 2 may be pulled as well. I jumped…yeah, okay, well Councillor Eadie has indicated that to me…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Basement Flooding Protection Subsidy Program

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Mayes to introduce Item 1.

Councillor Mayes: Largely self-explanatory, I think. The Province has indicated that it is not prepared to continue its cost sharing on this item. Recommendation from committee as well as EPC was to leave in place our $500,000, our being the City's $500,000 and to refer the issue of whether to continue with this program to the 2017 budget which of course, has yet to be debated on…here on the floor of Council. So I look forward to discussion.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I had the opportunity to attend the standing committee meeting and speak to this item. I would like to thank the standing committee for voting to keep the program…referring it, of course, to the budget but voting to keep it alive at least to the share that we were funding at. This program came about after a motion moved by Councillor Browaty to set up this subsidy program. It literally flowed from the rains of May of 2010 when huge sections…or certain parts of the city were hit in a course of an hour over a hundred millimeters of rain falling in some sections of the city causing massive amounts of basement flooding. No sewer…sewer…storm sewer system is designed to handle those kinds of storms. And one of the things that clearly came to our attention was the difference and the impact on homeowners who had proper protections in place, namely, sump pumps and back water valves and so those homes that tended to have sump pumps and back water valves that were able to keep them going where power was not lost and their sump pumps were able to operate, tended to fair better, much better than those who did not have sump pumps and back water valves in place. And so, you know, it's clear that this program has had a great uptake across the city. And I would just mention to members of Council, this does speak directly to the issue of raw sewage going into our river. For a lot of older homes, what is very common is the weeping tiles drain directly into the sanitary line of the…because the system in those older neighbourhoods that combine sewers, one sewer, and the weeping tiles do not drain into a sump pump, they're…and being pumped out into and onto the grass in the yard. They're going directly into the combined sewer systems so when you have heavy rains, when you have major melts and you have the system maxed, they are literally causing a lot of water, unnecessary water into our combined sewers which is directly causing the combined sewers to overflow into the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. So the fact that we can encourage normal homeowners to install sump pumps and back water valves is immeasurable in terms of trying to keep that water out of the combined storm sewer systems. So, it's going to take many years for us to do this, but these small steps do make a difference so I just want to speak to that part of it and thank the committee for keeping this going and hopefully, we can keep it going. I understand the Province is looking at many of their programs and revisiting them. That's understandable. But, you know, it's only a matter of time before we have another major rain event where this matter will hit home again. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers on Item 1? Councillor Mayes to close. I will call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Item 2 – Agreement with the Government of Manitoba regarding financial support for the
4R Winnipeg Depot Project**

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, do you wish to introduce the item?

Councillor Mayes: Wait to see what the comments are.

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

Councillor Wyatt: This is...thank you, Madam Speaker. This is our 4R depots which are an amazing project. You know, the Province decided not to join us in the last project we just talked about which was the sump pump program, but

in this case they are participating with funding to assist. This is the 4R depot which was announced strategic locations throughout our city to have a system of dropping off electronic waste, household hazardous waste, construction materials, all the recycling products that you typically deal with and to create these centres, one in the south, one in the north, east…or northwest, west and one in the east, and this is something which is, I think, been embraced by the public. Residents want to have the opportunity to keep electronic waste out of landfills, they want to have the opportunity to keep household hazardous waste out of the landfills and these depots are crucial to that. So it's great to see the Provincial Government participating in this and the option…looking at going down the road, the immediate participation in terms of Brady, but then talking about Pacific and Panet Road which are the other two sites. So hopefully, we can get those other sites up and operating sooner rather than later because this is a tremendous program in terms of diverting pretty bad waste out of our landfills. So, you know, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Mayes to close.

Councillor Mayes: We do hope to open the second of those 4R depots prior to year end. I would be remised in not…if I did not point out each 4R depot brings 14 CUPE bargaining unit jobs into the mix. So we will be having some discussions on the next item about bargaining unit jobs I'm sure, but it's worth noting that we have created the one out at Brady, we're creating another one with it by the end of this year and then there's plans for a third. So very progressive move by previous council and this council to start creating these depots and look forward to opening the next one within the next 60 days.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, I will call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 3 – Award of Contract for Integrated Solid Waste Collection in the City of Winnipeg – Request for Proposal No. 302-2016

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, do you wish to introduce?

Councillor Mayes: I can promise this will not be brief, Madam Speaker, sadly. A number of things to discuss here. First I want to thank Dave Sauer and Gord Delbridge for presenting today. They have presented a number of times here. I think Gord has stated his concerns with Emterra before and concerns with a number of issues. As I've said before it's not an easy job. I used to work for a union and I know it's not easy to be a collective head of a union. I said once to somebody here, you know, Mike Davidson isn't the sole shareholder of the CUPE Local, he is an elected official like us. So I know Mr. Delbridge has a large constituency of voters himself who he needs to represent to the best of his ability and Mr. Sauer, the same in a different capacity in that he is elected to speak on behalf of a number of unions and he's done that very eloquently here over the years. First thing, this is a change from the previous administration, we were told earlier that there has been no change, this is a change. I know that, because I didn't vote on bringing in Emterra in 2011, there was no vote. As you'll remember Madam Speaker, that was deferred to the administration. They made the choice of who would deliver the service. So to the Mayor's credit, we are dealing with this in a full-on open council. If you don't like it, you don't have to vote for it. But just to be clear, if you don't vote for it, we don't have any motions on what else to do. If you don't vote for it, our hands will largely be tied to either extending Emterra for one year or two years, you heard that discussion earlier today, you heard a number of discussions about Emterra's track record. So, if you don't vote for the proposal that's been worked out in front of us, then our hands really are tied in terms of where we can go. And some people don't like to hear that, but that raises my next point which is this process is well along and it's worth backing it up to talk about that, which is, in February of this year, we first had a discussion. Councillor Eadie and Browaty, not the usual line up, Councillor Eadie and Browaty brought forward a motion that said we should have three zones and not two for an RFP. Didn't say to bring any in-house, didn't say that, said, we should have three zones for an RFP. So we went forward with that motion, that largely got subsumed into…and Mr. Delbridge did appear in April. It's not actually in the minutes, it's in my notes, he did appear in April at the Water Committee to speak to that item and indicated that CUPE would prefer more zones and there used to be more zones. We moved forward from April to May. In May, the RFP comes forward to the Water Committee as well as that motion that says three zones not two. No one appears to speak to the RFP except, ironically, Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Lukes who had certain concerns. But no one raised concerns about bringing the work in-house at that meeting. That was it for the RFP, technically. What moved forward, however, was the Browaty/Eadie motion that said let's go to three zones not two. That went to EPC where no one appeared and then it came here and Mr. Delbridge did appear at that late May Council meeting. At that late May Council meeting, Councillor Eadie pulled that motion and I want to commend Councillor Eadie has been consistent on this, he voted against that motion. No one else raised concerns. No one got up and said I am concerned with the process here that we are embarking on this RFP. A lot of people showed up at committee in October and said I am concerned about the process but that was at the end of the very lengthy, expensive process. So nobody raised those concerns at the Council meeting in May, it's worth pointing that out. Nor did people raise concerns, bring motions, try to amend the RFP in any way over the long arc of months, June, July, August, September, we weren't debating it. There were questions and I'll come back to that in my closing remarks. So, I praise

Councillor Eadie's consistency on this. He did pull it, he did vote against it, I want to give him that. Certainly, he has been consistent on this. But the person who has the longest track record for being consistent is Councillor Gerbasi because if you go all the way back to 2005, you will see her vote against contracting out the second half of the City. If you go even further back to 2004, you can see she votes for the process along with, it wasn't the right wing caucus, it was Dorothy Thomas, Glen Murray and I think 12 or 14 others voted to have a business case analysis of in-house versus contracted out garbage. That came down in 2005, Councillor Gerbasi consistence over that 12 year arc voted against that, she felt the union have made enough moves to keep it in-house. Councillor Wyatt voted against it as well. Councillor Pagtakhan did not, but I'll come back to that as well in my closing remarks. So, I want to highlight, there's been some criticism of me and some criticism of Councillor Gerbasi in voting for what you see in front of you and I want to highlight that Councillor Gerbasi was there in 2005 and voted not to contract out the second half of the work and has been consistent on this throughout to her credit. The…one number that got floated at EPC was well, there was only $200,000 a part in 2005 and it was pure ideology. Well actually, it was $200,000 if you counted in…if you counted in the cost of the keeping people on staff, the carrying costs, that's the word they…transitional cost. So actually, there was still quite a bit of cost between the private and the public model and that and I think is ultimately what led Council by one vote to contract-out the remaining garbage work. So, that takes us forward then in May, we had the Federation of Municipalities, one of the items was talking about in-house garbage and recycle. I talked to some people, I made the determination based on a couple of things; Mr. Delbridge had talked about Ottawa, in his remarks here in May. Councillor Schreyer had asked about it in his questions in June. It had come up at the FCM. A number of reasons to look into the Ottawa model, kept hearing that we haven't done our homework. I don't know, I flew out to Ottawa, had a meeting with the Mayor, the Councillors, CUPE itself and the staff, kind of feel I did my homework and went and pretty thoroughly investigated the Ottawa model. Came back here and thought we should try and pursue that model. A number of people have spoken in favour, a number of people, Lynn Fernandez and others have written pieces in praise of what's being done in Ottawa. So, it's important to just highlight what's been done in Ottawa. It's not simply that the work was brought back in-house, it's a managed competition process in which, over an arc of time some of the work has been brought back in-house. It wasn't 50 percent right away, it wasn't 50 percent right away, it was over a long arc of time. When at about 16 years in, two of the five zones, so if you think of it, Ottawa is gone from one zone, 20 percent to two zones over a fairly long arc of time. A model that interested me, I talked to the Mayor, I talked to Councillor Morantz and some others, I think when I gave them some of the homework that I picked up in Ottawa, they grew interested that phrasing like, this is…we will deliver…they agreed to level of service at the lowest possible cost. The objective of the competitive procurement process is to choose the best value supplier arrangement regardless of whether the supplier is in-house or external service provider. I think the Mayor and ears perked up when I read the other thing from Ottawa, if the in-house bid is to be successful it needs to demonstrate that the team can transition the organization and services in a manner that provides value for money including performance and cost effectiveness. So based on all of that, EPC I think made the decision to go forward with Recommendation 3 that you see before you. Not mentioned in any of the e-mails I got from people saying why are you being anti-union and why are you not doing anything to bring work in-house? Look at Recommendation 3 is all I can say. This is the significant change from what was the policy since 2005. Councillor Gerbasi pointed this out rather clearly at the committee. Recommendation 3 starts us on a new course. It says the public service is in instructed to enter into discussions with CUPE to see if the work can be done at a comparable rate...at a comparable rate to the private sector in which case the work will be brought in-house. This is actually a pretty important change, Madam Speaker. I don't know that the media's picked up on it. I don't know if some of the people who e-mail us have picked up on it. But Councillor Gerbasi picked up on it. It's an important change from where the direction has been since 2005. You heard some comments earlier today about the staff didn't do their due diligence. I can be critical of staff when I think it's appropriate but this is…the staff actually did their job. The staff said, we had these instructions, they went back to 2005, nobody at Council changed it. Nobody at Council changed it when they had the choice in May or June when we had these debates on the RFP. Staff did their job. The staff went ahead and prepared an RFP. Now the staff will have different marching orders if we pass Recommendation 3. I've talked to Moira Geer, she's met with Michael Jack, she's met with others. To quote her, we're ready to go. We're ready to meet next week with CUPE on what's known as the bulky waste contract, that's the next contract that's coming up. It is smaller than these two, but it is a step forward, it's a step in the right direction I would argue. So we have changed the culture a bit here I think with Recommendation 3 and we're ready to go forward with that if it passes today. I will have some more comments after others have spoken, but I think it's important to know that history and that background that people have encouraged us to adopt the Ottawa model. We have done the research. We are taking steps towards implementing the Ottawa model. If they don't like some of the terminology, well it's the model that was recommended. I've had people say well Recommendation 3 is too wishy-washy to which I say, bring forth your proposed amendment that would make it more like Ottawa. And no one has. In fact, I can read you what the Ottawa wording is it's...going to run out of time here in a moment, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. I mean, the wording from the Ottawa model from my homework is the in-house team should invite the early participation and support of the unions and then another sentence about working

with the unions. So I don't think recommendation 3, frankly, is any weaker or more wishy-washy than the in-house team should invite the early participation in support of the unions. We are ready to do that starting next week on the upcoming bulky waste contract. We are not…we have not done that on this. It's not the staff's fault. The staff didn't get the instructions to go forward and work with CUPE. As you know, they did an informal costing and said, it would cost more to do it with in-house labour. Mr. Delbridge quite rightly pointed out, he doesn't have that study in front of him, that's tied up with the whole RFP process. So, we are, I think, moving forward in an important direction here. We're taking advice from the people who have appeared before us like Mr. Delbridge, like Mr. Sauer, like others from organized labour who have said, take a look at what they're doing elsewhere in the country. Take a look at some of the other models. Take a look at Ottawa. I wouldn't have known about it, I don't think, except it was raised here. And so we are…we have done our homework. We are looking at the Ottawa model. We are looking to move progressively here. It wasn't always easy to convince some of my colleagues, but I want commend the Mayor who came here with, you know, a Chamber of Commerce background, not a lot of experience working with organized labour and unions but, you know, he certainly said, look, let's give this a try, they're doing it in Ottawa, let's sit down with CUPE and see if we can come up with something that's roughly comparable. I would finally note, there was a poll out two weeks ago commissioned by CUPE. The second question was at the support of 15, 8 percent of the public saying, if the costs were roughly comparable would you be…would you support having it go public? I think what we are doing is putting that poll out question to life. We're saying we're going to give CUPE a chance to sit down with our staff and see if we can come up with a roughly comparable rate and if so we will bring it in-house. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, the next speaker.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thanks for the chronology. I want to just start off by saying, you know, while a lot of research wasn't done, what was happening in other cities prior to this process getting on forward and I appreciate that we have people like Councillor Schreyer and Councillors Mayes and others who have investigated how the delivery system works in other cities. I…in seconding Councillor Browaty's motion, I didn't know how Ottawa was set up. And so, you know, this research has happened. But what I would like to just start off with, you know, I have been probably the worst critic of Emterra since I didn't vote for the garbage master plan in 2011…2012, something like that. Anyway, I had concerns about different things, but you know, they had supposedly seven months to get ready to collect a new collection system, Madam Speaker. There was a new collection system. It wasn't the old, it was new. And so they had seven months to get up to gear to do the whole city for recycle and almost the whole city for garbage. But actually, it only…they only had four months to start picking up on August 1 where the former old auto bins were in place. So I just want to be clear in that it was a new system. There weren't enough skilled drivers. You know, Emterra, I think they underestimated, they low balled it, I think they made an error on how many crews they needed, but the point being though is just simply, it was a new collection system, new trucks, not enough probably qualified drivers, the skill required to do that. And Madam Speaker, what we need to realize now is this new RFP and moving into the future, it's the same collection system. It's still the same carts. All the carts are distributed. Everybody has the carts, those are there. We had to implement all that in the beginning when Emterra first started their first five year contract. So, I mean, I think they made a lot of errors and of course, they didn't treat their human resources properly because I think they underestimated the cost that it really was and so they low ball bid it and then you had a whole bunch of problems. I don't think that problem exists for them anymore. In the first five years, as we all know, whether the public service does it or the private sector, the taxpayers pay for all the equipment and the facilities required. That's what these private enterprises do and that's what we would have to do. So, you know, we need to remember that. So I just...like, I…you know, I have a problem with the RFP as it's going ahead because...and I don't think it's the end of the world to contract with Emterra...I would first point out a fact, Emterra's contract was expended I think recently for six months so that we could get to this RFP or might it have been four…six months…depends on when you say their first day started August 1st, 2012 or October 1st, 2012. But all is I want to say is that in that regard, Madam Speaker is that...is that Emterra doesn't have to be contracted with for another two years. As a matter of fact, I would say the private industry has said their vehicles last for seven years. If my calculations are correct, once Emterra's contract came up under this current RFP thing, their trucks would be another year and a half before their seven year limit, could be extended. We know that they sent out an offer in case the RFP doesn't go ahead. They have an offer, you don't actually have to agree to that specific offer if this report was to fail, for example, you could ensure, although I don't think they do it any more, they're under such scrutiny, you could ensure that they treat their employees and subcontractors and subcontractor employees, appropriately. They are under great scrutiny, we know that. And they know that. So I want to take that off the plate because you know, that's…that's the way it is and they can deliver it cheaper, actually, and that's because lots of their stuff is pretty well paid for and I'm sure they lost money, Madam Speaker. And they have an ability to deliver this, I think, for cheaper. But now, I want to just say, you know, that the two zones vs. three zones, whatever it is, you know there's, you know comprise and stuff, but we hear Ottawa has five zones. Well, Ottawa is a bigger city than we are. I don't know why we can't have four zones, but who did we...who did the administration tell me...I asked questions at committee. This stuff is not in the report. The reason we went with two zones is because the private sector recommended it. Are these the same private sector who don't like Ottawa? Is that what it is, Madam Speaker? Are these the same…is this the same private sector advice…is that what we're getting? Because I like that Ottawa system, it makes a lot of sense. And there

is time to do it Madam Speaker, I don't get it. But…and then, and then when we look at the fact that prices…we're running diesel trucks. That's what this recommendation is here. These companies are going to run diesel trucks. So my understanding it, diesel puts out a lot more carbon equivalence than natural gas. I don't like, you know, natural gas, it could be fracking, but you could get natural gas renewable as they call it, because I understand the new natural gas equipment, Madam Speaker, actually can use…not to appear…it can use less than, you know 100 percent pure methane gas, natural gas. So, it's kind of interesting how technology changes but the carbon pricing's not tacted in here. As I understand it…as I understand it, I believe, if there's inflationary factors that come into play such as the price of diesel going up, up, up, up, up, up, up…natural gas, you can secure a contract for a much longer period of time. You can keep your costs stable. So, carbon pricing, if it comes in…if we move ahead with these contracts, we, the taxpayers of Winnipeg, will be paying for that, we the taxpayers. And I know we have budgetary issues that we need to deal with going into the future, I understand and I too am actually a frugal person…a frugal person. I want to make sure, Madam Speaker, that we're getting the best price we can to deliver the best service that we can. And so, I am not voting for this. I again will be consistent because I can see that. And while we might argue whether the public service should do it or not, we owe it to the taxpayers of this city to actually do proper due diligence, make sure that we are getting the best prices we can so that, you know, we're not having to go to them for extra. Let's make sure that that's done. I really want to see that that happens. So, for me, and you know if you involve in bringing an Ottawa system after, you know, extending the period of time to come up with a plan, you don't have to give specific instructions, Madam Speaker. Does anybody move extension?

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

Councillor Eadie: So, you know, we can go back and do this. This is not the end of the world, honestly. It's not. Let's do it right. Let's do the best we can for our taxpayers of Winnipeg because while they're paying taxes, they also expect really good service. So…and just a point on Recommendation 3, it's not absolutely clear that it's necessarily going in-house and I just wanted to say to just the Recommendation 3, you know, I appreciate the hard work that it must have been to get that in, I understand that. But, I just wanted to point out that bulky waste isn't just about delivery…you know, different people can deliver services and so on but when it comes to bulky waste, Madam Speaker, there's an automatic referral on our table today, I just want to say, it's totally not associated with this particular thing, that motion is talking about the burning of Elmwood, the burning of the North End, the burning of the West End, that's what that's about. Fire fighters, since I've been elected, fire fighters have been collecting bulk waste out there. Public Works, not solid waste, Public Works has been out there collecting stuff. Parks and Open Spaces are collecting bulky waste, Madam Speaker. So, you know, like, I just want to make it clear that that automatic referral has nothing to do with this motion, has everything to do with…I'm sick and tired of this system for bulky waste not working and all these damn fires in the North End and everywhere and everybody's afraid that their house and garage is going to burn down. Okay. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Dobson, you have the floor.

Councillor Dobson: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is, should we have a price for the cost of doing the work with our own inside workers, I say, yes. But let me be clear, I want the best overall value and price whether we do it with our inside workers or by private outside contractors. So let's have a look at the RFP. It says in the award section of the RFP, B25.2.1, "Without limiting the generality of the B25.2, the City will have no obligation to award a contract where", and I'm going to jump to C, so I don't have to read it all, "the prices are materially in excess of the City's cost to perform the work or significant portion thereof with its own forces." In the standing policy committee on October 3rd, I asked what kind of business case was used to define the price in performing the work with our own forces. The terms preliminary, high level, internal, were used, all sounds good, but what wasn't done is the meaningful discussion with the union representing our inside workers and wages going out seven years, the term of the contract. It means that while the bidders were sharpening their pencils to win this bid, we didn't. We used the outdated data that had no relevance. Our inside workers have been asking for a chance to bring this work back in-house, they have stated that in the papers, at the standing committees, and to individual councillors. They indicated that their numbers would be competitive in price. There are numerous cities across Canada that have brought the work in-house recently and the primary reason was that it saved money. Isn't that what we are here to do today, get the best price and value for our taxpayers? Now, let's get back to the RFP section B25.2.1(c). The clause c is a critical element within this RFP, as it is used as a benchmark to compare inside worker prices against the private bidders. Furthermore, this clause is there to protect Winnipeggers. And it is in our best interests to ensure that it is done with integrity and honesty, and we didn't do it. We had no meaningful discussion nor did we obtain a price from our own inside workers on this contract going out seven years. We have failed the citizens of this city $175 million contract and we didn't even bother to have a meaningful discussion with our inside workers. Assuming a 15 percent profit margin from the private bids, and that may be higher, the price comes in around 150 million without the profit. That's a savings of 25 million which by the way equates to a one-time, 5 percent property tax decrease for everyone in the city. This RFP was a failure and therefore we must stop this process in its tracks and go back out to the market with a revised scope and do it the right way. In conclusion, the evaluation team on this RFP was using benchmarking against a ghost and it's not even Halloween yet. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, next speaker is Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Look, I mean, a lot is being said on this issue over months. I don't care to repeat everything I've talked about since last spring, that would...well, that would literally take hours, and so I just want to get to a few points. Enough's been said. But I do want to say that when we went into this last spring, I went into this in good faith. I went into this, Madam Speaker, thinking that the system in general will show due diligence on this issue for a few reasons. One, it was the general intent of looking for efficiencies across the board. Now, I think, I think Mayor Bowman, two weeks ago, I presented to EPC on this issue and he did clarify, and I do understand it is correct that the 2 percent efficiencies commitment that the administration undertook in all departments was to affect the budget bottom line, our annual budget process. And now I understand that. I didn't...but as the Mayor has also said in the same meeting that we do look for efficiencies in other departments...besides the bottom line. But that the 2 percent mandate specifically was not geared to private contracts. Well, now I see the clarity of that, there's a logic to it, I get it. But I didn't know through two years of being here, I didn't know it had to for the administration to work within the intent of what I thought and what I think Winnipeggers thought was the...was the intent of efficiencies and why the administration was looking for efficiencies and even service cuts, Madam Speaker, or the discussion was there and the administration among citizens, administration and Council in terms of what's the difference between efficiency and a service cut. But I knew on this one, Madam Speaker, we had a winner, because when it comes to garbage contracting, we may not cut services. So if we are going to find efficiencies, it would be without service cuts. This is one that was, to me a consensus issue. I thought it was a consensus issue, Madam Speaker, and not only that, to my comfort, we had clause 25b called award of contract in the RFP that I voted for and that we all voted for. And in the spirit of good will, when I started off as the Labour Liaison…Council Liaison for Labour Relations, I thought this was the issue that well, sort of answer itself, especially after I mentioned it in Council as Councillor Mayes points out, the chronology was after we voted for the RFP, which had the clause, I mentioned the clause in June. And I asked about the clause and actually Councillor Mayes is actually much better at citing these things, some of the good research on the chronology. But one thing we can agree on is throughout this time, when I mentioned it, when I asked about the provision that was included in the RFP, that states, called award of contract, that basically, to paraphrase today, since I have cited it enough, I've quoted it at numerous meetings, that the City doesn't have to award the contract if it's cheaper to do in-house. And, not just cheaper, if it's to the City's advantage to otherwise not award the contract. So, nothing new to anybody, and throughout this entire time, nobody said to me that what I voted for and what I said I voted for and the virtue of it, and my concerns over it, didn't apply to the RFP in terms of whether the City awarded it privately or to in-house. The specific answer to what we are deliberating on now, this dilemma was omitted. So we are talking about due diligence. Well, I thought due diligence is sort of, you know, we'll have…make mistakes, there's miscommunication but the intents there, you deal with the intent, otherwise you are just insulting each other. Recommendation 3 is fascinating, it's all very well. But it doesn't deal with the intent of the virtue of clause 25b in the RFP of the two zone contracts. Because the two zone contracts, what...the reason the city...other cities around Canada has one zone in-house or a sort of spirit of 50/50, not all of them, it could be 20 percent in-house, could be 100 percent in-house, but the spirit of it is that they offset each other, they complement each other, they compete with each other. We learn from it. Recommendation 3 for auxiliary contracts is all very well, but that's not within the spirit of what other cities do, what I've been mentioning, and it is not related to clause 25b. Recommendation 3 for auxiliary contracts doesn't apply to contrary to clause B, that those two zones, both zones don't even have to be privately contracted if they could be done cheaper in-house. So, it seemed obvious to me given no one ever said otherwise despite the comments on this that there was no obligation of the City to explain, express, manifest, to give comfort to Council, report to Council on the relevance of 25b as if it's irrelevant. Why would it be irrelevant? It's consistently in the spirit of what we have been doing all term. No contradiction. So, well, how convenient it is that we can say today, but we didn't have the specific clause to say that they actually have to activate clause 25. I didn't know we had to. So, how convenient is that? But I don't know to who it's convenient, Madam Speaker. We are trying to save money where we can. And…

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

Councillor Schreyer: I understand the two proficiencies…two percent efficiencies mandate does not specifically apply to the garbage contracts. I now understand that. But we are still looking for efficiencies anyway, as His Worship has stated. I can see now that there would be no collective will to really push clause 25 to make the administration act on it because it doesn't affect the bottom line of the annual budget. It's not a direct savings for City Hall. It's a savings for Winnipeggers, but there's no direct correlation. We have a correlation between water rates in the annual budget because we can take a dividend from water rates and put it into the budget, but that does not apply in this case. So, we've got a problem. I can't say that we have shown due diligence but what I can say, as a whole, as a city hall, as a council and administration at this point, but what I can say is if we vote this down and we have time for $200 million contract to look for efficiencies over seven years, then I can go back to my constituents and say we as a city showed due diligence. And I believe that that is our obligation to correct our mistake that took place over the last six months.

And to whatever extent I am inadequate in understanding the process that would omit the revelation that there is no obligation despite clause 25. I want to right that today and we can. Thank you, Madam Speaker.
Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker is Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thanks everyone for their comments. Thanks to our labour colleagues who we have all spent many hours meeting and talking about this one, it's a difficult one. And I would like to point out that I've been a longtime supporter of workers' rights and voted against as Councillor Mayes mentioned the contracting out of the service in 2005. And I believe now as I believed then that we are better off with a portion of the service in-house. I truly believe that. Where the City can maintain some control over the service and address problems that arise and many other reasons. However, the situation now we are in is a difficult one from a practical point of view. Since 2005, there's never been support on Council enough to bring the service back into house, or to take those steps, and given that, the Administration proceeded with a request for proposals as instructed by Council. And the problem that we face now is that we either award this new contract or we extend Emterra's contract for as long as two years while we try to sort things out with contracting out. There are a number of complications with this, legal, as well as other issues that I'm not going to get into all of here. The Emterra contract also brought with it a lot of challenges and it is not as straightforward as it sounds to extend it and be confident that things will work out in terms of the garbage being picked up adequately, and other…many other issues. I'm also not sure that extending that contract is going to make any of us feel like champions of the rights of workers, given the issues we have had with that contract. Ottawa has been talked about a lot in this discussion as a model that Winnipeg should look at. They are now up to 40 percent contracted in. But what happened there, as was pointed out, happened over 16 years and included a renegotiation of the collective agreements with the unions. And it is difficult to go from 0 to 100 quickly once something is completely contracted out. We have been told clearly at the committee that the current cost under our existing labour contracts would be significantly higher than the current RFP by about 10 million or 20 to 25 percent. And given the City's difficult financial challenges, that's not realistic. That's what we have been told by the department. Given Ottawa's experience as Councillor Mayes outlined before, Councillor Mayes was a labour endorsed councillor, went to the Mayor and Executive Policy Committee and his colleagues and managed to convince them to include Clause in the report going to Council. And this would…this clause would have Council endorse taking steps towards contracting in on five other contracts coming up over the next five years. I wouldn't underestimate that clause which has been done, but I wouldn't because it has enough support to pass. It's ready to go and it is actually instructing our staff to work on contracting in for the first time since 2005, and it just strikes me that that's an important step forward. I wanted to also comment on the environmental side of this issue, which is another issue that's been flagged in this discussion and I know it's important to a lot of us here. Compressed natural gas vehicles have been talked about, but in reality, none of the bidders offered that without caveat in the contracts. In other words, none of the bids including Emterra's, committed to this. So it is not a choice about whether to do something for the environment or not, all things being equal, from the information I have. This is an important issue and I believe we need to do more as a city in terms of adopting a sustainable procurement policy, and other issues which are part of what the climate change working group is currently examining. Carbon pricing is coming and we have to deal with that. That was also raised and discussed at the committee. It's our understanding that new taxes can be dealt within the contract as they come up if they weren't there originally, can be worked into that process at that time. And unfortunately, this issue has been framed as an either you are with us or against us situation and I assure you, it is not as black and white as has been portrayed. If the goal is...but the question is, the goal is to contract back in, how do you do it? The reality is, you have to do it gradually over a period of time in a way that you can get enough political support and actual numbers and figures to move ahead with that. And that's what Clause does, it takes the first steps towards that. By voting against this immediate contract, which we are being asked to do by some, it's certainly a protest but I'm not convinced anything will be accomplished by doing that towards getting the service back in-house. I believe that as elected officials, whatever ideologies or beliefs or alliances are, we have a responsibility to ensure that the services provided, that the garbage gets picked up and that our costs are covered. And I don't think we should bend to pressure to increase our real or perceived popularity, however, good that might feel at that brief moment. I can already envision a flyer being sent out listing who voted for privatization and who didn't, because I have seen those comments on social media already and I really think that would be an inaccurate portrayal and I hope that the people doing that consider that. The truth is, that Councillor Mayes with his work on Clause has fought hard to take the first steps in reversing the 2005 decision and beginning to bring the service in. And that's the reason I'm speaking out in a difficult manner with my friends in the crowd to say that, because I think people deserve credit when they do something good, and I think it's a reasonable position to support and I think that my record in standing up for public service has been a pretty strong one. Some of you may recall in the debates over the years I feel proud that an attempt to privatize our entire Water and Waste Department through the ill-fated private utility model was thwarted through those efforts, just to name one example of many. So, I would suggest the best way to move forward is to sit down with our work force and start talking about this. Build support among Council and work with our union to determine how we can best protect and improve public services. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Next speaker is Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Morantz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of approving these contracts today and I just have a few brief comments. But some questions have been raised about efficiencies, for example. And I just want to say, of course, the intent of the whole RFP process is to drive efficiencies. I imagine a day long past when there were no RFPs and contracts might have been awarded for political reasons and that's just not how we do things anymore. We tender projects, people come forward with bids, that drives better pricing. In terms of the debate over whether it should be private or in-house, I was happy to support this, the inclusion of this paragraph, recommendation 3. Only because of you know, from my perspective and I think from all of our perspectives, we want to provide the best service we can at the lowest cost to the taxpayers. Regardless whether that's, the best service at the lowest price, regardless whether it's provided by a private contractor, or provided in-house. That's really what our function is. We shouldn't be paying more for one or the other because of an ideological event. And so I think, you know, it would be fair to say that any service we provide should be viewed through this lens and then if we are doing something in-house now that could be provided at a similar comparable level of service and cost outside, then we should be looking at that, too. And I think that's a debate that we'll be having over many services we provide as we go forward. I'm not quite sure why we are debating this now, though, in terms of the in-house piece, because really, this is the...the RFP has happened. The bids have come in. This is the report. Councillors who are thinking of voting against this now as I understand from whatever just from Councillor Mayes, I mean, some people can stand up and correct me if I'm wrong, many of the councillors who are thinking about voting against this, these agreements supported the RFP process, and it didn't sound like there was nary a word discussed about bringing these in-house at the time. So I'm not sure why we are sitting here now and talking about whether it should be in-house. Again, I'm happy to see Recommendation 3 and perhaps it will prove that it could be provided in-house at a better cost or at a comparable level of service or perhaps it won't. And that's a great discussion to have. But just to wrap up, Madam Speaker, I want to thank Councillor Mayes for…and his committee for the heavy lifting they have done on this. This is a core service we have to provide. It's, what is it about in the end, I note my colleague Councillor Gillingham and I have discussed many, many times, what is the appropriate role of civic government. I don't think anyone could argue that this is in the top 2 or 3. And so, this is a huge responsibility. I think given the RFP process, our public services found...explored best alternatives it can and you know, that in itself as I said drives efficiencies and lower costs. So, happy to vote for Recommendation 3, I think it's a good starting point, and again, I think really we should be looking at viewing really all services through this lens, whether they could be provided in-house or not in-house. Thank you, those were my comments.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker and I first want to thank Councillor Mayes for his opening comments. He supplied a very exhaustive and helpful background to this matter. Madam Speaker, I'm certainly given great consideration to the member CUPE's presentation and I appreciate…I did meet with Mr. Sauer, Mr. Dellbridge, and I'm certainly, you know, sympathetic to fair process being given to make the case that possibly could save the City money in solid waste collection. I would echo in fact what Councillor Morantz said more eloquently than I'm about to say it, but ultimately that services are provided to the citizens of Winnipeg and it's up to this council to ensure that good services are provided for the best price, regardless of the provider, whomever that may be, private or an in-house contractor. I'm certainly all for reducing the costs to services for our citizens, and reading through Recommendation No. 3, I'm glad to see it there. Again, there needs to be a fair process, and so if our public service is tasked with communicating with members of CUPE, in regards to determining whether or not they can provide the services or a bid for services in the future for the best price, then that's absolutely discussion that should be had. However, even with the proposed one year extension that was mentioned to the current contract that Emterra is providing, I don't believe the City, someone can correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't believe the City currently has the equipment, the collection vehicles, the staff to provide waste collection service, nor could that be gathered within a year, and though I'm not on the budget working group, I am almost certain that the City...the City's 2017 proposed operating capital budgets could not absorb the costs that would be needed to provide the garbage collection service within the next year. I confess that I'm influenced today by Councillor Mayes and Councillor Gerbasi's arguments, their thoughtful approach to this and so ultimately, after a lot of consideration, I will be supporting this motion today.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. I too want to that all members of Council and of course our committee chair, Councillor Mayes for his work on this matter. I think Councillor Morantz' comments were very instructive in putting into context today's discussion and debate. City Council has previously provided direction to our public service which was followed. We instructed the public service to commence with an RFP process, that RFP process has been undertaken in accordance with our asset management rules and a recommendation has come forward with, in the administrative report that involves two separate multi-year contracts; a contract for Area 1 and a contract for Area 2. These are obviously very important contracts. Days before the public service provided their recommendation that we see here. Councillor Mayes I know and I had been contacted by Gord Delbridge from CUPE, welcomed the contact, I've always welcomed the discussions that I've had with him during his new term and his position as well as mine. And we

had a discussion in addition to the discussion that he had had with Councillor Mayes that has resulted in the inclusion of the...the recommendation in this report. And I want to thank the public service for considering that request and putting it in the administrative report. As the public and all members of Council can see, it does provide a basis upon which there will be ongoing dialogue for future contracts with CUPE. And I think that that's a positive step and one that, for those that want to ensure, like I, that we have as constructive a dialogue as possible with such an important stakeholder as CUPE, this is a positive step. Also, it's important for us and should be important for all members of this council that obviously we are looking out for the long-term best interests of taxpayers across the city, and not just, you know, those that may have supported respective campaign efforts, and I know that is not the case here in this Chamber today, which I think all citizens should be pleased to see being demonstrated. You know, this provides a fair way of moving forward to continue to strengthen that relationship. It also ensures that we make decisions here in this Chamber that we are entrusted to make. The process that's been followed has been appropriate. It's been open, it's been transparent, and delay for the purposes as contemplated in today's discussion, I believe puts at risk taxpayers bottom line interests. So I'll be supporting this report and I would ask my Council colleagues to consider doing the same. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll start off by saying that I will be supporting the report before us today, but I have to say I am completely and totally and utterly underwhelmed by the work of the public service in this particular process. Where were the opportunities to save some costs here? Both in terms of finding ways to reduce, you know, in the spirit of our waste minimization policy, as well as trying to protect taxpayers and ratepayers in the City of Winnipeg. A number of procedural factors are simply dumb. The expiry, the new contract is going to start on October 1st of next year. The greatest volume and the greatest complaints we have are at the peak of yard waste season. You were putting a new system and a new company with new gear and new staff and everything into effect at the absolute busiest time of year, dumb. The previous contract was five years with the option of one or two year extension. According to comments made by our staff, that opportunity was never pursued. That could have been an opportunity to save taxpayers and ratepayers money. We have opportunities to extend contracts. I mean, yes, Emterra has had some workers...or workers...worker right...what's the right language? There were some issues with some of their compliance with workplace health and safety rules. Unexcusable and they should be prosecuted and persecuted to the fullest extent allowed. But again, within that framework, as long as they are following the laws of Manitoba, we should be taking advantage of the best opportunities and pricing for residents. Councillor Eadie brought up some very valid questions about the number of areas. Why did we go to two? I'm not convinced that, you know, going to the market, asking the people who are supplying the service are the best people to be providing opinions on that. Councillor Eadie was I think actually right on that track. I mean, waste minimization program here in the city has really dramatically increased the price of solid waste pickup in our community. Back when I started on Council, I went and visited with the manager of solid waste at the time, I think it was Darryl Drohomerski, the cost in Winnipeg for solid waste services in its entirety was somewhere in the neighbourhood of about $80 per household per year. By comparison, the City...I mean, everybody is using, you know, some examples where CUPE has done some really great partnerships, and I'm more than open to looking at finding partnerships, whether it's with other private sectors or the public sector or whatever the model is. You are talking about some very positive things that have happened in places like Ottawa. In Edmonton, going back to 2008, or 2007, the cost of solid waste pickup was $240 per household, approximately, almost three times what it was here in Winnipeg. But we are going down that road. We're going to be...you know, if we keep adopting all of these fancy waste programs, we're going to be spending hundreds of dollars to haul your garbage away for something that we were doing not too many years ago for about $80 a household. Again, I don't care on the delivery model. I think there may be an opportunity if we have multiple zones, let's keep the private sector honest and let's have, you know, CUPE come in and perhaps do one. But we need to make sure that the costs are fully loaded, completely, totally, fully loaded. It needs to include fleet costs, the cost of the capital, the cost of borrowing to get that capital. It has to include management costs, it has to include worker's compensation claims, I mean, doing this type of work outside, some of it still somewhat manual, we've got to make sure we include those things, compared to, you know, using day labour and some of these other things that are currently out there and not responsibility of our taxpayers. So again, fully loaded, let's look at that opportunity. Those are my comments. Again, I'm really disappointed. I don't look forward to October 1st next year when people are putting out their yard waste and a new contractor is figuring out how everything works. I was looking for a lot lower prices. The last contract over the seven year period, we had to pay, we had to amortize the cost of new bins, these rolling carts. It was a big cost…when you look at seven years ago, the cost of manual pickup for the actual versus automated pickup, they're about the same. So we were spending a fair bit of extra money, and now it's what the 50…now $56 a year waste management fee is going towards. We were buying and getting carts for that price. And you know what, I have come to accept the carts, I don't think they are necessarily fair for big and small households, my wife and I, we can be as wasteful as we want because we are never going to fill up these carts whereas if you've got a litter of kids with diapers you're going to fill them up. Again, it's not fair because it doesn't base on the size household. So again, I just…I'm a little disappointed by the lack of opportunities to save money, and the...the lack of initiative showed by the public service in this particular report. Again, we've got lots of great folks working for us

throughout the organization, this is one case where I don't think we were given enough opportunities, enough scenarios to look for savings. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Next speaker is Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this item. I just wanted to say that Item No. 3, I wanted to talk about. I think that's great that Councillor Mayes was able to get this particular clause in here with the Winnipeg Public Service, entered discussions with CUPE. This past June, we had an opportunity, members of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, which was held here in Winnipeg, CUPE hosted a workshop from out-sourced moving back in-house. I attended that workshop. I thought it was fairly informative. They put out a little booklet as well. I had a chance to look through that. Just really quickly, you know, this…we have a climate here at City Hall, Madam Speaker, about innovation, looking at cost savings and this clause here really means something. And just again, I want to thank Councillor Mayes that that's in there. I want to congratulate CUPE for their continuous dialogue and advocacy relative to you know, pushing Council to look at more innovative ways that we can do business and to save money. And this clause I think is a great step in that direction. And thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Okay, seeing none, Councillor Mayes to close.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you for a good debate, heard from almost every member I think. A couple of follow-up comments, I think Councillor Morantz spoke well, he did say nary a word was said in opposition. To be fair to Councillor Eadie, he has certainly been consistent in opposition on this. Though I have to say, only Councillor Eadie has really been consistent in opposition to all this. I have to say to Councillor Browaty and Councillor Schreyer and Councillor Dobson, if you have these concerns about the RFP, bring them up at the start of the RFP. And that's part of the reason I'm reluctant to kill this and go into another RFP process is the very great likelihood we would get to the end of that RFP process and decide well, no, we didn't like that one either, and now that we're at the end, we're just going to scrap that one as well, and the years will drift by. So, I mean...Councillor Dobson did vote for the RFP, he's on that committee in May. Councillor Eadie did not. But I have to say, some of these concerns, with all due respect, really could have been brought forward months ago and at the start of the RFP process instead of waiting till the end. Councillor Schreyer said you know that these…the meetings seemed obvious to him. I have to say in the future, if that's the case, please don't ask me what something means three times as you did at the June Council. With all due respect, if you are taking the position now the meeting was self-evident, I'm not sure why you asked those questions. On a more overall note, it is worth pointing out…I mean the workers of GFL, the workers of Miller can still unionize. CUPE can unionize them, any other union can go in and unionize them. They would be in for a seven year period. That would cover a couple collective agreements so there's nothing that says this is...this work will not be unionized for the duration of the contract. Certainly there's every right that these workers will have as other workers do, governed by the Labour Relations Act to be unionized. The second point I just want to make is Councillor Gerbasi said some kind remarks there, and I do think it's striking that in 2005, Councillor Pagtakhan and Councillor Gerbasi were on the opposite side of that vote. They are both supporting this position today. They are both supporting moving forward with this new initiative that I think is a departure from the previous administration in terms of not even being willing to look at contracting something in. So, we are prepared to embark on that, if we pass this motion. So, I've got...I've got both Councillor Pagtakhan and Councillor Gerbasi on side with the recommendation 3, there must be some value and meaning to it. Thank the Mayor for his comments. This has, this has been a long process. I do think as Councillor Gerbasi said we are taking a step forward here though with Recommendation 3. And I guess I should probably close with the two things. Councillor Eadie spoke pretty eloquently about bulky waste and what it means to him. It would be fair to say to me while you've talked a lot about consistency, it used to be consistent and Ottawa did not start at 0, Ottawa started at 20 percent one zone, and they've gone over a long arc of time to 40 percent. We are being asked to go 0 to 50 in one shot here and we are not going to do that, but I would be supportive of the motion that Councillor Eadie has brought forward that talks about bringing bulky waste in-house. I do think some would argue that's being not consistent with what you are talking about in terms of...in terms of Recommendation 3, but I think there is some value to getting a foot in the door. We've talked about that before here, we've talked about CUPE as in Ottawa being consistent with that model and getting started with getting a foot in the door. So, I appreciate Councillor Eadie has brought forth that motion. Obviously, it means a lot to him and his ward. I know Councillor Pagtakhan has talked to me about bulky waste as well. So we may yet have a debate about the bulky waste contract. It too expires September 30th of next year. It's a much smaller contract and I want commend the staff for saying we are ready to go. You pass this Recommendation 3, we are ready to meet with the union next week, and I know Michael Jack and others have met with more…hear from our staff and are ready to go. Final comment, I guess is…I haven't talked about my own history. So, like Councillor Gerbasi, I received some e-mails, I've received some online critique about stabbing CUPE in the back and being anti-union. Well, I mean, people are welcome…people are very much welcome, quite literally, to come down and say that to my face. But first, they're going to have to look through my photo album, Madam Speaker, and they're going to have to look at my photos from 1988 when I was out with the Committee for Cleaners Rights in Toronto with the Portuguese women who were part of a union there. They're going to have to look at my photos from 1998, when I was a staff member for a union and took the Metro

Toronto Housing Authority security guards out on strike, extremely diverse bargaining unit there. They're going to have to look at some press clippings from about 2008 when I was a labour lawyer in Brandon, working on behalf of some unions there. I seem to remember being out on the picket line in bitter cold at the Vic Inn with the UFCW. Or they could just…there's going to be talk about being out walking the picket line during the last election campaign with the Vista Place strikers. I have to say, I don't remember any of those people who were e-mailing me and saying these things about me. I don't remember them being at any of those events over the past 30 years, from 1988 to now. So they are welcome to come down if they have the nerve and make those accusations to my face, but they're going to have to look at my press clippings and my photo albums, I'm afraid. So like Councillor Gerbasi, I'm pretty proud of my history on the Labour Relations file as well. So, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay. I'll call the question on Item 3. All in favour? Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

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

Deputy City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 6.

Madam Speaker: Item 3 passes. We're now onto a notice of motion moved by Councillor Schreyer and seconded by Councillor Dobson. It's regarding the public hearings for water rate increases. Councillor Schreyer, do you wish to introduce the motion?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT
NOTICE OF MOTION

Moved by Councillor Schreyer,
Seconded by Councillor Dobson,

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

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

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

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

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

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

AND WHEREAS even Manitoba Hydro has been subject to public hearings in recent years, implemented by the Manitoba Public Utilities Board, over Manitoba Hydro's request to raise hydro rates.

AND WHEREAS Councillors' concerns raised on the idea of the Manitoba Public Utilities Board conducting the such hearings was that it undermined the independence of the City Administration to conduct its own business;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council direct the Administration to call public hearings on the proposed Water and Sewer Rate Increases of 2017 and 2018.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, I have spoken with the Clerks about this. In discussion with other councillors, just given the intensity of the day and intensity of debate over budget issues for the season, looking at tabling this until next spring. It's a point of principle for me. It does not need to apply to any specific budget. So that's okay with me. So...

Madam Speaker: So you're moving layover to April of 2017? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have Motion No. 5 in front of us. It is moved by Councillor Eadie, seconded by Councillor Schreyer, regarding bulky waste. It's a referral to…it's an automatic referral to the Water and Waste Committee.

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

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

WHEREAS bulky waste that is dumped into Winnipeg neighbourhoods are a serious fire hazard;

AND WHEREAS over the last several years the exclusive collection of bulky waste contract has failed to keep up to the removal of bulky waste in back lanes, parks and vacant city lots;

AND WHEREAS fire fighters, Public Works staff and neighbourhood groups have had to pick up the bulky waste scattered all over the city, costing extra money over and above the payments to the bulky waste collection contractor;

AND WHEREAS the Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and Environment Committee was told by staff from the Solid Waste Division that the 4R Winnipeg Depots opening in the North and East will not accept bulky waste;

AND WHEREAS there are social enterprises in Winnipeg collecting bulky waste items such as mattresses with no ability to be a part of cleaning up our city under the exclusive bulky waste collection contract;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg Public Service undertake all things necessary to bring the collection of "bulky waste" into the Winnipeg Public Service with enough flexibility to allow environmental efforts from organizations for specific types of bulky waste.

Madam Speaker: We have no motions and no by-laws, any questions for Councillor Mayes? Okay, seeing none. that concludes that committee.

Councillor Mayes: Ten minute break?

Madam Speaker: Is that the will of Council? We have...there's four committees, four committees left. Is it the will of Council to take a ten minute break? Pardon me? Given the hour, I think it's prudent. We can take a ten minute recess. Okay, thank you.

Councillor Orlikow: I guess I would call for a recorded vote.

Madam Speaker: Councillors have been e-mailing me that they do not want to leave the Chamber today. So they want to be here for debate. People have to go to the washroom and such so should we call a recorded vote? Those are the e-mails I'm getting so. All in favour of a ten minute recess, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: We are not having any recess, so let's continue with the meeting. Okay, we have the Standing Policy Committee on Innovation. There was no questions for the Chair so it's Standing Policy Committee on Innovation. Councillor Browaty on the report dated September 23rd.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION
DATED SEPTEMBER 23, 2016

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce report 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. So noted, Mr. Clerk. There are no motions, no by-laws, we'll now have question period for Councillor Browaty. Any questions for the Chair? Councillor Gillingham.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a quick question, I'm just wondering if the Councillor could update us as far as what kind of innovations or how many innovations are coming forward that will make their way to the 2017 budget?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you to the Councillor. We had a very exciting meeting in October. There were some great proposals that came throughout the entire City organization, stuff that's come through, you know, Directors and senior managers in departments as well as stuff that were little more than emails from rank and file employees. I'm pleased to announce, or let you know, that we spent, we invested almost $300,000 of the million dollars allocated for 2016 at the last meeting. There were a number of additional reports that are going through a little bit additional betting that weren't on the agenda at the last meeting and we'll know at the next meeting what's used from '16 and I'm hopeful that the 2017 Capital Budget will have that allocation again.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Okay, seeing none. That concludes our question period under that committee. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Orlikow on the report dated October 11th.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT,
HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED OCTOBER 11, 2016

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Madam Chair. I'm going to move, again, I want to be respectful of Councillor Eadie, so I'm going to assume that he's interested in talking about No. 4. So I'll move 1 to 3. You know what, actually, if you don't mind, I'm just going to move...I'm just going to move…is he here? No.

Madam Speaker: You'll have to move Consent unless someone…a member of Council wants to stand down an item.

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah, so I'll move Consent Items 1 through 7.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all in favour? Okay, all in favour of 1 through 5 and No. 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 6 – Amendment to the Building Communities Initiative II – Phase 2 – St. Norbert Ward Capital Program Budget

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Orlikow, do you wish to introduce the item?

Councillor Orlikow: No, it's a wonderful project. I'd be more than happy to hear from my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I just wanted to rise to comment on this. This has been an interesting project. It's a skateboard park in the ward. And due to a very tragic death of a young boy and his family that lives in the ward, the family raised money to put towards improving and bettering the skateboard park. They worked with the Winnipeg Foundation, they raised private money and they are putting it towards this project. So, you know, it's...it's very heartwarming to see that families want to support our parks and expand on features that we have already put in in memory and I just wanted to make note of this on the record. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Orlikow, do you wish to close?

Councillor Orlikow: I want to maybe have the opportunity for the minutes, for my colleague to come back. I really don't see anything on this item, especially this item. I think this is a wonderful opportunity. Skateboard parks are…it's a nice commemorative. They're wonderful for the neighborhood, so just want to clarify for my colleagues that this isn't additional money from our budget, this is private money. Well, not private money, but they actually raised their own money. The family raised I think about six grand and then they also raised…they have money from I think it's the Winnipeg Foundation. Again, it's just going to enhance the park and our additional commitment of $1 million and it adds to that. So again, it's a wonderful project, and I'm looking forward to seeing how everybody gets to enjoy it in the neighbourhood.

Madam Speaker: Okay. I'll call the question for Item 6. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now move on to by-laws, Councillor Orlikow.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Okay, I'll move By-laws numbered 121 through 122, 123, 124, 125, 126 inclusive for first reading.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 121/2016, By-law No. 122/2016, By-law No. 123/2016, By-law No. 124/2016, By-law No. 125/2016, and By-law No. 126/2016.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, second reading.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd like to move By-laws 121, 122, 123, 124, 125 and 126/2016 for second reading.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 121/2016 to 126/2016.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow on the third reading.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd like to move By-laws...let me get back there, sorry...122 that was the first one...122, 123, 124, 125, and 126/2016 for a third reading and that same be passed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period, any questions for Councillor Orlikow? Seeing none, we'll move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection Community Services and Parks. Councillor Pagtakhan on the report dated October 14th.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED OCTOBER 14, 2016**

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to move Items 1 through 4 as Consent.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. No motions, no by-laws, any questions for the Chair? Councillor Mayes.

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

Councillor Mayes: This may not be appropriately addressed to Councillor Pagtakhan. In some ways, it'd be more appropriately addressed to Councillor Gillingham. But some coverage this week of police enforcing school zones speeding during holidays, which I have to say, was I'd have sped through myself if I were out driving in a zone. The Police Board reports through your committee, is that, is a question on that more appropriately addressed to Councillor Gillingham or to you, Councillor Pagtakhan. It is one of the vagaries of our system that is a very important job, the Police Board Chair, you don't have a question period here. So if I'm out of order, I'm sure Councillor Pagtakhan will rebuke me accordingly.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, I could look to you for direction on that. I believe Councillor Gillingham has the answer. I could get the answer from Councillor Mayes and provide that to him, through Councillor Gillingham. But I'll look through you in terms of how to proceed.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, can Councillor Gillingham answer the question at this time? We have done that in the past. Yeah, if you wish to answer at this time.

Councillor Gillingham: Councillor Pagtakhan. I'll just simply answer, Madam Speaker, by saying I invite any member of Council to bring any concerns or questions either to me, you know, one on one, when it comes to this matter of school zone enforcement on holidays, be glad to have the discussion. And if it's…if you want to…if any member of Council wants to have the discussion in public or asking me questions, certainly there's a process through the Police Board meetings to bring that forward and appear as a delegation to raise that. Some of this is, when it comes to where the…where and the zones are located and I'd have to check, even I don't even know if it's in regards even to the when enforcement happens, some of it is operational decisions that the service really deals with that it's outside the purview of the Police Board, we don't get into operational decisions. Nonetheless, that doesn't mean that discussion can't happen and that questions can't be raised other privately or publicly or both. So I would welcome my colleagues to choose either or both options. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, anything further? Okay.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, always eloquent from Councillor Gillingham that I will bring it up with him separate.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for the Chair? Okay, seeing none, we'll move on the Governance Committee of Council. Councillor Browaty, as a member of the committee, if you could report…move the report on my behalf please.

**REPORT OF THE
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 6, 2016**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to move Reports 1 and 2.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Wyatt, will you move adjournment? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Roll call, Mr…Madam Clerk.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 5:25 p.m.