COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, December 14, 2016

The Council met at 9:54 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 Browaty.

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: We have a first time page joining us today. Please welcome to the Chamber, Avi Mann who attends Garden City Collegiate which is in the Old Kildonan Ward. Thank you so much for joining us today. Mr. Mayor, I understand you have a few announcements this morning.

Mayor Bowman: I do, thank you Madam Speaker and good morning to everyone around the Chamber as well as in the gallery and viewing online. I do have a few remarks to share with Council today. It's been a very busy month, seems like only yesterday we were here. I'm sure everyone here today has lots on their plate both here at City Hall as well as preparing for the holiday season and I want to thank all of my colleagues for the extra time that they have invested over the last few weeks as we considered the 2017 budget. As all of us know, this time often comes at the expense of time with our family and our friends and I just wanted to acknowledge the significant time commitment that all of us are making for the betterment of our city. Madam Speaker, I was pleased at the end of November to once again showcase Winnipeg on the national and international stage by leading a business...leading a delegation to Toronto, together with Economic Development Winnipeg. We were able to meet with leading businesses and organizations in the innovation and technology sectors and identify areas of collaboration that can further grow those sectors here in Winnipeg. We continue to see reports praising the momentum of Winnipeg's innovation, technology and tourism sectors. Winnipeg's innovation and technology sectors continue to grow rapidly and I want to see that growth continue. Our delegation to Toronto not only helps our sectors to continue to grow but also identifies ways that…in which we can collaborate to increase investment here in Winnipeg. We were able to meet with and build relationships with organizations that included IBM and its Smarter Cities Initiative, Mayor John Tory, Johnson and Johnson, the National Angel Capital Organization, Toronto Pearson West Cargo, MaRS which is Toronto's version of our Innovation Alley, and the DMZ at Ryerson University. This is the top ranked university-based incubator in North America. It was a productive trip, Madam Speaker, and I will be continuing my efforts to build Winnipeg's national and international profile and promote our city as a great place to live, to invest and to build a career. Over the last few weeks, I attended and spoke at the annual general meetings of two of business improvement zones as well as the north…Forks North Portage AGM. And these organizations, Madam Speaker, are doing great work for our community. I want to thank the West End BIZ and the Downtown BIZ as well as all of the other Business Improvement Zones across Winnipeg for your partnerships, your passion and your hard work at positive change making. And I certainly appreciate your feedback and it's greatly valued, I believe, by everybody here in this Council Chamber. I learned an incredible amount attending the Forks North Portage AGM. I was in attendance with Councillor Janice Lukes and the Forks North Portage Partnership really has a rich history of being a behind the scenes steward of some of the marquee properties in Winnipeg's downtown. I am very proud of the work the Forks North Portage Partnership has done over the years. They have truly been a catalyst for the renewal of our downtown and based on their plans in the coming years, they show no signs of slowing down. Thank you to the board and the corporation for all of your work over the years. It was an honour to meet and welcome Rick Hanson to Winnipeg earlier this month. Rick is no stranger. As many of you know, he was the first person to break the two hour time record in a wheelchair marathon at the 1984 Olympic Games. He has won 19 wheelchair marathons, three world titles, countless medals at the Pan Am Games and the Paralympic Summer Games and on top of all of that, Madam Speaker, he founded the Rick Hanson Foundation to raise awareness and create a world without barriers for people with disabilities. It was very exciting to learn that Vincent Massey Collegiate was awarded the first ever Rick Hanson Foundation Barrier Buster Grant recognizing the work they have been doing to break down barriers and make their school more accessible for people of all abilities. I was also very pleased to join mayors across Canada in signing the declaration to make Canada fully accessible by the year 2050. This is a powerful statement and it tells Canadians and it tells the world that as a country, we are committed to removing barriers for people with disabilities and by removing barriers in places we work, live and play our entire community and in fact, our community benefits. Madam Speaker,

together with our CAO and other civic leaders, I attended the 7th annual celebration event honouring Indigenous Youth Achievement in Education and Employment Initiative supported by the City of Winnipeg's Indigenous Youth Strategy Oshki Annishinabe Nigaaniwak. As well, together with Premier Brian Pallister and the Manitoba Business Council President and CEO, Don Leitch, I attended the Aboriginal Education Award Celebration. At both of these events, I was able to meet with many different energetic, creative and optimistic young people. It was very empowering and extremely encouraging to see such an incredible group of young people, bright and talented, representing the future of Winnipeg and in fact, the future of our country. Also, this past Monday the City of Winnipeg hosted the annual Shoal Lake Agreement Committee meeting where we reviewed the 2016 annual report of the Shoal Lake Working Group. It was great to host and meet with Minister Clark and Chief Redsky at City Hall and I want to thank Chief Redsky, Minister Clark and our federal partners for continuing the work constructively together on a very important project. The City of Winnipeg has been and continues to be a committed partner with Shoal Lake and other levels of government. And as you know, construction began on the City's portion of Freedom Road in 2015. We have been leading the actual construction of the bridges that are part of a very important project. The Falcon River diversion bridge was completed on June 29th, 2016, and this is a permanent, all weather crossing and it was funded, designed and tendered by the City of Winnipeg. It will be an important link between the future access road and the TransCanada Highway. Detailed design of the second bridge, the aqueduct bridge is under way and construction is expected to begin in 2017. We are certainly in this together and by working together and creatively we can ensure great things for the Shoal Lake community as well as for the people of Winnipeg. Madam Speaker, many of us were able to share a very special moment here at City Hall in early December. Lisa Carson-Walton and Chris Herie, winners of the City of Winnipeg's first civil marriage ceremony contest became the first couple to exchange vows at City Hall on December 2nd. High school sweet hearts, Lisa and Chris shared an incredible story with all of us. They met in 2002 at Transcona Collegiate Institute, connected over a shared love of music and video games and have two beautiful children who were in attendance. Congratulations to both of you. We all have the pleasure of working in a uniquely beautiful building here at City Hall and I am now pleased that couples can have the opportunity to share one of life's most special moments here in this building. In a place that's used to seeing its share of vigorous debate, it's great to also see some more love here at City Hall. On the theme of love, I want to wish all councillors all the very best of the holiday season. I hope everyone is able to enjoy a safe and a Merry Christmas, a Happy Hanukkah, Kwanza and overall enjoyable holiday season with your families and your loved ones and friends. As well, I want to extend holiday greetings to all of our valued City of Winnipeg staff and Winnipeggers across our great city. Please remember to plan ahead, drive safely. Finally, I would like to recognize the hard work and the dedication of our emergency workers and responders and thank them for helping to keep all of us, our loved ones, our friends, our families, safe over the holiday season. Thank you, Madam Speaker, merci, megwich.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

MINUTES

Councillor Allard moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on November 16, 2016 be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I rise to ask to suspend the rules to hear Mr. Dave Sauer on the Water and Waste report, Item No. 1 in support.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of suspension? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Dave Sauer, in support of report No. 1 of the Water and Waste Committee report, Bulky Waste item. Welcome, Mr. Sauer.

Dave Sauer: Thank you very much Councillor Sharma. Well, this is my last presentation today as the President of the Winnipeg Labour Council. I will be moving on in the new year so I will try not to take up too much more of your time. But it has been quite interesting over the last six years to say the least. So, on behalf of the Labour Council 65 union affiliates representing 45,000 workers and we have been around since 1894 with a very long and proud history of our work here in Winnipeg. So, why we believe in bringing bulky waste back in-house? It allows for flexibility. We can deploy staff easier and in a more rapid manner to clean up bulk waste that sometimes lingers in back lanes and parks for a very long time, people who are illegally dumping or not dumping properly. And it's not bound by a private contract. That's the other thing to keep in mind, is we have that flexibility that you can redeploy your staff whereas in a private contract there could be provisions that sort of limit as to what people can and can't do. We don't have to worry about the city's image

being tarnished by employing day laborers from the Indigenous community and exploiting other vulnerable workers. We have stringent health and safety practices here within the City of Winnipeg with our current collection…I guess the collection work that's done. Public safety is also a big issue. We talked about cleaning...I just mentioned cleaning up debris that's left in back lanes, this is a huge fire hazard as I think has been noted numerous times by the Firefighters Union over the years. Accountability is now on you then, rather than on a private contractor. It falls to the elected officials and to the City administration for the bulky waste cleanup which will ultimately lead to a reduction in complaints. So, I think we should move forward with this, and I think it's important to try and bring public services back in-house. We have seen how private contractors have dealt with waste collection over the years and it has not always been very good. I do want to actually end off…just if I can have a little bit of a leeway here, I want to just point out what elected union representatives are. We are elected to do our job. I was elected to do the job that I am doing. Gord Delbridge was elected to do the job that he is doing with CUPE 500. John Callahan was elected with the Amalgamated Transit Union. Michael Robinson was elected with WAPSO. Alex Forest was elected. Mo Sabourin was elected. I do take issue with the word, "union boss" being directed at any elected union representative who is an employee of the City of Winnipeg. And I do want decorum to carry forward when you are talking about elected union representatives. They are elected members and they are workers of this city and they do a very valuable job every single day. So let's be careful with the pejorative terms that are thrown out. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Sauer. Yes? There are no questions when it's a suspension. Is that correct, Mr. Clerk?

Councillor Gerbasi: I just want to make a quick comment if that's okay. If I could have the…

Madam Speaker: Well, let's do a suspension of the rules for questions…comment.

Councillor Gerbasi: So I can make a quick comment.

Madam Speaker: I'm told that that is in order.

Councillor Eadie: I move suspension of the rules.

Madam Speaker: It's for questions not comments. So, would you like to ask a question? Is there a suspension of the rules?

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm going to ask if you are aware of how much...

Madam Speaker: I will call for the suspension. All in favour of the suspension? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Are you aware of how much Council appreciates the amount of work that…and dedication that you put in and your colleagues in the labour movement over the last six...you in particular, over the last six years and your dedication out of the caring for this community. And one thing I wanted to note and make sure that I hope everyone is aware, is your work on the commemorating the 1919 strike anniversary that's coming out, you're working…the labour movement is working with the City and with all sorts of partners to celebrate that important historical anniversary that's coming up. And so, I just wanted to, on behalf of my colleagues, profoundly thank you for your contribution to the debates…many long days of listening to debates and not always the warmest atmosphere. I just want you to know that your work has been greatly appreciated. On behalf of my colleagues, I would like to say that.

Dave Sauer: Thank you, Jenny. Yes, I am aware now. Thank you. Throw the answer out there.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I know this is rather impromptu and perhaps a difficult question to ask because it's a loaded question, but I do have a question for Mr. Sauer and given his time and the experience that he has acquired in his position as President of the Winnipeg Labour Council, what advice he now would give, now that he has had this experience, what advice he would give to his successor and successors.

Dave Sauer: Well, the successor, actually, I will just point her out she is standing in the gallery there, it's Sister Basia Sokal from the Canadian Union of Postal Workers. So my advice would be, you know...and that's a really...thank you for putting me on the spot. I would say, listen. I would say understand how Council works, and try to work with anyone and everyone you can to try and move your issues forward. I operate under an assumption that if you can do seven out of ten and if there's three things that don't work on, well, try to work on seven and it might be a little easier later on to work on those three.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. I would like it remind Council that we are dealing with the item of bulky waste. Councillor Mayes, you are the next speaker.

Councillor Mayes: I think I largely just want to echo what Councillor Gerbasi said that it's been...I have been here five years almost to the day now. I think and you have been here throughout that period. And I just...we appreciate the decorum and the efforts you have put in. Of course I agreed with somebody yesterday in a question and then it was written up that I was harshly criticizing them so I am leery about saying anything that might be taken either way now. So...but just we are trying to get this to the finish line of bulky waste. There has been a lot of talk and thank you for your presentation today. I know it's an issue that's come up. It's an issue that in some wards, is not a big issue but it's certainly...you know, we are trying to get this to the finish line today and to bring the work back in-house is certainly my intent. I've said that at the committee and at EPC and here again today, so we are trying to make it…push this through to bring the work back in-house, but thank you for your efforts and I don't know if that's clearly not a question but I am just trying to echo some of Councillor Gerbasi's comments and I don't know if you have any comment...you'll maybe have seen the amended motion here, I don't know if you have any comments on that. But certainly the intent is to bring the work back in-house.

Dave Sauer: So, do I have any comments on the amendment as it is? I mean, my understanding was that it wouldn't have gone through amended. That at the committee it was voted on, it was voted on at EPC and made its way through. So I would have to do a little bit more deep thinking about what that actually means because, frankly, it did arrive this morning and there is very little sort of notice as to what the amendment would be. I'm sure the intent is there. As I've said previously with the word 'intent' though there is always difficulty in that intent is different than following through and actually doing something. That's where I would have some concern because there has been some instances where I have been down here where intent doesn't always actually follow through on the action. So that's what I would say is a caution, is that if intent is actually meaning follow through, okay. But if that's not it, then we have to be a little bit more cautious.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the delegation? Mr. Sauer, thank you again for your community service and for your input at Council over the years. Good luck with your future endeavours.

Dave Sauer: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: No further delegations today. We will now move on to committee reports. First up, we have Executive Policy Committee. Mr. Mayor on the report dated November 23rd, 2016.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED NOVEMBER 23, 2016

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 5.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on 1, 2 and 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 3 – Mayor's Office Allowance Policy

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

Mayor Bowman: No. I'll first wait to hear from Council.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak to the report. I noted that the Mayor and Executive Policy Committee just decided to receive it as information and after listening to the media scrums and things, it sounds as though this process is on its way...I hope it happens soon. It was originally a motion that comes from the 2013 and then 2014 it was confirmed that the Clerk and the Mayor's office would be working on a Mayor's office allowance policy. And the report...the motion that was moved here listed out a number of particular items that should be considered, but was mentioned it wasn't all inclusive, Madam Speaker. And what I am very concerned about and we see it on the grants page in our budget that we voted on yesterday, there is a section there, what was it, 512 or $513,000 called civic initiatives which is basically controlled by the Mayor's office and I hope that that also will become part of the Mayor's

office allowance policy not part of what we call grants. Even though they might go to grants, I would note that grants that our ward allowances give out to, there is a policy on grants, it says, you know…limitations and so on, Madam Speaker. And...but those are not reported on the grants page in the appendices. So I just want to make sure that what my report was getting at was to cover all bases and to have a work chart, so as you know, our…as you know, Madam Speaker, our office is pretty simple work chart, there's two people; there's a city councillor and there's an executive assistant, basically. Anyway, so, I hope that when they are receiving this as information, I'm going to actually be voting against this report to just receive it as information. I think it should have been a report that will follow through rather than recommending to follow through. But rather than making a comment afterwards that somehow there is a process in place now, Madam Speaker. So...but I am happy there is and I am hoping that there will be one as soon as possible and if it isn't out by the end of the year, Madam Speaker, and we don't see a policy by, you know, the end of 2017 or before, I prefer to see it before, I don't see why not, Madam Speaker, it should...as the governance...as the head of governance, it would be good to see accomplishments achieved through there of the work of councillors and Council. So, I just...I was very disappointed to hear you just decided to accept it as information, throw it in the garbage can when it's a very important thing when we talk about transparency and accountability, because we know that there were issues in the past and people were and are posting all their transactions up to the web. But, there is nobody sitting there categorizing and putting it into a policy framework and actually a report every year, Madam Speaker, like we live up to as councillors of Council. And so, I can't believe, actually, that when we got a new charter for the City of Winnipeg and all these things, that when they are moving on and having all these ward allowance policies, why there isn't a Mayor's office policy…allowance policy been in place since whatever. It should always been one as long as there has been for councillors, Madam Speaker. So...and like I said, whatever does come out, eventually I'm going to be looking to make sure that it includes everything that the Mayor's office has control over. So I am disappointed how EPC treated this report. It was just an honest effort, Madam Speaker, for me to see a motion that I moved and that other councillors had moved in the past to see something like this happen, so that...and we all as councillors and Mayor and so on, we're going to only be around here in the City of Winnipeg for a certain period of time and this is something that will affect and should keep mayors as councillors are, accountable, well into the future. So I leave it at that, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to support the comments made by my colleague. I want to thank him, Councillor Eadie, and thank Councillor Dobson for moving and Councillor Dobson for seconding this motion. There is no doubt that this is long overdue. I do recall, there was a suggestion in the last term by a member of Council who is no longer on this council, to...who was then Finance Chair myself, that potentially we should eliminate the audited requirements of the councillors' allowances because this is costing money. It costs money for the auditor to literally go through every councillor's allowance to audit those statements. And my immediate and quick reaction was absolutely not. It is the one safe guard in place...and not saying that anybody's going to do anything untowards or anything to that effect, but it's a check and balance. It's a safe guard in place to ensure that what we see happening in other jurisdictions, even the challenge that they even still have federally, federally. Members of parliament, their statements, you know I mean…you know, there is no scrutiny there as far as I'm concerned, the type of scrutiny that we have. I think this would be good for the Mayor's office. I think this would be positive for the Mayor's office. You know, I think it would be positive for his staff. I want to thank the Mayor's office for forwarding me in the last month or so, the list of all the employees that he has in his office, employed with him. I have not circulated that. That is his office. If he chooses to circulate that to other members of Council or to the public, that is his choice, but I did ask that question and it was forwarded to me. And I want to reach out via this speech and just say to the members of his office if there is anything that I can assist his office with and his staff with, I would be more than happy to do so. And some of them I know, some of them I don't know. Probably wouldn't recognize actually. But anyway, I would welcome that. And you know, I just believe that this kind of reporting and audit statements from the Mayor's office, I think this is a good step. Frankly, I think it's a first step. I think frankly we should be moving to audit the CAO's office, too and all of the officers of the City but that would be something to follow. This is something which I think clearly is important. I'm glad the Mayor is moving on it. I'm glad EPC is moving on it and I want to thank Councillor Eadie, Councillor Dobson for reminding Council of the commitment made in the past via the fact they've moved this motion. Hopefully, we can get this happening as quickly as possible and hopefully it could be as sweeping and as comprehensive as the audit that every individual member of Council must follow and go through as per their CWA or whatever the name of it is now…okay, the councillors allowance. Thanks very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Look, it's a little uncomfortable that I decide to make comments on this one issue and the only people making comments are people that voted against the budget yesterday. So, I just want to explain and prove that what I am about to say isn't strategic because I'm going to go back to explain what I put on my one and only campaign pamphlet. I only put a few campaign platforms forth on the pamphlet and it's pretty simple. One was openness with government contracts. Two, make use of our existing use of our community centres. Three, give meaningful support to Chief Devon Clunis' call for raising the public consciousness of our community. And of course, put

a greater priority and resources towards fixing our existing infrastructure, primarily our streets and back alleys. And the other one was restore confidence in governance at City Hall. So, we are talking about City Council and City Councillors and the Mayor's office, that's what I put on my pamphlet two years ago. So, I am not being strategic, Madam Speaker, but it's been two years and you know, because this issue had come about before the election, this council is working on this over two years ago, three years ago. And on that basis, Madam Speaker, I am surprised that it's taken...well, it's over two years now. And the fact that Councillor Eadie's motion was taken as information, because there is already something happening, well, I would wish...I would assume, Madam Speaker, that if…that's only being moved as information because something else...we would have more information on what's happening. So, I'm surprised, Madam Speaker, and I don't think anybody should be surprised by my comments, given what I said over two years ago, during the election. We owe it to the City of Winnipeg to be accountable as a city council, all of us. And, I meant it over two years ago and why should I change my mind. So on that basis, I do find that unfortunate that Councillor Eadie's motion was passed for information without, after two years, Madam Speaker, nothing more specific in terms of how we are going forward. And Madam Speaker, remember, this did start in the previous term. So, we are behind and we are not that open and accountable yet on this issue. And that has to change. And presumably...no, I don't know what to say in terms of presumption, Madam Speaker, but it should be soon. Let's face it, thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Yes, I do, Madam Speaker. Firstly, I want to thank through you members of Council for their interest in greater openness and transparency at City Hall. It's a shared interest I believe all members of Council hold. EPC has moved to receive this motion as information as my office has been proactively working with the City Clerk's office to develop a policy and when that's complete, I have...I will...very happy to remind my fellow councillors that my commitment is to make that very public. Expect that it will be...that will be accomplished before the end of this year. And so I am looking forward to getting that out in public. As you know, Madam Speaker, all of my expenses, incurred, are posted to the winnipeg.ca website which aligns with all members of Council, all gifts, regardless of their value are recorded and posted. All meetings that I host in my office are recorded and posted online, something that I continue to encourage my Council colleagues to follow, in doing so, for the accountability that we are speaking about here today. And, of course, as my colleagues are also aware, grants that were traditionally provided from the office of the Mayor years ago, were moved into an open and transparent process through the budget process last year as well, Madam Speaker. I will be happy to let councillors know once we have more to share and I look forward to seeing their meeting schedules as well as gift disclosures, regardless of how those...the value of those gifts, online…having them posted online in the near future. There's other measures that we've been doing, Madam Speaker, at City Hall not just in terms of councillors or Mayor's office but more broadly speaking, things that we have doing to really continue to provide greater openness and transparency for our citizens. Whether that's the monthly proactive posting of capital expenditures regardless of dollar value, whether it's the posting of the employment contracts of our CAO and our auditor, which is unprecedented. And there is many other measures that we have been taking. But, like I said, I am looking forward to making this information available in the near future, that's why this was received as information. I would, again, ask all members of Council to follow my lead and proactively post their meeting schedules online as well as their gift disclosures regardless of value. For those that are watching these proceedings, members of Council and I are only legally required to publicly acknowledge gifts over $250 and I don't think that's good enough. I think any gift that you receive, regardless of the dollar value should be made public and that's something that I have been doing. I am not aware of any member of Council that is proactively doing that and I would once again, encourage all members of Council to follow my lead and make that information available. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I will call the question on Item 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 5, Mr. Clerk.

Item 5 – Review of Performance of the Pedestrian and Cycling Strategies Contract

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

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

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you. I stood this down. This is coming out of a motion...I want to thank EPC and the Mayor for supporting the motion that came forward last September, September the 23rd, 2015. There were two motions at the time. Motion number...there was an item with regards to a review of consultant contracts, employee code of conduct and a review of procurement and contract and subcontract, which I believe is the latter is this report coming back. First of all, I guess I have some concerns that I want to put on the record. First of all, I believe Council and Council motions state and should describe the title of a report. The title though, was changed of this report, by somebody. By the

public service I'm assuming because they are the ones writing the report back or with the support of others. The title was very clear, 'Pedestrian Cycling Strategies Review of Procurement and Contract and Subcontract'. This has now been retitled, 'Review of Performance of Pedestrian and Cycling Strategies Contract'. Well, okay, I guess it sounds the same but it's very confusing to someone who is trying to track this in terms of the DMIS system and ensuring that this is indeed the right report that one is referring to in light of the fact that there were two motions somewhat similar but quite different in many ways. Secondly, I want to note, this is to receive this as information but I want to note a number of things that I think are important to members of Council in terms of this matter. That there was a finding in terms of the audit that was done by the Public Service that...and Legal Services, that they determined, in terms of our subcontracts, not just in terms of this file, but all subcontracts done, procured through the City, that the same rules were not being applied. The same requirements on the contractors were not being actually...there was no safe guard or legal safe guards requiring a contractor to ensure that any subcontractor in the mind of our Legal Department, the wording wasn't tight enough to ensure that they were going to be subject to the same rules. That I think is huge. And it should be noted that this is a report for information which means that's not a council policy, this is administrative directive that this shall be followed. But I'm noting this because that sometimes concerns me, too, that it isn't being made a council policy. Something as substantial as that, and something that has been found in a report, and that the report is coming back for information and then rather than simply say, let's make that council policy so it has to be followed because the administrative directives can be changed. And there is no requirement for an administrative directive to come to this chamber. So you don't know if it's being changed or not our future council will not know if it's being changed. That concerns me as well. But I am stating here for the record, I'm glad that was identified. I'm glad that's being addressed but, you know, in the last number of years we've dealt with a lot of issues with regards to materials management. I like to be safe rather than sorry. I would have preferred to have seen that in the recommendation...in a recommendation, considering the fact I think that's quite substantial. Because frankly, if any of you who have been in business before know business and how it could work, you can...if you get a contract, you could subcontract the entire contract. You could just be the contract administrator. Everybody else could be doing subcontracts for you. That was a huge loophole, clearly, that existed previously. Finally, my last comment on this matter is that it was noted in the report...and I want to just bring attention to it, and that when this issue was going on at the time and we all know it was taking place if…I'll refresh the memories of what I am talking about so I'm not talking in riddles, the…this had to do with the active transportation file and at the time we had hired, there was a sub…a contractor hired and they subcontracted and the subcontractor who was hired, subject to the same rules…should have been subject to the same rules as a contractor, was out, involved tweeting politically on one side or the other on the issue and sometimes tweeting against members of Council. I don't follow Twitter so I really don't care but…but others were, they were contacting me and saying, you know, this is odd. And you know...and it's not right that this should be happening because that's not how we can do business. How can they do business this way? And it's not professional and it was recognized at the time and I want to thank the Mayor and EPC for recognizing that and bringing these motions forward. But it was noted in the report that at the time that when this was taking place, the Public Service, even though it was in the press, even though there was concerns being expressed, even though a member of Council was talking about moving motions and moved motions, nobody in the Public Service contacted the contractor to say, you know, like what's going on? Why is this happening? And there was no explanation, apparently, given by the Public Service why they did not contract the...contact the contractor, who should then have contacted the subcontractor. And that's a concern. So, you know, I realize that we operate sometimes in different worlds, the public service and us, but, you know, we really need to have a way to ensure that as the issue's unfolding, even if you are not a member of EPC and you are raising concerns about a contract that these issues are taking…dealt with seriously and quickly because frankly, I think it reflects on the City. So those are my comments and I will be supporting the report and, but I would have…again, I'm concerned about those...I have laid the issues on the table that I have concerns about and note. And don't really want to see titles and if we are strong recommendations, put them in the report. Put them in the report because frankly, it's far better to have a recommendation than an administrative directive. By the way, the other motion, I met with the auditor about this matter, the other motion which was moved at the same time by EPC, with regards to employee code of conduct, that report is still forthcoming. It's not done yet and should be coming, apparently, early in the new year so thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Schreyer: At this time, I believe I will say a few words in French. It's just that Councillor Wyatt touched on a subject that I believe to be fairly important. He said that the Administration has changed the titles of motions before they return before Council or a standing committee. And I must say that I too have witnessed this. And I must repeat, I must express my concerns about this. All of Council should be aware of this. To be a little more specific, Madam Speaker, last year, for example, Councillor Eadie introduced a motion regarding libraries in the northern sector of Winnipeg, for example, and Madam Speaker, you were also witness to this motion. But at this point, Madam Speaker, I don't

remember exactly what the title of the motion was when we forwarded it to the Administration for a report to be drafted. But I must say, Madam Speaker, that two months later, the title of the motion had been changed by the Administration and I have to say that I was confused at that point, as to the reason for the report, what it was about, what the expectations were for it... until I reviewed it and noted in the decision-making history what the history was and what had originally motivated this motion initiated by Councillor Eadie. And myself, Madam President, I noted that the explanation of the report, the reason for the report and the subject of the motion had been changed. It's not that it had been incorrectly stated by the new title, but it was not the intent of the motion that had been introduced by Mr. Eadie and that had come before the Standing Policy Committee for Protection, Community Services and Parks. At this time, I cannot remember the exact title, Madam Speaker, but it's all there in the minutes. It's permanently on record at City Hall so anyone can verify it. So I must say, Madam Speaker, that it is up to us to be diligent about this sort of thing. That is all I have to say on the matter, but Madam Speaker, it is very important. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Are there any further speakers on this item? Seeing none, I will call the question on Item 5. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 30th, 2016.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 30, 2016

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 4.

Madam Speaker: Okay, one and two have been pulled. I'll call the question on 3 and 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres – 2016-2018 Business Plan

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, do you wish to comment at this time? Okay. Councillor Wyatt, I believe you stood this down.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes. I just wanted to stand it down. I want to thank the Mayor for this report, EPC for the report. The GCWCC reports via EPC, this was something done a number of years ago. There is a number of improvements. I had the honour of attending recently in November, Above and Beyond awards night function put on by the GCWCC with Councillor Gerbasi and myself were there. Councillor Gerbasi representing the Mayor and Council and myself as the councillor for the community, Transcona, and it was great because we...for all of those members of Council who weren't there, we gave awards to all of the volunteers from your community clubs. It was great. It was...I would encourage you if you can go, go next year because it's a terrific function, professionally done, well done, held at a local community centre in the community…in a community. But they honour all the volunteers and each community club nominates volunteers. This used to be called the President's Dinner and they would honour presidents…outgoing presidents but what happened was the outgoing presidents…what's happening, you know, the challenge with volunteers today is that, you know, they don't want people to leave, and so what they were finding is by honouring the presidents, the presidents would then literally retire and there were volunteers retiring and they said we can't…we've got to stop...you know, we don't want folks to go, we want them to stay involved so they turned it around and said let's turn this into the Above and Beyond Dinner or function and awards night and honour the volunteers that we have that are still involved and doing great work. And it was great to be there and to be part of it. I know the year before...and I am reminded of this because he just put up his hand to speak, Councillor Mayes was at the function representing Council and they greatly appreciated that. So you know, it was a great evening and you know, these volunteers do amazing work for our city in terms of our community clubs. It's just really remarkable, their passion, the passion for kids and you know, if you have children and you go to a community centre, you're involved with community centre programming one way or the other, you're really touched by how it makes a difference and really a community centre is that, it's part of our community. The volunteers who give their time and their energy back to our communities, you know, there is no...it's hard to put a number on that. But just to give you an idea, the GCWCC recently attended and spoke at our standing committee and I want to thank Councillor Pagtakhan for facilitating that, Protection Community Services and Parks. And one of the figures stuck with me which they mentioned which was they estimate the volunteer base of the GCWCC in Winnipeg, all of our community clubs, being at 17,000, 17,000 volunteers city wide, it really is remarkable. It's probably one of the largest volunteer-based organizations in this city today. And you know, the amount of time and the commitment that these folks give whether it be coaching or convening or running a hall or volunteering in a canteen or assisting with the ice or setups or you know, whatever it may be, treasurer, secretary, on the board, these are positions which often go

unnoticed or unrecognized. And you know, you are reminded, you know, of that famous line from Kennedy who was very engaged in the idea of volunteerism and encouraging, "Do not ask what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country." The same goes for a city, the same goes for a community. And what can you do for your community? Do not ask what they can do for you. And that's something we always have to remind ourselves, these folks are doing that. They are doing that. They are out there, they are making things happen. I want to thank the president and the vice-presidents of GCWCC, the staff of the GCWCC for all the work they have been doing and I would encourage all members of Council…we supported the function by deferring, keeping the costs down. They will send you a letter next year just a FYI to members of Council in terms of a per capita grant for keeping the costs down for members and volunteers to attend this function. East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee, each councillor kicked in some funds towards it. I would encourage other members and other community committees if when you see the letter...I know we get so many letters and we get so many asks and, you know, it's hard to kind of, you know, differentiate one from the other, but this is a really important one. If you can assist with this function in the future in deferring the costs…because what it does is it makes it possible for folks to attend because they still have the costs of the ticket and it keeps that price down. And so, you know, I think it's great. I want to thank the Mayor. I know he campaigned on strengthening this volunteer base and every volunteer who was there who received an award, received a little package from the Mayor with, you know, different things from the City, in terms of the package, you know, passes to different things and stuff like this. So, it was a way...another way of recognizing these folks. And so, I think it was a great…it's a great organization. One of the ideas...and I will just leave this with EPC and the Mayor that came out of the budget process and actually came out of the meeting that came to the standing committee when GCWCC attended was...and I don't think this is a big issue and it's maybe for the Finance Chair as well, is one of the challenges that GCWCC identified when they spoke to us was the ability to plan. You know, the challenge they have is to write, whether it be strategic plans for a community centre or something maybe which is a little bit more costly which is design plans or functional design plans, you know, let's say a community centre wants to amalgamate with another one, you know, they typically…you need to get some professionals in to help write that and write the plan. Or let's say a community centre wants to expand, you know, a lot of community centres just don't have that extra cash to do that sort of thing. We do have, of course, set up previously, in the last administration, a fund which comes from the Land Dedication Reserve fund, a portion thereof, where a renovation grants are granted to the community centres twice a year. There's two intakes and it's up to $50,000 for renovations. Maybe there is a way to slightly tweak the terms of reference of that fund to allow for planning and functional design. We have moved motions, by the way, at the Standing Committee of Protection and Community Services and Parks so there is some wording around this if you need it. And…but the question is I guess whether or not that fund is being fully tapped. My understanding it is not being fully exhausted every year but maybe I am wrong. But it would be a question of checking. This is the kind of thing where we moved at the last committee to be considered actually in the 2018 budget $100,000 for this type of...city wide. It's not huge dollars but what it does, it really allows our community centres to go to the next level, plan for the future, build for the future, program for the future, and because quite often you know what it's like in our offices we are just so busy doing, it's another thing to be thinking of the future and planning for the future and that's what we've got to help them do as well. So I want to just leave those comments there and thank the chair for making note of them.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. Next, we will hear from Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, largely echo Councillor Wyatt's comments about the value of the group, and also point out that there is a motion that will be referred later today that talks about an issue that's been raised by the GCWCC. The issue they have raised at EPC with...whether they are in debate with the City staff about vehicle insurance and liability insurance and the cost thereof so we'll have a…that will be referred to committee and try and get a report back and my thanks to Mr. McNeil for his work on that and his discussions with the group. And Councillor Wyatt has pointed out that the budget yesterday which some voted against, does extend the program that was begun under the…under Mayor Katz to have a grant of $965,000 a year from the LDR going to the community centres. It's allocated not by councillors but rather by an impartial group. Sometimes we specify certain projects like Seven Oaks but this is a fund that was to expire actually in 2018 and through the work of Councillor Gillingham the fund has been extended into the out years now. If you look at page 290, I think it is of the capital budget you'll see that we are going to keep providing that $965,000 a year in capital expenditures. As Councillor Wyatt said, there may be some…maybe we can use some of that funding to some…fund some of these other needs. We will have to take a look at that. But just to highlight, that was something that wasn't mentioned in the budget yesterday that I am aware of that we did take steps to solidify that grant. I voted for it when it first came in and happy to vote for it again yesterday to continue that commitment to…to some of these older community centres that need the grants. They don't seem like huge amounts but I know…I believe every community centre in my ward has had at least one of these grants. Again, it's not politically determined. It's determined by the administration. So it's a program that I am pleased to see we are carrying on. Councillor Wyatt may be right, it may not be fully taken up and we may be able to use some of those funds for some of these other priorities that the leadership has identified.

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

Mayor Bowman: Yes, I do, thanks Madam Speaker. And I'll echo the comments made by my Council colleagues about the value and importance of volunteers that benefit our community centres as well as our city. This report is, for those watching, is the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres 2016–18 Business Plan and I am happy to support it. I'd also like to voice my appreciation for their efforts to move forward with the creation of a web based central system for community centre volunteers, for greater volunteer recognition as my Council colleague has commented on as well, as well as online cultural sensitivity training for volunteers. So, I applaud them and I thank them for their efforts. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. I will call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk Item 2.

Item 2 – Transcona Business Improvement Zone – Boundary Expansion

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, do you wish to introduce the item? Councillor Wyatt, you have the floor.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to rise…and this is an item that we have been working on for some time, being the Transcona Business Improvement Zone and its board of directors. I want to thank the board of directors, the President, Chris Lang, and all the board members including the former board members who worked on this who are stepping down from the board and the new board members who are stepping up to the board and joining the board in the coming year for all of their work and dedication to our community. The Transcona BIZ does amazing work in the community, supporting community groups, supporting community functions, supporting and enhancing the community. It has over the last number of years seen and supported the revitalization of downtown Transcona, with the Transcona Centennial Square being a major project that they undertook and spearheaded, which is absolutely amazing. They now run the programming out of the Transcona Centennial Square. Every year we have regular evenings of movie nights that take place on a big screen. And the community comes out in droves. It's really remarkable. We have concerts, free concerts, free movies, there is farmer's market taking place, there is craft sales. Right now, there is a winter wonderland in place. This winter...last year, we started putting a skating rink out, we're going to do it again. And you know, it's just amazing what the board of directors does. The Executive Director, Alexandra Morrison, she is absolutely amazing, the work she does, just terrific work. And her staff for…her staff, Jessica and her, and so, you know, there is two of them and they just, you know, go double time and they do great work for the community. And it really is remarkable, you know, what it's done over the years. It doesn't happen overnight. It takes time. But you know, just even going down there, if you go down there, I would encourage members of Council, take the drive, go in the evening actually. Drive in the evening at this time of the year, you can see the Christmas lights, it's absolutely beautiful in the community. And this expansion, by the way, will help enhance that. This expansion is a new area, a growing area which is being facilitated thanks to the fact that we have a joint venture and the joint venture is going to facilitate commercial development. The concern was expressed that the commercial development, new commercial development will potentially affect the old areas, no different than we kind of have that situation with downtown versus suburbia, right, and the concern of downtown being negatively impacted by the suburban malls over the years and so this kind of concern, right. So this was an issue and a concern and so by expanding the boundaries the board of directors made a decision that in the future, subject to kind of the same rules that we have applied for certain things, two-thirds requirement to change it, this sort of thing that the funds coming from that part of the ARV, the rental value revenues coming, the levy, the BIZ levy from that part of the ARV, those funds would be specifically dedicated towards enhancing, renewing, facilitating renewal and keeping the old downtown core strong and healthy. And it may not be a lot, but it may be depending on what kind of commercial and how successful this area...this new boundary is. So, it's really fascinating what you can do with Business Improvement Zones and members of Council may not have them, I would encourage...there was a resistance at the time when the BIZ was being created in the community, it was seen as a new tax and everything, but now you see the value. You know, we used to start to go to annual general meetings and there was always motions being moved to get rid of the BIZ zone and there was brew hahas happening and everything, now, you know, we just had our AGM in November and you know, a lot of the same individuals, business leaders who were there then are there now and I think it's turned a corner because they see the value, in terms of marketing, in terms of promotion, in terms of enhancement, in terms of making the area more viable, it really is remarkable. One of the last things I think we need to do as a city is we need to figure out how to do a policy initiative. It's done in other jurisdictions in Canada. Instead of a BIZ, a Business Improvement Zone, a BRZ, a Business Renewal Zone. BRZs are done in other jurisdictions to try to turn neighbourhoods around...basically, to explain it, they are basically like mini CentreVentures. And you do a mini CentreVenture in an area targeted in area and you do this renewal. It's really remarkable and that's...but you know, that's not what a BIZ's terms of reference is though some businesses have been defacto doing that sort of stuff. But you really need other tools, I think, to be able to facilitate that such as tax increment financing and what not. But nonetheless, BRZs are something which I think there are some older neighbourhoods in the city, business (inaudible) city that could really use a tool and a policy like that. So that's just a thought. But I want to thank the Public Service, Martin Pasieckza for all of his work, with all our Business Improvement Zones, it's really remarkable that he is very supportive of and does tremendous work for all of them. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor? I will call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor, on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated December 7th, 2016.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 7, 2016

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 12. I'd like to pull Reports 1 and 2.

Madam Speaker: Okay. I'll call the question on Item 3 and 4, 7 through 12. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Truth and Reconciliation Calls to Action

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This report is one that I would encourage all members, of course, of Council but all citizens to review. City of Winnipeg has been doing some excellent work over this year of reconciliation, and what I am hoping Winnipeggers will see and hear is how committed this council and our municipal government is at being committed to working to strengthen our relationships between our Indigenous citizens and non-Indigenous citizens. Just because the Year of Reconciliation is coming to a close that doesn't mean that our reconciliation efforts will. Reconciliation efforts will continue in full force for years to come, from the City, with our partners throughout the committee…throughout the community. So many groups are doing such incredibly positive work, grass roots organizations, Indigenous, non-Indigenous, academic institutions, not for profit groups, businesses and unions. Everybody from the vantage point from City Hall of the response that this community has collectively shown during this Year of Reconciliation should make us all very proud to be Winnipeggers. Most recently, our efforts on our end have involved consulting with leaders from the Manitoba's diverse Indigenous communities and other stakeholders regarding the development of an Indigenous Accord which is in development right now and it will be modeled after the City of Thompson's Accord. The Indigenous Advisory's Circle is leading that initiative right now and will be forthcoming for Council's consideration once they have a formal recommendation to provide. We know that the cumulative impact of residential schools is a legacy of unresolved trauma passed from generation to generation and has had a profound effect on the relationship between our Indigenous peoples and other Canadians. This Year of Reconciliation will certainly not wrong all the...will not right all the wrongs of the past, but it does continue our journey. Learning together and recognizing that we are all connected to each other and of course to this land. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to congratulate the Mayor for the attention the Year of Reconciliation has brought to a very dark period of Canadian history and a lot of disappointing things that have happened in our past and surprisingly recent past. I certainly will support the Mayor's reaction to the way the McLean's article was handled and I think that was done hand-in-hand with our Indigenous communities here and I think that was done very appropriately. In regards to the report before us here today, anything that the Mayor can do to put further attention on the issue without incurring cost to the taxpayers, I fully support. However, I am getting concerned that some of these suggestions and implementation of the truth and reconciliation items will incur cost or provide a decreased level of services to Winnipeg citizens. Specifically, under training there is a suggestion that half-day sessions on residential schools be delivered to all civic employees. That would mean, in my mind, that we're going to take away people that cut the grass, people that fill potholes and other important civic services to attend half-day sessions on residential schools. I don't think as an employer that that is a position as a municipal government that that is a level that we need to be going to. Winnipeg already has an absolutely stunning Canadian Museum for Human Rights, internationally awarded, world class Human Rights Museum and I would encourage all Winnipeggers to attend that. But taking away or paying employees overtime to attend this type of training, taking them away from cutting the grass, filling potholes and providing the services we count on, I don't think that that is our position. So again, bringing attention to this matter, I think is very important, very relevant and anything that the Mayor wishes to continue to do to raise this issue is great but where it actually incurs expense I have to draw the line.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, very much Madam Speaker. And I, too, would like to congratulate the Mayor on his very hard work on this issue, his strong leadership on this issue. These are not easy issues. They are not done for

political gain or expediency or. They are done because they are the right thing to do. And they are done out of a belief in making our city better and more inclusive. And I really admire the leadership that's been taken. You don't always get thanked as it was said…good deeds often don't go unpunished. And I really want to congratulate him on this role. I don't know if everyone's aware that our Mayor has also taken a leadership role at the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. He chairs the Big City Mayor's sub-committee on this topic in which mayors from across Canada are working to implement the truth and reconciliation recommendations that apply to the municipal level of government and that's what this report is talking about. The issue of activities of our training for all City staff is one of those five recommendations. And we do have an Indigenous office. We do have staff that exist that their role is to do that kind of work. There is nothing in the report that talks about cost implications, but I honestly think it's...I don't know. It's under the comments earlier of you know being so concerned that we are taking people off of their job for a few hours to learn about this. Sometimes you have to take action. I mean, this is about acting on important recommendations and if we are all talk and no action, you know, it's really not going to change our city. That's what this is about, this is about changing how our City staff and how we, in our city, relate to one another as Indigenous or non-Indigenous or new immigrants or everybody, how we relate to each other. Reconciliation is for all of us and for the tone and the type of inclusive city we create and, you know, I have nothing negative to say about taking action on this. It's hard to imagine how anybody would criticize that because it's really important that we back up our actions…our words with actions. That the TRC recommendations are about action on this, intent is really important and saying nice things but we also need to do things and that's what this report is about and that's what the work that is being done, Councillor Gilroy has been very active with the Mayor's Indigenous Advisory Circle and the Citizen's Equity Committee. There is a lot of things going on and I also want to acknowledge that grass roots of our community, this isn't something that any part of the community can do alone. It's not up to City Council alone, it's up to all of us in this city. And you know, as you can see, labour, the universities have been extremely active on this. Across the city, people are coming together to try to build a more inclusive and peaceful community and deal with the challenges we have. There has also been...I know the Mayor has spent a lot of time working with the Indigenous leaders working with them on the accord and the other volunteers on the committee have worked really, really hard on this. So you know, these aren't the things where you get the big political points and whatever and so I think somebody has to support…you know, we need to speak up and support our mayor in the amount of energy and focus he has put on this as well as all the other work we all do. I think we should be grateful that someone is taking that kind of a leadership stance. And we do have the capacity to do what is in this report. It's being done. You know, and I am honoured to be part of it in any way I can and I think that's the sense I get from the majority…from Council that there is a huge amount of support for it. And you know, I understand if there's some massive cost implication but it says clearly in the report there isn't anyway. But we do have dedicated resources to our Indigenous Office which is a very good move which by the way, Winnipeg has been a leader in this going back to when Mayor Murray was leader and was mayor and he...and had us work on an Indigenous Aboriginal Pathway Strategy. Way back…we were the first city in Canada to do that. And all of these things have built to where we are today. But the leadership of the Mayor today is particularly important and it's a national issue that our colleagues across the country are working on as well and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities is working on across the board as well as, particularly, the Big City Mayor's Caucus as well. So, thank you, Madam Speaker. I just…sometimes, you know, we hear a lot of...we don't always acknowledge the hard work that's being done on important issues like this. It's not always about dollars but it is about action and there is action that is coming further action beyond the Year of Reconciliation. It's just the beginning and yes, the Human Rights Museum is fantastic and it harkens to the fact that Winnipeg is a leader in human rights for people with disabilities, and we need to…we will continue that role as a leader in our city and in the national stage thanks to the leadership of this council and our Mayor. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I, too, rise to thank our Mayor for being a leader in terms of dealing with one of the particular types of racism that we face in the city and there is lots of racism and we can address many of those issues on a day-to-day basis as people…as we operate our offices. And we talked to the residents and people that live in our city of Winnipeg and my office does that all the time but for the Mayor, I think that you know, the...in the way we're moving ahead it's inspired like even neighbourhoods and residents to want to do something to try to come to a reconciliation and understanding that actually this city of Winnipeg had such an impact on the Indigenous people from its inception and before, long before. We have...we the city, we name streets, we acknowledge people through the naming of streets. And I wanted to…one of the things that our mayor leading this initiative has inspired in north Point Douglas is...and you might have read about it in the news. They want to move to name a street and trying not to give people a hard time in terms of where they live and their street addresses but ultimately, they are looking at naming Rover as Migizi...pardon me because somebody said it sounds like I said McGizi but I said, no, no Migizi because there is a lot of British Isle kind of names of streets and former governing people and so on in north Point Douglas. But Migizi is Anishinaabe language for eagle and an elder in north Point Douglas had noticed that there's eagles that sort of fly and looking to…for food to feed their young ones and so on. And so Migizi, as he is watching these eagles…and so Migizi Way, that's where the eagles fly and it's a really good initiative and we as a council and standing committees will be voting and I hope that…I stand in support of it, of that initiative and I think it's important. But what's also very important is

and actually, we employ a number of people of Indigenous decent. Everybody who works for the City of Winnipeg should have an understanding. And I have to agree with spending the money to do training. To understand what the Indigenous people have gone through and it's not just the residential schools, it's the scooping of kids and taking them away, it's loss of identity. I don't know if you have ever been in a place in your lives where you wonder about yourself and your identity, but you know, a lot of that can lead not knowing who you are and having that...a lot of that can lead to many of the things that our public service actually deals with on a day-to-day basis and our Winnipeg Police Board strategic plan and the Winnipeg Police Service totally acknowledge it. They are moving forward in terms of that kind of training. They're also moving forward in employing people as…more people to reflect…actually, not just the Indigenous people but to reflect the faces of Winnipeggers. And I think that's a laudable thing to do. In terms of spending money for people filling potholes, you know, you cannot change a racist perspective unless you go down to the lowest...I shouldn't say it that way...to every level, you gotta go right down to the root level to educate people so that they understand. So that I don't in my office get phone calls...and I'm not going to say the words that I hear and I say to those people, I'm not going to…if you keep talking like that, I'm not serving you. They are people, too. There is no difference between myself and Kevin Chief. Okay, there is no difference. We are human beings. We are all the same, human beings. Racism has no place. And we need to educate everybody and I am okay spending that kind of money for even people filling potholes because everybody needs to have an understanding. After taking the training, that doesn't necessarily mean they're going to totally change their minds but they really need to be exposed to the truth, the truth. And we know what the truth is around Council. We have read history. I understand history and we need to do that. So, I just…again, I'm going to end by thanking the Mayor for taking us down this road...oh, I did want to mention one other thing. I noticed that Michael Champagne and a crowd were gathered outside and you know, the effect that the City of Winnipeg had on Shoal Lake 40. We had an effect on them over a hundred years ago. A major effect on that Indigenous group of people and to the point where today, there is a lot of problems. Our mayor came…stepped up to the plate and said we will deal with our share and we will do it and it was excellent and I just want to thank the Mayor for his leadership. I know he had some meetings with the Chief of Band 40. I am hoping and we should all remember that we should...whatever the ending cost is of that one-third, we really should be contributing to that and I hope that we can do that in the future. And I'm sure our mayor as a leader will step up to the plate. So thanks.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to speak to this item. I think this is one of the most important issues if not one of the most important issues. We have the infrastructure challenge and we have this great challenge and great opportunity for our city. There is no doubt the Mayor's decision to bring light on to the subject and to make this essential issue and theme, I think, is fantastic and terrific that he has done this. You know, not very far from here there is a statue in Waterfront Drive, it's in the rotunda or in the centre of the roundabout and it's a statue of the…that marks the clearances that took place in Scotland when the English landlords literally drove the Scottish people off their land and replaced them with sheep and literally displaced thousands of people who previously had farmed these lands for centuries. And they had nowhere to go. They had no home, they had no place to go and they came here over 200 years ago. And they came here and they settled here and they settled here thanks to…directly thanks to the First Nations, thanks to Chief Peguis who basically brought them in with open arms and created a place for them. A place for them to live, a place for them to farm, the Kildonans and if it wasn't for Chief Peguis, these people would have been permanently...they were refugees. They were literally refugees, 200 years ago, refugees. And how did we thank Chief Peguis and his people? We drove them off their land. We being those much European decent, later on. That's how we repaid their thanks. You know, there is a lot of work here still to do, a lot of work here still to do. The history of this great city, there are still issues that have to be addressed and that history cannot be ignored. It cannot be ignored and it cannot be shoved and ignored any longer, it has to be addressed. I cite the Kapyong Barracks and what's been going on there…in 1989, the Federal Provincial Governments signed an agreement called the Treaty Land Entitlements which basically said for making it really quick and short, that any surplus land, identified surplus by the Federal Government shall be subject to and potentially claimed by the First Nations in terms of the Treaty Land Entitlement's in terms of the land that was taken illegally after treaties had been signed with the First Nations. The Treaty One First Nations made a claim on the Kapyong Barracks on the basis that this was now surplus land. The Federal Governments, and I say governments, have been fighting this and opposing this. The time has come to honour that commitment. The time has come to put aside paying the lawyers and paying all the legal battles and honour that commitment. To build Winnipeg's largest, if you want to call it...I know there was a…I was here for the debate under the Municipal Aboriginal Pathways which is a council policy adopted at the time under Mayor Murray which called for urban reserves…urban reserves, the vision being making it possible for employment, for opportunities, for jobs, for being able to have that life that a lot of us have kind of...we all have, the middle-class life if you like, for the First Nations, for those of an Indigenous descent. This is a…that is a tangible, economic policy and program that could be implemented now in the city and do amazing things, the Kapyong lands and the fact that it's been tied up and held up, if that's not racism, if that's not bigotry, I don't know what is. That has to end. What also has to end, in my view Madam Speaker, is the attitude of Federal Governments, and it's been more than one Federal Government…Federal Governments, the attitude that the minute somebody of Indigenous leaves the First Nation and comes to Winnipeg, it's not their issue any more. They don't have to address the

concerns and the issues arising out of this migration to the city and the challenges that many members of that community face in the city. The Federal Government has a huge responsibility in my mind and they have washed it on not just this municipality, but municipality after municipality after municipality across the country. This has to be addressed. There was great work that was taking place, unfortunately, the previous Federal Government killed it but there was great work happening with the Kelowna Accord in BC. The Kelowna Accord, in my view, was a model that should have been kept alive, but it was killed. And it was a huge opportunity and a blue print in many ways of what we could be doing here. I know that this is not going to be an easy issue. It won't be…financially, there will be challenges, there's no doubt. I am reminded in terms of the training aspect of our employees, I would like to attend this. If this is offered to our employees, I'm saying right now to the CAO via this meeting, offer it to members of Council. I'd like to go and be part of it. You know, 30, 40 years ago at the time when there was bombs going off in Quebec and the FLQ crisis and people being kidnapped and terrorism going on and the Federal Government declared Marshall Law, at that time, there was the By and By Commission and there was…the Federal Government employees have to attend training on the issue of the two founding nations at that time was the view of Canada, the Francophone nation and the Anglophone nation. That they...there has to be greater understanding. It took place. And today, I think the Federal Government, you don't have these issues today because they were able to transform themselves and get over this challenge. This in my view, Madam Speaker, is very similar. This is a huge cultural shift and a cultural understanding that must take place not just at the highest levels but down to the lowest levels across our society and across our city. But it has to come through policies, real policies that represent real change. In other words, this is a good start, but now it must be followed up with policy. Policy that will actually be seen as change out there in the communities, not here where we make speeches, but actually that is tangible and real to those little…those kids that are out there now, who are growing up in some of the poorest households in the nation. Something not to be proud of, but something that we can overcome and address if we set our minds to it. So let's go forward. I want to support, I want to thank again the work done by this council so far, but more has to be done. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. There is obviously a lot to talk about but as Councillor Gerbasi has said, it's not just about talk. It's about action. We have mentioned quite a bit of history, some good recounts of history which is important because we are dealing with history, Madam Speaker. I believe I am not putting words in His Worship's mouth when I say, I think an important motivation for His Worship is the fact that we are...this is an attempt, this is part of the job of dealing with history. And on that basis, Madam Speaker, I want to say a few things because they are inspiring. They are inspiring to me. They are humbling but they are inspiring because as we've said, it's not just about talk, it's about action, Madam Speaker. Now, I want to talk about part of this continuum of reconciliation which is a constant challenge for us. Talk about things that to show what's possible and to show why I am...from the very first moment that His Worship mentioned the Winnipeg's…the City of Winnipeg's involvement with the End Homelessness Strategies, I was with him from the very moment he said so. And from the very moment he hastily had to call a press conference about truth and reconciliation I was with His Worship from the very moment I heard about it and I showed up. Something symbolic happened at that first impromptu meeting when His Worship had to call around leaders and I heard about it so I showed up to be there with many different community leaders. And for me I got hugged by two chiefs in the same minute. I got a hug from the former Grand Chief Ovide Mercredi and within 60 seconds I got a hug from Chief Devon Clunis of the Police Services. So why were they giving me a hug? It's not like we're all walking around giving each other hugs. But, I was glad to see them, they were glad to see me. I guess, you know, when it comes to such an important issue we all rely on each other and His Worship brought together at that moment some people to, I guess, be part of a spirit and to create yet another directive on something that we have to continue on. Now, I talked about being inspired by what's possible and I want to offer that to this council, Madam Speaker. Because I want you to know that I was raised on the spirit of reconciliation and of truth and not just in words but in action. Just bear in mind, Madam Speaker and remind us what's possible here, when my father headed the first NDP Government in the history of Canada right here in 1969, that was the end, in its first term, the end of the 60s scoop when aboriginal children were taken away from their families and their communities. That was the end. They created the very first crystalized tripartite agreement between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government and First Nations through what was called at the time the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood. I remember Dave Courchene coming to our house for chats with my father. The Federal Government at the time called it the leading edge agreement with governments to create a real system of trust and understanding with the First Nations to deal with issues of health, education, welfare, economic development and in that eight years, Madam Speaker, we went from virtually no economic development for First Nations in the north to virtually every First Nation in northern Manitoba having an airport than in eight years, Madam Speaker. So, these things really happened. And, Madam Speaker, when we're dealing with issues of reconciliation and dealing with mending and healing us from the past and we're dealing with issues of empowerment, poverty, bear something in mind, Madam Speaker, because as well, during that administration something that hasn't happened…never happened before or since, in a period of eight years, this government created 12,000 affordable housing units, plus 2,000 nursing care units, 14,000 units in eight years, Madam Speaker. That's what's possible. That's not talk. That's action. That's our legacy. That's our history. That is an example, Madam Speaker, of what's possible of what we can do. And it is true, Madam

Speaker, it's often thankless, it can be forgotten. It can be forgotten in certain spheres, it can be forgotten in certain circles, but the reality is, Madam Speaker, when we walk the walk, the legacy remains. You can't actually change reality. These things happened and they are part of our history. Last weekend, I had an opportunity to actually hear Ovide Mercredi make a speech and he talked about as a child in Grand Rapids that a Premier drove up to Grand Rapids to talk to his mom. And had he never thought of such a thing, never heard about it. He never thought it would be possible and Madam Speaker, that visit to his mother is the kind of thing that changed Ovide Mercredi's life. Part of what makes him a leader. Inspiring, Madam Speaker, it's humbling because it shows there is a lot to do. There's a lot more to do and act on then there is to say and it's been proven right here. And on that basis, we must be positive about this and that is why, Madam Speaker, I am just so pleased that His Worship has taken on these initiatives and I'm pleased to be a part of it. As challenging as it is and in years from now might be forgotten but if we do the right thing, it doesn't matter. The reality of the legacy will exist. And that's what counts. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Thank you. Councillor Gilroy followed by Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Gilroy: I do want to thank the Mayor for taking a leadership role not only here at home in Winnipeg but I know he has been championing this with other Mayors and I know that they are looking to us, they're looking at Winnipeg as being the leader and he has taken that leadership role. I think that that's really key. I also want to thank Councillor Gerbasi for her role at FCM and all that she is doing on championing this issue. You know, and this sounds…we might get up and we might, you know, say things and it kind of sounds like, oh, we are thanking the Mayor or whatever, he has faced some criticisms on this issue. This is not an easy issue. And so I just…I do want to take…thank him for his leadership role because this is not an easy issue and just even listening to the dialogue that we are having today like, we have work to do. We have work to do. Now, as the Chair of the Citizen Equity Committee, I'm going to get up here and I'm going to support this. This is really, really vital. I am speaking to many different community groups that are out there, many different ethnic groups and they face racism and they also want to know that we are doing something within dealing with our Indigenous relationships that we have within our Indigenous communities. So Winnipeg is watching, different groups are watching us and they're wanting us to take a leadership in the role. If we are going to really, truly change the culture, as a large employer of the City of Winnipeg, we have to start with us. We have to change the culture within our own workforce. And we've got a lot of work to do. I am very proud of some of the work we do. I know that Citizen Equity Committee has been at the forefront of this. We had a speaker…we had an Indigenous elder that came in that we took part in with Human Resources and we had so many staff come out to this, it was overwhelming how many people want to come out and learn a little bit more and be engaged in this topic. I think that we have a role to play. I think in terms of the five recommendations we need to take that leadership role. We are doing it and I am very proud as a Winnipegger that we are stepping up to the plate here. And I hope that the country is watching and I hope that our citizens can be proud that we are taking this leadership role. So thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Next is Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Allard, Councillor Gillingham and then Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Mayes: Very briefly, it's my understanding that training funding is coming from within. We didn't have anything new specified in the budget so it's my understanding that staff have made efforts to fund that from within. And secondly, in terms of taking specific actions, yesterday's budget we had, as you know Madam Speaker, provisions for the Youth United of Winnipeg Project that I've talked about many times. This is the pilot project that's going to run the next two summers through U. of Winnipeg north end campus mixing together suburban kids and inner-city kids working in various projects in the North End, in the core, on things…food banks, community centres, all sorts of public service type of work. But the main thing in terms of the fifth day, every Friday they'll have a classroom component and that classroom component will be focused on the calls to action from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. So we are, I think really taking concrete steps there to fund U. of Winnipeg to do something with the young people both from the suburbs and the inner-city to try and work on reconciliation. So, very proud of that initiative and thank the Mayor for his support for that. And you know, I had a contact from one of the other universities in town, somebody had heard about the project and said, hey, why don't you come and talk to us, we would like to try and do something like that as well. So our hope is to try and grow the program elsewhere in the city and across the country. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I rise in support of this report. In this report, we are implementing the truth and reconciliation recommendations today in the City of Winnipeg. We are doing what is the City's part in the truth and reconciliation recommendations and they are quite detailed and this report is consistent with that. So I want to be crystal clear that if you vote against this report you are voting against truth and reconciliation. You are voting against the healing that needs to happen with our peoples. I have recently been starting my greetings on behalf of the City of Winnipeg with speeches with the words, "We are on Treaty One Land and the traditional homeland of the Métis Nation." I have heard of people grumbling and snickering because I have been starting my speeches with those words and I don't know if Mayor

Bowman, you do it all the time, you may hear similar things. I have even had somebody come to my face and confront me to tell me that starting my speech that way was not appropriate. Change needs to start somewhere. We have to do this. I was with a new Canadian the other day he asked me a question about the social conditions of our First Peoples. He was male. I told him that there was so much to this story. There is so much history. I told him imagine you were taken away from your family as a child. You are brought to a school where you were repeatedly raped, your language was taken away, you were told that your parents had a backward life and that you needed to learn a new way of life. How would you be today if this had happened to you? How would your relationship be with your parents? With your children? Would you be okay? We only had a few minutes but I think he began to understand. But this conversation needs to happen many, many more times and in a respectful way and I think that's what's being brought forward in this report. Imagine the Métis People who live with us, around us, who don't even know their own background. It was suppressed, it was hidden, it was shunned. The snickering needs to stop. The outright disrespect needs to stop. So thank you, Brian Bowman for your leadership on this issue for moving this forward in a real way and I urge all members of Council to vote for this report. And if you vote against this report, I don't see how will you are not voting against truth and reconciliation in this country. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Our last speaker is Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I want to echo what so many of my colleagues have already said and thank the Mayor for his leadership on this file. I will be supporting this report. Also want to express appreciation to our manager of Indigenous Relations, Rhonda Forgues, and her team, her crew for the hard work that they have…and diligent work that they have been doing for many months certainly even before these recommendations came forward and certainly after as well. I do want to take a moment to highlight some of the work that is being done and it's good work. It's the work of the Mayor's Indigenous Advisory Circle. When I served as Chair of the Police Board and Councillor Eadie certainly would know this as the new Chair, Councillor Browaty, we established a Winnipeg Police Board Indigenous Advisory Council on policing. And that group has offered and continues to offer such great insight and continues to do the work that the Winnipeg Police Service has been doing intentionally as well in building the relationship between the Winnipeg Police Service and the Indigenous community. I appreciate Councillor Mayes clarifying that when it comes to the training that is recommended here, that the Public Service is working within their current training budget to ensure that this training happens. And Councillor Wyatt beat me to the punch. I said I would certainly be willing…I was thinking I would certainly be willing to take the training as well so I will join Councillor Wyatt, east meets west at the training session and be certainly glad to…and look forward to the training as well. And I think that really speaks to a lot of what is before us. There are calls to action in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. In my mind, one of the biggest actions is listening. And I think that will be critical for all of us regardless of where we come from regardless of where we are today. But I think listening respectfully to one another, no matter what point in the circle you sit at, will be critical to a future that we really need to have certainly as a nation and as a city as well. And so, I...others have said at here today, I just will end with this, that we do…we have come a long way but we have a long, long way to go. But I am confident that this group of my colleagues here, the mayor and these councillors that we are willing to certainly roll up our sleeves, be part of the solution, be part of a better future and to do the hard work of reconciliation. As the Mayor said, it certainly doesn't end with 2016…you know, the last day of December this year, the work of reconciliation has really just begun and I know that I join my colleagues in being certainly committed to, to doing the hard work and I am confident that we are up to the task. So thank you Madam Speaker and I look forward to supporting this report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Mr. Mayor, back to you for closing.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker and very appreciative of most of the comments that my Council colleagues have made here today. The comment that Councillor Allard made about the acknowledgment that Madam Speaker you make at the beginning of each of our meetings now which I am grateful for and I think many Winnipeggers are as well is one that I now try to begin most of my formal remarks and meetings that I chair with just acknowledging that we are on Treaty One Land and the traditional homeland of the Métis Nation. The reason we make the acknowledgement isn't for the benefit of any one particular group in our community but to recognize that we are all, in fact, Treaty People. Whether you are Indigenous, non-Indigenous, whether you are a newcomer or whether or not your family has been here for many decades and many, many years, we are all connected. We are all one people at the end of the day. The report that is before us which is being received as information was requested at the beginning of this year, in which we did ask for that we continue our current activities of the City which have no cost implications, that relate to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission calls to action, that we have the public service investigate proposed actions outlined in the report in support of the TRC calls to action and bring forward to Council for consideration any initiatives or actions requiring incremental human resource or financial resources that we have the Public Service investigate additional measures that could be taken and report back to Council by December of 2016, I'm paraphrasing. One of the calls to action in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission is number 57 and that relates to training and has been much of what we have been talking about here today and I will just read for those watching, what that

calls…particular call to action says. It says, "We call upon the Federal Provincial Territorial and Municipal Governments to provide education to public servants on the history of Aboriginal Peoples including the history and the legacy of residential schools, the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, treaties and aboriginal rights, Indigenous law and aboriginal crown relations. This will require skills-based training in intercultural competency, conflict resolution, human rights and anti-racism." The questions about costs and the comments about costs here today, make me ask, what is the cost of inaction? What are the costs to various support services that are required for many of our people? We know what those costs are. We see them each and every day in our community. The…and there is a cost to inaction. That is why the calls to action are called just that, they are calls to action. They are not recommendations for a very reason. For those of us that have had the opportunity to speak with and to learn from Senator Murray Sinclair, one of the commissioners of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, he has certainly commented to me that they are...they were calls to action for a reason. They were to inspire action in the community by all levels of government, by all organizations. I have spent much of this year increasingly focusing my energies on having the community continue to do its part. So many organizations, grassroots organizations, academic institutions have been doing a lot for many, many years and they should be commended and recognized and applauded. Many other organizations, however, are just starting to do their work and our Indigenous Relations Division has been doing excellent work, Madam Speaker. They need to be commended for the outstanding leadership and work that they have provided this year. Our Winnipeg Police Service also has been doing excellent work for many years and we want to continue to support and encourage those activities. I have been reaching out to the business community, to unions, to not-for-profit groups, all of whom have been extremely receptive, some of whom have been doing outstanding work and have been partnering with us. The question I raise, when we hear about the costs of training is, what are the costs of inaction in our community? And I believe that some of those comments which are being made public here today, many of us have heard it behind closed doors, demonstrate to me why education and training is so badly needed. I continue to learn throughout this year and I continue to look for opportunities to increase my own education about the painful legacy that our community is dealing with of residential schools and the ongoing need for all Canadians to be part of the solution in responding to the legacy of residential schools and implementing the calls to action in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. I want to thank the Public Service for this report which will be receiving of as information and look forward to what we can do in the coming years to follow. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. I'll call the question on Item 1, Truth and Reconciliation Calls to Action. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, moving on to Item 2.

Item 2 – Annual Evaluations of City Council's Four Statutory Officers

Madam Speaker: There is an amending motion Councillors on your desk, it's Motion No. 2. Mr. Mayor, you are to introduce the item and you can introduce the motion at the same time if you wish.

Motion No. 2
Moved by His Worship Mayor Bowman,
Seconded by Councillor Allard,

WHEREAS it is desirous, for the first time in the history of the City of Winnipeg, to establish a process to evaluate the performance of the City of Winnipeg's four statutory officers; and

WHEREAS the City Auditor is the only statutory officer who reports to Council; and

WHEREAS reviews of an individual's performance should be undertaken in camera; and

WHERAS Council does not currently have authority to meet in camera; and

WHEREAS the intent of allowing Council to meet in camera was to allow performance reviews of the City Auditor to be undertaken in an in camera setting; and

WHEREAS the bylaw originally proposed by the Public Service provided Council in camera authority that was too broad; and

WHEREAS it was always intended that Council's authority to go in camera would be limited for the purposes of undertaking performance reviews of the City Auditor.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The report entitled "Annual Evaluations of City Council's Four Statutory Officers" be amended as follows:

(a) That Recommendation 3 be replaced with the following:

3. That an amendment to the In Camera by-law (draft attached as Appendix "A") be enacted that will permit Council to meet in camera to consider internal performance reviews of the City Auditor.

(b) That Appendix "A" be replaced with the draft by-law attached to this motion.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker and I will speak to both for…for brevity. I do want to thank Councillor Allard for his support and his leadership on this matter. I also want to thank members of Council who have been supportive. This motion is intended to allow for greater accountability and transparency regarding the performance reviews of our four statutory officers. The amending motion is to better ensure that should the will of Council decide to go in camera that it is only permitted for the purposes of performance reviews of the auditor on HR matters. I think that, obviously, is a needed amendment. I think it allows this to proceed in a way that is very progressive and should benefit all members of Council and the public to ensure that the will of Council is better being followed and supported by our four statutory officers. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any further speakers on Item 2? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker. I rise…the by-law that's being proposed as an amendment to the by-law before us today was brought forward, I think the initiative brought forward by Councillor Allard was pretty honourable and the intent of it was right. I want to thank...I don't do this that often, thank members of the fifth estate for identifying this issue at the time when this came forward at EPC, which was the concern that we were going to see an open ended by-law amendment in terms of in camera meetings. I am very hesitant to vote for the amendment and for the clause. Not because I don't believe in the idea of the annual performance review, I definitely do believe in the annual performance review. But I do believe that mechanisms already exist for members of Council to have that dialogue. If one reads the charter, that dialogue can take place, it's called Council seminars. Deliberations can be held and votes then can actually...still reports can come forward. The idea of going in camera into a Council meeting concerns me. The reason it does is simply because it is a precedent setting decision. Where does it end? What else do we then start to go in camera on? And I can tell you that the existing charter is very strict in terms of what we decide to go in camera on and not and it does have provisions for that, though. But it is very strict and it's strict for a reason because it did recognize, I think, that this body is the last oversight body in terms of decisions being made at other committees. Committees which are below this council that are reporting to this council and they report to this council for a reason, because this council is to oversee all decisions ultimately governing the City. The minute that we can start to go in camera in this council and to start to do it in terms of something as important as this, I believe we lose that ability and that oversight. Yes, it is a Human Resources matter, yes, it is. But at the same time, we are not talking about the entire City Public Service. We are talking about one of the officers of the City of Winnipeg. And it's a unique position, there's four officers of the City that report to Council versus report to the Public Service. I think when one decides to fill that role or pursue that role, there is a unique aspect to it and that is, that it is different compared to other positions and other roles and responsibilities and that you are reporting to a body as a whole and that the dialogue may take place publicly, but no different than it does in terms of our, as elected representatives, our performance takes place quite publicly as well. We are reviewed daily. I'm not saying that would happen in this case, we do the review annually, however, it is unique. I wish there was a better dialogue. I would prefer to see this matter referred back to EPC. I have spoken to it so I cannot move referral. But I would prefer to this matter be referred back, I would prefer that the by-law does not come forward as is even with the amendment because frankly, I believe, you know, it sets a precedent. And I don't think there is anything untowards but the concerns I raise is the fact that the reason we have discussions and discourse in the public forum here like this, is so that there can be no arm twisting behind the scenes. And ultimately, the votes and the decisions made here are made in the open but the dialogue leading to that vote I think is just as important because it will reflect how the vote actually and the decisions are made. So, I'm concerned about this in this respect and therefore will not be supporting the amendment nor will be supporting the actual report, nor supporting the by-law when it comes forward and the amendment to the by-law. So, I would hope this could be referred back because I think the idea of the annual performance review is a good thing, absolutely. I am not against that. I want to make it really clear. I know it was said today, somebody voted against the budget, they voted against all these other things, that's a bunch of nonsense. So I'm saying it here today that I'm in support of the performance review but I'm not support of shutting down open discussion in this chamber. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As the member for Transcona was speaking, I was wondering how many times his council and administration would have evaluated our statutory officers during his administration, but I digress a little bit. I want to rise in support of this motion for...it's a special motion, it's a special moment, a report for me, the first…my first act as city councillor was to ask our CAO to be evaluated and it's…and I am thrilled to be able to stand up here today and see comprehensive framework that's going to allow for the evaluation of our four statutory officers as well as the added bonus of having summary report cards published and made available to the public. I believe the step is unprecedented. In conversations with many people, I understand that, you know, there may not have been evaluations of our officers in the past and so this is, I think, a really good first step. In terms of accountability, our statutory officers, in particular our CAO, you know, these are the four staff people that we are responsible for evaluating in terms of a council so for us to be doing that I think is…it's tremendous in terms of accountability of us to the public. There is this narrative out there about, you know, who is in control of Council, is it Council or is it Administration? I think this is going to go a long way towards showing who is responsible for what and is going to provide that clarity that our statutory officers are doing what they have been hired to do and that we are satisfied with their work. And on the in camera, I mean, Human Resources matters are confidential. We need to have a safe place to have frank discussions about performance and I think that's why the by-law is there and I am happy to see the amendment address some concerns that the in camera powers would relate to other matters so the by-law is crystal clear that this is specifically for Human Resources matters of our statutory officers. So thank you Mayor Bowman, EPC for bringing this report forward and I think perhaps had this policy been brought in ten years ago or six years ago we may have avoided many of the things that we saw in past councils so I think this is a tremendous step forward for accountability for Winnipeggers. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Sharma. Wow, interesting to listen to opposing views and pro-views. Since I have been on...and actually, before being a member of Council, it was always made clear to me and it seemed like there was a good understanding. But, the Mayor and the Executive Policy Committee, Madam Speaker, are designated as the HR committee. They are the ones who deal with overall City HR issues and they have had in camera meetings in regards to HR issues I think in the past and so I have always understood why EPC would have to go in camera to deal with matters of Human Resources as well as other particular legal matters that sometimes have to go in camera, so there is a need. But, you know, as Council, as the whole Council, it seems to me that everything we do is in public. We actually had a public meeting to talk about the real estate audit. We had a public meeting to talk about the issues around the fire hall programs that happened in the past Madam Speaker. They were public meetings. Public meetings where we got to ask questions and, you know, within the powers that Council has and we can get certain information and we can ask questions and get verbal reports, and I think, you know, that's important, that's in public, and sometimes an administration person won't want to…or lawyer, whatever, won't want to say specific things in a public meeting. And one of the problems, Madam Speaker, is that we as a council are treated quite differently as the legislative assembly over on Broadway there, where, so long as you don't go beyond certain things because you could be subject to a lawsuit as well…the public…but basically, in that chamber you can pretty well say anything you want so long as it's not directly related to a crime or whatever. But so I am a little concerned as Councillor Wyatt is, in terms of Council itself going into camera...going in camera to deal with a performance review. And in the past, you know, Councillor Allard, I agree with you there has to be some sort of review, performance review to ensure that the person we've entered into contracts and we as all of Council have non…have actually recommended...we did vote on it and I've disagreed with some of the...with one of the charter hirings, the four that we are talking about, and voted against, but Council made a decision and that's happened and turns out...anyway, I won't get into details. But...so, I'm really concerned though, yes, we have public meetings at Council, there is none of that...and I don't know that I want to go in camera, but will we be going in camera as we did…we had a hearing at standing committee and we went into camera because we needed to talk about specific legal matters that required us go in camera and to be able to have an open discussion about the issues around that specific issue, specifics. But you know, that wouldn't be had at Council. Like, I'm…I'm…as I said, we have had seminars in the past and the thing is, Council itself basically are decision makers. Everything that comes to Council here, we are making a decision. You know, we had the big public meeting about the real estate audit and there were amendments made to recommendations and there was a report today, it's progressing good. We are moving along to address all those recommendations in that report. So I'm trying to figure out how I am voting right now as I am speaking because we are a decision making body. And, you know, I don't know…you know, I don't work with the CAO every day, okay. So you are asking me if we are going to be making a decision in an in camera meeting, so I'm going to be voting on whether or not the CAO is doing his or her job? Like, I think EPC has that responsibility and I am okay with that. You know...anyway, so, at this point, I can't support myself, now that I'm thinking about it…I don't...this is a decision making body. I have a problem...and you know, there is a reason also for a hiring committee for a CAO. Why didn't we have all of Council hire? We did in the end but we got a recommendation from who? Who was the recommendation we got from? The recommendation, I will remind all, came from the Mayor and his CAO search committee. There was a very brief report, welcome Mr. Doug McNeil. And I welcomed him as well. It was great. So EPC then has the responsibility because it was mostly EPC who made the hiring decision to do that and after you have done your performance review,

come back to Council and say, he is doing a good job. We don't have to get into the details. Let EPC do it. That's the responsibility that Mayor and EPC members have. That's in the org by-law I believe, it's probably in the charter, too. Anyway, so I am going to leave it at that and I guess I won't be voting for it today. I regret that I am doing that because it does have this provision and I agree that a performance review does have to be done. Councillor Allard for St. Boniface, you were elected on so…but I will voting against this report today. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Seeing the hour, I think we should adjourn and reconvene at 1:30 if that's the will of Council. Thank you. Can I just ask you for a quick moment to have a photo with our page just before we leave for lunch? Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
December 14, 2016, at 1:39 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of December 14th, 2016. We were on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated December 7th, 2016, Item No. 2, annual evaluations of City Council's four statutory officers. Our next speaker…that would be Councillor Orlikow. Yes, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I am just standing in support of the amendment. I have heard some comments this morning, I'm just…the intent here is not about secrecy. Actually, it's the opposite. It's trying to provide the opportunity for all councillors to have an opportunity to hear the information in a way that won't jeopardize us. So I…we do...we could theoretically leave it at EPC but I want to commend the Mayor to…that it's important for all of us especially when we're talking about evaluations, not only to protect the person we're evaluating in HR format but also to make sure that all councillors which has pretty well been the theme that I have heard for the last couple of days, they want to know and they don't want this secrecy and we are hearing that. There are some areas though where we have to be careful about information that gets leaked. I think the idea of using seminars, we have had some issues about leaked information through seminars before so you know, maybe the confidentiality agreement, that could work. But this allows it to be done in a way that all councillors, we can have a discussion when need be. So the idea of moving it to EPC and having EPC just do it on their own, sure, that could have been done. But I commend the Mayor for saying you know what, this is an issue and we want to have all of Council have the opportunity to speak on it but again, also protecting the people that we're evaluating. So I am a little confused this morning hearing some of the comments about we want to have more...we want to be more engaged in the decision making and we wanted to be a part of that process, but we also don't want…we also want to have it go back to EPC. So I was a little confused this morning but you know, I kind of understand this back and forth a bit. But I think this is a process to go forward with. They are really large decisions that should…all councillors should have. But again, we have to protect the people, our staff. We have had some comments in the past which have been quite harsh to say the least, to our staff, and publicly stated. I don't think that's appropriate then and I still don't think it's appropriate. But we do have to have an avenue where all councillors can have an opportunity when we're going through the motions to be able to speak to and get the same information. So I support the Mayor's recommendation and the amendment and that's it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Any further speakers on the item? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It happens to be at this very moment, clerks are printing out a motion to refer to EPC with instructions.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. I'll just wait for that motion to be circulated. Once the motion is circulated, Councillor Schreyer, it will be your opportunity to introduce the motion.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, point of privilege.

Madam Speaker: Yes, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Just, if the Clerk could read the...

Madam Speaker: We shall do that, thank you. Are you ready to do that at this time, Mr. Clerk? Are you still trying to print it off?

Clerk: I'm formatting it.

Madam Speaker: Why don't we give you a moment to do that. You go ahead and do that and then we will read it into the record when you are ready.

Councillor Allard: Can we have it read out now? I mean, Councillor Eadie usually gets the information last. It would be a nice break for him to get it with all of us.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, if you are printing it off can you e-mail it to at least the Deputy Clerk or City Clerk so they can read it into the record while we are waiting?

Clerk: Sure, yeah. I can…I'll read it into the record. The motion is to refer this matter back to Executive Policy Committee with instructions. And the instructions are to report back on the terms of reference that shall govern Council and its conduct and rules prior to, during and in the review. Moved by Councillor Schreyer, seconded by Councillor Dobson.

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

That Item 2 of the Executive Policy Committee report dated December 7, 2016, be referred back to the Executive Policy Committee with the following instruction:

1. To report back on the terms of reference that shall govern Council and its conduct and rules prior to, during and in the review.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer, are you ready to introduce your motion?

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I do wish to refer this motion back to EPC with instruction to report back on the terms of reference that shall govern Council and its conduct and rules prior to, during the whole course of the review. And the reason is, Madam Speaker, I truly do appreciate Councillor Orlikow's comments. The intent as he sees it in terms of a form of openness and accountability and he says he is confused by the comments that he has heard earlier on the debate on this issue, in this council just before lunch and given that, Madam Speaker, I hope that he could appreciate that I am doing this because of my confusion and my uncertainty as to the implications of this. Madam Speaker, we do have provisions already for in camera meetings. We do have a structure in place for dealing with such issues. And to change this, including changing the by-law regarding in camera meetings is something that I believe all Council would benefit from a greater understanding from the Administration, for this to go back to EPC for the Administration to take some time for us all to be aware of the implications of this. And I am not certain at all, Madam Speaker that we all in Council are aware of these implications. There have been times in this term to which I and the rest of this council am privy or witness to, in terms of in camera meetings and it's been kind of messy, Madam Speaker, and I would rather deal with that before we make a decision on this than afterwards. Just as an example, Madam Speaker, we are dealing with openness and accountability, such as meant to be the intent of this motion. If that's the case, Madam Speaker, we are dealing specifically in this case with only one officer, with the auditor. So why are we dealing with the auditor if it's meant to be openness and accountability and the motion we are dealing with all four of these major administrative positions, why is auditor singled out, independent of the other three? I don't understand this, Madam Speaker and I want to. That's just one example of sort of how Council...how every individual councillor is obliged to account to their constituents on making...on their involvement on what are some pretty serious issues. And I don't think we should be making a mistake on this and I would like some clarification, including why we are singling out the auditor as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. I want to remind members of Council that this is your opportunity to speak to the item again even if you have addressed it previously because there is a new motion on the table. Next speaker. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: So this is my opportunity...I haven't spoken yet, so I can just continue to speak?

Madam Speaker: That's right.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay. I think the amendment spells out the situation fairly clearly. But first of all I just wanted to say like, what this entire report is about is about, you know...and I would like to thank Councillor Allard and the Mayor and everybody for bringing forward a mechanism for more accountability for our statutory officers and a process for that. But what the amendment clarifies is that the auditor is actually the only statutory officer that reports directly to Council, and so therefore, this intent of this all along and this motion clarifies the intent all along, was that the only way that all of

members of Council even if you are not on EPC, all members of Council can be part of that review of the statutory officer, this particular one. The only way we can do it is if we create a mechanism to go in camera and the motion is very clear that that would only be used for this one purpose of an evaluation of the auditor. And we know that we do not do HR evaluations in public. Nobody does. It's not appropriate. I was disappointed to hear comments like that earlier implying that that would somehow be okay and that it somehow doesn't matter. It does matter. You know, because legal reasons why it matters, there's humanitarian reasons, there's all sorts of reasons why nobody does that and I think we all know that, that that's not what is supposed to be done in public. So what this is is simply an effort to create...to use an existing mechanisms which we can go in camera at Property Committee and other matters when there's certain matters that come forward, we do have all the mechanisms so there is no need to create a new mechanism. But, what this is doing is allowing us to do that one particular activity, an HR review of the auditor who reports to all of Council. It's actually broadening the inclusion of all members of Council whether you are on EPC or not which yesterday seemed to be something people wanted and has been talked about a lot. And this is…all this is doing, it sort of seems like another example of no good deed goes unpunished here because I don't understand why the amount of flak and negativity that you know, particularly the Mayor is being subjected to here. This is a measure to increase inclusion of all of Council in the process of the Human Resources evaluation of our statutory auditor that...statutory officer that reports to all of Council. The other officers have a slightly different process, they report directly to EPC. It's different. So, I mean, that's my point is this is a step to include non-EPC members of Council in an HR evaluation in a way that respects our staff, that respects the legal obligations of an employer, that respects the proper process and rules. It's not…it's about openness, it's about proper accountability, making sure all members of Council are included in that process. So, I would have thought this would have been something that would be embraced by all members of Council. You know, the media ran with the fact that there was...there is an amendment in front of us because the report did not reflect the real intent here. There was no intent to have all sorts of secret meetings about everything. That's how it was portrayed and that was a nice political thing to jump on for those of us who want to hurt the Mayor or hurt whoever and make a political battle out of something. But really, if you want the facts just look at the amendment in front of us. It's very clear, if you read it, it's nothing complicated about it. It's saying that the City Auditor is the only statutory officer that reports to Council. All members of Council can be included in that evaluation if we have the ability to go in camera which we don't currently have. And the wording is that we will permit Council to meet in camera to consider internal performance reviews of the city auditor only. No other matters. This is not a big secret thing. So, I just hope that's clear enough. Like, I don't understand why, you know, it's something different but it's something different in the direction of inclusion of all members of Council. It's something different in the direction of better accountability. You know, the last election, Councillor Allard alluded to, one of the two big issues that we heard about were roads and accountability and trust. That's what this is trying to do and I guess you just don't always get rewarded for good behaviour and no good deed goes unpunished because that's all this is. So I hope people understand that and I hope you support it. It's very straightforward. It's not...it's a good move and I hope that people will keep an open mind to reading the words in front of you in Motion 2 because they are really very clear. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gerbasi. Next is Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Mayes: I will try to be brief. One of the things the Mayor first said to me right after the election was, we're going to get some right, we're going to get some wrong and we're going to be open and transparent about it. So should we have copped the provision about meeting in camera? Yep, I am as guilty as anyone else for not spotting that but that's been caught now and corrected. I have to say, I sit here and look at a motion from the person who said yesterday, "I don't trust EPC." So here we are with Allard's motion that everybody, everybody not just EPC, the whole council's going to have a review of the CEO. We have a motion to refer it back to EPC, the very group that we were told yesterday is untrustworthy. I mean, there comes a point where you just got to go, okay, like, you just throw up your hands. I mean, I would like to resolve this today but if it gets referred back to EPC, I'm also fine with that but I have to say, I'm certainly not going to be too sympathetic to people who get up after that and say, now, you are not being open, you are not sharing it with the rest of Council, you are hoarding the information at EPC. If you're going to move something back to EPC, okay, but don't also get up and say that's the group I don't trust and you are too secretive and you hoard all the information and you don't let us in. So I mean, let's just be blunt here. I'm, you know…this has never been a huge priority for me. I do commend Councillor Allard for bringing it forward. Should the in camera provision have been caught originally? Yup, I will take as much responsibility as anybody else for that, but if you're going to complain about matters only going to EPC and not Council then don't bring motions referring matters that Allard's trying to get in front of all of Council, don't come and complain that you're…and say…insist that it has to go back to EPC. I really just think that we are spending an inordinate amount of time on this in some sort of weird effort to not to have Council hear it, to force it back to EPC because that way there is something to do with in camera. Look, it's a good faith effort to get everyone involved in a review. Of course, it has to be in camera if it's an HR matter. Anyone who has been a school trustee could tell you that. We had these tumultuous meetings when I was a Brandon school trustee when we were talking about the assistant superintendents and the superintendent. There is all sorts of legal issues why you would have to do that in camera. It's not particularly challenging to think that through on an HR matter. We are not talking about most other matters. We're talking only about HR matters. So, move the motion, if it comes back to EPC fine but I will

certainly be referring this the next time somebody gets up and complains that they weren't part of the process and was all being captured in some fashion by EPC.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Morantz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to also congratulate my colleague, Councillor Allard through you, Madam Speaker, for bringing this initiative forward. I do think it is pretty straightforward. I am not also sure what the concerns are. I think if...if I miss…I don't want to put words in anyone's mouth but I am pretty sure that we all agree that we want to have performance reviews of our statutory officers. And under our rules, the auditor has to…his performance needs to be reviewed by Council. The only way we can do that, because it's an HR issue, is to go in camera. It's pretty straightforward. So, today we have a chance to actually vote for something really good. What people have been asking for, what's in line with the Mayor's platform; real transparency and real accountability. We can do it right here right now and it…there is no...in my mind, no issue with the goal of this motion. I suppose if somebody wants to vote against it, that maybe, you know, I don't know what their motives are, I'm not going to question it but I would think that they want to have more transparency and accountability which is what this motion is simply trying to accomplish. I think everyone would agree that we can't have a performance review of a statutory officer in public like this because we are dealing with people's private lives. And we as Councillor Orlikow said, we do need to protect our public servants and their privacy. But this is the way to do it. Council has an opportunity to do this today and to...I think it's a very, very good message to the public to do something, really that has never been done here before. So I would urge all councillors, I'll certainly be supporting the motion. I think...I just also want to say, like, I agree with the comments that have been made around the by-law. You know, we are correcting it. The by-law is going to be very specific that it's just going to be dealing with the auditor in camera for HR reviews, that's all it is. So I would really encourage my Council colleagues to support the motion and strike a blow for transparency. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Morantz. Any further speakers? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. I am rising to support the amendment. I think, as I said, the idea of having the performance reviews I think are positive but like anything, in terms of this, we operate in the strong mayor model with EPC, the devil will be in the details. It's absolutely crucial that if we are going to have a process that ensures that all members of Council are equally involved, equally participating, have access to the same information at the same time in the same meetings that there is a clear and transparent terms of reference that will operate for that process. No one is disagreeing with the idea of having the performance review. What we are saying is the rules governing the performance is just as important in my mind, Madam Speaker, as an employer governing that performance review for the employee as it is for the members of Council participating in that process. No one is saying that the idea of doing this is wrong. Everybody is saying it's right. What we are saying is that there has to be a clear...and I don't think, frankly...I think it went to EPC and I don't think folks really realized what was being recommended then and clearly changes were being made to it at that time and now being made to it, dramatic changes. I think this would allow for that process. I don't think this is asking for much. I'm just saying, what I think the mover is saying, and I am supporting, I'm saying that there…he's saying that there should be clear rules put around the review itself and I think that's a good thing. I think it's a good thing because it ensures that everyone has access to the same information at the same time as the process goes forward. A terms of reference for the rules of the review, that's what's being called for, that's what's being referred back with instructions. It accomplishes the same goal, but I think we have to do this folks because of the fact we don't operate...most cities tend to set up HR committees, sub-committees, the HR committee does it, it's a majority…councillors elect themselves or the Mayor, they appoint, they go off and they report back. We have a different model here. We have an EPC strong mayor model, we do have two councils for all intents and purposes no matter what anybody says, we are now trying to do something as a group, great, no one is against that. Let's just have some rules around it, that's all we're saying here, okay. And you know...so I am not saying what you are doing here is wrong. I think it's great. I agree with all the previous speakers. I agree with everything and I thank the Mayor for doing this. I just think, this is not a bad thing, it's not a bad idea and just because it comes from a member who is not from EPC and relatively new to Council doesn't mean it's bad either. So, you know, let's just recognize it for what it is. So thank you. A good idea.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I already spoke to the main report, I'm just speaking to the amendment. Madam Speaker, I actually support this because I would like to know in detail how this is going to move ahead and work, honestly. Madam Speaker, there's a number of performance review tasks that need to be undertaken that…like, I don't know that we at Council are going to be talking about those kind of details. We're probably going to be talking about a summary report of a performance review of statutory officers, that's all I can imagine. But I just, I would like to know what is…how is this actually all going to work? Madam Speaker, it's very clear actually to me, and I am somewhat...a little bit confused. I get that the auditor is separate from the governing and administration structure of the City for good reason that being that,

that they need to undertake without bias, audits to ensure that we are committed and meeting policy, meeting financial goals, meeting all kinds of different things and actually, they also have a role to play in conflict of interest, employee code of conduct issues, they could have a role depending on if there is financial matters. But it's my understanding Madam Speaker, and I would like to see the terms of how this is all going to work and this is why the referral…before I vote on anything…but the auditor reports to Council, Madam Speaker through the Audit Committee, that's my understanding. Last time I read through the Charter and different by-laws and it's my understanding that the Audit Committee is EPC. So while the auditor reports directly to Council, that reports first go to EPC. That's where it happens. Now, because...anyway, the HR Committee, it's clear as well that's the Executive Policy Committee. No other standing committee has this role. No other standing committee has a role with the auditor, actually. So for me, there's…I need all kinds of clarification as to why you have to be in camera only for the auditor. And like…anyway, I'd say if we are getting into specific performance review issues, I don't think we want to be talking in open Council about our CAO, CFO and our Clerk to tell you the truth so because there is a sound reason to go into camera for Human Resource issues. So…and some of that performance review will have to be in camera I think. Like so anyway, I'm going to be voting for this amendment to refer it back so we can understand the process because we already have a process. It's basically laid out in the Charter as to how you deal with the dismissal of a statutory officer. It's a process that you have to follow which I sadly had to learn through the last thing. And some of that stuff has to do with not what you would call a performance review, my biggest concern, Madam Speaker, and I would like to see in the terms of reference if we are dealing with it, but there is an employee code of conduct that actually is a little lax in terms of when it comes to senior management and statutory officers, okay. And that needs to be fixed. It hasn't been fixed. Suggest the idea, took me a lot of work to prepare and asked to do that. But through that process, EPC is also the committee that deals with the CFO and the CAO and the Clerk and I think the auditor, anyway…not anyway…I'm not going to…the auditor actually helps for some of it. But, Madam Speaker, the…they are the committee that deals with the employee code of conduct when it comes to the senior management. So I will leave it at that, and I will be voting for the referral to get back at...I would really like to know how this whole process is going to work and what we actually at Council are going to be talking about. I have no idea at this point what the specifics are, we as an open council are going to be talking about. And what ultimately is the final decision we are making, Madam Speaker? That's not actually here. We're going to say yeah, you did a good job. Is that the decision we make? Like, I don't get it. Like, if I have some slight problems with a performance, I mean, like what is the decision we are making so? It does bring accountability though when you see a performance review report come to Council. That I'm sure it will be a report. I don't know. I want to know the details of the process before I am ready to vote on this. I support the idea but I just have some concerns so thanks.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers on this item? Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I'm just going to address the…my colleagues in French, just a fair warning.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: So thank you to my colleagues, Councillor Schreyer and Councillor Dobson, for your amendment. I will not be supporting your proposed amendment. I think that it is important to move forward with this evaluation of our...I'm looking for the word in French...our, well, our senior management. In my eyes, there were two major issues at stake in the last election. I know that we talked a lot about roads yesterday, but the other issue was the accountability of Council, the accountability of our administrators. Coming up to the last election, there were a lot of stories about the previous Council. Buildings were built on land that did not belong to the City. There were so many accountability issues – not just the accountability of the Council, but also that of our senior management. So I think it's important that we move forward with this proposal. We have a very clearly defined process that shows that there would be a committee responsible for the evaluation of our senior management. I don't see why we would continue to wait to implement a policy that is, in my opinion, extremely important for the evaluation of our senior management. How long do we want to debate this matter? Why wouldn't we choose to forge ahead, to show the public that we are doing our jobs as members of City Council? We have four employees. Four employees, four statutory officers, and the only ones responsible for their performance are the members of City Council. It's important, and we have gotten clarification on the municipal by-law regarding the possibility of discussing matters relating to human resources in private, because these matters are confidential, and there are all kinds of reasons for that. So thank you to my colleagues for their amendment. For my part, I am glad to see a way forward. I think that what is being proposed is reasonable and offers us a policy that will allow for the evaluation of our senior management; moreover, it proposes a way to show to the public that our administrators are, in fact, doing their jobs, and doing them well. Personally, I think that we've waited long enough and that we should move ahead with this policy that I think is well thought-out and offers us a way to take further steps toward transparency and accountability in City Council. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard, any further speakers? Councillor Schreyer to close on Motion 5.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I take heed of the remarks of all councillors that have just weighed in on the issue of referring this back to EPC. I don't really think I have got a problem with the intent of what anybody said. And I guess one could make the argument, well we could refer everything back to EPC. Well, we don't and I don't. So I am doing it in this case because we are dealing with, I would say, a notable change and that is having Council go in camera. And we've got issues of nondisclosure and we've got issues of process, because if we are doing this instead of EPC, then what are the rules? It's not clear to me, Madam Speaker. When you are dealing with in camera and keeping things secret from the public, I can appreciate as Councillor Gerbasi has said, there's reasons why it's done, that's great. But I need to know how it's done, Madam Speaker. And for Council to take the place, if you will, of EPC when it comes to the issue of the auditor, well what are the terms of reference? How do we go about this? It's a big deal for me, Madam Speaker, when I am told that we have a motion that...now I have to go in camera and withhold information and make decisions based on that. So, I am not against the intent of the motion. This is not a contradiction to openness and accountability. This is very much part of it. And for us to at least understand our involvement, what it actually has to do with closeness and lack of direct accountability because we are going in camera and we are dealing with nondisclosure, so the issues are there. And I don't know Madam Speaker, does the EPC now get information separate from the rest of Council on these Human Resource issues? Do they get the same information? Is information filtered through...from Human Resources and then filtered through EPC and then is it decided what comes to Council in camera? I don't know, Madam Speaker, it's not specified but it's a big deal because we are talking about openness and accountability and we're talking about nondisclosure and keeping information from the public when it comes to an officer of the City. Well, the least we can be, Madam Speaker is open and accountable in terms of the process and that's all I am asking for. It has been mentioned in Council that one might find it ironic...I don't want to put words in Councillor Mayes' mouth but the fact that Councillor Dobson is the one seconding this, who said he didn't trust EPC and yet why send it back to EPC. Well look, Councillor Dobson works with all members of this council, constantly, as we all do. No matter what kind of distrust takes place in this council meeting, don't lay it all on Councillor Dobson. Are we implying that Councillor Dobson is the only one in this circle that has distrust? For goodness sakes. But at least on this case, he's willing to be open and accountable and let's deal with some process. Okay, so there is some lack of distrust in this council, Councillor Dobson at least said so. All right, he is not the first one to say that by the way. There is baggage here. We all know that. I am not saying anything sensational. We deal with this. I have to sit here and be witness to it, Madam Speaker. So in this case, geez, Madam Speaker, the intent of this is not based on distrust, it's based on understanding so I can be accountable on the issue. So, what am I supposed to say? Well, what else can I do at this point, Madam Speaker, than refer it to EPC? We never had a seminar on this but I would like to know about it before we vote. That's clear. That's open. That's accountable. It's not even consistent with the intent of the motion itself. So anything Councillor Allard said I am in favour of. And this is not a contradiction to it, just clarity for all councillors before they get into the issue of having to go behind closed doors and make decisions and be privy to information that they can't share. That's what it's about and I haven't heard on this…on the Council floor...I don't blame anybody because I just ask the questions now, they spoke before, it's too late. So I'm not blaming anybody, but Madam Speaker, it hasn't been...despite the debate on this, it hasn't been...there has been no clarity shown to me in terms of process because I don't think there is, Madam Speaker. I don't think there is. And that's why I bring forward the motion. And I hope that's okay with Council. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, this is your opportunity to close on the item and the motion if you wish.

Mayor Bowman: I close?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This report is one that is providing all members of Council with greater authority to be part of annual evaluations. As has been mentioned, the opportunity for Council to decide as it deems fit as a whole, when it would like to go in camera, solely for the purposes of the auditor and performance evaluations is contemplated in the amendment that Councillor Allard and I are moving forward with today. The comments about process, I guess two comments, one is, Madam Speaker, the report does lay out a process. That has been available for members of Council for some time. The first amendment that is being brought forward today by myself and Councillor Allard is intended to narrow the opportunities for Council to decide when and if it so chooses, to go in camera solely for the limited purposes of performance evaluation matters related to the auditor. As always, Council is supreme and all members of Council will ultimately, if this is approved, ultimately Council will have the say on whether or not it wishes at any time to go in camera for those very narrow purposes. Council may not choose to do so. The general intent with this report...and I do need to commend Councillor Allard, he has been working on this for some time. And the general intent it to provide all members of Council with a greater say and input to the process and that's something that I am hopeful that all members of Council will support. I will not be supporting the second amendment, primarily because I believe the report does lay out a process. Ultimately Council can and will have its say as we go forward, including when and if it decides, as a whole, it is appropriate or needed to move in camera solely for those narrow purposes. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. So we're going to vote in reverse order. We will be voting on Motion 5 first, that's Councillor Schreyer's motion to refer. All in favour? Okay, call for a recorded vote. All in favour of Motion No. 5 to refer the item to EPC, 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

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 5 is lost. We're on to Motion No. 2 moved by Mayor Bowman, seconded by Councillor Allard. All in favour? All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Schreyer and Wyatt

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 2 is carried. We will now vote on the main item, Item No. 2 as amended. 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 Allard, Browaty, Eadie, Gerbasi, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Dobson, Schreyer and Wyatt

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 2 or pardon me, Item 2 passes as amended. Moving on to Item 5, Mr. Clerk.

Item 5 – CN Rail Cost Apportionment – Waverley Street at CN Mainline (River) Grade Separation

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item and I see that there is a motion before us as well, Motion No. 6.

Mayor Bowman: I will wait to hear from Council.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Councillor Wyatt. Okay, then you have an opportunity to introduce the motion at this time.

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

That Item No. 5 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated December 7, 2016 be referred back to the Executive Policy Committee with the following instructions:

That the item be referred to the Winnipeg Public Service for report back within 30 days to Executive Policy Committee, and that the Winnipeg Public Service be required to provide a full and detailed written report, in terms of, but not limited to, the following:

1) A copy of and a detailed description of the legal agreement between the rail authority and the COW as referred to in the extract from the administrative report re: 1930's;

While every grade separation project is unique, the CTA guidelines for cost apportionment suggest that, for applicable City costs related to grade separation primarily due to road development, 85% be apportioned to the Road Authority, and 15% to the Rail Authority. In the present case, CN Rail has an additional obligation due to the existence of a legal agreement entered into by the City and CN Rail's predecessors, The Canadian Northern Railway Company and The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, in 1930, which was ratified by Council as By-law 13988 on July 7, 1930. This agreement required that CN Rail construct a 50 foot wide two-lane overhead bridge structure including two 5 foot sidewalks at Waverley Street. Over the years, land development in the area and increased traffic demand at this site has resulted in a two-lane overhead bridge not being a feasible means of grade separation. Nonetheless, the existence of this agreement obligates CN to bear a more significant cost apportionment for the present project. The negotiated settlement reflects the change from an overhead bridge to an underpass due to land development as well as an expanded facility to accommodate five traffic lanes and two active transportation paths across the CN right-of-way.

2) An explanation, as well as the rational used, why the rail authority is not being required to pay for the grade separation as defined today, as the obligation was equally defined to be the financial responsibility of the rail authority in 1930's, now in light of the fact that a legal agreement setting such a precedent exists in the case of the Waverley crossing;

3) And further provide an explanation why, when such an existing legal agreement is in favour of the rail authority and not the roads authority, the rail authority always ensures any settlement, in such a scenario would reflect said fact, and why the roads authority, in this case the City of Winnipeg, does not use the same legal and financial position to protect the ratepayers of Winnipeg.

Councillor Wyatt: Sure, thank you. I want to make it very clear to those who are…whose wards are impacted with this project and in this area, this does not affect in any way shape or form your project. It does not affect the project in terms of the Waverley Underpass. It does not affect its construction, it's ongoing construction, it's procurement, project management, nothing in terms of this motion affects that whatsoever. This is a motion, Madam Speaker, which simply requests clarification on the information provided in the report before us today. This information, I think, is substantial. I can tell you that it appears from the report that a legal agreement had existed between the railway or the rail authority as they put it...as they call it in the Canadian Transportation Agency language, the Rail Authority and the Roads Authority…a legal agreement whereby there was a requirement for…back in 1930 believe it or not, a grade separation at this crossing to be fully paid for by the Rail Authority. That's what the report appears to say. It's not that clear even on that note, but it appears to imply that the Rail Authority had an obligation to construct a grade separation. I don't know why it didn't happen, don't know why it didn't occur, but that legal agreement exists. Just from my own experience in dealings with railways, I can assure you that the railways are the success they are today because they protect their interests to the fullest. And if such an agreement existed on the other hand, to require the Roads Authority to fully fund in 1930 a grade separation, I can assure you, in this Chamber that the Rail Authority would do everything in their power to

ensure they don't pay one nickel towards the construction of any grade separation. Maybe there is nothing untowards this. Maybe there was another decision made following...1930 is a way back, folks. I wasn't even on Council in 1930. Anyway, it's quite a ways back. And you know, it's...and even Councillor Gerbasi wasn't on Council...sorry, Councillor Gerbasi, I just had to...anyway just having some fun. Anyway, you know, we need to get to the bottom of this. We need to understand why...just to give you a perspective as well, the Plessis Road settlement was 7.5 million on a $87 million project. This is $156 million project fully understanding that a lot of it is related to upgrading to Taylor, upgrading intersections south of the underpass so on and so forth. But nonetheless at 9.5 million and a legal agreement existed, and it was important enough for the public service to mention it in their report, which means they want to make sure that we are aware that a settled legal agreement existed prior to adopting this settlement today. I think this is important enough and I would kindly request that the Mayor support and EPC...and you know if you need to take a coffee break, take a coffee break, watch...this is important, folks. This is...this is hugely important. This is a huge amount of money that we may not be required, and who knows...or receive a better settlement. Not to mention our partners on this project, the Provincial and Federal Governments who are also contributing to a project which, according to this, from what I can gather, appears a legal agreement existed for the railways to have to pay towards this. Now, there is not a lot of detail in this report and I'm sure there are members of EPC and Council who maybe provide some more light on, however, I would like to get that in writing, with all due respect. And I'd like to see that in a report because if we are going to vote on this today and settle with the railway today, I want to have the kind of detail that will give me the assurance that this is not the greatest rip off in Canadian municipal history when it comes to a railway that was supposed to be paying for the grade separation. Now, the report does say that the grade separation was supposed to be two lanes and only two lanes and over and not under. Well, that was in 1930. And I don't even think Tom De Nardi had a place back then in 1930 out there. There's probably…other than dogs and cats and maybe some horses. You know what, the reality is, that was the scope of the project then and I would argue the scope of the project today has changed, however, the intent of this agreement, the intent of the agreement in 1930, if applied today, should follow the same scope. Now, there's going to be negotiations, there's going to be back and forth, I understand that. But 9.5 million on $156 million project, when a legal agreement had previously existed that the Rail Authority from what I can see was going to be responsible, not the Road Authority, for that grade separation, this causes me real concern, it should cause every member of Council concern and pause. And this is one which, just because it went through...it got here...that's why, as the Mayor said earlier today, why Council is supreme. We are supreme for these reasons, to have these discussions. Whether we had them at EPC or not, that's why it all comes here, for us to have these discussions and have this dialogue. I would hope that we can take this a step back, send it back, get that information that this is requesting, this clarification and if there is nothing untowards on it, whether we settle today folks or we settle a month from now, won't make a difference in terms of the project. That's again, the project is proceeding. This is a settlement with the railway on their obligation. By the way, very early, congratulations. It's very early. Typically your project is well under way before the actual settlement comes forward. So, there is time to do this. I mean, from what I understand, the shovels haven't even hit the ground there. So, let's get this settled, let's find out what the history on that agreement was from 1930. There was a by-law passed by Council, not just an agreement. So, I want to thank Councillor Lukes as a seconder to this motion and I want to thank the clerks for their assistance in devising…I mean, this was written just literally over lunch and so it's here now today because of the fact there's a concern. I would greatly appreciate the time to take to look at this because I am uncomfortable voting on this as it stands right now and I would encourage other members…unless there is some sort of ground breaking news that the 1930s agreement doesn't exist and is null and void for some reason, signed in 1935 and that was not put in the report, I don't know. You know, let's have...and frankly, having this dialogue openly like this when we are still...potentially could be negotiating with the railway, that's one of the reasons why it could go back to EPC where you can actually discuss such transactions in camera if need be to protect the interest and the ratepayers of the city. Thank you.

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

Councillor Lukes: I just want to get up and speak to this also. I am seconding this motion. At the time when this report came forward, when this project came forward, myself and other members, I was Chair of the Public Works Committee, It came forward in January 18th and we spent four weeks with the Public Service discussing the many details about the underpass, we…if you recall, postponed the report for a while and came back on February 12th. At that point, the report had indicated that the CN cost apportionment had not been included as funding at this time because it was unable to be estimated. So we had done a lot of talk about this report, about the details and then in October the Public Works Committee asked the Public Service to start with verbal updates on the underpass file. And so, in all of these meetings and discussions there was no mention of the 1930 agreement. I'm sure that the Public Service has done their due diligence on this, but like Councillor Wyatt has mentioned, I would just like to see a little more clarity in the report that we are going to be voting on. I am, too, a benefactor of the Waverley Underpass so I, you know…I completely recognize that this is not going to delay the project itself. I want to be clear on that, that I wouldn't want to be delaying the project. But I would really like a little more understanding and clarity on the 1930 agreement. Having also worked with the Public Works Department for many years prior to being elected with rail lines and crossings regarding active transportation there is a lot of history and documentation with the rail lines that is set in stone and I would like to see...I have just

clarity, further clarity on it. And again, we know that because the Provincial Government has put a pause on projects, the Pan Am Clinic project, the relocation has been paused, you know, there was a bit of a rush when this project came forward because of the bypass road and the timing of the Pan Am Clinic. So I think that it would be very prudent upon us to just lay this over to EPC again. I believe that's where it goes, to EPC and have a more detailed report on what the 1930 agreement says.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Mr. Mayor, you would like to speak on the referral?

Mayor Bowman: Yeah, thank you very much Madam Speaker. My understanding from the Public Service is this motion would in fact affect the schedule. And perhaps Councillor Wyatt could provide this council on what authority he has reviewed this would have no impact. So, perhaps Councillor Wyatt can provide Council assurances this will have no schedule or negative cost impact if it's delayed.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Are there any further speakers at this time? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It appears that Councillor Wyatt has received his information from the report itself but that there is lack of clarity because he asks the question whether there is any further information that the Administration has not offered in the report that would contradict the agreement from the 1930s. So, Madam Speaker, we are talking about a negative financial impact, if in fact we don't heed the caution of Councillor Wyatt on this issue. We are talking about a lot of money. We are talking about a potential huge negative financial impact. Not just the financial impact in the name of process because everything costs money. Any time involved can cost money. But in fact, it would just be legally wrong and therefore unfair and illogical. It seems to me that if there is information missing, it's by virtue of the report itself which is inadequate. But from which Councillor Wyatt has received all his information. To me, it's logically impossible not to support this motion to refer back so that we know exactly what we are talking about because we are talking about a significant potential negative financial impact. And I don't have any insurances from this council at this point that we can move forward on behalf of Winnipeggers on this, in light of what Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Lukes have just offered us. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So again here today talking about positive news and trying to make it into a negative. We have incredibly secured the deal with CN. This 1930s agreement was around during the Kenaston Underpass, it's been around for a while obviously, what about, 80, 90 years. But again, it's always...it has been there. So we come here today, I was very excited to say, well this won't be like the Plessis Underpass. This is again showing our due diligence and showing how we are going to resolve these matters now rather than after the fact. So again, we have our administration have worked diligently with CN to come to an agreement that actually lowers our cost. You can speculate that oh, maybe it doesn't take into this, maybe it doesn't do this and you can cast shadows of doubt as much as you want but again, that's not making decisions. We're being told that we have to lead by example. Well, if you really had a problem, you should have come to EPC when the report was there. You should have asked the Public Service ahead of time. But to throw this type of cloud of suspicion today just because I believe, you know, it just makes a better story, I don't doubt that there may be somebody wants to see the 1930s agreement, fine. But I do trust our administration. Again, we have had some people say they never trust our administration. But again, we come to a fair agreement with CN. I am not getting into all the details of it, that's our administration's responsibility that I do trust and have worked on it. We are actually going to be reducing our costs. I do thank the Province and the Federal Government for not clawing back on that, they are going to let us take that right off our debt financing. But again, to sit here today to say...and knowing nothing to be honest with you, that this won't have an impact, how do you know? How do you know this won't have an impact? You know, I am actually quite concerned that it will have an impact. It will make CN start to sit back and say, okay, you want to go that route? So let's go at it a little bit harder. And we're not going to resolve this and it may delay the project. One year delay is millions and millions of dollars. So I agree with Councillor Schreyer, this is an irresponsible motion. It's been brought forward by a councillor who did not support the project from the first place so again, with all due respect, if you do have a problem with these motions, please come speak to the committee…the proper committees and ask those questions, but don't come here today to try to make some story up about how something untowards is happening. Please, people, this is a good story. We are actually getting the money ahead of the project. We are not getting clawed back from the Federal Government or the Province, they are letting us keep it all. But to say here, it won't have an impact is completely irresponsible, completely...how do you know? Because you say so? That's completely irresponsible. What I do know is what I have heard from the Mayor is that we are going to get the money. It's the best, fair deal that we worked out. Again, we can second guess every type of motion that comes forward from our administration, we can refer things back all the time, but again, I don't believe that's the proper way. If you do have questions, you know, if you do have concerns, then go on agendas for other committees. So come on out. Ask those questions. If you can't make the committee, that's totally understandable but then ask the question ahead of time. But to go off at lunch time to wrap out a quick, you know, from the hip motion like this and to make the claim that it will not have any impact, how do you know that? I believe it will have an impact. This project is on a very tight time line. We

have to move it forward. Every year that we delay this project, it costs more and more money. So again, I believe, again, just speculating, I feel as though I can just speculate, that actually referring this over will actually have a serious financial impact for the City of Winnipeg. It jeopardizes the money that we have been already offered. It puts uncertainty into the project and we can move forward. So again, this is a good story. This is a good story. This is not waiting until six months down...like, six years after the project. I think Kenaston was really late after. Plessis, I think we're still probably trying to resolve it. But again, this is a good news story, people. So again, I respect the fact that some people have some questions but you know, that's why we put these through the committee structure so you can come and ask those questions, you see it posted, it was posted many weeks ago, it gave people ample time to talk to the Administration but again, that wasn't done. So now today we're just going to make up the boogie man. So again, I don't believe in that. I believe that this is an irresponsible amendment and I won't be supporting it and I hope that you will be supporting the motion in front of you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Morantz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think if you read the report carefully there, there is no doubt that our not accepting the settlement would have a very serious effect on the project and I'll point out some of the provisions to my colleagues. I'm sure you have read it already, but just to remind you. Recommendation 1 says that Council approve the cost sharing arrangement for CN Rail to pay the City $9,500,000 as their cost of apportionment. Recommendation 3 calls for the City to enter into execute and deliver a crossing agreement. In other words an agreement that allows us to cross with CN Rail and such other agreements as determined necessary by the City solicitor. Now those are just the recommendations, but if you go further down to the bottom of page five and I think that's where you'll see the operative paragraph and I will just read it out. It says, "If the cost of apportionment is not accepted by either party, then the next step would be the CTA adjudication process. As noted above that process will take a minimum of six months to complete but could take several years thus delaying the project. The CTA decision would be binding not to both parties and there is no guarantee they will rule in favour of either party", in other words, we could get more, we could get less. But this last sentence I think really puts in perspective, it says, "The project funding from Infrastructure Canada is contingent on the City entering into a crossing agreement with CN who will not enter into the agreement without their cost apportionment decided." So, you know, I think that there is no doubt that referring this back would have a serious negative effect on the progress of the project which is really slated to start construction in the spring. It's a very good deal for taxpayers as well and I might add, and I said this to EPC when I spoke to it, that all of this money has been agreed to reduce our debt. There is no requirement for us to share the $9.5 million with the other funders of the project; the Federal or the Provincial Governments. So I think if you look at the report as a whole, it's very clear. There is no ambiguity about it. If we don't accept this offer which I think is a fair offer in the interests of the taxpayers of Winnipeg, there will be an effect on the project. So I would urge all my Council colleagues to support accepting the settlement. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I stand here guilty of not reading the full report, and I appreciate that when we work as Council and we work on a number of things we raise issues with each other and Madam Speaker, I think that Councillor Wyatt has raised a very interesting issue in regards to this report. I mean, it is in there. The Rail Authority was to build a bridge, they never did. So, you know, that's…and I know it's very difficult, you are negotiating things and the recommendations are there, Madam Speaker. Just on the matter of the referral, I'm glad that it's here as a debate but you know what, I'm not going to be referring it back because they point it out, the people who are running this project, pointed out that you know, there would be delays. What I did want to say though, Madam Speaker, is while I won't be voting to refer this back, I won't be voting for this report. I won't be voting for this report because I haven't the foggiest idea what all the implications are. A fellow councillor just named out some cost effects and delays could cost lots more money. Is there a specific number in this report and that's why I stand here guilty of not reading the whole report in detail, but is there actually a financial analysis that says if this doesn't move through at this point it's going to cost us this much extra over the $156 million that we are already talking about? There is construction inflation and I think we all acknowledge that. Yesterday's debate, I don't think anybody denied that there wasn't any construction inflation. So, you know, I understand that. But there is no value in here so people are standing and saying, well it's going to cost us more and cause big problems, delays. You know, I don't know the dollar value of the implication but I can tell you that I can honestly vote against it because in the report I have some concerns and I don't know how the negotiations go…went with the railway, but I know they are very difficult, very, very difficult. And should they be paying 15 percent or 25 percent? Is $9.5 million, 25 percent of the project in terms of the underpass, not excluding? So you know, what we do have is excitement about an agreement that we get to keep, the City, for the project, the amount of money that the 9.5 million, that amount of money from the railway for this project. That is exciting. That's good. But you know, I don't know. Maybe it could have been better, I don't know. Maybe that will be part of the performance evaluation of our senior administration when the time comes, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Wyatt, do you wish to close?

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I can say the same thing back to the Mayor in terms of his question. I can say, why is it not in the report? It's not in the report that there's going to be a delay if this is not adopted today. It refers to a process, an adjudication process, we know that. We know that process has always existed, it exists across the country set out by the CTA. We also know that the Infrastructure Agreement has always required this, always. So, why is the Mayor not saying simply that this will cause a delay? He didn't say that. He said...I challenge Councillor Wyatt to explain if there's going to be a delay. That is not answering the question and the concern. And I hear the words from the other members of the committee, serious issues, concern, potential, you know, I didn't think there was a cover up but now I'm starting to wonder that this is not being addressed, with all due respect Madam Speaker. With all due respect, when I read in the report…when I read in the report the following, "The CN Northern Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, the predecessors to CN Rail, in 1930 which was ratified by By-law No. 13988 on July the 7th, 1930, this agreement required that CN Rail construct a 50-foot wide two lane overhead bridge structure including, including two five-foot wide sidewalks at Waverley Street." At Waverley. Not at Kenaston, not at Pembina, at Waverley. And this is the first time this appears in the report…the former Chair of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works stands up and says that this is the first she has seen this and you know what, yes, we could have gone to EPC on the 7th during our budget process but it's here today and I just heard the Mayor earlier saying Council is supreme. Well, if Council is supreme, do our job folks. Let's do our job and our job is to make sure that we are not shafting the ratepayers of Winnipeg on this agreement which is my concern. Which is why I did the due diligence to move this motion thanking the clerks for their assistance which is why we should be ensuring that we take the time to ensure that there was nothing...not only that, but protecting our partners in this agreement is our obligation, our partners being the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments. Maybe they shouldn't be paying what they are paying based on this legal agreement from the railway. And you can be guaranteed, my friends, you can be guaranteed that if the railway...the shoe was on the other foot...anyway, Madam Speaker, those are my comments. I would hope that this could be sent back. This could be brought back. I said 30 days not 160 days and yes, I didn't support the project, I supported the Building Canada list but the Building Canada list is constantly being changed and we don't know where the heck it is today because there is a new Building Canada program and we still haven't seen the Building Canada list and we don't know what Build Winnipeg's up to, but they are up to something. So you know what Madam Speaker, let's get some transparency on this. We have an actual report for the first time saying there is a legal agreement requiring the railway to pay and yet the railway is paying exactly what they paid in other previous agreements. Now, if the citizens of Winnipeg should not be concerned about how this council is conducting itself before, they are now going forward because this is not doing due diligence.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close on the item?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The report talks about the fact that there could be delays. My comment earlier was hearing that there wouldn't be any delays if this goes to EPC, there was a reason for asking my Council colleague on what basis he'd be saying that. Because we do see in the report that there…it does lay out the process of delays and we are advised by the Public Service that...that a delay could very well affect costs. So, I will be supporting the report and ask my Council colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I will call the question on Motion 6, motion for referral. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Dobson, Lukes, Schreyer, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 6 is lost. Now I will call the question on the main item, Item 5. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Gerbasi, Gillingham, Gilroy, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma
Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Lukes, Schreyer and Councillor Wyatt.

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

Madam Speaker: Item 5 passes. Mr. Clerk, Item 6.

Item 6 – Winnipeg Police Pension Fund Letter of Credit

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

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. This was stood down by Councillor Wyatt, is that yourself? You have the floor. Item No. 6, Winnipeg Police Pension Letter of Credit.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, thank you. I am voting for this but again, this speaks to the issue and the concern that I think we have heard many times in this Council Chamber with regards to the liability that we face with regards to the defined benefit plan versus the defined contribution. So I just stand it down to note that and the fact that it's...I look forward…I understand the Mayor has initiated a process at EPC to address this going forward. Hopefully, in terms of new hires and I thank the Winnipeg Police Association as well for the fact that they have identified this as an issue that needs to be addressed as well. And so I'm...hopefully this is something that will become less and less significant as time goes forward once those reforms are made.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers on the item? Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Bowman: Just for clarity for those watching, the City was advised by the Winnipeg Police Pension Board that a solvency exemption was not granted. The City has secured a letter of credit of sufficient value to the…to offset the solvency deficiency obligation at a cost for one year of just over $94,000. This letter of credit's fee is projected to increase annually by about $5,000. This report is proposed to be received as information as Recommendation 3 of the February 27th, 2013 Council decision requires the Chief Financial Officer to report annually to Council on the City's projected future commitments under any letters of credit issued to offset the solvency deficiency obligation for the Winnipeg Police Pension Fund. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I will call the question on Item 6. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, Councillors, Motion No. 1 on your desks; moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan. It's an automatic referral to EPC. It's regarding liability insurance regarding the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres, an automatic referral to EPC. Motion No. 3 on your desks; it's moved by Councillor Eadie, seconded by Councillor Schreyer. It's regarding the Frontage Levy for Cemeteries. This is an automatic referral to EPC. We will now move on to by-laws under EPC, Mr. Mayor.

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

That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to investigate and report back to Executive Policy Committee on liability insurance and vehicle/equipment insurance costs for the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres.

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

WHEREAS religious and not for profit cemetaries are exempt from paying property taxes;

AND WHEREAS religious and Non-Profit cemeteries have been adversely impacted by the 41% increase in the 'Frontage Levy' imposed on their large properties, located throughout Winnipeg, in the 2016 & 2017 budget;

AND WHEREAS some of these Cemeteries have also been re-assessed by the Public Service and 'Flankage' as been added to their calculation of the 'Frontage Levy' which has added to their tax related payment problems;

AND WHEREAS cemetery representatives have specifically requested that an 'Administrative Committee' be established and tasked with reviewing this matter together with all 'Religious and Non-Profit Cemeteries' and then report to EPC with recommendations and;

AND WHEREAS cemetery representatives note that long term increases in this 'Frontage Levy', without relief to all cemeteries, could result in some or all of them facing the possibility of ceasing operations sometime in the future, due to the high levels of taxation;

AND WHEREAS these Cemeteries may face only one option under current circumstance and that is to "turn the keys over" to the City of Winnipeg which will impact future City of Winnipeg operating costs;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council direct the Winnipeg Public Service to review the impact of the 'Frontage Levy' on the future operations and viability of religious & not for profit' Cemeteries, and that representatives of all these cemeteries be consulted;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Public Service report back to Council by July 30, 2017 on the financial implications to the City's budget and recommended changes to Winnipeg by-laws to remove frontage levies on religious and not for profit cemeteries.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time, By-law 133, 134, 135/2016, By-laws 141/2016, 142/2016 and By-law 147/2016.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law 133/2016, 134/2016, 135/2016, 141/2016, 142/2016 and 147/2016.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, on the second reading.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law Nos. 133/2016 to 135/2016 both inclusive, and By-law Nos. 141/2016, 142/2016 and 147/2016 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. So noted, thank you. Mr. Mayor, on the suspension.

Clerk: By-laws 133/2016 to 135/2016 both inclusive, and By-law Nos. 141/2016, 142/2016 and 147/2016.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 133/2016 to 135/2016 both inclusive, and By-laws numbered 141/2016 and 142/2016 and 147/2016 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. So noted, thank you. We'll now move on to Question Period…Question Period for the Mayor. Councillor Gilroy.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Chair. My question is, I know that there's been some great discussions around Shoal Lake, and I'm just wondering if the Mayor could give us a briefing on what's going on, especially our commitment to building the bridge and where we're at with that project. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Through you, to my Council colleague, I thank her very much for the question as well as her commitment to supporting our friends and our partners at Shoal Lake. I'd also like to thank all members of this council for their support as well, as well as the citizens of Winnipeg, as well as many grassroots organizations that have advocated for many, many years to support Shoal Lake and the access road, "Freedom Road" as it's known. Since 1989, when the City and the Province entered into a tripartite agreement, Madam Speaker, with Shoal Lake First Nation 40, the City has remained steadfast in its objection of promoting sustainable economic development for Shoal Lake First Nation 40. This includes recognition that an all-weather road access is key to that sustainable economic development and this clear intent has been stated in every adopted budget since 2012. Work on this project has begun, notably this past summer, the City completed the construction of the Falcon River Diversion Bridge. The City of Winnipeg's investment of $4 million and committed to an additional $6 million in last year's 2016 Capital Budget. The budget that we passed yesterday included monies through Water and Waste to support a bursary program to youth and their education at Shoal Lake and the City has been working to date, based on a total budget of a cost of $30 million. When the Federal Government announced their commitment and participation back in December of 2015, they indicated they were making their commitment based on the $30 million budget. We have since seen that the costs are likely higher than that, as Members of Council and Winnipeggers will have seen, Chief Red Sky as well as Minister Clark and I met as part of our Annual Tripartite Agreement here at City Hall earlier this week. It was a great meeting and one that during which, the Chief provided information that he learned from the Federal Government that would move this forward. It was certainly something that was welcomed. And of course, while the City of Winnipeg has been leading and building the bridges, we are expecting, as a result of the news from earlier this week, that we will see further construction amplify and pick up pace and of course, the project management is being administered by the Province of Manitoba, was under the previous government, of course the new provincial partners, the new Provincial Government have changed the mechanism by which that project is going to be managed. But the project is ultimately being managed by the Province of Manitoba, and we'll work with our provincial partners, our federal partners, and our friends at Shoal Lake to ensure that Freedom Road is completed as soon as possible. And at that time, I'll certainly look forward to going on a drive with Chief Red Sky, with Minister Clark and others including many from this Council, who I know have been waiting for this for a very long time. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Over the last decade, there have been a number of new developments happening within the East Exchange, Madam Speaker, a lot of condominiums being built on Waterfront Drive, on James Avenue, we have condominiums on Bannatyne. We now have heard that there's the James Avenue Pumping Station is going to be a mixed-use development with retail office and residential. And we have a new Support for Life Centre that's going to be opening up next year in 2017, Madam Speaker. The Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation, Madam Speaker, sees over 933,000 patrons every single year, and with the influx of new, more people living in the East Exchange, parking is a number one issue. This council, in March 23rd of 2011, Madam Speaker, concurred in the recommendation of the ASD Committee, which was to set aside $5 million from the sale of the Winnipeg Parkade towards a James Avenue Parkade. I'm wondering what's happening with the James Avenue Parkade, Madam Speaker, and want to know if the Mayor could shed some light in terms of what he knows relative to the project, its timeline, its schedule and has he heard anything regarding that from the Centennial Centre Corporation or the province whether it's going to be completed or not.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I'd like, through you, Madam Speaker, I'd like to thank the Councillor for his advocacy and his passion for this important project, which we all want to see proceed. My understanding from our administration is that the Province is…or has advised that as part of the new Provincial Government's commitment to projects that create value for money, the Province is reviewing its role and activities in the downtown with an eye to efficient and thoughtful development investment. So we are waiting to hear back from the Province.

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

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank the Mayor for that. It's good to hear that the Province is going to look at this. And I wanted to know if the Mayor, in my supplementary question, would be willing to discuss this matter with the Province of Manitoba as early as could be regarding the James Avenue Parkade?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I'd be happy to do so and work collaboratively with my Council colleague in that regard. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, we heard earlier in a discussion about another EPC report that and probably for good reason and I respect the decision about the Civic Initiatives Grant line of 512,000, which was formally under the Mayor and has been moved to a different format of application process, Madam Speaker, that's what was explained to me. So what I'd like to know, Madam Speaker, is I would like to know in detail, so the Administration, I don't know which level of Administration, is it the Clerk's Department, whose department, receives these applications and then, once those applications are in, who's making those decisions. Is it part of the EPC budget process in determining which of these applicants receive money?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I'd be happy to speak with my Council colleague after the meeting in greater detail. But if I understand his question correctly, I believe we've moved the grants process to Council as part of the budget. So ultimately Council decides on which grants are provided. I trust that's the line item that my Council colleague is referring to.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, is there anything further? Second question.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, that grants process does not list in detail where the money is going, the 512,000, I think it refers to some economic thing and I don't know what so.

Mayor Bowman: I'd be more than happy to sit down with my Council colleague to discuss this matter and see what information I could provide or the Public Service or the Clerk's office could provide.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any further questions for the Mayor? Seeing none, we will move on. Moving on to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. We have the report in front of us dated December 5th, 2016, Councillor Orlikow.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED DECEMBER 5, 2016

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to move Items 2 through 8.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I am declaring a conflict on 7.

Madam Speaker: Okay. So we stood down, sorry…2? Was 2 stood down? No, 8 and 7 will have to be stood down and 1. Okay, so I will call the question on 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 1.

Item 1 – Rezoning – 956 and 958 McMillan Avenue – DAZ 211/2016

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

Councillor Orlikow: No, actually I do not Mrs…Madam Speaker. I would like to allow...just to make sure that the process is deemed fair and open for all, I don't believe…because this issue has been quite excited, I guess we will say, that I should be opening and closing. I believe that's not really fair in the process. So I would like to allow Councillor Gerbasi to open and close this matter.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Yes, it is permitted. Councillor Gerbasi to open on Item 1.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay, well, just to introduce the item, as you know, this was originally a hearing at City Centre Community Committee and I guess the comment I'd make is our community committee process is usually a very, very detailed public hearing, that there's a lot of thought goes into it. It's not either for or against infill as has been portrayed in some cases, if we say…if a community committee says no to something, it doesn't necessarily mean they oppose all infill or they are in favour of all infill. It means that that is the decision they have made based on the particulars of the particular property that they are discussing in front of them. So, I think I want to put it in that context. One of the...there is positives and negatives to different models. Some cities have models where there is a planning commission that decides everything and councillors aren't involved in their local decision making whatsoever, some people think that might be a way to go. There might be advantages to that system. The advantage of the current system we have, and I am not saying one is better than the other, what we have now is that the local councillor has a unique and detailed understanding of their own ward. And not that they are always right and not that there aren't cases where people might disagree and you have every right to make your own decision on these matters today, obviously. So, I guess with that introduction...and I guess I also…this is kind of a unique one because there was a lot of public advocacy from the proponent during the process, after the public hearings were held, and so I would imagine that Councillors received a lot of pressure and, you know, we aren't supposed to receive communications past that public hearing whatsoever from the developer, from the residents, from anybody. We are not supposed to be hearing that. We are supposed to be basing our decision on our own discussions when we are in a public hearing or here or at property committee. So, there is some concerns about the process and I guess the reason I am concerned is, you know, in this particular case, it was the proponent that got a lot of extra...you know, was putting forward and they didn't break any rules. They are allowed to send e-mails and they're allowed to take out newspaper ads. In the current time, that's our process. But I mean, I just wonder how residents, you know, or people who may be on a different side of the issue, in some cases might feel that the process seems somewhat unfair in that regard and it could be the other way around it could be a resident group that got really organized and put newspaper ads and pressured all the councillors to not support something once the public hearing was closed. So I mean, my concern is just the process here has been a little bit strange and I think that's something that we should all be considering. We as councillors should be basing our decision based on the information in the report from our planners, reviewing them, you know, and following the process. So I am a little concerned about that like from the point of view of the public perception of fairness, about this particular issue. You know, and there has been a lot of political accusations flying around. You know, councillors are not supporting infill. You know, last night at City Centre Community Committee we had three infill projects which were approved by the committee, significant ones that involved significant change in those areas of the neighbourhood. So, you know, I just wanted to put those thoughts on the table for you to consider. I know Councillor Orlikow, you know, whether you agree or disagree, he makes his decision with integrity. I certainly don't think he deserves some of the scorn and the abuse he took over this. And I think that he is a person of integrity that we should show respect for. So those are my comments in introducing the item. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thanks Madam Speaker. I'm not going to speak to the merits or demerits about this specific project. The planners did their report, there's all that stuff. I just wanted to speak to…seeing as how the process, it's been introduced, Madam Speaker…a discussion about the process. And how we are not supposed to talk about it or after, you know, the hearing is over we are not supposed to…at community committee, the hearing's over, you are not supposed to talk to the zoning agreement or whatever as it moves on to P and D. Madam Speaker, my problem is, and I have been through this, trust me, I have been through this…and what's interesting about the process regarding this one is that two of the actual members of that community committee are on P and D. On P and D, Madam Speaker. What happened to me back in, what was it, 2011, Madam Speaker, the process, I heard it at community committee and I wasn't allowed to come and speak to that report when it came to P and D and P and D reversed it, Madam Speaker. Reversed it, Madam Speaker, without my ability as the councillor for the area, without my ability to even present on it. I was told no, conflict. No, Councillor Eadie, you are not allowed. But here we have two City Centre Committee members Madam Speaker, on P and D. And they are voting again on it and they are going to stay consistent. That's fine, however, for me, why as I as a councillor at 108 Scotia was not allowed to come and speak at P and D? Not allowed to talk to it till it came to Council I was able to speak to it, Madam Speaker, but by that time it's too late, right. So, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to point out issues of process in discussion and people hearing from the proponents and after hearings before making a decision and making a decision on the planner's report. I just happen to agree with the planner's report so I will just be sitting down and waiting to take a vote. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Mayes: Briefly, I supported Councillor Orlikow's position at EPC, I will do so again today. I also supported Councillor Eadie on that 108 Scotia vote. Five years ago today, my first Council meeting after the budget meeting the day before, so I went with the local councillor, I don't think that fast but I went with Councillor Eadie on that Scotia vote and I'm going with the local councillor because I tend to think the local councillors have the best reading and that there is something fundamentally democratic about our public hearing process. It isn't, well, City Planner said X, we got to do X. You have no control, you have no input. Sorry if you voted for a councillor who doesn't agree, too bad, we have to follow the Planning Department. We have a democratic process. Sometimes the councillors follow the planners, sometimes they don't. As I've said before, if we all followed the planning report we'd have that nice water park at the Forks but luckily we didn't follow that planning report, a number of us voted against it and we don't have the water park at the Forks. I think that was a triumph for democracy. So keep that in mind when people are saying you automatically have to agree with the planner's report. And final note, I guess, I don't feel particularly hard done by in this debate but I have to say, no one's voted for more infill than Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Gerbasi who've taken a lot of heat on this. We had an appeal hearing once where I said to the applicant, look, you haven't even been able to get Councillor Gerbasi on side with your infill project here and if you can't do that, you know, what do you…how do you expect to get the rest of us on side? I think Councillor Gerbasi's voted for a lot of infill projects. On this particular one, they did the public hearing, they heard all the debate, all the input and made their judgment. So, we get told, well we don't...I mean, I voted for an infill street, a new street in my ward on the Monday night before EPC and none of that gets covered, but you do get labeled as anti-infill because of a vote like this. And I asked some members of the media and I was told, well we don't cover the ones where you vote for it in agreement. We do cover the residents' opposition if they come forward on appeal, like they are on some tomorrow, we'll cover the residents' side there but if you disagree with the planners, that's news worthy so we cover it when you are…you vote against infill. So I've got to say, I think we need a little better guidelines on infill, I think we need a little better approach in the media because I think some people here, not so much me perhaps, but others have voted for a lot of infill and not been given the proper credit for that. But again, you don't always...if we always followed the planner's recommendations we would have a waterpark at the Forks so on this matter…and trust me, I have voted against that as did you Madam Speaker. On this one I'm going to go with the recommendations of the community committee and the local councillor because I think they have had the most time to review the procedure. I don't know if I will always do that but on this particular matter, maybe I will echo what I said a couple of years ago at Appeals Committee. If you can't get Councillor Gerbasi on side for your infill project then maybe you need to go back and revisit the application.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I guess there's a few things to talk about and I'm not sure...well we have ten minutes but...or eight. First of all, I do want to mention that I believe that Councillor Orlikow for years, I believe, has been rather consistent and...well, he has done his part. He has done due diligence for infill, I'm not denying that. And at the same time, Madam Speaker, as a new councillor, dealing with the mantra of infill and density, I have been trying to do my part as well in my ward. It's not simple. For a couple of reasons, one...well for a few reasons, but I will mention one is...I am trying to create sort of a pattern in the absence of one as we move forward, trying to deal with issues of density and infill and I am trying to do my best. At the same time, we are creating that pattern as we go along, I believe. And in depend of creating sort of a grand strategy by convention because we don't have one yet. Councillor Lukes did bring forward a motion to create an infill strategy and that's great. Having said that, even with that, I believe Council...at least in the short-term will remain supreme on these issues on councillors...in the end have ultimate decision, such as our process. And I assume that bringing in an infill strategy doesn't change that. It's still about terms of reference because everyone is different. And I can surely appreciate Councillor Orlikow in his insights how he makes his decision. And I was actually rather impressed with how he went about showing his thought process as I sit on Property and Development Standing Committee with himself, Councillor Dobson and Councillor Gerbasi. I know it's an issue when I said about...you know, it's not the same if you don't know the community and if you don't know the community maybe you will be less sensitive to it. And I do want to address that because yes, I have lived in every province, worked in every province and I've travelled around but Winnipeg is my home and you know, this area of the city...I have lived in different parts of the city. I don't know, ten different places in the city and you know, this is one of them. I have lived on Dudley. My brother-in-law...my brother's family…family-in-law live on Fleet. My cousin, our good family friend live three blocks away on Grosvenor. I spent years as Communications Chair for UNICEF Manitoba just three blocks away. The UNICEF office was there for years. Now, of course we've all…you know, we're all…celebrate Corydon Avenue as a commercial district but I understand it's in the about being there as a consumer, it's about living there and I appreciate that. What can I say, community events at Earl Grey School and Kelvin High School, the church basement and the Anglican church just two blocks from there…I can't remember the name, but very much part of my life. I know it's an Anglican church because I was there with Helen Norrie in the basement there, as an example. The place isn't foreign to me, it's dear to me. But I also feel that it's dear to people that are residents that have been lifelong residents in Crescentwood and River Heights area and that it would be those people that would be most inclined to want to live in such a…what seems to be such a nice condominium or they can retire in their community. And that's what I was thinking about. I admit and it's very much obvious to me, as Councillor Orlikow and Gerbasi made...brought forward the case,

that this was definitely pushing it. And that there were alternatives that Councillor Orlikow was in favour of. It's a grey area to me but I did say at that meeting, I'm in the dark here because we are trying to create the conventions in the absence of more specific terms of reference as an infill strategy which albeit, I hope, would still be terms of reference and we still make decisions. It's a difficult decision. But I truly respect the arguments of the...of the...not saying resident plural, resident councillors as Councillor Gerbasi's from very close by as well. Having said that, I believe that...as they said at the meeting, this way is out. We make so many decisions, Madam Speaker. It's not black and white. We make a decision as to...we weigh things out. We literally weigh things out is the best metaphor. We weigh things out and this balances out to me to be a decent development and good for the community. But it is a close call, Madam Speaker, it really is. And you know, I am not surprised that the vote went the other way at EPC. There was no recommendation from Property and Planning Standing Committee. It was a tie vote. But I want to learn from this and I hope we all do as we all move forward on dealing with the issues of infill and density, it's very serious. And we are making decisions, long term decisions for the future and trying to find our way in what we…I guess we consider a new era. Not completely new, we are always dealing with this stuff. But nonetheless, in this new term, dealing with issues of density and infill, I certainly believe that we all have more to learn about this and I truly appreciate it. More than anything else it was the process. It was the debate, the discussion and the insight from the thought process from Councillor Orlikow and Gerbasi. And process is paramount, Madam Speaker, process is paramount on this as we move forward, and I thought this was an excellent process and one that I have learned from. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Gillingham followed by Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise just to express that I will be voting consistent with my position at EPC but I want to do…do want to make a couple of comments though and they are similar to what I made at EPC. The first is that, in regards to my colleague, Councillor Orlikow, I don't think in any way that anyone in his community or watching or observing this should in any way ever question his commitment to his community. I have been thoroughly impressed, I'm always impressed with the hard work that many of our colleagues do here and Councillor Orlikow is certainly, in my mind, one of the councillors who certainly has his thumb on the pulse of what's happening in his community. So I have the highest regard for him. I do want to take the opportunity to though to really express and what so many others have expressed, but I want to get it on record is that the need for the infill guidelines. Councillors, planners, developers, residents, the general public, all need to be kind of working from the same understanding. And so I know there has been a call for that and those guidelines are being developed and you know, we will be coming forward in due course and scrutinized. And I think that's really an important next step to us improving this process. Much has been said about the process already and I think there needs to be...there is opportunity here for improvement of the process on a number of fronts and I think it's incumbent upon us as Council to where we can and how we can improve the process so that it's a better process for everybody. The, you know, the stakeholders that I just listed would really benefit from improving the process through detailed and comprehensive set of infill guidelines that dovetail with the OurWinnipeg plan and our complete communities plan as well. So, thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I rise in support of the City Centre's decision and I was one of those councillors that made that decision there and I just wanted to be able to talk a little bit about why I made my decision. And you know, we do have one of the busiest committees when it comes to infill and I think most projects, I think, do get approved so you know, it was sad to hear some of the comments raised but anyways that's the way it is it in public life I guess. But what really is important to me, I'm one of the City Councillors, I don't get as much infill development, I'm starting to which I'm really, really excited about but I don't get as much. So I am learning a lot from of course Councillor Gerbasi who gets most of it and Councillor Orlikow and I get to hear a lot about what sets a precedent, what are the...how are the administration looking at that, why are they allowing it, why aren't they allowing it, so I am learning really a lot sitting on the City Centre Community. So I am very lucky in that respect so when it does comes to future developments, like I feel like I have a ground...you know, a good footing on the ground to deal with it. So, in terms of the public hearing process, it is so invaluable and that's the one thing that I have learned sitting on this committee, how important it is to have public hearings and to make sure that the people have ability to say what they feel in the development. And yesterday, I had one in my ward and it was about...it was a rezoning and it was a subdivision so it was an amalgamation of lots. But, if you look on the agenda item it showed on there that it was an amalgamation of a lot and a subdivision. So people going to that public hearing knew exactly what they were going to the public hearing for and when you're talking about amalgamating lots, that's very, very vital. It changes the scope. When you're talking about a rezoning, it's different and when you're talking about bringing two lots together that's totally changing the scope. And if you look on the agenda from that night, you will not see that we had a subdivision amalgamation because that was done in a different way. The developer chose to go through Land Titles. So it didn't allow for the public to speak on the issue of amalgamation of two lots. And I think that that really does change the scope and I feel that that's an important process. I feel that by…when we talk about transparency, when we talk about making sure that people have a voice at City Hall, that's the one thing that we need to do. So if any one of us has two amalgamations of lots beside us that we can come and voice our

concerns and be able to talk about that. So that's one thing that I was very uncomfortable with that did take place and I know that the administration recommended that, you know, that they go through the proper process but that didn't happen. So anyways, they were allowed to do that. Hopefully that we look at changing that because I don't think that that's fair to residents. Another thing is when we do allow for developments, we are setting a precedent and that's very clear just from seeing the amount that goes through the City Centre Committee. And usually our administration tells us that what their reasonings are for and the reasoning that I heard was a very old building, a hundred years, which wasn't in the close proximity of the development and the other one was in Jenny Gerbasi's area which is zoned totally different and has a totally different amount of development. So for me, I feel that the administration was really wrong and you know what. We can disagree. And our job is not always to agree with our administration. Our job is to look at these projects, keep in mind the community that…which it serves, and look at all those aspects. The administration's job is to look at the project, our job is to look at multiple aspects, I think. And so I disagree with the administration. And I don't know if I'm going to change anybody's mind here tonight, but...or today, but you know, this is three councillors at City Centre that hear a lot of development and I just want to say, you know, like when you're saying that you know, this isn't something right across the street or down the street, you are looking at a total different community with different zoning and, you know, and then we are also looking at this…that there was no public hearing on amalgamation of a lot. That's two things I think that are vital when we're talking about this. But anyways, thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Any further speakers? Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I spend more time than normal reading this particular report, listening to the previous hearings that have been involved in this one and I do want to say that I very much respect the area councillor and the Chair of the Property and Development Committee. These ones aren't easy decisions. At the end of the day, I am going to vote against the recommendation that came out of the EPC and perhaps support a…if it doesn't pass the motion, to support a motion to approve this particular development. That the zoning…sorry, rezoning. Again, OurWinnipeg talks about densification of these neighbourhoods. These are the types of projects that you don't want to see mid-block but on the ends of the blocks. The neighbourhood character changes and that's not necessarily a bad thing. One of the things I've always said about densification projects, rezonings, even roadways, I appreciate that if you've been a long time resident of the neighbourhood, this is a character change perhaps to the neighbourhood that you know and love. But does it substantially decrease the value of what is people's most valuable asset, in most cases, their homes. And I don't believe that's the case here. This is an evolving, changing, vibrant neighbourhood. This is where a lot of people want to live and the scale and size of this unit of this particular development I think is appropriate. There is more parking than many developments that are similar to this one that you would see otherwise. Again, I don't take this decision lightly and I do very much respect the area councillor and the process but I will not be moving...following the motion before us.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I guess I'm not going to speak specifically to this project but I'm going to speak to a couple of things that I think has come out of this process. So as this project has worked its way through committees, we have heard a lot of perspectives in the media, on talk shows, watched videos, I have received countless e-mails weighing in on how we should be growing our city. And from all these discussions I really believe as Council we should move forward on two action items. I spoke to this on Standing Policy Committee on PD, Heritage and Downtown Development and I will just highlight them again. I think the first action…item Council should move forward on is developing and seeking Council approval for a residential infill strategy. It's really surprising that this new council hasn't moved forward on this action especially since an infill guide was already developed in 2011 and then on May 14th, 2013 City Centre requested an infill policy to develop and Public Service was directed to do so and especially in light of the fact that Council is moving forward on impact fees and having the desire to grow up. I brought forward at the Standing Policy Committee on P and D and I invited the Chair, Councillor Orlikow, to work with me on editing the motion which he did and I am thankful for him to do that. And it reads that, you know, within 90 days that the Public Service prepare a residential infill strategy which will prescribe anticipated stakeholder consultation and deliverables including those that could be prepared within OurWinnipeg review as well as policy framework to encourage infill development, planning and design guidelines for residential infill and infill communication strategy to share information clearly and widely with builders and residents and I think that's really important. I see experiencing a lot of fallout from the fact that we didn't do any consultation…public consultation with the impact fees, and residents need to understand and they need to know…understand why we are doing this and how it impacts the bottom line. So the motion was accepted by the standing policy committee. I thank the committee but now we've got three directives to continue forward to develop a residential infill strategy. In the Chamber yesterday, we heard councillors...how councillors felt pressure on the budget where it resulted a huge cost of suburban growth and I think I have to say, one of the reasons there has been so much suburban growth is because it's been very challenging, time consuming and costly and convoluted sometimes to do infill projects. Probably some of the reasons for denser growth in my area is because it's just easier for developers to just say, look I'm just going to go out to the burbs and develop this. If we are to grow up versus out, we really must enable a

good process that facilitates infill in a timely and cost effective manner. And I really hope, I actually expect that under the leadership of Mayor Bowman that this infill strategy will come forward to Council, we will have discussion on it and we'll make a decision on it in our, you know, our next…in this coming year. I think the second action Council should take from this is to...it's really a cry for a review of the government's model that we do business under. I really strongly believe that it's been 20 years since we've almost had a review of how we are governed. Many corporations do it every five years. The current governance model is ward-based enabling the opportunity for local decision making. And while it may have many benefits, it does enable a process and I have seen it time and time again before I was elected and now that can lead to decisions which really may not be in the best interests of the city, they are in the best interests of the ward but not the city. So, I think a combination of tools, policies and guidelines along with a governance review will improve our decision making abilities for the entire city. I won't be supporting EPC's recommendation on this. I do respect the decisions of the City Centre Community Committee but from a big picture perspective I won't be supporting EPC's recommendation.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: This has been…this has been right up there with the battle that I had on the other side of the fence on Academy Road. And I understand the public's desire, passion and it goes both sides. These are...the hard part of our job. Many things are very hard in our job but let's face it, these rezonings where you're actually impacting people's lives, they're impacting what people feel especially in areas like Crescentwood. And I admit it. I'm one of those kids that grew up two blocks away from where...moved now two blocks away from where I grew up. And most people in Crescentwood are the same. We all went to Kelvin, we all know that. You know, that's the first thing that we say, what school did you go to? Well, I went to Grant Park for school, eee. But again, people in Crescentwood are generally...they move back to the neighbourhood because they love of the tree canopy, they love the front yard setbacks, they love the homes even though they cost an astronomical amount of money to keep fixing up but we're willing to make that commitment. So again, I respect that and I also respect Council's decision today and I believe I know where that's going. So first of all, I just want to point out, there's been a lot of things said and I actually went media dark for a while because I just…I can't respond but I hear these accusations that just get my blood boiling. But again, everybody has a right to their opinion, wrong or right they have an opinion. So density requested in this rezoning is for 12 units and I've got to state that those 12 units could have been accommodated in another way, so it isn't about density. We could have done R2 zoning on two lots. We could have increased and that would have been in keeping with the scale, character, and build form of the area and the R1 neighbourhood. Unfortunately, for me, the developer is not willing to compromise which is his right but this offer still stands. Let's be real, what has been applied for is unprecedented in the area. This isn't something that's happened before. There are no RMF-Ms on residential streets that…in the River Heights area. Maybe on a regional street, but there are none. This is unprecedented called zoning creep into the neighbourhood. Again...so again, that's my...it's not…I'm not taking this lightly for a reason. This is not some nimbly thing for me. This is an unprecedented increase in zoning from R1 to RMF-M. I've never seen that before. So it is a very serious precedent that's being set today and why I don't support it. I also don't support the planner's report's rational. Again, we used OurWinnipeg as well all know and again, I agree with Councillor Lukes. I agree with everybody who wants to have guidelines. OurWinnipeg is very, very broad statement but I want to address it because they use OurWinnipeg and their guidelines as a rational in the report. So I don't agree this application is consistent with plan Winnipeg. OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities outlines mature neighbourhoods and areas of stability, policy direction one, that planning is to support low to moderate changes in low density neighbourhoods through development and redevelopment that's complimentary to the existing scale, character and build form. This is not a moderate change and it is not complimentary to the existing scale, character or build form. B, I believe it does create a substantial adverse effect on the many used conveniences. The neighbourhood is comprised of older two and three story single family homes, detached homes and there is no equal lot size in the company build form on any other residential street in the area. This rezoning would create a lot three times larger than any other lot…similar lots in the area. It would create the high…the biggest and the highest building around and again it's unprecedented throughout River Heights. Again, I have been around River Heights for quite a few years. So I disagree with our planner's report that the scale and form of the development are compatible with the context. I do not know how they possibly came to that conclusion. It's not. Item C was actually missing so again, that's why I go to D. D, it is not compatible with the property to be effectively situated. The rezoning required to accommodate development which goes from an R1 on a residential street surrounded on three sides with R1 zoning do not one, two, but three levels up to the RMF-M that introduce significant and unprecedented zoning increases massing and lot size to a neighbourhood which is not compatible with the area which the properties would be affected and situated. So again, I disagree with the planner's report in that this isn't scale and form are compatible to context. The other is…Councillor Gilroy pointed it out, I was very impressed, that I also don't agree with is the precedent that they are using. One is that they...to put it in context and why area councillors are there, Stafford Street is the end of the ward. On the other side of the ward, on the east side, it is Councillor Gerbasi's wonderful ward. But there are two different wards. Councillor Gerbasi has a lot of apartments, she has condos, she has a whole bunch of different mixes of housing. That is not so on the west side of Stafford. Again, we know that some pressure's going to come up. We have done some R2 zoning on Stafford already. We have some stuff moving on Corydon already. But again, they are different. So for the develop…for

the planner to use an example from Councillor Gerbasi's ward, why would he do that? Because there are no more in my ward. There are no more. That's a serious precedent that we should all be a little bit worried about in my opinion, so I don't agree with that one. The other one is, if we use an example, the only one example in the area, so it's a hundred years old, that it's not on a residential street. It's on two collector streets. Again, residential street and collector streets are quite different. So I believe that second example is quite worrisome. The third example that they used is, well, you know what, Corydon is just right next door. So that means to me we should all be very worried about the fact that pet streets that are paralleling regional corridor streets…or high level collector streets, every street that parallels it, oh well, one street over is an RMF. So again, your R1 could go an RMF because overall, Corydon is an RMF. Well that's pretty….that is called creep. Creep of the neighbourhood. So, if we want to have area councillors in the neighbourhood getting on board about densification, then so be it. But we have to have some trust in the system. So in the end of the day, I believe that the precedents to justify the application are lacking. The lack of support…the reasons are lacking and I also believe that it is time for the guidelines. Why it wasn't done in 2011, I have no idea. But we will commit to this process early in the new year and I look forward to working with everybody. So, in conclusion, I got to move on this one…is this the minimum zoning required? No it is not. Can the same number of units be achieved through R2 zoning? Yes it can. Is RMF zoning unprecedented in the area? Yes. Would allow RMF zoning set a precedent for further similar rezonings in the area? Likely. Did the developer follow the administration's recommendation to go through the public hearing process to amalgamate the lots? No. Was the area councillor consulted during the pre-application stage? No. No, then we could have resolved a lot of this if that happened. Does the planner's recommendation use examples to support that? No, they do not. Are decision makers being influenced by a lobbying campaign? I have to say, I have been influenced so I believe so. We all must work together to ensure councillors remain the best interests of all the benefits of Winnipeggers. The process has checks and balances to ensure that the best decisions are reached collectively. I respect that. However, I believe that the precedent setting nature of this, the fact that there were better alternatives to lot split and have detached, single-story…three-story homes with given the same density but would be much more in line with the neighbourhood character and build form. So there was options. So I understand the developer wants to have an elevator but that is not in our zoning guidelines. That is not in OurWinnipeg. That's what they need so he can develop his building and sell the units. But that's not my concern. My concern is being able to increase density, but also make sure that that density increasing respects the neighbourhood that it's joining. So again…

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

Councillor Orlikow: So what good has come out of this process right now for me? Well, it has shown me a lot of loopholes in our process that need to be closed. It has shown me that we need…I think Councillor Lukes has pointed out, the whole process of how we do public hearings and that governing system has to be reviewed. And it also shows me the guidelines both infill for a multi-unit and for a single family residential are very important to move forward on. So I look forward to working with all Council regardless of the vote today in the early new year to get that process started. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Or pardon me, any further...any other speakers? Okay, seeing none, Councillor Gerbasi, do you wish to close?

Councillor Gerbasi: Well, I think everything has been said. I will leave it to Council to make their decision.

Madam Speaker: I will call the question on Item 1. What is before us is a recommendation from the Executive Policy Committee to reject the application. Was there a call for a recorded vote? Okay, call for recorded vote. All in favour of supporting the recommendation coming out of the Executive Policy Committee to reject the application, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Gerbasi, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow and Pagtakhan

Madam Speaker: Those opposed to the rejection, please rise.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Item 1 is defeated. Pardon me, yes, Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, it's my understanding that without concurrence of either recommendations submitted by Executive Policy Committee to reject the application or concurrence with the recommendation by The Public Service to approve the application presently, there is no formal deciding outcome or decision on the application presently. So therefore, I have prepared a motion that I'd be…would like to move. And I think it's being distributed presently, but I'll just read out…the 'whereas' is what I just actually said and so I'll read out the 'therefore'; "Therefore be it resolved that Council concur in the recommendation of the Winnipeg Public Service of the report dated November 1st, 2016 contained in Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated December 5th, 2016." What it's simply saying is that we go back. It's a motion to concur in the original recommendation of the Public Service on this rezoning application.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, what is the motion number for us?

City Clerk: We will refer to it as Motion 7.

Madam Speaker: Motion 7. And it is in order? Okay.

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

WHEREAS without concurrence of either the recommendation submitted by Executive Policy Committee to reject the application or concurrence with the recommendations by the Public Service to approve the application, there is no formal deciding outcome or decision on the application;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council concur in the recommendations of the Winnipeg Public Service in the report dated November 1, 2016, contained in Item 1 of the Report of Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated December 5, 2016, namely:

1. *That the Developer be required to enter into, execute and deliver a Servicing Agreement with the City containing all the conditions outlined in Schedule 'B' the report of the Administrative Coordinating Group dated November 1, 2016.*

2. *That the Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 200/2006 be amended by rezoning the planned area as shown on Schedule "A" for File No. DAZ 211/2016 dated November 8, 2016 to an "RMF-M" Residential Multi-Family District, subject to the following:*

    A. *That the applicant enter into, execute and deliver a Zoning Agreement with the City of Winnipeg pursuant to Subsection 240(1) of The City of Winnipeg Charter to provide for the following:*

        i. *That final plans, showing the location and details of buildings, elevations, parking, landscaping, signage, garbage, lighting and fencing shall be submitted to the City Centre Community Committee and the Director of Planning, Property and Development for approval prior to the issuance of any building or development permits, and thereafter all to be constructed and maintained to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Property and Development.*

        ii. *That the height of any building shall not exceed forty-five (45) feet.*

3. *In lieu of the dedication of land, the Developer shall provide cash payment representing 10% of the appraised value of the Development Application, as determined by the City.*

4. *That in the event the matter is not proceeded with expeditiously and the by-law is not passed within two (2) years after adoption of the report by Council, the matter shall be deemed to be concluded and shall not be proceeded with unless an extension of time is applied for prior to the expiry of the two (2)-year period and Council approves the extension.*

5. *That the Director of Legal Services and City Solicitor be requested to prepare the necessary by-law in accordance with the above.*

6. *That the zoning section of the by-law shall come into force when the Zoning Agreement is registered in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office by caveat against the subject land within one year from the date the by-law is passed, failing which the by-law will expire and the matter shall be deemed to be concluded and shall not be proceeded with unless an extension of time is applied for prior to the expiry of the one year period and Council approves the extension.*

7. *That the Proper Officers of the City are hereby authorized to execute said Zoning Agreement.*

8. *That the Director of Legal Services and City Solicitor be requested to do all things necessary for implementation in accordance with the terms of The City of Winnipeg Charter.*

City Clerk: Yes, it's in order. And it follows Council's past precedent and practice. It doesn't happen very often but in previous experiences where we've somehow dead locked a decision we have allowed a different motion to come forward on the floor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further speakers on Motion 7 that was just circulated?

Councillor Wyatt: Point of order, Madam Chair. Can we take a five minute break so we could read this? It was just handed out to us. I haven't seen this yet and you're going to be debating and asking…can we take a break?

Madam Speaker: I think…Councillor Gillingham, did you clarify that there is nothing different than the initial report?

Councillor Gillingham: That's right, Madam Speaker, but I am fine for…if my colleagues want a couple of minutes to...it has just been put in front of them. I just brought it forward…just anticipation as we may end up dead locked, but I have no problem if there's a few...right to read through it, that's fine.

Councillor Wyatt: It's two pages long.

Madam Speaker: We'll take a five minute recess. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
December 14, 2016, at 3:55 p.m.

Madam Speaker: I would like to reconvene the meeting. We left it off Councillor Gillingham had introduced Motion 7. Are there any other speakers? Okay, Councillor Gillingham, do you wish to close on the motion?

Councillor Gillingham: No, Madam Speaker, simply to…I look forward to the question being called.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Call the question and there was call for a recorded vote. So all in favour of Motion 7 to recommend the project, please rise.

Clerk: His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors…

Madam Speaker: Just a moment. Is Councillor Eadie...is he aware that we have started? I think we need to give him the courtesy to...you know what, is someone helping him? He may need assistance. Okay, okay so. Because we normally don't take recesses, I think we need to make sure each member knows that we just started. Where is Councillor Lukes? Commissioner will have a look. Councillor Lukes, is she aware that we have started?

Councillor Eadie: Point of privilege, just to speak. Madam Speaker, you know, when we could use washrooms and stuff, where our Council Chambers were you could always hear what was happening in the Chamber while you were away from the Chamber. The problem right now is you can't hear that, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: That's the other issue. That's right and I am quite aware of that. I was down stairs myself during the proceedings yesterday so I think we are going to give Councillor Lukes the courtesy of just waiting for a minute. Once again, we are on Item No. 7 that was moved by Councillor Gillingham…Motion No. 7, pardon me, moved by Councillor Gillingham. There is a call for a recorded vote. All in favour of Motion 7, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow and Pagtakhan

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 7 passes. We will now move on to Item 7. Councillor Mayes, I believe you are…are you leaving the Chamber? Is Councillor Orlikow…he's also left. Who would be...Councillor Orlikow to introduce Item 7. We need you here.

Councillor Orlikow: I am just teasing you all. Not really.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk.

Item 7 – Lease Agreement – Unit 230 – 266 Graham Avenue (Skywalk Level)

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow to introduce the item.

Councillor Orlikow: I will just wait to hear from my colleagues. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Right. Is there anyone that wishes to speak on this item? Councillor Orlikow, do you wish to close or I can call the question. All in favour? Contrary. Carried. Item 8, Mr. Clerk.

Item 8 – Planning, Development and Building Fees By-law No. 66/2016 Amendment

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow to introduce the item.

Councillor Orlikow: I will wait to hear from my colleagues. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: This was stood down by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yeah, I stood it down. Thanks, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I didn't have time to listen in on the deliberations in terms of this report, Property and Development, Downtown Development and Heritage. I just wanted to speak to this issue. I will be supporting it. I just wanted to raise a concern. I don't know...it's not like...I just want to start by saying it's not that I don't trust our administration, I do trust our administration. They are charged with doing jobs but when we allow directors to waive part or all of a fee, this is in regards to a penalty, Madam Speaker, in terms of...I can't remember what the exact penalty this is for but Madam Speaker, I just wanted to just let our senior administration know, I'm just wondering, Madam Speaker, that when the director is making decisions and such I am not sure if there is like a list or what have you, but you know, I referred to the employee code of conduct earlier today which needs to be tightened up in terms of the senior management. But, my concern is just, does the director report these decisions to our senior administrator, the CAO? That's my only concern it's just like a check stop just to make sure a decision was made, rational was there, so I do support this effort here because when we have various zoning permits, planned stuff going through, we do have to allow the administration some flexibility. We just dealt with a difficult issue where we've let Property and Development...they have flexibility in terms of what kind of infill development is happening right now because there is no guidelines. But, I digress. I just wanted to say that that was my only concern, but I support the committee's recommendation on this and just...and maybe I could find out later if there is a second check, if there is a report that goes to our senior administration. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Orlikow, do you wish to close? Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will move on to by-laws under this committee, Councillor Orlikow.

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

Councillor Orlikow: I have to get organized here. I'll move By-laws 107, 108, 137, and 146.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 147/2016, 108/2016, 137/2016 and 146/2016.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor on the second reading…or Councillor Orlikow on the second reading.

Councillor Orlikow: I wouldn't want that job...sorry, I am a little frazzled right now. Can I move those same motions the second time please?

Madam Speaker: Yes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 107/2016, 108/2016, 137/2016 and 146/2016.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, you will move the suspension of By-laws 107, 108.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll move By-law…rules be suspended and By-law Nos. 107, 108, 137, 146/2016 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will now have question period for the Chair. Any questions for Councillor Orlikow? Councillor Gerbasi.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: I just, I would like one of the issues that was dealt with at EPC and the matter didn't come any further to Council, so it wasn't on our agenda today but, there's a lot of, I've been hearing for many months about from the heritage community, there's a lot of interest and concern about the future of the Archives Building. I know it's, this council has done a lot of work protecting heritage buildings, this is something we all value. But obviously, we're in a dilemma with making sure that those materials are protected as well. In the meantime, until this is sorted out, I guess what I, my question to the Chair is, what is the future of this building? Is there any update that we can be given? I mean in an ideal world that building would be…continue to be an Archives Building and the first Carnegie Library in Winnipeg, a beautiful building, first public library. There's a lot of concern and love for that building and it's in our hands in terms of future capital investment, either reusing it for something else or somehow returning it to the uses from Archives. So if you could make any comments on that, it'd be much appreciated.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. Yeah, there has been a fair bit of questions about this building because it is a beautiful building with an incredible heritage for Winnipeg. So I can only speak for myself at this point because it'll be up to Council decision with what's going to happen in the future for that building. But the intent, my understanding is that we are first of all, we are going to make sure that the building is secured properly and won't be sitting there for neglect. It will be maintained, staff will be going there to make sure that it's heated, serviced and monitored and the grounds maintained throughout the year. That will happen for sure. I do want to have the issue about what we're going to be doing with the building come towards Council sooner than later. I have asked the administration if that would be possible. There are some significant, we did have a roof leak recently that damaged some of the walls, however, that insurance claim has been resolved. There's also been a number of other investments into the building, but to repurpose a building at this point will cost some cash. But again, I think either the Archives goes back and/or we find a partner that wishes or could use a building as well that we work collaboratively with them because my intent is to make sure that that building carries on as an asset for Winnipeggers.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further? Any other questions for the Chair? Okay, seeing none, we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. Councillor Pagtakhan on the report dated December 2nd, 2016.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED DECEMBER 2, 2016

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. By-laws under this committee, Councillor Pagtakhan.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yeah, thank you Madam Speaker. I'll move that By-law No. 143/2016 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law 143/2016.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan for the second reading.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll move that By-law No. 143/2016 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law 143/2016.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan on the suspension and the third reading.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 143/2016 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have Question Period for Councillor Pagtakhan. Any questions of the Chair? Seeing none, we'll move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Morantz on the report dated November 29th, 2016.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED NOVEMBER 29, 2016

Councillor Morantz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 to 3.

Madam Speaker: No. 3? You had four fingers up Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Lukes. Three? Thank you. That was 3, Councillor Lukes? And two. All in favour of Item 1? Contrary? Carried? Mr. Clerk, Item 2.

Item 2 – 2017 Pedestrian and Cycling Program – Action Plan

Madam Speaker: Councillor Morantz to introduce the item.

Councillor Morantz: I will just wait to hear what my colleagues have to say.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thanks, Madam Speaker. And I know everybody is eager to end the year and move on, but you know when we have something as positive as this I think a few words have to be said on it and I am not going to let this go by. This plan is taking the Active Transportation Strategy that Council approved and making it real. It was made real in the budget yesterday and this is...what's in front of us today is the plan for the coming year and some looking forward a little bit and this plan was put together in consultation with councillors and is moving forward. And one of the things in here I want to let my residents know about in Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry, is that this plan includes planning for a pedestrian bridge connecting Osborne Village to downtown. This was something that was in the Go to the Waterfront Project, you know, we've approved the Taché Promenade Project. This was the other biggie in that plan, that in my hopes and dreams I wanted to see and it's so important because Osborne Village is the most dense neighbourhood in Winnipeg. This will connect Osborne Village straight from the transit station, across on a pedestrian and cycling bridge right to the Assiniboine bikeway to all of downtown. It's just going to be incredible. And this begins the planning for that in the near future. So, along with other...there's many other projects in here we could all get up and talk about the different ones in our wards and I don't usually do that, I usually just try to look at the whole big picture thing. But I think this is one that a lot of people aren't aware of and when I have been telling people that this is part of our strategy along with many other things, it's pretty exciting. Another key piece I think is the downtown network, you know, we have talked about looking at that. We are looking at whatever way it can be done even faster, but there is some significant progress in the downtown cycling network that we're going to be seeing and that is a priority of the overall strategy. So you know, having said that, the strategy is very comprehensive. It's looking at education. It's looking at practices of, you know, enabling winter cycling. It's looking at everything and improving our network, improving our…for both recreational and commuter. So thanks for your indulgence for getting up and talking about one project in my ward, but this is something that connects our city in a way that it has never been connected that. Osborne Village, this is going to be huge for Winnipeg and for our entire connections between…as people travel through the city to downtown and to all the neighbourhoods. So thanks for your indulgence on that and I think we need to celebrate our successes and celebrate the investments we are making in our city because investing for pedestrians and cycling creates happiness, so thank you. You've made me very happy.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any other further speakers? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I just…obviously rising in support of this and I just want to thank every member of Council for your engaging conversations. When we sat down, I got the opportunity to meet with many of you and go through this plan, this action plan for this year. It's…it's really long...many, many years of work to get to this point from my perspective and it's so rewarding to hear every member of Council say, well I want this, I want that, everyone wants more than they can have, but from an active transportation perspective, it is…it's very rewarding. I am...I am…this work of active transportation has given me the opportunity to work throughout the entire city into every nook and cranny in communities and it really, really...what I've learned about pathways and bike paths and trails is it really connects communities. They connect, they bring people together. And, you know, I could go on about all the great projects too, but I really have to say one project I've worked with a group for probably ten plus years who are so dedicated, they are from Transcona and to see the Transcona trail receive the extension that it's going to have is just…it's a wonderful time. So I'm really…I'm really happy for them, I'm really happy for the Councillor for Transcona. We all know how badly you want to get out of Transcona and come downtown and hopefully you will be able to be biking downtown in the near future. But I am really pleased with that project because they have got a group of volunteers out there that have been working tirelessly. So…and I am really pleased we didn't have to hear hundreds of applicants come down like we have in the past. This process that we've done now has really helped communicate and have everyone understand. So I just want to thank everyone for their involvement and really pleased we could all came together with the funding that we have for next year's action plan.

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

Councillor Morantz: I will just thank my colleagues for their comments. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 3.

Item 3 – Truck Route Options – West of Route 90 between Saskatchewan Avenue and Inkster Boulevard

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

Councillor Morantz: Just to hear my colleagues comments, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Who stood this down? Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just first of all, just to say a word of insurance that no one should be concerned that the Finance Chair was calling for No. 3, but holding up four fingers a moment ago. Must be the hour that we are in so. The report before us, I just draw to our attention, it's truck route options. It may seem like a small and somewhat, you know, insignificant report. It's a list of streets, we're moving some off of truck routes and changing them and then we're putting others on, but I just want to acknowledge that this is the work, result of the good work of our administration with…in consultation with the Manitoba Trucking Association and I know that Councillor Pagtakhan...Councillors Pagtakhan and Lukes have worked on this with me as well and with the administration. I just want to restate again the importance of the trucking industry and the transportation industry to our city. Winnipeg is a hub not only in Canada, but a transportation hub in all of North America. And by making these seemingly small changes, it makes it easier and safer for the trucking industry to transport the goods through…in and through our city and around our community. It's in accordance with the Transportation Master Plan and some changes that…as that is reviewed on a regular basis need to be made. I also want to take the opportunity too to talk about...a little bit about the future of our transportation industry when we're looking at areas like Centerport and the Winnipeg Airport Authority's lands that are poised eventually here for development. That has a huge transportation component to it. And this means a big boom for our economy. It…these truck routes, they translate into…into economic routes as we have many people in our city and around our city employed in the trucking industry, the transportation industry in one way or another. So I just want to take the opportunity that this report affords us to stand and talk about the importance of the transportation industry and of making sure that we are doing what we can as Council to make sure the routes are there and the routes are updated as needed so that the important economic activity that this represents continues, so thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Any further speakers on this item? Councillor Morantz, do you wish to close?

Councillor Morantz: Call the question is fine.

Madam Speaker: Call the question on Item 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will now move on to by-laws under this committee. Councillor Morantz.

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

Councillor Morantz: Madam Speaker, I would like to move by-laws be read for the first time; By-law No. 144/2016 and By-law No. 145/2016.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 144/2016 and By-law No. 145/2016.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Morantz on the second reading.

Councillor Morantz: Madam Speaker, I'll move that By-laws No. 144/2016 and 145/2016 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 144/2016 and 145/2016.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Morantz on the suspension and third reading.

Councillor Morantz: Madam Speaker, I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 144/2016 and 145/2016 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will now have question period for the Chair. Councillor Wyatt.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to ask a question pertaining to the roads budget, the regional streets budget specifically, but also all the roads the budget was voted on yesterday. We didn't have a first call on a good chunk of the roads program; that's not necessary, the vote has taken place. The Provincial Government has now building or going out to tender on their roads program, half a billion dollars. I want to ensure that even though we're breaking for the Council, for the Christmas session that not necessarily our entire Engineering Division breaks that we move as quickly as possible to get tenders out in the winter to do this work ASAP or to get them tendered out so that we can get pricing back as early as possible rather than what we had last year or this year, 2016, where pricing was coming in on April and May, which we heard definitely has an impact on our ability to get good pricing. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Morantz: Madam Speaker, I didn't actually hear a question, I'm sorry.

Madam Speaker: Can you clarify your question?

Councillor Wyatt: My question is are we going to get the tenders out or can we work to get the tenders out ASAP to ensure that the work is, we get work started as soon as doable in light of our Winter season that the work can start the minute the frost is out of the ground and tenders can get out now in the Winter time and bidding can happen now?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Morantz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Now that the budget's been passed, I will be asking for a meeting with the Director of the department very soon to get the timing on when we'll actually be able to finalize our tenders and our construction contracts. Of course, passing the budget this early, which is somewhat of an anomaly, is a huge benefit because now the departments know exactly what their budgetary appropriations are for the entire 2017 year. So I think that's a very good thing and we'll certainly move forward. Also I want to say, you know, just having been in the Chair now for about six weeks, I've been spending a lot of time really learning about the procurement process and I look forward to working with all of my colleagues to enhance and improve processes as we move forward and I would also note and thank you to the Mayor, through you, Madam Speaker, for putting that goal within the mandate letter because not only helps me, but that helps the entire department understand that we want to move forward with early procurement and enhancing our timing, our procurements to the greatest extent possible. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for the Chair? Seeing none, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. Councillor Gillingham on the report dated December 1st, 2016.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
DATED DECEMBER 1, 2016**

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. There's no motions, no by-laws today. We'll now have Question Period for Councillor Gillingham, our new chair. Seeing no questions, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. Councillor Mayes on the report dated November 28th, 2016.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 28, 2016**

Item 1 – Bulky Waste

Councillor Mayes: We have only the one item and that is…I think there is an amendment. So I don't know, just procedurally, do I speak first and then we have the amendment?

Madam Speaker: You can introduce the item and then Councillor Gillingham who moved Motion 4 can introduce that amending motion.

Councillor Mayes: And then I would close?
Madam Speaker: You can close, yes.

Councillor Mayes: Okay. I won't go on at length then as I'll go on at length when I close. This is one item only. This is the bulky waste motion. This came forward roughly the same time as our bigger, broader vote on the garbage and recycle system motion from Councillor Eadie. Apparently we're going to end this session of Council perhaps all or almost all of us united behind a motion from a non-EPC member so perhaps inspired by Councillor Wyatt's invocation for peace, we will try and work together on this. The matter at hand is the Bulky Waste Program, a relatively small program but a small program that is of great importance in three or four wards; Councillor Eadie's, Councillor Gerbasi's, Councillor Pagtakhan's, Councillor Gilroy's I believe, would have the most to do with this item. Councillor Eadie has spoken with some eloquence at the committee about the need to amend this program and ensure in-house collection for his ward and the wards around it. I think what we are doing today is trying to move on that. It was passed at the committee, it was passed at EPC, there was an amendment that will clarify the intent. The intent certainly is …the intent is, a) to bring the collection service in-house and thus, b) not to proceed with an RFP, c) perhaps I'm speaking to the amendment before it's introduced, but c) the idea is to get a costing so that we know, for example, which classification in the collective agreement that pertains...there has been a new classification that is needed, the cost of the trucks. We are not looking to revisit the matter based on costs, we are looking, however, we do have a budget that we have to work within so we need to know what this would cost and then move forward from that. Obviously, there is a cost to having it contracted out as it now is, but I will come back to some of the details later. But I want to thank Councillor Gillingham for trying to work through the details, but certainly the plan here is to bring the collection in-house upon the expiry of the current contracted out arrangements next fall and to proceed therefore with…with CUPE represented workers. But still, some implementation issues that would be reported back and I'll speak more to that, perhaps, when we…when I close.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham to introduce Motion 4, it's an amending motion.

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

WHEREAS, on November 28, 2016 the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment accepted a motion by Councillor Eadie which directed the Winnipeg Public Service to 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.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED That given the direction to bring the collection into the Winnipeg Public Service , that the Winnipeg Public Service to be directed to report back to Council (through the appropriate Standing Policy Committee) for consideration prior to February 2017 with a plan that includes the results and costs from the analysis, timeline and process currently ongoing.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Councillor Mayes for seconding this motion. He really covered quite a bit of it already but yes, the amending motion here really has to do with ensuring there is a measure of scrutiny in regards…in regards to the costs from the analysis that will be done. So whether it's wages or capital costs, operating costs. Just...and this is directed...request to this be brought back to Council. So for full disclosure, we have a clear understanding all of us around this room in regards to the results of the analysis and the costs contained wherein and the timeline and the process concurrently ongoing. So I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak to the motion, but I just want to clarify something, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Councillor from the Old Kildonan Ward, I want to just speak out…I'm moving…I move this motion on bulky waste, not just for four of five wards. I mean, there is a dumping problem in all wards. It's happening, abandoned waste happens in every ward but specifically high in the four…in Daniel Mac, Mynarski, Point Douglas and specifically in one area, more so in the neighbourhoods closer to the inner-city. Inner-city seems to be a place where, Madam Speaker, we have people dumping stuff. Lots of it comes from the neighbourhoods right immediately there, but Madam Speaker…and this more than likely happens in your ward I am sure, is that you will have people who have a bunch of bulky waste way up in say I don't know North Kildonan or somewhere, anyway, could be further up in West Kildonan, it could be in different places and these people, they dump it in the inner-city areas. They will drive in and they'll dump it because…because they don't have respect for our area. So this bulky waste motion is not to support those people who are violating by-laws…violating issues because you know, we do have a responsibility, Madam Speaker, to deal with our bulky waste that we, if we are buying it and we have it in our house and we're getting rid of it, you know, we do have a responsibility. But the problem is the system as it was set up with the new master plan and with the private collection, there is a contractual agreement, there is difficulty so you know, that's kind of the history of it. But the history of...and I provided some numbers. You know, you can see the top ward. But being understaffed in my ward office as many of our ward offices are understaffed, we didn't have time to put together all the numbers for everywhere and do the research but we did do some...a fair amount of research on it and presented that report. But I digress from the real issue. And the real issue is that solid waste will say, well we have a cost related under a contract to have bulky waste picked. And you know, it involves the 311 system and so on and there's some by-laws that talk about if bulky…abandoned bulky waste shows up and it's on private…some vacant lot that's owned by a private owner versus the City and it's right of way and so on and so forth. There's all these rules that By-law Enforcement has to…so By-law Enforcement themselves have a lot of work and spend money on Human Resources to go out there and look at this stuff. And that's...there are some problems there. I mean, if it is on private property, it's on private property and private property holder has to deal with it. But, you know, measuring to see how far on…you know, it's partially on public and partially on private, like come on. It's a fire hazard. So, we've got by-law Enforcement, they're spending money on this abandoned bulk waste because the way the system is. Then we have Fire…the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service. You know, I am trying to remember the statistics and there's issues there, Madam Speaker, in terms of fires. How much does it cost for our firefighters to go out there all the time and deal with these abandoned bulk waste fires? And a lot of them aren't crimes. When it's a crime, police officers get involved as well, but it costs a lot of money and I'll hope to find that information later. And then, you know, if I am at Water and Waste and I say, you know, how much bulky, abandoned bulky waste do we pick up? Because the contract that's there right now, technically under that contract they pick up the abandoned stuff too if it's on the public right of way as far as I can remember. I can't remember…details might have been changed a bit when we looked at an arson plan and on and on we go. But Madam Speaker, the reality is is that there is a department…a division of a department that actually collects bulky waste and they're called Parks and Open Spaces, another standing committee I happen to be on. But I can't get any information from them what it's really costing. What I do get, and I haven't received it yet, I hope to, I asked for it in the budget process or at a budget meeting because I'm trying to find the back-up here because I agree with the Councillor Gillingham. I am actually a prudent financial person, I'm frugal. And actually, maybe I should have brought this to the…to our Innovation Committee originally. Because what this is, the change to bring this into house, it's going to be Innovation because we're going to be able to deal with it in a less costly manner, Madam Speaker. Less costly. Hopefully we're going to be saving our other departments money from having to deal with bulky…abandoned bulky waste. And sometimes there is problems with the…you know, there's a lot of people who do respect the system and they pay the fees that are there to do the pick-up and so on, but sometimes the private contractor misses it and they won't get back to it till the next garbage cycle. Well, we need to get that…if it…you leave bulky waste in one spot and you don't deal with it quickly, Madam Speaker, you know what happens, it's called pile on…pile on and it piles. Believe me, it piles. So, we need to deal with it quickly. So that's the reason behind the bulky waste. I want us to take this in-house. It's going to cost us some money, absolutely. But I would like to know, Madam Speaker, how much money it's really going to save us on the other side if we don't have to send out a fire crew. It costs a lot of money to send a fire crew out. So I'm just ending by speaking to the motion. I appreciate the intent here I think is just, so we know, prudently, when we are making decisions how much it's costing. What the time lines are. There might have to be some changes to some other systems, I don't know. I'm not running this solid waste. I'm not running all these things. I mean, I could spend the time and do the work and figure it out and manage it for you if you want, but then I guess I would have to step down as councillor. Anyway, so Madam Speaker, I'm okay with the motion but I just want to make it clear though…with the amending motion, I just want to make it clear though, that analysis that has been started, that's great. But I'm not sure that that analysis is going to be collecting like, because usually when you are measuring how much it costs, like you have to measure how much is it costing us under this system? And then how much is it going to be later? And I'd like to know that myself. Actually, I think it's very prudent to know that. And I have my suspicions, right? And so I support this motion, but I really would like our administration to try to figure out what it's been costing us. I know the Fire…I know the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service presented numbers. I know that…I know that Michael Jack was there in the room and we had discussions about this. We know that it is costing them some money. We know there was a whole list of how many fires there were in Elmwood and Mynarski because there was a big fire problem we had this summer, Madam Speaker. So I know the

numbers are there, we could calculate. Hopefully, it'll be quickly. I know that the head of the Parks and Open Space Division could really give what the cost is, but does know how many pickets they had to do. So I will support the amendment and let's move on. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt followed by Councillor Gilroy. Okay. Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: I just…I just wanted to express appreciation to Councillor Wyatt. He just pointed something out in the motion…the resolution…just to add the words "bulky waste". So I appreciate that added. So it is really clear that given the direction to bring the bulky waste…or collection of bulky waste into the Winnipeg Public Service...

Madam Speaker: Could you read the line that we're editing?

Councillor Gillingham: Sure. "Therefore be it resolved that given the direction to bring the collection of bulky waste into the Winnipeg Public Service" and it goes on from there.

Madam Speaker: Okay. So it's a friendly amendment? Councillor Mayes, do you agree? Okay, we'll move on, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: So I just…I need a little bit of clarification. So I don't have the copy because I gave my copy to Councillor Gillingham. But, this is an amendment…this is an…your proposal is a motion to amend the clause before us today. Is that correct? Okay. So, report back to Council…okay, for consideration prior to…because there is right now as it stands, as we know, there's no administrative report before us here today. And this is directing for the administrative report to come back for consideration. So just on the amendment, I'm not quite clear…if I…it is more of a point of order, I suppose, the 'be it resolved', are we striking the item one and two and replacing it with this? Or how is the amendment fitting in here? It's not clear.

Madam Speaker: We're adding it.

Councillor Wyatt: Be it resolved that this be added…so this is now number two and two becomes three? I need some time to think about it before I speak.

Madam Speaker: We will come back to you Councillor Wyatt. You can chat with Councillor Gillingham in the meantime if you would like. Councillor Gilroy, you have the floor.

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah, I just rise in support of the amending motion that's here for you today. And you know, I know that Dave Sauer is up there, today is his last day so it would be pretty nice for us to get something through here. But it is important that we be mindful that we know the costs of things. I think that that's important, that's what our public would want us to do. So that's just what the amending motion is doing, but I really look forward, as a city councilor that's in it…that has…represents an inner-city ward where bulky waste is a huge impact for my community, I would really look forward to having it come in-house making sure that we can get the staff out there to deal with these things in a timely manner is important. Making sure that the health and safety of our community is important and making sure that we are accountable to the residents that we represent. I really rise in support of this motion. And I would like to thank a lot of the councillors here today. There's a lot of great…I know Councillor Mayes, Councillor Eadie, that have really taken a charge on this. And thank you very much because I think this is a great motion and a lot of people came…came on to support this. So thank you very much for all of your hard work.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, I'm pleased to support this today. I was here when the decision was made to contract out our service 100%. And I was opposed to that at the time. One of the reasons was, you know, certain services are complicated and require flexibility in order to have the kind of level of service we really needed and some of these issues. I know part of my ward, in West Broadway, this is a huge issue as well. We had…when I was first elected we had the arson crisis. And some of you may remember that, the early 2000's. We had a lot of this bulky waste lying around and a strategy was put in place to take care of it. It needs to be taken care of in a flexible manner and with good service. As Councillor Eadie pointed out a lot of other departments get drawn in to deal with it. There's, you know, informal mechanisms of trying to deal with this stuff that we have been trying to hammer through for all these years. And I think this will provide a better level of service. And I'm pleased it's a small step towards where we are going. I know that in the previous debate on the larger contract, you know, we were looking at moving towards bringing in other aspects, other contracts potentially in the future. But this is a first step, it's an important one and it's a complex one. I mean, it's difficult to deal with these issues. The reason we have it in certain neighbourhoods too is when there's high levels of rental properties, people moving every month and they just don't have the resources to deal with this stuff. And it

becomes a real problem for arson and other things. So again, I want to thank the…Councillor Eadie, Councillor Mayes, the other advocates that have been talking about this for many years from labour. It's an important first step today and I'm happy to support it. The motion just provides some information coming back to Council on it. But I'm pleased to see the direction is clear. We're not putting out an RFP, I think that…comparing this to the private sector at this point or we are not…we're basically saying the direction of Council is to have this in-house and to go through the proper process. So thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm happy to support this today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to have been the seconder to the original motion moved by Councillor Eadie to which this is an amendment. It's an important amendment. Especially considering at this time, I'm not aware of an accompanying report that one might think would include what this amendment is requesting. So on that basis, I would have to say that the amendment is essential, as a matter of fact. And on that basis, I'm pleased to support this amendment. Councillor Gilroy has mentioned that it is Dave Sauer's last meeting of Council to which he is witness in his last week as President of the Winnipeg Labour Congress. And yes, I agree with Councillor Gilroy that it would be nice for us to get this through while he is here. Bear in mind, we are not doing this, I would say for Dave Sauer, we are doing this for the people of Winnipeg as Dave Sauer would like to see this done for the people of Winnipeg, and I hope we all concur with that. Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thank you to Dave Sauer for his part as well.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, Madam Speaker, I've heard a number of speakers now refer to the fact that there's going to be no request for proposal. I don't see that before us here today. And I would be happy to, if I could hear some clarification on that because that does run contrary to Council policy and or at least our practice when it comes to garbage and garbage collection. The request for proposal is something which has always been done. I don't have…I understand the motion that is moved by Councillor Eadie though there is no report here, that Winnipeg Public Service undertake all things necessary to bring the collection of bulky waste into the Winnipeg Public Service. You know, but that does not say that there shall be no RFP, no request for proposal. I've heard two speakers now saying that there will be no RFP. And that is a real concern to me that we are going to throw due diligence right out of the window if that's the case. I want…I'd like to get clarification on this, if that's the case. I'd like…I'm supportive of the motion moved by Councillor Gillingham, seconded by Councillor Mayes that there shall be a report back in February 2017. But this is the first time that I'm hearing that there shall be no RFP on this subject which causes me concern, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Gillingham, do you wish to close on Motion 4?

Councillor Gillingham: No. Simply to express…on my amending motion, specifically, just to express appreciation to those that have kind of helped to sponsor it. And it's an attempt as I said, to provide a level of scrutiny that councillor…out of Councillor Eadie's motion. So in regards to Councillor Wyatt's question, a good question, I will defer to others to respond to that. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Good debate. Good summary of the various issues that have been raised. Inherent in Councillor Eadie's position right from the start which was to bring the work in-house is that there would be no RFP. That is clearly the intent of the original motion. That is clearly the intent of the amended motion. Councillor Wyatt raises a point which is, does this run contrary to what we've done in some other areas? Arguably it does. But Councillor Eadie has made the case that this is small contract, bulky waste, that should be brought in-house for a number of reasons that he has elucidated in his speech today and at other levels so…and which other councillors have talked to. So I'm certainly supportive of this. It also goes to a point that I made at EPC I think which was, I've said all along, and I said in October that I…one of the models that the labour movement asked us to look at was the Ottawa model. In that model, there is…they started with one zone being in-house, four zones contracted out. So 20% in-house, four zones contracted out. Over a 14-year ark they've not brought in a second zone. 40% in-house, 60% contracted out. The suggestion that was made here was let's go 50-50 right off the start. I said that's not the Ottawa model to which people like Mr. Sauer and others said yes. But Ottawa didn't start at zero and you're saying we have to start at zero. So this is an attempt to bring to life the Ottawa model here, which is okay, we won't have all collection being contracted out. Councillor Gerbasi is quite right, she was here, so was Councillor Wyatt, in fact, when that vote took place in 2005, I think, and they both voted against contracting it all out. So what we are doing is, I think historically taking a step back from that, bringing some collection back in-house. We do need to clarify the wage rates, the cost of vehicles to fit that into our budgets but there's also a cost if you contracted out. Companies don't do it for free. So I think Councillor Gillingham is right, we are trying take due diligence here. We are, I think, taking a historic step to bring this back in-house but also getting a report back for the January 30th, Water Committee meeting on what that will mean. Councillor Eadie makes a good point which is, what that means also may entail some savings from fire departments and other City departments. He has

talked again, with some eloquence about the costs in his ward and others in terms of the current city staff having to go out and deal with these pile-on problems. So, you know, there's some hope for savings on our other City services like Fire and Paramedic. So in short, I think we are taking, perhaps a small step, but a historic step to bring this aspect of collection back in-house. There won't be an RFP. There will be a costing presented at committee to indicate possible savings of what this would cost. Which aspects of the collective agreement will apply. So I want to emphasize that I think by doing this, we are really doing something innovative and doing something along the lines of the Ottawa model. I will somewhat defensively point out that Recommendation 3 to that October report which I helped champion which was denigrated by some online commentators, some in labour, some in the media…oh that won't do any good, that won't take place for years. The union is already sitting down and meeting with our administration. They won't have to talk about bulky so much but they will be able to talk to our administration to try and put together a bid when we get to multi-family collection. There are I believe five of those coming up over the next few years, different apartment buildings. So, recommendation three from that October report which called for an Ottawa-style consultation and negotiation between the City and union to see if an agreement can be made, like the Ottawa model that would allow some work to be brought in. Recommendation 3 is alive and well, Madam Speaker, and moving forward. So that is a good sign and I know Moira Geer and others from our staff are meeting with Gord Delbridge. And so, before we send Mr. Sauer off into that good night, I would like to thank him for his years here and his decorum and his effort on behalf of the workers. I will close, given our musical theme of late with a quote from another great Manitoban, Tom Cochrane, honourary degree from Brandon University which I nominated him for. Also, a highway named for him. But in the likes of Tom Cochrane, a good Manitoban and I know Mr. Sauer's a little over 31, a little over 30, but you'll give me the liberty, Madam Clerk, of using the final verse from 'Boy inside the Man', which is, 'Now I just turned 31 and I have lost and I have won, still I kept my dreams alive cause the boy will never die'. So I know Mr. Sauer said, some wins and losses down here but he is certainly far for the cause he believes in. So with that I will close.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. I will call the question on Motion 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And call the question on the main Item 1, as amended. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will now have Question Period for Councillor Mayes. Any questions? Councillor Schreyer.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I understand that we have a Motion No. 4 from Councillor Gillingham, and seconded by Councillor Mayes, himself, to amend the bulky waste motion, which I said was essential because of, well, there is no report to that gives a greater depth for clarification, so independent of the fact that this exists, I would just like to know in terms of the process given, well, all that's been put into this is, on this one item a notable amount of discussion and acknowledgment of involvement. So I'd just simply like to know, because I will learn from this, Madam Speaker, in terms of process, why there was no accompanying report to this, given all the involvement apparently that's just been mentioned on the floor in the last 15 minutes or 20 minutes.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, Councillor Eadie, quite correctly, pointed out at the committee that if this got stalled out by having a report written that the moment would pass in which we could do this and we'd be into the period where we would have to do an RFP. The only way this could succeed frankly, was by moving it forward. So Councillor Eadie brought a motion, as is his right, it was first considered at the late November, right, it was moved at Council in late October therefore it missed the early November meeting of Water, therefore it fell to the late November meeting of Water, which is the one that leads into this cycle. Councillor Eadie, will perhaps forgive me if I speak on his behalf here, but I think he, and Councillor Allard and I agreed, referring this out for report would actually haven been fatal to the intent of the motion, which was to get this resolved before an RFP was issued. So fair question, why no report? Equally fair answer is the author of the motion, quite correctly and strategically pointed out that delaying it would have been fatal and as Councillor Eadie is mentioning, there will now be a report indicating what the costs of this or benefits of this step would be.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Schreyer: Fair answer. But given that, given all that has been talked about in terms of the history.

Madam Speaker: Okay, you're question, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Previous, yes. Is there information that we can attain regarding insights into this offered by the Administration, pre-motion by Councillor Eadie, given all that was said that transpired before the motion by Councillor Eadie, himself?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'm not sure I understood that. Could that be clarified?

Councillor Schreyer: I'm given the impression, Madam Speaker, during the course of the last 15 minutes on this that there was significant.

Madam Speaker: You're question, Councillor Schreyer.
Councillor Schreyer: A history of the movement on this issue before Councillor Eadie officially made, brought forth the motion that I seconded, but stuff was happening before then, Madam Speaker, to which Councillor Eadie, Councillor Mayes is alluding or and mentioning.

Madam Speaker: Is there a question?

Councillor Schreyer: Yes. History from the Administration's involvement pre-motion, given all that's been said about it.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Okay, got it. There has been no administration involvement. Councillor Eadie took it on his shoulders as a democratically-elected representative to move this forward, as is his right. These don't often get all the way through, this one did. There has been no report because this was moved as a motion of Council, it bounced to the committee. There was…have been discussion of bulky waste, there's been discussion of the multi-family, there's been discussion of the Ottawa model at this forum and at the committee. But there was no administration involvement. The Administration, to its credit, after we voted in October on the aforesaid Recommendation 3, the Administration was ready to go, they went out and started meeting with Gord Delbridge and CUPE. But we don't have a report from admin, I think Councillor Eadie recognized with Councillor Gillingham's biblical phrase, "The hour comes and now is." So it was now, he had to move forward, if there had been a report, I think this would have been lost, by it would have become moot because the RFP would have gone out. So, frankly, Councillor Eadie did the strategically correct thing to move it forward, which was to say, "No, I stand by the principle of bringing it in-house." Councillor Allard and I supported him, and by today we've reached a point where we're all in agreement on it. So I'm not trying to confuse matters, I'm just saying there was no involvement in from admin in the drafting of Councillor Eadie's motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Despite all the mention and discussion of bulky waste and potentiality for in City worker involvement since spring time.

Madam Speaker: Your question.

Councillor Schreyer: We are to congratulate Councillor Eadie solely despite all that has transpired before then?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Congratulate Councillor Allard and me for voting with them at the committee. I don't know, I mean, you know Councillor Pagtakhan and Councillor Gilroy for supporting it at EPC along with Councillor Orlikow, and we all voted for it today. So I got to say, I mean Councillor Eadie pushed it forward talking about, I mean, it's not, you know, it was an issue of particular importance in certain wards. I understand what he's saying, which is, it's not just his ward, he didn't do it just to be, what's your expression Councillor Eadie, "I'm not ward-centric." So he didn't do it just to be ward-centric. But yeah, I mean he moved it forward. This discussion took place in October and has since moved forward from there. So I guess, to give primary credit where credit's due, Councillor Eadie has been, has pushed this. I've certainly said I would support it, starting in October as a kind of reasonable first-step toward to the Ottawa model. So I stand by that, I think I've been consistent in what I've been saying. So, but yeah I mean if the question is, who came up with this motion, yeah Councillor Eadie.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, on to you, and then we'll hear from Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Wyatt: The RFP, in your view then, the City, an RFP precludes the ability to have in-house bids?

Councillor Mayes: No, due to the commendable Recommendation 3 that we've now put forward that we are moving forward in an innovative model. I want to commend the Mayor for being supportive of this and took quite a bit of discussion. So under the new model that we will have, not for this, not for bulky, and not obviously for the big…the big contract that we voted on in October, but going forward on the multi-family collection, we will now have a process, like Ottawa, where the admin will sit down with the bargaining agent, with CUPE, and see if terms and conditions can be worked out that are roughly comparable, no I don't I think we took the word "roughly" out, Madam Speaker, I think it is comparable to the costs from the private sector. So, we will now have, à la Ottawa, a situation where, if the bargaining agent can come forward and say, "Look we can do this at a rate comparable to the private sector," we will consider that, we will take that into consideration. I don't know the exact wording from October. But I thought it was a step forward, Councillor Gerbasi, to her credit, backed me on that amidst some considerable backlash. It's a step forward to say, we can now look at bringing these things in-house. It's not, however, moving across the board to bring things in-house, it's giving a chance to CUPE to sit down with our staff and see if we can work out a costing model that would be acceptable to Council. I hope that's clear, if not, I'm happy to go on for hours about this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: That may be more of a threat. My question is, reading the Clause 3 that we voted on back in October and I don't mean to be (inaudible), but where I'm getting confused on this, Councillor, and I'm sure you can help clarify or provide some light on the matter.

Madam Speaker: Your question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, sorry. Is on Clause 3, it refers to it could be awarded in-house in the future, could deliver to garbage and recycling costs on a cost-comparable to the private sector. I don't see, I need the clarification in terms of the, what I heard today in terms of no Request for Proposal, is that precluded then based on, in your mind, based on the fact that this Clause 3 did not clarify that at that time?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: This is what we voted, what we have just voted on today is an exception to that, we are moving forward without an RFP. Councillor Eadie has made his case, successfully that we should bring bulky waste in-house. He may have tried to do the same for multi-family, I probably wouldn't be as disposed to simply bring that in-house without going through the Recommendation 3, which is the model that a number of people in labour pushed for, the Ottawa model, which is you would sit down and give a…have a chance to talk to the bargaining agent, you're not simply saying, "It's contracted out, and it's going to stay contracted out," you're not simply saying, "we're going to bring it in." You're saying, "well, let's sit down and negotiate with the union and see what we can come up with." Again, this is, I think the first step toward this, and Councillor Gerbasi can correct me if I'm wrong, since 2005. So I think, you know, we talk about creating a culture of innovation here, I think we're doing that, we're admittedly taking the model from the City of Ottawa, but that I went there this summer as you know, and was quite impressed. I met with the staff, the union, bureaucrats, I went with the Mayor, I met with the Council, so I came away thinking that it's a model we should try and replicate. So no, if it's a fair question, doesn't this run counter to what we passed in October, if that's the question, I think the answer is yes, but Councillor Eadie has made his case, why we should bring this in-house. Nevertheless, what we passed in October continues to govern for the multi-family pick-up that will be as said, coming forward in the near future.

Madam Speaker: Final question.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, and are you aware, more are you aware question, just my concerns with regards to due process that this Councillor for Transcona also voted against Report No. 8 of the Property and Development Committee because there was also no report on the agenda, just a motion. Are you aware of that?

Councillor Mayes: I wasn't sure why you were voting against it. But I'm aware you voted against it, you once voted against a report at the Jonathan Toews, is it then that did it go to Community Centre for a Zamboni I think it was at the St. Vital Arena and then after a spirited exchange we sorted that out and moved forward. So he hasn't, there won't always be reports, sometimes that's not do to maleficence or an attempt to bamboozle anyone, it's just coming out of a motion like this, there isn't a report. So yes, I am aware that you didn't vote for that.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for the Chair? Okay, seeing none, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Innovation. There's no report today, no motions, no by-laws. Are there any questions for the Chair for Councillor Gilroy? Okay, that brings our meeting to a close. I know it's been a long day. Tomorrow, Councillor Morantz, you are chairing the Appeals Committee, myself and several members of Council will be there. Next week, there is other meetings that are scheduled as well, but I hope that all of you take some time later this month to rest and recharge and

spend time with family and friends. I join the Mayor, he had mentioned in his opening comments, he wishes you all a joyous holiday season and I do the same and I wish you the best for the New Year. Thank you. Councillor Dobson, will you move that we adjourn? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Roll call, Mr. Clerk.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 5:04 p.m.