COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, November 21, 2019

The Council met at 9:38 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 Santos.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos and Schreyer.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you Madam Clerk. I'd like to now recognize our first…our two first-time pages who are with us here today; Elora Cromaty who attend Murdoch McKay Collegiate in the Transcona Ward and Ryan Ross who attends South East Collegiate in the Waverley West Ward. Thank you for joining us and for serving council today. We'll now move into morning announcements, Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker and good morning to each of my colleagues, also good morning to those that are watching via the livestream as well as all those citizens that are here to watch today's proceedings. I understand there is a number of members of the Winnipeg Police Association here and I want to welcome each of them to Winnipeg City Hall as well to watch our work. Madam Speaker, there are a few matters I want to update members of council on. Firstly, I want to thank all members of council who took time out of their busy schedules to attend and participate in a number of the Remembrance Day ceremonies that were held in many corners of our city over the course of Remembrance Day. This is a particularly important year to mark the 75th anniversary of D Day. I had the opportunity to visit Normandy and to attend a number of the events with some of our veterans from Winnipeg and from coast to coast to coast. Today I was thinking about their service and the service of so many that have paid the ultimate sacrifice to defend our freedoms in the service of our country in numerous conflicts around the world and of course, here at home. And I want to thank members of council again just for attending and being part of the Remembrance Day ceremonies. One of the ceremonies that was particularly...was just a beautiful service was the service at Deer Lodge in the St. James Ward. And it was certainly one that I have attended many times with Councillor Gillingham along with many of our veterans that reside in that location. I also want to just acknowledge the beginning of the Bloomberg Harvard civic leadership initiative that kicked off earlier this week. What we're trying to do is to reduce the demand on calls for service for the Winnipeg Police Service by working collaboratively cross jurisdiction. There are many members of various agencies that were present for that initial discussion including Councillor Klein and Councillor Rollins that were in attendance and I want to thank them for their participation as we try to engage many agencies notably provincial agencies to try to work better and more effectively to reduce the demands on members of our Winnipeg Police Service and first responders community. Madam Speaker, I also had the opportunity to attend the speech from the throne at the provincial legislature this week. I appreciated the opportunity and the invitation by the provincial government to attend, and also appreciated the number of times that the City of Winnipeg was referenced. There is certainly increased attention to the City of Winnipeg right now. There were various measures including economic development as well as public safety measures that were announced. Notably also, additional support was recognized for mental health and addictions support in our community and so that's something I have been advocating for and members of council have been advocating for, the illicit drug task force recommendations are something that we have begun implementation and obviously we want to see more robust and timely implementation from other levels of government notably the provincial government. And I certainly welcome some of the announcements in the speech from the throne. Of course, the...it will be important to see the implementation and the delivery of those and would be willing to continue to work collaboratively with our provincial partners on matters that benefit the citizens that we all serve here in the City of Winnipeg. Madam Speaker, I also had the opportunity to attend the Driving Competitiveness Metro Region announcement. This is the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region. Members of council including Councillor Lukes, currently Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Gillingham are serving on the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region Board, recently rebranded Winnipeg Metropolitan Region. This is an effort to work more collaboratively with our capital region partners and the provincial government through an economic development lens. And again, we're working collaboratively. We think that we could have much more to be gained by working together in this new approach and I have had excellent dialogue with Minister Rochelle Squires and will be continuing that dialogue going forward. Lastly...or one of the final items I will mention is

we've recently concluded a lot of road construction work including the Fermor construction project. Councillor Allard is overseeing of course our IRPW committee and Councillor Mayes was in attendance for a project that he has championed for many years. Certainly, a multi-year project that will help keep our city moving as we continue to grow in that region of the city. And last but not least, I know a lot of us are wearing blue and gold today. We want to wish our beloved Winnipeg Blue Bombers all the very best as they take on the Hamilton Tiger Cats in Calgary at the CFL final this weekend. It's been a long time that the cup has come home where it belongs here in the City of Winnipeg and I would just encourage all of us, and Bomber fans from coast to coast to coast to cheer hard this weekend for our team. Let's hope they are able to beat the Hamilton Tiger Cats. We know that they are the underdog going in but that's the story of Winnipeg, underestimated but the grit and the passion that I know they will demonstrate on the field is reflective of our community. And I want to congratulate Wade Miller, the entire Winnipeg Blue Bomber organization and of course, every member of the team both on and off the field for their work. We're proud of them, win or lose. Obviously we're hoping that we're celebrating and I would just invite all members of council and every member of our city to get behind our team and use this as an opportunity to celebrate what's good in our community and what can bring us together as a community and that's of course, through sport. Thank you Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, the Mayor referenced Remembrance Day which has just passed. The legions…Royal Canadian Legions across Winnipeg play an important role in our community and they certainly play an important role in the lives of many of our veterans. On Sunday, the St. James Legion Ladies Auxiliary recognized four remarkable women and I just want to put their names on record and acknowledge their outstanding achievements. Jane Deller, Phyllis Psooy, Corinne Van Meer and Kathy McKinnon were recognized for their outstanding service to the work of the Ladies Auxiliary in the St. James Legion. Combined these faithful volunteers have over 130 years of service and commitment. And so as I said, I just want to publicly acknowledge their service. I want to thank them for their work in making St. James, indeed all of Winnipeg a better place to live.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Gilroy followed by Councillor Nason.

Councillor Gilroy: I rise today, Madam Speaker, to congratulate the Valour Patriots Football Club. The peewee won their championships, yay, West End proud. So we're very, very proud of them and I just want to really take this moment to really congratulate all the parents, the family members and most of all, all the coaches. The football…if any of you have ever participated in the football, it takes all summer so there are three nights a week that they are coaching and then on the weekends. So a lot of their summer goes missing and they are coaching a young youth. So I just want to congratulate the football club and the peewees.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason and our final speaker will be Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to open my speaking today to offer thanks to those that have sacrificed their lives and fought for our freedoms that we enjoy today and also those that continue to serve. I observed as many of my council colleagues different communities, cultures observing remembrance events leading up to and after November 11th in many different ways. They remembered them. Seeing over 500 school children participate in the no stone left alone ceremony at the Transcona cemetery and leaving poppies at the grave of the fallen, graves of the fallen, they remembered them. Seeing hundreds gather and march in Transcona remembrance service, they remembered them. In my role representing the Mayor and our council as Veteran and Military Liaison, we remembered them and we will honour them. Seeing the project put forward by Sheilah Restall via her vision of the Poppy Project or Poppy Blanket Project with the support of you, Madam Speaker in your role as councillor for the area, pulling together a community far and wide to build a blanket of over 8,000 hand crafted poppies made by the community we serve. Pardon me. Many of those poppies were adorned with acts of remembrance for those lost or those that serve. Sheilah pulled together our city on this project and I want to thank her for those efforts.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Very briefly, we had thanked members of the Winnipeg Police Association for attending and it is unions in this matter with the police family. Sometimes overlook that, I am as guilty of that as anybody. So we should know that the Winnipeg Police Senior Officers Association is also going to be appearing or the representative appearing in delegation. So I don't know how many of the members of that different union are here, but welcome them as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With the concurrence of council, I would like to move forward with the meeting. Councillors wish to make morning statements I would appreciate if I knew ahead of time.

MINUTES

Councillor Rollins moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on October 24th, 2019, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will now get into our delegations. I would like to call forward Mr. Loren Remillard. Is he here today? Mr. Loren Remillard, he is the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and he is in support of Item 3 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 12th, 2019 regarding revisions to the Winnipeg Police Pension By-Law. Welcome and we'll have ten minutes on the clock, please. Sure.

DELEGATIONS

Loren Remillard: Mr. Mayor, Madam Speaker, members of city council, thank you. On behalf the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and our 2100 member organizations, I want to thank you for the opportunity to be here today in support of the recommendations in the report and the motion that we believe will be coming forward from Deputy Mayor Markus Chambers. Our support follows long standing policy dating back to 1999 advocating for civic agreements founded on the principles of the ability to strategically deploy human resources, advancement based on merit, recognize and rewarding productivity, remuneration and benefits consistent with community standards and, of course, sustainability ability to pay. I want to make a point that I think is very important in that we can have a difference of opinion on a multitude of issues and on this I imagine there's going to be many that follow me that have a difference of opinion. But please do not take that as that difference being a devaluation of the contributions of the women and men of our police services. This is a difference of opinion. We value the work that the women and men of our police service do every day. But we appear before you today as champions of the final two principles that I listed, specifically, the consistency with community standards and sustainability ability to pay. You have before you the opportunity to fix a long standing cost driver that is both inconsistent with the vast majority of your own workforce, but unsustainable at the expense of core services. We've all seen the experiences of some U.S. cities where uncontrolled emergency services have led to bankruptcy. I'm not going to pretend this decision is easy but this is municipal government. No decision is easy. And also, the easy road is never the right road. The only...the real and only question before you today is whether the City should change the police pension plan and the answer as it has been for many, many years is absolutely yes. The recommended changes will allow the City to bring parity to its civic pensions, eliminate unsustainable costs and maintain service levels. Again, we absolutely respect the important work done by our police service and recognize that our community is going through a challenging period with respect to crime and substance abuse. But it is a period. Good decisions are never made in a knee-jerk reaction. They are always done with the long term vision in mind. It's also why this is an important opportunity to redeploy financial resources to bolster our responses to these challenges. We are supportive of reinvesting the savings into areas like community services or the City's homelessness initiative so that some of the root causes of crime can be addressed. And obviously as the motion that we believe will be coming forward, a redeployment of the savings into the police services directly is not only encouraged but supported. These changes bring the police pension plan more in line with the pension plan of other civic employees including emergency service workers like firefighters and paramedics who also put their lives on the line on a regular basis. A vote to maintain the two-tier civic pension system where by all employees are equal, but some are more equal than others is simply put, bad human resource policy. What do you say to the men and women of the firefighting services that we value their contributions and sacrifices but not quite as much as we do others? Or those that worked around the clock to get the city back on its feet after the October storm. Maintaining separate pension plans with wildly different terms for different groups of employees as I said is bad practice. While we all accept that different jobs have different levels of pay, we shouldn't be telling one group of employees that they have special rank, status over others. Comparative and I emphasize comparative to the pensions enjoyed by the vast majority of those employed not only within the City of Winnipeg but the City of Winnipeg proper, this is moving from a platinum-plated pension plan to a gold-plated pension plan. We are not stripping away the pension from the Police Service. We are bringing it in line with the sustainable pensions of others. In the end, the women and men who serve our community with honour and distinction will still receive a pension that remains amongst the most generous in our entire community. At the same time it allows for critical reinvestment in policing and other City services to help ease the pressures that our community is facing now and long term. In conclusion, the chamber supports the recommendations and motion to come forward that is...as it is consistent with fundamental human resource principles, again, principles, and provides council the opportunity to create a systemic fix that will support the sustainability, fairness and re-investment. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any questions for our delegation today? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you for the presentation. You talked about the standards and levels of the budget seminar (inaudible). I think we're advised by our staff that only 35% of residents are non-residential. In order to deal with all of the

problems you indicated the City budget faces, would you now then support having more funding come from non-residential…the business community to help out with the community standard?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Remillard.

Loren Remillard: I think you stole Councillor Eadie's question. You know, we can do this and we do this every time we go through a budget conversation about should we increase here, increase there, those conversations are before you and will continue to be before you. The question before you today is about the police pension. And we can throw in all sorts of red herrings and misdirection and so forth, but it doesn't detract from the fact that this has been a longstanding issue. I reference 1999. We have had policy on this dating to that date and before. This is an issue that requires leadership to address, again, not just for now, but going forward. We can get into those kind of side issues, but it really does nothing to further the conversation about the issue before you today.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Since 2004, residential property taxes have risen 56.7 percent in terms of the total budget revenues. By golly, business tax revenue in that period has dropped from 61.9 to 56.9. We've actually collected $5 million less. Wouldn't this seem to be wildly different in the special status? You have faulted the police pension plan for being wildly different in the special status, but by golly, you're down about 10 percent, residential property taxes up 57.6 percent. Isn't that wildly different treatment of different group?

Madam Speaker: I just want to remind the gallery, there are no presentations permitted during council meetings from the gallery if we could please respect that. Thank you.

Loren Remillard: Fair comment. I remind Councillor Mayes that Winnipeg is the only city with a municipal business tax and if he is eager to see parity, maybe he should move a motion to eliminate the business tax. So I would also contend, though, that when you take a look at those ratios maybe the question before council should be, what are you doing to encourage economic development so that we see more businesses. I would caution you on that to suggest that that should be a worrying trend and potentially the business growth that is happening in our community. Again, it's a side issue. It's a redirect. It's a misdirect. The fact is this pension plan issue regardless of the current spike in crime, the current ratio of property taxes, residential to commercial, those are all issues we need to deal with.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, you've answered the question. Final question and I would like to remind everyone, bring your questions and your answers through the Chair. Thank you.

Councillor Mayes: As to misdirection, yes eliminating the business tax would result in a very large increase indeed in taxes for residential property taxpayers in that, as you know, we can only set one mill rate. Has the Chamber ever at any point…could you please forward me any documentation you provided to the Province asking for different mill rates because that's what we would need to do if we eliminated the business tax or we could massively increase residential property tax.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Loren Remillard: Thank you Madam Speaker. Actually, it is an issue we are assessing right now and I would be more than happy to share information with you as we move forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker. In all serious, Madam Speaker, I was wondering if the delegation could explain the relationship of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce with the Mayor and his office.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Remillard.

Loren Remillard: Thank you Madam Speaker. I believe it's well documented that Mayor Brian Bowman is a past Chair of the Winnipeg Chamber. I believe over the history of our city, many men and women that have served in this council have also been members of the Chamber. And I believe some of the current members around here are also members of the Chamber.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. It sounds like through your presentation that you have a lot of experience negotiating with CBAs. Can you tell me how many years' experience you have in that?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Remillard.

Loren Remillard: I have over 12 years' experience representing the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce. That is what I am bringing the position of the Chamber. I have never presented myself as a labour relations expert.

Madam Speaker: Second question Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you for the answer and through you, Madam Chair, I do appreciate that answer, but also as representing the Chamber and many businesses, surely we have a policy or thoughts that all private enterprises adhere to which is you know, integrity in your negotiations. So if you make a contract, you sign an agreement, you don't want somebody halfway through just pulling out of that agreement. And often, when we notify or we want to start talking about changing an agreement, you do that properly and through the proper channels and we don't misdirect by only informing one and talking about an overtime issue, and we don't misdirect by leaving out the point that the City has taken money from that fund previously and we don't misdirect by saying it seems to me the City is also trying to get away...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein your question, please.

Councillor Klein: I've been getting to it. Taking away their...pardon me…I have got more for you later. It's…I'm wondering how then with all the misdirection that's going on, as business people or as representing business people we would sit back and say, this shows the City can be trusted and acts with integrity by going ahead and just moving forward with trying to pass a by-law.

Madam Speaker: The question Councillor Klein, please.

Councillor Klein: Would you support that as a business community?

Loren Remillard: Madam Speaker, I'm going to try to interpret if there is a question in there. I would argue that this has been well known to council subsequent to the election campaign. This issue was well identified as something that would be coming forward during this term. The presentation we made was on the principles of sustainability and consistency with community standards. That issue has to be addressed. And you know, that is the issue before you. And I would also suggest that there is an issue of integrity and responsiveness and respect for the ratepayers that are funding our city day in and day out. So absolutely, you need to show respect to the men and women that serve in all aspects of City operations. But you were put here fundamentally by ratepayers, by voters and you have a responsibility to them to show leadership and fiscal responsibility. And make hard choices. We have seen successive councils time and time again, kick the can down the road. This is your opportunity and I would say that is an opportunity to demonstrate the values and the respect you have for ratepayers.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Final question, thank you, Madam Chair. And through you, then I will pose this to you. The men and women of the Police Service are also taxpayers. They also...we should also be respecting them. There is labour laws that will probably have a weigh in on this entire issue. We've also heard from these taxpayers that they are willing to sit down and talk about it. So you may or may not know that Councillor Mayes and I have put forward a motion requesting that the public service actually sit down with both of the unions that are involved and actually negotiate this. Sit down and talk about what is the best way to get to the final result that we all want. Would you not support that as the approach or just arbitrarily vote and take it away and let's see how it plays out in court?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Loren Remillard: Madam Speaker, I wouldn't categorize what you are doing here today as an arbitrary discussion. I think, again, the issues before you today, I don't think delaying it 90 days...I would support you voting on it today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, we will move on. Thank you for your presentation. I would like to call forward Mr. Maurice Sabourin, President of the Winnipeg Police Association in opposition to Item 3 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 12th, 2019 regarding revisions to the Winnipeg Police Pension By-law. Following that, we'll here from Mr. Kelly Dennison if you would like to come down at this time and have a seat on the bench behind the Speaker's chair. Welcome. We will have 10 minutes on the clock and we will take questions following the two presentations.

Maurice Sabourin: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good morning to Mayor Bowman and members of council. My name is Moe Sabourin and I serve as the President of the Winnipeg Police Association. I am here this morning not only on behalf of our 1400 members of the Winnipeg Police Service but also thousands of retired members and their families. Many of them have joined us here today in the gallery and we thank them for coming to show their support. You all know and understand why we are here. We are appearing in opposition to the EPC item before you today that will unilaterally cut our pension benefits. The plan recommended by EPC is a mistake for several important reasons. First of all, this approach puts the City at a legal risk in terms of losses because of its…it unilaterally tears up our collective agreement. Secondly, it is a slap in the face to the members of our service who are working so hard at a time of unprecedented crime and violent crime impacting our community. Thirdly, the current course of action will deliberately drive a number of these members to retire immediately, depriving our front line service of vital experience and perspective. Fourthly, the so-called savings to be gained from cutting our pension benefits will make no difference to the budget challenges created by the choices of the Mayor and City's senior administration. Finally, and most importantly, there is a better way forward for all of us. I will now take a few minutes to explain what I mean. Let me start with the legal risks. Our collective agreement is clear, the Winnipeg Police pension plan is part of our collective agreement and the City cannot, I repeat, cannot make unilateral changes to it. It's that simple. A number of you here have backgrounds as lawyers and professional lawyers tend to understand that a contract is a contract, and that one party can't tear it up when they decide they no longer like it. Our members ratified this contract and so did city council. In fact, in June of 2017, on the same day that Winnipeg City Council ratified our collective agreement, Mayor Bowman stood in this very chamber and referred to it as, and I'm quoting Mr. Bowman directly here, "The most sustainable negotiated agreement in 20 years." The most sustainable negotiated agreement in 20 years. And lest you think the Mayor misspoke or simply chose his words poorly his office also sent out a media release with the headline and I quote, "Proposed agreement with the Police Association, the longest, most sustained in almost 20 years." On top of all that, the Mayor was apparently so excited about how great and sustainable the deal was he logged on to his Twitter account and sent out not one, not two, but three separate tweets where he called the agreement, and I quote Mayor Bowman again directly here, "The longest most sustainable in 20 years." Those were his exact words less than two years ago regarding an agreement that he now wants to unilaterally tear up. Now the City administration has pointed to a by-law provision that suggests the City can do as it pleases. What you haven't been shown is the collective agreement provision that overrides that by-law. After all, why has the City administration ever negotiated with the WPA on pension issues? It has repeatedly done so for 40 years. It is because even the City knows that it is legally required to do so. That's what makes this gambit even more irresponsible. The current course of the Mayor and City administration rips up this agreement and exposes the City to serious legal liability. If you endorse this unilateral action you are voting to expose taxpayers to hundreds of thousands of dollars in costs, legal fees, actuarial fees and other expenses and that is before any penalties which might be incurred. You have been told by the City administration that there is a legal opinion supporting the Mayor's position. We obviously don't agree. But you don't have to take our word for it. Instead, I ask you to consider very carefully the administration's record on legal matters which have impacted taxpayers over the past number of years. Think of the stadium Think of the police headquarters just to name a couple. With that track record in mind, are you prepared to risk the costs on even more penalties? On even more taxpayers' money being needlessly thrown away on legal fees? This unilateral attack on our collective agreement as I said is also a slap in the face of our members. Chief Smyth's own data presented last week shows that crime in the city is currently at dangerous levels. Violent crimes, 14 percent above the five year average. Property crime is 44 percent above the five year average and we all understand that unfortunately, we may set a record for annual homicides. As our members grapple with this reality you want to unilaterally cut their pensions less than two years after you voted to endorse the negotiated collective agreement. That is a harsh statement to make not only to our members but to their families. After all, a pension is about family, about ensuring your family is taken care of and not just an individual member and that is what you see in this gallery today. We do have members who are currently serving that are eligible to retire. These experienced veteran members play key roles in providing our services. By taking this course of action you are potentially driving a great number of them to retire early. A move that will make the challenge our community is facing even worse. Let me move to my next point. You have been told that the savings from cutting our pension plan will be directed towards addressing these challenges. But in reality, this could not be further from the truth. First of all, it is worth noting that of the so-called savings, only a small portion might be made available to the Winnipeg Police Service while the rest goes to general revenue. This alone should tell you a lot about the motivation behind the unilateral plan. Would some money go to the Winnipeg Police Service? Maybe, but where does the rest go? More Wi-Fi on buses, a bigger office of public engagement, when it goes to general revenue as a council you will be forced to hunt it down. I know there is discussion of a motion to share more of the savings with the Winnipeg Police Service in order to address operational challenges. This is another distraction and you cannot even count on those savings due to the legal issues I have mentioned. This is a false choice. It doesn't matter if you propose to redirect 5 percent of the money or 50 percent of the money. It is not right to expect the pension plan of our members to be paying for operational services of the Winnipeg Police Service any more than you would expect transit operators to payout of their pension to keep fares lower or Public Works employees to pay from their own pockets to build new bridges. I know the budget process is separate from this meeting. There is more to say on the process at the appropriate time. But don't believe for a moment that the savings in this reckless approach to pensions are the solutions to Winnipeg's violent crime problems. So you have a choice today but you might ask, what is the alternative? Well, I have a better alternative for you, a real alternative

you can negotiate. You have been told by the Mayor that discussions on the issue have been ongoing for several years. However, you have been profoundly misled. Delivering a threat is not a negotiation. All we have heard on the issue from the Mayor and his administration since 2016 are threats and nobody negotiates under a threat. But the Winnipeg Police Association has been ready to engage in honest, open, transparent negotiation process, three things that Mayor Bowman has prided himself on in the past. We want to be a part of the solution because we always have been. We were the first police association to agree to the creation of a cadet corp. We were not popular with the rest of the police associations in Canada, but we did this and we understood that it was important, and we agreed through a negotiation to do it. A cadet is paid less than half the average salary of one of our full…fully sworn members. Which other association has agreed to a new class of employee, making less than half of the other established employees? Another example; years ago many people insisted that more positions in the service should be civilianized. Well, we negotiated. We came to an agreement and look at the results. More than 40 positions within the WPS are now civilian positions. Again, this was achieved through negotiations. It is projected to save nearly $4 million over the next three years. We also…

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

Maurice Sabourin: Thank you. We also agreed to reset the levels of civilian salaries to more closely match their equivalence in other departments. This created further savings for the City of Winnipeg. And yet another example of observers have been concerned about court costs. Well, we negotiated. We agreed to the reduction of compensation of our members when they attend court. These changes are projected to save 3.7 million according to the City's own figures. The results of negotiations between the two parties are clear. Nearly $8 million in savings by the City's own figures achieved, thanks to the City and the police association sitting down and negotiating. This is how I will close here today. The Winnipeg Police Association has always been ready to negotiate with the City of Winnipeg. We remain ready to do so. When you have the opportunity to vote today, vote to stop the current reckless and legally risky approach. Vote to send a signal to the Mayor that you respect the collective agreement process, something that this very council and Mayor ratified in 2017. Even if for whatever reason you don't agree with us, we would at least ask that you vote to delay until the arbitration and legal process can resolve the dispute. This could at least mitigate the possible impacts of a wave of retirements arriving January 1 at a time when our community in the Mayor's own words is facing a crisis. The WPA has always been part of the solution, ready to make a difference in the community that we protect in the city that we care about. There is a greater way forward towards stronger community and a better solution for constituents. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Sabourin, if you could just remain on the floor while we hear from the next delegation and then we will get into questions if there are any. I would like to now call forward Mr. Kelly Dennison, President of the Winnipeg Police Senior Officer Association. Five minutes on the clock and then we'll take questions. Welcome.

Kelly Dennison: Thank you. Good morning Mr. Mayor, city councillors. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you this morning in opposition of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 12th, 2019 regarding revisions to the Winnipeg Police Pension By-law. I am inspector Kelly Dennison, the President of the Winnipeg Police Senior Officers' Association. I am here representing 34 senior officers and civilian managers who upon promotion to executive members form the Winnipeg Police Senior Officers Association. Although senior officers contribute to the same pension plan as all sworn members of the police service as executive officers, we are represented by our own association. On behalf of our members I stand before you today knowing that our Winnipeg police pension plan forms part of our collective agreement. As it has for the entire 30 plus years, I have been a police officer. Therefore, I am of firm belief that any changes to this plan should come through negotiations. I am not here today to debate what should or should not be benefits to our pension plan. What I am here to express is that unilateral changes to a previously negotiated benefit is unethical, amoral and open to legal challenge. The information that has been presented publicly, regarding this issue, simply does not tell the whole story. The Winnipeg Police Senior Officers' Association has always been prepared to discuss terms of the pension plan. During our most recent contract negotiations with the City, the Senior Officers' Association was prepared to deal with issues pertaining to our pension. The City chose not to bring these issues to the table. That five year agreement included a number of concessions including reduction in our complement and an increase in the number of hours we work without overtime. As leaders we make difficult decisions every day. Many of those decisions centre on fiscal responsibility. But make no...but to make sound decisions all the information must be communicated and it must be factual. The City's communication on the effects of these unilateral changes on members of the Senior Officers' Association has been almost nonexistent. At times, communications with the Senior Officers' Association has been totally forgotten. In the entire report you are being asked to consider, the Winnipeg Police Senior Officers' Association is not mentioned other than to describe the makeup of the pension board. And yet, the changes dramatically affect each and every member of our association. Every member of the Senior Officers' Association were contributors to the police pension plan in the early 2,000s when the City chose to use surplus funds that has led to the contribution levels today. Every member of the Senior Officers' Association has contributed to their pension plan as agreed upon their entire careers. All police officers accept that we are held to a higher standard by our community. Living up to this higher standard requires that we respect our community, respect the justice system, respect the rule of law and respect one another. An agreement negotiated in good faith should be binding. But we are

also no strangers to change and recognize our responsibility to our community. Therefore I must reiterate again that the Senior Officers' Association has always been in a position to negotiate changes with our employer. The average seniority of our association is just short of 30 years of service. The experience and expertise is here. However, these unilateral changes has sent a ripple effect through the Senior Officers' Association causing members to re-evaluate their future with the service and contemplate retirement now. Sixty five percent of our senior officers have completed 28 years of service while the remaining 35 percent have at least 24 years of service. One hundred percent of our senior officers have spent a career serving the citizens of Winnipeg and 100 percent of our senior officers have lived up to our negotiated collective agreements over many years. At a time in our city when senior officers are doing everything possible to address violent crime in their divisions and provide the leadership necessary to foster good morale in the entire service, our employer has publicly tried to undermine our efforts. As executive officers, our role is to assess risk. We provide direction to members and our community based on this risk. When risk outweighs the reward you must reassess. Today, you have had President Moe Sabourin and I stand before you and publicly state that our associations are continuing to be prepared to engage in negotiations in regards to the Winnipeg Police pension plan. This is a process both associations have demonstrated can lead to mutually beneficial results.

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

Kelly Dennison: I personally work closely with many of you in this room and I continue to do so. Together we have tackled many problems in our community and together we have found many solutions. There is a solution to this issue as well. And imposing unilateral changes to a pension plan is not it. We are asking council today to conduct their own risk assessment. We are asking that our collective agreement be respected, that decades of precedent be respected, that our proven track record of finding mutually beneficial solutions to problems we are confronted with continue. In conclusion, we are asking that council be fair and just by rejecting this proposal and request that the public service add the Winnipeg Police pension plan to their next cycle of negotiations. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for the presentation. We will now take questions for either Mr. Dennison or Mr. Sabourin. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, many times I have been accused of having very close blue ties by both the media and the members of this council. Today I definitely feel very well to have lots of blue surrounding me. Though, with that, some shades of orange may creep into this. And with regards to labour I find that, you know, a deal is a deal is a deal. And you know, in the middle of the deal, I don't think we should be breaking that deal. So my question is pretty simple today. Could one of the two members that are before us explain to us with regards to overtime, is it mandatory?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Maurice Sabourin: Madam Speaker, Councillor Nason, thank you for the question. Overtime is completely voluntary. Members cannot be forced to work overtime. Chief Smyth has taken some steps to try and reduce the amount of overtime that has been worked by the members by unfortunately reducing services to our citizens of Winnipeg. So unfortunately, overtime is controlled by the service. And at one time, when the part of the pension plan that was negotiated, overtime was something that was not very common. But because of the challenges that we face in the City of Winnipeg, and part of those challenges are a reduction in complement, and when you have a reduction in complement the unfortunate result is members now have to work overtime to be able to provide or to continue to provide the services to the citizens of Winnipeg that they deserve. So ultimately, overtime is not a mandatory thing. It can be controlled by the service. I hope that answers your question.

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

Councillor Nason: I know my councillor colleague, Councillor Orlikow, will jump all over me if I preamble too long so I will try not to. With regards to special duty, I know recently we had white out parties and hopefully after Sunday night there might be an opportunity for some special event coming forward. I'm wondering if special duty, would that be considered overtime, for parade duty, perhaps?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Sabourin?

Maurice Sabourin: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Special duty is basically the Bombers, the Jets, can request that certain number of police officers are on scene. And special duty, in particular, yes, the members are receiving overtime. It's duties above their regular duties. But the service and the City actually make money off of special duty. The officer may be receiving time and a half but the rates that they are charging for that member is I believe two and a half times. So the member now is collecting overtime but he is also...or she is also paying their 8 percent contribution to the pension plan. So again, it's a money-maker for the City and for the service.

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

Councillor Nason: So my last question, and it's more reflective of the officer's families. Can you explain to us how this will affect the families of the officers?

Maurice Sabourin: If the motion is passed, sir?

Councillor Nason: Correct.

Maurice Sabourin: I think it…there is many results that will come from this. There is a survivor clause within the pension. I think everybody in this room realizes how dangerous and difficult the position of being a police officer is. You are placing your life on the line on a daily basis. The likelihood of mostly these members in the room will die probably five years prior to say, their neighbour or a counterpart employee in the City of Winnipeg. So there is a reason why we negotiated such good terms of a pension plan. And I really hate the term "platinum coated", "gold plated" because those are all conditions that we negotiated for in the past. A 10 percent pay increase was turned down at one time to obtain better pension benefits. It is a very difficult profession and I don't think any of you in this room would deny that. So that is why we have gone to great lengths to ensure that we have a pension because I might not be around, but I need my family to be taken care of because I have made, every member in this room has made numerous sacrifices, missed Christmases, missed birthdays, the birth of their own children. There are sacrifices that have been made and our members deserve the pension that we have been able to negotiate over the past 40 years. Thank you, sir.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer, you are the next speaker.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I recall voting for the collective agreement with…for the members of the Winnipeg Police Services last term. I believe it was unanimous. If not, it was nearly unanimous, but my recollection is that it was unanimous after a real drawn out negotiation. But we are using quite the terminology today. We're saying we're tearing up a collective agreement. The people of Winnipeg are paying attention to this and I think they…we need some clarity. Why are we saying that we're tearing up a collective agreement? We just voted for it last term. What was the intention in terms of how long it was meant to last?

Madam Speaker: Thank you for the question. Mr. Sabourin.

Maurice Sabourin: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you for the question, Councillor Schreyer. We are referring particularly to the police pension because the police pension is entrenched in the collective agreement. And if this council votes to unilaterally change the plan, what prevents council tomorrow from saying the wages that you have negotiated in the past, we don't like that anymore. We're going to pay you 3 quarters of what you are being paid. So it's a fundamental principle that if you are breaking one portion of the collective agreement, then what's next? And that actually goes a little bit towards how the so-called negotiations have gone with the City since 2016. And I mentioned, it was under a threat. It truly was. So the threat of being...we know that we can change this so you better agree to everything that we want. That's no different than say myself saying to Kelly here, Kelly, I know you got some milk money in your pocket. I want your milk money. I know I can take it, but I would much prefer you give it to me. You've got until four o'clock to give me your milk money or...you know, I much prefer that you give it to me. That was the negotiations that were occurring unfortunately. And we have always been open to changes whether it be increasing contributions, changing other provisions of the pension plan. So when you ask about tearing up an agreement, it is a small portion of the agreement, but what else gets put on the chopping block? Thank you, sir.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Schreyer if we can get right into the question, please.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. In the experience of either Mr. Sabourin or Mr. Dennison, do we recollect another time when there has been a move by City Hall or by Council to change the collective agreement without negotiation before two years after a unanimous vote?

Maurice Sabourin: Madam Speaker and Councillor Schreyer, to unilaterally change the pension plan? No, there has never been an attempt to change the plan. The by-law was changed by agreement back in 2013. I believe some of that information is in the package that was presented to EPC and also to this council. Keep in mind that those changes came about because the City was using surpluses from the pension plan. They were caught with their hand in the cookie jar, the people that were here at the time. And as a result, sweeping changes were made to the by-law about surplus sharing, as well as, the fact that the City is completely on the book for any…

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

Maurice Sabourin: That any unfunded liability would be born solely by the City of Winnipeg. So in good times, when there were surpluses, they were happy to share in those surpluses. And now that...as a result of the unfunded liability and as a result of an actuarial evaluation that says the City has to pay 19 percent, you know, that's never been discussed in the media by any of the councillors around the table here...I'm sorry, I'm grouping everybody in. But that's never been discussed why that has actually occurred and why there is that discrepancy. And that 19 percent isn't a forever number. It's what the actuary has deemed the City has to pay as a result of the agreement from 2013. And with a little bit of leverage, I'll say, from the associations back in the day to prevent people from facing significant legal action, the City was more than happy to sign that agreement. So again, it's another agreement. There has never been another instance where the City has tried to unilaterally change the plan. And like I said, we have negotiated that plan for the past 40 years so I'm not too sure how the City can think that they can change it now.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Councillors Klein and Mayes have come forward with a motion.

Madam Speaker: The question.

Councillor Schreyer: Do Mr. Sabourin, Mr. Dennison…are they in agreement with the idea of having 90 days of negotiations with the City with representatives of the Winnipeg Police Service in order to deal in terms of proper form of negotiation regarding the pension and come back in 90 days?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Maurice Sabourin: Thank you. Well, part of my presentation is the fact that if you don't agree with us that the plan cannot be unilaterally changed, at least vote to delay the implementation of the changes to the plan until it can be heard through the arbitration process, legal process. We would welcome any sort of a delay because there are a number of people in this gallery that are very frustrated, they are angry and they are panicked because I don't know of any other pension plan that is trying to implement changes in a month and a half period...not even a month and a half. You could see a significant number of these people walk out the door and it's going to make our situation in this city even worse. Fortunately, we were able to avoid breaking the homicide record, a very vicious attack last night at a MLCC, the young woman who was brutally attacked for standing behind the counter is lucky to be alive today. So if you want a chance having some of these people walk out the door, I say that's not the right answer. But we would welcome any delay in the implementation until we have an opportunity to see this through the legal process but also to give members more of an idea. Because that's also part of the problem is that the City administration hasn't provided any of our members with how these changes are going to affect each and individual person. People are panicked. The pension people are inundated with e-mails and phone calls saying, how are these changes going to affect me in the future? And the material that you have before you folks is ambiguous and it is also contradictory because one benefit change is contradicting timelines and how it will affect the same person in the same situation. And I'm sorry I don't want to monopolize the podium, Kelly. I'll turn it over to you.

Kelly Dennison: In answer to that question, you know, I will…I am not going to reiterate everything Moe said. You heard both of us stand up here for…me for 5 minutes and Moe for 10, telling everybody in this room that we would be willing to negotiate. You have heard that loud and clear. As far as to reiterate what Moe has said about the panic, I can only speak for senior officers and the Senior Officers' Association is not mentioned in that report that you are about to read. This is an agreement that was struck with us as well. We have got no information about...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason moves extension for five minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Kelly Dennison: There is no information been presented to the Senior Officers' Association on how this specifically affects each and every one of those members as well. As a matter of fact, our collective bargaining agreements are slightly different between the Winnipeg Police Association and the Winnipeg Senior Officers' Association. We would actually be in violation of our own collective bargaining agreement if we were to retire by January 1st because of the imposition that we have been put in by the City of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We have a few more speakers. Councillor Klein followed by Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Klein: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll admit I'm guilty of saying this leadership acts as if they are above the law, above democracy and that they are the final decision makers. I will quote a former...or a councillor, "We need the input before the fact, not marching orders. The consultation process is totally unacceptable." That's a quote from Councillor Orlikow from his own website. And in this case, we weren't provided with a lot of information. We weren't provided with how many times the City may have attempted to sit down with you and actually have a real negotiation to

tell you what our financial problems are because one must assume we're having major financial problems. So can you tell me, did you say no to several attempts or how many actual attempts did they not say, I want your milk money, but to say we need to sit down and find an answer to this?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Dennison.

Kelly Dennison: From the Senior Officers' Association, it's a simple…a very simple answer. We have never said no. Not once, not ever. And I'll reiterate again, the report you are asking…being asked to vote on, if this says anything, the Winnipeg Police Association is not mentioned in that report other than to describe the makeup of the pension board. And I'll let Moe handle…

Maurice Sabourin: Thank you. We did have several meetings with the City…the senior City administration. But I can tell you that the tone of those meetings was always, we know we can change this so either accept all of our conditions or we are just going to do it. And we have always said we are willing to negotiate. Several contracts ago we offered to the administration at that time to increase contributions with a caveat that if the plan was ever in surpluses again, that you leave the surpluses there to ensure the health of the plan. They didn't like that idea and they walked away from the table at that point. So again, Councillor Klein, it's always been under a threat that we can take it. So it doesn't do us well because we would just be negotiating with ourselves.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Chair, and in the interest of time, we do hear many comments from various sources especially through social media that the Winnipeg Police Department is the highest paid police department across Canada, yada, yada, yada.

Madam Speaker: The question, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Are you the highest paid police department across Canada?

Maurice Sabourin: Currently, no. Regina, a city of 600...with 600 officers with a much smaller population that doesn't have nearly the call volumes that we do. Last year, 618,000 calls for service were trending at 660,000 calls for service and they don't have nearly the amount of violence or the increase in crime that Winnipeg has seen on a regular basis.

Madam Speaker: Final question, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Chair and through you, because I know we don't have a lot of time. I think my position is that we need to find an answer. I appreciate the fact that you want to negotiate, but my last question is concerning the actual women and men that serve our city. What kind of impact is this having on morale?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Sabourin.

Maurice Sabourin: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, I would ask all of you to take a look into the gallery and look at the faces of these people. In the gallery behind you, I know the Mayor jokingly said that he didn't think there would be a lot of people here because we are so busy and we are very busy. But this is a major issue for our members. They are here in droves to let you folks know that this is going to impact them negatively. I have never seen the morale in the service so low. Our members are going from call to call to call. There is no proactive policing in this city any more. It is all responsive. And members are burnt out. PTSD claims are on the rise.

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

Maurice Sabourin: The use of sick time...sorry, I apologize. The use of sick time has increased dramatically. We did a study a few years ago about the well-being of our members. Probably about four years ago. And those results were startling. The use, unfortunately, self-medicating with alcohol, with other legal...and I wouldn't doubt if there was some illegal there as well, to deal with the stress that our members are facing. That was four years ago, and we have decreased our complement by over a hundred. So you can imagine the calls for service in the last five years has gone up more than 40 percent and our complement is going down. And even with all the reorganization that Chief Smyth is trying to do to help mitigate the workload, it's not helping. The citizens of Winnipeg are suffering. I went to several town hall meetings where almost everyone in the room would put their hand up and say yes, I have been a victim of crime. And what's even more disturbing is that when I asked how many have reported that crime, three quarters of the arms in the room went down. So 660,000 calls for service, I'm going to say is a very low number when you look at the whole thing. But our members are feeling the stress. They are becoming burnt out. And as a thank you, the City is now trying

to change our pension plan that we have negotiated over 40 years to make sure that we had good benefits not only for ourselves but for our family members because we're not going to be here as long as probably yourselves around this table. So it is having a major impact and that is why you see so many people here today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes, your question.

Councillor Mayes: A bit of history and a bit of lawyering here. The report in front of us relies heavily on By-law 126/2011 that was passed in December of 2011, my second day on the job here as a matter of fact. The report that accompanies that report, December 14th, 2011 has a paragraph that says…talks about some history. It talks about the tri-lateral agreement that was reached in 2002, tri-lateral being the two associations and the City, three-way agreement to deal with the surpluses. And so my second question's going to come back to that. But we've got a paragraph here as well in 2011, a further memorandum of agreement was entered into by the City, the Winnipeg Police Association and the Winnipeg Senior Officers' Association on March 3rd, 2006 under which the two police associations agreed to the wording of a new by-law namely the Winnipeg Police Pension By-Law 2/2006. I guess here is my dilemma; I'm being told that the associations were entered into an agreement dealing with the wording of the by-law in 2006 and then we are now saying that that...the association...the association's agreed to the wording of the by-law which gave unilateral scope to the City to make changes to the plan. Was it your understanding, is it your view that in 2006 when the City actually entered into an agreement on the wording of the by-law, is it your understanding that that...that your associations agreed at that point to allow the City to make unilateral changes? It does seem a bit odd to me that if the City felt it had the unilateral right to act, why then it required the agreement of other parties to give it the unilateral right to act?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Sabourin.

Maurice Sabourin: Thank you Madam Speaker. It's always been a negotiation. It's always been an agreement. And even though it is a by-law and the City does have the right to change provisions of the by-law, what they don't have the right to do is change the benefits to our members and that is the portion of the collective agreement. I believe it's page 74 that talks to police pensions, insofar as benefits are concerned. It can only be changed through negotiation, agreement or arbitration. So while the City does have the ability to change the by-law, as far as the benefits go, that is something that has to be negotiated.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Second question Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Two report…was not provided in this most recent report to us, but the 2002 report contain...prepared by City staff contains the phrase, "The Winnipeg Police Pension…"

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes moves extension. All in favour, 5 minutes? Five minute extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Mayes: "Winnipeg police pension benefits are generally comparable to pension plans provided by other police services", this from City staff December 2002. Not speaking to contribution rates, can you discuss any substantial changes in those benefits that would not have been agreed to by the parties since 2002? It appears in 2002 staff were saying it's generally comparable to the benefits provided by other police services. Today we're being told obviously this is the richest plan or one of the richest in Canada. Can you elucidate, can you clarify what benefit changes may have happened in the intervening years? Not contribution rates, that's a separate discussion.

Maurice Sabourin: Without having my file in front of me, I can tell you if there were changes they would have been very minimal. But our plan has been pretty much the same plan since that time frame. And any of those changes that would have come about, would have been by agreement. And as I stated earlier, 40 years' worth of negotiating to make changes and this is the first time that the City has deemed or believed that they could change the provisions of our benefits. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, thank you for your presentations today. The next delegation is Mr. Barry Rempel, President and Chief Executive Officer for the Winnipeg Airports Authority. Is he here today, Mr. Clerk? Yes, thank you. Mr. Rempel, welcome. He is in opposition to Item 6 and 7 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development, the report dated September 4th, 2019. And it is regarding the amendment to the Airport Vicinity Protection Area Secondary Plan By-law No. 6378/94. Welcome and we'll have 10 minutes on the clock sir.

Barry Rempel: Good, thank you very much. First, I want to thank you all for the opportunity to speak to you here today. I really wanted to talk on behalf of our group and many behind us to really two things. One is just to talk a little bit about

concerns over process and the other is hopefully to inform your own decision-making process just a little better. As we look at the entire discussion that's evolved around specifically, the Polo Park application that's before council, we really see this boiling down to nothing more than three questions. And the three questions…I have to do things quite simply, so the three questions are really why, what and how. And so when I take a look at the first of those questions, the first question is really around should we or shouldn't we, continue to protect the 24-hour nature of the airport and its operations, the connectivity that it provides to our community. It's an interesting question. WAA and recall that we are a non-share capital corporation with one sole purpose and that is to serve the needs of our community. We clearly believe that continued protection of the airport's 24-hour operation is critical to the economic strength of our community. In fact, it's interesting during this entire process I have not heard anyone say otherwise. So when we look at that and we look at the benefits of the airport, clearly, the airport generates today $3.4 billion in economic impact to our community. We are currently responsible as the airport operation for over 17,000 jobs on the facility. And there is no one that would intentionally want I believe to jeopardize that. In fact, just this past year, I'll note that we added about $70 million in capital infrastructure all with the purpose of growing our community. And we entered into an agreement for a facility just about to be launched with the federal government to commit to another $70 million facility on the airport that will create another 1,680 jobs in overnight freight operation as we position our community with others, to be a global centre of trade and commerce. In fact, I should add that just the one facility we put on the airfield this year to accommodate this is estimated to be contributing $220,000 per year to the City's coffers in additional tax. That's the reason the ABPA was put in place in the first place. I would say we clearly all agree on the first question. The 24-hour nature of protecting the community's connectivity and its life line to the world is critical. The second question and sort of the what is whether collectively here in Winnipeg, do we see new development in Winnipeg and more to the point, do we see new residential development here in Winnipeg as something that is important? In fact, I would say on the second question, we also all agree. In fact, WAA supports new residential development including residential development in St. James. I should probably note that we have been a strong advocate for residential development and general development in St. James for our entire history, and we have been putting not just advocacy but real money into that particular process. What do I mean by that? Well, since 2014 we have been working with all of the land owners in the area of the airport to add a secondary plan amendment, and some infrastructure on the west side of the airport to ensure that we are able to do that. And that particular amendment would add about 4,000 homes in the vicinity of the airport. So we're clearly pro development in all of these ways. The good news on that I should add as an aside is that we are now very, very close. The better news is both the land and the developers are still here and we are anxious to be working inside a planning framework that benefits our community. So if we all agree on questions 1 and 2, the third question then is how. For us it's about finding the right balance for continued growth and to protect that connectivity. As we've heard, there already is a plan for airport vicinity work. As it relates to this particular request, I believe council is now facing a fork in the road. And I was reminded of this the other day, the great philosopher, Yogi Berra who said, "When you come to a fork in the road, take it." Well, folks, we're at a fork in the road. Let's be clear, there are two paths. Either path will end us up with a new AVPA. One is an accidental path. That was, we will continue to poke holes in the existing AVPA and we will end up in a place where there are spot amendments constantly coming to you for exactly the same thing. I questioned you on what principle will you say yes or no? I don't believe that by putting spot amendments forward, we are in any way contributing to the good planning of a city that we all want. It is imperative that we put good plans in place with everyone's input to understand what it is we truly want for our community. That's really kind of what I'm…my message...key message for this. We already know on the heels of this particular one there are now at least two others that will be coming to you immediately following this one. I refer, again, to the question of on what principle will you then be able to stand and say yes or no. I can tell you under path one, there will be opportunities for wealth creation. There will be opportunities under path two, and I will talk about that in a second. But I question whose wealth and at what greater cost for our greater community. So I wasn't going to, but I think I will add that I have already had questions from people committed in the past to the development of Winnipeg as what it has become, the major gateway for all air freight or aircraft in Canada. They are asking me already if their investment is safe. Business absolutely wants certainty. Good planning brings that certainty that allows all of us to take that forward. But back to the matter at hand, these types of amendments, as I said, will continue to come forward. Council will be left to decide with each application on its own merit or not. We firmly believe that increasing...it will become increasingly difficult for you to make those decisions in a spot amendment process. We have seen how this story unfolds in other cities. I can tell you it's not always pretty. I can tell you that Alberta, Calgary specifically just went through this and the provincial government in that case just finalized their AVPA in October this year. Where it ends up is citizens groups, apps as they have in Montreal for application…or for sending in noise complaints, lawsuits, flight restrictions, that's what insufficient planning looks like. It's always...it always results if conflict and usually lose-lose scenarios. I can tell you it doesn't have to be that way for Winnipeg. We can still have both the airport and our communities' connectivity protected and we can have residential development. But this only happens if we are deliberate and clear in our intentions. We can develop a new AVPA through proper planning process guided by those first two questions that I talked about and finding ways to build the community we truly want. Many years ago, the leadership then, both the City and the Province because what's before you relates to both City and provincial acts in this case, put in a place an AVPA that was designed to do that and it has been tremendously successful in that job creation. When I first came here there were less than 7,000 jobs on the airport, today there is 17,000. There was 385 million in economic impact, today there's 3.4 billion. And all of that pays taxes to the City. The

decision before Council is much more than just the spot amendment that's before you. It's really about how are we going to decide on future development for our city. One path is through spot amendments and seeing this discussion return time and again for Council's decision, the resulting friction, the noise that we are seeing in our community today. And if we've learned anything from other communities, eventually lawsuits and restrictions on airport operations. The other path is to work together to design a new AVPA that truly serves the interests of the entire community today and into the future. This should be a community plan bringing together the City, the airport, planners and I would say probably even the Province to work towards that common goal, development, directed around a sound plan and based in today's science. A review of this process would likely represent good planning.

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

Barry Rempel: A review of the process would result in good planning and would provide this council and future councils with an updated, relevant and forward-thinking guidance for all future decisions. I think we would all benefit from being on a path where we are working together toward that common goal and where everyone has that opportunity for input to help shape a plan. I really, really recommend that we look together towards finding that path forward together around a sound plan. Spot amendments will not serve us well into the future. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Rempel. We'll take questions in a few moments if you can just stay at the bench. I would like to now call forward the next speaker on this same item. That would be Ms. Dayna Spiring, President and Chief Executive Officer of Economic Development Winnipeg and she is also in opposition to the same item. We will have 5 minutes on the clock. Welcome.

Dayna Spiring: Thank you. Good morning, everybody. This morning I am happy to be here on behalf of Economic Development Winnipeg. I have my Bomber gear on because I am Chair of the Winnipeg Blue Bombers and excited they are going to Calgary in about an hour and a half. So I will not be long. At Economic Development Winnipeg, our job is to be the champion of Economic Development Winnipeg for the city and for the region. The 24-hour airport and our ability to have the third largest cargo hub in the country is a significant economic driver for our community that generates hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Any change to our development plans or the ability to build around that airport must be done with the consideration of not jeopardizing that 24-hour status. I don't have enough information right now and Economic Development Winnipeg does not have enough information right now to say that any building on the Polo Park lands will not compromise our 24-hour airport. We need to understand the consequences of developments. In many ways Economic Development Winnipeg is judged by the amount of new developments that comes to the City of Winnipeg. We want development. We are pro development. But we won't do that development at any cost and we will not do that development unless we understand the consequences. Since this issue has become more public, EDW has begun working with both the Winnipeg Airport Authority, the Province of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg to try to get enough information to understand where the boundaries should be, what development will not impede our 24-hour airport, and what that looks like. But frankly, we don't have that information yet. I think it's also important to note that the land owners who are anxiously waiting to build at Polo Park bought that land with the current restrictions in place. These restrictions are not new. They are not being hampered in any way other than they want changes to those restrictions which may be the right thing to do and that may be the best way to encourage additional development. But we have to do our homework before we go out and make changes to this plan in one off ways. With respect, I believe that sending this issue to the community committee is not appropriate because if Economic Development Winnipeg does not have the right data. I promise you that the community committee will not have the right data. And when that right data is available, my office will share that with the City of Winnipeg, with the Province of Manitoba, working collaboratively with the Winnipeg Airport Authority. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentation. We will now take questions. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. For the delegate from Economic Development Winnipeg, it's been made pretty clear that Economic Development Winnipeg, in our budget process, has been talked about as our economic development people we rely on. And my question really is I believe the Province of Manitoba who partially funds...or who funds some of the operations has given a letter outlining a mandate for development land usage of industrial/commercial land. Can you explain that a little bit for me as to…in relation to your recommendation for the City to hold off?

Madam Speaker: Okay, Ms. Spiring.

Dayna Spiring: Sorry, I have received a mandate letter from the Province to appoint Economic Development Winnipeg as their regional economic partner for their economic development growth strategy. I am not certain I understand what you are referring to in terms of infrastructure or development. I'm not following that. Sorry.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, do you wish to restate or I can come back later?

Councillor Eadie: Really, the question is what effect do you think the City giving over economic development land use up to the Province of Manitoba is basically what it is. Do you believe that that's helpful for the airport…airport vicinity area as well?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Dayna Spiring: From my perspective, the City of Winnipeg is not giving up economic development roles or land use to the province of Manitoba. I think Economic Development Winnipeg is the lead economic development agency for the City of Winnipeg. We work very collaboratively with the Province of Manitoba. We will continue to do that. We are one of the Province's key economic regional partners for their economic growth strategy. I believe that we need to move in a united way, in a collaborative way to understand what development makes the most sense. And we need to understand the consequences of our development. If we do development without understanding those consequences, we could be jeopardizing an asset that generates currently hundreds of millions of dollars a year. I have the benefit of being able to speak to companies who are looking to invest in our province and who are looking to invest in our city and the regions surrounding our city. Many of those companies are in the distribution business. Many of those companies are in agriculture and food processing. They need a 24-hour airport. They need certainty. And if we were to do or enable development that could jeopardize that, I think that's a mistake for the City of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I recognize neither of you are on the board of CentrePort but I also recognize you can both work very closely with CentrePort. Over the past ten plus years both the Province, the federal government and the City of Winnipeg have been investing hundreds of millions of dollars into developing CentrePort to be a global, multimodal distribution hub in the centre of Canada. Do either of you have any idea what that level of investment is from all three parties? A ballpark? I was following it for many years.

Dayna Spiring: I'm not sure I know the aggregate investment. So we know that the federal government has contributed substantially to CentrePort Canada Way. We know the Province has contributed land. Economic Development Winnipeg works with CentrePort on a number of opportunities. You know, the most recent one we've dubbed a team Manitoba success, Burcon is setting up a production facility for protein in the CentrePort area. So in terms of what the aggregate investment is, I'm not certain. We're watching every day as companies begin to develop facilities, develop buildings and roadways and we're seeing a lot of traction in that area right now. All of the areas around the airport from an economic development perspective are really seeing growth in percentages that we haven't seen before.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: This is more of a 'did you know'. Did you know that the majority of the population of Winnipeg in my opinion, doesn't understand what is being developed in that area, and they do not understand the significant value that the transportation, the air, the train and rail will bring to the city and I would recommend that going forward, you really try and get that message out. I sit on a committee related...it's a 'did you know', related to the...well there is a lot to know. That is related to the transportation system and the south perimeter highway. And the expansion of that is to support CentrePort.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, thank you. Point's been made thank you.

Councillor Lukes: Point's been made. Thank you.

Dayna Spiring: If I could just respond to that, there is a lot about this city and what drives our economy that Winnipeggers don't know. And part of our job at Economic Development Winnipeg is to do a better job of telling those stories. There are many stories in the transportation distribution sector especially, that drive our economy every day. We have more than 40,000 people that work in that sector and more than 6,600 jobs that are...sorry, more than 6,600 companies that are related to that sector in Winnipeg alone. So I look forward to being at the Economic Development Committee of Council and I believe I am on the docket early December. So I hope to continue that discussion and I take that on in terms of trying to give Winnipeggers a better understanding of the magnitude of the economic growth that comes from that sector.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. The first two questions are for Ms. Spiring. Thank you very much for your presentation. I'm just wondering, has EDW over the last couple of months, met with the three potential developers that

are talking about development there, to help facilitate a mutually beneficial agreement or tried to bring the parties together?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Ms. Spiring.

Dayna Spiring: Madam Speaker, sorry. We have not met with the developers. Each of those developers I believe are investors in Yes Winnipeg so our staff does have dealings with them. We have not met with them on this specific issue and partly, you know, that I think was my office not wanting to overstep in terms of how we bring the parties together. But that's something that we'll look at in the coming days. We have worked with the Airport Authority and we've spent some time working with the Province on the data that we need to be able to make this decision in an educated fashion and to make sure that we don't create unintended consequences.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair, and through you, thank you Ms. Spiring. I mean obviously, I would have liked to have known that we did get proactive in this. Having said that, what number of companies or how many companies that are located now at the airport that depend on 24-hour service are organizations that have moved here because of the work of EDW to go out and bring them here?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Rempel, Ms. Spiring?

Dayna Spiring: Yeah, I'm sorry, I don't have an exact number of that. I mean, we work with companies every day. So whether we help them expand, whether we help them move to Winnipeg, whether we help them expand their workforce here or increase their capital investment here. All of those come under the EDW umbrella and I would tell you that we're out selling the city and the Winnipeg advantages every day. So I don't have an exact number for you and wouldn't want to give a number that was inaccurate.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Rempel.

Barry Rempel: Councillor Klein, some of the activity that's happened around the airport dates now back even a little bit before Dayna's particular tenure over there. We currently have as a result of working with the Province, the City and Economic Development and its predecessors, the largest freighter...dedicated freighter airport in Canada and now the third largest freighter or freight aircraft...airport in the country. That was not in place prior to working together to accommodate this. The result is that we have, of the approximately 17,555 jobs that are on the airport today, about 20 percent of those are because of the overnight networks and having worked with the City, the Province and others.

Dayna Spiring: Could I just add one thing? The one thing that that doesn't take into account are the companies that we are meeting with now that are looking at developing in that space and that we are making bids to or pitching to, together with our team Manitoba partner. So I don't want to forget that as well.

Barry Rempel: Actually, that's a very good point.

Madam Speaker: Final question Councillor Nason.

Barry Rempel: Sorry, if I could just add to that, very good point. The numbers I gave you are specifically on airport numbers. Many, many companies whether it's the agricultural business, Boeing, Standard Aero, all of those that are not physically located on the airport rely heavily on our distribution network.

Madam Speaker: Final question, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Chair and through you, thank to you both Ms. Spiring and Mr. Rempel. For the record, I know both of them and I respect their work that they do in the community and appreciate what they have done. And I can't help but feel that given the business acumen you both have, is it possible to sit down with all of the parties and reach a mutually beneficial agreement on this and how long would that take?

Madam Speaker: Our question period is finished. Councillor Gillingham, you move extension. Five minutes. Councillor Gillingham moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And the question, Ms. Spiring?

Dayna Spiring: I think it's absolutely possible to sit down with all of the parties to have that discussion and frankly, EDW will make an effort to go and reach out to those parties. Whether we can find a mutually acceptable agreement, we'll do our best. But I think we have to have those discussions, but we also have to have the data. And we have to understand

what the barriers should be. What we need to have in place to ensure that our 24-hour airport is protected. So we will take on two challenges; one, we will go and...with your permission, we will go and meet with all the parties involved but two, we will work together with our partners at the airport and with the Province to make sure that we get the data that's required so that we could have this conversation in an educated way and truly understand the consequences.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins. No?

Councillor Rollins: Thank you Chair, I'll pull my question so that folks can head to the game.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. We do have a question from Councillor Nason and then Councillor Schreyer and Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Nason: I do look forward to Economic Development coming to Innovation and I am confused though because generally we don't have those that are part of the administration coming before to discuss stuff at Council. I hope this is a trend that may start for the future because I do believe that you receive money from the City of Winnipeg. And will be reporting to the Innovation and Economic Development Chair. So I'm curious if one or both of you have met with the Mayor or his staff on this matter prior to coming today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Rempel.

Barry Rempel: I can answer that on the part of WAA. And I will be clear, it wasn't because I didn't try to meet with a number of them including the Mayor. The first comment from the Mayor's mouth when I actually approached him was I am not allowed to talk to you about this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions, Councillor Nason? Second question.

Councillor Nason: I guess the question is for Economic Development Winnipeg, Madam Chair. Can you explain to us just briefly, you know, with regards to spending money within the City of Winnipeg on economic development, what benefit we get from that?

Councillor Gillingham: It does not pertain to the agenda item. The agenda item before us is regarding the airport vicinity plan.

Madam Speaker: Yes, whether there should be a public hearing or not. Do you wish to restate your question, Councillor Nason? Or we can move on? There's other speakers.

Councillor Nason: Sure, I'll give somebody else time to speak.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer and then finally to Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. A question for Dayna Spiring; at one point she said that the community committee is not the right place to go and if Economic Development Winnipeg doesn't have the information then the community committee wouldn't have it. And then she said when the information does come into her offices, that she would share that with the City of Winnipeg. When it comes to that information that you said the community committee wouldn't have, that information that we are awaiting, what kind of information are we dealing with specifically there and where would that information come from?

Dayna Spiring: Sorry, can you just repeat the last part of the question? What type of information are we?

Councillor Schreyer: Are we waiting for that you would share with the community committee and where would that information come from to share with the community committee or the City?

Dayna Spiring: I think what we're beginning to understand, all of the information that we need to ensure that we don't make a decision that has unintended consequences. So one of the things that we're doing is a sound study and one of the reasons why development is more restricted in certain areas of the airport is because there is a lot of noise that comes from planes and whether that is conducive to residential development is a question. You know, this plan was first put in place a decade ago and there have been a lot of changes in technology both in aerospace but also in building parts and various things. So it's possible that we don't need to have this same buffer area that we had when we put the plan in place. But we don't know that for a fact. We have to go do that homework. You know, it's possible that the technologies that have resulted in quieter planes and, you know, planes that come down faster and various things will expand that area. But again, we don't know that yet and so I am not comfortable as the President and CEO of Economic

Development Winnipeg to make decisions until we know that answer until we know we will not compromise our 24-hour airport.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. Through you, Madam Speaker to both our delegates, thank you for your presentations. I'm wondering, it's an 'are you aware' question that back in 2016 during my first term of council, I asked through public motion that the City of Winnipeg and the Airport Authority begin discussions...a process of review of the 1994 airport vicinity plan and bring forward informed, appropriate recommended amendments to establish where if possible multi-family development may be accommodated. Are you aware that three years ago I asked for this?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer, are you moving a two minute extension? All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Barry Rempel: Councillor Gillingham, actually, I was aware that you had brought that to my attention probably about 6 months ago, 8 months ago now. My understanding is that there was from Council's direction, some discussion...a question from administration went to one of my staff who appropriately, at that time, had said that we were not as an airport authority in a position to negotiate away legislation. That wasn't our role and it was left at that. I don't believe any discussion actually transpired out of that, certainly none that came through my office.

Madam Speaker: Okay. And that concludes our question...Councillor Gillingham, second question.

Councillor Gillingham: One follow-up then, to be clear then, I guess the follow-up question would be, are you now saying the Airport Authority is in a position to have those discussions they weren't in a position to have years ago?

Barry Rempel: What we're saying is that, as Dayna sort of referenced, is that with the AVPA that was put in place many years ago, there may, and in fact, I would say have been changes in technology in a number of areas, that are appropriate to look at. But it should be done in the context of a review of an AVPA as opposed to just spot amendments that are coming forward. We are entirely supportive of a full and fulsome review of the AVPA, the civic as well as the provincial legislation that impacts this.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, we thank you for your presentation today and go Bombers go.

Dayna Spiring: Go Bombers!

Madam Speaker: We do have a final delegation, Mr. Jakob Sanderson. Mr. Clerk, is he here today? Yes. Mr. Sanderson is the President of the University of Manitoba Students Union. He is in opposition to Item 2 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, the report dated November 4th, 2019 regarding Negotiation of the U-Pass Agreements with the University of Manitoba, the University of Winnipeg and Red River College. Welcome.

Jakob Sanderson: Thank you very much for giving me the privilege to speak here today. Dear members of council, as I said, it is my privilege to speak to you regarding the U-Pass fee proposal. I had the privilege of already speaking to the Public Works Committee on this matter where I expressed my opposition to the fee increase and submitting a proposal for a summer expansion alternative. And I want to begin today by expressing my gratitude to the members of the Public Works Committee for directing the public service to study our proposal and bring that in within 90 days for review. While this wasn't part a satisfying result for us, I still came today because I wanted to do a couple of things. I wanted to express my concern at the increase, but I also wanted to express my deep desire to preserve the past program more generally. And I wanted to talk a little bit about the alternatives that we propose and there is a briefing note on that that's being passed around as we speak. I do apologize that this is a little bit repetitive for some of the members I spoke to that are on the Public Works Committee. To start with, beginning to praise this U-Pass program and why it is so essential. Since the pass began in the fall 2016, 62 percent of students say that they are taking transit more often and there was a 25 percent increase on ridership on routes heading to the University of Manitoba. Just looking at the U of M with an eligibility base of 20,000 plus users throughout the fall and winter term, that's taking up to 5,000 vehicles off the road every day on commutes to the university. The U-Pass though, I think is essential it not be seen just as a subsidy for students but actually as a program that reduces traffic on major thoroughfares, frees up parking spaces and makes a major impact on the city and sustainability. The impact the U-Pass has made on this city and on our students has been unambiguously positive. As you consider the fee increase today, but also the retention of the U-Pass program more

broadly over the coming months, I ask you to think of the U-Pass in this way and to consider what could be put at risk with this fee increase or other alternatives. UMSU must take any fee increase above inflation to referendum with the student body. Increasing costs on our students by 24.50 per term with no additional benefits to U-Pass users is something this is, frankly, a tough sell. And it's a tough sell to students whose actions after endorsing the U-Pass program in a referendum four years ago have provided such a benefit to our city's sustainability efforts. Even Winnipeg Transit in their report has expressed concern that this recommendation could put the program at risk which is something that I believe strongly the City should not want to do. The City has prioritized investments in public transportation and this would reflect that you have been willing to make investment in transit a priority. Four hundred and sixty seven million was spent on the most recent southwest rapid transit expansion that flows primarily to the University of Manitoba on top of major investments in bus corridors, electric buses, park and ride facilities and upgrades to major stops and terminals. Because of this it's my belief that the continuation of the U-Pass program at U of M is paramount to ensuring that investment is worthwhile. Now I do want to note that while I oppose the fee increase I want to make clear that I'm very understanding of the difficult financial position that the City is currently in especially with regards to transit and the City's need to increase revenue for the program to make up for provincial cuts to 50/50 funding and the of the competing priorities currently with Transit such as the low-income bus pass and extending the U-Pass to Red River College. But again, I want to return to the idea of the U-Pass. It's been said before that the U-Pass program is a deeper subsidy than the low-income pass that would be proposed. Now, in some ways this is true but in other ways I would push back on that. For the U-Pass essentially has 3 categories of students. There are riders that are getting a subsidy, quite a deep subsidy. There are drivers that are paying for a program that they're never going to use. And then of course, there's the most interesting group which is the converters, those that drove before the U-Pass and those 5,000 students that are now busing when they used to drive because the U-Pass program exists. When you balance out all of the students that are getting that major subsidy, even higher than the low-income bus pass, with all of the students that are paying for a service that they are not using, the actual subsidy becomes a lot more affordable. I also wonder whether or not this move will be seen as worth it in hindsight to potentially put the program at risk at U of M, if the result of adding Red River College of 7,000 plus users ends up being…losing the U of M's 20,000 plus users. Again, telling students to pay $50 more a year for the same service they have been getting is a very difficult sell to students especially in an era where tuition is rising, health care has been removed for international students and of course, fees have become unregulated. If it fails, would that be the move that would fulfil the City's commitment to sustainability? Would that maximize its previous investments in transit in the southwest? And would that be fair to the students at the University of Manitoba and to the University of Winnipeg that pioneered this program and have built it into the success it is today with over 5,000 cars each weekday to the University of Manitoba being taken off the road? So the Council does have options today. You could attempt a more gradual, graduated fee increase for the current schools to ease students into those higher costs. And we have also presented you all with our proposal on a summer pass extension that we hope the Council will get a chance to review after being brought back from public service. Our proposal on the summer extension is fairly simple. It creates an opportunity for transit to expand revenue generation while also giving students an additional benefit in exchange for the increased cost. We are no longer asking students to pay more for no additional benefits. What we would like to see and is something we met with nearly all of you on over the last spring or tried to is to create a new 8 month term 2 U-Pass that would be based only on the winter eligibility. This increase in eligibility from roughly 6,000 students in other summer models that have been considered to 20,000 students basing it off winter eligibility will provide over $1.4 million in additional revenue to help offset some of the additional subsidization costs and RRC's addition to the program. Now, our proposal is based on a 50 percent increase and I do want to stress it to determine the rate that would maintain cost neutrality with the program or at least improve the financial situation from what would occur under the current U-Pass deal, we would need to consult with Transit on this as we don't know the exact numbers for the current post-secondary buyers they're getting in the summer that they would be losing off of this program. That being said, we believe strongly that a summer pass could be a more efficient investment financially than what the fall and winter passes are and could necessitate a lower rate and the reason for that is because of a limited based service demand. Again, I would return to that idea of the three classifications of riders. The U-Pass will always lose money in terms of revenue from students that were riding anyways that they are now subsidizing and they'll always gain revenue from students that continue to drive and are paying for a service that they are not using. The issue with the fall and winter is that the converters, which is really the students we're trying to reach with the program, you'll end up paying increased service cost to be able to subsidize…to be able add those students on to buses. However in the summer, as someone who buses every day to work I can attest to you that most buses simply are not full in the summer months in the way that they are in the fall and winter. We could be able to stomach a lot of those increased additional riders without as many increased service costs and of course, extending the program into the summer would continue to fulfil the obligation of the U-Pass on sustainability by taking those 5,000 vehicles off the road for yet another four months. Now I want to acknowledge the timeline concerns. But we pitched our summer extension to Transit at this time last year and we tried to pitch this to many councillors throughout the spring, and I hope some of you remember those meetings. If Transit had studied it when we'd first requested or if the report was done last June on time we could have been able to work this out by now hopefully in a way that was cost neutral for the City. Given that, and I understand it's a currently time sensitive issue, it may not be possible to fully explore this proposal prior to next February with the budget cycle upcoming and the fact that we would have to run a referendum next term. So we feel the City ought to extend the existing schools

contracts by one year on inflationary increase, which is an option that is outlined in the contract, giving us more time to work on this idea with the public service and hopefully to be able to find a cost neutral rate that extends a very useful program for the City of Winnipeg, does not require significantly more subsidization costs for the City of Winnipeg and provides additional benefits to students that would make them more likely to want keep it in a referendum. So I'll leave you with this; the U-Pass agreement states quite simply in its first clause that its aim is to reduce automobile traffic, reduce automobile emissions, ease parking pressure, increase transit ridership and improve mobility in the City of Winnipeg. There is no doubt that the U-Pass program thus far has accomplished this. And our proposal would only improve on each these measures outlined in the agreement. So I do present to you today not at all to complain about a fee increase, though I do want to acknowledge that it would be difficult for students to afford, but to paint a picture of what benefits the U-Pass program has already given the city and what we could be possibly putting at risk. I hope you choose not to vote for this increase or at least leave open the option of preserving our current contracts for one year with an inflationary increase that would give us further time to build support for the U-Pass on our campuses and work towards that cost neutral summer extension to satisfy all parties. If that does not happen today I cannot promise you that we'll be able to endorse the U-Pass program later this year after going through a referendum, but if our students are willing to pay that increased fee to keep up its commitment to such a vital program I truly, truly hope that the City will at least do the right thing to continue this program later on this spring. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Sanderson. We will now take questions. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think the U-Pass or post-secondary pass, I think Red River is part of that, Madam Speaker. I just had one question in terms of…I'm wondering, this program has been in place for some time and I was just wondering if the leadership of the universities have looked at...surveyed or looked into how much the U-Pass is being used outside of getting back and forth to university?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Sanderson.

Jakob Sanderson: Unfortunately, I probably wouldn't be the best person to ask that question. What I can say, as we've said, it's a 25 percent increase on ridership on routes to and from the University of Manitoba. We have been presented with a different heat map and of course, the routes that get closer to the universities are going to be the ones that are most utilized. I can speak anecdotally for sure that 62 percent of our students say that they are using transit more in general and that's not confined just to the University of Manitoba. And 59 percent of our students have identified that they are daily users of the program. So what I can say for sure, and even just anecdotally speaking to students and based on that data is that students certainly are using the U-Pass program to and from university, but also to work and throughout the city as they're embracing a more sustainable mode of transportation and this program has really been a success in being able to do that. As terms of the exact numbers of what the route increase is on routes not going to and from the campuses I can't speak directly to that. Winnipeg Transit has collected some data on this in terms of the heat maps that they've correlated and potentially they might be able to provide a more detailed answer than I would be able to.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes. Thank you for the presentation. I wonder if you could clarify, and forgive me if it's already been addressed in your presentation or in your documents. But so this concept of the students who pay for the service who do not use the service, do you have an idea in terms of how many that might be or is that information housed with our public service? Do you have that answer?

Jakob Sanderson: Right. Well, so I would say per our survey data at least, only 17 percent of respondents have said that they absolutely have not used the service. Fifty nine percent would identify as daily users and then that remaining 24 percent are students that sort of use the U-Pass program when they need to but not entirely. So it's not necessarily binary and I think that's actually one of the even larger benefits of the program is that you get students who would probably qualify themselves and be non-busser category and that would probably vote no on a referendum that would prefer they weren't paying for the U-Pass, but once they're paying for it, if you need to get somewhere and your car is in the shop, you know, you're probably going to take the bus and you're going to take advantage of that service. Or I think there's been many people that have tried to just pick up their U-Pass because, hey, you know what, I need it. I already have it and I'll see how it goes and they end up converting gradually towards using the bus. So we don't have the data for sure. It's based off of survey data because it's a little bit hard to track exactly who is not using it but that's per our survey data, it would be roughly in that 15-20 percent range that are never using it and then about 40 percent that would use it not on a daily rate.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further? Second question Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes. Are you aware that the proposed report is…actually goes over and above the status quo mill rate support because we have included new bus purchases, which has not been charged against this program?

Jakob Sanderson: Well my understanding of the report...and if I am wrong please be forgiving on that. My understanding is that a lot of the new bus purchases were related to the Red River College expansion. Is that not correct?

Councillor Allard: I don't know. In terms of rules of order I can ask questions.

Jakob Sanderson: Sorry.

Councillor Allard: You can answer.

Jakob Sanderson: Okay.

Councillor Allard: I know my colleagues will remind me if I (inaudible) statement. I know I did the same to my other colleagues. I'll leave it at that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. There are other speakers. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much for your presentation, it's always comprehensive. Could you explain to Council the process of the referendum and the time limitations of the referendum in relation to the continued service of the U-Pass?

Jakob Sanderson: Right, for sure. Well, it's become a little bit difficult. And as I said, this isn't necessarily the timeline that we would have preferred. But for us to be able to run a referendum it would be based on the 90 day timeline that Public Works granted the public service to be able to bring back our proposal for a review that would put us to the beginning of February, if that report is done on time. And of course, then that would go to Public Works. And if Public Works decided to mandate Winnipeg Transit to negotiate with us over that summer extension, that would then probably have to come here I would imagine, although I am not as much of an expert on the proceedings here as I'm sure you folks are. And then we'd have to go through a bit of a negotiation process. So the timeline would be quite tight. It's possible that we could do a pre-emptive referendum before we get to that point, but that wouldn't be our preference because if we went to referendum with our students on something that didn't end up actually being the exact contract before them, then we would potentially have to go back to them again. Based on our contract it expires May 31st and so what is in the contract is that if the City and UMSU would be willing to come to an agreement to extend the contract for one additional year by inflation they could do so at any time before May 31st. I believe there is a date in January where we would have to signal our intent to do that. We absolutely will intend to do that and we'll leave that option up to the City from there. But it is going to be a very difficult timeline to be able to have this referendum certainly. And I would say that also it's quite likely that we would end up having to have this referendum based on the timeline of the school year before the budget ends up being passed. And so moving forward, in potentially later conversations I would have with city council is that if we do have to have a referendum on an increased fee for the U-Pass and we're telling our students to hopefully try and continue this program and our students make that sacrifice to pay $50 more per year for the program without the additional service benefits they certainly would be very disappointed to end up seeing that program on the cutting room floor.

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

Councillor Lukes: Do you think that the students would see the added benefit of a price increase being the now almost...or come April, the fully functioning rapid transit corridor and the improved service. Do you think that they would not see that as a benefit? Or how do you think they perceive that? I mean, that's a $400 million plus investment. It is beneficial to the city. How do you think the students would see it in relation to the price increase?

Jakob Sanderson: For sure. I think that for every student it's very different and of course, depending on where students live, that rapid transit route may or may not apply to them. I think certainly that students would perceive that as a benefit but I would also say for the City that one of the reasons why we're making that type of investment is for routes going to the U of M. So it's a bit of a chicken and egg situation where yes, certainly, I think that students would appreciate that benefit and we have been for certain extolling the virtues of the rapid expansion and the service that that can provide to students, but I would also say that it would be a very disappointing and somewhat backwards move for the City if we ended up spending, as you said, over 400 million and is recited in my report, over a quarter of a million on a rapid transit expansion and then ended up in a situation where the U-Pass program goes away and we now have empty buses running through a beautiful $400 million corridor. I don't think that would be anyone's idea of a perfect situation either.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you very much. Thank you for your presentation. Just pointing out the one section here where it talks about the public service recommendation to increase this program to Red River College students. And I recognize that you are here representing the University of Manitoba but again, as it's rolled out to Red River Community College, they have the opportunity to participate in this, again, change their behaviour in terms of driving vehicles, less cars on the road and that shift in modal transportation to buses. Don't you see that as an opportunity for sustainability in terms of climate change?

Jakob Sanderson: Well absolutely. And I hope that none of my comments have been misconstrued in this way. I think the U-Pass is an excellent program and I think that I've tried to get that point across today. And I have been a fan of the U-Pass program from when I voted for it as a first year student over four years ago. So seeing that program expanded to Red River College is something that I am certainly happy to see. The issue is, is that if…with the program designed in such a way where it's a net subsidy, then when it's being brought to Red River College that that's causing now price increases for the U of M and U of W and that that could potentially result in the referendums failing at U of M and then having 20,000 students pulled off the program for 7,000 students to be added, I think that it's something to consider. So I don't have any objection to being added to Red River College, I think that would be a benefit to sustainability for sure, but I do worry about the potential ramifications that that could have on the students that have been using this program for the last four years and have pioneered this program.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer moves extension of 2 minutes. Councillor Chambers, your second question.

Councillor Chambers: Has the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg…

Madam Speaker: And I didn't call the vote. Mr. Mayor, thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Chambers: Has the University of Winnipeg, the University of Manitoba had consultation with the student union at Red River College as well to collaborate on this?

Jakob Sanderson: Yeah, we discussed with Red River College back last year before this program was being expanded. At that point it was never indicated to us in our negotiation period that there would be an increase in fees beyond inflation. And so we were very happy to see Red River College come aboard the program. And I remain very open and happy to see Red River College come aboard the program. Since that time I think we spoke to Red River College and they have been happy that they are getting the U-Pass and I certainly don't blame them for that in any way. And frankly, I would again reiterate that U of M…I am quite happy that we have a U-Pass at our program. And if this fee increase does go through at that point it's up to the students as to what they want to do. But I can tell you that I would vote yes because I like to see the U-Pass program continue. What I'm trying to get across today is just the potential ramifications that decision could have. And so I am very, very understanding of the difficult financial situation that the City is facing and I appreciate the desire to expand the program to Red River College. I just wonder if by doing that we're putting other things at risk and expanding the program in terms of the scope for Red River College, but keeping a firm cap on the amount of money we're willing to spend to subsidize that program and then not looking at other potential revenue options such as a summer extension model I think is creating a bit of a difficult situation. So I would hope that if we are open to extending that scope of the program to Red River College and if the City feels it's necessary based on its financial situation to have to raise additional revenue that we look at other ways to raise that revenue that includes expanding the benefits of the program as well.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Move extension Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? There are two. So all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: There's other speakers so I get a chance to speak. Thank you Madam Speaker. Mr. Sanderson, I voted against the bus rapid transit corridor or the bus corridor in the last term. I am the only member of council today that did vote against the bus corridor. I did so in the name of sustainability of our city, of sort of taking a longer series, deep approach to budgeting. I wanted to have more buses to save time for students so they would wait less time at a fraction of the cost of building the bus corridors which cost us $30 million a year at this time because of construction inflation. Police officer salaries and pensions are not the highest rate of inflation at city hall, contrary to what's been implied, it's actually construction inflation. And I just want to ask if it's understood that to save that five minutes from U of M to downtown and vice versa at rush time…rush hour only, for that extra $30 million a year, it has to get paid...I voted for the U-Pass, but these things are coming up now in terms of budgetary constraints. Is there some sort of

understanding that to pay for that bus corridor, there's going to be some sort of…had to give somewhere? There was going to give on bus fares.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Sanderson.

Jakob Sanderson: Well for sure. As I've said, I am understanding of the difficult financial constraints that the City is under. And I think, as probably many members would agree, I think that the cuts to 50/50 funding from the Province is probably one of the key issues that we're facing with difficulties in transit funding and it's something that we were disappointed to see. In terms specifically of the bus corridor, I understand that with transit there is a lot of competing priorities. We talked about the low-income bus pass that is a very admirable...

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer moves extension, two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Jakob Sanderson: But the low-income bus pass was trying to extend this program to Red River College with the bus corridor with trying to improve front line service times and I understand there is not enough money to pay for everything, I do. In terms of with the bus corridor certainly I would agree with you that any opportunity to improve front line service is fantastic for students and that they would see that as a benefit, but in terms of the corridor the decision has been made at this point and a lot of the rapid transit infrastructure investments that have gone forward are at least, from the way that I see them, and the way that they are being built are quite clearly centred around that southwest area and around routes that primarily go to and around the University of Manitoba. And so what I am saying at this point is let's not look at this as an opportunity to risk that…risk not using that investment in the best possible way but how can we maximize that investment by extending the scope of an already successful program that you mentioned you did vote for and extend that into 12 months. And what we would like to have is the opportunity to engage in a good faith dialogue with the public service and Winnipeg Transit over how we can do that in a cost neutral manner that makes sense for the City, that maximizes investments in transit infrastructure and that also gives students with the type of benefit cost balance that they're going to want to vote for and continue a program that enhances the university…the City's sustainability efforts.

Madam Speaker: Final question Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Mr. Sanderson you mentioned your wish…Mr. Sanderson wishes that we extend by one year the status quo, but it's based on and an inflationary increase. Does he know whether the inflationary increase is based on the standard consumer price index or like given sort of the nature of inflation when it comes to transit, is there a special inflation index that we are dealing with? Is it construction inflation, which is two to three times higher than standard inflation? Does it come into play in this contract or this agreement?

Madam Speaker: If you can quickly answer the question. I don't see any extensions.

Jakob Sanderson: I don't believe that it would go different than any standardized measure of inflation. But if I'm wrong on that on the contract, then I stand to be corrected.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes our questions for this delegation. We thank you for your presentation today. We will now move on to reports, finally. We have the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 5th, 2019. Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 5, 2019**

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thanks to all those that have been waiting for us to get to this portion of the agenda. I introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 5, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay, 1 through 5. I will call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 12, 2019**

Next is the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 12th, 2019. We do have amending Motions 1 and 2 which are on your desks and they go with Item 3, the police pension item. So we will stand down Item 3.

Councillor Orlikow: Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Orlikow: Cast down on this one. I have heard a lot today. I would prefer if we could take the lunch break now so I can take some of the information I heard this morning regarding one item today. But...so I request that we go for lunch now before we start debate.

Madam Speaker: Lunch is at 12:00 normally, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: I think out of respect for those that have joined us here today that we don't extend their time to wait here, that we just do our job and continue on and with this and break after the...an item that is most concerning to all of us.

Madam Speaker: Are you moving a motion to suspend the rule to work through…until we continue and finish Item 3?

Councillor Klein: Happy to do that ma'am. Yep.

Madam Speaker: Pardon me? Well that is our procedure currently that we break at lunch. So that's what we normally do at 12:00 till about 1:30, but there is a motion to suspend that rule and that we would require...I will get to you in a moment. We will require two-thirds, so 11 votes to continue going forward with our meeting until the police pension item is dealt with. We do have a full gallery. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, there are some people around council who need to eat, but Madam Speaker, there was a motion from Councillor Orlikow first that should be dealt with. Councillor Klein has stood and moved a motion after Mr. Orlikow, so I believe…

Madam Speaker: The councillor understands that, thank you. And I have been getting many e-mails from all of you and texts over the last 15 minutes about the same item. Councillor Orlikow, it's a majority vote, as you know.

Councillor Orlikow: Now knowing that the twelve o'clock button is here, I will stand down my motion.

Madam Speaker: Well that was my understanding earlier. Thank you. So the motion is that we continue with our meeting just out of respect for individuals that are in the gallery to hear Item 3. Is that correct, Councillor Orlikow? I'm not overstepping your request?

Councillor Orlikow: My understanding is Councillor Klein had a motion to waive the rules so we sit past 12.

Madam Speaker: Yes, and you're…

Councillor Orlikow: And I am standing down mine.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: I'm just wondering, in all seriousness Madam Speaker, if there are those that do need to eat for medical reasons that's legitimate, is there anything that we...I don't know everyone's medical situation. I understand some councillors do need to for various reasons…health reasons, to eat.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gillingham. And we have moved past 12:00 prior in this chamber. So I will call the vote. Let's call for a recorded vote. So all in favour with continuing with the meeting for a period of time? It's to continue...Mr. Clerk, would you clarify what the vote is?

City Clerk: Thank you Madam Speaker. The motion was to continue the meeting past twelve o'clock until the police pension item, Item 3 of report of the EPC dated November the 12th is complete.

Madam Speaker: So all in favour of continuing as per the Clerk's instructions, please rise. In order to continue 11 votes are required, two-thirds, otherwise we will break at 12:00 and come back at 1:30. So all in favour of continuing please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Gillingham, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Gilroy, Santos and Schreyer

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 8.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I would like to ask that we recess at this time. Yes?

Councillor Browaty: Madam Speaker, I would like to move a motion before you do that to request that we shorten our lunch hour. We may have a long day here. I'd like to move that we shorten the lunch hour and we resume at one o'clock.

Madam Speaker: And I do want to remind everyone there is no food service on campus right now as we did have previously. So I just want everyone to know that before we agree on that. So we need a motion for that.

Councillor Browaty: So moved. As I moved.

Madam Speaker: Do we have the concurrence of council to shorten the lunch break to one hour? Okay, thank you. We will see you back in the chamber.

Councillor Allard: Wait, isn't that two-thirds vote?

Mayor Bowman: I thought we were still going on till noon?

Councillor Allard: We can change?

Mayor Bowman: I have a question also about the motions. You referenced that there were four motions. I have not been provided a copy with nor do I understand everybody's been copied with a second motion. So if one was provided for the…

Madam Speaker: Everything has been circulated as I understand it, Mr. Clerk, is that correct? Everything has been circulated and it was this morning. Okay, we will recess now and reconvene at one o'clock. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
November 21, 2019, at 1:10 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene the Council meeting of November 21st, 2019. We are on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 12th, 2019. Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 12, 2019**

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Welcome back, everyone. I introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 7 and I know 3 is pulled.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Call the question on 1 and 2, 4 through 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 3 – Revisions to the Winnipeg Police Pension By-law No. 126/2011

Madam Speaker: We will have Mayor Bowman introduce the main item followed by Councillor Chambers introducing amending Motion 1. Following that, Councillor Klein to introduce amending Motion 2. Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I want to begin just by thanking all those that have come down to city hall today to watch democratic proceedings of Winnipeg City Hall including all of the delegates that we heard from, both those in favour and those that are opposed to the changes that are being contemplated here today, Madam Speaker. I also want to thank my council colleagues. You know, when I first ran and I know the motivation for each member of this chamber, you know, the motivation was to make a positive difference in our community and to affect the kinds of changes that help us build a more sustainable and healthier community. The changes to the police pension as articulated in the administrative report, Madam Speaker, are ones that will help us build a more sustainable model for not only the pension but also for other City services. I have certainly campaigned in the most recent election campaign for these kinds of changes for reinvestments of funds which are now locked into pension benefits to be better utilized under the direction of the Winnipeg Police Service for operations. And thanks to the amendment that is being proposed by Councillor Chambers and Councillor Browaty, there is roughly $20 million being reinvested with the support of Council today that would be reinvested in matters that could be used for operations including those that could be potentially used under the direction of the Winnipeg Police Service for front line officer positions. We have heard from our Chief of Police recently that given the financial constraints and targets that have been set to bring our budgets into balance, that there are a number of front line police officer positions and cadets positions that are contemplated to be removed as FTEs. This does provide a funding source at no additional incremental cost to taxpayers. There are also other City services that this council has the obligation of protecting, and Madam Speaker with some of the savings that could be had by the reforms contemplated this afternoon, those funds could be directed to other City services that help us deal with the root causes of crime, that help us deal with the needs of our entire community, not just one group. I do want to say that we certainly hear from those that are in favour and that are opposed to these changes. Their input is valued and appreciated this afternoon. While I clearly don't agree with the reasons for opposing that were articulated today, I respect the two unions ability and rights to make their case here on the floor of this chamber and to exercise their rights as they deem appropriate. And that's something that is a value, I know, all of us on this floor respect and continue to protect. I often ask myself, what would it be like if the provincial legislature or in parliament if you could attend on the floor of the house, both the legislative house and the parliamentary house on controversial issues and be heard, to be livestreamed and to allow your voice to be heard. And even when...in fact, especially when we may disagree on policy issues, coming here, making your case, being given the time and a lot of extensions of time to allow your voice to be heard is something that we should continue to promote and respect. We certainly have a difficult decision to make. I will be obviously supporting the main motion. I will be supporting Motion No. 1 and I thank Councillor Chambers, a member of the Police Board and Deputy Mayor for bringing forward the proposed amendments and Councillor Jeff Browaty for his support, specifically, to extend the implementation date and move it from January 1st to April 1st so that the members and their families have additional time, once Council makes the decision, if the decision is in fact to proceed with changes as contemplated this afternoon to work collaboratively with the City and their union to understand the implications of the changes. We have certainly been doing a lot here in this chamber for the last number of years as previous councils have as well to build a safer community. We all need to be working together in order to effect that kind of change that we know build healthier people and healthier communities, making sure the resources are there throughout our community as well as for the police service is one of the reasons why one of the largest increases to the police budget is contemplated in the targets that we set out, and we will be dealing with in a separate matter when

we deal with the budget. But we're going to continue to provide the support to the Winnipeg Police Service. I have heard for many years that the demands and the calls for service are significant, that's one of the reasons why the Bloomberg Harvard initiative is proceeding with the specific intention of trying to reduce the demand on calls for service to the Winnipeg Police Service. I want to thank Moe Sabourin for participating in that exercise recently as well as the Chair of the Police Board, Councillor Kevin Klein who was in attendance. That's the kind of collaboration that we need to see, in order to…in order to really be more effective with multiple stakeholders across multiple jurisdictions. We continue to implement the downtown safety strategy. We implement…we are in the process of implementing the illicit drug strategy recommendations and we continue to advocate for other levels of government to do more. But we know that these dollars could be better spent on front line police services as well as, of course, in other areas of our City budget, which are under great pressures as well. I will not be supporting the second motion primarily because we have in fact been in dialogue with the police union for a number of years, and their position is clear. They oppose this. And they have articulated that today. We should not be surprised by this and we should respect the fact that they have made this position very clear in dialogue, certainly over the last three years and then again here today. I respect their position. I disagree. For that reason, I will not be supporting the Motion No. 2, would ask my council colleagues to consider voting for the amendment, Motion 1, and the overall motion which brings about change that has been demanded by Winnipeggers for many, many years. It certainly is an opportunity for us to demonstrate the kind of leadership that I know we all ran on, and we all promised that we would provide to the residents that we all collectively serve, Madam Speaker, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Our next speaker is Councillor Chambers. Your opportunity to speak to the main item and amending Motion 1.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Chambers,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Bowman,

WHEREAS police and public safety are top priorities for Council and the residents of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS Council has approved significant investments in these key areas including a record level of funding for the Winnipeg Police Service in 2019, funding for a downtown safety strategy as well as a Community Safety and Crime Prevention Fund;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg continues to implement the recommendations of the Illicit Drug Task Force that are within the City's jurisdiction;

AND WHEREAS in recognition of the critical role that the Winnipeg Police Service has in keeping our residents safe, Executive Policy Committee (EPC) recommended a 2% annual increase to the Winnipeg Police Service Operating Budget (exclusive of capital related expenses) within the multi-year balanced budget (the "Target"), which is equal to the highest increase provided to any City department;

AND WHEREAS the Winnipeg Police Service has proposed in its Budget presentation that in order to meet the Target it will be required to reduce its staff complement by 34 sworn officers and 25 cadets over the next 4 years;

AND WHEREAS the total cost savings associated with eliminating 34 sworn officers and 25 cadets is estimated by the Winnipeg Police Service to be $14.74M from 2020-2023;

AND WHEREAS a report before Council today titled Revisions to the Winnipeg Police Service Pension Plan By-law No. 126/2011 identifies a series of reforms to the police pension plan, which if approved by Council will result in total estimated savings of $32.9M from 2020-2023 net of $1.5 M annually relating to police overtime to be reinvested in Winnipeg Police Service operational budget;

AND WHEREAS a portion of these pension savings can be reinvested back into the Winnipeg Police Service operating budget to assist with the transition to a more sustainable budget for the Winnipeg Police Service, and with the final allocation to be determined by the Winnipeg Police Service, could be utilized to fully fund the cost related to the aforementioned 34 sworn officers and 25 cadets which would enable the Winnipeg Police Service to meet the Target without having to eliminate sworn officer or cadet positions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 3 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 21, 2019 be amended to add the following new recommendations:

"2. That savings of $14.74M from the police pension plan reforms detailed in the report Revisions to the Winnipeg Police Service Pension Plan By-law No. 126/2011 from 2020-2023 be utilized as a funding source for the Winnipeg Police Service operating budget to meet the Winnipeg Police Service Target."

3 That the police pension plan reforms be implemented effective April 1, 2020 and that the draft amending By-law No. 86/2019 be revised to reflect this effective date.

and the remaining recommendation be renumbered accordingly.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair. Today I am speaking, I rise to speak with respect to the matter of police pensions and the motion that I have worked on with Councillor Browaty. Again, listening to Chief Smyth speak at the Police Board budget meeting that we held last week, his comments were that with the two percent increase that was target, expenditure target that he was given would potentially result in the loss of 24 sworn officers...sorry, 34 sworn officers and 25 cadets. To me that became the immediate concern certainly given the current situation that we find ourselves in. Winnipeg is experiencing unprecedented rise in property and violent crimes and has matched the highest number of recorded homicides with just over a month to go in the year. So this was particularly concerning to me and you know we had to look at resources available that would allow the full staffing complement over the next four years to address the concerns that we are currently seeing. We also need a revenue source that allows us to be sustainable with our police service going over the next four years as we're going into this multi-year budget cycle. So that's where we sat down or I sat down and discussed with Councillor Gillingham with assistance from the Mayor's Office to look at the savings that the police pension would provide so that it could be redirected to front line services and allow the staffing complements to be secured during that four year period, which is why I drafted this motion. And again, with the aid of Councillor Browaty in the 11th hour, was able to put together the last piece of this motion which speaks to the implementation date. And giving senior officers the opportunity to consult with their families, to consult with actuaries, to consult with their pension board to determine exactly is this the time to be retiring. If it's not, what will be the impact of the incremental changes that are being brought on as a result of this pension reform. So again, thank you to Councillor Browaty. When I ran, I ran on a premise that I was going to try to work collaboratively with all members of council and bring forth change that is sustainable for the City of Winnipeg not just now but going into the future. I thank all of the members of the Police Service that are here today for your valued service. I have had the opportunity to go out and do a ride along with you and I see...I see the dignity that you provide to the citizens of Winnipeg as you are performing your duties and I applaud you. I applaud you. So thank you for your valued service, but understand that we are here as elected officials to do a job as well and we have to look at the sustainability of our city and look at how we are providing services to the many people who are on fixed incomes, who are pensioners, who are saying that we want a age in place and with unsustainable labour costs, we won't have the opportunity to do that. So thank you here today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. I would like to remind our speakers to bring their comments through the Chair and do not direct them to the public in the gallery, please. Councillor Klein to introduce amending Motion No. 2, please.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Klein,
Seconded by Councillor Mayes,

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That Item 3 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 21, 2019 be laid over for a period of 90 days.

2. That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to meet with the appropriate representatives of the Winnipeg Police Association and the Winnipeg Police Seniors Officers' Association with a clear objective of finding alternatives to reaching mutually beneficial terms that will increase pension contributions by members and discontinue pensionable overtime, including but not limited to the following examples:

A. The cancelation of the benefit of pensionable overtime for members with 7 years or less service;

B. Increasing the members pension contributions by 2% every year until they are equal with comparable CBA's within the City;

C. Having the City pass a by-law that ensures we are not permitted to remove funds from the pension and direct to general revenues,

and report back to Council with an agreement within 90 days.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think this is one of those items where politics has to be pushed aside. There are requirements. There are obligations. There are legal issues that are facing us right now with this move. The new motion brought forward, the first time I heard about it was on the news about the money. It's a bait and switch as far as I'm concerned. We have a 2 percent increase imposed on the service. I don't know if that means that now we're going to change that. Now we're going to add $24 million, but what I do know is we don't have that money right now. What happens if we all vote for that and we lose in court? And we have to go back to what we promised to do. What happens now? Now we have a whole whack of money that we promised the Police Department to hire more officers, but we don't have it any more. What happens if the women and men that have worked for us, I'll note we took a lunch break, I'll guarantee you everybody in this room who works for the service has had numbered…numerous times where they haven't been allowed to take a lunch break and if they had, it would have been anarchy. I think we need to think about the facts here. We are listening to an administration, some are, some people were privy to a lawyer's opinion that was done for the City as I understand, all those people had to sign an NDA. Not all Councillors were privy to it. And we have had promises made to us before about collaboration. We're going to work together as a council decision. I would like proof. I would like proof. This is about integrity. This is about adhering to our promises and those made by elected officials before us. Have we really tried to negotiate? I see no evidence of it. I have not been given copies of any letters saying that we've sat down and asked them to meet. I hear from residents they are worried about the growing crime rate. They are worried about the financial health of the city, with all the shock and awe that's going on right now. They are worried about the disregard for business in a sense because we are facing so many court challenges. Here is another one. Last look I took we were over a hundred million dollars at risk should we lose court cases. These are court cases that even have breach of contracts. This is setting a precedent. This is saying who we are. We have court cases that have effed us and the brand of our city and we're at risk. We are not above the law. We are here to represent the residents. We are the guardians of this city. We are the guardians of taxpayers. And I believe we have an obligation to sit down and provide a more practical and disciplined approach, that we have an opportunity to address this and use this as the foundation of moving forward to address other crises facing our city. This is not how leaders act. Leaders involve, they want negotiations. They talk to them. That's our job as leaders is to bring out the greatness of our city and to encourage people, not to divide and conquer. Leaders must act with strength, courage, boldness and collaborate with integrity. Words mean little after one year. Actions, actions are what counts. So let's talk about the facts. I asked the Mayor with two councillors with me if I could sit down and talk about the issue of pensions with the association myself. I wouldn't get involved publicly, just here is what I think we can do, give me the opportunity to talk to them. I had a little experience in that world. Give me a chance. No. I looked at the decision and the by-law itself that said that they negotiated this agreement. I believe the courts are going to come back and say, having been involved in these things, that you have to prove that you tried to negotiate. I don't think one letter is going to prove that to a court that we actually tried to negotiate. There is no evidence proving we have. We're listening to the same people that got us into this problem in the first place. We did this because we took money. Let's admit it. Let's accept it. Now let's fix it. Not one of us around here think the pension can go on the way it is. I agree. I said that to the association. Let's work together. Let's collaborate. Let's collaborate with integrity. Imagine what would happen if a service said no, I'm not going to work overtime. But that never would. Even if we did what we want to do today, it wouldn't happen because every one of them wear a badge with honour and they have integrity. We need to show that. It's typical for benefits to be part of a negotiation. It's typical for benefits to be described and explained and dealt with at a CBA table. Why now? Two years ago, why not then? We talked about it for I don't know how many years. Why not then? Afraid? We needed to be able to say we have a great contract? This is nothing more than really a motion that's going forward that makes no sense. If we are that bad financially, we need to be having a different conversation. The money's not going to go right to the police. The money's not going to be there until we know we actually legally have it. And I'm going to ask...I implore council, it's 90 days. We get reports that we put off from 2017 that still haven't come in. This is 90 days. I think a more practical approach...a disciplined approach that has the same financial benefits in the end is what leaders do. I think we have to respect the people that have dedicated years of service to this community. Ninety days is not a long period of time but these negotiations must be entered with a clear objective of reaching a mutually beneficial term or terms with both organizations that will deal with this issue. We have heard that they want to. Now is the chance. We have 90 days. Are we going to say no to that? I don't think we can say no to that. Look, every one of you get phone calls or e-mails from residents. They are afraid. They don't want to go to liquor stores. The men and women do their job. They arrest them. They are out in a week. Let's help them right now. Let's go back to a table like leaders, and have the discussion. We owe that to them. We owe it to them because they stay on the scene however long it takes. They show up when they are supposed to show up. Residents are afraid and they want to feel safe. They don't want to play this game. The uncertainty in this city is having a negative impact on our residents and more importantly, think about it, on our brand. It's making national news. You think people are sitting there watching TV and watching that on the news and saying, hey, I want to move to Winnipeg. Please. Please. You say no to everything else. But please say yes to this. Yes to 90 more days.

Madam Speaker: Again, the second reminder for today, no presentations from the gallery, please. That is our process here. Councillor Klein, that was your opportunity to speak to the main item and speak to your motion. Councillor Eadie, there is a speaker before you. I did have Councillor Santos on the list and we will certainly come to you after. Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: Firstly, I want to thank Councillor Chambers for his efforts and advocacy. This amending motion before us is very noble and I believe it comes with good intentions. However, I find myself questioning the motives of this amending motion. Maybe to others it's not as bad as it sounds. But at this time, I find this to be a very bad policy to deal with the police operating budget shortfall. The question we could be asking ourselves is, what are the goals of putting the savings into the police operating budget? The past week and a half have been grueling with budget meetings and we still have another two weeks to listen and debate. We just recently heard from the Community Services Department talk about reducing their operating budget by decommissioning wading pools, closing down libraries and not being able to support any of their new capital projects. We also heard from Transit Department about their service reductions. The list goes on. What are we doing right now to fund those costs, related to those operating budget losses? How dare we put the cart before the horse? How dare we discuss the budget funding allocation now before we even had a chance to listen to what Winnipeggers want? I am literally struggling internally with this very decision we have before us today because it goes against the very essence in what I believe in. Our investment must go into our children and our communities. I can't stress that enough. If we invest in our community infrastructure I believe we will be saving taxpayers' money in the future. Winnipeg is sick right now. We have meth and other illicit drugs affecting our families. We have teenagers robbing the LCs and local businesses. We have now reached our 41st homicide. We have babies being stabbed and young adults being shot. These are all symptoms of a very sick city. And it's our job to figure out how to cure the symptoms. We need to stop being reactive to the symptoms. We need to be proactive. Get our kids off the streets. Get these kids into school and eating healthy. Support our growing multicultural families by offering them a safe community space. These kids need to get into an afterschool program where they can feel safe, secure and surrounded by a community that loves them. When we shift all the onus on to our police and only the police enforcement, we are reinforcing the mistake that we have been making for a long time and we have got to stop that. This is an actual quote from Michael Redhead Champagne's speech earlier this week when he came to our Community, Protection and Services Parks Committee. Someone we all know too well, and who understands what happens on our streets. You know, what's very interesting is my office is getting e-mails from people asking me, support our community centres and facilities. Support our transit. Save our tree canopy. Not one e-mail from a resident who objected to the pension plan reform. I am listening to them. So I want to make it crystal clear. I support the revisions to the Winnipeg Police Pension Plan By-law because I believe it's fair to my taxpayers to have equal sharing costs. I worked my whole life in a legal profession where my pension has been 50/50 between the employer and the employee. Even our own firefighters and paramedics, might I remind everybody here, they also serve and protect us and put their lives on the line and sacrifice their families being out there, and they, too, have equal sharing costs into the civic pension plan. So to me, it makes sense to support the by-law amendment. But it makes me just sick to my stomach that we are debating this issue on where our city's savings should be allocated. Having to choose between investing in our communities and our children's lives to get them off the street versus a retirement of one police officer, in my heart I choose my children. But in my mind I am struggling with this decision right now. I will respectfully be continuing to listen to my colleagues as my decision is literally the last minute. So maybe instead of asking the question of what are the goals of putting the savings into the police operating budget, we should be asking ourselves, what are the goals of putting investments into both our police and community operating budget. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd just like to start off by leading with...it's clear to me, to you up there and to anybody who is watching today at council, it is clear to me that this city, under the new management that got elected in 2014, the fall is operating according to Chamber of Commerce procedures. It's very clear to me, Madam Speaker. What is happening with this city right now and it's been happening now for some time is that really, we have said we don't agree with collective bargaining processes. There's been violations all along that I have been following with other unions, not just with the Winnipeg Police Association and the seniors police...I can't remember the exact name of it, but other ones. This whole way that the direction we're being taken by the leader of this council is wrong. Nobody is going to trust us. How do we go into another collective bargaining…I hear we got to go in with the middle management union association. How are we going to go in there and collectively bargain with them when they're not going to trust a darn thing we say? Not a thing. What is going to happen? It is just inappropriate the way we are doing this. This is about the public. It's about our workers but there is a whole bunch of stakeholders, Madam Speaker, in this city regarding the police service, but all of our services. They're all needed for the quality of life that we want to experience in Winnipeg. And, you know, to pit and start talking about the idea of savings by unilaterally changing a by-law and changing the savings, the retirement savings of these officers up here, all around here, all the ones out on the street today working hard, trying to protect us, can't even do proactive policing because of the way we have been managing our budgets and all these things. And so what do we do? We pit each other...we pit different departments

against each other. We pit areas of the city against each other. Now Council is fighting...fighting...I'm saying fighting and there is no constructive fighting that's going on. Ask any officer who is out there trying to stop things and there's fights and all kinds of crap going on that threaten people in this city. It is not an appropriate way to deal with what should be a collective bargaining process. It has been pointed out by a retired officer who pointed out in negotiations that negotiating pension and changing things is a collective bargaining item and there is a solid case. We are discussing undertaking something in bad faith here today, people. All of my council colleagues. This is bad faith. It is bad faith to do it the way the Chamber of Commerce and our leader of this city wants us to do it. It is wrong. You don't go out into the public and debate and talk about wrecking a collective bargaining agreement that supposedly was supported. I can't support this. And there is so much more I would like to say but I know it's going to be a long debate. But I want to just...I won't be voting for amendment 1 at all because my problem with that is if you go to April 1st, the so-called savings, that's not savings. Those aren't savings. Why are you using the word savings? Is that for the public's good, Madam Speaker, is that what that is? Is that to make the public think that somehow that's savings? What we're doing is we're stealing the savings of all these officers. That's what we're doing. Their future, we're stealing their family's future. They have kids, too. They see what's happening out on the streets. I get it. We have to have a police service that has a good morale because it isn't an easy job. When their employers are attacking them and they are out on the street trying to protect us and that's stuff they have to deal with every day. I hate to tell you this people but many of our neighbourhoods in this city are dying. People are dying, yeah, but whole neighbourhoods are collapsing because of the way the leader of this city has decided to undertake business. And it's not business, this is public service. Anyway, the numbers in that motion are wrong if you want to say April 1st, it's not savings. So where is their 14 million? There isn't even 14 million. The Police Association's going to win in court. Like really, it's bad faith. I just...and they know that we...in the interests of everybody, of all our departments, in the interests of the people of this city, the taxpayers, they know that we have to be more sustainable but you know what, they don't even have enough officers to get done what they need to get done now. Like really. And to say, steal some of their pension away from them, so that we can keep some officers, well, that's just pitting one officer against another, Madam Speaker. It's awful. What kind of business is that? On the motion for the 90 days, I more than likely will support it but I have a concern. It should be asking our administration to go to the WPA and the seniors' officers and ask them to reopen the collective bargaining process so we can deal with these issues. Collective bargaining isn't done in the public. It is done across the table and it should be interspaced bargaining, Madam Speaker. We have to consider all the interests. I think the police service and everybody who works for it under stands that this city is under financial strain. There is no doubt about that. But let's work that out. Let's consider all people's interests as we move ahead, Madam Speaker. So I do have a concern that we are just going to ask them to talk to our administration and work out something. It's always been negotiated in the context, I believe, in terms of the whole collective agreement. I think that would be the best process but I will be supporting the motion from Councillor Klein today. Thank you.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I want to acknowledge the efforts of the service through you at this particular time in Winnipeg, and I, too, have heard from my ward residents that they feel conflicted. In the words of one of my residents opposing the motion before city council, although wanting me to do that, although agreeing with the objectives of the recommendation that is to redirect money to the police budget and prevent layoffs. I have also, Madam Speaker, on behalf of the service and thinking of them, entered into discussions recently with the Police Commission of Manitoba as part of their recent efforts, directed by premier to consider the downtown safety, asking them to address legislation that I believe handcuffs our department in terms of preventing us from working the layers that other provinces are afforded within their legislation. And I am considering today other voices that couldn't have been more eloquently summarized than my contiguous colleague here, and an inspirational speech about prevention, community service investments, housing and root causes of crime, than that of Point Douglas Councillor, Vivian Santos. The starting point for my support is to increase resources to community including the Winnipeg Police Service, Madam Speaker. And I would like to thank my colleagues, Councillor Jeff Browaty and Councillor Chambers for forwarding that motion today and I will be supporting it.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am here in this chair and on the floor of council representing the residents of the Waverley West Ward. And to contribute towards the betterment, health and well-being and quality of life of all residents of Winnipeg with my one vote on council. I want to thank the Winnipeg Police Service for the incredible work they do to protect the residents in our city. You chose a career that few do and you are doing incredible work. I want to thank all the residents who reached out to me to provide their views on the vote before us today; e-mails, phone calls, conversations in the grocery store and more. And I still have a healthy list of calls and e-mails to return, too, that came in. I want to share with all who are listening in the gallery and online and have this on the record. The process on how information is shared on city council is not equal. It's not fair. And it does not represent collaboration in the very basic sense. Contrary to what many say. If you are not on the Mayor's Executive Policy Committee, Deputy or Acting Mayor, then you are almost half of council who is not in the inner-circle where you are not allowed in-depth weekly

briefings by the public service. And you do not have the opportunity to discuss details with colleagues, the Mayor and the department directors in the same room. The revisions to the Winnipeg Police Pension By-law report is a significant report. And for a report with such significant implications, you would think that a briefing would automatically be provided to council members who weren't already briefed. It wasn't. I had to ask for a briefing. And it was only granted to be held after the Mayor and EPC voted on it. Then, two days ago, a motion comes forward supported by the Chair of Finance. The dialogue around the motion indicating the Mayor is somewhat supportive of returning money from the pension plan modifications back to the police budget to save positions. There was no dialogue from the Chair of Finance on the implications other than what was written into the motion and now that has been modified. And then yesterday another press release comes out, this time from the Chair of the Winnipeg Police Board and a member of the Mayor's Executive Policy Committee supporting asking for a delay of the decisions and presenting some options. You are not, but he is. I want to ensure everyone understands the information sharing on council is not collaborative. It's not equal and probably, most importantly, it impacts the quality of decisions made and in many cases has negative impacts on the taxpayers. But I will say specific to the report in front of us today. The Mayor has made it very clear since 2016 that a review and changes to the Winnipeg Police plan would be...pension plan would be occurring and presented to Council. The Mayor has been very clear on his intentions over the past five years and reiterated his intentions in the recent election. I will say he has been clear on that. It's also very clear the Mayor has extended far more dialogue and notice to the Winnipeg Police Service about his intentions than he ever did to the development community during the very brief 6 month engagement regarding the implementation of the impact fee. So in addition to the limited amount of information non-EPC members receive it is also incumbent on a councillor to investigate and seek further information. I want to thank Mr. Sabourin for providing comprehensive information on the Winnipeg Police Services perspective. I appreciate your perspective. I clearly hear and see two completely different perspectives on the recommendations made in the Winnipeg Police Pension By-law report on what is legal and what isn't, on what can occur and what can't, what is a collective…what is in the collective agreement, what is in the by-law. These are high stake, multimillion dollar discussions impacting the lives of the members of the Winnipeg Police Service and also impacting the lives of taxpayers. I've spoken in great depth to many residents in my ward about the overall sustainability of the police pension plan and they want to see change. I do not believe both sides are able to work through this independent of a third party be it arbitrator or lawyers. This discussion of the sustainability of the police pension plan has been going on for years. And it's been no secret that it will be coming to this council and we would be dealing with it in this term. I will be supporting the report and Motion 1 and I will support the arbitration and any legal challenges that will occur as a result to secure some kind of more sustainable move forward for all the residents of Winnipeg. These are not easy decisions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Lukes. Councillor Nason followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, originally I was going to read an e-mail that was provided by a resident of Winnipeg that most of council, I think all of council, may have received but probably dismissed. But alas, just listening to what's going on in the chamber I jotted down a few bullet points and maybe speak to those. Our community is afraid and we're hearing it loud and clear. No matter where you go, you know, be it at the coffee shops or at restaurants or grocery shopping, wherever it might be, a great deal of these officers probably were at the hockey rinks and were probably hearing about it there. We don't have local policing. We don't have our community officers. Our district offices are closed. We've got restrictions of 2 percent placed arbitrarily on the WPS budget by the Mayor and the EPC. It's not a council directive. It's placed on by the Mayor and EPC. To me, this is a manufacture crisis. This is one that doesn't need to be had right now considering what we have in front of us as a council. This is a labour...sorry Siri, you're going to have to wait. This is a labour item and it was said before this should be done through negotiation. If we can't get the administration and the police officers to do it equally we should have a third party as part and parcel of this. We just went through a summer where another labour agreement crisis was coming and the Mayor decided to stoke fears in our community. This time, I think just his policy alone is doing that. We don't need to add more to this. We need responsible government and we need responsible agreements. I don't feel the time is now for this kind of conversation but yet here we are. We have got to get better at this as Councillor Lukes said, you know, we don't get the same level of information. There was a media item yesterday, a councillor had put something out on social media and the Mayor used the term of "lying". So I would ask this, is Councillor Lukes lying when she says we don't get the same information? I challenge that. I say we don't get the same information and I would like to see facts of where we are getting the same information. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. It's never easy or pleasant having to deal with compensation or benefit issues in public like this. I mean, all of us have friends that are...you know, we went to school with people who are police officers, family members, all that sort of thing so it's never the best to have to deal with this in this particular venue. Again, Mayor Bowman campaigned on this back in the last election that this change would be coming so we all knew that this was on the agenda and something that we would be discussing here. I don't think it's...you know, the head of the Police Association made the comment that he doesn't like referring to gold or diamond or

platinum or whatever types of pensions. The reality is, this is within the city of government, the top pension program that there is. And even after these changes it will remain so. The reality is, I mean, our police officers are very, very well compensated. The one point that hasn't really been brought out today is that when we go into negotiations and we talk...and we go to sit down at the table with the Police Association, the City is at a disadvantage. They know, the Police Association knows that if we don't come to an agreement, it has to go to binding arbitration. And the pattern has always been, let's look at what's happened in other western Canadian jurisdictions. Well what happens is, they will always go and look at the top level, even when the circumstances are different in some other cities. A number of years ago when the commercial retail...or the commercial properties and the commercial assessment base in places like Calgary and Edmonton were way up there and there was the ability to pay the officers a lot more. The reality is, Winnipeg we're getting similar levels of increases in salaries. I mean, you look at this last agreement, I compliment Councillor Gillingham and Councillor Morantz before that, overall increases were kept in the 2 percent neighbourhood or this contract that is still way higher than any other public sector type employee in this province. Yes, in the past they were close to 4 percent but when you look at pattern and you looked at the patterns in western Canada that was what was happening. So in some cases, and I do give credit to the Police Association, we found ways of providing better value for taxpayers in Winnipeg even at those higher numbers. We found a way to bring in the auxiliary cadet program. We found ways to bring in operational efficiencies rather than, you know...we don't really to impose the 4 percent, let's find 4 percent and find some operational improvements so we did that because we knew the number where we were likely going to land when it came to salaries. We have long been told by our public service and our bureaucrats, our CFO, acting CAO that there was an opportunity to make changes to the pension program outside of the collective agreement. We have had some legal opinions that that is so. I am still nervous about it but I think unfortunately that this is a road we're going to go down because we need to, because we do go in with such a competitive disadvantage when it comes to bargaining. You look at the increases over time they are again completely off what everybody else has been getting in the public service in the City as well as generally speaking. I would like to thank Councillor Chambers. Winnipeggers realize things out there are ugly. We have ongoing issues with the meth crisis, mental health. I don't want our officers to think that they are any less valued than they were yesterday or they've ever been. Things are worse. And I mean, it feels awful having to do it at this particular time because again, you are out there working harder and seeing worse things than you have ever seen before. So...but I mean, that's not unique to police either. I mean, look at our paramedics; the number of injections of drugs to deescalate people going through meth psychoses, through the roof. You look at the violence and the lack of respect on our transit buses even. It's out there everywhere. So I thank Councillor Chambers for the motion that redirects a good portion of those resources to maintain deployment numbers in the police service. I think that's important and I thank him for bringing that forward as well as entertaining another small addition that I suggested and worked with Mayor Bowman on was the delay of implementing anything until April 1st. I recognize that this will have an impact on people's families and decisions that they want to make personally. They may need to speak to a financial adviser or actuary or what have you, to make decisions that are right for your family and you should have that ability to have a little bit of additional time. My understanding was if you wanted to retire before December 1st your deadline was literally like today. So by going to April 1st, we're going to get a little bit of additional time so I thank Councillor Chambers and Mayor Bowman for making that small change to the motion before us. So again, never easy or pleasant, but the reality is these are changes to bring fairness and a little bit back to taxpayers. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Browaty. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, Madam Speaker, I'll echo what several of my colleagues have said already, is that these are not easy decisions at all and I'll also echo the fact that I like I believe everyone around this chamber appreciates the work that the men and women, not only who are here, but all of 1400 or so sworn officers, currently, those that have come before them as well. We do appreciate the hard work that they put in day in and day out in serving our city. I will be supporting the main motion for the revisions to the police pension by-law. I'll also be supporting Councillor Chambers and Councillor Browaty's motion. I want to thank them for their motion. I will not be supporting Motion No. 2. I think, for me, the...I guess the primary reason for supporting the changes is that one of the things that motivates me in this role is to make sure that we are making as best we can, we don't always get it right, but as best we can, making long term decisions. And in the capacity as Finance Chair, which I am privileged to serve in, you take a look at the long term financial implications of the decisions that we make. We want to ensure...we have to ensure that through the future years, labour costs are sustainable for the taxpayers. And while I look to these chambers...this chamber that you know, that is full or this morning certainly was full on both sides with members of our Winnipeg Police Service, I also look beyond the members sitting here. And we think about the 750,000 residents of the City of Winnipeg. It's incumbent upon us to make decisions that ensures that the services they need today and in the future, can be provided in an affordable way. I had, just a fact, on Sunday, I sat with a group of senior ladies at the Ladies Auxiliary Legion, I referenced it in my announcements this morning, and I had some of these ladies talking to me about and kind of putting the screws to me, which is good, they should, about the cost at the City. And they say, we can't afford more, we can't afford more. You have got to keep the costs down. We make decisions certainly for the members here but we also make decisions for the men and women of this generation that live in Winnipeg and future generations as well. And so this...these amendments will control the costs. You can see the numbers in the report of over $50 million in projected

reduction of City contributions. Appreciate Councillor Chambers' motion to ask that more at this time, of those savings, go back into the police budget, the multiyear budget. The chief has articulated clearly, you've heard it before, to make the 2 percent target would necessitate some very difficult decisions on complement. This would provide a way for those front line services to be maintained and protected should the Police Board and the police service that allocates the budget so choose to allocate them in that way. I think also as it's been said, these changes would bring the police pension more in line with other...the pension of other City of Winnipeg employees who are also valued for the work that they do for our citizens and among our residents. And finally, I want to thank Councillor Browaty for his amendment that's being brought forward. And I concur with Councillor Browaty that by moving to an April 1st implementation, it does allow more time for employees to…City police employees to understand the implications of the changes that are contained within this report. And I do acknowledge as well, Mr. Sabourin. I thank him for his presentation and Mr. Dennison as well, but I know Mr. Sabourin did ask for, you know, more time before anything is implemented. I trust it to some degree this answers that call. So I will be supporting the main report. I will be supporting amendment number 1. I will not be supporting amendment number 2.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And like everyone else, I want to thank everyone involved. I want to thank Winnipeg Police Service, the members of the WPA. I want to thank councillors, the administration, everyone that is...has their concerns with us. The people of Winnipeg for paying their taxes so that we are even having this conversation about something that's really important. And it's a big budget issue. Last term I voted for it. I was a little uncomfortable about it but that's the collective agreement we came to. It came to Council. I had faith in it. I was uncomfortable, but I did it. I didn't think we would be here today changing the essence of what we were doing last term. And I'm kind of surprised. However, I do want to deal with some specifics and as far as I'm concerned for saying this I should be given a couple of extra minutes because it's in everyone's interest to understand this. It was mentioned this morning that municipalities or counties or cities or towns in the United States went bankrupt because of uncontrolled emergency service budgets. First of all, let's take some things into consideration. We're talking about places like Detroit and California as well. Bear in mind a few things. In the states it's a little different because they were constantly, for decades and generations, losing the population from the cities because they've moving out to the suburbs because the suburbs aren't part of the tax base, they're not part of city. Now when my dad was premier of Manitoba, he kept his specific campaign promise of amalgamating the 13 municipalities into one city so that we don't have that problem of competition or whatever. We have this tax base, yeah and of course, we can see in this day and age, yeah, we're competing with East St. Paul, Springfield and things like that, but let's face it, it allowed for the city as a whole to grow and maintain a growing tax base and that's not what happened in Detroit. They were losing the taxpayers because people were leaving the city, okay. Next point about that is that...well, they didn't have a tax base, they couldn't raise their taxes. Our city is growing and despite what people say in terms of having a zero tax increase for years before…in the last term, when most of this council was here, we started increasing taxes…the entire tax rate…the entire budget revenue, tax revenue increased. But before that, for ten years, we didn't have a flat tax freeze. We had net for the city. But, many Winnipeggers, in fact the poorest Winnipeggers' taxes were going up the most. We all know that. In the poorest neighbourhoods, the taxes were going up because people could afford less. They were competing in the poor areas for those houses so the demand for the poor neighbourhoods went up and the values of those houses went up, people ended up paying more despite the fact they're trying to pay less and thus their tax…their property taxes went up. Okay, plus, our taxes...we have been increasing our taxes every year, okay. So it's not the same as what was going on in the States. As well, whenever they say it was because of uncontrolled emergency service pensions, I have seen that before. But one thing that's higher than that, including here in the City of Winnipeg, not just Winnipeg, but they never talked about the rate of construction inflation in those cities, in those municipalities across the continent. So why would you...why would you use one statistic? I hope I just explained to you how although it's a factor, saying it's due to uncontrolled emergency service budgets or pensions, well, to say that's the reason is false. It's one factor. I wouldn't call it uncontrolled either. Knee jerk reaction. Well consider we talked about this just a couple of years ago we made our agreements, now it's coming up in this budget year, to me, it seems to me like it's a knee jerk reaction. I'm glad we're...if this is what it takes for council to think longer term by having these four year budget processes, fine. I'm for it. But as far as I'm concerned we are all supposed to think beyond four or five years anyway and I thought we were because we always see our projections from the administration when it comes to budget time, and I thought that was okay. I'm not…wasn't agree with...in agreement with it a lot of the time. I didn't think we were thinking far enough ahead, but four year budgets don't really do that either. So in terms of knee jerk reaction, I don't think opposition to what we are trying to do today is a knee jerk reaction. It looks like we're just taking it out on police pensions right now as we are approaching what could be...what is…what looks like an ominous budget. And we are taking it out on police pensions right now in the process. We've already taken it out on CUPE and other workers and I think it's a misleading statement. Now, it's not all wrong. The issues that this deal with aren't all wrong. In fact that's…they should be dealt with. That's what collective agreements and negotiations are about, to deal with these things. And everyone is entitled to their opinions and some very good points have been made today in terms of some inadequacies with the collective agreement. And you know what, we could have mentioned those two years ago as well or three years ago as well. So today, we're not just talking

about the substance of the motion, we're also...there is another point here and that's dealing with whether it's within the integrity of our system to do this at this time. Look, when it comes to issues of sustainability, you know we have to...we're talking about sustainability. Sustainability and we need a sustainable budget. We need a sustainable city and that's true. And I have been talking about this since I was elected five years ago. And which is why I had to...it wasn't fun, I had to vote against the bus corridor, you know, that goes from downtown to the U of M that saves, according to Winnipeg Transit, saves 5 minutes at rush hour only, because we're talking about hundreds of millions of dollars, and I had to bite the bullet. I'm not saying that we shouldn't build infrastructure but what I've been saying is because of construction inflation we're operating a disadvantage and they said, but other cities have been doing this and that, yeah, but I'm going to tell you something, the larger cities who have been there and been building these transit infrastructures over the decades and generations, they weren't doing it on these terms of what the cost of construction are. And we have got to have a real serious talk if we're talking about long term budgeting and sustainable budgeting but we're taking it out and on now about changing a collective agreement midstream which goes against the essence of what we are supposed to be doing here at city hall. It's been mentioned already. Who is going to trust us? We have to...year after year after year...there might be a year in between where there is a break, but let's face it, we are responsible as a council to vote on collective agreements. I don't have much involvement with the...most councillors don't...in fact, the Mayor does…there is a process. It's not comfortable. It's not perfect and we are entitled here at council to vote against it and changes can be made. But to do it unilaterally, I have to say, I have never seen this before. So what precedent are we starting? So look, we have had the largest tax increases in the poorest neighbourhoods of the city. Their taxes have gone up by 50 percent you know, in the last decade or more. And so, well…

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

Councillor Schreyer: So in the poorest areas is where we need community development and where we need the police the most. So where we've had the largest tax increase…in fact, the only tax increases in a sense were in the poorest areas, the most notable ones, in the last decade and the last dozen years, have we had a proportional increase in budget towards community development. Councillor Santos made some excellent points at last year's budget speech. The budget passed, but nonetheless, she made some good points; are we doing for Point Douglas what we have to do for community development? Well, the tax…if you look at the tax increase in Point Douglas, the amount of property taxes increased by those residents themselves over the last dozen years, does it not merit some sort of proportional increase in community development investment from this city for the taxes...the increase in taxes they received by the residents of Point Douglas? Well no. She made that point. She never said in relationship to the taxes. But that's a fact. Check it out. So my concern is, we're supposed to...we are saying today that the reason we can take this money now is…from the police pensions midway through an agreement, where ten councillors here voted for it two years ago, I don't know how that's a change in mandate since last term. It can go to community development. Well, that's…isn't that what the tax increases were for, for the people in Point Douglas or I live in Elmwood or North End? So I just want to make that point. And I'll just...one more point. It is about precedence. It is about integrity and trust and the vote we make today can cause some precedence that we don't want to live with. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Madam Speaker. A couple of preliminary things; first, I am not going to say thank you to people because nothing to me says thank you like not taking $12 million out of someone's pocket every year. Number two, we have got to clean up our provision around legal opinions and nondisclosure agreements. I believe I'm the only councillor who read the legal opinion and I say opinion because I asked yesterday if there was more than one and I was told there was only one. So I'm told, no, I can't discuss anything from that legal opinion, I can just confirm its existence. However, you have heard the staff can characterize it. You have heard people characterize it here on the floor. You have heard Councillor Browaty say we have had legal opinions, plural, that says we can act unilaterally. So we do need to seriously clean up the way we do nondisclosure agreements otherwise you are penalizing the people who have tried to do the research and read the actual opinions. Number three, Councillor Lukes has convinced me of something today which is historically we have said let's not spend all the money from the impact fee, none of that revenue because it's under legal challenge. We know this is under legal challenge already because we had a grievance filed at the same day as EPC at least by Mr. Sabourin, possibly by Mr. Dennison, possibly two legal challenges. So I agree with Councillor Lukes who has always said, well, let's go spend the money from the impact fees. And the Mayor also ran on that at least insofar as helping out Councillor Lukes' ward with the Southwest Rec Centre. So I will be shifting position on that convinced by Councillor Lukes, let's go spend the impact fee revenue because if you vote for this today, you are voting to take a rather large risk. And the risk is twofold. Number one, you are voting to say yes, we want $12 million out of the pockets of the plan members, B) we're planning to spend it. We're planning to spend it not just on police but on other things as well. Now if we lose in the courts the first year, we could appeal, then we are doubling down. Now we're going to owe 12 million back to the members for the first year and 12 million for the second year. And if you think these things can't take multiple years, please come talk to me about the case law research I was doing until midnight last night because these things can take several years to work their way through courts of appeal. So just be aware, if you vote for

this, you are not just voting for one side of the risk that we're going to take the money and might have to pay it back, if you are doubling down, you're saying, no, let's go spend it. I certainly will not be supporting Councillor Chambers' amendment because Councillor Santos more or less had it right which is, are we writing the budget here today? Because I sat through some pretty painful budget presentations where people I liked, people I know, their job is there in front of me, we are eliminate that man's job, that woman's job and the staff had said, we have revenue ideas. No. No we can't hear those. That's not part of this process. So to hear today that we are going to establish a sustained source of revenue for years to come to eliminate layoffs in the police service, I frankly find that isn't what we are doing. Secondly, you can say I'm in favour of layoffs, go right ahead and I'll say the Police Board…and Gillingham phrased this correctly, we can only recommend, the Police Board sets its own budget. We don't know if they're going to use the money to alleviate layoffs. We don't know if they're going to use it for cash to capital to buy vests. That will be up to the Police Board and the Police Chief. So let's not get up here and say those who vote against it are in favour of layoffs and those who vote for it are in favour of saving police jobs because we don't know what might happen. Secondly, it's accurately stated, if we are unsuccessful eventually, now we've really got a hole. We've got a hole that we have both been taking the money and must pay back and we have been spending it over here to keep people employed. Where do we find that money? Thirdly, I have been told, well, if we don't get it here, where else are you going to get it to keep police services going? Why did I ask that question, you may ask me, Madam Speaker? Yesterday at EPC about the $23 million southwest rapid transit way, the uncertainty that surrounds that, the provincial pay back, we're told, we don't know if we're getting it back so we didn't put it in the budget. So there is 23 million we could allocate that to the pension board…to the Police Board and that would cover off the cost of their shortfall. Do we know for sure we're getting that 23 million? No, but we're relying on the fact that we have a legal agreement that we think will be binding. We don't know if we're going to get this $12 million a year, we do know that it's under legal challenge. So let's not pretend that if you vote for something today you are voting in favour of layoffs or conversely that the money will necessarily be going toward any aspect of the police service. And finally, in a broader sense, I think Councillor Santos is right. Well, if we're saying to other departments, you're going to have to find these savings, I sit there and people's jobs are listed right in front of me but we are not offering them, hey, let's keep the savings and planning that you've identified and we'll keep old so and so employed. We're not saying that. Let's just keep this to a pure vote on whether we're taking money out of the pension fund or not. None of this...all of this is not the core point. I hear former Councillor Vandal saying, don't get caught up in the details, focus on the main issue. This is the main issue; can you do it unilaterally? All we have in front of us is a report that says that the by-law says you can act unilaterally. It's interesting to contrast with the report from 2011. If you look at the report from 2011, it references, by my count, four different instances where the agreement has been trilateral. In 2002 a report came to Council, both unions sign off with the City on how to dispose of the surplus, 2003; memorandum of understanding, trilateral. A further memorandum agreement...the Winnipeg Police Pension Plan 2006 incorporated the provisions of those two agreements between the City and the two police associations and repealed the former police by-law and the police associations agreed to the wording of the new by-law. So to assert that we can act unilaterally is to say, yes, we called in the police associations to get their agreement, but really what they were agreeing to was that we could act unilaterally. Why would you need the police associations to sign off on that? It makes, frankly, very little sense to me. There is a long history here of acting in a trilateral fashion. Both the senior officers and the WPA; 2002, 2003, 2006, it's in the 2011 report. The by-law incorporated the three-way agreement. That's right in these reports. Curiously, no mention of any of this in the '18 report that we have in front of us. All it says is, the by-law says we can act unilaterally. So let's just get all of the facts out there. There is a long history here of acting in a tripartite way, 2002, 2003, et cetera. What did the 2002 report to Council say? The new agreement resolves the legal uncertainty with respect to the disposition of actuarial surpluses and maintains the financial security of the plan. A three-way agreement resolves the legal uncertainty. Why would there be uncertainty then? And wouldn't it be everyone agreed we could act unilaterally. That resolved the legal uncertainty. But a three-way agreement resolves the legal uncertainty. Wouldn't that suggest then that the uncertainty has been resolved and you need to move forward in a three-way fashion? It certainly does to me. There is a long history here. I think if Vandal were here he would say, okay, you're still too much on the details, what's the big picture? The big picture…I'm going to need a slight extension, Madam Speaker. The big picture is this…

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

Councillor Mayes: It doesn't matter if...would it be okay if it was building cleaners? Well, they don't do lifesaving work so yes, let's take their pension. Oh they are not rich, so let's not take their pension. It doesn't matter if it's the police. It doesn't matter if it's building cleaners. It doesn't matter what people do. It matters what the law is here and there is a pretty obvious past history here of acting with all three parties coming to agreement. Councillor Klein's motion attempts to keep that going and I was pleased to support it to try and get some sort of agreement in place. Maybe you can't, maybe it will have to go to an arbitrator, but the idea that it's okay to take it because they are wealthier, maybe Nason has a better mortgage provision than I do. I don't know, but it would be because he negotiated it with somebody and I didn't. That doesn't give me the legal right to unilaterally change his mortgage. So the core issue here is, can we act unilaterally? We can pass this, we probably will here today. Just be aware though, it's an extremely risky strategy to try and get the money and if it fails in the courts, we will be owing back a large amount of money and be left with a rather

large hole in our police budget. What's the better course? Try and get a deal. Try and get a deal and if you can't, go to an arbitrator. People have said to me, well, we need some movement on the early retirement. We need some movement on the contribution rates, I think that's fair. But I would encourage my colleagues, do the research. Look at what was presented in 2001, the by-law we're amending. It talks about a history of acting in concert with the two unions. It doesn't say we have always acted unilaterally. None of these reports, '02, '03, '11, say we can act unilaterally but we chose to cut a deal with the associations. So the history is there for those that choose to read it, Madam Speaker, I suppose we'll probably take step today to make some history and perhaps we'll see what the courts do. Perhaps it will succeed in the courts, but it is a very large risk being taken on behalf of the taxpayers of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Mayes. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Klein, this is your opportunity to close on your amending motion and speak to the item.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you to Councillor Mayes who is supporting me on this one and we have had conversations about it and his very articulate presentation. This is really about thinking…taking a moment right now and think about the facts. Two months ago we saw tweets from a couple of people at this table that were in New York City saying how great we are at managing this city and other people are telling us and today, the sky is falling, that we are in great trouble. What happened? Maybe a really well-engineered PR stunt or campaign, that's what I see in my experience, to control the narrative, to pit the masses against each other, to create the vision. So let's think about the facts because I would like to know…I know you're not going to answer, that's fine…but if you have done the math, it went from 14…or it went from 12 million to 14 million now it was 20 million. It's...let's just say it's 14 or 12 million, that's $10,000 per officer. Divide it. Where are you getting it from? If you're going to do it like that, really. Everyone has a calculator it's on your phone. Try it. Councillor Browaty talks about, oh, our guys are paid a lot, they are this, they are that, you know, we have to be fiscally responsible. Now, two months ago we were great. We have to look at the facts. The fact is the average wage of a police officer across Canada is $98,000. I looked online while we were here. It says Brandon police officers actually get paid more than ours. Not by much. Brandon. This isn't about their pay though. This isn't about that. It's about whether we have done our homework and whether we are going to act with integrity. We, each of us right here, I'm sure residents will ask us, did you take the time to call a third-party independent of what you are hearing and ask them for their opinion? Did you call a labour lawyer? Did you take five minutes to call a labour lawyer or are you just going to listen to the people that are sitting upstairs? You have a phone. You have the ability to do that. You have the right to do that. If we haven't, then how can you make this decision? I don't think you can. This isn't about whether it should be done or not be done. I agree with Councillor Mayes. This is about integrity. The amount has changed three times and that doesn't create more questions about the integrity of that information? We're missing documents. Some people saw it and had to sign an NDA. You don't have any integrity questions around that? Here are some more facts for you. We're talking about money, money, money, money, money, money. I can give you $12 million right now. Recently, council...you know, we started charging the police for rent, $10 million a year. But we say that's part of policing. Is it? Or is that a shell game? We pay $2 to $2.5 million in admin fees, we being the service, in admin fees for what? So we can say our, you know, corporate officials upstairs are doing a really good job of managing their budget because all this money is coming in? Come on. This is…again, this is…you have to be asking the right questions. This really is about, is it legally proper but it's about integrity. You cannot have closed door meetings. You cannot make these discussions outside of everybody else on council. It can't happen like that. It shouldn't happen like that. It's been happening like that for I don't know how many years and how are we doing? Not very well. This is really about one person's agenda, I think. If it's really about the money, why is waiting 90 days so bad? How come you don't have the ability to wait 90 days to do this? We've waited years. Now we're doing it because the sky is falling. We won't be able to have rinks soon. Look, everyone here has their own thoughts, their own opinion and I respect that. Everyone here has a power. But you all are given, when you win on election night, you have the ability to say yes or no. You are not here to follow. You are here to represent, in my opinion, the taxpayers and to be…to do that with integrity and to do that with transparency. Ninety days is nothing. We have never, ever said no to an extension of time, during my time, not once have we ever said no, that report's due, you've got to bring it in. Ninety days is not a lot to ask so that we can earn back the trust of hundreds of thousands of people that each have their own opinion on this. It's not a matter of if it should be fixed. Everyone at this table thinks it should be a fix and I think everybody in this building today thinks it should be fixed. It's a matter of how and what gives us the right to say no, without...or to say, we're going to do this without all the facts. Period.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Klein. Councillor Chambers, your opportunity to close on your amending motion.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair and thank you for…council colleagues for your comments with regards to this robust discussion that we're having this afternoon. Particularly, I want to thank Councillor Santos for her very passionate words this afternoon. I just want to point out that my motion does discuss $14.7 million of the overall 32.9 over the next four years. And certainly, looking at that $14.7 million, you know, once this motion is passed, that would be redirected back into frontline police services to address the staffing complement that could potentially be lost

even though we are seeing a 2 percent increase to the police budget. There is a balance there that could be considered for other government...or other departments within our civic government. But I also think it's important and incumbent upon us to work with the other levels of government to bring attention to some of the social ills that we are experiencing here in this city, homelessness, poverty, mental health issues, addictions. And certainly we are moving on...some of the recommendations of the illicit drug task reports and again, I think we need to work in collaboration with our other levels of government to address these issues. So again, thank you for your support today of my motion. And again, thank you, Councillor Browaty for the addition in terms of moving this to April 1st, that will give officers that are in a position to retire, to go through the numbers, see if it's right for them. Again the implementation of this is incremental. And there is an increase to the police salary of 2.5 percent that's going forth on January 1st. Again it's an opportunity to look at the numbers and make a decision on whether you're going to stay or whether this is the time for you to retire and enjoy this time with your family. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Chambers. Mayor Bowman, your opportunity to close on the main item.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you very much. I want to acknowledge and thank all my council colleagues for their thoughts today. Look, the reality is if we want to effect real change in this chamber we have to have the ability and the strength to make difficult decisions. Otherwise, we are essentially saying the status quo is fine. The status quo is not fine. When it comes to public safety, we need to be able to have the courage to make difficult decisions so that we can prioritize the available resources that we have in our community to help build a healthier community. There is a growing recognition that while we continue to provide additional resources to the Winnipeg Police Service, that we cannot arrest our way out of crime. We have to continue to build healthier people and healthier communities in every corner of our city. And I think what we have seen over the last number of years is really a turning point in our community's understanding and appreciation for making sure that we are making investments to build healthier communities so that we can better deal with the root causes of crime. And so one of the reasons why I am...I continue to support, finally after years and years of talk, and delay, finally making a decision to modernize and make changes to an unsustainable pension, it does allow us the ability to convert words to action and provide the resources in areas of our community that desperately need those investments. There will be additional discussion and dialogue, of course, during the course of the budget discussion and debate and I welcome those...I welcome that discussion. Councillor Santos, Councillor Rollins, others around the floor, on both sides of this issue that we are voting on here today are expressing a real desire to make meaningful inputs in areas of our budget that aren't necessarily in policing. They are upstream investments. This allows us to do that and we have a lot more work to do in this budget and in future budgets to do that. And I think that is changing. That has changed significantly. Before I was elected, certainly if you look at the investments that have been made in the past, I believe previous council certainly felt that you could spend your way through investments in the police service in an unsustainable way to build a healthier community. And the reality is, I agree with the crime prevention through social development philosophy. The question is, do you do that simply through the police service or do you do that through other investments. I believe we have to have a balanced view. You know, with difficult discussions and debates as is often the case in democratic institutions like a city hall, when you actually come to vote on something like this, it's not uncommon for everybody to have to look and say well, it's not perfect but you know what, we're moving the ball forward. We're finally taking a step forward to do something that has been requested by our citizens for many, many years. And so obviously, the…some of the language used in this floor today, Madam Speaker, is arguably confusing a very simple question for us. It's whether or not we want to modernize the pension or not or we want to continue with the status quo because I don't think it's working for anybody right now, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor, with that we'll call the vote, Mr. Clerk. Call for...there will be three votes. The first is we are voting on the motion put forward by Councillor Klein. It's amending Motion 2 to layover the item for a period of 90 days. Yes?

Councillor Orlikow: Are we going to make sure the whole motion...

Madam Speaker: I was just reading that to make sure everyone's on the same page. We won't be reading any of the motions out in full. Okay, just to avoid confusion, it's the motion…amending Motion 2 and there was a call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Klein, Mayes, Nason and Schreyer

Madam Speaker: Madam Clerk, if you could count my vote, please.

Clerk: Oh, sorry. Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Orlikow, Rollins and Santos

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. So the amending Motion 2 is lost. Moving forward, we have amending Motion 1 that was moved by Councillor Chambers, seconded by Councillor Browaty. Is there a call for recorded vote on this as well? Yes. Okay, all in favour of this motion, amending Motion 1, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Orlikow and Rollins

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Klein, Mayes, Nason, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 7.

Madam Speaker: Motion 1 passes. Now we will vote on the main item as amended. All in favour? Does everyone understand that? All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Orlikow and Rollins

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Klein, Mayes, Nason, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 7.

Madam Speaker: Item 3 – Revisions to the Winnipeg Police Pension By-law passes. Thank you. Moving on now, do we...I would like to take a few minute recess if we can. I'm sure we want to clear the gallery, Mr. Clerk. Thank you. No vote necessary, but thank you for that. We will just take a few minute recess. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
November 21, 2019, at 3:02 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I'll reconvene the meeting…the council meeting of today November 21st, 2019 just after a short recess. The next item will be the two notice of motions that were brought forward by Councillor Klein. Notice of motion brought forward by Councillor Klein and Councillor Nason at the October meeting of Council. They are part of the agenda published on your computers. Councillor Klein, to introduce your first notice of motion regarding an amendment to the City of Winnipeg Charter.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTION

Item 1 – City of Winnipeg Charter

Moved by Councillor Klein,
Seconded by Councillor Nason,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg Charter Act (the Charter) specifies that where the Mayor is absent or unavailable for any reason, the Deputy Mayor or in the absence of the Deputy Mayor, the Acting Deputy Mayor performs the duties and functions, and may exercise the powers, of the Mayor;

AND WHEREAS in accordance with the Charter, if the office of the Mayor becomes vacant in the last 12 months of the Mayor's term of office, no election shall be held to fill the vacancy for the balance of the term, making the Deputy or Acting Deputy Mayor, the de facto unelected Mayor of the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS while acting as the unelected Mayor, the Deputy or Acting Deputy Mayor would substantially increase their profile, giving them an unfair advantage should they chose to run for the office of Mayor in the subsequent election;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED That the City of Winnipeg request the Province of Manitoba to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter Act to disqualify the Deputy Mayor or Acting Deputy from being a candidate for the office of Mayor in any election where they have been previously acting as unelected Mayor, due to that office being vacated.

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Speaker. This is basically an opportunity to put a motion forward that really, really puts things into perspective and trying to put everybody on the same playing field in the sense that certain positions come with certain benefits and certain opportunities, and I think it should be a fair playing field for everybody moving forward. There is no other reason for this. And it's not unusual in many political arenas to have this because it is an internal appointment. Because of the benefits that are offered and allotted. So I think that this is something that this council, with the integrity we have, is to make sure that it is fair for all involved.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Next speaker to this motion, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, our new councillor, Klein from Charleswood-Westwood-Tuxedo…or Tuxedo-Westwood has brought forth a…and with Councillor Nason, I think has brought forth, I think, what is a really important amendment that should be required. We are, you know, just mere civic politicians. However, when you look at the provincial and the federal levels and you look at how...how the leader if they do lead for whatever circumstances...I remember, was it Robert...I can't remember his initial, Steen passed away midterm, and I'm not sure what happened in regards to that while the by-election was called, Madam Speaker. However...or if he passed away close to the end of his term. But one of the things we should consider federally and provincially, it is a party system, different than ours, however, if a leader steps down, for example, Gary Doer stepped down to become the Ambassador to the United States of America after a long tenure as premier. The party itself, who was in governance, were the ones…their caucus were the ones who decided who would represent that space, I believe. May not have…I'm trying to remember. I think it was pretty close to the next election. But they decided who would be...take that leadership role until the next...until a nomination process was finished and they dealt with it and, you know, you should go to an election, we have fixed elections at city level. But…and there is all kinds of precedence at the federal level for this kind of thing. And so recommending...because the Deputy Mayor, Madam Speaker, would become and act as the mayor, that's in our Charter, but in the circumstances of someone leaving midterm, I think it would be important that there would still be 15 members of council who were democratically elected to represent the people. And it would seem to me, the best way to operate would be for the 15 of us to make a decision by vote, of course, but make a decision as to who would fulfil the mayoralty...fill the role of the mayor until an election takes place. And so that is what I would believe is the most democratic, best practice method to use. So I will be supporting this motion from Councillors Klein and Councillors Nason. And I think it is...well, integrity. Anyway, I think it's the most democratic...the best democratic way to do things. Thank you.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today in opposition to this…to this motion. It's…I guess now that the rumours have been put to bed that our mayor is staying put for the time being, at least until the end of this term, that there wouldn't be any need for the Deputy Mayor to step up and become the next mayor. I think by virtue of the fact that we're all elected officials, there is a certain power to being an incumbent that, again, you know, all of us have as elected officials. And I think there is no advantage in terms of the titles that we play...and certainly for those that are

chairs in their respective standing policy committees, have leadership experience, whether it is Chairperson of Water and Waste or Finance or Innovation or even Chair of a Police Board shows leadership and has the ability to run for mayor at an election. So I think it would be undemocratic to limit people just based on the title that they hold while they are sitting in civic government. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Any further speakers? Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Having...being a person who is…I guess had the opportunity to be Acting Deputy Mayor, I would like to share with my fellow Councillors who have not been in…had the opportunity to be in that role. To say that it's likely a role that has very little benefit in terms of visibility, in terms of...you know, it's a role that you do that fills up your calendar, you bring greetings on behalf of your colleagues and the City of Winnipeg. And if anything, because of that, you might even see your visibility in traditional media, social media, maybe even positions on issues, probably reduced as opposed to other roles that exist on this council, whether it's EPC or any other role in this chamber. So I don't know why we would single out Deputy Mayor and Acting Deputy Mayor. I don't know how we would operationalize this, you know, because I signed a letter one time on behalf of the Mayor when the Mayor was out of town does that mean I can't ever run for mayor ever? And to the movers of this motion like if you're planning a mayoral run in the future at some point, then are you scared of whoever might be running in that election? Wouldn't you want the people to have all the choices that are possible in that said election? And finally, I think the only instance of this occurring that I can recall is when Dan Vandal ran for mayor against Sam Katz and I voted for Dan Vandal. And I think if more people had made that choice, we might be in a much better place today as we would have been. Of course, that's my own personal opinion. But even though Councillor Vandal at the time had the formidable force of the Deputy Mayor role behind him, he still lost to an outsider, the former mayor of the City of Winnipeg. So I really don't get this motion. I really don't. I actually, I think I laughed out loud when I read it the first time. I really don't get it. Deputy Mayor or Acting Deputy Mayor? I mean, you could maybe look at other roles that have higher visibility roles like...I don't know, EPC Chairs. Was the Mayor himself not on this list? I mean, this…I think the Mayor has the biggest role in terms of visibility and media. We see him doing the scrums every day at council. So anyway, I think I have said enough. I just really don't get this motion and where it's coming from and if somebody wants to run for mayor who moved this motion, then let the people decide. Don't bar people from having choices. And I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Allard. Councillor Nason followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, the power of incumbency. You know, the last election there was lots of these sign that are put on boulevards, they were put on street corners, they used the metal frames, they have two words on them "Mayor Bowman". It wasn't Brian Bowman, but it was Mayor Bowman. And they were placed in areas that may or may not have been allowed to be put, but that's the power of incumbency. Is it a point of order? I'll sit down, you can…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, let's stick to the motion before us in a professional manner. Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, I just offer some information. It was mentioned that we weren't certain about how Bill Norrie, whether he was the Deputy Mayor or the Acting Mayor before the election after Mayor Robert Steen passed away while in office. Just to offer that information. He was the Deputy Mayor and thus became the Acting Mayor upon the death of Mayor Robert Steen. But just to make the point, he was elected by Council to the position of Deputy Mayor so that when he became the Acting Mayor, it was by virtue of being elected by Council. Just thought I would share you with that because the point was made we were uncertain about that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I agree with Councillor Allard on this one. It's a bizarre motion for us to be considering. Firstly...and I would like...like many of the motions that are coming from these councillors, I'm not sure they have done their due diligence to really think it through based on their intent. For starters, there is a power of incumbency that every member of this chamber has when seeking re-election. The public visibility of any member of council is high. Being Chair of the Police Board is a noteworthy position of leadership in our community that provides ample profile. I'm not sure why this left that position out or others. I think our Deputy Mayor and Acting Deputy Mayor are doing outstanding work in our community. I appreciate their service to our community and I know all members of this council appreciate their work. Ultimately in the next election, members of this council will consider whether they want to run for various positions and they should have the democratic right to do so. And also, correspondingly, our citizens should ultimately have the opportunity to make the decision that they feel is in the best interests for our city at that time. I am privilege to serve in the role as mayor right now, having ran and won two elections. I hope every member of this chamber and this council feels the same sense of pride that I have coming into City Hall each and every day. And the reason that I feel such pride is because we are only here because of the vote of confidence that Winnipeggers have

entrusted in each of us to work hard for their benefit. The way that this reads, Madam Speaker, and I'll be voting against this, but the way that this reads, you know, anyone who has served in the term as Deputy Mayor or Acting Deputy Mayor would be disqualified. By that rationale, I could appoint the movers of this motion for ten minutes and then take it and then retract it and they would be disqualified. I don't think that makes a lot of sense. So I would just urge us to oppose and I think we should let the democratic wishes...I know, obviously, some are very focused on the next mayoral race, that's very clear to all of us here and to observers at City Hall. I think we should focus on doing our jobs right now and in due course, folks will assess their future and decisions with their families and ultimately, will be entrusted by the wisdom of Winnipeggers to decide who has the opportunity to serve in various roles here in this chamber.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I will call on Councillor Klein to close on your notice of motion.

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Chair. Thank you. The Mayor had mentioned doing due diligence. I agree. You should do yours as well, sir. Because the motion does read, "While acting as the unelected Mayor, the Deputy Mayor or Acting Deputy Mayor", that's what it says in there. So I don't know why everyone and Councillor Allard...sorry, I know why, it's a way to misrepresent the thing. It does say in here that they are acting at that particular point in time. I will talk about division. So when I first put this motion forward, you will remember at the start of it, I said it's about equality. Because we talk and we hear an awful lot about equality, this is not equal because certain positions do come with benefits. Certain positions require…like certain people on EPC or Deputy Mayor will get invited to bring greetings. Not that area councillor, not necessarily the person who is the chair of that committee. Is that equal? I don't know. That's what this is about is creating equality within the house and within this chamber, sorry. And I think it's very, very important. And I will point out that because of these small…these small items that seem small, it does impact the rest of the city. Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood doesn't have a voice at certain tables and so on and that has been spoken about for several years. And I will use another line from Councillor Orlikow, that there is no point in participating in a sham that is the...when concerns cannot be raised and information is not shared equally. I agree with that. So I would be certainly open and shocked to maybe see a different approach that says, you know, all of these invitations, all of these invites are not held in secrecy in a box somewhere to make sure that non-EPC members don't know about them but they're all shared with everybody and if it's in their ward or if they are the chair of that, they would have the opportunity to represent the City because we are all one team when we are being collaborative.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Klein, with that I'll call the question on the notice of motion to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter Act. All in favour? Contrary? Notice of motion is lost. Moving forward, next notice of motion to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter Act to ensure all councillors are allowed to participate in the budget recommendations. Councillor Klein to introduce your...

Item 2 – City Organization By-law No. 7100/97

Moved by Councillor Klein,
Seconded by Councillor Nason,

WHEREAS section 62(1) of the City of Winnipeg Charter states that the Executive Policy Committee of Council must formulate and present recommendations to Council regarding budgets;

AND WHEREAS under the City Organization By-law No. 7100/97, the Executive Policy Committee has jurisdiction to formulate and present recommendations to Council on Capital and Operating budgets;

AND WHEREAS there is currently no provision in the City of Winnipeg Charter, or the City Organization By-law No. 7100/97, to allow all Councillors to participate equally in the formulation of the Capital and Operating budget recommendation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that:

1. *The Province of Manitoba be requested to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter to ensure all Councillors are allowed to participate in the formulation of the budget recommendation.*

2. *The City Organization By-law No. 7100/97 be amended to allow all Councillors to participate equally in the formulation of the Capital and Operating budget recommendations.*

3. *Presentations from departments on their respective budgets be made to all members of Council during the Budget Review process.*

Councillor Klein: Let's try again. Let's go at this from a different perspective. If you read the quotes, if you look at the statements that are made, it always says Council will make a decision, great. Then you know what, let Council make the decision. If the Mayor is going to pick a Budget Working Committee, why would he not pick all? And I would venture to say, what's your fear of having other people in there to use a line from Councillor Allard? Why are you afraid to have other people at that table? When we are discussing where certain funds will go, to what ward they might be spent, what roads might be selected? Why wouldn't we have the voice of every ward in the city at the table instead of bringing it here in one shiny ball and saying you either vote for it or you don't and then have it used against you in many different ways? So here's an opportunity, yet again, I think this is opportunity 412 if we're keeping track at home, to allow all of the councillors in every budget meeting to ask questions. Not give a speech, to ask questions, to get information and be able to be at that table and make a vote on all of the details.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm actually rising. This one I'm not going to be supporting, Madam Speaker. The reason being, I'm not sure what the status is of the governance review being undertaken by the consultant that was hired, but I think we have all provided what we believe we think would work. It would be great for looking at what the recommendations are in terms of that governance report. Hopefully it not being overly an undue influence by particular leader's office because I would be concerned about that, a governance review should be one that reflects recommendations that are based on what's been gathered and what's best practice, Madam Speaker. What else can I say about it? This...well, what Winnipeg public has come to see is some of the things that go on in the meetings with the budget committee in the past, it's open now. I would like to…actually, in hindsight, the courage of the Finance Chair to bring forth the level of openness he did, in hindsight, it's a very courageous thing to have done. But it really opens up Winnipeggers' eyes as to how this city has been led through a budget process, not only by the current Mayor who was elected to fix things, not perpetuate things, but previous mayors as well undertook this whole thing where, Madam Speaker, you are pitting one area of the city against another because oh no, don't cut my library. Well we need a library, you better build that library. Oh no, who cares about West Kildonan. Ah well, who cares about Waverley West, you know, like we're all of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker. And it also pits the current budget process...and I think this is why the frustration in that the motion came forward, Madam Speaker. There is also pitting departments against departments. We heard some of that, actually, in our last...in the debate today regarding the police services pension, Madam Speaker. You know, one deserves the money, one doesn't deserve the money. Like listen, every service, every department that we have is important. Every service they deliver is important to all of Winnipeg. And so if we were to amend it and go ahead, I would say that you have to set up a process, Madam Speaker, that doesn't pit ward against ward. We are constantly reminded, Madam Speaker, by our leader, the Mayor, that it's about all of Winnipeg. However, Madam Speaker, what we have discovered is the way that it's governed is it perpetuates just a total focus, ward by ward by ward, don't take mine, don't take mine, people are fighting with each other, arguing when what we have now is what the people expect. Somehow people are led in elections to believe that somehow there is this lake of money hiding in reserves. Well, I got a message for you. It got all used up under the former mayor. And whatever little was left was used up in our first couple of years under our new mayor. So what's happening is we should have changed the way this thing works. That we all care about the whole city and maybe the recommendation is that all of council once does it...but what we have to do is we have to ensure in the rules, somehow, somewhere, that we work together and we have to believe it's for...and it is for all of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker. And you know, the only people that have benefited over the last five years are those with cash. Those without enough cash to make ends meet are paying more and those with cash are paying less. It's wrong. So we do need to fix it. So don't get me wrong, I'm going to vote against this one because the process as it stands is open. We have a report, a governance report that's supposed to...I can't remember what the timing is, but let's look at what those recommendations are. We still get to vote as to whether or not it's a go ahead or not. If they are recommending charter changes as our previous...actually, this motion might require a charter change because the charter does say that EPC is the budget committee...or the ward by-law. Is it in the charter? Anyway, it's in the charter, right. So in the charter, it says that EPC is the budget committee and this mayor came up with EPC plus 2. It was good to see that EPC plus 2 didn't work on the last vote, thank you. But I just wanted to say that the process needs to be changed. I'm not sure that this is the solution. I want to find out what the recommendations are from our consultant in terms of how we govern this city. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do agree with Councillor Eadie that this motion is certainly relevant. It's just a question of timing. And so the point was made that we should await the report by...well the new audit report or governance report. And it may be at that time that we could consider this motion pending what recommendations are made there. Having said that, that doesn't make this motion irrelevant at all. In fact, I will...I hope that the governance report is dealing with these very issues. If not, then I would be the first to say that do we have to revisit this motion. And therefore, what would we be talking about? What is it that is done on the budget committee that

all councillors can't be involved? You know, I know we have our primary responsibility to our ward. We all have primary responsibility to the city. And everybody has to make that decision for themselves. The way I look at it constantly is we are fighting for our piece of the pie as the pie dwindles, and personally, I can't stand it because it's our pie. If there is only one pie to fight for and we can miss the big picture by having councillors involved in the big picture of budgeting, we have to look each other in the eye and deal. Now, I've been accused right on this floor of just being pro Elmwood and East Kildonan. Well, I am pro Elmwood and East Kildonan, but I have always said for the city to work in Elmwood and East Kildonan, the city has to work properly. And if the city isn't functioning properly, then the people of Elmwood and East Kildonan can't be served properly. I want to bring forth a couple of issues that I would bring forth if I was a member of a budget committee. Now bear in mind, five years ago it occurred to me upon election that I didn't want to vie for an EPC position. Being on Council, the way Council ought to work, and being a councillor was good enough for me and I would stand by that to the people that I represent in Elmwood and East Kildonan, that we all have to work together to make the city work and if we don't, our wards aren't going to work for the most part. But it happens to be that there are a few issues that I think are important to my ward that I have stuck my neck out in terms of being priorities for the city. Does that mean that I am doing this above the rest of the city? Well no, because I think it's important to the city that these issues in my ward are being dealt with. As an example, the Louise Bridge is...saying that the Louise Bridge should be a priority for construction, is that being myopic? Is that putting my ward ahead of the city? No. That's a city priority as I see it. That bridge is over a hundred years old. It's the second oldest bridge in the city, and my goodness, if it's not a priority for the city in terms of when we're going to build a new bridge, well, that's what I call the City not working. If we are putting ward…other ward priorities ahead of that, I don't think we're seeing the big picture. That bridge is important to many parts of northeast Winnipeg and I know, for a fact, having stood at the corner there by the bridge, I know a lot of people from the North End and the Maples use it as well to get to St. Vital and Transcona. So that's one issue where something that happens to be in my ward I will promote. I am very aware of it. But to say that that's putting my ward ahead of the city is…it's not true, certainly not my intention, but you would have to prove it to me. Councillor Allard did say that the last major project we're going to do is going to be the Arlington Bridge and we don't know what we're going to do after that. If I put words in his mouth, I apologize. It was a couple of meetings ago. If we do it…if we do it, it would be the last one. It's the last priority, thank you. But what can I say? The Louise Bridge is a priority. Now, there happens to be what might be the worst case in terms of sheer metrics, the worst case of river bank erosion and damage in the city or perhaps the second or third. And that is in front of...it's city…on City property, City-owned property, at 4 Desalaberry in front of the seniors non-profit...seniors apartment. They have been losing land for...one foot per year for over 30 years. And two years ago there is now a chasm increasing every year if not more often, eight feet from the building. So I consider that a city priority. Who wouldn't consider it a city priority? The City owns it. The contract is up with the seniors group in nine years and the Province holds the mortgage on the seniors' centre which is at risk because it's 8 feet from the chasm. Two years ago or a year and a half ago, the chasm was one foot deep, one foot wide. This spring, the chasm was two feet deep, two feet wide. So I'm going to check it this fall. Am I supposed to consider this merely a problem in my ward? Merely a local issue? No, that's City-owned property and that's one of the biggest issues of soil erosion and potential loss of City-owned land that we have in the city. I know they have a way of prioritizing this thing and the matrix they use, does it include the sheer metrics of measurements because they say there is other human judgment involved. That's fine. But I haven't seen that. And we are in a position to build a question that I would say, but in terms of sheer metrics, I want someone to tell me that it isn't...why it isn't a City priority and where does it rank in terms of the sheer metrics of river bank erosion, loss of river bank every year because it is the first major turn of the Red River after the Forks after it meets up with the Assiniboine and the mighty Seine River. So these are issues that I have campaigned on that I have talked about but because they are meant to be dealt with as City priorities, as City issues as the residents of Elmwood and East Kildonan aren't second class citizens and they deserve that representation as part of this budget. I understand right now we don't have the budget and in general we are not putting the priority into river bank stabilization. I understand we are doing that as a city-wide decision and I am willing to say to my…to the...to the people I represent there that we are doing that as a whole but that doesn't mean it's not a priority when we have the money. So these are examples of I believe properly representing your ward, not trying to take a bigger piece of the pie, but trying to make the City work. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Allard followed by Councillor Nason.

Councillor Allard: So first off, thanks to the movers of this motion. I just wanted to share my experiences on EPC, off EPC, and my…some thoughts about the current budget process. I noticed that three is already being implemented so the presentations to...from respective budgets be made available to all members of council and share with my colleagues. I'm currently poring over all of those presentations to try to figure out what I can recommend to Council and to my colleagues in terms of this budget. Is it perfect? No. Is it the best, most transparent process that we have ever had that I have ever seen in the history of this city? I mean, objectively, I think you have to say yes. We are in November, our statutory obligations to pass budget by March 31st. To anyone who wants to meaningfully participate in the elaboration of budget the information is all there, line by line. You can go through every single departmental submission and if the information that you are looking for is not explicitly in that line that you are looking at, you can ask the public service what it means. I have always been able to get information on EPC, off EPC from the public service when I ask the

questions. You know, like when I was starting out, sometimes I didn't really know exactly how to formulate the question that I had to figure out what, you know, it really meant in terms of the day by day operations if I were to support or not support something. So I guess what I want to say is that there is pros and cons to a strong mayor model. If you like what the Mayor is doing, chances are, you support the strong mayor model. If you don't like what the Mayor is doing, perhaps you would prefer a flatter system. So you know, there is pros and cons. I know I engaged heavily with the consultants on the governance review and got into a lot of conversation about, you know, what my thoughts were personally. I hope that you have all done the same. That work is ongoing. So I think we are addressing the…at a high level, the governance issues that many of us have concerns about. The public hearing process, is it the perfect system? Well, definitely not. And I know that that's part of the questions that we are being asked in terms of the governance review. So when…so I voted for almost every budget, but there is one budget I didn't vote for, and the budget that I didn't vote for, Councillor Schreyer or Madam Speaker, to my colleague, Councillor Schreyer, as Councillor Schreyer will recall, the budget that I voted against, I moved motions. I moved a motion that said what I was looking for as the area councillor after poring over the budget documents, I gave a substantive recommendation to my peers and at the time that recommendation wasn't heard. And that, I think, fundamentally was the reason why I ended up not supporting that budget. But what I did when I voted against that budget, and I think what's maybe different than some of my colleagues today is that I offered a substantive recommendation in terms of what would fix the budget for me. And I think we are better placed than ever for that scenario to materialize. If you want to change the budget, the information is all available. You can make those substantive recommendations. And we have months to do it. So I mean, in terms of the proposed budget I think I'm probably one of the most impacted in terms of St. Boniface Ward, of all of us here today, maybe, maybe not. I mean, I'm looking at facility closures specifically. And so I'm actively poring over these documents to try to figure things out. And anyone of us has access to that information. And if you want more access, I mean kudos to my colleague Councillor Lukes, who is interested in the Public Works Committee. She has participated in private briefings with the directors. I am basically committed to making as much time available of the directors as is humanly possible. I know we're all busy, I know the directors are busy. But anyhow, I think we are at a point where this is a way better process than we have ever had if you want to meaningfully participate in the elaboration of the budget. I think all of us have reasons or concerns with the departmental submissions that have been proposed, well now is our opportunity to be able to recommend what changes we will or will not support. So I mean, so we have got a governance review going. We already have point 3 incorporated in the recommendations. If there were charter changes that I would recommend to the City...to the Province of Manitoba, this would definitely not be my top priority. I think there's more material things to consider and to ask the Province of Manitoba about. This wouldn't be my top ask. That's part of why I won't be supporting this motion today. But if I can close, to my colleagues who want more access to the budget process please, just approach your committee chair. Go through the documents. They are all there. You can read them. You can propose changes. You can ask questions. We have several months to do so. So I'll leave the comments of that and kudos to Mayor Bowman and Councillor Gillingham who I think have really objectively given us the best budget process we have ever seen. Is it easy? No. Does the public see the types of decisions that we'd had to make? Well, yes. Is it the first time we have to balance over four years? Well, yes since the time of Glen Murray. And is the structural deficit getting worse? Well, yes it has been because we've essentially been holding the line on taxes for about 16 years since Mayor Susan Thompson. So the problems are getting more and more complicated and harder and harder to resolve. I voted for the multi-year budget and you know, it's a very big task that we have ahead of us, but it's also a huge opportunity to finally vote for a budget that is more sustainable, that addresses some of these structural issues that, I mean, to the credit of Councillor Gillingham, the Mayor, everybody involved, these are not easy conversations to have. Probably the easiest thing would be just to vote for the status quo budget forever and we could get elected forever if we did that, but would we be building a better city? I don't think so. So we are making some really difficult decisions and let's get it done.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Allard. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: This is going to take a lot, but I…you know, in the time that's passed since we put this forward, I want to take a second to acknowledge at least the olive branch that was reached out by Councillor Rollins and Councillor Gilroy with regards to at least a debrief with the departmental officials following their presentations which at committee, we're not able to ask questions at that time. So we have a private, you know, closed-door session to have that. Councillor Rollins one...I had to do a little point of order with regards to...she kept referring to as Council implemented these restrictions with regards to the budget. It's not Council. It was the Mayor and the EPC that put these caveats with regards to the cuts that are coming down. But I do want...you know, Councillor Allard alluded to Councillor Lukes being invited to a meeting. And yeah, on November 7th, his office did offer one to the members of the committee, plus Councillor Lukes. Not all of Council. So it's not inclusive. It's not collaborative. It's selective but I guess we have to ask for those questions and like I say, it was nice that, you know, Councillor Rollins and Councillor Gilroy did offer that olive branch. And I just…I want to thank them for that. We do have differences of opinion. Our avenues to bring stuff forward are through these motions. You may laugh about them. You may say, what the hell are you...sorry. What are you thinking? Sorry for that slip of tongue, Madam Speaker. But...well, it's salty language in my neighbourhood. But anyways, we do have differences of opinion. We have differences of approach. What may have worked in prior councils

might not be what the will of the committee is now. So if it's been reviewed by a community…or a committee or by a councillor in the past, might not be the thinking and approach that the City is looking for now. We have you know, agreements that are now being broken halfway through. So obviously, there is, you know, revision, reminders, change of heart. But as a council, this is where we bring things forward. We have those conversations. We hopefully come to consensus. But it should be in a free and open way to have that. Not a belittling and sometimes I'm guilty of that as well. You know, I was reminded at my rotary meeting about my four way test. And I look at the four approaches that we have. I go, well, sometimes I go this way at this, one might be a stretch, but in the end, I'm hoping that what we are doing here is beneficial for all, Madam Speaker. And we have to work together for the betterment of our city. Right now, our city is crying for help. Our finances appear to be a mess now, even though just a few short months ago they seemed to be great. You know, at some point the half-truth or whatever, the bottom line of our reserves will be exposed and we will know the full picture of our finances. But at this time, Madam Speaker, I do think that at least we're trying to do something to move this city forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Councillor Lukes followed by Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Lukes: I'll be brief. Madam Speaker, we are not party based here at the City of Winnipeg. Budget occurs throughout the year. The development of a budget occurs throughout the year. And as long as there are weekly closed door meetings with handpicked members of council, the dysfunction will continue and in my opinion, poor decisions will be made.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I won't be supporting this motion. Currently we work, of course, under the Winnipeg Charter Act and the Winnipeg Charter clearly spells out that there is an Executive Policy Committee giving kind of roles to the policy committee members. One of the duties of Executive Policy Committee, reading right from the charter, "62(1) the Executive Policy Committee of Council must formally present recommendations to Council respecting policies, plans, budgets, by-laws and other matters that affect the city as a whole." As Councillor Eadie pointed out, we are going…we're into a review of...a governance review that's ongoing right now. We have all had the opportunity, I believe we have all had the opportunity, to participate in a dialogue with the consultant that's doing the review. And as Councillor Allard said, I hope that everyone has taken their opportunity to express their views about the current governance structure under the charter and whether any governance model should change in any way. One of the comments I do want to address, I have heard it a couple of times today is that our finances are fine then suddenly they are not fine or something...I'm paraphrasing. I didn't get it exactly right to my colleagues, I apologize, but I think I have got the spirit of the comment. Couple of things I will note, first of all, so S&P Global just affirmed the City of Winnipeg's ratings on November 15th of 2019. So just affirmed the City's ratings in our view and it says, Winnipeg exhibits strong financial management which supports the ratings. I take no credit for that. Credit really goes ultimately to our administration and they are the ones that provide the continuity. Councillors come and go, you know, in our various roles, but the point of the matter is just on November 15th, S&P affirmed the strong financial management that they view the City with. Adding to that, I'll just note that back in, it was June or July of 2018, I don't remember exactly the Council meeting, but that was the Council meeting that we voted...the previous council, to go to a multi-year budget process. And at that time, and I'll paraphrase my comments if we could go back to the Hansard and see them. I stated with clarity by moving to a multi-year budget process it's going to be difficult. It's going to force Council to make difficult decisions because we're going to be looking at longer term decisions. What we have been doing in the past years of our budget is we have been consistently dealing with a budget a year at a time, an operating budget we balance one year at a time. And what we have been doing is we've been pushing out into the next year, the next year's financial problems. Moving it down the road, we'll deal with it next year. And then we looked at the projections, say, we'll look at the next two years and there is trouble in those years but we'll deal with those next year. By moving to the...this multi-year budget process and looking at four years at a time, we are now dealing with next year's financial problems this year and we are trying to deal with the financial problems of two years from now this year and we're trying to deal with the financial problems three years from now this year. It is a longer term view. It's a longer term challenge. It's a difficult process. And so our financial picture looks different than it's looked before because now we're bringing it all...we're laying it on the table in a public forum not one year at a time, but four years at a time. So rather than saying we are going to project...we'll deal with this year and then we'll just project the deficit of $80 million, $90 million, $100 million in the next year, we're saying that's no longer acceptable. For the sake of long term decision making, we're going to do what we can to balance...not...over four years…not to project big deficits in future years, but to deal with the financial challenges of tomorrow, today for the sake of our citizens, for the sake of longer term planning. We have brought the budget process out into the open. The headlines don't surprise I think a lot of people because what was seen with the budget working groups in the past and those that are…have been on budget working groups can probably attest to this, what was seen in department presentations and some of the difficult things and the dire scenarios is now being seen publicly at our standing policy committees. I acknowledged already. I'll acknowledge again, my appreciation for both Councillor Eadie and Madam Speaker yourself who suggested years ago to make use of the standing policy committees and so we are

trying to do that in a very sincere, open way. Providing Council, this council with more information and more impact than Council has had in the past and we will continue to do that. I think it was Councillor Allard that alluded to the fact that we are relatively early in the budget process on one hand. Councillor did say...it almost never stops throughout the year and that is true. But as far as the formal process this time, we are very early in the process. We've just concluded our presentations from departments and we'll move into the meetings...the standing policy committee meetings where we'll have delegations where members of the public. Now that they have seen the presentations of the departments, can come forward and express their views, their ideas, their opinions. And then ultimately, we'll move to the third meeting for the standing policy committees which will be recommendations. And I do, I hear that councillors are thinking about different ideas and I do ask Council to participate in sincerity in bringing forward ideas for recommendation to the budget process. And so at this point, is it a perfect model? No. Is it a better model than we have had before? I believe that it is. I have already told many of my council colleagues because it's the first time we have done it this way by using the standing committees and doing a four-year process, I have already been thinking about, you know, after we get through the budget, there will be time to talk to everybody and do a post-mortem on this and see what can be improved. But all that to say in a very roundabout way, I won't be supporting the motion that's before us.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I will be very brief. I know it's been a long day for everyone. Firstly, I want to thank the councillors for bringing this forward and of course for the discussion here today. We're very fortunate to have the Finance Chair that we have right now and I hope all members of council and those that are watching these proceedings appreciate that this is someone who consistently denigrates…demonstrates a level of collaboration and integrity that is something I know I and all members of this council appreciate. The new budget process as he has outlined, and I'm not going to go through it in any detail just so we don't have to go through it more than once right now, but I'll just remind everyone here that, Madam Speaker, this flowed out of a strategic planning session that we had, the first one that I attended certainly of its kind since being elected, and was really appreciative of the collaborative spirit that was demonstrated by all members of council at that gathering. Also want to echo words of appreciation for you, Madam Speaker and for Councillor Eadie who had approached me also to suggest that one way in which there is an existing open and transparent mechanism for members of council to be better engaged in the budget process was through the standing policy committees. And so I want to thank everyone including the Clerks and of course the public service for that work which is ongoing right now. I also remind everyone, we do have council briefings. I think they are a useful tool to disseminate information. I know the Chair of the Police Board has briefings which we're not privy to and I think that's appropriate that those briefings would occur. I'm hearing now that there are briefings that have been offered by members of various committees that I was not invited to, Madam Speaker and I take no issue with that. I think that having those briefings are certainly helpful to have the level of collaboration that we all so desire. And I trust also the movers of this motion also met privately to discuss it before it came out. That level of dialogue and collaboration is something that we should welcome, Madam Speaker, and I'm very pleased that we have made some significant positive strides to the budget process which will absolutely be reviewed and improved upon going forward. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, point of order. The Mayor just indicated that he wasn't invited. He was invited.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. That is not a point of order though. Thank you. Councillor Nason...Councillor Nason. Or pardon me. Councillor Klein, do you wish to close on the notice of motion? Did you want to speak to the item? You've already…

Councillor Nason: It's a factual correction, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Don't challenge the Chair at 4**:**00 p.m. Councillor Klein, do you wish to close on this motion?

Councillor Klein: Sure. As always, when I come to these meetings I am invigorated about our debate and what we accomplish as city councillors. Look, here is the realities that I have to talk about with this. We have had 6 years to change the process. We have not. Now we are, however, I will point out that this is not the first time ever as Councillor Allard said that we have done this type of consultation. The public has always been allowed to come to a standing policy meeting and watch the budget presentations and to give a statement if they so wish and they could if the information was actually put up online before the meeting. I want to talk about specifically, the...and I guess one question I will ask of our Finance Chair about the stabilization fund. I'd like to be clear about the charter. The charter does not...has been changed several times by this council. We have sent the letter and got...requested it and it was changed. I will point out that the charter does not allow Winnipeg City Council to have a four year budget. Please write that down. I have had my discussion with my colleague about that. True, we do not have that right, and we will have to come back year after year and vote on the budget. So let's not be misleading. Let's be clear that this is a four year forecast. I am fine with that. It's

a good idea. Let's have a four year forecast, but the fact remains that interest is a big part of the City of Winnipeg budget. We have to pay interest. We have big debt. Interest rates change without any…you know, notice and our interest rates could change as well somewhere down the road and we're going to have to address that. I would also you know, point out that line by line that we see...quite frankly, I wish everyone here...I mean if you look at a budget that is at least...let's just say it's over $500,000, line by line, is not four or five PowerPoint pages about other. We have this, this, this, this, other. Or it's not a number of staff that don't actually work there. The number of staff we would like to have, but we'll just use that money for something else. The governance survey; it came up, let me talk about it. Yes, I had a very engaging conversation with the person who interviewed me and in fact, I said to the interviewer, if he actually felt the questions that were being posed would be considered a factual representation of how councillors felt about the EPC model. No, I don't think that. Thank you. And then I asked, because I have heard, I can't obviously substantiate this, we always hear lots of rumours, but there was actually some governance work being done to consider the Winnipeg City Council going…City Council changing to 12 Councillors. And he confirmed that yes, as he is aware, that is also being looked at. Interesting, I don't know what that has to do with government so why are we hiding it. The reality is this; this is the real problem. It's sad that some of us sit here and believe what we are being shown is a budget. That we actually look at it and go, yep, this is a budget. Not to mention that it's a billion dollar budget. We don't ask questions line by line, category by category at best. Please talk to an accountant. Don't take my word for it. I know you don't. Don't, I know you are told not to. Don't. Go ask an accountant. Show them the budget. Show them the budget book. Get your own opinion because that's the real problem. I don't know how any organization of this value and of this importance can budget like we do and can…and first of all, can budget without a real strategic plan. I mean, that meeting we had, I don't even want to talk about that. I mean, we know that that…we are not supposed to talk about it so I don't know how we're allowed to say it was great. But if we are going to talk about it, no, no it wasn't. That was in a strategy meeting. So we didn't do much there that would help taxpayers. So I would just implore people to say look, if you don't want to include everybody on the budget, you're going to have to ask yourself why because residents are going to want to know. You have half, almost half of the people that are paying the bill that are really not included. And we are accepting what we get as a real budget. So it's your vote. I respect that and you know, I wish I had more quotes from Councillor Orlikow to use but I'll keep searching.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And with that we will vote on this notice of motion. All in favour? Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Klein Lukes, and Nason

Nays

Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

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

Madam Speaker: Notice of motion is lost. We will now move on to by-laws under Executive Policy Committee. Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law 87/2019, By-law 88/2019, By-law 89/2019, By-law 90/2019, By-law 91/2019, By-law 92/2019, By-law 93/2019, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 87/2019, By-law No. 88/2019, By-law No. 89/2019, By-law No. 90/2019, By-law No. 91/2019, By-law No. 92/2019 and By-law No. 93/2019.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor on the second reading.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the By-laws numbered 87/2019 to 93/2019 both inclusive be read a second time.

Councillor Eadie: I need clarification. Just a point of order or point of privilege I guess.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: The By-law number regarding the…

Madam Speaker: The police pension?

Councillor Eadie: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: What number is that?

Madam Speaker: And of course, you would catch that. We are not voting on it. It's By-law 86/2019. We are not voting on it today. We will be voting on it at the December Council meeting. It will be ready at that time because of the amendments that were proposed today. Thank you.

Clerk: By-laws No. 87/2019 to 93/2019 both inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Okay Mr. Mayor, I think we are on the third reading now.

Mayor Bowman: Okay. Thank you. I move that the…

Councillor Gillingham: Did we vote on the…did we call the question on the second reading?

Madam Speaker: The second reading? Let's call it again, doesn't hurt. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor on the third reading.

Mayor Bowman: Yeah, no problem. Thank you. I move that the rule be suspended and By-law Nos. 87/2019 to 93/2019 both inclusive be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will now have question period for the Mayor. Thirty minutes on the clock, please. Councillor Eadie.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. So I have...regarding the governance review, Madam Speaker, I...you know, I have...I campaigned quite a bit and been involved in the politics at the city level for quite a long time, although not elected but I have ran in wards that have changed and have a lot of experience related to you know what number might be workable. I distinctly recall at the time when city council was considering the iteration we're living by right now in the 90s when we got...afterwards we got rid of the commissioner, so but I just heard in the commentary that somebody or people were being consulted about the proper number of wards and stuff and my question, Madam Speaker, is was the Mayor aware that Councillors were not consulted about boundaries and numbers and...well, not necessarily boundaries but the number of people and the bigger overall democracy, part of the governance that we weren't consulted. Is the Mayor aware of that?

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

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker if I understand the question, there is a governance review that's under way. I know a number of us have met with the consultant to provide our input. I hope and trust all members of council have provided their input. I, too, was curious about the comments just made on the floor of council. It's the first I heard of that and I would ask that Councillor Eadie may want to direct his question to the member of council who made those comments for clarity.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any further questions? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Follow…I'll ask it but just a question. Has the Mayor been consulted by our consultants and what line of questioning did he answer that they were asking?

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Well, I provided my answers to the consultant when those questions were raised but to this question, I provided positive input and I hope he did as well, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Final question, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. In 2015, what advice did the Mayor get about maintaining the quality services that the City of Winnipeg has now?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Sorry, Madam Speaker, perhaps the member of council can clarify from whom he is referring. As council, we all receive advice through standing policy committees.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, could you be more specific, please? Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. From the CFO.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, all members of council receive financial updates from our CFO through the Finance Committee as well as through Finance Chair. We have known for many years that there is a structural operating deficit. My member of parliament now who is providing his public service now in a different form and I want to congratulate Councillor Marty Morantz on his election. He…certainly in my time and I can speak to my time in office over the last five years, both he and our current Finance Chair have been saying for many, many years that the current structural operating deficit, the growing gap between expenditures and revenues is something that requires additional leadership and focus by members of council as well as the public service. Our current Finance Chair is providing that leadership and I believe all members of council and I are also providing that leadership to provide the structures and the debates and input that we're having right now on a difficult budget. And the…I'm also…would like to point out words of appreciation for our Finance Chair's efforts, our interim CFO as well as our interim CAO for their ongoing work and their team's ongoing work to maintain a very stable credit rating.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Now that we have dispensed the…with the matter pertaining the police pensions, I'm wondering if the Mayor could possibly outline now if his next step would be to open up the collective bargaining agreement with the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service and deal with the matter pertaining to the union president's salary.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I would welcome a motion from Councillor Nason to that effect. I am not one as a taxpayer that is pleased with the arrangement that taxpayer dollars are being used to pay a union leader's work. I think those should come as they do, and my understanding from other...in other cases from the union dues and memberships themselves. But I'm not sure. Perhaps Councillor Nason could let me know what advocacy he has provided to deal with the inequity that he's raising here today in his conversations with Mr. Forrest.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason. Councillor Klein. Pardon me.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Through you, the Mayor had mentioned the Police Board has briefings that nobody else is invited to. I am not aware of those so maybe I am one of those people that were not invited. But I will…I would like to ask the Mayor now that we are on the topic of that if he can confirm or deny that in fact his staff and members of the administration receive all confidential police briefings.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, when there are critical incidents historically, the Chair of the Police Board has provided me with that information. Certainly that has occurred with the previous Police Board Chair. I think the last time I received such critical incident from the current chair was in April of this year. And so I certainly will receive updates from time to time from the Police Board Chair but I haven't received any recently, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you.

Councillor Klein: Madam Speaker, that doesn't answer the question though.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: …answer the first question?

Madam Speaker: The Mayor can answer…the Mayor can answer how he wishes. Second question, please.

Councillor Klein: Oh, it's question period not answer period. Okay. Then I would like to ask the Mayor what will happen now that I understand in court today, the court charges that I saw online last night anyways, the supplementary briefs that were submitted includes evidence that a member of our PP and D staff has admitted now under discovery that he filed an affidavit that wasn't factual. Will the Mayor now hold a council briefing and update all council members on the risk of that case?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, if member of council is referring to an active court matter, I don't think it's appropriate to be commenting at this time on a matter that is before the courts. I think we need to put the best interests of the City of Winnipeg and taxpayers first and foremost. So I'm not going to be providing comment on a matter that is before the courts this time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Klein, I'm moving on to Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thanks, Madam Speaker. The question is did the CFO in 2015 advise you that in order to maintain quality services you would need to raise property taxes 6 percent a year.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, the only person I have heard consistently say that they didn't want to jack up property taxes around this council chamber is Councillor Eadie.

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

Councillor Eadie: That is correct and we should do it in a prudent way absolutely, Madam Speaker. So did the Mayor advise his promise to maintain quality service, was he told existing quality service, was he not explained to him that it would take a 6 percent tax increase to do and maintain that quality of service to Winnipeggers?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, every year, members of council ultimately have the discretion and have dialogue with members of the public service as well as with each other and the public about the options of dealing with expenditures or revenues and there are various ways in which council can do that. One option as Councillor Eadie has advocated for is increasing property taxes. That is his right and a position that he has been consistent in. Others are to better control expenditures. And all members of council continue to have dialogue with members of the public service with each other and the public on various options. Those decisions ultimately are made by Council and I have a proven track record over the last five years of supporting a dedicated 2.33 percent property tax increase. I'm very proud of that. I do look at a number of our residents who are living paycheque to paycheque who are just getting by and the prospect of increasing property taxes further, to me, causes great concern about their ability to pay. There is far too many people that are just getting by. And so I appreciate and I respect the councillor's position on tax increases as a member of council obviously that's his right and I know he will continue to advocate for that as is his ability as a member of council. But my position has been and one I've been consistent with as well and it was consistent going into the last election, I made a commitment to Winnipeggers and I'm going to continue to support that position.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Final question, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Final question, Madam Speaker, in the previous answer, does that mean the Mayor supports my hundred dollar property tax credit for those people who are having the harder time making ends meet?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, that is a matter that I would like to have further dialogue with Councillor Eadie on. I understand that it's going to be considered by committee and look forward to the discussion and debate. It's one, like all ideas here that I will certainly keep an open mind to but do I have significant concerns about it at first blush and so I am unlikely to support it, but I do want to do my due diligence and have some further dialogue and analysis to better understand what in fact is being proposed, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any further questions? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think it was last year, it came to public attention that part of the salary for the president of the firefighters union was being paid for by the City of Winnipeg…by, directly by taxpayers' money. However, we were told that the administration didn't know why. It's my understanding the administration didn't know why that was so. How it happened. It's a standard practice in jurisdictions throughout the western world is my understanding, there is reasons for it. I would like to know if the Mayor is aware if the administration finally found out why it was in the agreement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I believe there was correspondence from the administration to members of council on this matter. I can double check if that was accurate and ask for an update to be provided to all members of council. That's something that Councillor Schreyer could also make that request as well directly to the public service through our CAO.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Any further questions? Seeing none, that concludes our question period. Next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Mayes.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 4, 2019

Councillor Mayes: I will move the report of September 4th, 2019 and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 6 and 7.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all in favour? Pardon me? Okay. I'll call the question on 6. All in favour? Contrary. Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 7 – Amendment to the Airport Vicinity Protection Area Secondary Plan By-Law No. 6378/94 Properties Identified Generally along the West Side St. James Street between Portage Avenue and Sargent Avenue

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes to introduce Item 7.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, these are…6 and 7 are similar. This is the long debated...you heard several hours ago a couple of speakers on this issue of the importance of maintaining 24-hour operation status at the airport. Conversely, there is a request by certain developers to densify certain areas as laid out in the maps that you would see at 6 and 7. The plan as it currently stands is to refer that to the relevant community committee for first hearing. I think Councillor Orlikow made it excruciating, abundantly clear at EPC that while he was voting to refer procedurally, that did not in any way mean he was supportive…perhaps I'm stealing your speech, supportive of the content or the proposals I echoed those comments. It's more of a procedural moving the thing along rather than any sort of judgment about the 24-hour status or the potential merits of the two proposals here.

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

Councillor Gillingham: For the sake of ease, I'd like to copy and paste Councillor Mayes' comments. Basically I find myself in a position, I think I have been pretty clear at several committees my position on this. I stand here today to

support this...I will be supporting this going forward procedurally. And in due course then, if passed, then a hearing would be held and it would be at that time, you know, that the merits of any proposal can be looked at, discussed, two sides, all sides can be heard as is part of the process. So I am supportive today of moving this process along and I have said before that I frankly wish that some of what we contemplated doing...or I think you know, should have been done a few years ago as far as analyzing the overall plan, the airport vicinity plan should have been done but that's not where we're at. That's water under the bridge. We have a decision before us today, so I'm supportive of the decision to move the process along.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. It seems sort of long ago now that we heard from the delegations on this point, Madam Speaker. And I agreed with much of the analysis that they presented in terms of the flexible plans that would help us respond in a timely way to what is our changing environment. And every time that people from the airport came before us in committee to date, they have asked us to recognize that rapid technological change in vicinity planning and the technical advancements and really gather around that to produce something important and special that doesn't result in unintended consequences on the economic development, economic benefits for Winnipeg and really beyond. So but that being said, I think sometimes both things can be true and with that I will be supporting it moving forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much. I, too, will support it going to community committee because of process. However, I'm perplexed at why we are waiting…or why we're looking to EDW to provide facts and figures and what their involvement really is because I would think that that's our decision as a council and that's why we were elected. I'm concerned and I am confused why we are not or at least some of us not putting a push on for resolution and trying to find the most beneficial way forward so that we can enjoy both. If we are hearing that that's possible, obviously there is a conflict somewhere and maybe we have people involved that are not able to do this or not in the position to do this and is that not why we are here for? I mean, we are here to promote the city. We're here to bring business. We are here to help it grow and we're here to modernize as I heard earlier today. So let's modernize our approach and become actively involved in the process and see if we can't fix that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Klein. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: I will be supporting this going forward. I think it's really important that new members of council and some of the former members of council if they weren't able to, to really learn a bit more about CentrePort. As a matter of fact, I will personally make an effort to organize an orientation for Council with Diane Grey. What's happening with CentrePort and the south perimeter and the St. Norbert bypass, Winnipeg, the City, the Province and the Feds are positioning Winnipeg to develop…to be developed into a multimodal global distribution hub which has many, many implications that I know people don't really understand. This will come to a committee of three members to hold the public hearing at. The system currently is set up so that that committee hears it because it happens to be in that area. This is a massive decision that ultimately will be made for the betterment of the City and the Province and I really encourage all members of council to become more educated on this. It's not the same but it is similar in one way that the rapid transit corridor and infill development along the corridor in certain sections are only responsible...or only occur due to the committees where that section lands, which again, the City as a whole is making this $400 million investment and I'm sometimes challenged on why certain committees can make decisions along the corridor, it is the system we operate under, but we're all paying into this. So I will take it upon myself to organize an orientation with CentrePort, so you can really understand what's going on out in the west part of Winnipeg.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, I didn't really want to speak to it but I'm rising actually in support of moving it to the committee. Madam Speaker, you know, my problem with the presentation from the Airport Authority as well as Economic Development Winnipeg is this; you know, there was some controversy about what we could build on the old stadium lot as it relates to this. There is property all around the airport, Madam Speaker, that…and CentrePort property, that's been in play for years, years. To actually hear them come and say they need to stall this till they have the proper information to come forward in a hearing blows my mind, Madam Speaker. Like…like what's going on? Like…since I became a city councillor, I heard about CentrePort. Some of the other developments that have happened around there happened, you know, later on, Madam Speaker. But I think it is proper for it to go through and it is the community committee. Yeah, you may not like it but actually, Madam Speaker, I can actually attend in delegation to the hearing as the city councillor from Mynarski over at their community committee meeting. There is nothing stopping me from going there to speak about that. So...and there is nothing stopping you, Madam Speaker, if you would like to. But you know, I would point out that I trust in my colleagues. They were elected by the people. They are...and I know that community

committee, they are very conscious of economic development and all that. And they have a lot of their own background and expertise in these kind of things to be considering hearings of such thing. If Economic Development Winnipeg can't get their act together after how many years, and the Airport Authority after how many years, like it just blows my mind. But we, Madam Speaker, as you know on the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee, we are making some decisions and hearings about employment lands, King Edward, north of Inkster, is kind of a weird defining area but it is adjacent to CentrePort. And we had hearings on that, what was to be developed and so on and so forth. And we moved that forward up to Council after that. And so the Property and Development Committee does get to take a second look at whatever decisions come out of the hearings at those committees. And then ultimately it goes on to Council, Madam Speaker. So I just think this does need to move forward. It's time to resolve the issues in this neighbourhood, and that's it. Thanks.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am struck by one thing. The talk of...two things standing in contrast today; lamentations about the results of prior civic elections, I was still in Brandon so I didn't vote in that by-election back in '04, but you know, you sit here and things prior to 2014. This was in the Mayor's comment today, but you know, lamentations about that and yet here we are debating the U-Pass later today. We're debating the bus rapid transit later today. We're debating road policy, the 1 percent, 2 percent dedicated to road modernization and renewal. So I have to think some of the things that I voted for prior to 2014 actually stand up pretty well. So this is another attempt to modernization. I have no idea how it will play out at Assiniboia Community Committee. I am pleased to finally be moving it off of this shelf on to someone else's agenda though. And I look forward to a robust discussion from the community committee on this item.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. With that, I will call the question on Item 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We just need to go back to an item. There is a motion…notice of motion on our desks. It is my error earlier. We didn't get to it under the EPC section. I was distracted with Councillor Eadie's point of order there about our by-laws. So it's the Motion 3. It's a notice of motion that was moved by Councillor Nason and seconded by Councillor Schreyer regarding photo enforcement and it will be on next month's Council agenda for December. That's Motion 3. It was circulated this morning. Now moving on, Councillor Mayes, for the next report under your committee.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS on December 12, 2012, City Council awarded a contract for the supply, installation and operation of photo enforcement program to ACS Public Sector Solutions Inc. for the period from January 1, 2013 to May 31, 2020;

AND WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba enacted legislation in 2002 to enable stationary and mobile photo enforcement which was designed to improve safety on streets by enforcing posted speed limits;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg is the only municipality in Manitoba to use photo enforcement;

AND WHEREAS the effectiveness of photo enforcement and whether it's improved safety on streets has been questioned;

AND WHEREAS on November 13, 2019, the Province of Manitoba announced that the government will conduct a comprehensive review of the photo enforcement system in the province;

AND WHEREAS the review will assess how photo enforcement is used, where it is used and whether or not it is improving road safety as it was designed to do.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council hold in abeyance any renewal, extension or approval of the supply, installation and operation of a photo enforcement program, until such time as the Province of Manitoba releases the results of its comprehensive review of the photo enforcement system.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED OCTOBER 28, 2019**

Councillor Mayes: I'll move the report of October 28th, 2019 and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 4 inclusive.

Madam Speaker: So we have 4 pulled. Any others? I'll call the question on 1, 2 and 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 4 – List of Historical Resources – Nomination of Trees-Spriggs Building, 312 Ross Avenue

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes to introduce the item.

Councillor Mayes: I look forward to hearing comments pertaining to this item and may wish to close.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Chair. I want to stand because this is a…one of those examples where we're going to designate a building and some of the inside interior. And you'll recall, it wasn't that long ago that the PP and D committee did put through a heritage status on the Bay that they were asking us not to do. And we felt that that would have absolutely no impact on that location and we read a…or I read a story the other day in the Winnipeg Free Press that quotes our very own CentreVenture as saying, the building is far too old and is worthless and needs to come down. And now of course, we know that the Bay has had it officially appraised at $0 and said that there is no way economically for them to continue with that building. So I'm just wondering, shall we take a moment and re-think some of our processes moving forward on heritage buildings knowing now that that building may or may not sit empty for a very long time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Klein. Seeing no further speakers, Councillor Mayes, do you wish to close? I'll call the question on Item 4. All in favour?

Councillor Klein: Opposed.

Madam Speaker: Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Klein: Opposed. Can I be recorded as opposed, please?

Madam Speaker: That has been noted, thank you.

Councillor Klein: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: We'll now move onto by-laws under this committee. Councillor Mayes.

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

Councillor Mayes: Madam Clerk, you're first or am I first? Very good. Somewhat unusual, we're only doing first reading on this first set. So I'll move the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 48/2019, By-law No. 49/2019.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 48/2019, By-law No. 49/2019.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

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

Councillor Mayes: It's not the usual ballet then on these other ones. So I'll move the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 77/2019, By-law 78/2019, By-law 79/2019, By-law No. 95/2019.

Madam Speaker: Was that for third reading? Three reading. Yeah, okay, great. Thank you Councillor Mayes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 77/2019, By-law No. 78/2019, By-law No. 79/2019 and By-law No. 95/2019.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move that By-law Nos. 77/2019 to 79/2019 both inclusive and 95/2019 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 77/2019 to 79/2019 both inclusive and 95/2019.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 77/2019 to 79/2019 both inclusive and 95/2019 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 under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Mayes? Seeing none, let's move on. Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED NOVEMBER 1, 2019**

Councillor Rollins: Thank you Madam Speaker. I want to introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Item 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Rollins? Okay next committee, Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Allard.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED NOVEMBER 4, 2019**

Councillor Allard: I think likely have some questions on 2, so if I could pull that and move Consent…okay, 3 has been pulled. So move 1 and 4. So I'll move 1…Consent Agenda 1.

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

Item 2 – Negotiation of U-Pass Agreements with University of Manitoba, University of Winnipeg and Red River College

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yeah, so I just wanted to maybe make a pitch on this to Council. So as you may be aware, if you've seen the Public Works presentation, the Transit budget is currently facing an over $40 million shortfall in capital in their budget. The low-income pass is not included in the budget submission. Heated bus shelters have been cut.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, are you speaking…are you introducing the item?

Councillor Allard: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Allard: Should I speak to it or…?

Madam Speaker: Well, you sound like you're speaking to the overall budget. Are you speaking to the item here?

Councillor Allard: Right, so the U-Pass is in the budget and this is the policy around the U-Pass.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Allard: Did you want me to…

Madam Speaker: Well, you sounded like you were getting into the low-income pass and other items. So go ahead.

Councillor Allard: Well, so as councillors are aware, expenses that are related to one program sometimes impact expenses in that same budgetary line. Therefore, I'm pre-empting some questions, which I'm sure some of my colleagues may have about, you know, should we be supporting this report at this time given the substantial budget shortfall that we're seeing in terms of the capital submission…or the budget submission from the Transit Department that has over $40 million in unsecured capital to basically keep our status quo implementation of our transit system. So I wanted to make that point in that I think the concerns that I have heard from colleagues around the U-Pass at this time, around our budgetary capacity to support this program, I would encourage councillors to support this. It was unanimously supported at Public Works. It does lay out the foundation of if the monies were available for the U-Pass in the multi-year budget process. This is how we would go about doing it. And so I see as many of my colleagues do I think see that there is, you know, there are policy votes and there's budget votes, and the U-Pass as in its current implementation is in the current four year budget submission as it is a budget neutral submission based on prior years, and so this U-Pass proposal is….has essentially…has the same mill rate support as what we saw in last year's budget. And that is part of the reason why it is in the current budget submission. All that being said, there are many considerations that pertain to whether or not we might want to support U-Pass in the budget or not. I would encourage my colleagues to support this U-Pass policy as presented knowing that if we were to make changes to the budget submission, they could be made and it could…if it is the will of Council, include or not include the U-Pass program. So I am pre-empting some questions that I expect might be asked from some of my colleagues and fundamentally, we can vote for the U-Pass policy today, and if we find that the budget is not available or that there's other priorities in the budget process, we can make those changes at a later date. So please support the policy today and please let's have a budgetary discussion tomorrow. Well, tomorrow being a figurative term, in terms of not today. In the future. Yeah, thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: I guess I don't know who pulled the report down, but I am supporting this report because, I mean, there is a cost to deliver certain kind of passes and programs. And so in speaking to this, I am wondering, there was no pre-emption of the question…of what I was wondering is, with having to raise the amount of money for the students' payment for a U-Pass, will the value of…that they are paying be close to or similar to what we were proposing to do for the people at low income? And I will be supporting it as it is.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I just want it noted, the earliest reference I can find to the U-Pass is the motion that came out of here February 26th, 2014 that I believe you supported, I supported, I think Councillor Orlikow and a few others, perhaps here, Councillor Eadie supported. This is an issue we have worked on in previous council and in this council. But I did want to point out this actually dates back to former Mayor Katz's period and to, I think, Councillor Vandal might have been Chair of Infrastructure still at that point. Not sure of that. But in any event, it's been something we have implemented I think with some considerable success. And hopefully, we can continue to implement it with this council, but certainly 2015 there was an important vote here that was 13-3 in favour. And back in 2014, February 2014, this first got going. So I just wanted to note that some previous councils have done some good work on this file and hopefully we can, as Councillor Allard has said, keep that program going.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Mayes. Any further speakers? Seeing none, back to you, Councillor Allard, if you wish.

Councillor Allard: Just to close, I think there was a question with Councillor Eadie. I can confirm that the current U-Pass support levels, if they are implemented the way that this report is suggesting, would be in fact deeper than the full implementation of the low-income bus pass which would have at the end of the program, an implementation of $50 cost, whereas the U-Pass is as described here would be less expensive than that. We heard the student body here earlier today talking about some of the benefits. It is a universal program so that means a number of people from the student unions are purchasing passes. They may or may not be using them. So I think in terms of fair products, it is…you know, the students are bringing something to the table. And so I think that it is important to recognize that. The reason why the student bodies have not supported at this time is that the fee would increase for their students. And so it is understandable to see them in delegations. I have encouraged the students, you know, please take this deal. It is a good deal. And so we will see if they do or not because they do need to go to referendum. But in terms of this report, it is neutral in terms of having the same mill rate support as last budget. We are bringing in a new institution with about 7,000 new students. So that is the reason why there is an adjustment in the cost for keeping the mill rates for the same, but we are bringing in 7,000 new riders as long as everybody says yes. So yes, there isn't harmony on the low-income pass. There's currently a transit master plan study looking at all fares and there's going to be recommendations there. We currently have a complicated fare structure that has different fees for different demographic groups. We have a cheaper rate for seniors, students, kids under six are free. Kids between six and twelve pay a different rate. Anyway, there's a whole lot of different deals, depending on where you are at in life and so we are, through the transit master plan, re-evaluating that fare structure. And so in terms of the program, it's been a great program for mode shift. As council is aware, we have a goal of reducing mode shift to 50% by 2030. There is a whole lot of work to get to that point. We are not at 50% mode shift. Mode shift is people using…choosing to take passenger vehicle trips. Mode shift is essentially not driving alone in your car. So if you are a passenger, if you're using active transportation, biking, walking or busing, you are choosing mode shift. This is a tremendous program for mode shift not only in terms of university students using the bus today, but also university students getting into the pattern of using a bus as a lifestyle for the future. So a very important program and we'll have to talk…if it passes today, we'll have to talk about...if it passes today, if it gets passed by the various referendums with the student bodies, we will have to decide where it fits within the budget process. So I think that addresses the questions and comments that have been made today.

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

Item 3 – Southwest Transitway Route Network.

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

Councillor Allard: So I didn't pull this, but since somebody did, I would like to speak to this. So this southwest transit route network which is part of the budget submission as I understand it, you can see the financial implications. It is…it is almost...well, I don't know if we can officially call it a first phase of the transit master plan implementation, but it is something like what you might see with a full transit master plan implementation. For those of you who may not have had the chance, please check out the maps, please check out the consultation being proposed by our public service. Several members of our public service that I have talked to are excited about the revolutionary nature, the game-changing nature of this transit master plan. We are moving from a hub and spoke network where all the buses go to Portage and Main and from Portage and Main, all the buses go from there to whatever destination and they're re-writing the entire network to look at a frequent…a rapid and frequent service network. So there is going to be, if passed…implemented, there's going to be frequent service on rapid transit routes like Main, Portage, other streets and there's going to be frequent transit routes like, I mean, Provencher. It's the one I retained. It's in St. Boniface Ward. Very close to my house. It is going to be I think the transit system that had we done it before rapid transit, which you know, I am not going to cry over spilled milk. I think rapid transit is moving the city into 21st century in terms of transit. And we're going to see it implemented with southwest transit network if we vote to adopt it today. I just want to stress how this is really a game changer. And I don't think people have noticed yet how much of a change is being proposed. I think we will probably really start getting calls when the changes actually happen. Councillor Lukes I think said some municipalities put a bulldozer up at specific construction sites to get people's attention. Well, we are not going to do that. I am not sure it would be effective in this particular case. But all that to say, the transit master plan, and this is sort of a micro implementation of that, is a fundamental rewrite of the transit system, and it's…it may be difficult to bring online because we are reorganizing the whole network. So somebody who was used to taking a bus to a specific location may find that their bus is not coming there anymore. But I think once people start using the system and when we start seeing the efficiency increases of having a rapid transit…a frequent service network as opposed to a hub and spoke model, I think we're going to be able to deliver a way better product for the dollars that we are putting into the system. Just a final note, the current budget submission as it pertains to this, my understanding is that it includes the southwest transit route

network but it does not include the other quadrants of the city. So even if we can restore the over $40 million in capital into the transit system to get a status quo implementation of transit in terms of how Winnipeggers are used to using it, we're going to need to find additional dollars at some point in the future if we want to fully implement the transit master plan. And that might mean adjustments to this southwest route corridor if we can't find the dollars for the whole network. So that's this report in the context of the budget and the context of the transit master plan. It really is going to be if we can find the money, well, whether we can find the money or not, it is going to be transformative. It's going to make transit a lot better with the resources that we're putting into it. I hope that we can find a way to at least get to a full implementation of the transit master plan or get to a point where, you know, we are close to the vision that's being presented by our public service because it is pretty awesome if you picture what it might be. So thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Allard. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. I will be brief. I want to thank Councillor Allard for his leadership. I also want to thank members of council. Specifically I understand there was extensive dialogue with Councillor Lukes, Councillor Mayes and Councillor Chambers and many others, Councillor Orlikow. There are a number of wards being affected by these changes, and this is absolutely a positive step forward in our ongoing desire to make improvements to public transportation in the City of Winnipeg. I am looking forward to traveling down the blue line when it is operational in April of next year. And I'm extremely grateful for the work of the contractors and all those involved in making sure that this major project came in under budget, and I believe ahead of schedule. There were major improvements to obviously road network, but these specifically relate to the fact that we've built the second phase rapid transit building on the positive work of the previous administration for phase one, and ultimately the network…the scope of network changes that are contemplated here are the most significant I can remember. I have often referred to transit, and again, not to disparage the good work of everybody involved, but it really has been your grandma and grandpa's transit system, certainly from a routing system. And we want to move it, obviously, to build it for us and our kids. And making changes to routes where routes are being canceled, in particular, does take political courage. I want to commend the work of the committee and members of council who've been working collaboratively to support these changes. Anytime, like we have seen here today, anytime you affect changes, they are difficult. I'm looking forward to seeing how this rolls out and getting the feedback and hearing that from my council colleagues and the public service and from riders on how it is working and seeing if adjustments are necessary. But I just want to say, I am very excited about this. It is a positive step forward and I want to thank everybody involved for their work today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Two things, briefly. Good to hear terms like 'awesome' and 'visionary' used to describe the second phase of BRT. I want to thank a couple of our City staff, Mr. Sturgeon, Mr. Radstrom from Transit who sat down and talked me through the one proposed change or the two route changes in St. Vital and we worked out some glitches there. So I want to thank those members of the public service. But also, for clarity, there was a very controversial vote here in 2013 about whether to proceed with the second phase of BRT. The last council voted on how to fund it. That is certainly true. And that was a decision made, I think correctly, under Mayor Bowman. But it was the council before that which some disparage, the council before that under Councillor Wyatt leading the Finance Committee and others, Councillor Vandal I believe leading Infrastructure Committee that we decided to go ahead and do a second phase of BRT. You of course were here, Madam Speaker, and voted for that. So it's…it is I think a game changer for the southwest part of the city and hopefully is a precursor of what we might be able to do if there is provincial or federal funding available in the future. But certainly, phase one pre-dated me, I think pre-dated you, Madam Speaker. But pleased in that period in 2013 to vote for continuing with the progress and vote for BRT. It was a 9-6 vote. I remember that. So fairly closely run affair. But pleased to have supported that and pleased to see it heading toward opening with some terrific public art projects as part of that and look forward to those opening next year. Thank you.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. Yes, this is going to be transformational for transit. It's going to absolutely change transit in Winnipeg. This is a very exciting time. I do want to make a note of caution, and I want to bring this to the attention I have already, but I would like to put this on the record. It's interesting, we've got tens of thousands of people riding the current transit system in south Winnipeg, yet only 1,000 people participated in the public engagement strategy or the public engagement on the actual routes being proposed. So when you think about that, I think we all just heard recently that 2,000 people have been involved in the impact consultation process. This is only 1,000 people. So I know that probably, very confidently could say that there will be route changes coming up. But I guess my point I want to make is that I do believe the public engagement process was very poorly conducted, very poorly delivered, and I think going forward there should be no surprises when there is a lot of outcry about the routes that are being proposed. I know the department has worked very hard on it. But when you only have 1,000 people giving you input, you are going to get

an interesting level of input when the routes actually change, there will be a lot more input, and we'll be hearing about it. And I am looking forward to accommodating the changes. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Lukes. Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise. I am in support of this report. It is running late, Madam Speaker. But I just thought I would bring a perspective from a transit user to our council. So Often I get invited and since I've been elected since 2010, but even before that, you know, they always say I am kind of confined to having to mostly use transit, but often in my previous life I was a business owner. I would have to travel all over the city, Madam Speaker. My method of transportation was, for the most part, transit, because I couldn't afford to take taxis if I was in a rush, so it was always a bus. Anyway, I had the occasion in…during my first term, I believe, it might even have been in the second term, to have to travel over to just south of McGillivray near Kenaston to attend to some business and do some things. And I can't remember the route number that I had to transfer on to, but Madam Speaker, it was the craziest route. It wasn't great. It was on a lot of roads that I know Councillor Orlikow knew needed to get repaired and so on, but and have been improved over time. But with the...as I was looking through this report, I'm just…I'm trying to remember the route number, but anyway, I noted that there was change to this route that will make it much better to get to your destination if you're trying to get from Pembina over to Kenaston. Actually, Kenaston, if you want a bus that actually goes down, you know the…anyway, I don't want to go there. That is not what is the question right now, but it is great to get to Kenaston when there's not a lot of buses running up and down Kenaston along spaces. But…so I digress. But I know that there are definite improvements that are coming to the routes and some people might be a little upset because they become a little bit dependent on a certain place where a certain route might take you, and those…and how close it comes to you, how far you got to walk to get to a stop and so on and so forth. They'll…you'll hear some of those issues, Madam Speaker. But ultimately, it looks to me like it's going to be a great improvement on bus service for that whole area along the southwest rapid transit corridor with phase two being finished and they're being able to modify routes. I also wanted to point out like, it is interesting on consultations when you start talking about southwest rapid transit. People would be asking me, why Ross, are you voting for rapid transit for the south part of the city? That is an awful thing. Well, I am a transit user. You know, you never know where you are going to find a job. You never know where you got to go. You never know what you have to do. And you know, what's really pleasant, Madam Speaker, is when you find a great, efficient, easy way of getting to where you need to go. And so technically, if you were consulting and being concerned about there's tens of thousands of users, there might be as a result of changes here a number of people who will be using routes that they never did. There will be more people utilizing those routes because they're finding it convenient to get to where they need to go. So there's those kinds of changes as well. A thousand people, consideration on their routes. I think the 1,000 who showed up, Madam Speaker, were probably the people who had the most concern. And that's…that's actually good. A lot of people might not have showed up because they are good with what is there or whatever is going to be provided to them. So I will leave it at that, Madam Speaker. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. I don't wish to diminish His Worship's words in terms of evolving from what we call grandpa and grandma's transit system. However, the irony Madam Speaker, I just thought I'd give some historical perspective in terms of where we are trying to go. Bear in mind, in 1891, Winnipeg's first electric streetcar on light rail travelling through the streets of Winnipeg, 1938, the first trolley bus ran down Sargent and that was electric transit as well. So Madam Speaker, in a sense, if we do this right, we can go back to our great grandma and grandpa's transit system and get back to all electric transit system. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Mayes…Allard, pardon me. Councillor Allard, back to you if you wish to close.

Councillor Allard: Yes, I will just maybe close in French.

Madam Speaker: I was just going to ask you to do that please because we have someone sitting up there.

Translation of French Spoken:
Councillor Allard: Thank you to my colleagues for their feedback. As for my colleague Janice Lukes' feedback, I think it is always difficult to get people's attention when there are no high stakes. People often become more active once they see the changes, whether those changes are imminent or in the process of being implemented. So, I know I had asked Councillor Lukes how we could change the way we do public consultations. The feedback she gave during the last presentation to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works made me believe that local councillors should be more included in the consultations that are organized in their jurisdictions. So, I think we can always improve the way we do things. I think that Councillor Lukes' feedback tells us that we should find ways to better include councillors. So, if there are any practical ways to achieve this, I would be happy to explore them. I know that,

having worked at different government levels, such as the Province of Manitoba, this dynamic was constant. Members of the Assembly often heard of things going on in their constituency through the media. It is never a good feeling for a member of the government to learn that something is going on in their constituency, which they were unaware of, because the information went to the Premier's office or to the departments. This dynamic was very prevalent at all government levels, so I think it is always important to try and find better communication systems with the local City Councillors. So if the Councillor has any concrete ideas on how to change our system, I would be happy to try and change them to the best of my abilities and in my Councillor capacity. On that note, I think that these are great news. Thank you, Councillor Mayes, for reminding us that this report is really the result of a big endeavour, which was started by councillors who came before us. So, we are about to see an entirely new system, after numerous conversations, countless debates, we finally have a product that is almost finished, a modern form of transit that we all will, soon I hope, experience, at least in the south-west quadrant of Winnipeg, before we consider adopting a similar one in the rest of the city. We will answer this question later. So, on that note, thank you to my colleagues for their attention. I know it is getting late, so I am going to sit down before I must talk again. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. With that, I will call the question on Item 3, Southwest Transit…Southwest Transitway Route Network. All in favour? Contrary. Carried. Now with the concurrence of Council, for the next item that was originally pulled, there is no longer any speakers so I would like to call the question on Item 4, Air Force Way Realignment Phase Two. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will now move on to the motion on your desks, Motion 4. This is a motion from Councillor Nason, seconded by Councillor Klein. It is regarding conversion of diamond lanes. And it will be an automatic referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. We have no motions, no by-laws under this committee. We'll now have question period for Councillor Allard. Any questions for Councillor Allard? Councillor Klein.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Nason,
Seconded by Councillor Klein,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg utilizes reserved diamonds lanes to increase the speed and reliability of the transit service while providing a safe lane for cyclists;

AND WHEREAS on December 13, 2017, City Council adopted a resolution to permit licensed taxis to travel in diamond lanes on a one-year trial basis;

AND WHEREAS on June 20, 2019, City Council authorized the continued use of diamond lanes by taxis;

AND WHEREAS cities around the world utilize High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes, which are typically reserved for the use of vehicles with three or more passengers, including taxis and buses;

AND WHEREAS HOV lanes are not currently used in the City;

AND WHEREAS converting diamond lanes into HOV lanes would reward carpooling and support a greener commute.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back on the conversion of diamond lanes into high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, to be used by vehicles with three or more passengers, buses, taxis and cyclists.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. Through you, I am just wondering if Councillor Allard can just explain why only select members were in fact invited to the IRPW budget briefing?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I invited members of the committee and by request Councillor Lukes indicated an interest and I'd like to commend her for being proactive in her interest in the Public Works portfolio. And so the invitation was extended to members of the committee and Councillor Lukes who made a special request to participate. That being said, if anyone would like to make a similar request, my office would be happy to oblige.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. And through you, does that mean that the meeting was just going to be for...excuse me. It is very late. Is it going to be…was it the meeting planned then or the believing only for committee members or was it something that Councillor Lukes had requested? Because I'm not quite understanding it, I appreciate the…well, thank you for asking. But if you are having the meeting and other councillors are coming…I'm just wondering why. What was the purpose of that meeting? Was it originally set up just for the committee or just for Councillor Lukes?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I mean I don't want to repeat myself. So my recollection of events, Councillor Lukes being proactive and engaged on the Public Works file approached myself and Councillor Gillingham and asked if she would be invited to have access to the departmental elites. I was thrilled to hear about the request. I contacted Councillor Lukes as soon as I was available to do so. She happily picked up the phone and I happily invited Councillor Lukes to the informal meeting where other committee members indicated interest in participating and Councillor Lukes also attended.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. And through you, just one final question. I've seeing information online going back and forth about a traffic study that is specific to your ward. Forgive my ignorance. I'm not familiar with it but I know it is specific to moving traffic through or to certain areas in St. Boniface. I'm just wondering when was this approved and is it part of the budget process? Just a few more details on it other than what we're seeing online would be nice.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I appreciate the Councillor Klein's question about traffic studies. I think if there was a gold star for request for traffic studies, my office would probably be the winner of that gold star. We request traffic studies on a very regular basis usually in response to constituent concerns. Any councillor is welcome to move for traffic studies. We've also as a Public Works Committee identified that one of the ways that we could at no cost to the City better information transmission on traffic studies is to create comprehensive website that essentially links to the various reports prepared by our public service on traffic studies. I'd invite councillors to check out that website because I think it's a good resource. Also I just want be to commend Council for the interest in traffic safety. I think we have a record road safety spending of $2.5 million which was a result of federal government replacing the $40 million that had been cancelled unilaterally by the provincial government and out of that we were able to I think bring in probably the biggest road safety program possibly in the history of this council. So traffic safety, traffic studies I think are a huge priority. I think some of my colleagues have said that they've never seen so many. And I think that is a good thing. I think values are changing. Traffic safety I think is becoming more and more important over time. And if Councillor Klein has or any other councillor has ideas on traffic studies, I would welcome to hear about them so that we can move it through the committee process.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Councillor Mayes. Did you have a question?

Councillor Mayes: No, I didn't.

Madam Speaker: No? Councillor Nason, you did?

Councillor Nason: Yes, I did. Since we just referred the diamond lane motion to his…the chair's committee, I'm hoping that he might be able to also explain with regards to the diamond lanes, I know many areas of the city, diamond lanes are both directions be it north/south, east/west. I'm wondering if he could explain on Marion and Goulet, why there is only one direction. I'm hoping if he could explain that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: So as Councillor Nason may be aware, Marion and Goulet are one way streets. That may be the reason why there is unidirectional direction on the diamond lanes. I welcome any further questions on the topic.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason, second question.

Councillor Nason: If I understand correctly, $600,000 was spent on the first Marion study.

Madam Speaker: The question, please. Thank you.

Councillor Nason: I don't have preamble? Six hundred million spent on the first study, a million plus probably on this one. Is the…are these studies to better effectively move regional traffic or to stymie regional traffic through his area?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: So the Marion study has quite a bit of history, which is documented in media reports, Hansard. The current study implementation is called "Moving on Marion Street". It's looking to move all road users. It is…it's being done right now. I just want to correct the record. It's not a $600 million study. It's a $1 million study ballpark. It's the study that comes after the original study that looked at grade separation and road widening of Marion which produced a report that had a class 4 estimate of $560 million to do a diamond interchange system and widen the road. It was pretty ferociously opposed by many in the community in St. Boniface and everyone in Winnipeg and so I did not support that report, one, because the public service determined that we can deport it. It brought us way over our debt ceiling which is currently around $150 million. And at a class 4 $560 million according to our estimate systems, it could go up to as much as over $800 million which would be I think for most people way too much to spend on a single intersection for grade separation and not really fixing the other circulation issues outside of that one narrow grade separation project. So I'm pretty confident that I made the right direction and Council made, sorry I made the right decision…I think Council made the right decision in not supporting what…had we gone forward with it, would have been probably the biggest boondoggle in the history of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: I always have to think to make sure that I'm asking have this in the right way. Would it be accurate that we spent $600,000 for the traffic study on Marion to effectively reduce the speed of Marion and Goulet to 50 kilometres an hour? That is the one take away, correct?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you very much for the question. The speed limit study was actually a separate process, which is very similar to any process where a councillor asks the public service to look at speed limits on a particular street. Report came back, which is available for the public record that recommended that speed be lowered from 60 to 50. It's a comprehensive report coming from our public service. It was supported by the Public Works Department. And I mean it's a bit of a history already when the report passed, we actually didn't have the authority to set speed limits on Marion Street. So I had to go to the Manitoba Highway Traffic Board which at the time was being run by the former government's political appointees, so essentially what amounted to NDP government appointees killed the speed limit reduction request not once, but twice. And then further to that, the legislation changed allowing municipalities to set their own limits. And as part of the report that looked at the whole city in terms of speed limits throughout the city, Marion was one of the only places where there was a recommended change because it was one of the only places if not the only place where our public service and council had made a determination that the speed should go from 60 to 50. But at the time, it was denied not once, but twice. Now that we have the powers to do so, we had a comprehensive speed limit report that affects Marion and the rest of the city. And we're now setting those speeds to what has been recommended by our public service and voted for by this council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Councillor Lukes, were you on the list? Yes, pardon me? You are next, yes.

Councillor Lukes: I would like to ask Councillor Allard, through you Madam Speaker, noting that the Office of Public Engagement had such a poor input from southwest and south Winnipeg on the consultation done for routes and having brought this up with Councillor Allard and many directors and many individuals, I am wanting to know what Councillor Allard has done or plans to do on future public engagements related to infrastructure projects in his portfolio.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I mean I…thank you for the question. I have no current plans. Councillor Lukes has specific ideas on how to better reform our public engagement system. I know that it's just getting started essentially. It's a fairly new initiative I think. The office probably is dating back to 2016 I think. And we just saw reports and the budget submission for the CAO's or through the EPC budget submissions how those public engagement sessions keep increasing with the

new Office of Public Engagement with last year being the exception with the last election. The substantive feedback I heard from Councillor Lukes in our meeting and more recently at Public Works is that Councillor Lukes would like to see more engagement from the area councillor I believe. And if that is not the case, I would like to know. And if Councillor Lukes has concrete ideas on how to better reform or outreach or public engagement, I would be happy to give out those concrete ideas and start moving theme through the system.

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

Translation of French Spoken:
Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am going to take this opportunity now to ask a question in French. We just talked about the history of public transit in Winnipeg and of the fact that we are closing the circle when it comes to electrifying or re-electrifying our public transit system. I have to say that, one day, we will have to purchase more buses. I would like to know if Councillor Allard could remind us what the City, our administration, intend to do. What proportion of electric buses will we be buying? What proportion of buses would be fuelled by gas and diesel?

Translation of French Spoken:
Councillor Allard: Thank you for your question. Madam Speaker, I would like to answer my colleague. In November 2019, we approved $1 million for a study on the electrifying of our buses. Essentially, the budget allocation is needed because there are a lot of things to take into consideration when it comes to electrifying our bus system. We must decide what kind of buses to purchase. Do we want buses that can be recharged quickly? Do we want buses that can be charged overnight, when they are not in use? The hours of operations are another consideration for electric buses. Diesel buses can ride almost 24/7, so they do not need to be recharged. Then, there is hydrogen cells technology. Sorry, I do not know this term in French. But that is another consideration. So, there is much to consider when implementing an electric bus system. I think that not electrifying all of our buses right away is the right thing to do to get to a system similar to that of our grand-parents'. Thank you for the history lesson, Madam Speaker. It is interesting to note that our grand-parents and even our great-grand-parents had designed a public transit system that was more sustainable, not only with regards to the environment, but also in terms of service delivery. I think that in the past, we made the mistake of focusing on cars and not on public transit –

Madam Speaker: Sorry, Councillor Chambers moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Translation of French Spoken:
Councillor Allard: I am almost done. All this to say, that, yes, there is a study. The point of this study is to determine if we can purchase 20 to 40 electric buses. One day, electric buses will be more affordable than diesel buses. We are not there yet. If the federal or provincial government allocated a grant to improve the efficiency of the business plan for electric buses, all our buses could one day be converted. But for the time being, I think we should start with 20 to 40 buses. Then we would see if maybe someday, the entire fleet could be electric.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Translation of French Spoken:
Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, it is true that technology is changing very fast, these days, year after year, especially charging stations for electric buses. Yes. That is correct.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, en français get to the question as well.

Councillor Schreyer: Excuse-moi Madame la Présidente de la Chambre. Au président du comité des travaux publics, j'aimerais savoir… Alors que nous produisons les autobus pour les états partout aux États-Unis, est-ce qu'on peut assurer que les autobus électriques seront aussi produits ici à Winnipeg?

Translation of French Spoken:
Councillor Schreyer: My apologies, Madam Speaker. To the chair of the committee on Public Works: As we are making buses here for various states throughout the US, can we guarantee that we can make electric buses here in Winnipeg?

Translation of French Spoken:
Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker. That is not a bad idea, though there are important things to consider. We have a materials management policy. What you propose, Councillor Schreyer, is (in English) single-sourcing with one specific manufacturer. We would have to make an exception. Council should explore that idea if there is any interest in it. We would also have to ensure that it is in line with our interprovincial and international trade laws.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That brings our question period to an end. Let's move on to the next committee, Standing Policy Committee on Finance. Councillor Gillingham, on the report dated November 8th, 2019.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
DATED NOVEMBER 8, 2019

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

Madam Speaker: Okay, 1 has been pulled. I will call the question on 2. All in favour? Contrary? That is noted, opposition, two councillors, thank you. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Southwest Rapid Transitway (Stage 2) and Pembina Highway Underpass and Provincial Project Contribution Agreement Update

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham, would you like to introduce the item?

Councillor Gillingham: I will wait to hear from my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Page 6 interestingly contains a reference to the vote I have made some reference to earlier by the previous council to proceed with the BRT. Oddly, I remember the vote precisely and was off by a year on the date which may say something about the way my mind works around here. But in any event, page 6 references June 2014, the decision to go ahead with the project. The project nears its completion, now we have an issue over $23 million. I also referenced that earlier today in the pension discussions. I wonder if Councillor Gillingham, I know it's not question period, I will be voting in favour, but I do think there needs to be some clarification here of the $23 million that's in dispute. Is it money that we have put out and may not get back requiring debt payment? Is it…it's my understanding it's not included in the multi-year budget, yet here we are saying we think we are entitled to $23 million. So while I am prepared to vote for it, I would like to hear some clarity from Councillor Gillingham. Not at great length, but we do have a $23 million apparent IOU or claimed IOU that we are not budgeting, as I understand it in the midst of as Councillor Santos indicated earlier today, some pretty trying budgetary times. We've probably all indicated that. So I would just…for voting, I would like to get some more clarity on this disputed 23 million and where, if anywhere, it fits in the multi-year budget process.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Mayes. Councillor Gillingham to close.

Councillor Gillingham: Yes, thank you, Councillor Mayes. I will take the question under advisement and what I'll do is I'll get the information, I'll distribute it to all my council colleagues with a clarity. Thank you, and call the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Let's begin. I will call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried? Let's begin question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Gillingham? Councillor Klein.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a few. I am wondering if Councillor Gillingham can provide some information as per page 5, the transit report shows a category for expense of $47.3 million, and it is under other. I'm just wondering if you can enlighten me as to what the $43 million other is.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Sorry, can the councillor clarify what report he is referring to?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein, if you can…

Councillor Klein: It is 2 at page 5, the update administrative report for the financial status report. I know but I am asking a question now.

Councillor Gillingham: Let me get back to the councillor on that question. I will find the answer to the question and take a look at it, and get back to him.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Any further questions? Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Yes, Madam Chair, thank you and through you, I have had a meeting with some of the admin and we talked a little bit about the financial stabilization fund, funds in, funds out, funds in, funds out. I'm having difficulty understanding or learning or finding any supportive documents that can tell me exactly how much is in the stabilization fund.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Sure, I will certainly provide that documentation to the councillor as well and to all councillors. We did indicate that based on this report that is the councillor is referring to which is a financial status report to September 30th, it does also look at the fact that with the storm event that took place in October that is really a $5 million incremental cost that there may be need to draw down on the stabilization reserve at year end, depending on how things ultimately go at year end. My recollection is we have just over $100,000, pardon me, just over $100 million in the stabilization reserve. I think it's about $103 million, but I can certainly get clarity for the members of council and provide that through an e-mail to everybody.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. Through you, yeah I saw the budget book that says 103 million just for the record. When I asked, I was told it is in fact much lower than that. So my follow up question is I just…in reviewing the documents that were sent to all department heads to prepare their budget, and it was a general template.

Madam Speaker: Your question, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: I'd have to give the discussion so he can properly answer it. The template that went out to the department heads was the same for each department, fair enough. It did look for, you know...it gave the direction but it didn't say anything about looking internal.

Madam Speaker: The question, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: It didn't say anything internal…about looking internally for cuts. We just kind of went to services. So I'm wondering if that was planned or an omission or if I am reading it wrong.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: I thank the councillor for his question. Our public servants, the directors of the departments or chiefs are Chief Administrative Officer in the entire team in the administration, when the departments are called for their budgets and their budgets presentation and then they develop their budget presentation. When the letter goes out, it is an expectation that the departments do the best that they can in identifying savings, efficiencies, innovations. Subsequent to the letter going out to all…the annual letter going out to all departments to prepare their budgets, of course, we introduced this budget. The budget recommended targets of 2% for certain departments, of 1.5% for anther department, .5% and 0% year-over-year expenditure increases. There is an expectation and understanding that departments will do what they can to look internally, both at their own items line by line to be responsible for the budgets that they present. Each department head was responsible and has presented a budget in a public forum with the standing policy committee. And so it is the expectation of the department heads to prepare their budgets accordingly to meet those targets. Now the advantage we have of course this year of having the standing policy committees involved in the process is that each councillor around the committee table is able to ask the questions about other expenditure reductions or revenue increases or how the departments came about in preparing their budgets and came to recommend what they ultimately did recommend in the first round of standing policy committee meetings. So I would say that that was a…that has been an open and very transparent opportunity for councillors to ask direct questions of the department heads and their controllers that presented the budgets at the standing committees as to how they arrived at the numbers they arrived at.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none. Councillor Klein. You can ask again.

Councillor Klein: Thanks. I just want some clarification on that. So okay, we've left to the staff to find some reductions. We could ask them questions at the standing policy committee. So we don't direct them to find savings so when we do ask the question and I did ask the question. Some information could not be given to us. I asked why and they said we are giving you what we were told to give. Will we be changing that in the second round? Or the…I know in the second round, we're going to make our recommendations and the third, if they don't come back with the recommendations we've asked for and having to implement it, will we have time even as councillors not on that committee to question this through the public service as to why they didn't look into those particular areas that we mentioned?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, just to restate in the budget process, there is quite a bit of time left in the budget process. I think Councillor Allard was alluding to the fact that if members of this body, of this council are looking for more information, they can certainly ask through their committee chairs or they can ask the CAO directly for information that perhaps that they are still looking for. They can direct their e-mails or the questions to the CAO if they need. As far as ongoing input and dialogue, as I said that it's…we're still fairly early in the budget process. We just finished the first round of meetings, the public presentations by the departments of the standing committees. And we have two more those sets of meetings to go before the new year, our delegation meetings and then the recommendations. And then after those recommendations are made to the working group then ultimately in the new year, the preliminary budget will be…will ultimately be tabled in due course. At that time, it will go back then to committee meetings that the standing policy committees can continue to engage with the preliminary budget at that time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Councillor Gillingham, this is a question for Councillor Gillingham. I am challenged to make recommendations when I don't know the revenue and all I am seeing is selected options. We sat in the PP and D meeting and we were told that there are other options that weren't brought forward. So I don't have all of the options. I don't have the revenue and I'm just…I'm wondering if Councillor Gillingham can explain to us how he envisions making credible recommendations.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Lukes. Again if there is…I'll restate, if there is information that councillors are looking for that they did not get in the first meeting, they can contact their chair, they can contact the CAO to look for more information. I do remind everyone as well that we did put on the table an option for committee…standing policy committees to hold a briefing in which all councillors can be invited too. And so maybe I'll just put on the public record here if there was any confusion prior to this moment then if there is a request for a briefing, please make that to the respect of the chair of the standing committee and the respect of the chair of the standing committee should put out an e-mail to all councillors letting them know when the standing committees' briefing will be and the dates and time and make that available to all council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: So Madam Chair, I specifically asked the director for revenue numbers and he said he was told not to provide them. So I guess my question to Councillor Gillingham is how do I get that information if the director says I was told not to provide the venue numbers, to speak about revenue numbers?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't know if (inaudible) councillor…I don't know who would have said that, but as I…I'll restate. If there is information on the revenue, expenses, expense reduction options that the councillors are looking for, contact me, contact the CAO, contact the committee chair and we will get the information that…try to get the information that the councillors are looking for.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, next committee is Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. We have no report, no motions today, no by-laws. We'll now have question period for Councillor Gilroy. Any questions for Councillor Gilroy? Councillor Nason.

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

Councillor Nason: I'm wondering if the chair, through you Madam Speaker, might be able to update us with regards to the high water levels and what the current status of our riverbanks are.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Through you Madam Speaker, thanks Councillor Nason for the question. Currently, our Red River level was at 15.44 feet above James Avenue tandems. So it is something that we are monitoring very, very closely. Of course, this is due to a lot of the ice that is being built up on the river. So you know it is a concern. We are monitoring that. So far there's no properties at risk but it is something that we are currently monitoring. And if somebody wants really…they're really keeping up-to-date information on the website. So you can go to winnipeg.ca/river levels. So I know that some of you have a lot of constituents in your wards that are very concerned about this. They can also be checking that out online too as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy or pardon me, Councillor Gilroy. Councillor Nason, second question.

Councillor Nason: Second question, Madam Speaker, would be could the chair possibly advise us if there has been any discharge of solid waste materials from the north Winnipeg plant.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Through you Madam Chair, I will look into that for Councillor Nason. I can provide a report back to Council, for all the councillors.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have had the opportunity to live close to the Red River for 20 years and have worked in the community where residents have lived there for 40 years. We know that there are a lot of variables related to flooding. We've got a lot of time to go till the spring, but never, never has the river level been this high in the winter and the ground being so saturated. I was a Brownie in a Girl Guide. We grew up in…always being prepared is what our motto was. I would like to know what the City is doing to be prepared for what could be a catastrophic flood this coming spring.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And just so everyone knows, you know the last challenge that we had with the big storm that we had, this is something that we continuously do monitor so even though we do have one big event that we hear lots about, we do continue to monitor different things like flood, like different weather patterns that could affect the city. So it is something that we're continuously monitoring. But I do understand the major concern that we have regarding the flooding concerns. So some of the activities that we are doing is we are including or monitoring river levels, ice and weather conditions, we're preparing our pumping stations, we're deploying temporary pumps to protect the sewer systems and closing outfall gates as needed. We're also liaison with the Province Hydraulic Forecast Centre to determine anticipated river levels. So we're…we are working closely monitoring this and we will…if there's any kind of questions or concerns, please let me know, because I do know that there are councillor…councillor colleagues that have constituents that are very, very concerned. They live on the river and are very concerned about their properties. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Any further questions? Seeing none, final committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Innovation and Economic Development. No reports today, no motions, no by-laws. Do we have any questions for Councillor Orlikow? Could we re-set the clock, please? Thank you. Any questions for Councillor Orlikow? Councillor Klein.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Klein: Thank you. Madam Chair, through you, in speaking recently with the founder of a very successful start-up company here in Winnipeg, the inform…I was informed that the EDW, Yes! Winnipeg is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars, hundreds and hundreds was the way it was explained to me, thousands of dollars investing in Brazil to try to attract tech people to come to Winnipeg to work that the tech person had told me that that is not a good use of funds, that we are smarter and it would be more effective to go after people in Toronto, Vancouver and other cities in Canada because of the cost of living here, and that you know these are the people that can get here quicker. So I'm just wondering if this is something that the Chair of Innovation and now Economic Development is aware of and if they would look into it further to see if this is the best use of funds or where the funds are coming from.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow

Councillor Orlikow: I am aware just through social media and by following the EDW's page. And the reason why they did that, the economic benefit of that, I will be more than happy to reach out to the EDW to see if they can provide that information.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Klein: Okay, thank you Madam Chair. Priceline, a very large and recognizable brand throughout the world is in Winnipeg right now, and they are here in Winnipeg. But they are here for a test. They are trying to see if this could be an opportunity for them.

Madam Speaker: The question.

Councillor Klein: The question is coming. I needed to give him the information. So they are trying to find staff. I'm wondering if we have reached out to help them to ensure that we do everything possible to keep a company and brand like Priceline here in Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Again with economic development, I know that the City has…we have now a newer process. I will see where that's at, where there's a one shop…stop shop for businesses. And we're also looking at…if you looked at our report from IED that we are looking at moving some of the responsibility to Yes! Winnipeg to catch. So on this particular company, I am not sure the exact…what's been going on, but again I can reach out to the EDW and ask them.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. Through you…

Madam Speaker: There is no preamble, Councillor Klein. Is part of our…

Councillor Klein: Do you want me to say thank you because I don't have to. It's a very Canadian thing so I'll say sorry then. So my last and final question would just be with respect to the EDW, CentrePort, we have all these economic arms if you will, are we looking at the necessity for having an economic development department internally then if these other organizations are taking on the responsibilities?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: There is what will be coming forward shortly I believe with the new org plan. Again that's really not up to myself. That's up to the CAO's office. That discussing the new roles of our CentreVenture which we did about two years ago, three years ago maybe, and then now with EDW, having them collaboratively working together and we also have the Winnipeg capital…or metro region as well now and some of the issues (inaudible) the Province. So there is a lot of things moving around but the key here right now at this point is to make sure that businesses that come to Winnipeg have one place to go and that's where the process is we are streamlining right now to make sure that businesses don't get sent from one area to next area to next area. Economic opportunities are just that. They're opportunities. They're not guarantees. So when the businesses start to come to look at Winnipeg, they aren't flying over as much as they used to. They are actually stopping to look at our value and lands and also with our labour. We do have some labour that's available in other cities such as Vancouver and Toronto. Finding IT workers is very, very difficult. They're very kept up but we are actually heading to that mode as well where we know that the IT sector is growing here

in Winnipeg but we have a limited market of employees. And I know the universities and the colleges are doing their best to fill that gap. But again I will get a better coordinated answer about that and how they…at IED, we will discuss…we have…most of these groups are just making their first foyer to our committee to give us an overview of what they're up to and how they are doing things and what their goals are. We get the business plans. But we are trying to get a little bit more in depth in having these groups all kind of collaborating together. But again the other day, for the City of Winnipeg our role is to make sure that if it is EDW, Yes! Winnipeg or CentreVenture that we are working in collaboration with them whatever format that is so again businesses will be able to get the answers that they want quickly and we'll be able to capture more of the economic benefit.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Any further questions? Seeing none. Councillor Schreyer, will you move adjournment? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Just hold on, we're going to have roll call, but just before we do that, I'd like to ask that we gather here in about five minutes or so for a photo in support of the Blue Bombers as planned. Madam Clerk, roll call.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos and Schreyer.

Council adjourned at 5:44 p.m.