COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, December 12, 2019

The Council met at 9:43 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Schreyer.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: I would like to now recognize our pages for today's meeting. We have with us Aimie Langan who attends Mennonite Brethren Collegiate Institute in the Elmwood-East Kildonan Ward, and Caleb Shelvey who attends Springs Christian Academy in the St. Boniface Ward. Welcome and thank you for serving Council today. We'll now move into morning announcements. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. Thank you Madam Speaker, and morning to my colleagues. Morning and welcome to all those that are here in the gallery or watching via livestream. As we commence our last meeting of 2019, I want to begin by acknowledging and congratulating our Winnipeg Blue Bombers on their outstanding victory to bring the Grey Cup back home to Winnerpeg where it belongs. It was a long time coming, but watching the grip and the determination of our team during the Grey Cup game certainly made it worth the wait, and it was a pleasure to participate in the parade to unveil…and to unveil Grey Cup Champions Way; honorary street sign on Chancellor Matheson Road between University Crescent and Pembina Highway. I'm hoping and expecting it'll be a reminder to all those opposing teams of who they're about to play. And it will be a tribute to all of those fans who have and will continue to support our Winnipeg Blue Bombers and the Winnipeg Football Club. I would like to also, especially congratulate Dana Spiring. She will be the first female name to be engraved on the Grey Cup in Canadian history. And I want to wish her and the Winnipeg Football Clubs congratulations for that historic first of many. I'd like to also just advise members of council and those watching the proceedings of some of the conversations and dialogue that I've had with other elected officials over the last month. I had the opportunity to meet with Deputy Prime Minister of Canada, Chrystia Freeland, speak with the Honourable Mélanie Joly, the Honourable Dan Vandal and I want to offer, of course, once again congratulations to him and his new appointment as a Minister of Federal Government. The Honourable Brian Pallister, the Honourable Rochelle Squires, the Honourable Sarah Guillemard and Member of Parliament, Leah Gazan who came to City Hall to meet with me, just open up dialogue. And so I want to obviously congratulate her and all those that were recently elected or re-elected to both federal parliament as well as the provincial legislature. Some of the topics that we've discussed include infrastructure funding, responses to public safety, economic development and human rights. I also continue dialogue with many members of our First Nations leadership community including Treaty 1 chiefs as well as the Manitoba Métis Federation president, President Chartrand. I had the opportunity to participate in the Shoal Lake 40 Tripartite Committee meeting that happens annually. That was hosted here at City Hall earlier this week as well. Madam Speaker, I also want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the work and dedication of Dr. Réal Cloutier who is retiring as the President and CEO of the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority. It was an absolute pleasure to work with him in his volunteer capacity on the Winnipeg Promise, which was comprised of local leaders in Winnipeg who are dedicated to finding the best way to remove barriers currently preventing low-income families and children from accessing the Canada Learning Bond. And I look forward to welcoming the new President and CEO, Ms. Vickie Kaminski to Winnipeg who will begin her new role with the WRHA on January 6th in the new year. Very pleased that Winnipeg has been ranked second in Canada in Public Sector Digest Open Cities Index. The index measures the level of openness of Canadian cities by analyzing the state of their open data programs. Our open data program has progressed from 20th to 10th to 3rd and to now 2nd in the country with the Open Cities Index. And the progress clearly demonstrates the ongoing and the strong commitment of city council and city administration that we have to open and transparent government through the open data program. With over 140 data sets now available to the public, we're continually increasing the amount and the quality of data across a broad reach of City services, and this is all possible due to the dedication of all departments in making much of their service delivery data available as possible. We also have collaborated with external public sector entities to have their data available through the open data portal, further benefiting residents, businesses, the media and other organizations as they're able to access an even wider set of

information for their needs. So congratulations to everybody that's involved, and also, of course, to my council colleagues who continue to support our measures to increase openness and transparency here at City Hall. I have also heard many positive comments regarding our new Christmas tree at City Hall. And again, I was honoured to host the annual tree lighting and open house. We had many Winnipeggers come to see our new artificial tree that they've marvelled in its beauty. Of course, the tree may be artificial, but the feeling was very real, of course, for the holiday season and for all those that are celebrating Christmas. Speaking of trees, I also want to acknowledge the generous donation that was made yesterday of 250,000, a quarter million dollars over five years from Telpay, local company and local community development leaders in terms of some of their giving to treat Canada to meet our million tree challenge efforts. This bill is on the generous foundation of CNs $1 million contribution, and it's just incredibly gracious. And I want to take a moment to thank them. And finally or one of the last things I'll say here in the opening statements, I want to give a special shout out to St. Vital Park, and of course, Councillor Brian Mayes, where the toboggan slide, the Manitoboggan received two international architectural awards recently; the IOC IAKS Bronze Award as well as the OPC IAKS Distinction Award at a ceremony in Germany recently. Please get out and enjoy St. Vital Park as well as our other City parks, a fun place for people of all abilities to embrace Winnipeg's winter. So congratulations to everybody involved. Holiday season is fast approaching. I'm just going to finalize my comments just by wishing everybody all the best of the holiday season. For all those, like my family that celebrate Christmas, Merry Christmas, happy Hanukkah, Kwanzaa. And overall, we want to wish everybody all the very best for the holiday season with your family, your friends and your loved ones. We just remind everybody to plan ahead, to drive responsibly, and I want to wish my council colleagues all the very best of the holiday season. I do hope everyone here at City Hall, both public service and elected officials and all those that are watching these proceedings have time over the holiday seasons to spend quality time with your family, your friends and your community members. I know all of my council colleagues in particular, work very hard throughout the year and I hope they're able to enjoy some much deserved downtime over the holiday seasons. With that, those are my opening comments. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. We'll now hear from Councillor Klein, followed by Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. Today I wanted to make two quick announcements if I may. First one is to recognize a gentleman who has spent a much longer time in this building than many of us and who has worked tirelessly to make sure that residents are informed and that they're shared information and different views from what's happening within the walls of City Hall. I know that this is probably the last official city council meeting that Winnipeg Free Press reporter, Aldo Santin will attend, and I want to wish him a happy and well deserved retirement and thank him for all of his efforts in keeping us informed. The second announcement would be similar to what Mayor Bowman had just spoke about with families at this time of year spending an awful lot of time with their loved ones, spending time with their children that they don't get that amount of time sometimes during the workweek and such throughout the year. There's families that are coming into town, families that will be traveling, all kind of festivities for people to take in and enjoy throughout the holiday season. So I want to recognize and say thank you to all the first responders that won't have that time that will be protecting us, that will be answering the call for help. Our paramedics throughout the city, our firefighters and our Winnipeg Police Service members as well as doctors, nurses and those who keep our hospitals running; a shout out of gratitude and personal thanks for having care and compassion, not only for our city, but for all of us that live in it. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: I think Councillor Lukes had something related to that.

Councillor Lukes: I had something related to this. He scooped my story, okay. I was going to just…to also comment that today's a very significant day and I want to recognize this also as the last city council meeting Winnipeg Free Press reporter, Aldo Santin will be covering as he's retiring next week. Aldo's been a journalist for 42 years with 33 of those years working at the Winnipeg Free Press. He has covered virtually every beat and whether by his personal choice or the wisdom of his editor, has been covering the City Hall for the last...his final years working. I thought...I always recognize the importance of media, but now in this role where power, money, influence and agendas are in play every day, the importance of independent media can never be underestimated. Aldo has done a stellar job of holding city council to account. He's provided the public with a level of scrutiny that will be a challenge for many to match. There's something to be said about wisdom of age and experience and of being a constant figure, part of the institution where so many decision makers come and go, independent media is a vital feature of any liberal democracy. Aldo's done an outstanding job. Cheers. Enjoy your retirement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Mayes: I had suggested to Aldo that like Bernice Pontillo, when she left, she…he blow us kisses as she did. He declined that suggestion with thanks to his nominator…but there's still time, yes, thank you Rollins. I rise just to

briefly mention a report that unfortunately didn't get in the Free Press which was an announcement made with U of Winnipeg and the City and Royal Bank last Wednesday. We have been funding for three years. Part of the Mayor's initiative out of the 2014 election to do more with the city universities, we do of course the U of M infrastructure professorship. U of W, we've had a good run; $200,000 a year with the…what was called Youth United but is now called Inner-City Work Study. This is a project we fund. Suburban students and inner-city together, not one group or the other, summer program run by U of Winnipeg, working four days a week in the community, places like Graffiti Gallery or Ma Mawi. Fifth day, they're in the classrooms studying Truth and Reconciliation Calls to Action. So this has been a great success, and Royal Bank wanting to do something on the reconciliation front asked U of Winnipeg for a list of projects. The one that Royal Bank chose, commendably, was Inner-City Work Studies, so Royal Bank announced last week they're in for half a million dollars, $500,000 over five years. I think it's a testament to what we've been doing in conjunction with the U of Winnipeg. I've always said, I think I wrote about this back...I think I ran on this in '91 and wrote about it in the mid '90s, but within two years of the Mayor getting in, we were actually doing something. So I'm pleased to see this idea come to life and my thanks to the Mayor for his support for this program and thanks to the Royal Bank. Half a million dollars is a lot of money, and allows us…we must of course choose whether we wish to continue through the multi-year budget. Hopefully, we will. It is in the budget that was prepared in draft or has been publicized so far. So hopefully we'll keep it going and hopefully we can continue to work with U of Winnipeg and now Royal Bank on this reconciliation project. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. We'll hear from Councillor Rollins, followed by Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. I too want to say through the Chair, mazel tov to Aldo Santino. I will miss him screaming at me during scrums. I quite enjoyed that. And although I might have feigned shock and awe, it was enjoyable each and every time. I also wanted to…so congratulations and mazel tov on those 40 some years. Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service had awards and recognition on November 21st. A ceremony...I believe I was sitting in committee and I was unable to attend it, so I wanted to congratulate all of those Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service that received awards including exemplary service medals, department years of service, graduation certificates, recognition of retirements, and in addition to City of Winnipeg long service pins. I also want to comment on Wildwood's age friendly community project. This was a group of citizen scientists that looked at age friendliness of Winnipeg's Wildwood Park neighbourhood, and I want to recognize their efforts. They...it may come as no surprise, identified themes such as greenspaces, programming and sidewalks that was an area of focus that they wanted to…that they identified through their work and wanted to make more age friendly, and I will be very excited to work with these citizen scientists as they go forward in their work to make their neighbourhood more age friendly. As Chair of Community Services and Parks and Protection, I think it's important to be an age-friendly city, and to continue work with them would be a joy. Finally, I want to thank Mayor Bowman and the 23 community groups that received funding for community safety and crime prevention activities through the city yesterday. These 23 groups received up to $5,000, but I think it's important to acknowledge their work on making the city safe. It was a good announcement at IRCOM, and but more importantly, these 23 organizations that have existed for several years, working on such issues as caring for youth in care, North End women's, West End...a lot of our women and children's centres that are making…and making safety a priority in the city, and it was good to see that they received grants, and I'll be thinking about those type of grants as we form the multi-year budget.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. We'll now hear from Councillor Chambers followed by Councillor Allard.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair. I rise this morning to pay recognition to the St. Norbert Celtics football team that was here with us earlier this morning. They won the championship on the B side division two of the Winnipeg High School Football League. In their ten years of football at the College St. Norbert, they played three previous times in their finals, but lost all three, but their fourth time was the charm. So they too had a bit of a drought like our Winnipeg Blue Bombers and were able to overcome that. They had 29 players this year on the team with a mixture of grade nine through grade 12 students, so again, that is a major accomplishment to have that mixture of players that are younger as well as some of the senior and veteran players. Their semi-final game was played on October 1st…31st against Beaver Brae High School from Kenora, and their final game was played on November 8th, an awesome experience which they were able to capture the championship against West Kildonan Collegiate, which I believe is now in Councillor Browaty's ward. So again, congratulations to the team and the coaches and to the high school for winning their high school football championships. Madam Speaker, the second announcement that I rise for is to recognize more of a sad event that took place just last...or a couple of weeks back. A musical voice in our city is now silent, and we will greatly miss a dear friend, Gerald Philip Atwell who passed away on Saturday, November 23rd, 2019. The evening before doing that, he was doing what he loved to do, which was playing music and sharing it with others. Gerry attended school in St. Norbert where he was the student council president in his senior year, and then was active in the navy leagues and sea cadets, playing trumpet at their marching bands. Gerry was also considered a renaissance man. He was most known as a keyboard player and vocalist with bands such as Eagle and Hawk, which he had won a Juno Award in 2012. He was also a member of Ministers of Cool, Rockalypso, and the Boogie Nights band and the Voice of Boom. While he was a musician at heart, Gerry also held numerous continuance senior roles at the St. Norbert Arts Centre including president

and board...President of the Board and Artistic Director. Throughout his almost 25 years with the St. Norbert's Art Centre, his first connection with the SNAC was as a commissioner…he was commissioned for an inter-disciplinary theatre piece, Soul in Ice. The piece tells the story of his grandmother's experience in growing up as a schoolgirl in the St. Norbert convent, highlighting the Atwell family's deep roots in the St. Norbert community and displaying a wide range of Gerry's artistic abilities. Gerry's commitment to the arts was not only in the spot...was not his only spotlight. He's a dedicated member of the…board member, mentor, facilitator and contract grant…a contract grant writer, to name a long list of his dedicated service to the community and as well to social justice organizations often times as founding members of new organizations where he saw the need. I could go on and on about the accomplishments of Gerry Atwell to the community, not only to the community of St. Norbert, but indeed to all the City of Winnipeg and would like to take this time to just acknowledge that he will be greatly missed. Thank you.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you. I thought I would take a moment to recognize a couple news worthy items I guess in St. Boniface. One is I'd like to recognize and congratulate Morberg House, which is an organization that works with the homeless in St. Boniface. They were experiencing a funding shortfall and were set to close if they didn't successfully fundraise necessary funds to continue their operations. And I think everyone was shocked and very happy to see that they were able to fundraise over $400,000, 400,000 of which came from an anonymous gift, and much of that…much of those dollars coming from across Canada, and some support in Winnipeg as well. So I want to recognize Morberg House for the excellent work that they're doing in St. Boniface, working with our homeless and congratulate them on this great news. The other thing I'd like to recognize, Mayor Bowman, myself, Councillor Mayes, we're happy to announce the construction completion of the Fermor Bridge. That was a big project, $29 million approximately, and a project that took approximately two years to...well, to start and finish to minimize traffic disruptions. So I know Councillor Mayes likes to say with…when you're dealing with Bonivital issues, it's…or issues that are on the border of St. Vital and St. Boniface, things are a little bit easier because you only have to deal with one other councillor. So I wanted to recognize Councillor Mayes in particular, who I think started very early on on lining up the funding required for this major upgrade in our neighborhoods and wanted to celebrate that as well. So thank you very much for your attention. Look forward to the meeting.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Councillor Schreyer, and our final speaker will be Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. It's unfortunate to me personally that Aldo Santin's leaving now. I had a scoop for Aldo and now I'm going to have to at least ask his advice. I need it in terms of what I'm going to do about this. So I'll be talking with Aldo. Hopefully, he's not going too far away too soon. I'll need to speak with him in the next couple of weeks. My old friend Gerry Atwell, as Councillor Chambers has explained his life really rather well, in such brief time of announcements. I performed with Gerry over the last 20 years. He's going to be missed by so many people. As a fellow collaborator of ours told me, the day after, our friend Chris Brett said that Gerry shone a light on many people in this city and he certainly did, certainly to me. He's meant so much to me in terms of music. It's going to take me years to still express what Gerry has meant to me. And I miss him and I know that it's…in a way, it's just very selfish because he's meant so much to me over the last 20 years and he'll mean so much for the rest of my life. Now, Madam Speaker, it was requested upon me that I wait until after a couple of elections that I talk about a certain issue, and that being the commemoration this year, 2019, the 50th anniversary of my father, Right Honourable Edward Schreyer being elected the premier of Manitoba, and that being the election of the first NDP Government ever elected in Canada. And I feel I should say a few things about this at such a rather salient anniversary commemoration. Just very briefly, a number of things that were so leading edge at the time; as an example, as it applies to us right here in this chamber, the creation of Unicity, Winnipeg, the creation of the unification into the modern day…City of Winnipeg from 13 municipalities into one tax base. The creation of Autopac, Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, where the profits stayed in Manitoba, the premiums reinvested into the local economy of the taxpayers and payers that paid for the insurance agency, for those that paid for it. Also, in terms of health care, in terms of medicare, taking the payment away from premiums, putting it into income tax, the ability to pay for health care rather than merely user premiums. So before, if you could afford health care, even though we were already establishing medicare in Canada after Saskatchewan started, if you could pay for it, good for you, if you couldn't afford it, too bad. You didn't get hospital coverage, you didn't get health care. Today, I wonder if people really understand what it would be like if that was the case today, 50 years later. We reversed 85 years of public treatment of Louis Riel as a traitor and public enemy to Manitoba and to Canada. We reversed it, and we brought an end to that frame of mind. And in commemoration, symbolic commemoration, brought forth a sculpture of Louis Riel in his memory. Homecare, the very first homecare program in Canada, what my father called the Cinderella of public programs and other provinces followed. In terms of northern development and development of the future for Indigenous people, bear in mind, in two years, this government brought in 22 landing strips for 22 communities in a two year period in the '70s. Winter roads, before Indigenous communities were isolated. Not only did we bring in airstrips, but we brought in winter roads to the extent Manitoba, and I dare say, northern development in Canada had never seen so that Indigenous communities could plan for their future, they could have

guaranteed access to food on a daily basis for the first time. Many things to talk about; as an example, the very first woman Deputy Minister in Canada, and that being Mary Elizabeth Bayer who was the Deputy Minister for Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. And then the next…the second woman Deputy Minister in Canada, that being from…the Deputy Minister for Labour, and it went from there, Madam Speaker. Fourteen thousands in eight years, Madam Speaker, 14,000 affordable housing and nursing home units, Madam Speaker, the likes of which I don't know when we will see again. Canada's first environmental assessment on a hydro development project, which the government listened to, reduced the flooding, reduced the hydro project and where there was the need for building new homes, the government did that. Madam Speaker, it was also the most culturally diverse cabinet in history. I mentioned my friend…forgot to mention this friend, mathematician, Marty Green…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, you are wrapping up?

Councillor Schreyer: I am definitely wrapping up, Madam Speaker. His father, Sid Green, as well being in my father's cabinet, most culturally diverse cabinet including for the first time, four Jewish MLAs, three Métis MLAs in cabinet, and for the largest number of…happens to be today, Madam Speaker, appropriate to mention, three Jewish cabinet ministers for the first time in Canada. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Our final speaker, Councillor Eadie, and then we'll get on with our formal proceedings.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Chairperson. I will be short. I just wanted to rise as well to congratulate Aldo Santin on his retirement and all the work he's done down at City Hall and many other places as a highly respected journalist. And always challenged…he has great integrity, and always challenges…well, what am I going to write about that Councillor Eadie? Like there would always be an analysis of an issue, but I wanted to actually thank Aldo Santin for his article he wrote when I was preparing to run for city council in 1998. And he depicted this blind fellow who's always wearing leather coming to City Hall, walking up all determined and he gave me that profile of being a solid North Ender and trying to resolve the issues. So I wanted to thank him as well as congratulate him. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. With that, our announcements are complete now.

MINUTES

Councillor Santos moves that the Minutes of the meetings held on November 6th, 2019 and November 21st, 2019, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move into delegations. I'd like to call forward Ms. Margie Reis who is here on behalf of the Garden City Community Centre. She is in opposition to Item 4 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated December 3rd, 2019. And it's regarding the Community Centre Universal Funding Formula Review. We'll have ten minutes on the clock, and I believe the presentation's been circulated to you. Welcome.

DELEGATIONS

Margie Reis: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I bring greetings from the Garden City Community Centre board of directors and we thank you for giving us this opportunity to stand before you today. I am here on behalf of the board to express our concern and opposition to the community centre universal funding formula review, approved by the Executive Policy Committee and being presented to Council today. Our presentation today will outline our concerns as previously communicated to community services, GCWCC and the UFF Review Committee. For the record, our community centre did not vote in favour of the proposed UFF responsibilities document or the formula. There are 63 community centres in Winnipeg, and all of these centres provide valuable services and programs based on the needs of the area they serve. All are very unique in size, services provided and population based that they serve. The facility hierarchy as outlined in the City's recreation, leisure and library facilities policy, that's a mouthful, states that we must recognize that the size and, as such, the focus of facilities differs. Some facilities focus on the neighborhood level, providing services to a relatively small population, while others focus on the community, regional or city-wide level. The RLLF currently uses the following guidelines to differentiate between two levels of community centres: the neighborhood community club, which serves a local neighborhood by providing a range of sport, culture and drop-in play, as well as youth and seniors programs. These centres may have athletic fields, gyms, multi-purpose space and outdoor rinks and are intended to serve a population of approximately 12 to 15,000. Community recreation and leisure centres serve a broader community of 35 to 50,000 and provide more extensive sport, culture, seniors, youth and fitness programs. Amenities include indoor

ice, indoor soccer, outdoor rinks, athletic fields, gyms and multi-purpose space. These definitions themselves are out of date in our opinion as it already appears to be a three-tiered hierarchy and centres include much more amenities than outlined in the existing policy. The evolution and growth of community centres; as acknowledged in the policy and strategies documents, the community centre model is not a one-size-fits-all. It is constantly evolving. We need to ensure that the processes and funding in place accommodate the diverse functionality and evolution of our centres or we will be left with additional maintenance and infrastructure issues instead of creating facilities and services that are sustainable into the future. How has the community centre model changed? The establishment of various associations, sport associations and organizations has led to centralized registration for most sports with the exception of baseball and soccer, and we expect that these sports will also be moving to this model soon. As a result, the functionality of our centres has changed, and we are seeing a trend towards more programming and facility rentals than organized recreational sport. Larger facilities are playing host to major events and tournaments, and so are now providing a sport entertainment service. Programming has to constantly change to accommodate our ageing, diverse, and growing population. Mental health issues and growing security concerns also play major roles in the type of programming we provide. Not all community centres can rely on a volunteer basis to run or manage their facilities and must have paid staff. This requires that the larger centres have a more diverse and comprehensive business plan with enhanced responsibilities and therefore should have more accountability to community service and City of Winnipeg directly. What hasn't changed? The expectation that the City of Winnipeg and its community centres provide recreation and leisure services which are affordable, accessible and sustainable. What are the challenges faced by these larger community recreation and leisure facilities? Additional staffing costs as we cannot utilize volunteers in many, if any of our positions. Additional IT and administration costs to accommodate accounting, bookings, registration and membership requirements, maintenance repair and service contracts far beyond typical HVAC preventative maintenance. Off-season impact on facility revenue is much higher in larger facilities. Existing…most of the existing grants offered to centres are matching grants, meaning that we must have 50% of the cost in order to complete renovations or major repairs. Until mortgages are paid off, surpluses to do this don't exist. Summary of the UFF proposal; the old formula was reviewed and this is simplified, the old formula was reviewed, and only the basket of goods used to calculate the specialized community centre index was changed. This new index was then used to determine the per capita rate and heated square footage rate used in the UFF calculation. So what we have is the per capita rate times the community centre catchment, and add to that the heated square footage rate multiplied by the heated square footage, and that gives you the new total for the community centre funding. Why this formula doesn't work, and I'm using Garden City as an example, this will affect many other larger centres as well. The heated square footage funded makes up only 35% of our 140,000 square foot facility. This was based on the assumption that because these centres are larger, provide more services and are open more hours, that they should be making more money off of the non-funded areas such as arena, turf areas, field houses. There is not a direct correlation between the size of the building and its revenue generating ability. Other factors play a role in the net revenue abilities. For instance, the City of Winnipeg rental rates are used to set the bar across the city, whether the facility is City run, board run or private. The City rates might reflect what it cost to run a City-operated arena, but they do not generate the significant net profit to run and maintain the newer facilities. However, in order to accommodate affordability, accessibility and in most cases, competition, we must stay as close to these rates as possible. All facilities, whether it be indoor soccer pitches, gymnasiums, arenas, field houses or walking tracks, will have their off peak periods for which revenue is very low or non-existent. And finally, it doesn't take account…into account specific demands placed on larger multi-sport facilities. The second reason this doesn't work; the per capita population number used in the calculation is only the community centre's immediate catchment of 12,520, and not the estimated 50,000 plus the centre actually serves. By using only the immediate catchments in this formula, we are not taking into consideration the following: closures of other facilities that resulted in the need for existing ones, therefore adding to the population being serviced. It does not factor in the city-wide population that uses these facilities through organized sport, school programming and sport and other specialized programming, events and free services. Approximately 72.5% of our users are from outside our catchment. Facilities like ours play host to international events bringing in thousands from across North America annually which is a benefit to the city as a whole. Under the new formula, our facility, which by RLLF definition is a community recreation and leisure centre ends up receiving an additional $4300 annually towards a $2.5 million operating budget. This amount does not even cover annual projected increases in utility costs. The total UFF funding received would still only equate to 7% of our operating budget. We cannot sustain a viable operation based on this percentage. In summary, both the existing and proposed formulas are the equivalent of trying to fund a freeway servicing thousands with the same formula used to build and maintain a neighborhood foot bridge. It just doesn't make sense. In closing, I would like to say that it is an honour and a privilege to manage one of the best facilities in Winnipeg, and to be a part of improving the...

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

Margie Reis: Thank you. It's an honour and a privilege to manage one of the best facilities in Winnipeg, and to be a part of improving the delivery of sport, recreation and leisure in our great city. We appreciate the efforts of community services, GCWCC and the UFF review committee for their work on this proposal and acknowledge that it is indeed a very laborious process. Unfortunately, we feel that the outcome of these efforts will not improve the status of larger

centres and allow for their continued high standard of management and service. The proposed formula does not allow for adequate funding of any new facilities being considered in the Winnipeg Recreation and Parks Strategy. We have to get this right the first time or we will forever be revisiting the UFF, and this will hinder the maintenance, improvement and growth of recreation and leisure facilities in our city. Our recommendation; as this funding is crucial for the continued operation of many facilities and cannot be delayed, we would ask that the proposed UFF formula accountability document, and retroactive payments be approved for the 2020 budget only, and that a committee chaired by the Director of Community Services and comprised of the large multi-facility and regional stakeholders is established immediately. The committee would be tasked with determining appropriate structures and funding models to ensure the needs of these centres are addressed now and in the future. These recommendations could then be brought forward to Council at a later date but hopefully not later than October 2020. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you Ms. Reis for your presentation. If I could just ask you to stay down on the floor, we'll hear from the next speaker and then we'll call you both back for questions. Next, we will hear from Ms. Michele Augert who is here on behalf of Dakota Community Centre, and she's also in opposition to the same item. Welcome.

Michele Augert: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Mayor Bowman, Madam Speaker and councillors, good morning everyone, and thank you for the opportunity to speak to this matter before Council today. I also want to thank my colleague from Garden City Community Centre and I fully concur in support their position and important…on this important matter facing the future of community centres and particularly those who have taken on the important role of running multi-use centres for the benefit of many. So as you said, my name is Michele Augert, and I am the CEO of Dakota Community Centre in southwest Winnipeg. And I had a whole bunch of stuff written here that I was going to tell you all about; our centre, the size, the complexity in the things that we do, but I do want to take this opportunity to really, you know, drive home the fact that I am one of the few professional CEOs running a community centre operation in Winnipeg. And my journey coming here, and I'll tell you a little bit about myself, was that I had a 25 year in health care...in health care administration and leadership. I was the Director of Corporate Affairs and Communications at Health Sciences Centre for more than 15 years and I was the head of Communications and Public Affairs for the WRHA for a number of years before I decided to step away and go to that easy world of consulting. And boy, that was a fun place until a head hunter came along and said to me, you know, we're looking for someone to lead the Dakota Community Centre. They needed to build a big expansion project and were really looking for someone different. And again, I thought, what do I know about community centres? And they said, no, they're looking for someone like you because they need to do things differently. And of course, this was my community centre. My children grew up there. They played their sports there. I met most of my friends there and much of my neighbours because that is where we gathered. And so I saw that as both an opportunity and a challenge, I thought, how hard could that be, really? And well boy, did I learn a lesson on that one. I walked into that community centre to see a centre that, you know, had staff who were trying their best to keep things together. They were lucky financially because they had two rinks, and two rinks can make you some money if you do the right thing. But they also were not supported. They didn't know exactly what to do to fix the place. The place had been in a state of somewhat disrepair. It had not had a lot of attention to small renovation projects and upkeep over the years because what we were to found out, that's really a difficult thing to do sometimes in our system. But I was there, and I was there and excited and enthusiastic because I was going to build the new field house. And I was going to build the new field house because we had funding, and we had talked about it for nine or ten years, and we were going to build this field house. And you know, we had a whole bunch of people that on the board that were volunteers and didn't know much about building anything, so we set to getting this done because we had the funding to do it, we had the commitment from the community, and the community wanted this...this project. And as I say, you know, when I think about all of the competencies and the talent that I brought to go to community centre, I needed every bit of that to navigate the difficult waters and the difficult processes that there were to getting anything done and accomplished. I started in August of 2015. I had an open house in October, had a sod turning in November, and we had the piles going in the ground in December, and boy, did we have a lot of challenges to face in getting that done. Every step of the way, we encountered...and there was not a lot of support for someone like myself who again, knew a lot of things, but didn't know a lot of things about the City. And what...I think to sum it all up for you, is what I really encountered was a system that wanted change, they wanted to do things differently, they wanted to do things better, they wanted to do things smarter, but the system was not there, and it wasn't built to support that kind of progress and that kind of growth. Our community centre model on which the UFF is based and the UFF agreement that prescribes a lot of very detailed operational requirements and accountabilities for community centres is not at all designed...it was designed in the 1960's when we built a very proud system of community centres. And we should be so proud of the assets that we have here in the city. Those 63 centres, it is…this is not replicated anywhere else in this country.

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

Michele Augert: Sorry. I'm very passionate about all of this as you can see. But when I say that, we, the system is not there to support the agreements, the funding models. I can tell you...I can give you all kinds of numbers, and I pulled some today. I don't know if many of you know about Dakota Community Centre, our incredible new field house, and the

only one that operates in this city. We recently opened the Jumpstart Community Rink in partnership with Jumpstart Charities, a $680,000 asset to the city of which only $50,000 of that came from City of Winnipeg funding. So we have learned to do things differently at Dakota, despite the system that is in place that doesn't support us. And I will tell you, I know that I've encountered many good people from the City of Winnipeg, the other community centres, the GCWCC. They all want to help. They understand that we're trying to do something different, but the system and the structure for funding, the structure for how we operate and how we get support as community centres and how we move ahead to do those very important things that our new communities are looking for and want...and I invite every one of you at some point to come, set up a meeting with me, and I will take you, and I will show you what we have done in spite of the obstacles and the barriers and the lack of funding, the lack of support. And again, all of that not to be blaming anybody, but it is a system that was created to support small little centres in the 1960's, and it was based on a generation that we...that was looking and doing different things. We have such a large population of seniors who are looking for active living opportunities. If you come to our centre, you will see that as of today, there's 1600 people who use our field house every day, and...

Madam Speaker: Yeah, thank you. Thank you for your presentation. We will take questions now, and I believe there are some. If I could call Mr. Reis back as well so either of you can answer the questions or both of you. Councillor Rollins, we'll start with you.

Councillor Rollins: Well, thank you very much for your presentation today and I want to acknowledge the hard work and the leadership including…and thank you for taking us through your career. I knew of it as a private citizen, of course, and what a very important career trajection you've had through health and now, of course, what we…and I consider as Chair of Protection, Community Services and Parks, still a health care job, a very important health care job. So I want to acknowledge that. I want to acknowledge the international events that you both held in the community centres that you represent…both held as important regional centres. And as Chair of Protection, Community Services and Parks, I absolutely agree there is really important policy work that needs to continue to acknowledge the role that community services and community centres play in our city to make sure that our city is healthy and protected now and into the future. So I want to acknowledge that. My question is this: you know, we follow the politics of other arm's length organizations like the ones that you and had elected representatives to represent you over the past 18 months I would say to get to where we are today with this formula. April 2018, a motion was put forward by Garden City Community Centre that the next UFF review committee assess the current formula as it related to the various classifications of community centres in Winnipeg, and that's I think your substantive presentation today. The motion at that time was defeated democratically, and so I was wondering if you could comment on that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And I'll just remind everyone, questions and answers will come through the Chair. Thank you.

Michele Augert: Madam Speaker, in response to Councillor Rollins, the motion was in fact defeated, but that's based strictly on the number of community centres there are in the city. There are 63. We make up a very small portion of large community…the large community centres do not make up the majority of the vote. We didn't stand a chance. The other community centres felt that we were somehow going after what they had, and that wasn't the case.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Rollins: So the challenge, I think for Council, is that I know for certain that community centres do want more money and more support and most would agree, it should not…you know, there's a tension between the larger centres and the smaller centres that as you say, make up the majority.

Madam Speaker: The question, Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Oh, I'm sorry. I was preambling, Madam Speaker. So is there a budget ask?

Margie Reis: I don't believe at this point we could come to you with a budget ask. I think we need to look closer first at how the funding formula could work better and how the flow of responsibilities could work better so that all the needs of small, large, medium centres are met. I couldn't even begin to answer the question regarding a budget ask today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Ms. Augert, do you wish to respond to that?

Michele Augert: Yeah, if I could just say, I'm here today because I want to be heard. And as my colleague from Garden City said, while we are big, we are few. And so the system is different, and we need…I think not just an agreement or a funding agreement, but we need a structure for which to support the activities of these larger centres, and as well as the funding that goes along with that. So I think what we really need to do is take a look at the entire system that we created

many, many years ago and take a look at how we can maybe do this better, we can do it smarter. I'm a taxpayer. I don't want to pay any more taxes either, but I do think that giving opportunities to some of the centres that are larger, there is a lot of different places to access funding, not just from the City all the time, and we've proven time and again that we can access those dollars and leverage them for the benefit of the community.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Margie Reis: Madam Speaker, if I could just clarify one thing, the larger community centres, and especially Garden City, we're there to support the smaller centres at all times. I just held a fundraiser in our arena by a group of individuals in order to raise funds for Luxton Community Centre. So we are there for the smaller centres too to support them.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further, Councillor Rollins? Not at this time. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Speaker, and through you, I want to acknowledge the good work that both of these ladies have exhibited. And I have had the pleasure of being at Dakota on several occasions refereeing and being there with our young referees as well. And it is a fantastic facility. We hear a lot of talk about the funding model that goes to our community centres, and we hear a lot of talk about the City trying to be equal across our community centres and how important they are. I have a...can you confirm for me if your organizations or community actually own the building and the land on which it sits?

Margie Reis: Yes, no. The City of Winnipeg owns the facilities and the property on which our community centres reside.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Second question, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: I would assume that that answer is for both community centres, Madam Chair.

Margie Reis: Yes.

Michele Augert: Yes.

Councillor Klein: Have you taken the opportunity to evaluate or have the asset that is owned by the City of Winnipeg that you're taking care of, you're raising money to take care of, that offers City programs as I understand, we're just (inaudible) and such, part of the agreement. You have to fulfill those needs for the city. Do you know how much your…those…either of those assets have grown in value because of the efforts of your organizations and volunteer group?

Michele Augert: That's a...that's a very good question because we depreciate it every day on the balance sheet. I think that how Dakota Community Centre as an asset in the community has viewed since we have invested significantly and changed significantly the way we operate and run that facility, I would say 200%. If you talk...that's why I invite you all to come down because I want you to talk and see the people. If you came here right now at this time during the day, so many community centres would not have anyone in them. Dakota would be full of people using the track. Two hundred and some odd people playing pickleball on 12 courts, and I might add, paying 100…$1.50 a day for the privilege to do it. And actually, most of them…some of them would bemoan the fact that they have to pay the 100…$1.50 a day because they feel they've paid their taxes, and don't you know, we're funded by the City. So what they don't know is on my $5 million operating budget or nearly that, I only get 6% of that from the City through the UFF program, and that does not even cover my hydro bill.

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

Councillor Klein: It's actually my third, Madam Speaker, and final one. I just would like clarification because the first speaker had mentioned that the vote was not unanimous, however, what we've seen or the documentation I've seen claims that in fact, it was unanimous, so I'm perplexed by that.

Michele Augert: I can add to that. We at Dakota actually abstained, and part of it was that our president who's actually our board chair was away and was unable to vote. But we had, in the process, and that was quite disheartening to me as well because of my professional experience in running a very large community centre, and I know that the UFF was being reviewed. I asked, and...on many occasions to be included as a rep on that committee. I was denied that opportunity. There was a rep from a smaller centre who was to be representing our issues. If there was a change in the rep at one point, but I never did hear from anybody, and at the eleventh hour managed to get my concerns in writing to the committee. When I saw the results of all of that, my concerns were never even acknowledged, nor were they…any of them reflected in the documents that were put forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Ms. Reis.

Margie Reis: I do have a copy of our ballot which indicates no to both, and it's signed by our Treasurer on behalf of Andy Heyworth, the President.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker Councillor Lukes, followed by Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Lukes: Just a quick question here, do you have any account or record of how many people come from out of catchment to your facility? Are you able to track that in any way whatsoever?

Michele Augert: Yes, actually, and I'm glad you're asking the questions today and not four years ago because we have implemented a number of systems that allow us to be able to operate at the levels that we do. And so I did ask my staff yesterday…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Chambers moves a five minute extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Michele Augert: I asked my staff to run a few quick numbers just based on cursory postal code reviews, and overall, for the programs, and these are just like our senior programs, our track, our pickleball program and our hockey league, about 70% of the postal codes were not in the catchment to which we get funding for. So essentially on average...I mean, we have a nursery school, 71% of the nursery school children, 60 of them that come daily to our facility do not come from our catchment, and on and on. So if you look at the 1,600 people that use the track every day or that have active memberships for the track, about 800, 850 of them come from elsewhere.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Ms. Reis.

Margie Reis: As stated in my presentation, we did calculate approximately I think 72.5% come from outside, and that's taking into account all our seniors programs, our indoor mini soccer program, the hockey we host, the elite soccer that we host et cetera.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, our next speaker is Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, I'll just be one other question. So you both operate multi-million dollar organizations with very large budgets, the City has set up a very interesting model…

Madam Speaker: The question, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: The City has set up an interesting arrangement with Assiniboine Park Conservancy, I don't know if you're familiar with it at all. If you are, if you could comment on it.

Michele Augert: Actually, thank you for raising that, Councillor Lukes, because it is…you know, in my pursuit of trying to find a better way and in, you know, having success despite all of these barriers, looking at models that could work for these newer centres, and I know the City is contemplating that model for the future. We could look to a model like the Assiniboine Park Conservancy that allows…you know, that sets very high accountabilities and agreements for professional boards and management to, you know, operate towards, and a funding structure that...that properly acknowledges the role that that organization plays and allows them to access other funds through fundraising, through grant applications et cetera. So thank you for raising that because I do think that that is a model that the City should look at for some of these larger centres.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Seeing nothing further, I'll move to Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair. Councillor Lukes actually asked my first question with respect to catchment area and the percentage of draw that is coming from outside the catchment area. The follow up question, Madam Speaker, is what is the impact both financially and the impact to services as a result of that high usage not being within the catchment area?

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Augert.

Michele Augert: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. We are very welcoming of everyone who comes to use our centre. We are very recognized and we have walls, but we don't have borders. And so I've encountered people in our facility who I know who live in another catchment. I've had them hiding around the corner because they go, I'm not sure if I'm supposed to be here. I go, of course you need to be here, but what we…and some of them looked...are we going to

charge them more money because they're coming from outside of catchment? We could. I don't think that that's the right way to do it. A field house does not exist in any one of these other people's back yards, and this is about health and wellness and providing the facilities where people can play and participate. And what's very important to us is all of these facilities, all the new things we've done to the highest accessibility standards. So when you come to our track, people are walking on there with walkers and knee braces having just had surgery and we have you know marathon runners, we have...the kids from St.Amant are there to walk around and participate with the community. So it is more than just health, it is wellness, it is gathering, it is connection, and we shouldn't define that on boundaries, but unfortunately, the funding that supports us is defined that way.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers, anything more…no? I'll move onto Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Long voyage at Dakota, five votes at Council, thank you for all you did to make that finally happen. My question is about arenas that was raised earlier. About 2013, Council made a decision to start shutting down if possible some City arenas and reopening sheets of ice at new facilities such as Garden City. One of the items in budget '14 was a Browaty suggestion that we no longer…that the water utility absorb the cost of water used at City-owned and operated arenas. That has happened. Took me three years, but I finally managed to get the three other arenas…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes move extension for five minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Mayes: The three City-owned but not operated arenas were treated differently until we got St. Vital and Allard and West K, I think, in as…they also get water subsidized by the water utility. You don't at the community centres. Given some of our debates about City-owned and operated arenas possibly having to close, possibly, no decisions made yet, we are treating the two groups differently. Any idea then of just one cost factor, what it might cost for water for relatively modern arenas at the community centres that you operate?

Margie Reis: For our community centre, assuming that we don't have to take out ice and put in new ice because that's about an added $12,000 bill, we run approximately 10...it's quarterly, so I have to figure this out, approximately $40,000 a year in water.

Michele Augest: And I would say that we're fairly similar, but if you add the outdoor rink to that as well, it's significantly more.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Anything further, Councillor Mayes? No? We'll move to Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. Before my time on Council, when Gateway Rec Centre originally went about getting their indoor ice or their community centre ice, as well as when they went about getting their soccer complex, they had to have a business plan that showed that that heated indoor space, that separate space that wasn't under UFF, because it was a City asset or a City liability depending on how you look at it, they had to have a business plan that showed that it would pay for itself. Was that not the requirement for your community centres, for whether it was the field house or your arenas?

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Margie Reis: Madam Speaker, in response to Councillor Browaty's question, as with all business plans, there are unforeseens and unknowns. When the Seven Oaks Arena Committee prepared the business plan, utility costs were based on existing facilities. No other arena like ours existed in the city. Didn't have the same ice plant, didn't have the same structure, so those forecasts were unfortunately significantly off. As well, the calculation or estimate for our UFF, that was off as well. And there's been some struggle with advertising and sponsorship revenues not being where we had hoped they would be, but those are the four main factors that have affected our business plan.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Any further…Ms. Augert, would you like to respond to that?

Michele Augert: Well I could just add to the field house, obviously there was a business plan built on that prior to my arrival that built in a small…on a…I think it was a $17.9 million project when I got there. In the end, it was a $20.5 million project to actually build it the way that we needed to build it and for all the things that were promised to the community. The UFF on the original plan was about $38,000, and I think in the end, we got about 10,000 additional to that.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Looking at the Garden City recommendations here, I guess my simple question is that the request is asking for consideration for the 2020 budget only. As we have heard multiple times, this is a multi-year budget forecast, whatever it may be. I'm wondering if you could explain what the reasoning for only the 2020 consideration as opposed to multiple year impact of this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Ms. Reis.

Margie Reis: Thank you. Just to clarify that, the reason that we asked for 2020 only is because our centre for sure, as well as I'm sure 80% of the other centres cannot go without that funding for the next year while this is considered.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for our delegations? Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes. Thank you to my colleagues who asked many questions. Just one thing is sort of sticking with me. So in St. Boniface, we have several smaller community centres. We have one larger one. And I heard...I heard...well, I heard you address the question of smaller centres, I guess versus the larger ones. I don't know if that's how you framed it, but why would the smaller centres, I guess, be on board with this, and...versus what you're proposing here today? I mean, I have to look out after all of our community centres, the smaller ones and the larger ones, but it makes me nervous that I'm not seeing representation from the smaller centres today and I wonder why that is.

Margie Reis: I can't speak to the…

Madam Speaker: I'm just going to ask for…Councillor Lukes moves extension. Two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Margie Reis: Thank you Madam Speaker. I can't speak to why the smaller centres aren't here today. I can tell you that it is not our intent to take anything away from those. As I stated in my presentation, every centre provides a valuable service for the communities they serve. We're just asking to be able to continue to maintain that standard of service in the larger facilities. And it's our hope that we can come up with a solution that isn't to the detriment of any other community centre.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Ms. Augert.

Michele Augert: Thank you. If I can just add to that, I think really, the important part here is what's being proposed. I think it's actually beneficial to all centres because it is an increase in the amount of funding they're going to get. Proportionately, though, some of the smaller centres...I don't know the percentages, but I would hamper to guess that the UFF comprises a large portion of their operating dollars as opposed to the small portions that it is for the larger centres.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions, we thank you for your presentation today. Okay. I'd like to now call forward Mr. Chris Lorenc. He's the President of the Manitoba Heavy Construction Association. He is in opposition to Item 6 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated December 3rd, 2019 and it's regarding the 2020 Infrastructure Plan. Welcome. We'll put ten minutes on the clock.

Chris Lorenc: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good morning Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor and members of council. We appear this morning, one; disappointed…disappointed to have to oppose EPC's recommendations that the 2020 Infrastructure Plan be incorporated into the City's annual investment planning cycle and multi-year budget process and that its intent be implemented as the blueprint arising from which you will receive and have to debate recommendations prioritizing investment in Winnipeg's infrastructure. And two; to ask you to refer this matter back to EPC to address gaps which I will address. First, make no mistake, the recommendation before you is not to receive the plan for information. The operative words are incorporate and implement. And second, after its adoption, it will be a little late with any credibility to say, well, what about this or some other consideration? The time to ensure those considerations are factored in, weighted and balanced appropriately, is now. Not after its incorporation into the multi-year budget planning cycle. I don't need to tell you that. You live the political world. You know this to be true. We oppose the proposed plan, not because we have issue with prioritizing and planning long-term investment in infrastructure, quite the contrary. We unequivocally support those as appropriate policy objectives. We oppose this plan and ask for its referral because of its fundamental flaws in process, transparency and content. As for process, there was no consultation at any level with the private sector or the public which should have been recognized and harnessed as key stakeholders in shaping prioritization strategies. As to transparency, transparency is misapplied to the process in this instance. The report was released as an addendum to EPC's agenda on Thursday afternoon, November 28th, for consideration at an EPC meeting Tuesday morning, December 3. According to the World Bank, having a sound and transparent prioritization process is essential for governments not only to maximize the economic, environmental and social benefits of

infrastructure investment but also to attract additional funding, financing including the private sector. As for content, absent any opportunity, any opportunity for discussion with the business community or public, there is no reflection of how critical considerations could have manifested themselves to more fully shape a truly ground breaking, best practice establishing long-term objectively weighted criteria-based investment plan including consistency with a forward looking strategy, underpinning the plan which has critical to its long-term success, the buy-in of cross political interests, business community and the general public. As crafted, the plan will act as the slippery slope upon which to foment political ranker, not clarity around investment purpose and project prioritization. According to the World Bank and Canada West Foundation reports, prioritizing investment projects is not only crucial, but they recommend choosing those investments with the greatest economic impact as a matter of priority balanced with the need to renewing existing infrastructure to achieve identified service level target deficiencies. The plan's primary focus should be looking at growing the economy, which means a larger assessment base and growing revenues with which to fund priorities. It should acknowledge that every capital program as a matter of principle be measured as an investment, not an inconvenient expenditure and weighted not as a spend, but for its overall impact on growth. It should harness capital budgets as investment instruments to grow the economy, expand the assessment base generating revenues, to fund allocation to critical services beyond core infrastructure such as emergency services, transit, active transportation, parks and community centres and libraries. The importance of climate resiliency and environmental responsibility is given insufficient weighting at only 7%. According to the January 2019 Ivey Business School report, moving Canada's economic infrastructure forward, there is need for broader consideration of the impact of climate change on infrastructure assets and how to incorporate environmental sustainability through design and building process that is climate smart. Satisfying new regulation and maintaining level of service are given priority weightings at 31% each, excessive in our view. We do not quarrel that they are criteria and that they are important. They are. But each area's funding need is enabled by growth, not the other way around. Ignoring the private sector flies in the face of literature which consistently recommends its up front and ongoing participation. Again, Canada West Foundation and now the Business Council of Canada, for example, recommend engagement with the private sector beyond short term consultation to harness its knowledge about which infrastructure is critical to growth to facilitate ten to 25 year planning and delivery time frames required to invest and improve competitiveness. Short and long-term project cost impacts on operating and capital budgets including life cycle considerations and opportunities to offset or mitigate the impacts by revenue generating strategies and leveraging public and private sector investment or funding are ignored. Accepting the obvious, that without economic and therefore assessment based growth, there are no revenues…no new revenues to government. It is surprising that enables growth as a weighted criteria generates only, and I stress only a 7% weighting. A further concern is that its definition is too narrow. It speaks only to where development does not exist or is targeted for densification. The definition should underscore the broader economic growth that comes through policies and programs aimed at the economy, including moving people to jobs and products to market. The plant's criteria and economic impact allotted again only 7% is also too narrow. A broader recognition of economic growth as a criteria would fully consider all factors and assist in increasing the City's GDP. We suggest that growing the economy should be identified as a separate category having a much higher priority and weighting than what has been accorded in the proposed plan. To conclude, we respectfully ask for the plan's referral back to EPC to address its identified gaps. Referral enables this council a ground breaking opportunity to adopt a leading edge policy, guiding investment in core infrastructure, using objectively weighted and prioritized criteria to address the economy and the environment, to discharge legislative and regulatory obligations, to balance investment between new and rehabilitating existing infrastructure, to engage the private sector's critical market knowledge, and ultimately to respect the pressures placed upon the shoulders of all rate payers. This is not a delay tactic. We urge investing the upfront time to ensure the right product. Councillor Allard, to his credit, chaired a multi-stakeholder committee to come up with recommendations to accelerate the capital budget approval and project completion process. This was accomplished in four meetings over two months. Nothing is lost by referral but much is to be gained. The business community which relies on being productive and therefore competitive in a competitive world expects investment principles coupled with sound, long-term planning to support growth. Winnipeggers expect their governments, this government, to do what is right for the economy and therefore best to preserve our high quality of life. And they collectively anticipate you making the obviously right decision, in this case, referral so please make it. Be transparent about what it is you wish to achieve, how you wish to achieve it strategically, including what roles the private sector should play in helping shape investment in our city's growth, therefore, our collective economic and social well-being.

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

Chris Lorenc: The die is not yet cast. The responsibility and opportunity for the right decision rests before you this morning. Please make the right decision. Please refer this clause back to EPC. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay. We'll now take questions. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much, Mr. Lorenc. It's always a pleasure. Just want to make a quick one question for clarification. What you're asking for today inside the referral is really to review the matrix that we used, is that correct?

Chris Lorenc: Yes. We think that the matrix is inadequate, inaccurate and doesn't focus priority on growing the economy which ought to be as literature will…and research will show should be a priority.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Mr. Lorenc for your presentation. Yes, I or at least almost half of council was quite surprised when this came up, and we had a very brief briefing on it and didn't have the opportunity for much input amidst all the budget deliberations that were going on. My question to you is...and at the time I presented at EPC, too, and understood many of the Executive Policy members speaking to this as an information document, it's an information document. But yet, the motion before...or the report before us today ends up as...to be incorporated in the annual investment planning cycle and in the multi-year budget process. The question I have for you is, what do you think the impact on Winnipeggers and taxpayers will be if this report, which…it's absolutely headed in the right direction, but again, I, too, feel it's half baked. It's not quite there yet. What will the impact be on taxpayers if this is incorporated into our investment plan and multi-year budget cycle?

Chris Lorenc: Madam Speaker, if the ask of administration who I respect…I respect the authors of the report, was what should we as internal managers of assets looking narrowly at how we manage existing assets focus on, it's a good report. But this is not a report that speaks to managing Winnipeg's infrastructure beyond the narrow internal focus, and that is its biggest deficiency because assets, whether managed internally, existing or new shape the future direction of this city. Investment strategies will either help grow the economy or simply extract more revenues from existing ratepayers without creating a bank of more shoulders upon which to make investment strategies going forward, and you will be in the continuous struggle of cutting transit, cutting parks, cutting recreation, having insufficient revenues, walking away from plans that already are behind schedule as it relates to infrastructure. You need to focus as a council on the number one priority which enables everything else, and that's to grow the economy, and that is not what this document enables. What you are going to have with the adoption of this document is constant political haranguing over whether or not something has reached a priority to make the list, and that's not the purpose of the document. It has to have cross political buy-in around the criteria. It has to have buy-in from the business community and the general community. You're not going to get unanimity, but if we understand and appreciate the weighting and the criteria, then it's a completely different discussion which this document does not enable. It does the opposite. Therefore, it should be referred back.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Councillor Lukes. We'll move on. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. I always respect the hearing from Mr. Lorenc about infrastructure. My first question, Madam Speaker, because I believe he's getting into the consultation regarding the private sector, those private sector people who actually build the infrastructure. I don't think the City builds anything anymore itself. So the first question I have is, this weighting system for asset management has been in progress now since my first term, late in the first term, with...under Mayor Katz, and it was developed all the way through for the last five years under Mayor Bowman, and I'm just wondering, in the consultation that Mr. Allard was there, you also, I know, were involved in other consultations during my first term. Has...have you ever been consulted about this weighting system for our asset management in the City of Winnipeg?

Chris Lorenc: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Eadie, no, we have not.

Councillor Eadie: When you talk about economic...growing the economy, I heard you refer to assets that we can apply property taxes to, but when you consider economic growth, is it your belief that we should be looking at, you know, for example, Chief Peguis Trail, does that create…help create more jobs? Because really, if you want to grow the economy, it's about growing jobs is one of the most essential components.

Chris Lorenc: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Eadie, the objective of the presentation is not to identify projects that we may or may not, as an association or as an industry, view as being priorities. But I can as I did cite to Executive Policy Committee, the example of CentrePort Canada Way which is a tri-level investment and a major transportation corridor that was built during the period of Premier Selinger and Mayor Katz and that investment has enabled in excess of $700 million of private sector investment in the belief that CentrePort Canada can transform the local and regional economy into a global trading hub. And that $700 million has not stopped. That $700 million will more than double, much of it enabled because of that transportation corridor. And it's those kinds of impacts on the economy that in the business community view should hold a much higher role and a higher weighting and a higher consideration than what is in the plan because as I noted, the plan, if it's for the purposes of pure narrow managerial review of how I

need to manage the assets as a department of head is fine. As the document that projects how we allocate capital resources for the purposes of economic growth to get an ROI from that, it's an inadequate incomplete flawed document.

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

Councillor Eadie: This would be my final and third question. I'm wondering if our…if Mr. Lorenc had heard that CP Rail said that they would not go with a P3 model to build the...a new Arlington Bridge. Are you aware of that?

Chris Lorenc: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Eadie, no, I am not aware of that. I am now.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Eadie, thank you for that. We'll move on now to Councillor Schreyer and then Councillor Klein.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Mr. Lorenc has mentioned and as it is written in the report that the Manitoba Heavy Industry Association suggests that growing the economy should be identified as a separate category, having as much a higher priority in weighting than what has been accorded in the proposed plan. So I can see why it's part of the weighting system. I'm not sure if Mr. Lorenc is saying it should be taken out of the existing weighting system, but saying it should be given special consideration, given how important it is, growing the economy. Could Mr. Lorenc perhaps explain a little more what is meant by the issue of growing the economy and the importance it should be given within the weighting system or as a separate attribute, which is at the top of page 3.

Chris Lorenc: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Schreyer, the document that that portion of the presentation references is page 8 of 2020 Infrastructure Plan which provides the criteria and the weighting and the descriptives associated with each of the categories. And if you look at page 8, you'll see the new regulation maintaining level of service are each weighted 31%, and if you then take a look at enables growth and economic impact, they're each given a weighting of 7%. Growing the economy needs to be part of these criteria, not as a separate part…in a separate document and a separate policy, but part of the policy. What we're saying is that growing the economy has to have a higher weighting allocation, a higher prioritization than the 7% that it's been accorded. And again, what we're offering, what we're suggesting is based on the research, albeit recent...

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

Chris Lorenc: That I have been able to undertake since the tabling of this report. And hence the reason for requesting that it be referred back so that there can be the kind of discussion with the private sector that is required in order to ensure that the weighting is appropriate.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Given the state of our budget and economy, we don't know even when we will be...

Madam Speaker: Your question, please.

Councillor Schreyer: You know, redoing our next 100 year old bridge, would Mr. Lorenc and the Manitoba Heavy Industry Association consider using the term, not only growing the economy, but things like sustaining the economy and working within that concept as well?

Chris Lorenc: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Schreyer, growing assumes sustainability. I'm less worried about the descriptive than I am focusing and ensuring that the concept, the priority, the need, the obligation, the responsibility to focus capital programs as a matter of priority on growing the economy is part of the weighted criteria and weighted appropriately.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Speaker, and through you, recently...not that recently, our speaker spoke to the environmental sustainability aspect of being included in some of the projects, especially like infrastructure. Moody's stated not long ago that environmental sustainability along with other considerations are now considered important components of their rating and sovereign analysis which, of course, would be followed by people like S&P and others. Now what I'm hearing, and I hear often from the community, is there's no consistency in what we're doing. There's no…it seems we're picking and choosing on a regular basis, but there's no plan. I'm wondering in your experience, through you Madam Chair, in our speaker's experience, if he has ever seen a document or a report put together that is actually the strategic plan for the City? Many cities across the nation, big and small do do this. Because I'm wondering without the

development of a true strategic plan of where we're going to be in five, ten, 15 years, how could we put forward a plan for infrastructure that has changed from year to year to year and continues to do so?

Chris Lorenc: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Klein, I have often, and in many venues, public and private, complimented the City's approach in terms of its long-term planning. That doesn't mean that we'll agree on every decision that Council ultimately makes, but you have the elements of the policies that enable you to move forward well ahead of other municipalities in this country. What we're saying is that...and at EPC, for example, I complimented the fact that the City has the dedicated local and regional streets program. That it has the updated state of the infrastructure report, that it tabled in May '19 the unfunded liability report, and that recently it came up with the 2020 infrastructure plan. The deficiency is not with the fact that you're not addressing it. The deficiency is that the document, the 2020 infrastructure plan as that final piece for your discussion is incomplete. And because it's incomplete and flawed, it doesn't add to the value of your capital asset management plan and the other reports that collectively enable and help Council make the decisions that it makes. So there is no shortage of reports, there's no shortage of policy. In the case of this one, it's incomplete, it's inadequate. It has not had the benefit of consultation or collaboration with the private sector. It needs that in order to assist completion of the directions that Council needs to make.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, thank you to the speaker…our guest speaker. I'm wondering if our speaker could comment and provide some insight into how community input and business input will make this better.

Chris Lorenc: Well, again, literature consistently suggests, the most recent one being from the Canadian Business Council suggesting that there ought to be consideration by the federal government as an example, to adopt legislation that creates a permanent panel consisting of government and private sector to help the national government framework frame and shape priorities for investment in Canada's trade gateways and corridors. I'm not saying that we need legislation, but I do suggest that a committee could and should be struck with the City, with the private sector and in short order be able to come back...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Chambers moves a two-minute extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Chris Lorenc: Be able to come back with advice to Council upon which it could make a decision.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Any further questions? No? Seeing none, thank you for your presentation today, Mr. Lorenc.

Chris Lorenc: Just on a personal note, may I take this moment to extend each of you a very Merry Christmas, happy holidays to you individually, collectively and your families. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, and the very best to you as well. Thank you. I'd like to now call forward Mr. Jack Moore if he's here today. Yes. Mr. Moore is the President…Vice President, pardon me, of the Transcona Museum, and he is in opposition to Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks, the report dated November 14th, 2019 regarding museums as a special operating agency. Welcome.

Jack Moore: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, Madam Speaker, member of council, thank you for the opportunity to be speaking today. It's actually to recommendation 9, I don't mind. I'm speaking today about the…in opposition to the redeployment of the curator at the Transcona Historical Museum. This redeployment, number one, will not only eliminate a CUPE museum position, but it also leaves the Transcona Museum without its senior staff position. Although this item has been approved for Council consideration today in a vote, I'm here to ask that you consider one of the two following options moving forward. Number one, of course, oppose…please oppose this motion. Remove it completely from this report. The City has not provided the board of directors at the Transcona Museum with any reason or justification for removing or redeploying the curator, and we feel it's unwarranted and unnecessary. If you feel you must vote on this and approve it, we are asking that you amend Item 2 on the standing committee recommendation, that...I'll read it to you, "That recommendations 3 to 7 of this report of the Winnipeg Public Service be laid over for up to 180 days, and that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to consult stakeholders on options and alternatives and provide a written report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks." We're asking you, if you have to vote in favour of it, amend it to be laid over for up to 180 days. With respect to option one of voting and opposing this option, removing it altogether, the board appreciates the fact that the City's still going to continue funding the museum. It's either through the Winnipeg Arts Council or however it's going to be decided upon. We...it was presented on a plan b to the standing committee. It was...the plan b was organized and prepared with the help of Councillor Santos and a consortium of the civic museums. They're looking, and we thank you for all the work you've done on that. We do not see any benefit to redeploying the valued and knowledgeable employee away from this position. You're not saving any

money. You're not eliminating a position, you're only redeploying it. You're still going to be paying this person. Why not leave her at a job she's fully qualified and highly recognized on doing. She's at…our curator not only guides the day-to-day activities of the museum, but she's actively involved in an ongoing fundraiser for our current major undertaking, the preservation and restoration of the historic steam locomotive, the CN 2747, the first locomotive built in western Canada built at the Transcona shops. This engine has become a Transcona landmark and it represents a poignant piece of Transcona's history. The curator also develops and conducts educational and school programs to bring Transcona youth to the museum. She accepts the artifacts into the museum's collection, supervises and trains staff and volunteers, prepares the exhibits, constantly works to engage and build our sense of community, and the list could go on and on. She's also recently been recognized through the Association of Manitoba Museums. She was presented the Award of Excellence for creating our Remembrance Week exhibit, Remember and Reflect: The War Efforts of Transcona. She was given that award at a dinner about a month and a half ago. Given the pivotal role the curator plays with respect to the success of our community museum, the board of directors can see no reason for this suggestion of redeployment. There has been no mismanagement of resources, no abuse of time, no incidents of discipline. Deadlines are met, new programs and exhibitions are created, artifacts are being cared for and this museum is successful and thriving under the leadership of our curator. If you feel you have to vote in terms of option two, to redeploy, we are asking that you amend the item, Item 2, to be laid over...to be included to be laid over for 180 days. This way, the board of directors of the Transcona Museum will have an opportunity to consider a strategic plan going forward in the case that you do move forward with the redeployment. This time would allow us to make preparations, should we have to hire a new executive director-curator to handle the day-to-day operation of the museum. It will have…we'll have to restructure the job responsibilities to include not only the aforementioned curator responsibilities but also take on the management of payroll and other day-to-day operations for the museum. This person would also, of course, be responsible for applying for and reporting on additional grant funds for the museum, and I would like to add that our curator since 2017 has secured over $161,500 in additional grants for our museum from all levels of government and that's over and above the operational grant provided by the City of Winnipeg. We'd also have to create a payroll system for our new executive director-curator, our assistant curator and other contract employees, as right now it is being done through the City of Winnipeg. And even though our assistant curator is not an employee of the City of Winnipeg, it is being done as a courtesy through here that she is being paid. We refund the money through our operational grant to the City for her salary and her payroll and all her paperwork, her T4s are done through here. I have a feeling if our curator's redeployed, that agreement's going to end. We will also have to create a bookkeeping system for our accounts receivable and our payables for expenses related to the operational expenses of the museum, as currently, it's all done against the operating budget and are paid directly by the City of Winnipeg, which again would likely end if that position gets redeployed. Without a new bookkeeping system in place, this place is in an increased pressure on the amount of work already being done by our volunteer treasurer. We would also, before any redeployment, have to investigate the status of the City of Winnipeg pension. The assistant curator, although not an employee of the City of Winnipeg, has an agreement through the City and the museum that she can contribute to the City pension plan. Now if no longer being payrolled through the City of Winnipeg, what would happen to her plan and all the money she has put into that plan? This is something that needs to be discussed. So on behalf of the board of directors at the Transcona Museum, we are asking, number one, that you oppose this motion...this item altogether or that you consider the other option. We know that the council recognizes the strong sense of community that our local museums can cultivate, and we at the museum want to be prepared as possible should our curator be redeployed so as not to interrupt the quality of programs and service that the residents of Transcona and other residents of Winnipeg have come to know from our museum. Should Item 9 be adopted, our board members and remaining employees will be left to perform the multitude of duties I have outlined that our curator currently undertakes until such time she can be replaced. Given that our board consists of volunteers, most of whom work full-time at other positions at other places, this would greatly impact the quality of the day-to-day operations of the museum and more than likely result in the museum needing to temporarily close while we regroup and determine our next steps. Not having time to prepare for this redeployment would only serve to hurt the membership of our museum and the residents of Transcona. Thank you for your consideration.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for the presentation. We'll now take questions, starting with Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you for coming and talking about the impacts. It's an important reminder that…of the difficulties we've been talking about; individual budget concepts, work units and the co-committed impact it this has on staff like you've talked about. Are you aware, and I think you are, given your presentation today, that we did lay it over for six months, and so redeployment by its very definition would suggest there is a different action, so the six month consultation. My second question, quick succession is, are you aware that, you know, there was a layover in six months to provide more consultation and...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins, let's keep that for the second round. If we can let him answer the first question, go ahead sir.

Jack Moore: Item 9, the redeployment of the Transcona Museum curator was not laid over. It was recommended on the agenda today to be voted on for approval. It was not laid over.

Councillor Rollins: Sorry, I didn't mean the layover. I meant I wanted to clarify. I meant the substantive piece, right, of whether or not to move that to the Winnipeg Art Council. Sorry, I misspoke. My second question is, are you aware that a councillor could today lay over that item, the one about the staff for six months more simply to continue not only paying the employees at the museum, but there could be a motion today that amends that, and I think that that is what…

Jack Moore: That is what I'm asking an option…sorry, that is what I'm asking in option to.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for our delegation? Seeing none, we appreciate your presentation today, sir.

Jack Moore: Okay. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Sure. Thank you. Thank you.

Jack Moore: Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: I'll hand this over to the Clerk for our records. Thank you. We'll now move into reports, Mr. Mayor, of Executive Policy Committee. We'll start with the report dated November 26th, 2019.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 26, 2019**

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

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor, on the next report.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 3, 2019**

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 9.

Madam Speaker: Okay. We have two motions, so we will pull Item 4 and Item 6 to start…2, 5, 7 and 8. Okay, Councillor Lukes, you had your hand up, same thing? And I had…saw a hand over here. That's been covered? Okay, great. Mr. Clerk...so I'll call the question, first of all, sorry, on Items 1, 3 and 9. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 – Destination Marketing Reserve – Multi-Year Downtown Public Safety Strategy

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, your opportunity to introduce Item 2 – Destination Marketing Reserve.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This was an extension for 30 days with a report back of the use of the funding from the reserve for downtown safety. I'll wait to hear from my council colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And this was stood down by Councillor Klein. Go ahead.

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Speaker. Safety downtown is paramount, but it's also paramount to all residents who live throughout our city. I understand this was to extend it, but my fear is that we're not looking at the bigger picture here. The budget, really, for this…the fund is $11.292 million in 2019. And I didn't see this opportunity for lighting put into the budget process, but I did see cuts, not additions. So I wanted to really try to find out why we're considering such actions when we're walking into a four-year forecast budget, when we're attempting to identify cuts to services, libraries, and so on. Here we are taking funds out of a reserve and putting them towards a program that doesn't serve all residents. It has a place. Downtown safety is paramount, agreed, but is this the proper step forward? Is this the proper

way to manage City funds? I believe that we should be considering what people...the people we work for would want. We should not be reducing funding overall in the city or cutting services, and we should not be approving such items or even taking it back. We should be taking it off the table and making it a part of the budget process because there is no evidence that comes with this report that would suggest in anywhere in the documents that I've seen that this is…this will work, that this is what residents have wanted. This is how businesses have come forward and said, this is what we need. There is no examples of success. This is just a, you know, an addition to a program that's been running for some time. I haven't seen an evaluation on the return of this project, considering we are once again draining dollars from a reserve account that was not established for this purpose, I cannot imagine how any of us could vote for that, even for the extension. I think we need to vote or send it right back to the budget working group because that's where it has to go to be considered this time when we're looking at difficult decisions. It is hard to understand how in one meeting we can talk about turning off streetlights to save the City money, and here we are today, we are going to extend it and bring it back to put money into a lighting program. So I would ask that my colleagues consider sending it back to a budget working group, not extending the program, evaluate the program. Tell me if it works, show me that it works. Give me some tangible evidence. Let's talk about, is this the best use of taxpayer dollars, not just put it off and bring it back, make it a part of our vision and our strategy because I'm not seeing any vision or strategy when it comes to the program in front of us.

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

Mayor Bowman: Yes, Madam Speaker. Councillor Klein may wish to review the transcripts and the Hansard from the meeting at committee. There was a desire from members of committee to have a written report from the public service so that we could all as a council and public have more detailed written information on the status and the delivery of this matter. One item that I don't think requires a report, Chief of Police identified the transit stop at Portage Place as a particularly...particular location they had concerns about. Part of the implementation of the downtown safety strategy which pulls money out of the destination marketing reserve to assist specifically with downtown safety matters was in fact to demolish and replace the transit stop at Portage Place, and that has been done. You don't need a report to see that, you simply need to go by on Portage Avenue and see that. So there have been deliverables to date, but we'd like a written report, and we'd like to have that detail provided sooner than later so that all members of council and the public can see the status. I would like to thank the Police Service for their assistance in this matter. This effort has involved the Police Service, and I'm sure that Chair of the Police Board would know that as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? And we'll note Councillor Klein in opposition, thank you. Councillor Nason as well, thank you. Item 4.

Item 4 – Community Centre Universal Funding Formula Review

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Mayor to introduce Item 4.

Mayor Bowman: I'll wait to hear from council colleagues on this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes, it's your opportunity to introduce your amending motion. That's Motion 1.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Lukes,
Seconded by Councillor Chambers,

BE IT RESOLVED that item 4. of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee date December 3, 2019 be amended by deleting recommendations 1, to 5 and replacing them with the following:

"1. That the existing City of Winnipeg / General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres / Community Centres Universal Funding Formula remain in place until such time as a fulsome review of the funding formula is adopted by Council, with the following amendment:

A. That existing Universal Funding Formula be modified, based on the specialized community centre index of 2.42% with resulting rates of $1.95 per capita, $3.57 per heated square footage, $6,050 for the first two rinks per site, and $3,025 for each additional rink per site, to be adjusted annually for inflation each year thereafter. The Universal Funding Formula funding envelope will be increased

annually by the Public Service by the greater of CPI or the specialized community centre index.

2. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to form a working group consisting of the Director of Community Services, representatives from The General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres, and include large to medium size community centers to meet to review and update the Universal Funding Formula to ensure the model is more responsive to local needs, leading to a more contemporary and financially sustainable model.*

3. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back to Council with the findings of the working group and recommendations for the adoption of a new City of Winnipeg / General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres / Community Centres Universal Funding Formula, when a fulsome review of the funding formula is completed.*

4. *That a one-time retroactive UFF payment adjustment to community centres totaling $102,975 for 2018 and 2019 be approved.*

5. *That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing."*

Councillor Lukes: Motion 1, okay. Thank you very much. All right, just a minute here. So I will say I'm a little...I'm quite disappointed that there was no briefing on this to non-EPC members. I think that our community centres are our heartbeat and life blood of the city. They do so much for our city, and this is an integral part of their existence, so I'm…you know…but this is a common thing around here. So I'm disappointed that we didn't get a briefing. I think we heard today that community centres are not a one-size-fit-all, that our city is growing and changing, we're projecting 11,000-plus people a year. That centralized registration is occurring for many organized sports. Catchments are no longer as relevant for when organized sports are in play using facilities. Larger facilities provide a sports entertainment aspect. Volunteers are declining. The City is having to take over and run some centres. We have 63 community centres. There's no way one model can fit all, especially under the growth we're expecting to see. I'm hearing from these larger centres that there really wasn't meaningful engagement with them, and I've spoken to my community centre also who couldn't come down today and speak. And I think that...I'm also hearing that the UFF model and the current system doesn't really support or enable the community centres to become sustainable, and I think we really want that. Of course we want that. So the motion in front of us here is to ask that we keep the UFF formula, the formula in place, recognizing that many centres would fold without it, but it's a request to have a further fulsome and meaningful conversation and review with all sizes of community centres, and having them at the table. And to discuss and bring forward recommendations to Council that are more responsive to the local needs and provide more contemporary and financially sustainable model forward. The review…the two-year review came forward and nothing changed, so again, I'm really challenged by the fact that nothing changed, and we're growing at an incredible rate. So this motion is to say look, let's keep the funding going to the community centres to keep them alive and going and have a more meaningful conversation with all community centres.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Next speaker is Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much. I do believe Councillor Lukes and Councillor Chambers' motion will be ultimately a referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. I'm looking strategically at the clerks for a nod. But potentially, it's Executive Policy Committee as Councillor Lukes indicated, that's where it went first, Madam Chair. And I will note that as an Executive Policy Committee member, I did not receive a pre-briefing. It would be PC? Okay. But I just want to put a few thoughts on the table with respect to Protection, Community Services and Parks and with respect to, you know, the meaningful engagement. I think it's interesting that councillors democratically elected, likely feel that their presence in this council, Madam Chair, is as a result of democracy and perhaps meaningful engagement during the election, and I can't make sufficient amount of jokes on my colleague from Waverley West who was actually claimed, so not necessarily suitable for Waverley West in these next comments. But in terms of the debate, it is really important to note that out of the 63 possible community centres, 48 did support what we have before us today, and that's important because it did also include large centres that came before us in delegation today and large centres that voted specifically for this formula. Some of them recognizing that smaller clubs would receive less funding if there were a different kind of formula and that is in part what's at issue today. So with respect to meaningful engagement, it did start two years ago, and in part it started two years ago because our ward boundaries were changing. And we as a council held that up. They waited to look at that. But in April, it's also important to note that a motion of the kind that Councillor Lukes might favour, Madam Chair, was forwarded by Garden City Community Centre that the next UFF review committee assessed the current formula as it relates to the various classifications, read

bigger community centres in Winnipeg. And that motion was defeated. So if that is how the well gets poisoned, and then people don't feel meaningfully engaged, well, at the end of the day, they may have lost that effort. Their renewed effort is not being met with that fears today, but I think it's really important to acknowledge that there were 48 of 63 centres did endorse the plan before us. And I appreciate that the motion in this regard by Councillor Lukes, the amending motion…and Councillor Chambers, doesn't interfere with the plan today. And the plan today has some benefits. It...it...but I think it's really important to mention that that vote was lost and defected, that the five districts, maybe they were...there are different thoughts of how the five districts who then created that representation that took you…took us through October 2018 meetings, that the surveys that were in the fall of 2018, that review of the surveys in January of 2019, and so on and so on, about half...about a dozen different meetings that leads us to this report of arm's length general council meetings that looked at the review, but it's important that yes, they didn't look at changing the review because that vote was defeated. And so, that review of the responsibilities document had a specific scope. So there was an endorsement of what we see before us. There was also endorsement of that annual inflationary tool, again, what we see before us, and there was endorsement for that one-time retroactive adjustment to centres for the past two years totalling over $100,000. And I think that that's...that should give councillors comfort that that's what we're doing today. I'm happy to participate at the will of the Mayor on discussions with our larger centres. I do think that, you know, there is, like I said, policy work to be done not only in Community Services and Parks, to look at the issue of regionality, to look at the issue of larger centres, but also within the general council. But I don't want this chamber to not acknowledge that people powered work, the work largely of volunteers, the work and the many, many meetings that got us to this report today, and I think that we risk that when we characterize that external democratic process as faulty. It was a minority opinion, a minority opinion that has weight and should have perhaps a life, like it's suggested in this motion by Councillor Lukes and Councillor Chambers, but there's cautionary notes. There's cautionary notes for, you know, the Davids and the Goliaths, and there's cautionary notes on clubs that have more of an opportunity to be able to raise revenue, more of an opportunity to interact those regional and national events, more of an opportunity to yes, you know, have...look strategically at their rental rates, their tracks, their ice time, so...and have more of a catchment. So I think it's important that even among the large centres, there were people who voted in favour and fully supported this proposal in light of that 2018 defeated motion. And so I wanted to add some context to this report, how it was created, the over a dozen meetings that led us to this place, and I wanted to specifically honour those that put it...that put in a great deal of time in the work, that were representative of their centres, and give them thanks. And they include; from district one, Julie Bubnick, district two, Terry Wolowiec, district three, Nathan Wild and Crystal Courtland, district four, Tom Nesby, district five, Dina Moore and Kevin Leclair, and of course, the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centre representatives, Marlene Amell, Cindy Fox and from the City of Winnipeg, Paul Skutnik, Jeff Smithson and committee Chairperson Steve Bemrose, all of whom stayed with that review that began in 2018 and got us to the report you see here before you today, including the review and supported by their community centres. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak in favour of the amendment, thank you to Councillor Lukes and Councillor Chambers for bringing that forward. Dakota's actually never been in my ward though people used to think it was. It's always been in Councillor Lukes, Councillor Swandel, Councillor Chambers' ward. And it is a different sort of operation in scope than something like Greendell which is maybe a mile away. It's vastly different. It's more of a regional facility. We wanted it to fill that role. We put money in for it to have that role. Therefore, it has that role. They're doing what we wanted them to do. I would vote for this amendment solely on one thing which is…I get…and none of this faults Councillor Rollins to...luckily I never had to put in all this time on this formula when I was Chair of PCS many years ago, but she's obviously had to put in some time on it and it doesn't leap out as being a particularly fun or interesting exercise to be blunt. When I'm given a document signed by GCWCC that says, the GCWCC and its members have unanimously endorsed the proposed changes, and then I'm told, 46 out of 63, unanimous. I said well, wait a minute, that alone gives me quite a bit of pause, no fault on Councillor Rollins. But you can't send me something that says it's unanimous and then say, oh, well we got 46, close enough. I can't vote for that. So I like the amendment. It doesn't undo all that's been done. It does get the money flowing. It does say the bigger ones have some different interests. They do. It's obvious from the scope and the difference in size. Why did I ask that question about the water, you may ask? It's to show the difference in operations, especially back in 2014, we had an arena policy that involved shutting down some of the City arenas to open up sheets at the community centres. That's never been taken off the books. If we are continuing to head in that way, and maybe we are, maybe we aren't, then we really have to be cognizant of the different ways in which these larger community centres operate. The Dakota's, the Garden City's, East End, I think. New sheets of ice were built in about 2014 at Garden City under your leadership, Madam Speaker, and out in the East End, and with councillor…former Councillor Wyatt. There are differences. We do give free water to...free water, the utility absorbs the cost of the water for the City-owned and operated arenas. Now also the three City-owned but not operated arenas, but we don't do that for the community centre arenas. That alone creates a discrepancy, makes it a little bit harder for them to find the operating funds to operate arenas. And if we're going to ask them to do more of that, if we're going to ask them to do more operation of arenas, I think we have to be aware that there's a certain different funding obligation on them. Now, it's not all bigs or mediums that operate an arena, Glenwood has an arena in my ward, but it's part of the

puzzle here though. I think we need to endorse the amendment, keep this moving forward, but also come back and talk to some of the bigger ones. It wasn't unanimous. And if you look at our arenas report, as you are fond of doing Madam Speaker, from April of 2010, you'll see that we actually now have more community centre operated sheets of ice than City-owned and operated sheets of ice with the closure of Vimy and Michener and one other that will come to me in due course. Then we're down to I think 12 owned and operated if you include Sawchuk and all the other community centres, we're up around 19. The balance here is on the community centre sheets of ice, and if we're saying to them, well, we have a different set of rules for the City-owned than we do for the community centres, that alone I think should give us some pause on having a universal formula that doesn't take into account some of these regional aspects. So Dakota is doing what it was set up to do, act as a regional centre. My son was playing basketball there as part of the Ruta's Winnipeg Minor Basketball Association on Sunday. It draws from all over the place. Now so do some of the others. My kids played at Linden Woods. That's not a big, huge regional centre. But if you go by these facilities...and Dakota has been the beneficiary of a lot of expansion, you'll see it's a very different operating model than the Greendell's and some of the other small ones. So I endorse the motion. Thanks to Councillor Chambers and Lukes for bringing it forward. No criticism of Councillor Rollins and her role as chair, but I do think we need to take a second look at a report that wasn't unanimous and see if we can't do something about that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing the hour, Councillor Browaty, was that your comment? Okay. You'd like to speak. It is 12 noon, so it is time for Council to recess and re-adjourn at 1:30. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Just because we're just getting going into the meeting, could I ask that we do 1:00?

Madam Speaker: To break at lunch? There are some members that may have purchased a…may have a commitment, a previous commitment. I don't know if that's still the case. No? So okay, is it the will of Council to continue and recess at 1:00 p.m.?

Mayor Bowman: No, no, I meant recess and come back at 1:00, rather than 1:30 just so we can…

Madam Speaker: Okay, so just one hour, Mr. Mayor? Okay.

Councillor Allard: I mean, I have a lunch appointment. Well, it's two-thirds. I mean, I don't need to vote, whatever.

Madam Speaker: Okay, I think the Mayor's fine, okay, 12. We're going to break now, and we will reconvene at 1:30. Thank you. Councillor Lukes, there was no motion put forward. Well, it's too late now. I've already said that we are…

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
December 12, 2019, at 1:49 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I'd like to reconvene the council meeting of December 12th, 2019. We are on the reports of the Executive Policy Committee dated December 3rd, 2019 – Item 4, Community Centre Universal Funding Formula Review. We have amending Motion 1 before us on this item, and the next speaker is Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We're still working on this motion, but I do want to reiterate the sentiments that were made this morning by the two CEOs of the larger community centres, Dakota Community Centre and Garden City. Again just drawing specific reference to the use of their facilities, the lack of catchment area per se, and the fact that it is a City of Winnipeg wide draw in the use of their facilities impacting on the resources that they have available. As mentioned, I think Councillor Mayes may have mentioned earlier, is that some community centres are closed throughout the day and don't have the impacts of lighting and staff and those other resources that draw, you know, on their financial resources when they have to be open during the day to accommodate the thousands of people that go through there on a daily basis. So again, in terms of looking at the funding formula that's currently in place, it doesn't address the fact that they're drawing from a city-wide perspective, 70% in some cases are...of individuals that are using their facilities are outside of their catchment area. So again, the motion that has been drafted does not want to impede the dollars that are going through the door retroactively to help those smaller community centres meet their financial targets and needs. But as well, does speak to the issue that a proper formula has to be in place so that it speaks to the use of the larger facilities that again are drawing residents and citizens and users from all across the city.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think the bigger question that we have here is how did we end up with a motion in front of us at this stage that hasn't been vetted properly? I understand that the GCWC reports to EPC if I have that accurate and correct, so there is no discussion at committee level. You know, in listening to comments around the table, I don't think that just because two particular community centres are successful, that they should be punished, but I haven't looked at the formula because yet again, this is an example of how great our governance model is. The public service did not meet with all councillors to explain the rationale for the proposed changes. Now, hey, there was meetings apparently and there was discussions of council votes and the previous council, but that's then, this is now. We should have had, at the very least, an opportunity to be told and to hear from the public service their rationale. We weren't given that opportunity. We weren't given that opportunity at all, and you know, it's something that boggles my mind because we talk about now, you know, everybody has the opportunity to debate and ask questions. You can go to committee meetings, but if a motion is brought forward at EPC, how do you do that? And when I have…there's various e-mails going back and forth, trying to get a meeting to discuss the rationale for proposed changes. Nothing, nothing was done. I know, and I know Councillor Lukes is trying. Another example, if we're talking about, you know, a change to funding for some people, not a part of the budget process, and we're identifying a couple of groups, I think referred to as David and Goliath, but these are residents that are doing their best to run facilities that we failed at running. And if we look around the city, we have a number of community centres that are failing, and that was under our management. The centres that have taken on a new approach, a new look, have been successful, so we're saying to them who are taking care of our assets, thanks for your hard work. You have too much money. I think that we're also…we really have to understand why…why this is being pushed through today. You know, I'm looking at the secondary motions and such, and I'm listening to the conversation, and what I'm hearing is that we're actually debating something in a way here at Council, but we're trying to push it through in one day when not all councillors have been told or shared the rationale for the proposed changes from the public service. I don't know how anyone could vote in favour of a motion when you haven't had that explanation provided to you. It's about making informed decisions. I understand this is two community clubs. They're not in my ward, but they're a part of Winnipeg. In my ward, we have a community group taking care of an arena and doing their best to ensure it stays up to date with its requirements, that the general maintenance is done and routine maintenance is done. I just can't understand why we're sending messages to taxpayers in the way we are. Community centres were our responsibility, and we moved away from that. Instead, we want to close them now. And we're saying, well, you know, they're in bad shape, we're going to have to close them. Whose fault is that? That's our fault. I think it's shameful that we're doing that. I mean, just based on the fact alone that two residents came forward and said they didn't vote for it, and to Councillor Mayes' points, we were told it was a unanimous vote, but in fact, it wasn't. And the majority rules, apparently. Majority opinion, that's fine. But I'd like to do that for the bike paths then throughout the city. And now we can pick a whole bunch of other things and say well, let's get the majority to rule on that. I think this is one of those moments when we really have to stop and think about why we're here and what impact our votes are having on the future. And this is one where we've heard from the residents that needs to actually be open and transparent because obviously, it has not been despite meetings and different people around the table. There hasn't been equal representation. However, we have an opportunity to do that, and I hope that as elected officials, we'll see the value in gaining more information before we cast a vote in this chamber.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. That's interesting to follow up with Councillor Klein. So I'll just…when I was listening to the two residents who were actually the two managing…they run two community centres…those two community centres, so they're residents as well. But, I just want to point out they're (inaudible) community centre, they did a great job this morning. What I was more floored about was when I was listening to the comments about the fact that, you know, we provide different unique programming, we...you know, we can't pay our bills with this formula. We need to be treated maybe differently. Universality of the formula does need to be changed. You know, it struck me quite amazing because I could have put my community centre manager there, and she would have said the same thing. And she doesn't run a regional centre. She runs a small centre. They have infrastructure problems. The funding formula is not big enough to accommodate all the different needs, including the seniors that are coming forward. They want more money to be able to run these centres. So again, why I'm more astounded, because I'm used to hearing those ones about the smaller community centres. But I remember back in the day when we had these debates about the regional centres, and they wanted to close down three of the neighbourhood centres and amalgamate them into this big regional centre. And as we've had some debates about recently, the walkability to sites is important to some people. The flavour of the specific neighborhoods are defined by their schools and their community centres. If you do a regional model, how does that impact? So these are all facts that we went through, and then we went through a plan of trying to amalgamate some of the community centres into regional models and we kind of adopted this regional model. But the reason why I was quite supportive of the regional models; one, you know, I'm not saying it's for everybody, we are lucky in the Corydon, River Heights and Sir John Franklin to say, okay, where's our actually key asset problems, there's volunteerism and programming, so why don't we share one board but keep three different sites? The model is still stressed like something like the regional model. But in the regional model, and again, I definitely…while I do support looking at the regional model again, the big sell factor for me was that it be self-sustaining. That these regional models

would be able to provide enough programming and enough options that it could be self-sustaining. So today to hear that they need more money from us, again, that's what I heard, it may be wrong, but again what I'm looking at today, what I've heard today was we want to either rejig the UFF formula, which means taking money from one group to the other, that's generally what that means, rejigging. Or they need to have some revenue because they can't make ends meet. So they need some more support from the City. So again, that's what I've heard today. Those are some of the concerns from a person who runs a small neighbourhood community centre, and is very supportive of the neighbourhood model, not saying I'm opposed to the regional model, it could fit in certain other areas, and I'm fine with that. But as we talk about open and transparency, I wonder how many small community centres would have showed up today if they knew this amendment was coming forward this morning. This amendment...we're still working on it now. I heard about it second hand this morning. Again, so when we talk about it, it's very important that these two residents came forward today to talk to us, I agree. I guarantee you if we talk about…and if my information is wrong, I'm just going on what I'm hearing right now because I didn't have time to discuss this with Councillor Lukes or anybody prior. I still don't know what we're actually voting on yet and I hear typewriters clicking and I think we're going to get to that spot in the middle, where we'll be able to get the money flowing. Why we need to do this today? I want to get the money flowing. I think we all agree that. But we do need to look at the regional model. Again, maybe for different reasons but I am interested in looking at that. But again, tying these two together as it is right now...my understanding is that the amendment can't just be referred, it has to go with a motion. I can't delay this money to the community centres. So I know that they're trying to work on that problem right now, and I appreciate it, but at this point, not that I don't think we shouldn't look at the regional model, definitely since I thought it would be self-sustaining and actually a revenue generator, it doesn't appear that…we gave a lot of loans, grants, a lot of money went into these regional centres because they are a valuable piece of our complement of community centres, I do believe in that. But again, it really was my belief that they would be self-sustaining more, and maybe they are. But you know, I think we have to look at them again, maybe take that chance and review it, but we can't delay the money getting out the door now for those other community centres. So because a motion is attached…the amendment is attached to the motion, I'll have to decline on the amendment to be able to support the motion of the money getting out, unless some change happens. Thank you.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise today regarding the report before us here. Community clubs are very different. The universal funding formula, I think in my mind, is really for a lot of these community centres and a lot of space in these community centres that really does not generate that much revenue. Community centres are important community gathering places, they're places to come together, and the reality is, you know, there's a fairly significant cost to keep the lights on, to keep the water flowing, some of these very basic costs. When it comes to arenas, field houses and stuff, the user costs are going to use these facilities is significantly higher, and there's actually revenue opportunities from it. As I was mentioning in sort of my questioning of the reps from Dakota and Garden City, when Gateway got their own original ice, they had to have a business plan to show that they would be sustaining. They would not get universal funding formula whether at a regular rate or an enhanced rate. But rather they could do it based on their business plan. They went out to the hockey associations and they got them to guarantee, this is what we'll do, they went out and sold the advertising ahead of time, and they go that in writing. You know, here's naming rights for this room, here's this and that and here's the skate shop that pays rent for the next five years. Here's all these other things. I mean, when I hear, you know, complaints, like, we built the soccer complex…I was not on council when this happened, but when we as the community built the soccer complex, they had a thing with the Winnipeg Youth Soccer Association or alliance or whatever they call themselves for many, many years that you know, basically covered the term of the lease. The City saw that. The finance people at the City you know, said, okay, we can do a loan guarantee because there's a funding source and a financial model for this to make sense. It was interesting, towards the end of that period where they were still making payments, they actually burnt a bunch of their time there because they ended up moving their programming down to the University of Manitoba's new facility. It actually did hurt Gateway because they actually lost a significant amount of canteen revenue. So they've got the two sheets of indoor ice and the indoor soccer pitch, the soccer pitch isn't being used, less coffees and slurpees and all that stuff being sold. I mean, they made it work and it wasn't a terrible amount of money, but it was a thing. Going forward now, I mean, I meet with all my community clubs on a somewhat regular basis. The newest thing with Gateway now is they're concerned about the Winnipeg ice complex coming up. They're talking about four more sheets of ice, right on the boundary of Winnipeg and the RM of Donald. You know what? This time of year, they don't really see much of an issue in terms of their rentals. It's those, you know, shoulder periods. Their hockey camps are probably okay, you know, during the summer months. It's that spring season after the regular winter hockey season, that spring period where they're really kind of concerned. So what I kind of would prefer to do rather than looking at a generic universal funding formula change is look at some of these arena one-offs. I mean, if you haven't made your business case, Dakota or Garden City, you know, if you've not succeeded in what you had, you know, promised to do, let's take a step backward look how we can maybe make you successful. Let's hold your hands, let's figure out a way to get you back on track to where you need to be in terms of your revenues if you've gone off course. Smaller community clubs shouldn't be giving up their portion of the universal funding formula because they have generally higher needs. They're in smaller, older neighbourhoods and

they don't have as many resources in some cases. And again, run by, as Councillor Eadie's pointing out, many cases run by volunteers. I mean, I think that's really the great success story of our community centres, is the number of Winnipeggers that spend a lot of their time, their Saturday mornings, their you know, their own personal time, whether it's working at the canteen or flooding the rink or removing the snow from the rink after it's snowed overnight, stuff like that. So I thank the GCWCC. I mean, would more money be lovely? Of course it would. I mean, we continue to support some of the older infrastructure with the community centre renovation grants. So it's nice that we've been able to do that as long as we have. And I know all of the community centres in my ward, my now expanded ward, have benefited from that program. When it comes to the arenas, I mean, I'll support some version of this motion or whatever's coming forward today, but my preference would be to figure out what the City-backed assets...where we have these assets that aren't meeting the business plan, that we take a look at them and have a discussion about those separately. I've communicated with Gateway in the last day and they said, you know, we don't want to take UFF dollars away from these smaller community centres, really. And you know, although they pointed out some, you know, potential issues on the horizon, especially with the Winnipeg ice facility and McDonald, the overall, you know, are making a go of things still today. So thank you for your time, Madam Speaker. Again, we did have a...I know, Madam Speaker, you and I, and I think Councillor Santos and I think Councillor Eadie, we met up at Northwood Community Centre earlier this year and had a good meeting with the community club presidents from the northwest and there's a lot of good things going on out there. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Next is Councillor Eadie. Councillor Eadie, yes.

Councillor Eadie: Thanks, Madam Speaker. And actually glad that I waited till the two senior councillors on the City of Winnipeg Council spoke first because they do remember part of the reason why we've come down this road, Madam Speaker. Time served. However…I'm going to do. Yeah, not (inaudible). Can you take a minute off? Anyway, I just wanted…the two presenters that came from Garden City and from Dakota, I really appreciate the work that they do. My speech doesn't reflect...is going to reflect some concerns I have related to where their particular centres are at, but I really do appreciate the work. And so for example, Garden City Community Centre, which is in West Kildonan, the original community centre was built on the site that it is by the City of West Kildonan as I recall. And when they opened up the indoor soccer complex around the same time that Gateway had theirs as well, they were providing a regional sport recreation activity in which all people in West Kildonan and Old Kildonan, Madam Speaker, kids benefited from it in the Maples. Amber Trails, I'm sure there's some kids the early days on, and so on. My boys played indoor soccer at Garden City because that's where the facility was. And so yeah, of course, it wasn't about a catchment area. Those kind of facilities are about an off the block. In Dakota's case, field house, well that's…there's no other one in the city, so it's serving the whole city. Of course they're going to see people using it from outside. Now, some of the bigger centres also have…bring in enough money and program dollars that they can provide various services. I know that...well, Brown, for example, Councillor Rollins thanked our district…our Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan area and Nathan Wild was working along with the City about the formula, that's probably the smallest catchment community centre…well, in our area, Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan for sure, but probably in all of Winnipeg. And they do good work, and they have a lot of people there but they don't provide senior services because it is a small place. But they are providing a bunch of programming, and they have a lot of people using it. So my concerns were when I start hearing about the big regional centres and the issues that they have...well, what they do have to realize is they're offering something way bigger. And those people who can travel to those places to do that will do that. And I want to refer to something when they talk about...I hope soccer doesn't centralize. Winnipeg hockey is centralized, and I have to tell you, Madam Speaker, there is no outreach to bring kids to play hockey from out in the North End anymore. As a matter of fact, Hockey Winnipeg or whoever they were, decided to just cancel the whole area because some community centres over in Daniel Mc decided they didn't like it because somebody who is a volunteer failed to do some financials for example. Things like that. But what's not happening, this whole regional versus local, like, I just...and even the local community centres have a hard time doing the outreach, getting out there. Some of them have some pretty big catchment areas and they're not really pulling people in. And part of it has to do with the high cost to be involved in sport. That's the reality. And yeah, the City has a little program as long as you plead I'm poor, please let my child play hockey. I've got to sign a paper saying I don't have money, take away people's pride, make them feel bad about their situation, that doesn't work. So when we look at how we provide community centre recreation and sport in Winnipeg, we consider these things under…and we try to fund them through the City. Community centres, I don't know how they were...how the whole funding thing worked back in the '80s and so on, but we know that GCWCC was formulated, and they're there, and they're the ones who worked with all the community centres; small, medium and large. It's very good. I think that's okay. And there is a…and a former policy because Councillor Orlikow properly brought up the old regional-local debate, and there was limitations on how much heating space the City said we would allow people to go to. Now enter in a policy about building new sheets of ice that the City of Winnipeg does not want to run. They want to get rid of their hockey rinks, right? So we're going to have the community run them. That'll save us money, the City, so we won't be having to operate these facilities that need repairs. Well, our City arenas are in the same situation as the Dakota and Garden City are talking about. There is a cost to maintaining your buildings and keeping things going over the years. That's the reality. But anyway, so you put in…and those hockey rinks, when they were in, there was a big debate and discussion about, well, how much heated space,

how much formula money do we get? And so I heard Garden City today talking about...and I still love the work they do. They offer, and they have many good things for the people in my ward, as well as your ward, Madam Speaker, as well as Councillor Santos and people from all around the city play. Of course, there are hockey leagues and they all play at different rinks. Right, that's how it works. My kids played indoor soccer over at Gateway against a team out of Gateway, so you know, that's how it goes. So when we get into all this centralization and regionalization, we drop it out...and then we won't give $50,000 to the North End hockey program that got developed through an off-duty police officer and a guy named Will Hudson who tried to operate this thing and it cost $50,000 a year to run it, but at least somebody's doing outreach to get those kids out playing hockey. Keep them off the street, give them something to do because their families can't afford it, but they're doing it. It's a good thing. So when we're looking at this whole situation…oh, I forgot to mention, we have a recreation and parks master plan. So here we are, we're talking about large regional-type facilities with offerings that go beyond a catchment area, and I hope that's part of our recreation master plan because as I understand it, that plan is to come up with what is sustainable for the City of Winnipeg to be able to pay for and afford from the City's side because we know there's lots of people who donate money for various things to build sport and recreation for the City because everybody in this city knows that recreation and sport is important to the health and quality of life of this city, very important. So I am actually going to be supporting this amending motion which says to review...and they've got to figure out how to do this. But I have to remind people as well; they signed agreements to get money, and they knew they were only going to get so much heated space. And because they really wanted to serve the City of Winnipeg...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, Mr. Mayor moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And Councillor Eadie, just for your attention, I'd like to advise you that another amending motion has been circulated to Council, just momentarily.

Councillor Eadie: I'll have a look at it…I won't be able to speak to it. But I'll have to decide which one. I just wanted to…where was I? I was just trying to conclude. People wanted to build these things and people want to...we know, Madam Speaker, that the Maples Community Centre wants to build a wonderful big operation that you could have international basketball tournaments, volleyball tournaments with a whole bunch of gymnasium flooring that would blow your mind, would make the City of Winnipeg…put us on the map as a place to come to do big sports, somewhat different than the field house at Dakota. So as we're moving along and we're looking at all these plans, Madam Speaker, we're going to have to look at what is considered to be community centre offerings and what are considered to be those bigger regional recreational opportunities because I think there is a possibility to merge them together. In the meantime, I think there should be some discussion because we do have the recreation master plan. We haven't seen it yet, but that was about what's sustainable, and I think there should be…the original motion that Councillor Lukes, that I was referring to, it talked about creating a committee to talk to the large ones to figure out how we can do this. But I'm not sure that that hasn't happened, though, under the recreation and parks master plan process. But that was all about all these issues that we're talking today. And so I would really want to support them, and yes, these great facilities at Seven Oaks got built, and the field houses there, and just leaving it at that. UFF formula, it's important to all levels; the small, medium and large. And somehow, we actually need to help those community centres reach out as well because there are a lot of kids that are missing opportunities to participate in an excellent system that we do have.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Lukes. Councillor Lukes. Yes, I think someone wants to rescind her motion. Okay. .

Councillor Lukes: Yeah, I'd like to rescind my motion because other people are working on another motion.

Madam Speaker: So Councillor Lukes, you wish to rescind your amending Motion 1?

Councillor Lukes: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Do you have the concurrence of your seconder?

Councillor Lukes: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Yes, and with the concurrence of council, we'd like to rescind Motion 1. We do have a similar motion. It's Motion 4, just a moment. Moved by Councillor Rollins and seconded by Councillor Lukes. Just to draw your attention to that. And we'll read it into the record in a few moments for everyone's benefit. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Madam Speaker, just my question is on process, I'm not saying I want to speak to it, but those that have spoke to the amendment already that's being rescinded, and now, we have a new amendment, do we get to speak on this new amendment? Or…

Madam Speaker: Yes, Councillor Orlikow, there's a chance for everyone to speak on this new motion.

Councillor Orlikow: But they don't have to? They don't have to.

Madam Speaker: Don't have to, but I think they will for sure now. Certainly don't have to. Now just before we move on, let's have a vote on the motion that Councillor Lukes has rescinded. She'd like to rescind amending Motion 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And now we have Motion 4 before us. Mr. Clerk, if I can ask you to read it into the record, please, the new amending Motion 4. Or Councillor Rollins has the opportunity to introduce...you know, it has not been electronically circulated to Council so I do prefer that it be read into the record at this point, please. Councillor…Mr. Clerk, amending Motion 4.

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Rollins,
Seconded by Councillor Lukes,

BE IT RESOLVED that item 4. of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee date December 3, 2019 be amended by deleting recommendations 1, to 5 and replacing them with the following:

1. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to form a working group consisting of the Director of Community Services, representatives from The General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres, and include large to medium size community centers to meet to review financial formulas, including the Universal Funding Formula to ensure revenue sources are sustainable and responsive to local needs.*

2. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks with the findings of the working group and recommendations for the adoption of a new City of Winnipeg / General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres / Community Centres Universal Funding Formula, when a fulsome review of the funding formula is completed.*

3. *That a one-time retroactive UFF payment adjustment to community centres totaling $102,975 for 2018 and 2019 be approved.*

4. *That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.*

Madam Speaker: Just a moment. Councillor Rollins, your opportunity to introduce Motion 5...Motion 4.

Councillor Rollins: Actually, Madam Chair, I'm actually going to withdraw that motion at this time and…with permission from my seconder because I believe in the intervening period, we've got a Motion 5 coming. I can speak to why.

Madam Speaker: Yeah. I just want to confer with the Clerk for one moment, please. There's no motion circulated at this time. Okay. Councillor Rollins, it was your intention to rescind Motion 4?

Councillor Rollins: It was, Madam Chair. It was my intention to…because the…and to do a standalone motion.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, we don't need a reason. But I see another motion being circulated now. So it is ready at this time. So if you'd like to rescind Motion 4, and with the concurrence of your seconder, Councillor Lukes. Okay. All in favour on rescinding Motion 4? Contrary? Carried? We now have before us Motion 5. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I'm wondering if we could just amend Motion 5. It'd be a friendly amendment because we have large to medium-sized community centres…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy, that's out of order right now. Just before we get into the debate on this Motion 5, the amending motion, I'd like our clerk to read it into the record, please. Amending Motion 5, moved by Councillor Rollins, seconded by Councillor Lukes.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Rollins,
Seconded by Councillor Lukes,

BE IT RESOLVED that item 4. of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee date December 3, 2019 be amended by adding the following new recommendations 5. and 6. and renumber the remaining recommendation accordingly:

5. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to form a working group consisting of the Director of Community Services, representatives from The General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres, and include large to medium size community centers to meet to review financial formulas, including the Universal Funding Formula to ensure revenue sources are sustainable and responsive to local needs.*

6. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks with the findings of the working group and recommendations for the adoption of a new City of Winnipeg / General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres / Community Centres Universal Funding Formula, when a fulsome review of the funding formula is completed.*

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins, your opportunity to introduce your amending Motion 5.

Councillor Rollins: So yeah. So Madam Chair, I beg your patience. We are...there is almost concurrence. There is a word missing in this motion. We've been drafting it on the floor, and the word is small, and so there's...I wish to withdraw this motion and get a No. 6 motion in.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Rollins, you wish to rescind Motion 5? Do you have the concurrence of Councillor Lukes? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Rollins: Do I have the concurrence of Councillor Lukes?

Madam Speaker: I'm going to call the vote on that. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. I'd also like to call for a five-minute recess. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
December 12, 2019, at 2:44 p.m.

Madam Speaker: It's our Council meeting of December 12th, 2019. We are on the Executive Policy Committee reports dated December 3rd, 2019 – Item 4 – Community Centre Universal Funding Formula Review. Circulated is amending Motion 6. It's moved by Councillor Rollins, seconded by Councillor Lukes. Mr. Clerk, if you could please read it into the record.

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

BE IT RESOLVED that item 4. of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee date December 3, 2019 amended by adding the following new recommendations 5. and 6. and renumber the remaining recommendation accordingly:

5. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to form a working group consisting of the Director of Community Services, representatives from The General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres, and include large, medium and small community centers to meet to review financial formulas, including the Universal Funding Formula to ensure revenue sources are sustainable and responsive to local needs.*

6. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks with the findings of the working group and recommendations within 180 days.*

Madam Speaker: We'll now hear from the mover of the amending motion, Councillor Rollins. Following that, it's open for debate by any member of council. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much, Madam Chair, and thank you very much to…through you, to my colleagues for their patience. This amendment to...acknowledges and still gets the money out the door, money that has been worked on since 2018, but it also acknowledges that there is more work to be done, forms a working group to do the work, and in terms of the working group, acknowledges the role of every community centre in the city but also, you know, the review of financial formulas. And I...I've...in this motion, it also asks that if there's a report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks, on the finding of the working group and recommendations within 180 days, with the help of the public service, of course. I do want to acknowledge the work of the GCWCC. I also want to acknowledge that to position...that there is always work to be done in this city to position our neighborhood centres, that they care about now into the future, and I believe this amendment is in that spirit. Having listened to concerns of councillors and to the delegation today, this motion acknowledges the work to be done to strengthen the community centres and pulls it into a committee where ample discussion can happen through the work of standing policy committees as we know, and it pulls it and it grounds it into a home. And so that's the spirit of the motion, and I hope folks are supportive. And I'd like to thank the colleagues who ran around this chamber like I've never seen them in my first year of work at Council, Madam Speaker, to assist, so great team work today.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I'll be supporting…seconding this motion that Councillor Rollins has put forward. Thank you very much, Councillor Rollins for listening and working on this. This whole thing's about leadership. It's on an issue that's critically important to all citizens. I came to the Mayor and his Executive Policy Committee as I've been told many times if I have concerns. I came to share my concerns to the Mayor and the committee members. I don't recall anyone asking me any questions on this. As you all know, I've sent countless e-mails, trying to get information from the departments, having a meeting, having some form of conversation, copying Council. I've sent questions out. There was no council communication or information on this issue at all. I decided not to bring out the dirty laundry at that point and speak about the dysfunction of how the GCWCC operates in relation to community centres, the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars due to red tape around securing…or not being able to secure sponsorship, the requirement now of police checks on volunteers because funding is being stolen. I did not hear the regional representatives asking for money from the smaller centres. What I did hear was that the current model within the GCWCC system restricts regionals and large centre…larger sized centres to become sustainable, and they want to become sustainable.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, just a moment.

Councillor Allard: Did Councillor Lukes just imply that the GCWCC was involved in a criminal act?

Councillor Lukes: No, I did not. So if you were listening…

Councillor Allard: Point of order. I heard the word stolen. Stolen has some implications involved.

Councillor Lukes: If you were listening, you would have heard what it was about. The requirement of police checks…

Madam Speaker: I didn't hear the exact word. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Allard: I heard the word stolen.

Councillor Lukes: Well, just because you heard the word stolen isn't implying that. I could check with the police up here, maybe not. Anyways, the bottom line is I'm supporting the motion.

Councillor Allard: May I have another point of order?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, you hear the point that Councillor Allard has made. Please clarify.

Councillor Allard: I'd like to ask a question.

Councillor Lukes: I'll clarify. I did not imply that at all.

Councillor Allard: Do we have a list of acceptable language? Do we have a list of that?

Madam Speaker: This is not question period. We expect decorum in this chamber. Councillor Allard, let's continue. It's been a long day for everyone. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: I said what I had to say. I'm supporting it.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you. This has been certainly entertaining, but also, again, I've got to go back to the original statement of our process and what's going on. This obviously is a result of not having the public service meet with all councillors and explaining the rationale for any proposed changes. Hopefully, that will be discussed in this motion. I think it also sends a very clear message to a number of other associations and groups during the budgeting process, the libraries that we said we were going to close, and the fitness facilities we were going to close and all that. I suspect that we must now go back to the table and have a report done including all of them involved in the process to determine where funding should be allocated, and how funding should be allocated. So I think we have set the stage for a very different budget process moving forward from this point because clearly, we weren't ready when we put this forward. Clearly, we should have had a discussion and an opportunity to hear from the public service so that an informed vote could be made because really, if you look at this, it's pretty much what we've been doing for the last two years, except now it's going through the Standing Policy Committee on Community Services and Parks. But anyways, I wanted to mention that because I think it's important that everything we do here can be done again.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Klein. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair. I rise to support this amended motion. I want to thank the Clerks for their diligence and their patience with us as we sorted this out. I would also like to offer if possible to be part of the working group that is being struck with Councillor Rollins, a committee, if that is to be eligible for consideration. Thank you.

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

Councillor Orlikow: I'm good.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the amending motion. Sounds like all the groups will take another look at the formula. Madam Speaker, it is difficult discussions that they will have, I'm sure, in that you do have the regional sort of kind of community centres and the locals and the medium sized, whatever. But ultimately, I think the formula that's there with the money that's available, Madam Speaker, is ultimately...is what the question is, and what space gets heated in regional ones where...community centres where you have regional type facilities built along with them, like the Seven Oaks rink or even the Garden City indoor soccer. These things are...and the field house, they attract bigger levels, and community centres with bigger catchment areas also are able to offer more programs and for some groups that, Madam Speaker, are ones considered from other catchment areas because their community centres don't offer that kind of service and that's the reason they go over to a different one because that service isn't offered at their local community centre. So I want to speak to...Madam Speaker, you know, with all due respect for my new colleagues on Council, and the new ones before that, when I was new, Madam Speaker, in 2010, I wasn't really new, Madam Speaker, in that I listened to the debates and everything that happened at City Hall, always very interested. You know, the puffs…I remember the debate that happened. It was in the media. Everybody knew that there was this policy, do people agree with it? Debates around it. We have in this city, Madam Speaker, so many policies and plans that look at various aspects of the city. And to think that, well, you haven't been put in the loop, one should really, really, really ask for whatever they need to in whatever portfolio they're looking for, where to find policy and direction. If you want to know why we're moving ahead with certain things in a pedestrian cycling arena, please read the policy. It's big, but t's there. There are all these things Madam Speaker. And so, I just want to remind my colleagues that it's not like these things happen in a vacuum. They happen, and they were transparent in debate years ago. Anything that's recent, of course, we're all familiar with it. But ultimately, GCWCC, the reason it's coming through EPC is a past decision under a different mayor decided that that would be the responsibility of EPC, not Protection, Community Services, Madam Speaker, and that's what I like about this motion. So they're going to come back to community services. I was actually thinking of moving a motion that brought GCWCC and all they do through our standing committee so that it would move up to EPC because our standing committee chairperson is on EPC. So to...the way it got structured, I think it does pose somewhat of a problem, but again, I'm saying that formula, it's existed a long time. And it will exist, and actually...and I'll just mention it again, when they come back in 180 days, and they look at different formulas, we have to look at it in the context of the whole recreation master plan because that's trying to get recreation and sport into a sustainable way that our city can move forward. I may not agree with it, but what it is is we have our administration and consultants working

on these things to try to come up with plans. And again, I might vote against...I voted against the library plan because I didn't quite like it. I didn't think it was quite right. It didn't recognize our part of the city properly, Madam Speaker. But once it was put into place, why would we be considering shutting down libraries when we already had a plan to move it to be sustainable over the next number of years? So like anyway, it would be just really great if we looked at policy and we looked at budget and we did it in a more appropriate manner. I just don't think we do that. And again, I'll just finish, I support the amending motion, and let's just move on. I believe the funding will continue on until things get resolved and the community centres will have their money, so that's a very good thing. Thanks.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I rise in support of the amending Motion No. 6 that's in front of us. And I just, I do want to thank Councillor Rollins and Councillor Lukes for working together with all of us here. We were all running around frantically, making sure that we got a motion that we can support. Of course we want to support getting that funding out the door, that's critical to a lot of our community centres. We need to make sure we get the funding out the door. And I'm in favour of establishing a working group, and...I do...I do share the concerns that were...some of that were raised here today because there is not the ability for some of the smaller community centres to really get the fundraising activities that some of the larger centres can do. But if there is some sort of mechanism to working together and to come up with some initiatives that maybe could support everybody long term, I think that's a positive step forward. So I just want to thank Councillor Lukes and thank Councillor Rollins for the motion and for working collaboratively today. Thanks.

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

Councillor Allard: So I'm going to speak in French, because this is my opportunity.

Translation of French Spoken:
Councillor Allard: So thank you to Councillor Rollins and Councillor Lukes for this work. Thank you for reaching a point where we can all, I think, probably approve. Nobody wants the financing not to go to the community centres. So I think we're attaining that objective or proposition. We are also going to review the way we finance community centres in Winnipeg and so I'm…I want to say, excited to have this. My fear, I suppose, I think of my experience as a boy who had the benefits of community centres in Winnipeg. I particularly think of when I was too young to drive, before I had my first car, I had the benefit of visiting places in St. Boniface, whether it was recreation centres, pools, barboteuse…barboteuse is wading pools in English if the interpreter didn't know. So I'm torn between my understanding that the residential centres, in some regards, are more effective, can deliver a service with less money, finally. The same service when the centres are big like they are specified. But on the other hand, these regional centres are, by definition, are farther from residents so in particular, the residents who maybe don't have access to transportation, like I didn't have access to transportation when I was too young to drive. So I want to pay close attention to this discussion. I don't want to be in a position where we have a recommendation in 180 days that says that we should finally de-finance the local recreation centres in favour of the bigger recreation centres. I hope that's not the direction that we're heading. I think that we need to re-add the word 'small' for the recreation centres. It will help the discussion. I wasn't prepared to approve this proposition without the word 'small'. I think, in particular, Councillor Eadie, knows the history better than me. Councillor Browaty, knows the history better, because they were councillors before me. But finally, there's only a certain amount of money that are available. And the fact that there was two representatives here today from the large recreation centres asking for this amendment, I know that they said that they don't want take the financing from the small centres, but if we are in a financial situation where there isn't any new money, I'm scared that what this means is that the small community centres will be lost. So I am ready to approve this proposition at this point in time, but I'm not comfortable if we're going in a direction where we favour the regional centres and we lose the local centres. For me, as a child, it was all these things where I could finally walk to my activities. Councillor Eadie mentioned soccer in regards to this discussion. When I was little, my parents…we were never without, but we didn't have much money to finance leisure activities like sports. So my parents encouraged me to play soccer. I was never a good soccer player, if I can admit that to whoever wants to listen. But it gave me an opportunity to be active, make friends, and be involved in very important, productive activities at that point in my life. So there is something…I understand the finances, I understand the delivery of services better than I ever have, but there is something so special to be able to take the hand of my little Louec, four years old, we walk together to Provencher Park. We benefit from the park, we benefit from the recreation centre where we can borrow a room, no matter when. It's always a nice story, the story of the success of our recreation centres. Councillor Klein mentioned earlier that we have decided to delegate the recreation centres to groups of volunteers. I don't think this is necessarily a bad thing. I think that maybe the volunteers are the best to offer these community services to everyone. So it has the double benefit of implicating people in their community to be active. So it's not only youth that benefit from the activities, but also parents who participate in the volunteer community on the advice of the administration. So this discussion is very hard for me in particular, in St. Boniface, probably given that the cuts by the City of Winnipeg Community Services Department will probably mean more cuts to St. Boniface than any other ward. And the majority of

these cuts are for the smallest facilities. So these same facilities where I benefited with my son Louec, where I benefited as a child when I didn't have access to transportation to the regional centres. So yes, we had six motions, but I think the fact that we had six motions is because it's vital for all the councillors, for the public, I think it's good that we're talking, and we might not agree in regards to each question, but I think we will probably agree with this proposition today. Finally, I think that if we want to avoid having six motions in the future…if this was a separate motion that wasn't attached to a report, there might be fewer problems, we could refer the motion, we could have the discussion at standing committee and we wouldn't have spent the last two hours trying to find a motion that all councillors could approve. So I think we could have saved two hours if this was a motion against. So I think that is all I wanted to say. I know that the legislation and parliament have, Madam Speaker, lists of parliamentary languages, but I think that we absolutely shouldn't be inference or explicitly, accuse organizations or people of crimes. It seems to me that it's entering into a very dangerous language for us as councillors and us personally if we consider that this type of defamation could arrive in the halls of (inaudible). So thank you for your attention and I will approve of this motion, but I will (inaudible) the report that comes out once we approve this motion. Thank you.

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

Translation of French Spoken:
Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. I would like to say something, not too long. But I was listening to Councillor Allard, and maybe this is because of my loss of oral comprehension, but based on the translation I heard, I don't want to put words in his mouth, but I believe I heard that certain community centres…

Councillor Rollins: Point of order. I believe in defense of colleague, she clarified that and it's been twice. So you know, I appreciate that it was serious, but point of order, the question's been asked, Councillor Lukes has clarified and you know, point of order Madam Chair.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Translation of French Spoken:
Councillor Rollins: In French or in English, I understand. So it's the second time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Rollins, anything further Councillor Schreyer in your speaking time, go ahead.

Councillor Schreyer: I'm not sure what the concern is Madam Speaker. I'm open to whatever the concerns of the chamber are.

Madam Speaker: We're trying to listen through a translated device, you have the floor, please continue.

Councillor Schreyer: All right, I mean if…

Madam Speaker: Speak English or French…sure.

Councillor Schreyer: I'll just say…in response to Councillor Allard's comments…

Madam Speaker: Or speak Punjabi, how's that?

Councillor Schreyer: Well, it doesn't matter to me, I'm just saying, it seemed like what he had said…I just find it's an interesting point…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, would you like to take your seat? Yeah, thank you. Councillor Schreyer, please continue in English or French. Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Look, all right. Just a brief statement, it just occurred to me, listening to Councillor Allard, that he was saying he'd find efficiencies in the different community centres when they're larger or more specialized, is what I thought he had said. And so it had just occurred to me that in...in sort of developing this perspective, it might be useful that there might be a difference between those that are larger and more specialized and maybe the ones that are smaller, had the opportunity to be specialized and therefore contribute to a regional sort of catchment that a larger community centre would do for a larger catchment being larger and having sort of more amenities, maybe not specialized. Anyway, I just thought that he mentioned an interesting point. I'm not sure if that's what he meant, but it occurred to me, it's a good way of looking at it. Smaller ones for a regional area where you have smaller community centres could have the virtue of being specialized. All I meant to say, thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Next speaker is Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Yeah. I've been wanting to use the term bass ackwards all day, and I think this motion might qualify. You know, I've taken a look at, I guess it's the third iteration of the same motion. I am concerned with Item 5, about the working group, consisting of membership of large, medium and small. I know we had representatives from two large here today. I believe they might be in the employ of the organizations. The challenge is that when we get down into the small centres, perhaps that's why they're not here, they're volunteer-based. I'm concerned that their voice, they may have challenges in this period of time, bringing their voice forward to ensure that it's properly heard, that they're equally represented, that they're not overshadowed by the voices of the large community centres. We continue to fail our community centres in the community. These are very much, for the most part, outside of, in your fine ward, councillor…or Madam Speaker, fairly old centres. Some have had some new additions to them, but for the most part, their bones are pretty old. Their ice plants are old. For those that…the rinks, they're getting expensive to keep running. The training that's required to operate them is getting harder and harder to find that specialized training because our school system seems to not be pumping out enough of those red seal engineers that we need to run them. But on this point, it is getting more expensive to operate our centres. We have many of them, 63 of them. I'd love to know how many of them are 50 years or older. Sorry...63, yeah, I think that's what I said. Anyways, they're over 50 years. You know, the centennial has come and gone. We've got a changing face of our community. We need to make sure that whatever changes we make for the next ten years because as I understand, this is a ten-year plan that was being put forward, that it meets the need of our growing community. You know, we'll be looking at 2030 pretty soon, 2040 will come, and as the Mayor has eloquently repeated time and time again as we grow to 1 million, will the funding formula we have for the community centres be something that will support the growing communities that we serve? And on that, I stand down.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Nason. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Hopefully briefly. I just don't want to let stand the comments that have been made about we failed our community centres. I don't think we have. We here, being in my eight years, certainly former Mayor Katz brought in the community centre renovation grant program to fill an election promise of his. That was a million dollar new program that the community centres, older, could apply for. Dakota's got money to that, too; one of the newer centres. Mayor Bowman pledged to double that. That commitment has been fulfilled, so we are I think putting in millions of dollars. We have expanded a number of community centres. I know my predecessor, Gord Steeves, in conjunction with the province, got an expansion at Norberry after some several years of work with several different councillors and everyone from Theresa Oswald to Rochelle Squires to Michele Augert to Lukes to Swandel to me, Steeves, we got an expansion at the Dakota. A lot of work, a lot of cooperation, so I don't want to let it stand out there that we've somehow failed the community centres. Additionally...the goal here is not to pit small...somehow those of us who have spoken on behalf of Dakota are bad, greed hogs looking for money for the bigs at the expense of the plucky little small ones. I have done quite a bit for the plucky little sound ones in my ward, quite frankly, and I'm capable of walking and chew gum at the same time. And going back to Southdale which isn't in my ward, but people use it, and Dakota which isn't in my ward, but some people use it. Chambers has now got all of that area in his ward and he's done a good job going to bat for Dakota. The idea here is not so much there's only a certain amount of money, and let's have a big fight over it, but the idea is, some of these big ones who we've given more and more responsibility to, there isn't a field house…there is no rec centre in St. Vital, you can't go to the Fort Rouge Leisure Centre equivalent because it doesn't exist, it isn't run by the City of Winnipeg. In St. Vital, you can however go to the Dakota Community Centre field house and use that facility. And as Augert was saying, people then get upset they have to play $1.50 to play pickleball, because by god it's a City facility and they're paying their money. Well, that's the difference. It isn't purely a City facility. It's a community centre facility. You can't really blame people like Augert for getting up here and saying well look, we have to have some accommodation here. So I appreciate the heartfelt sentiments that those of us who have spoken for it somehow are going to bat for the bigs at the expense of the small, but frankly, we're doing our jobs and trying to represent some of the large centres like Garden City and Dakota with whom we've tasked things like operating sheets of ice because we've gone out of that business in a couple of parts of town. So if we're going to ask the community centres to suck it up and to do more, and do some stuff we were doing in the past, yeah, I think we do need to sit down and, talk about what kind of funding formula would work because if we continue on a path of shutting down some of our aging arenas and re-opening new ones or opening new ones at community centres, I think there's going to be a lot of push back of people saying no, this is uneconomic and the business model won't work. So good on Councillor Rollins for working with Lukes here to try and get a report back in a few months, and we'll see if we can't get some satisfaction for Garden City and Dakota, Southdale and some of the other major centres.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I will be brief. I will be supporting the…both the original report, and I will support the amendment as well that adds recommendations 5 and 6. In the great length of time that

we've been debating this and talking about this, I was able to go back to some old records at the City of Winnipeg and of course, some of you may know and I think predates almost everybody here, except perhaps Mr. Santin who might have been here during this one time in 2004 when there was a…it was known...Councillor Eadie referred to it, the PUFS report; the public use facilities report. Then ultimately, I think one of the things that spun out of that was the 2005…May 18th, 2005 council before us adopts what I believe…is affectionately known as the Ralph policy. The council of that day was doing really this work in preparation for the discussions we're having today. That May 18th council minutes talks about the establishment of GCWCC or the work that GCWCC would do, and it talks about the fact that our city is evolving. This is 2005. Our city is evolving, and so there's going to be...I'll summarize, among other things, a mix of neighborhood community centres, which will serve populations of approximately 12,000 to 15,000 people, but it will also include new community recreation and leisure centres serving broader communities at the ratio of 1 per 35,000 or 50,000 people. The point being is that our…the one-size-fits-all model perhaps doesn't fit our city anymore as we grow and change and evolve and as just the way community centres provide services or what new families in new areas are looking for. There's also been so much talk and some policy put in place over the years and even recommendations by previous councils to, where appropriate, amalgamate community services, find cost efficiencies, find ways to provide levels of service for the taxpayer at an efficient way, but to make sure that they get…our community members get the services they need…recreation services for their children, for their families, for seniors as well. And I would argue that I hope that this council perhaps through the next coming months and coming years would take it upon ourselves to go back to some of the old documents and work the previous council has done and see if there are some good ideas that were made there that will help us make the best use of taxpayers' dollars while responding to a growing, emerging, changing city in a way that makes sense so that the services our families need, and our residents need in this city, not just today, but in future years is provided. So that's why I'm in favour of taking another look at this universal funding formula. It's not a one or the other. It's not a one at the expense of the other. But it's got to be at both ends because we need to respond to the change that has occurred over the last 10 to 15 years and set ourselves up for the change that's coming to recreational services as well. So I'll be supporting both the original report and the amended motion.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Rollins, this is your opportunity to close on amending Motion 6.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Wow, a Lukes-Rollins motion was bound to happen, Madam Speaker. And you know, when I think of moving the money out the door, I think about community centres, and I do think about the community centres in Ralph Maybank, the Ralph Brown Community Centre in Councillor Eadie's ward. I think about the programs like the Speak Cree Class that they run, the free play, the GAP, the graffiti art and I think of the children they feed each and every day. And so with that, I want to close, I'm glad there was hot, hot debate on this. And I look forward to more discussion, thoughtful discussion, with our partners in the community that each and every day fill calendars and events at the community centres across Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close on Motion 4?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. I think enough has been said, I'm looking forward to voting on this matter.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. All in favour of amending Motion No. 6? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. All in favour of the main item, Item 4 as amended? Contrary? Carried. Moving on, Item 5, Mr. Clerk.

Item 5 – Revisions to the Materials Management Policy F1-003 to Delegate Authority to the Chief Administrative Officer to Approve Agreements related to Cooperative and other City Contracts

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, to introduce Item 5.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I'll wait first to hear from Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. This was stood down. Councillor Gillingham. I think they were talking amongst themselves.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. We…about the same time. I just simply want to say I'll be supporting this motion and…this report. I commend it. I think this is a good move, a good…I think a prudent decision by our administration, and I know our Mayor back in last month of November brought forward a motion related to this called cooperative purchasing. What this really does is by partnering as the City of Winnipeg with other agencies or other entities such as the provincial government on procurement opportunities and purchasing opportunities, it really improves the City's purchasing power. As the report says there, there's a potential for the City and other participants to realize savings from participation in cooperative contracts. In a common sense kind of way, I think the residents would expect the City of Winnipeg, where possible, to work with others like the Province of Manitoba because if we're all buying widgets for the

City and the Province needs widgets, I think common sense says we should work together to procure those hopefully at a…ultimately at a better price, at a savings for our residents and make sure that the tax dollar goes further. So I'm certainly glad to see this motion and this report and will be glad to support it.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think the concept is very valid and something that is long overdue. My concern that I have and I'm trying to get mre information on is the potential risk that might be facing us just with something that was in the executive summary that gives the CAO the power to participate, and this was just great. But it does say, even if such participation may not strictly comply with various trade agreements, and I'm just wondering if we've taken the time to look at that a little further and make sure that it's not a major risk that we're facing as a city, and it maybe is just minor, but it doesn't provide any further detail.

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

Mayor Bowman: Yes, Madam Speaker. And I echo comments of Councillor Gillingham. We would like to see greater purchasing power and pricing by cooperating more fully with other parties including, of course, the Province of Manitoba. In my first meeting with the premier after he was elected his first term, this was a topic that I raised that I would like to see us trying to facilitate cooperative purchasing and there were a number of things in which I think by better cooperating in terms of some of the matters that are discussed in this administrative report, we can find some cost savings. So very pleased to support this today and want to thank the public service, our materials management, my council colleagues for their support for this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question on Item 5. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 6.

Item 6 – 2020 Infrastructure Plan

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item and then we have amending Motion 1 that was moved by Councillor Lukes and seconded by Councillor Klein. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This document…the 2020 Infrastructure Plan really is the first document of its kind for the City of Winnipeg. The goal of this plan is to build upon the information previously outlined in the 2018 City Asset Management Plan, the 2018 State of the Infrastructure Report and Unfunded Major Capital Project Report. The Infrastructure Plan is meant to provide a cross departmental review and enhance decision making on overall city priorities. A strong consideration of the collective benefits for our city, the risks associated with project deferral and service affordability will help drive development of the multi-year capital budget. Following a review of the asset management prioritization tool, improvements were made such as incorporating service usage and service importance in order to address limitations on the previous version. The document we are considering today in this infrastructure plan provides a prioritized list of projects based on the cost-benefit point ratio ranking. The plan is inclusive of both tax supported and utility-based services over $5 million. This includes the projects identified in the Unfunded Major Capital Projects Report. Important points to make, and I appreciated the contributions of Mr. Chris Lorenc this morning from the Manitoba Heavy Construction Association, on the issue of the criteria that is used. Firstly, I'll just highlight for everybody that might still be watching these proceedings at this late hour, that this is something that is unique to the City of Winnipeg. We don't see this level of openness and transparency about how recommendations are made, let alone what recommendations are being made to other levels of government when it comes to infrastructure. This level of openness and transparency and accountability is something that does provide and in fact invites greater participation by the citizens we serve as well as groups like the Manitoba Heavy Construction Association to provide us with their input, which we greatly appreciate. The criteria that is used and the cost benefit points analysis certainly is open to debate given the fact that some members of council, myself included, might want to see a higher ranking for certain areas rather than others. And I know if we went around the table, we would probably have many different views on how much should economic development be. Personally, I'd like to see a higher ranking of that. Some would like to see greater criteria or points given for environmental or sustainability matters, all of which are legitimate viewpoints, but I think what's important with this document like other asset management tools for the City of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker, is the fact that what we are asking for, is we are asking our professional public service for their recommendations and making it open and transparent then allows council ultimately to decide whether we agree with their recommendations or not. What we are not being asked to approve today, are budget items, to approve any of these projects proceeding. This is simply a document that can then be reviewed and considered by our public service for the provision of advice to council in the course of the coming year and coming years. I don't want to go back to the days of where we have political direction being provided to our public service about what recommendations they provide. They are providing their recommendations. We can review them, agree, disagree and go from there. So I welcome this document. Keeping in

mind, I respect the fact that some would like to see different rankings. What I would like to do is to allow the public service to provide their advice. It's open, transparent. Council is ultimately supreme and will ultimately decide what recommendations in the course of our budget and other deliberations will or will not be followed. But it will be done so in a much more open and transparent way than ever before thanks to the work of our asset management professionals as well as the public service including Finance and respective departments that have contributed to this document. Some have inferred through the deliberations of this document that this would somehow mean that decisions were being made about which projects to proceed. That simply is not accurate. It is a document that is ultimately used as guidance and referral by the public service. And I'd just remind everybody that then, as always, Council will decide on which projects to proceed or not with. But I do want to thank the public service for their work on this. I think this level of debate and consideration about our infrastructure and the needs of a growing city are something that we all gain from as Winnipeggers and as Council, and I continue to thank the input of third parties that provide us with their input given the fact that this document is made open and transparent for the scrutiny and deliberations that we're seeing here today. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next is Councillor Lukes, your opportunity to speak to Motion 2.

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

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 6 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee date December 3, 2019 be referred back to the Executive Policy Committee until such time as updates / reviews on the following policies have been submitted to Council for approval:

- *Our Winnipeg*
- *Complete Communities*
- *Strategic Priorities Action Plan*
- *Transportation Master Plan*
- *Parks and Recreation Strategy."*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Public Service report back to Council with an updated Infrastructure Plan, taking into consideration the updated above noted policies.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank the asset management team for the great work they're doing in pulling together this first phase of the infrastructure report. I strongly believe they are doing good work and are attempting to provide Council with more informed data-based decisions. I won't be supporting the report that's in front of us today because the primary reason is that as much as this is an information document, that it's being put forward, what's happening with this document is it's being...the motion, the report is asking us that we incorporate this into the annual investment planning cycle and multi-year budget process. So sure, we will have an opportunity to politically vote on it. It's either yes or no for the budget. I will not be supporting it for multiple reasons, and I'll give you a few of the reasons. Just over a week ago, we were presented with this report that prioritizes 45 infrastructure projects. The presentation was about 45 minutes long in duration and we maybe had a 20 minute question period. Almost…just under half of council saw this report for the first time, had no time to read it before attempting to ask informed questions. It was at a glance, and here we are, we're going to be voting on it with no further discussion and embedding it into the annual investment planning cycle and multi-year process. In my opinion, this is how bad decisions are made. Almost half of council did not have any opportunity to meet with the department, discuss, and do...and discuss this report due to the fact that it was presented right in the middle of the budget deliberations. I don't care. This is just not right. It's not fair. It's not open, transparent or collaborative. Reason number two; we've all now had a presentation on OurWinnipeg, and we should have a clear understanding of how OurWinnipeg and the Complete Communities Direction Strategies inform the transportation master plan. Public Works requires the land use assumptions that are being pulled together in the OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities document do model the transportation master plan. OurWinnipeg is nowhere near complete to properly inform the transportation master plan, and we know that Public Works is working on this, but it won't be completed. So how can these projects listed in this priority document be accurately prioritized when OurWinnipeg is nowhere near completion and we don't understand how land use will be occurring before we work this into the infrastructure plan...before we work this into the investment planning cycle and multi-year budget process? And on the topic of transportation, there are prioritized projects that are listed that aren't even in the current transportation master plan. Lagimodiere and Fermor fly over being one. Where did that come from? Why not Lag and Regent, one of the top five high collision intersections in the city? And related to the high collision intersections, they aren't even mentioned in this report. The inner ring road is not even mentioned, where thousands of collisions occur annually and cost taxpayers millions of dollars in claims annually. The inner ring road analysis was in our budget projections for the last four years but then was bumped and isn't even being considered in the infrastructure report. And there's other

projects that aren't even being considered, and there's no priority at all being given to the City of Winnipeg's Archives facility, our city's history. Anyone who's taken an interest in this very important asset will understand why the facility will cost over $5 million. And what of that catastrophic leaking membrane that's causing to rot the city's underground assets at Portage and Main? Not even mentioned again. Going from critically failing infrastructure to not even mentioned, the criteria used to rank. There's never been a council…never council input on the criteria used to rank. Council's never been asking by asset management. What kind of city would you like? How much ranking should we apply to this or that? Criteria…the environment, economic development, we've spoken about it. Instead, the public service has selected criteria, then changed the criteria over the last time we saw it without even informing Council. And there are dozens of gaps in the active transportation network, yet I see only two projects that out of 45 that speak to active transportation. Why weren't these gaps bundled together and presented in a project? Where is the active transportation upgrade in the Osborne underpass? Madam Chair, there are no connected AT links in the north east quadrant of Winnipeg. Where's the hydro corridor pathway? Councillor Nason; Transcona, you're never going to get out of there because there's a huge gap missing in your network. Why aren't these bundled together? Just to reiterate, I am very supportive of the work the Asset Management Department is doing, but I absolutely do not think that this report is anywhere near ready to be incorporated into the annual investment planning cycle and the multi-year budget process, and for those reasons, I won't be supporting it. And that is why I brought this new motion forward that we look at completing those reports and then go back at looking at incorporating the information that we have received into the infrastructure plan. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Three things. I won't be supporting the amendment because I think it's time we moved on on this report. This is, in my view, art masquerading as science. There's not an exact science to this. If there were, you wouldn't really need us to have election priorities, somebody would just pull the lever on a machine and that would be the next funded capital project. I like to think I'm doing this for some reason. I like to think the election pledges I made matter. So it is an advisory document, as the Mayor I think has strained to make clear. There are certainly some numbers that beg questioning; how in the 2011 master plan was the widening of St. Mary's Road 60 million inflated then to 78 million in the 2016 Henson Report and has now mysteriously taken a dive down to 65 million in 2028's dollars, which is about 40 million in 2011 dollars? And the answer I got was, we've refined it more and it's Class 5 so it could be 100% off. So when you've got that big a variable firing into the machine here, it does tend to make the rank ordering a little dodgy, quite frankly, in that it's you don't know what the thing is going to cost within 100%. It makes the rank quartering a little harder. That said, I don't necessarily take issue with a lot of the rank ordering in that a lot of it is water and sewer which I think is a priority that isn't politically always fashionable, but to the Mayor's credit, he created this Water Waste Committee of council. I think that these are important, huge items. Third thing and final thing I wanted to mention was the number one item here is listed as bio-solids facility in North End, actually I think appropriate. It's identified as the primary driver is growth, and we could get into an hour-long debate on that. For example, the Waverley West fire station isn't identified as growth because it's bundled in with Windsor Park. So the word primary does matter here. The staff have said, well, it's about 51% growth, it's 49% regulatory, I might take some issue with that. But the point I wanted to drive home here, the growth here isn't the usual scapegoat of the suburbs, the growth is everybody needs a bio-solids facility so it's infill and the suburbs. But the real point…the real point to make is what was made at committee, which is a lot of this is generated by corporate use of the bio-solids facility. It is agro business. It is not necessarily even within the City of Winnipeg boundaries because we've had clarified since EPC that yes, there are processing plants coming on in some of the RMs that have access to our sewer disposal system. I think the number that was given at EPC was that well, you could have one factory that's like putting in 4,000 new homes. I think we need to keep that in mind as we discuss economic development. We need to keep that in mind when we're talking about business taxes. We need to remember that there are some costs here. There are the socialization of costs, and this is a good example in the privatization of benefit. I think Aldo will like that. In the…if we are simply encouraging economic growth, we had better recover all of the associated costs because otherwise we shouldn't be building…have billion dollar facilities in order to help out businesses that might bring 20 or 30 employees to the City of Winnipeg or in fact, not even to the city of Winnipeg, to some of our partners in the neighbouring RMs. I look back today as Councillor Gillingham does, December 14th, 2011, my second day on the job here, I think, there was a vote on whether to extend water and sewer and the water didn't come to anything, but sewer services to some of the other neighbouring rural municipalities. And there was much talk in there about excess capacity and how we should be offering to extend these services and getting our money. Well, eight years on, here we are and we're now talking about a half billion dollar project, some of it to service our growth, some of it to service as regulatory requirements. But let us remember, a big chunk of this is to service the requirements of corporate entities that are going in and setting up. Agro business is hugely important to this city. I've been on that band wagon with Councillor Lukes for some time. However, we need to be conscious that some of these facilities we're doing aren't just because of people in infill or in the suburbs, there's a corporate aspect to this, too. So in summary, I'm okay with the report. I'll continue to advocate for the priorities that I have for my ward. However, I think it's a good faith effort to at least give us some rank ordering so I won't be supporting the amendment. But I do think it's an advisory document, and it's worth to, when looking through it, to remember well, not all of these costs are necessarily from what you would…might initially think, and the bio-solids stands as a good example of that, something that for eight

years we were told was regulatory suddenly appears as growth. We did get a pretty good explanation though from our staff, it isn't just residential, it's commercial as well.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And through you, I do want to bring up a few points that were mentioned earlier, that this was an advisory document. However, this council already has approved a payment to a specific project on the advisory list that we have. I do hear from my colleagues, and I hear them again today that we should be looking back at past council decisions, and that this has been discussed for many, many years, and I would venture to say that doesn't mean it's right if you look at where we are today. Things do change, and environments change. We have had...we don't have the resources, obviously, to look into that or the access to the administration, which has recently been even limited to sending our e-mail to a generic e-mail to see whether or not we can be provided those documents. It's quite silly. The open and transparentness, let's just be clear on this, a one-hour presentation from the service to councillors that can get there on that day at that time with limited questions and no discussion of what would change or how the ranking would change because everything is already printed, is not open, is not transparent. In fact we have somebody saying right from the residents, no consultation at any level with the private sector or the public. Transparency is misapplied to the process in this instance. Absent any opportunity, any opportunity for discussion with the business community or public, dare I say some council members. I hear it often. It deserves a rebuttal. This is not a question of the abilities or skill of City staff. It is a question of our obligation as elected officials to ask the questions, to become informed, to make a wise decision based on the facts. I'm sure every statement I make here or on social media, some people around this table or upstairs, go and fact check it. Right? We don't just assume that it's right. That's what we're trying to do with this process. I think that this…that's why I'm supporting Councillor Lukes' motion, and I think that we should be taking more time as opposed to saying, this is how it was done in the past. This is a great opportunity. It needs discussion, and we're not getting that opportunity to discuss.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of the motion that's in front of us here today on the infrastructure plan, and I was just…my kids would be real proud of me right now because a lot of the times you hear them talking about how they never use what they're learning in school. So I am learning…some of the stuff that I remember learning in school, when I remember taking classes on public service, their roles and responsibilities, and also the roles and responsibilities as elected officials, so I'm kind of channelling back some of those old professors of mine. So for the roles and responsibilities, I personally feel that this was the role and responsibility of the public administration because I think that we come and go. You know, councils change. If you look at the council from a few years ago, we have new members, and if every time we all decided on what ranking we thought there should be, what priorities we thought we should be, you know, that would be kind of devastating looking at the future as we move forward. So I think that that is a role and responsibility of our administration to take on that. I don't agree with the ranking. I think that environment should be way up there, and...but I know that they did their due diligence of looking at other cities and comparables. And as far as the other documents are going, I do think that they collaborate and they work collaboratively with other departments to know what priorities are within those departments, so I feel that that's being done. And in terms of our roles and responsibilities, I think that is...absolutely. Like some of the things that were raised today by Councillor Lukes and Councillor Klein, those…that's our job when it gets put into the budget and when we start debating those things around the table, those will be the times when we bring those points to order, and championing the things that we believe in and we value. So I do support this. I think that we need to have an overarching document that moves forward in the future, and I look forward to some of the debates because there's items on here that I fully support, and some items on here depending on when they move forward, I wouldn't support, so but I look forward to those debates. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The...so this is a report based on the cost-benefit ratios and how we weight things, and it's interesting how these various projects have aligned. My concern is if this is moving ahead and it will guide us in any investments that we may be looking at over the next number of years, Madam Speaker. It is a cost benefit, and you can...the work that our administration put into it is quite heavy. And I just wanted to first speak about the economic growth aspects, the growth aspects to that weighting it at 7% or whatever. Ultimately when we did have that seminar on how things were proceeding, that was one of my concerns, Madam Speaker. So right now, most of the growth we talk about, and we think of it in terms of, you know, new assessment base to tax that will help us afford to pay for various things. But there's a lot more to the growth aspect for the city that is important, and we discuss those matters actually when we're on Innovation and Economic Development, and it's a bit bigger of a picture. We look at various growth aspects. But you know, having a good job means you can afford to pay for a nice home, for example, and so on. And then, there's commercial building, and on and on we could go. But some aspects I believe are not really factored in

into these projects. However, it is just...it is a cost-benefit thing, but there are more important things to measure against. The amending…the motion moved forward by Councillor Lukes is interesting in that it talks about the transportation plan. She mentioned the inner ring road, but I noticed that all the pieces of the inner ring road are in the list, I believe. I was just having Councillor Gillingham take a quick look at William Clement.

Councillor Gillingham: William Clement is not on the 45, but it's being looked at.

Councillor Eadie: It's not on the 45, okay, so that's the only piece of the inner ring I think that's missing. Anyway, what I'm getting at here is, it is a list, but it is our guidance rate now. The transportation master plan, and within that, I believe, the cycling and whatever is...AT stuff is a subset or smaller piece of the overall transportation master plan...at least I hope it is because that's all part of moving people around the city. The...I just…when you look at this cost benefit calculations, it just behooves me. For example, like to see the Arlington Bridge down lower than the Kenaston widening, for example, now I know they get a Kenaston widening…is about growth, Madam Speaker, but you know what, that particular piece of the inner ring road exists. There's traffic on it…yeah, it's congested, there's lots of problems, but it exists. If the Arlington Bridge is shut down, it's no longer there. I don't know what level of priority you give that, but all of a sudden, you are causing problems for other roads like McPhillips, Salter, and you cause a whole bunch of problems…even more problems with Leila and Templeton in our area, Madam Speaker. You know, so when it comes to all this traffic pressure and accidents, all these kind of things that are to be considered. So I do have some concerns. We know that the numbers change. One good thing I will say about this is in the past when...well, when the new council came in in 2015, and there we were, having to make a decision on which of these projects are we going to go ahead with, all we could say is, well, whichever has the Class 3 first. That's a real bad way to do things. It really is. I mean, the Waverley underpass is an excellent facility. It will help move along traffic. It's a great thing but, you know, like just because it was a Class 3 first, we were going to go ahead with it. Anyway, I don't…whatever. And I was wondering what was happening over the years when it was coming to the studies on the Chief Peguis west. I can't figure out how Chief Peguis west rates lower than the Edward Schreyer Highway, pardon me, Councillor Schreyer. But I don't understand how it's two notches up from the Chief Peguis west. I haven't really looked into the detail, and it's a very detailed cost-benefit look and the criteria and all that stuff. But I have some concerns with a lot of how it worked out. I know you can factor in a lot of things, and it was done purely scientific through our asset management and the people we have in charge of it. I know it was a scientific thing. It's nothing…there's no personal perspective on this. It's just a study in applying a technique called cost-benefit ratio. There's other techniques of weighting, figuring out how to prioritize things. But when it comes to the overall plan and where we're moving forward, you know, acknowledging the bigger picture of, for example, the inner ring road, most of the pieces are there. Actually never did understand why the William Clement Parkway extension was part of an inner ring road because Kenaston gets you pretty close to that whole airport, St. James industrial area. I mean, it gets people there quite well. So I still don't quite understand that, but maybe Mr. Lorenc will explain that to me on the side some other day. Anyway, so I do have concerns. I really…I was at a loss as to whether or not to vote for it, whether or not Councillor Lukes' amending motion...which I'm going to vote for it because I think a bigger plan is more important than just the consideration of a cost-benefit analysis because once you start getting into this cost-benefit analysis, and you apply it to community centres and different things like that, like...and you know, expected numbers, usage, you get into all that stuff, like, humans are not pure science. There's art science as well, the psychology and things like that. That's not an exact science, okay. Like mathematics is pretty exact, right? So I get concerned about that, but it's good to see that our environmental projects are…rate higher, some of the bigger ones.

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

Councillor Eadie: Anyway, so I'm going to be…I'll just conclude, I'm going to vote…although, it's going to take too long for those plans to come forward. I think we do have to have some sort of criteria, but I will be supporting the amending motion and I haven't decided even yet how to vote with this list of advised 45 projects. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie, and just to clarify, it's a referral motion, not an amending motion. Thank you, yes. I'm sure that's what you meant. Any further speakers on this item? No? Seeing none. We will go back to you, Councillor Lukes. Are there any other speakers on this item? Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. I'll just be very quick. I'll meet with Councillor Eadie to maybe revisit history a bit on how the Waverley underpass was chosen. It was regulatory, that the Rail Safety Act, that really jumped it up the ladder. It wasn't because it was at a Class 3. But on Class 3s, the way I talk to my great neighbour here, I'm very impressed now that we have…we don't put projects forward unless they have a Class 3. We do have a project in my tenure where we brought it forward for funding on a Class 5 model-ish, you do the math, and the cost overruns are astronomically huge. It was a pain. So we have cleaned that up. So I just want to point out, I am...I do believe that moving projects forward only that have a Class 3, we've got the counterbalance problem about how many projects you want to get to a Class 3 level before you submit them, how many projects are going to go sit on the shelf forever. We really do have to be considering our budget. We have a real issue right now with the matter…we've always had it, I think we're all

realizing it, the issues of our costs versus our revenues. So I'm going to…I do believe that this plan is a good starting point. I see the amending motion here, and it's pretty well saying, make sure you do all these plans first before you do anything. That's what I'm reading it for, and it's even got in there a plan…strategic priorities action plan, and I know that's something they've been advocating for. But I see that there, so I won't be supporting the amendment. Of course, when OurWinnipeg comes forward, whenever that is, and you know, we can muster the finances to get across the line, or the parks, you know, we may have to amend the strategies for it, but that's why you have the matrix in there, so you can amend things quickly. But again, this is just a starting document. We are a living, breathing city. We can't just stop doing everything until everybody agrees on everything completely. We have to keep moving forward, and so we're striking a good balance here where we have some idea of where we want to go forward. I think most of the projects, sure, we can look at it and say, why isn't that sidewalk in there, why isn't that in there, and yeah, those are fine debates to have, but it gives us generally a document to go forward, general matrix that we can discuss, and it's all there for everybody to look at. And when some of our priorities may change...levels of service, I know some people have spoken...again, it'll be a very interesting debate when we change some of our levels of service maybe for transportation. Well that's going to be interesting. What about in a year, we don't even…I guess a transit master plan will be part of the transportation master plan, I gather. We should probably wait for that as well. So again, we have to be moving forward. So there is some...quite a bit of good in this document. It gives us an idea...a solid idea. I personally have no idea. I'm still stressing about this budget, about how we are going to figure out a way to move forward when some of the…with the very evident problem of our structural deficit in there. So how are we going to afford any of these projects? Again, so this document did more than just stress me out as well because I see some of the costs just to the Kenaston widening. Many of the projects in there, you know, the City requires two things; we need some new revenue streams and we need to be able to share some of the growth money that the Province has. That's plain and simple. We've been asking that for 30 years but we need to be able to share some of the growth revenue because as we've seen, growth does cost cities a lot of money, but we need to keep growing, so we have to figure out this balance. Again, we can say on page 62, this document, this document, I don't like this piece here, and that's again why we have…we're trying to get out of the politics. I remember when the Plessis underpass came in, I believe it was the day of the budget. It just showed up. (Inaudible) Now we have a kind of idea, a road map. You know, I've talked to Councillor Santos, and definitely, she's going to keep advocating hard for the Arlington Bridge, and you know, I totally support that. So the question really is, you know, do we just don't do anything and we wait until all our plans are done? No, I think we have to do the best we can and keep the ball rolling forward. We are…as much as…maybe some of the councillors don't agree with it, but I see the progress forward. We are going forward. We are getting a major stand that was never existent before. We are showing the documents in a public document that everybody can see that I can't (inaudible). We are doing Class 3 estimates before we submit funding. So there are a lot of positives. Could it be better? Yeah, but we need to keep moving forward and keep working on the positive. So I will be supporting the main document, but I won't be supporting the amendment.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker is Councillor Lukes, your opportunity to close on Motion 2 which is a referral motion.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. So just to be clear, I'm very supportive of the work that's being done by the Asset Management Group and the work that's being done to put this document together. What I'm not supportive of, and I think that almost half of council here should not be supportive of this either is to see this not fully robust document yet incorporated into the annual investment planning cycle and the multi-year budget process because when it's incorporated into those two processes in the cycle, people that are not on the Executive Policy Committee that basically have a yes or a no vote to the budget are really limited in having input, and I don't think that's right, and that's why I'm not supporting it.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. When I meet with representatives from other levels of government, whether it's Member of Parliament, Dan Vandal or the premier or the prime minister, in many of the discussions, there is an attempt to try to find alignment with other levels of government and their funding priorities. And one of the things that does not exist, as far as I'm aware, is a public document of this kind that explains at least what advice is being provided to provincial and federal governments based on the professional advice of their public service. This is absolutely head and shoulders above and beyond what you would see in terms of openness and transparency with respect to this kinds of advice at other levels of government. It's something that all members of council should be proud of, and all Winnipeggers should appreciate this level of openness and transparency so that we can have the kinds of debates we're having today on this floor, and we'll continue to have. Like I said in my introductory remarks, ultimately, decisions will be made by Council, but I certainly appreciate the fact that this is something that is open. It's transparent. It's for all Winnipeggers, including other levels of government to scrutinize to better understand the kinds of advice that we're receiving and the basis upon which that advice is being provided, and for that reason, I'll be supporting it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'll call the question on Motion 2, the referral motion. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. That's not what I meant. What I mean is the motion...Motion 2 is defeated, okay? That's what I heard, but we can certainly have a recorded vote if you wish, okay? Okay. We'll call for a recorded vote. All in favour of the referral motion that Councillor Lukes moved. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Klein, Lukes, Nason, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Motion 2 is defeated, and that is what I meant earlier, my apologies. Now we'll vote on the main item, Item 6. All in favour? Call for recorded vote, once again, all in favour, please rise. All in favour of Item 6 – the 2020 Infrastructure Plan.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins and Santos

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Klein, Lukes, Nason, Schreyer, and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. Item 6 passes. I'll move onto the next item. Just before we do that, I would like to call our Deputy Speaker up to take the Chair so I could attend to...

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right, Report 7 was pulled? Go ahead.

Item 7 – Amendment to Fees and Charges By-law No. 196/2008 – Impact Fee

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Your Worship. Okay. Councillor Klein, go ahead.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I pulled this item because quite often when we have asked questions in these chambers, we've been told that we can't talk about issues that are before the courts, and this item is before the courts. And here we are, talking about this when it's before the courts, and we've been told that we can't do that on a number of occasions. I guess I can't understand why this is not troubling because I think we are, you know, we have had this happened before where we were told to do something or not do something and we did the opposite and we are now again before the courts with doing that. So here we are, once again, voting on a motion and an item that hasn't been decided on by the ultimate authority, which would be the Court of Queen's Bench.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any other speakers? Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Mr. Speaker, I'm so used to calling Madam Speaker, I almost made that mistake. I believe Councillor Klein is basically, based on what he's saying, is stating that this item is out of order. Would that be correct?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That's not what he said specifically. He was just questioning the legality of it. He didn't call…

Councillor Nason: Is there a way to confirm if it is in order or out of order before we vote on it?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I can confirm with the Clerk. Based on the advice of the Clerk, we believe this is in order. We'll consider it in order.

Councillor Nason: Has a legal opinion been provided on this matter?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I'm not aware of any such opinion, but again, the decision of the Chair was that this report before us today is in order. If you want to challenge the Chair in the very first item I've ever dealt with, go for it.

Councillor Orlikow: Welcome to the team.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It's not really question period, if you wanted to continue your time, Councillor Nason. No? Speakers. Okay, Councillor Eadie, please.

Councillor Eadie: That was an interesting point Councillor Klein has brought up. But as I read it, it's talking about who's allowed to increase it. And I don't know if it really gets to the substance of what the court matter is, but we are definitely charging the impact fee at this point, Mr. Chairperson or may I call you Speaker Browaty? Anyways, sorry. As…anyway, it seems to me that we are charging the impact fee whether or not there's a lawsuit on right now. We are collecting it from anybody who's building in the growth areas, and that money continues to be there whether or not…the court case is about whether or not it is legally established impact fee according to our ability under the charter...City of Winnipeg Charter, and so I don't...I don't see that this actually ties into that legal matter. This is allowing the CEO to set the increase in what the impact fee will be, and I guess it's incorporating whether or not there'll be an inflationary factor on the impact fee and that sort of stuff. So for me, I think it's in order. I haven't decided if I'm voting for it yet, Mr. Speaker Browaty. Thanks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Trying to find the provision in the org by-law, but I presume that the clerks has already wrestled with whether or not this is in order as it does, in a sense…well, it does deal with a matter that is before the courts, but many things we deal with are matters before the courts. We're not debating though the merits of the impact fee. This is, as Councillor Eadie has said, an attempt to clean up some wording that was passed here a couple of years ago which is…there is an index. The impact fee has increased as construction inflation has, calculated by our staff internally, has increased over the past few years. This year, due to a number of factors, the calculation was the…actually a deflationary amount, so we've had to change the provisions because that wasn't foreseen when we passed it. Not surprisingly, it's been rare to have deflation in Canada on…certainly on construction matters. It's almost unheard of. I would think back to perhaps the early 1980's. So we have this index, we needed to correct the by-law to allow for a lower amount to be charged in next year's impact fee reflecting the inflationary increase or decrease that we calculated for the construction costs. So housekeeping matter to some extent, and we continue to await the decision of the courts as indicated on the legality of whether they are...whether we can charge the impact fee at all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Just for Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein's questions, the Clerk just pointed out to me that in the procedure by-law, there is a…it does specify that during question period, questions are not to deal with matters before the courts, but it does not say anything otherwise. Any other speakers? Mayor Bowman to close.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I think Councillor Mayes summed this up best, so I'll keep my comments brief. The by-law that has previously been voted on by Council contemplated construction inflation. It did not, however, properly contemplate construction deflation. It seems appropriate for those that are affected by this...this impact fee that it does contemplate construction deflation and that's what this attempts to do, is to reflect that. A vote for this is to allow in the new year the amount that would otherwise be paid to be lowered for the industry. Certainly, members of council can choose to vote against this if they want to have the current by-law in place. I think this is a smart thing to do for the industry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, thank you. All right. All those in favour? Opposed...recorded vote's been called for. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Browaty

Nays

Councillors Klein, Lukes and Nason

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right. The vote…

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. We'll move onto Report 8. Move on to Report 8, please, have the Clerk introduce it, Report 8. Was 8 pulled? Okay.

City Clerk: My apologies Mr. Deputy Speaker. The recorded vote was 12 to 3, not 13 to 3.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Item 8 – Audit Department Peer Review

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right. Who pulled this? Does anyone have any comments or questions? Councillor Klein pulled this one? Go ahead.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I pulled this one because it's about credibility. It's interesting that on the documents we have, there's no phone number or address of the organization that has given us the certificate and that has approved our approach if you will. I'm a little bit baffled as to why that's off, but if you look near the bottom, there appears to be a line which means when they photocopied it, it's quite possible, who knows. But I can't understand why that would be kept out of the documents. I'm not sure what the secret would be or what the danger to our personal safety might be if we found that out, that we would go to any such precautions because surely, letterhead would include an address. So I took some time to investigate the organization myself...thank you, Google. The organization is for members only. The City of Winnipeg does pay a membership fee to be a part of it. Members of the board are not available to the public, and one would assume that, of course, the City would attend conferences on occasions. The group known as the Association of the...of Government Auditors is based in the United States. I see no Canadian representation on the site other than an auditor general from Toronto as an at-large, and in fact, when we're paying a fee to be on there, should we be using this as the credible source for our processes?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yep, I'm going to rise to speak to this, Deputy Speaker Browaty. In terms of, of course, the review is done, and somebody needs to ensure that we're meeting some kind of professional standards. And I...I brought up the fact, and I personally...I'll give you another example of the City of Winnipeg where we're paying money to live by American standards called International Policing Standards, which I don't necessarily agree with, either. But in the sense that there's a lack of a credible organization that's presenting new policing standards or a Canadian group providing auditor standards that one should meet, I think that that is what we have, and I know that our auditor and the way they conduct themselves is quite good, and I'm glad that they've exercised, look at the means that they have within the City of Winnipeg Charter. I don't know if other cities have similar abilities, they do probably in Manitoba, but I don't know across where else. But so when measuring and certifying those standards, it leaves something to be. But if that's the organization that provides those standards, then those are the ones we follow. And we have...we do have...we do have different accounting standards in Canada than we do in the United States, I'm pretty sure of that. What used to be called the CICA standard guideline book that one would have to follow when being an accountant, I don't know if they've provided any auditor standards, but what is it now, just the Canadian public...I can't remember. They're not chartered accounts anymore, they're...anyway, I'm so far out of the practice, Deputy Speaker. Anyway, I'll be supporting this report, and it was good to see it got good certification and everything's cool there so thanks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Good, so we'll call the question, then, all those...oh, sorry. It's for the Mayor to...Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: Just to comment, I want to probably echo pretty much what Councillor Eadie said. I appreciate the work of our auditor and you know we have to…there's a measure of, obviously, by virtue of its very position, the City's auditor, you know, has a level of independence and the highest priority of their work and their office's work is the integrity with which they conduct themselves. They have had a peer review as is part of the Association of Local Government Auditors, which we I think should be able to assume our entities and organizations that are part of that organization because of the work that they do and the integrity with which they do their work, and the peer review is just very much that. So I think that this is a very positive stamp of approval on the work that our auditor and his team do on

behalf of the citizens of Winnipeg. We do note that there's a couple of items here that the peer review that were mentioned, as far as the auditor, you know, in their capacity or their…the appropriateness of them doing audits on some of the councillors', you know, expenses and what not, but that's all contained within there. But I do certainly support adoption of this report, and it's good to see the good response and report that...that was provided by this organization, the Association of Local Government Auditors, for our audit team.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further speakers, oh, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I just wanted to read some information for the record. I did take the opportunity to Google the Association of Local Government Auditors. So one of my colleagues mentioned there was no phone number. That is correct. I did find a website, and in the about section of the organization, which appears to be a peer review organization, it says, "ALGA was formed in 1989. It has since enjoyed a growing membership. There are more than 300 organizational members and more than 2,500 individual members of ALGA. Our membership represents a wide diversity of local government audit organizations, ranging from one person audit shops to other with more than 75 professionals." I mean, I have no reason to doubt the merits and the value of this peer review organization for auditors, and I wanted to share that information with Council.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer. You're good? Okay, do you wish to close Mr. Mayor? You're good? Okay, so we'll call the question then. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Oh, you want to be recorded in opposition? Okay. We'll record Councillor Klein in opposition. Okay.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTION

Item 1 – Photo Enforcement Program

Madam Speaker: Next is the notice of motion brought forward by Councillor Nason and Councillor Schreyer at the November meeting of council. The motion is part of the published agenda. It's on your computers, and it's regarding the photo enforcement system. Councillor Nason, this is your opportunity to introduce your motion.

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.

Councillor Nason: I think I have the opportunity to let my colleagues speak to it, and then I'll respond.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Any speakers on this motion? Okay. And the seconder was Councillor Schreyer. No speakers? Councillor Allard. In French, please.

Councillor Allard: Actually, our interpreter is away, so I will not be speaking French right now. So the be it resolved, "Council will hold in abeyance any renewal, extension or approval of the supply, installation and operation of a photo enforcement program, until such a time as the Province of Manitoba releases the results of its comprehensive review of the photo enforcement system." I mean, this, I think is a totally loaded motion. I mean maybe obviously, I will not be supporting it. I do believe the photo enforcement program is...makes our streets safer, especially in construction zones. I...before the meeting, I Googled what I was aware of in terms of the photo...one of the recent updates to the program, Brittany's Law, was brought in at around 2014 after a horrible accident in a construction zone where a worker lost their lives on their...in their place of work. And so Brittany's Law was...you know, was updating the legislation to ensure that we have essentially tougher enforcement…you know, photo enforcement. One of the changes was to remove the speed limit while workers present. The rationale was that there…people should slow down in construction zones and there was a risk that people might not see workers if they were present or not. And that was some of the rationale for Brittany's Law. I don't see why we would want to stop enforcement before knowing that there isn't benefits to public safety. And I presume that regardless of whatever study comes out from the provincial government that there's still going to be disagreement about whether or not photo enforcement makes our street safer or not. I mean, I got a photo radar ticket one time, and I think only one time. I was in a motor vehicle, not on my bicycle. I don't quite go fast enough to get a ticket on my bicycle. It was on Provencher Boulevard. I think I was going 67, which is pretty fast for Provencher Boulevard. And I haven't gotten one since. So I mean, I think, my own…in my own world, the photo enforcement program, before I was, you know, heavily involved in municipal politics to the point that I am, when I've really had to look at these policies, which ones are effective, which ones are less effective. I know that for me personally, I got one photo radar ticket, and I slowed down after that. So I know I'm...that's an anecdote. Obviously everybody's going to react differently, but it always strikes me as, you know, if you don't want to get a ticket then follow the speed limit. And I don't...I don't see why we would want to potentially make our streets less safe. I mean fundamentally, I guess it's that simple. Why would we want…to the movers of this motion, why would we want to make our streets less safe? Sure, the Province is reviewing it. They reviewed our Planning Department. I think they had 50 anonymous interviews. You know, is that the kind of report that we can expect next time? I don't know, maybe I shouldn't pre-judge what's going to happen in that report. So I guess I'm saying, regardless of what comes out in that report, I still see some value in the photo enforcement program in making our streets safer. And so with that, I would urge everyone please don't support this. I could see how it might make sense…political sense in some circles, but we're responsible for people's safety, and people lose their lives on our streets. Photo enforcement makes workplaces safer, so please don't support this.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think I owe an explanation as to why I seconded this motion given Councillor Allard's justified concerns in terms of his concerns for safety. My understanding was, the reason for this motion is we're coming up with a review. We're talking about months, not years or seasons, and in this case, we're not talking about dismantling the photo radar program. It's about any further costs to dealing with this in the months ahead before the provincial review comes out. It's not about lack of concern, certainly not my motivation or my understanding of how this could be applied by the City of Winnipeg. I see the value of photo radar, and to me, this is more like a bureaucratic or administrative directive that's very temporary until we have a review by the Province that is imminent, we're talking this spring. And on that basis, it's just a matter of not doing any enhancements to the program, continuing the program as it is, until we get that. My thinking is it's meant to be a cost saving measure, not at the expense of safety, but basically assuming that the provincial report that's coming out is, as well, in the name of safety. And on that basis, what is the problem waiting for the administrative...a report from the Province before we make any further changes to our photo radar program? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wasn't going to speak to this, but I think we have to be realistic that, you know, it's not the time to put this towards the safety of people. If voting against it means, you know, you're voting against safety, sure, we hear that a lot, and the motions will be used against us. I agree with the reasoning of reviewing the system right now, that is the government of Manitoba's jurisdiction. It's their responsibility to do it. They are doing it, and I think that this isn't specifically about construction zones. It's about whether or not how the legislation reads today actually is...you know, has some support to show it is saving lives on our road...or is there a better way that we can do this? But most importantly, the program raises a substantial amount of money. I know we don't want to talk about it, but let's be realistic. The program raises a substantial amount of money. Locations are chosen by the City, not police. If you were to take this money away, what would happen to the expenses or the police service because they are told to get that...that has to generate so much revenue for their budget. So we need to be looking at the entire...when we talk in here, let's be, like, open about it. The fact is it generates money for the City. I know…again, there's both sides; we don't want to talk about that, we don't want to talk about having traffic enforcement through cameras. But let's be real now, there's revenue that comes from it. We want to know if it's safe. Where should it go to be safe? How should it go to be safe? Those are all questions that I know the service would like to know. Red light cameras have been in the same spot

for what, 10, 15 years, they still generate revenue from people going through red lights. How do we make it so that it reduces the amount of people going through red lights? And I believe that is the purpose of the review. I don't think it'll be unnamed sources in a back room. I don't even think it'll be held in a back room not involving all people like some meetings are. I think that this is just an opportunity…what the two colleagues are saying, I understand, however, we do have to consider all the other facts, and I don't think they're saying remove it because of safety or they want to remove it, thinking that it will put people at risk. It was concept. I applaud the concept of putting it forward, I certainly wouldn't bash it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Councillor Browaty followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I just maybe would like to get a little clarification from the original mover of this motion here when he closes. I just wanted to understand, like, again, it says that any renewal or extension in terms of this. Are you talking about like, the day the current contract ends, you pull everything off the street or are you saying that, you know, we go into an overall hold position potentially on the current contract, don't invest any more money or you know, sign a new long-term contract. I think it expires in March or April of next year in the event that the provincial review isn't done in that time frame. Perhaps we could get a clarification from the original mover of the motion. And then on the…on the other side too, I mean, we don't know what the Province is going to say. Like right now, there's three places you can use photo radar: intersections, playground zones and construction sites. Perhaps we'll see that it's effective or maybe it could be more effective if we deployed it even more broadly being able to use them in other high risk zones, for example. So anyways, we'll definitely wait to see what happens. I think the intention here is okay, but I just want to get clarification from the original mover.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm standing in opposition actually to this motion. To not be able to talk about safety out there on the streets, I always give this example, Madam Speaker, in your ward, Sinclair and Leila, which has a red light camera. I used to use that intersection quite a lot. And I'd have to tell you, there's a lot of near almost me getting hit at that intersection because of people not paying attention to their driving or follow the rules. I always follow the rules on the street because I'm trying to stay as safe as possible. When I'm out walking on the streets, I'm trying to stay as safe as possible. And I noted when they did put in that red light camera and people started to recognize it was there, and when I would use that intersection, I can tell you that the incidents of near misses and so on went down. Yeah, there's still people who get tickets, but actually, I'm going to rise and say to suggest...it's good that the Province is going to do their study. I think that's important. I think they will discover that photo radar does…and red light cameras, those sort of things, do provide a level of safety because most people are like Councillor Allard. You know, it happens once, pay attention. I stand here today, I say to the public, Madam Speaker, I think every signalized intersection should have a camera and then everybody would know that no matter where they go if they are violating the rules, they will get a ticket. Problem solved. Problem solved. Just do it. That's called…what do they call that? Zero what? Zero tolerance. Put them in all of the intersections. All of them, do it. And then no driver is going to take a chance because they know every intersection is covered. You are going to get a ticket. That will solve the driver issue with people who have attitudes, who think that the road is theirs and they can do what they want on it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie. Are there any further speakers? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will not be supporting this motion. I think it's important that in our…I think it's important in our public statements that we properly inform ourselves before making statements on matters relating to obviously public safety as well as the enforcement of photo radar among other topics. I have heard the comments made by some members of this council publicly through the media on this topic in advance. I did some research just to find out if in fact the City and not the police actually chooses the locations. That from what I have been advised is not accurate. And I heard it once again today that the locations are chosen by the City and not the police. I think it is important for all of us and especially those that serve on the Police Board to be properly informed of these things before making public statements. Under the provincial legislation…

Councillor Klein: If our honourable mayor could prove the statement that he just made; it is not the City that dictates where the cameras go or the photo radar? Going to make the statement, much to Councillor Allard…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein, thank you. I am sorry. I have a number of you e-mailing me and texting me at the same time. I didn't…certainly didn't catch that, Mr. Mayor, but please respond.

Mayor Bowman: I just heard a statement made that the locations are chosen by the City and not the police. If I…if that is not accurate, please let me know. But my understanding is that a statement was just made and I want to provide some commentary on that as it relates to this topic. In the advance of this meeting, I did some research along with my

staff just to find out the question of where the locations are actually chosen. And what I have been advised is that under provincial legislation, mobile photo enforcement is restricted to construction zones, playground zones and school zones as has been cited by members of council today. The Winnipeg Police Service maintains a list of all current enforcement zones and provides the list to the City's mobile enforcement contractor, Currently Conduit. The Winnipeg Police Service has the authority to direct mobile enforcement locations, but in general, mobile enforcement locations, I am advised, are chosen from the list of current enforcement zones by Conduit. I will not be supporting this motion.

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

Councillor Mayes: Just wanted to clarify…I won't support the motion, but this dates back…I'm just looking in minutes of debate we had here and thank you to the Clerks for alertly finding this in December 2012 about photo radar. This wasn't…this goes back before my time on Council. This wasn't a response to just a construction related situation. I think that was suggested by Councillor Allard. That is an important issue. There were fatalities in construction zones back in the early 1980s and that changed some of our patterns on how we do late night construction which only recently has been changed back. So there is a long history on this. If you look at that debate from 2012, there was pretty good support, frankly, for photo radar, but I just…it wasn't as late as may have been suggested. This actually goes back quite a bit further in time and wasn't simply something that came on in response to a construction incident. It's…I don't have the exact year here from the 2012 report, but even in December 2012 there was the debate about whether to renew an expiring contract, so this actually does go back a fair way.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Mayes. Any further speakers? Councillor Nason…oh, Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: I wanted to just echo some of Mr. Mayor's comments. The Winnipeg Police Service does have a handy photo radar technology page. How does mobile for radar vehicles work? And it does outline that photo enforcement is part of the Winnipeg Police Service's overall strategy to make the city streets safe for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists alike. I won't be supporting the motion only because through my e-mails as of late it has come to my attention that members of the public are harassing photo radar units, taking photos of them. I am not in favor of anyone harassing our public servants or contractors that work for the City of Winnipeg and I'm not suggesting that that was the intent of the motion here. But I am concerned about that because it…you know, sometimes policy works in trends and I would hate to see it…anything misconstrued in this council chamber that we aren't fully behind not only the Winnipeg Police Service's efforts to make the city safe, but also the photo radar in particular as a program that works for schools, that works for our community and that maintains some order in terms of that photo radar enforcement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Klein: Point of clarification; having been here for a year and listening to all the back and forth and wants…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein, this is not your opportunity.

Councillor Klein: Point of clarification; the Police Chief himself, in a public meeting said that they do not set the locations.

Madam Speaker: This is not your opportunity to speak Councillor Klein. This is not your opportunity to speak. Councillor Nason, this is your opportunity to close on the motion. And I will turn microphones off. It's been a long day. Let's get through this meeting, please.

Councillor Nason: I've only got one eye today, so trying to deal with this as well. So you know, Councillor Allard brought up about safety. It bothers me that, you know, I put this motion forward a month ago, and you know it's been thrown in my face many times about not coming forward and discussing it. This was not discussed with me prior to today. Councillor Schreyer, he was somewhat misunderstood about the intent of the motion. You know, I do apologize. The intent of it is try to be more proactive than reactive so that come May, come June, we are not retroactively approving a contract that is expiring. Trying to be proactive with this matter so that we can do due diligence, so that we can better inform the public service, the administration as to perhaps some direction as they go into discussions of this potential provincial change in photo enforcement so that we don't renew early and expand or purchase new equipment. You know, Councillor Allard brought up about the fact of Provencher and red light camera or may have been a photo enforcement. I drive down the road most daily. And I will note that the Provencher photo radar camera that is the fixed one is painted a very nice blue with some characters on it, you know, some design on it. It's not the plain ordinary dull steel. I will also note that there is no flash attachment just to the east of it. So I'm not sure if it is an actual working camera or just there's a piece of public art I guess, per se, because I know that there is somewhat more boxes than there are cameras in the city. They sometimes move the cameras around. I think there's three additional boxes than there are cameras. But safety is paramount, be it construction zones, school zones. I have recently succumbed to the

distraction of getting a school zone infraction. And I will most definitely learn from that. I always scold my wife because she may have got a couple more than I did, but it is something we need to pay attention to. We are moving towards possibly having some of those wonderful flashing amber lights in the school zones to alert people. The discussion though is that we don't enter into a new agreement, that we don't expand the agreement, that you know, if this review is not done by May 31st as I understand that's in front of us today, things would end. There would be no renewal. It wouldn't stay in place. You know, if we truly are concerned about safety, you know, we have a matter that's coming up forward today to talk about a by-law that only last month we changed that will remove police officers from the street. So if we are talking about safety, how can we downplay this in the name of safety and say that we are putting people at risk but yet when it comes to hard and fast numbers of police on the street, later in this session we will be voting to do just that, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. I'll now call the question on the notice of motion. All in favour? Call for a recorded vote. All in favour of the notice in motion regarding photo radar, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Nason and Schreyer

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

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

Madam Speaker: Notice of motion is defeated. Moving on here, we will now move into by-laws, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law 98/2019 and By-law 99/2019.

Madam Speaker: There is a call…sorry?

Councillor Klein: Yes, call for a standing vote. Counted vote, whatever you call it.

Madam Speaker: You mean a recorded vote, Councillor Klein? So that is for which one…99/2019?

Councillor Klein: Yes, the by-law for the…

Madam Speaker: I will call the question on 98/2019. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And you had asked for recorded vote on 99/2019, that is the police pension by-law. 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, Rollins and Santos

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: First reading passes.

Clerk: By-law No. 98/2019, By-law No. 99/2019.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, on…I guess we will call the question on the second reading for 98/2019. Mr. Mayor, go ahead. There was a call for recorded vote on the second by-law.

Mayor Bowman: Sure, no problem. I move that By-law No. 98/2019 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 98/2019.

Madam Speaker: Can we continue for the third reading? I was just going to…okay, go ahead Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law No. 99/2019 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: 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

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

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: The second reading passes. Mr. Mayor.

Clerk: By-law No. 99/2019.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Sounds good, thank you. I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 98/2019 be read a third time and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered…sorry, By-law No. 99/2019 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I've been advised by the clerks that we can have it split the two. The one requires two-thirds to waive the rules. Then there will be a separate vote on whether to approve the by-law.

Madam Speaker: Yes, that is in order and we can certainly do that. And there will be a recorded vote. So Mr. Mayor, we will call the question on the suspension first. All in favor of suspending the rules to hear By-law 99/2019? 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, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Madam Speaker: The rule has been suspended. Those opposed of the suspension? Councillor Eadie.

Nays

Councillor Eadie

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 1.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, the suspension passes. Mr. Mayor, on the third reading for 99/2019.

Mayor Bowman: You want me to read it out again?

Madam Speaker: That was just to suspend the rules and now we need a majority vote to pass the actual by-law.

Mayor Bowman: I move that By-law No. 99/2019 be read a third time and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. 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, Rollins and Santos

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Those opposed to the third reading of By-law 99/2019, please rise.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: The third reading for By-law 99/2019 – the Police Pension By-law passes. We will now move on to question period for the Mayor. Councillor Eadie.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I rise to…I think it's kind of a "did you know". I was a little concerned about the debate on the notice of motion. Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if the Mayor understands that the Province actually decided how many intersections red light cameras could go into and that the number of established facilities to be able to mount the camera and take the images. I don't know if that is understood, but I believe the police service can have an influence as to which there is more mountings for the red light cameras than there are red light cameras. So they get moved around. And I am just wondering if anybody on Council understands that they…on Provencher, the camera might not be in there sometimes. It might be somewhere else. The idea is, Madam Speaker, the idea there is that it's randomly around so people, you know, you don't know. Just…so I'm just wondering if the Mayor and everybody around the table here understands how the Province allowed us to move ahead with red light cameras many years ago and how it is actually…so I believe it was the City itself I think who originally decided what intersections could have the mounting for a camera and then they get moved around based on issues. Were you aware of that, Mayor?

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

Mayor Bowman: Some of the information that the councillor just referenced in his questions, I was not aware. I appreciate his previous efforts not only on Council, but on the Police Board. Certainly he has an understanding given the information he would have been provided as a member of the Police Board that many members of council would not have. My comments…in addition to opposing the motion that we just…that Council just decided to oppose, I just researched given some of the comments I had heard through the media and wanted to confirm whether or not in fact,

the City does currently choose the locations or if it was rather something that is within the authority of the Winnipeg Police Service and of course their contractor. And so, through that research was advised that it is in fact, the Winnipeg Police Service that has the authority to direct mobile enforcement locations, but in general, the mobile enforcement locations are chosen from a list of current enforcement zones by the contractor Conduit. And I wanted to, given the comments that were made on the record today, at least put those comments, given the research that was conducted, just on the record.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Nothing further, Councillor Eadie? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Pleased to see that people, fellow councillors, voted against the notice of motion in the name of safety and that's more than fair, Madam Speaker. I wanted to ask of His Worship whether he knew about a situation a few years ago in which on Panet Road, which was recently twinscaped for higher speeds in front of King's School in my ward. We had a massive, disordinate number of speeding taking place despite the signage and despite the fact that a completely inordinate amount of speeding tickets was being given out. And yet, it wasn't really having the effect that we would like in the name of safety. It was creating a lot of income for the City, but indication obviously, Madam Speaker, the fact that people were speeding in the area. I got a lot of phone calls and e-mails on this. People saying, you know, I just…wasn't my intention. I brought this to the Police Board. I brought this to the administration. And I was told by the administration that they didn't consider it a safety issue, they considered it an issue of traffic management. All they wanted was the extra signage on Panet because the proof was there's too many people speeding. And in the name of safety, we felt that…a number of people felt that extra signage would stop a lot of people from speeding, just reduce the speeding, increase safety, just from extra signage alone. I was told that wasn't being denied by those represented the administration, but that wasn't the issue, the issue was traffic management, not safety.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Was His Worship aware of this mindset that occurred here at the City of Winnipeg regarding Panet Road and the request for extra signage?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I am not aware of the councillor's mindset or other people's mindsets so I'm not going to offer an answer on judging people's mindsets. I am happy to answer the question if perhaps he could clarify. I will do my best to answer the question I think he was trying to ask.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure, Madam Speaker. What I meant by mindset is the perspective of not including extra signage when it comes to an inordinate amount of speeding taking place in a school zone. That it was…the mindset being sort of the perspective of the department.

Madam Speaker: The specific question, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: That's what I meant. That's a clarification on the request of His Worship. So I would like to know if the…if he believes that if we had a vote on this one day in terms of extra signage in these safety zones, whether we would be dealing with the issue of safety for children or whether it is an issue of traffic management. What would his perspective or mindset be on that?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: My vote on the matter that has yet to come before Council is not something I can provide a response this time. If the councillor does ultimately bring a motion forward, I will review it and make a determination at that time along with my council colleagues and would welcome any comments or any motions to that effect that the councillor may have that are within our jurisdiction here as council that pertain to safety matters.

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

Councillor Schreyer: As he did on the previous notice of motion vote, vote in the name of safety, which is fine with me, Madam Speaker, would he consider extra signage when it comes to an inordinate amount of speeding in a school zone? Does he believe that extra signage could be, in the name of safety, rather than just be voted against in the name of traffic management?

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

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, signage is an important part of ensuring that drivers understand the rules of the road and I would encourage all Winnipeg drivers to follow the law so they don't end up like some of the members of council, and sadly myself, who have been subjected to infractions for having a heavy foot. But I think the signage is obviously an important part of ensuring that the rules of the road are known and communicated to drivers.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Next, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Based on some comments, I have a grave concern that I would, through you, like the Mayor to address. First, I am impressed that he…the Mayor was able to do some research on the question of photo radar and who is responsible and provide such detail from going through the website. That is fantastic that quick. However, I would suggest that potentially we take the time to watch the budget proceedings of the Winnipeg Police Service where it was noted that by the Police Chief that they do not say where they go. However, let's be word…let's play some word spin games, yes, they can be in construction zones and someone picks from that list. I have never heard that it is the actual company that selects the location where we would put a radar camera. I am perplexed by that.

Madam Speaker: Your question, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Yes, my question is, now I am faced with the dilemma. Is the Police Chief not giving me accurate information or is the Mayor not giving me accurate information?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Well, firstly, in terms of accuracy, the reference to website was Councillor Rollins who I believe visited the website during this council meeting. I can simply speak for myself in terms of the research that I conducted. I heard through the media comments attributed to members of council. Obviously, I haven't weighed in yet, but when I hear comments on the floor of council that I believe are not accurate, I will do my best to provide members of council and the public that are watching these proceedings with the best information I have available to me and what I was advised I have put on the record here today.

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

Councillor Klein: I am not a firm believer that everything you read online is true. And I am sure everyone shares that. So I would like to be clear then. So the Mayor is basing it on…he heard it in the media, someone had told him that that is not the case, but didn't take the time to go back and watch the budget review tape for the Winnipeg Police Service. Is that accurate?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I heard the member of council today make a statement that I didn't believe was accurate based on the research that I had conducted. I've obviously provided my comments. I obviously…it's upset the member of council. I have been reviewing the proceedings of the various committees as part of the budget process and I look forward to the new year when we table a budget and four years, in fact, that are in fact balanced.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Final question.

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Chair, and through you, got a bit of an answer. Just…has the Mayor watched the entire budget process for the Winnipeg Police Service, our largest cost for the City?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: As I just mentioned, Madam Speaker, I am in the process of reviewing proceedings from all of the committees. It's been a busy month. And I know members of council are reviewing minutes of all of those respective committees. I was pleased and appreciative of members of council who voted for the minutes in the proceedings of various committees to come forward to the Budget Working Group. I know that was not the case in all circumstances. But certainly, the reason why I'm appreciative of those minutes being forwarded to the Budget Working Group is in fact to address the concern that Councillor Klein is raising right now. I appreciate the fact that he would like to ensure myself and members of the Budget Working Group are following the proceedings of the respective committees. That is obviously something I support as well. And for that reason, I have been and will be continuing to do the research that is necessary for the preparation and tabling of a four year multi-year budget which I might add is being overseen and led by our Finance Chair whose efforts I greatly appreciate.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. On to you, Councillor Santos. You have the floor.

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Chair. With all that is happening on the new security measures at the liquor marts and recently through news and social media, we're hearing that there's now off-duty police officers at grocery stores like Superstore. It's my understanding that we can't have question period for our Chair of the Winnipeg Police Board during council meetings, therefore, my question to the Mayor is, I'm wondering if he's had an opportunity to follow up with the Chair of the Winnipeg Police Board recently about the off-duty police officers.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Obviously, the question that was raised would be best directed to the Chair of the Police Board given his…sorry, it's okay, given his role as Chair of the Police Board. I have not been briefed to receive information from the Chair. I know there was an undertaking or commitment in previous meetings for weekly updates to all members of council. I don't recall receiving more than at least one. Perhaps they've been circulated and I've just missed them. But the short answer is, I have not received information from the Chair of the Police Board on that subject.

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

Councillor Santos: My second question is I'm wondering if the Mayor has any discussions with the Chair of the Winnipeg Police Board about suggesting that the off-duty police officers attend preschools and high schools to be proactive by interacting with the school kids and making those connections with their children so that children can grow up and respect our police officers.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I have not received any such information nor have I requested information on that topic from the Chair of the Police Board. The questions that are being raised I feel would be best directed to the Chair of the Police Board. I appreciate that there is no question period at this time. Certainly that may be a matter that councillor may wish to consider at Governance or have considered at Governance given the size of the police budget and the matters as important as they are. But in the interim, I would just suggest that she and other members of council direct those questions directly to the Chair of the Police Board, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. That is good. Next speaker…appreciate that. That is not part of our process at this time. Councillor Lukes, you're the next speaker, followed by that, Councillor Browaty and Councillor Eadie, thank you.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm wondering…it's been almost a year now that the Mayor and his recruitment team have been looking for a CAO. I'm wondering if we could have an update on that, please.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The consulting firm, Harris has been working diligently. The committee…the CAO Recruitment Committee or Hiring Committee has been deliberating and will be, obviously, providing an update very soon in due course.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Nothing further? Councillor Browaty. Okay, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, another "did you know", regarding the constant back and forth about photo radar and any kind of ticket revenue. I'm wondering, Madam Speaker, if the Mayor is aware that it has been the City of Winnipeg's administration whose provided the amount of revenue advice for the budgets that the Winnipeg Police Board puts forth as the Winnipeg Police Board and the Winnipeg Police are to provide us, council, with the expenditure side. And it is the City's administration that advises what they think the revenue projection should be for ticket revenue and that sort of thing. I'm wondering if the Mayor knew that?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, the short answer is I don't have that information. But certainly I would be open to having further discussions with Councillor Eadie. Ultimately, of course, the budget is passed by all members of council in terms of our estimates for the coming year. And this year, of course, it's a four year, multi-year budget process. But in

terms of specific matter that Councillor Eadie is raising, I'd welcome an opportunity just to better understand it from such dialogue.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Final speaker, Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, the City of Hong Kong is under crisis, and the City of Winnipeg is engaged in a conference business college, whatever it may be, that has the name of Bloomberg attached to it. And most recently at a Bloomberg Global Business Forum, the name on that, Michael Bloomberg made reference to the supreme leader or whatever it might be called in China, Jinping, that he is not a dictator. He has to satisfy his constituents. I am wondering, you know, the Mayor gave his update of all the meetings that he had. He did leave off the Chinese Emperor…sorry, Ambassador that he met with on I believe it was December 5th. I am just wondering, in light of the totalitarian approach that the Government of China seems to be employing on its constituents if we might want to reconsider our alignment with anything to do with Bloomberg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, the Bloomberg Harvard initiative is certainly something that many mayors around the world have benefited from the resources that have been put forward in terms of professional development. Madam Speaker, certainly…obviously, Councillor Nason has strong feelings about the meeting that I had with the Chinese Ambassador recently. Councillor Nason has been certainly someone who has worked for, my understanding is, the Conservative Party both federally, certainly in the news today, as well as provincially for my understanding for the current Finance Minister of the Province as well as Minister Clark. I thank him for his public service both as a public servant but also as a member of council. By way of protocol for meetings, Councillor Nason referenced the meeting. The Protocol Office at the Province of Manitoba, and I am sure he understands this, they receive requests for meetings with provincial officials as well as municipal officials. It is because of the Protocol Office of the Province, the outreach occurs to the City to request that we meet with ambassadors who come to Winnipeg. In the case of the Chinese Ambassador, we were advised by the Protocol Office at the provincial government that the Premier would be meeting with the ambassador and that a request was made for me to also make time available to meet with the ambassador. This is the protocol and the process that happens throughout the year with many ambassadors. It was upon the basis of understanding the Premier was, and my understanding, did meet with the ambassador that we also accepted that request. And I will add, I made public, through my social media accounts, the fact that the meeting occurred. I also indicated as I am indicating right now and I have indicated through the media, that I raise matters pertaining to human rights as well as trade and the negative implications on the trade barriers pertaining to canola producers in the Province of Manitoba. And I believe having that level of engagement to voice those concerns is important. I see through the ambassador's social medial account that the Premier did in fact meet with the ambassador. I trust he also engaged in similar discussions and of course, I thank him for those efforts. I know he is a strong defender for trade and the export markets. But I am sure Councillor Nason is aware or should have been aware of the manner in which those meetings are requested from the provincial protocol office.

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

Councillor Nason: It is great that the Mayor brought up the Protocol Office. I'm wondering if the Mayor could perhaps enlighten us on the customary exchange of gifts if he happened to have provided the ambassador the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in a framed matter so he might reflect on that better.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I provided a human rights gift to the Chinese Ambassador because I wanted to remind him of the importance of human rights. I also encouraged the ambassador as I do with all ambassadors of the importance of human rights and the value of visiting the Canadian Museum for Human Rights, which I am very proud of is here in the City of Winnipeg. I would welcome the councillor's advocacy and support for human rights initiatives. I know he cares passionately about the human rights of many members of our community. I thank him for that and I would welcome the opportunity to work collaboratively with him to continue to support human rights here as well as around the world. And I would also ask, of course, if some of the concerns he's raised, if he's also raised them with other levels of government that I know he is strongly associated with through party membership.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Any further questions? Seeing none, we can move to the next committee. I am wondering there is an interest in taking a short recess. I know there's members in the gallery that probably want to depart. Councillor Eadie, you had asked for a short recess, how long? How long would that be?

Councillor Eadie: Is 10 minutes good? Five?

Madam Speaker: Five minutes. We will have a five minute…eight minute recess. Eight minute recess. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
December 12, 2019, at 5:30 p.m.

Madam Speaker: I'd like to reconvene our council meeting of December 12th, 2019. We are dealing with the Standing Committee on Innovation and Economic Development. We have no reports today, no motions. We will have question period for Councillor Orlikow. Councillor Klein.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. At the last council meeting, I asked what efforts our funded ED partners were making to assist Priceline who is looking at Winnipeg as a potential market as well as two other locations across Canada, and I had asked what they're doing to show our commitment to that business and help them along the way, and I'm hoping that the Chair can provide Council a detailed status update on what actions have been taken since that last council meeting.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I did respond…and again, the question was from Councillor Klein, not from Council. I'd be more than happy…we were able to bring the matter up. EDW came to our last meeting. They actually talked about Priceline and they also talked about the other question regarding the recruitment drive in South America. So…Brazil? So they explained it to us quite clearly on what they thought and why they did it. And it was quite…I thought quite interesting. We'll keep having EDW coming back. So it is there for view on the DMIS system, their response is there. And again, I just want to stress this is…it's an interesting portfolio in this case because it is a third-party group that's their own board. So I'm still struggling a little bit about how to answer questions for someone else because I think the best course at this point...and I'm going to work with the committee...you know, we just never really had EDW reporting, just on a business plan model before and that used corporate. Now we have this report and how much do we want Council to get into the operations of EDW? They are a separate organization for purpose to run, you know...we're not questioning each little detail. We kind of just question the business plan that they have. But again, we do have the right. We do pay them money, a fair bit, so we do have the right to ask questions. So to try to find that balance between those two, I would say at this point, I strongly recommend councillors...and I actually talked to Ms. Spiring about it as well. She's been more than happy to hear any comments or questions from councillors. And just call her directly, she'd be more than happy to explain.

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

Councillor Klein: Through you Madam Chair, thank you very much to the Chair for that answer. I'm just wondering now in the future if quite possibly we could have presenters that will be providing such information do so in a written submission so that it is on there beforehand and we have an opportunity to review it before the meeting in case we have any questions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: It has been taken under advisement. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if the Chairperson knows that Priceline is doing quite well and is already moving to expand to the full floor, their current footprint is expanding and that things seem to be progressing really well for their Winnipeg operations which had its most successful year yet. I'm wondering if the Chairperson knew that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much and yes, I do, but mostly, I thank you for the question and bringing that up because this is what we need to do. EDW is quite clear and says we need to be ambassadors about some of the positive things that are happening. I don't think Priceline would say…wouldn't mind some Winnipeg work. But again, they are doing well internationally and that is a local company doing very, very good internationally. So once again, very proud of our Winnipeg companies that are reaching with the World Trade Centre and EDW and all of these other groups. We do some really fine work here, and so thank you, Councillor Eadie for the question and promoting Priceline for the public.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further? Let's move onto 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 NOVEMBER 18, 2019

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll move the report dated November 18th, 2019, Items No. 1 through 8 inclusive.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now we'll move onto by-laws. Councillor Mayes.

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

Councillor Mayes: I'll move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 96/2019, a by-law of the City of Winnipeg to amend Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 200/2006 to rezone land at 198 McPhillips Street in Lord Selkirk-West K Community. And I'll move By-law No. 97/2019 to amend the Winnipeg Zoning By-law 200/2006 to rezone the land located at 2525 Pembina Highway in the Assiniboia.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 96/2019, By-law No. 97/2019.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move that By-law Nos. 96/2019 and 97/2019 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 96/2019 and 97/2019.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 96/2019 and 97/2019 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. Questions for Councillor Mayes? Councillor Klein, we'll start with yourself.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Through you, I'm just wondering, I've recently learned that the City is paying out about $8 million to third-parties for rent, and I'm wondering if the Chair can tell us if the department has had a discussion with the committee or himself considering efficiencies and potential cost saving by looking at moving some of those departments to buildings that we own that are currently vacant.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Probably two answers there. One is the ongoing work that we're looking at in terms of dollar-a-year leases, though much of that is within City-owned facilities itself in terms of the City paying, but a lot of work being done there to look at consolidation or efficiencies, none of which has been approved yet by Council and that obviously will be a big ticket item when it comes to council. B) In terms of the amount being paid for rent, I know we've approved some lease agreements at Council over the years. We haven't had a comprehensive discussion or at least I haven't with the department about that matter in terms of consolidation. Obviously, the...some media reports this week about the building on Graham, that's something that undertaken to discuss with our director, get an update on that. That's the information I have at this time, and if Councillor Klein wishes further follow-up, certainly, he can pursue that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further question for our chair? Seeing none, let's move to the next committee. Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. Councillor Rollins.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED NOVEMBER 14, 2019

Item 1 – Museums – Special Operating Agency

Councillor Rollins: Only one item, the museums special operating agency, and there's a motion on the floor for councillor…for myself and Councillor Nason, and it's an amending motion. And essentially, it's...if I can introduce it, Madam Chair.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

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

BE IT RESOLVED that item 1. of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks dated November 14, 2019 be amended as follows:

- *Amend Recommendation 1. By deleting "-9" and Recommendation 9.*
- *Amend Recommendation 2. By adding "and 9" after "3-7" and by adding the following to the end of Recommendation 2.*

> *"9. That the Human Resource Services Department manage the redeployment of one Transcona Museum CUPE Museum Curator employee per the Letter of Understanding between the City of Winnipeg and CUPE – Redeployment."*

Councillor Rollins: Okay. So essentially on November 14th, the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks concurred with the recommendation of the public service, but amended that recommendations 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the public service be laid over for up to 180 days and that further directed that the Winnipeg Public Service was to consult stakeholders in the museum's community and provide a verbal report to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks on the matter. At that time, and then they'd submit the matter to the Executive Policy Committee and Council and so on. At the time that we did that, there was an item that, you know, just didn't follow that same logic, and that one is taken care of here, and it's one that the delegate spoke to today that...and so to this end, we're amending recommendation 1 by deleting 9 and recommendation 9, and amend recommendation 2 by adding 9, and after 3 and 7, and adding the following; that the Human Resource Services Department manage the redeployment of one Transcona Museum CUPE museum curator employee per the letter of understanding between the City of Winnipeg and CUPE redeployment. And so this amending motion is to take care of the substantial concerns that were brought up following that November 19th meeting and throughout actually.

Madam Speaker: Any other speakers on Item 1 – Museums – Special Operating Agency? This is under the report dated November 14th, 2019. Any further speakers? I don't have an amending motion. Is there one, Mr. Chair? Okay. Was it...okay, I don't have that on my desk. Okay. Yeah. I think it was e-mailed to me. Okay, I'm sorry. A paper copy was not provided to me. Okay. Got it here now. Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, are we speaking on the amendment as well?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Nason: Transcona is unique of the unicity museums from the perspective of we're the lone curator standing. It's the last CUPE position that's remaining in our many museums that we have. And I appreciate the Chair, Chair Rollins, in her amenable motion, amendment to this report, to allow an additional 180 days so that the board can gather and discuss this and try to find a way forward that is almost a peaceful transition. We know that this has been something that's been sought before, to be in alignment with the other unicity museums. When we're talking, the person, the body behind it is very instrumental in the success of the Transcona Museum. In recent years, they've expanded their mandate to take on a very volunteer heavy project that they're gathering significant funds to support saving a piece of Transcona history in the 2747 engine. It was I believe if my history is accurate, the first steam locomotive to roll off the line in Transcona. Not an easy object to move from where it is. They had to build a spur line to get it to where it currently sits in Rotary Legacy Park. And…but the person is working very hard to support the volunteers, many of whom are retired CN volunteers. CN, of course, also just celebrated their 100th anniversary as an organization and are very instrumental in the City of Winnipeg and most importantly the community of Transcona. Though I don't want to see this position go away, I definitely want to ensure that through discussion, we find a way to ensure the long health and success of our museum with...through whatever decision of Council is finally made on this matters. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Any further speakers on the amending motion or the main item? No? Seeing none, Councillor Rollins, do you wish to close?

Councillor Rollins: Sure. When we decided to lay it over for 180 days, substantively nothing was going to happen. It was status quo for the museums. And so, other than they were to be meaningfully consulted. I anticipate that happening. Redeployment by its very nature infers that something is going to be happening and that the job is taken away. In this case, that's not the case. So this just amends it to match that timeline and happy to move it with Councillor Nason.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question on amending Motion 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And call the question on the main item as amended. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period for Councillor Rollins. Any questions under this committee? Councillor Klein.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I'm wondering, I heard that the Winnipeg Fire and Paramedic Service is engaged with consulting group MNP and I'm just wondering if the Chair could provide details on that and if they've looked at any other internal resources to do whatever work it is being offered.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: I can inquire. The Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service may have engaged consultants for any number of things and so unless there's more specific file that this is pertaining to, I'll have to check with the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service and get back to councillor...through the Chair to Councillor Klein with respect to a particular contract that they might have with any given consultant including Meyers Norris Penny.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Nothing further? Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Through you Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if the Chair can provide us an update with regards to our fire paramedic equipment. The most recent incident that involved a stolen fire truck has put the complement of fire trucks at a critical level, and I'm wondering if she could update us with regards to procurement of additional fire reserves?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Chair. This was the subject of some discussion at the standing policy committee over recent deliberation of the proposal...budgetary proposals put forward by the department and the Fire Paramedic Services through Chief Lane and his department. In fact, the subject of the fire truck that was damaged came up at those deliberations. I have since talked to the chief, and of course, know that we…and have toured myself the maintenance facility that repairs our trucks. We are tight with respect to fire trucks, and we could not afford this fire truck

being damaged as it was when it was taken on a joyride through Winnipeg, potentially really hurting people and hurting city infrastructure as well. We couldn't afford to lose the truck, and that has been the extent of the discussions with the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Nason: I would not consider that a joyride. It was I think a very malicious attempt. But...so I didn't hear an answer to that first question; so is our current complement of fire trucks sufficient to provide coverage to the citizens of Winnipeg?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Well, this is an active debate, so it...I...I would say in my opinion, and that I've asserted at the Standing Policy Committee of Protection, Community Services and Parks, that…and I appreciate the clarification from my colleague about characterizing it as a joyride. I, too, took no joy in seeing that. But I have on the record said that if you...if this council believes that if we need Waverley West fire station to accommodate 40,000 Winnipeggers, and if we believe that there should be coverage, then we absolutely would not be reducing fire trucks at this time. In terms of…in terms of the general procurement for fire trucks, we...I believe that we do need additional pumps and ladders to cover our growing city. If...and I've asserted this at the Standing Policy Committee of Protection, Community Services and Parks, and most recently, at the very last meeting when we were deliberating the budget for the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service.

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

Councillor Nason: Can the Chair confirm that our complement of fire trucks are sufficient to await 2020 budget decisions?

Councillor Rollins: Can he clarify the question? I think he's asking, Madam Chair, if we have sufficient fire trucks, and I think that I've answered it twice now, so I may not be understanding the question.

Madam Speaker: Pardon me?

Councillor Rollins: Well I just asked for a clarification.

Madam Speaker: Sure, let's clarify the question.

Councillor Nason: She used the term "tight" earlier, so I'm wondering if…and she talked about the fact that it was brought forward in deliberation for the 2020 budget, so I'm trying to determine if we have sufficient…at this time to make it through the budget deliberation period.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Nason. Councillor Rollins. We can maybe restate the question. You were coughing.

Councillor Rollins: Yeah.

Madam Speaker: Would you like the question restated?

Councillor Rollins: Yes because I think he's saying to make it through the budget, which is now a point in time versus the number of trucks. I've stated that I think we need an additional ladder through the discussions with the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service. That is a specific type of truck, I note. So the addition of…to get us through the 2020 budget, I've noted that the fire truck was damaged, and that that is a disservice to the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service. We could not afford, given the amount of trucks that we need to do maintenance on a weekly basis, monthly basis and that turn that there needs to be sufficient coverage within the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service. So need a ladder and then...and then a truck was taken out of service, and that is a current state through the 2020 budget process, that is…am I being asked for a specific number through January, February, March for instance, when we table the budget here? That's the clarification maybe I need.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Any further questions of the Chair? Seeing none, we'll move onto the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Allard on the report dated November 19th, 2019.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED NOVEMBER 19, 2019**

Councillor Allard: I guess I'll move the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 4.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Items 1 through 4, I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Eadie. Yes, thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move into by-laws under this committee. Councillor Allard.

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

Councillor Allard: Yes. I move that By-law No. 94/2019...am I reading the right script?

Madam Speaker: You sure are, yes.

Councillor Allard: A by-law of the City of Winnipeg to amend the Streets By-law, be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: Okay. So you've moved 94/2019 and 101/2019?

Councillor Allard: So I'll start over. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 94/2019, By-law No. 101/2019.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 94/2019, By-law No. 101/2019.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, I move that By-laws numbered 94/2019 and 101/2019 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 94/2019 and 101/2019.

Councillor Allard: And I move that the rules be suspended and By-laws No. 94/2019 and 101/2019 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period under this committee, any questions for Councillor Allard? Councillor Klein.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. Recently I had…but it's a different one…I'll go to a different one…I recently was listening to an interview on the radio and it was with our Finance Chair, Councillor Gillingham. And it was with respect to a crosswalk where we had an unfortunate incident and the report that had come back or that was shared was the we only had four issues at that crosswalk so we were considering whether or not action needed to be taken, paraphrasing, of course. However, the next day the radio program said they had received a note from Councillor Gillingham saying it was going to be changed immediately. And I'm just wondering if that was…if I heard that correctly or if the Chair can confirm that the lights, in fact, at that intersection will be changed and how does one go about having that done so quickly?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, thank you for the question. I will have to check in with the director to see what the status is of that situation.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Chair? Seeing none, let's move forward, Standing Policy Committee on Finance. There is no motion, no by-laws. We do have a report though, but we'll do that first. Councillor Gillingham on the report dated October 11th, 2019.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
DATED OCTOBER 11, 2019

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a matter that is before us. We're moving this to basically give it 90 days. So I introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Yes.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I didn't quite hear what he said.

Madam Speaker: It is Item 1 – Financial Management Plan. It's the financial management plan.

Councillor Gillingham: Yes it is. Perhaps our Clerk can clarify exactly what...

Madam Speaker: I think Councillor Eadie was just asking what item it is. It's direction to report back to the standing committee in 90 days.

Councillor Gillingham: Yes. This is the matter, Madam Speaker that came before Council last meeting. And there was a request that there be an extension of time so there could be a better and a fuller review. Council's going to have input on the establishment of the financial management plan, but to get an extension of time, the request for an extension of time has to come all the way up from the standing committee to council. Council has to approve the 90 day extension of time. This is what this vote is, is to approve the 90 day extension of time, so our administration can get feedback from all councillors.

Madam Speaker: Okay. That's what you were looking for Councillor Eadie. So Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Would Councillor Gillingham offer a council seminar…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, this is not your opportunity.

Councillor Lukes: It's not question period.

Madam Speaker: That's right. Thank you. So with that, I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period and I'll call on you, Councillor Lukes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. Sorry. Could...through you, Madam Chair, could Councillor Gillingham request the public service provide a council seminar on the financial management plan prior to it coming back to the committee?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, yes, I will make that suggestion to our administration.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions, Councillor Lukes? Councillor Allard, onto you and then we'll hear from Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Allard: Yes. So I heard a question earlier today whether or not the Mayor knew that the City tells the police how much revenue must be generated by traffic violations. I was wondering if Councillor Gillingham could address that question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank Councillor Allard for the question. The CFO has confirmed that the Winnipeg Police Service puts forward their estimates for revenue as part of the budget process.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions Councillor Allard? No. And seeing the hour, Councillor Nason has a motion to suspend the rules, so we can continue our meeting according to our procedural by-law, we do need to adjourn at 6:00 p.m., so the motion to suspend the rules to continue our meeting today, so we can finish. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Mayes, we'll hear from you now. Thank you.

Councillor Mayes: Second time I've made a request of this sort so I'll ask Councillor Gillingham, if in the financial management plan, you can ask them to actually include a reference to the 2012 budget. We have a mysterious…it was all tax freeze…

Councillor Gillingham: I'm having trouble hearing the question. Sorry.

Councillor Mayes: No problem.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Could we...second time I've raised this, in the financial management plan, we curiously missed the year 2012. It was all tax freezes and then all tax increases devoted to infrastructure. Basically, no it wasn't 2012, it was an operating budget with a 3.5% property tax increase that was not allocated to the roads. That came later in '13 and '14 when they started to allocate the 1% increase, then 2% increase to the roads. I've raised it before. I don't know why it doesn't appear. It does need to fit the narrative perhaps, but if we could perhaps have a sentence added to the financial management plan that concedes the reality that in 2012, there was neither a property tax freeze nor was it devoted to infrastructure. Could we ask staff…Mr. Ruta was here at the time, I think he'll agree with me that was the vote in 2012. Perhaps we could just have that added in since this does not paint a full picture of what has happened.

Councillor Gillingham: I thank Councillor Mayes for the question. Duly noted, I will pass his suggestion onto the administration.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This one just came up and I'm wondering if the Chair can clarify for council if the admin actually has the ability and the authority to change any financial projections or budget requests or allocations of the Winnipeg Police Service budget because we just heard that a question pertaining to that, but I think we need some clarity on whether or not the admin is able to say if the service comes back and says x, they can send it back and say no, we prefer y.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Yes. As I said, Madam Speaker, the Winnipeg Police Service establishes as part of their budget preparations and estimates the estimate of revenue. There's...I imagine there's discussion, I'm assuming there's discussion between the administration and the Police Service, but perhaps the question could be directed to the CFO.

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

Councillor Klein: Through you, thank you to Councillor Gillingham for that response. I'm perplexed, so the Budget Working Group or Finance…as Finance Chair and heading up the budget, that information's not provided to yourself or the group of if...whether or not the administration does send back changes?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. As the councillor knows, ultimately, under provincial legislation, Council ultimately determines the budget for Winnipeg Police Service. And so Winnipeg Police Service as with every other department, brings forward the recommendations for the budget, Council will ultimately makes the determination of what the budget levels are.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question.

Councillor Klein: I'm just wondering…that doesn't really answer what I was asking. So if I could get an answer for that, for clarity, it may not have been understood. Does the administration…the Chair obviously knows, he sat in that role before, on the Police Board that the administration does have the ability to send it back and then that will go to Council. I'm just wondering because he said that he wasn't sure, so I'm asking if that information is not shared with the Budget Working Group prior to them seeing the budget.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Yeah. As I stated a moment ago, the Budget Working Group receives from the Winnipeg Police Service and through the board the information for estimates on the budget and ultimately Council makes a determination on what the budget levels are.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you. It does sound confusing but, Madam Speaker, my question…and having had been the Chairperson of the Winnipeg Police Board in the past, the Chair of Finance might be aware and I'm asking the question, if he recalls, the provincial legislation asked the Winnipeg Police Board working with the police service to submit the cost estimates to provide a safe...cost estimates to provide a safe da, da, da, da, da community. Is that not what they're charged to do?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Yes, Madam Speaker. Yes, that is the legislation. The Winnipeg Police Service does submit to the...as part of the budget process both the revenue estimates and cost estimates for budget deliberations.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Okay. Seeing none, let's move onto the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. The report dated November 28th, 2019. Councillor Gilroy.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 28, 2019

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment dated November 28th, 2019, 1 through 3, please.

Madam Speaker: Three has been pulled. I'll call the question on 1 and 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 3 – Source Separated Organics Pilot Project – Residential Food Waste Collection

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy, your opportunity to introduce the item.

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah. I'm very happy to introduce this item. It is for a pilot project for separated residential waste. And this is an exciting moment for the city because in order for us to meet some of our 50% of our diversion target for our landfill, we need a residential pilot project for residential food waste. So I'm very happy to see this here today in front of us. I also want to note that our climate change action plan targets looks at reducing our greenhouse gases by 20% reduction by 2030, and 80% reduction by 2050, so these are...this is very, very important for us to meet these targets, and we're finally looking at a pilot project. We're one of the last major cities in Canada to have a residential food waste program. So this pilot project will be the start of it, and we hopefully will be able to study and see how it could be incorporated on a larger scale.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. My colleagues here…through you Madam Speaker, we need to stop this today, $1.8 million we're proposing to spend in 2020 when we're looking at closing arenas, playgrounds, swimming pools to provide organic composting for 4,000 homes. That's a cost of $450 per home. You're voting for that today if that's what you're doing. You're going to say yes, let's close swimming pools. Yes, let's reduce our library hours. Why? For this green washing program and that's what it really is, $1.8 million. And you think that's bad? Go look at the infrastructure plan we voted on earlier today. They're proposing spending $100 million on capital,

just the capital, to build a big facility to deal with the organic materials to provide carts to every Winnipegger. And you know what? These carts smell like shit. You go into a city…you go in Toronto and you walk down the street when these carts are out...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty, let's keep things respectful in this chamber. I know it's been a long day.

Councillor Browaty: This stuff smells awful. I apologize for my language. I hear from my residents, and what they tell me is, they are taxed to the max. They are paying too much tax, too many fees. On your water bill today, you're already paying $60 towards the cost of solid waste programs where above and beyond the base mill rate support on it. When I started on this council, the cost per household for residential bin or cart...no, not cart, the small, 60-litre bin plus manual pickup, the cost per household was about $80 per household. On the track we're going today...so we added…we went from $80 when I started, added about $60 for the residential carts. We're going to add another 60 to $100 per household per year, over $200 for our most basic service. When you look at tax payers, when you look at voters, why is everything getting more expensive, it's because of programs like this. This isn't going to keep kids off of the streets and you know, robbing LCs. This isn't going to help provide recreational activities. This isn't going pave our awful streets. This isn't going to fix sidewalks for our seniors or better plough our amenities. Colleagues, we have to stop this right now. We need to give our department a revised version of our waste minimization plan, and we've got to watch out for our taxpayer dollars. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Next is Councillor Nason…Councillor Mayes then on to Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Mayes: Hard act to follow. If you would look at that agenda from December 14th, 2011, first meeting I was at after the budget, you'd see many of the same items you see here today. It's an annual renewal. The local improvement interest rates first call on capital. But if you look at this agenda, you see something that wasn't there, and you see this item, and this is of anything we've done today, I think the big step forward. Kudos to Councillor Gilroy for getting it this far along to this point and kudos to the Mayor for supporting it. There was a big initiative undertaken just before I was elected, October of 2011, by former Mayor Katz and the council of that day. Some people here voted for it, some against to move forward with the standardized recycling and garbage bin collection. That was a pretty big step really in looking back. This is the next step. So we're finally embarking on it. So I pretty much disagree with most of what Councillor Browaty said. I do think it's time we get going. This is relatively simple technology. It is a way of getting our diversion rate up, which we want to do for the sake of the climate. So here's something we can do, other cities do. We're finally getting started. Councillor Browaty does hit on one thing though, and I hope to be the first to point out the incongruity in that 2020 plan with something else we're considering, but he's beaten it to me by about five minutes, which is, he's right, the 2020 plan, priority 8 is city-wide organics plant; $101 million in 2024 dollars. You wouldn't get that sense reading this report which says, 17 million to implement, 25 to 58 for a facility and then some annual operating costs. Let's go with the higher estimate, the 58; 58 plus 17, $75 million item, except it's $101 million about three hours ago elsewhere on the agenda. So perhaps Councillor Gilroy in the fullness of time and not today because we should celebrate this, perhaps Councillor Gilroy can get back to us. We will have seven years probably before we look at that, but that's a pretty big incongruity even if you build in construction inflation of massive amounts. We don't get from 75 and $18 to 101 million in 2024 dollars. So it is a…on that I agree with Browaty. That's a number that stands out from that 2020 infrastructure report of priority number 8, but I don't want to dwell on that. I want to dwell on the good news aspect of this, which is we're finally getting going, which I support. It's going to take us a while to get these results back, but eventually, eventually, we're going to have a vote here on whether we do this city-wide. I hope to be here at that time when we decide to do it and we can fuse it in with the garbage and recycle pickup. It's a step forward. It's not a dramatic difference from what other cities do. It's what many, many, many other jurisdictions are already doing. So just as I think the council of 2011 had their chance to vote on something historic, here, look at the agenda from December 14th, 2011 compared to this one. Here is something we can do that I think is historic, so I intend to vote for it. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm skeptical about the financial allocation and what we get out of it in terms of reduction of greenhouse gases in terms of a comparative alternative to how much we could be spending elsewhere and getting more in terms of reduction of greenhouse gases. So I mentioned that in the last term. I don't know how this is going to work out. I have voted for this in standing committee because I want to see the results and the research. Bear in mind, this unto itself isn't a complete report in terms of how we should spend our money to reduce greenhouse emissions. Let's bear in mind a few things; one, we say that the Brady Landfill is the largest single point of greenhouse emissions in the province. Yes, because the entire City of Winnipeg uses it as a singular focal point for their garbage from which at that point, one could say, it is the largest emitter of greenhouse gases from a single point. But it's for all of Winnipeg. Bear in mind, Madam Speaker, as I said last term, we're worried about greenhouse gases. Let's all talk about what they are. What are the biggest ones? Is it garbage? Well, it doesn't even compare to the two biggest

ones. It might be third, but it's not…it doesn't compare in any way, shape or form in terms of the proportion to which our main two create greenhouse gases. Number one, for the Province of Manitoba, it's agriculture. Number two, it's vehicles. So after that, you get into residential use of natural gas for heating and industrial. So bear these things in mind. If we want to do something about greenhouse gas emissions, we have to deal with these points. Otherwise, we're not dealing. Look, I voted against the bus rapid transit corridor. It…you know, it wasn't a fun thing to do, but we're dealing with either-ors as we've realized in this budget. It's either this or either that. Where's our best bang for the buck? I felt in terms of having functional transit, that the best result would be spend a lot less money, have notably more buses on the road and encourage people to take the bus because they don't have to wait as long for the bus, i.e. less time dealing with public transit because they're not waiting as long. More guarantees to get on a bus, therefore, more people are going to be using the bus. More busses, better functional transit. In terms of putting hundreds of millions of dollars into a bus corridor that will save sometimes five million…five minutes, well, you know, I had to make a decision, I made mine. In terms of this, in terms of where we can put our money, bear in mind, Madam Speaker, two things. One, bear in mind, what is the largest creator of greenhouse gases in the Province of Manitoba, it's agriculture. Why? Livestock. Why? Because it's the cows and the hogs that we eat and it's their flatulence. Either way, whether you're talking about cars in the city or livestock in the country, we're talking about gas, that causes the greenhouse emissions. So let's accept that, let's deal with it, let's understand it because I don't believe for a moment we're going to be solving the greenhouse gas emission problem by dealing with composting. What percentage of greenhouse gases, in Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba are going to be decreased by this? And bear in mind, we already know, at least the members of the standing committee are witness to the administration telling us that there are companies that are interested in harnessing the methane gas at Brady. In other words, it's a point by which you can actually harness natural gas. You can say, well that's old fashioned, we shouldn't do that. All right, but we actually take greenhouse gases…we actually take natural gas from out of the ground, where it's safe there for centuries. And we can use it as a store, just leave it in the ground, just like oil, you can just leave it in the ground for centuries. And that's our store of natural fossil fuels, which, whether we like it or not, are pretty important, they're pretty powerful. It's hard to compare other forms of energy except here in Manitoba. We're one of those places in the world where we're special because we've got hydroelectricity to the point where we can export it. Oh yes, mentioned the 50th anniversary of Ed Schreyer becoming Premier of Manitoba, doubling the hydroelectric capacity of this province into the export level because there's more than we could actually consume. So we export it internationally to the United States. This is where we're at with hydro. How many places in the world can say they export hydroelectricity internationally? Those hydroelectric dams will last almost the length…the time of the pyramids if they are maintained. We're talking about, well, energy that will last thousands of years if maintained, compared to an oil era of the world that's going to last approximately 100 years. So Madam Speaker, what is the City doing to get electric vehicles on the street? I know that doesn't apply to every single place in the world. Let's face it, even our neighbours to the south or even Alberta, they don't even have the electric capacity, the hydro capacity for their electrical grid. Their electrical grid is based on natural gas. Isn't that incredible? It's hard for Manitobans to conceive of the idea that electrical grid uses fossil fuels, but that's the way it is, but not here, Madam Speaker. We've got hydroelectric capacity to run electric vehicles for which I would say the investment per vehicle, how much greenhouse gas savings is there by running an electric…single electric car on the road. And how does it compare to how many compost bins? I want to know. And I think everyone should know, because that's responsible budgeting and that's really taking a look at what we can do regarding greenhouse gas emissions. Manitoba's special. This is something that we can do, Madam Speaker, is electrify our transportation system in the City of Winnipeg. But we don't talk about that enough, do we? As a matter of fact, last term, you know, we had a motion that I think was unanimous in terms of looking at charging stations. They're not as expensive as you think. The prices come up and down. Heck, with construction inflation deflating, you know, they might even be getting cheaper to build these electric car charging stations. Madam Speaker, that encourages people to go to electric vehicles and we need to know how much money is saved for what unit of money to reduce greenhouse gases. Because I'm not convinced at all that this is the way to go with composting in terms of how many hundreds of millions of dollars we're going to be spending on this over the years to come and how much we get out of it. We have to do cost comparison in terms of electric vehicles as well, and what the City can do to encourage people to use electric cars because it matters, Madam Speaker. Because, well, we have a lot of gasoline and oil to run our cars and we don't have to here in Manitoba. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, today, Time Magazine named person of the year, a young teenager who's been certainly encouraging greater dialogue and action amongst policymakers in chambers like this around the world. And here we have today a chair who has finally brought this...the pilot to the finish line. I want to commend Councillor Cindy Gilroy for her leadership on this. She has been working diligently since she was first elected and patiently to finally bring something like this forward so that we can take the early steps and get more data and get more facts so the we can consider the possible full employment of curbside organics. My new Youth Advisory Council membership has made it very clear with me as well that climate change is a priority for them. When I speak with my children about some of the things that we do here at City Hall, climate change is a topic that they raise with me. It was one of the reasons behind the Million Tree Challenge. I know in speaking with many members of council including

Councillor Orlikow who has also been a very strong champion since the day I was elected and well before then in terms of combating climate change, that we have a role to play. I commend the diligence to scrutinize our expenditures that Councillor Browaty has been raising today. We need that level of scrutiny and we will have difficult decisions to make as part of the budget process. I would like to have some more information as a result of this pilot to see how we could look at deployment. It is going to be a challenge. Not just this year, but in the coming years to prioritize our expenditures to make sure that we're meeting the demands of a growing city and that's something we should absolutely be having discussions and debates about matters like this. But you know, I know from my first term, I saw the politics of organics play out in real time like many of you. And we had a council seminar and during that council seminar, news of what we were discussing was provided to the media. And of course spun in a very negative fashion, it set us back many years from even just getting the research done for a pilot. I really regret the fact that's how it played out. I think we have a role to play. I think, you know, the support that this council has shown for public transportation is a key component of building a more sustainable world and a more efficiently run city that can keep people moving. I think, obviously, the Million Tree Challenge is one way in which we can combat climate change and there are many others in terms of our planning and our development and other initiatives that we work on, including of course, our active transportation efforts. All of these combine to help do our part to lead a council that we can be proud of. This is an important decision. It's an important step. I, for one, want to see the information that would be gained by this. I recognize there is an investment to be made. But it is a healthy investment in order to get that data. It's also the right thing to do in terms of combating climate change. We see other levels of government finding creative ways in which to combat steps like this, steps to deal with climate change. I want to be part of a municipal government that is on the right side of the issues to move forward so that we can look our kids and we can look our residents in the eye and say, we're doing everything we can within our means to combat climate change. It won't go far enough, of course. Our means are limited and restricted, but this is one way in which we can get the data to make more informed decisions going forward. And again, I want to finish as I started. I want to thank the leadership of Councillor Gilroy. She has been stewarding this through committee process where I'm grateful for the committee membership for its unanimous support. And I'm looking forward to voting for this in a few minutes. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. We'll hear from Councillor Lukes, followed by Councillor Nason.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I will be supporting this motion. When organic waste is added to a landfill, added to a landfill, the organic material breaks down and it decomposes. And it can give off a very fragrant odour to the surrounding neighborhoods. As the councillor for Waverley West that has the shadow of Mt. Brady overlooking our beautiful community, I think with some really good education and discussion, this is one of the rare times I feel my constituents are behind me probably 100% on this one. So we have five years basically to conduct the pilot, assess it and consider the implications before the contracts for garbage and recycling collection must be renewed in 2025. The way things operate around City Hall, I think that's a good window of time to...it's going to get tight...I'd like to think that is a good amount of time to conduct the pilot and see where we're at. And you know, maybe in five years we'll have even newer technologies to address the end costs if we do decide to go forward. But I think it's really important to conduct this pilot and for those reasons I'm very supportive.

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

Councillor Nason: So, we've got, you know…Councillor Browaty was very passionate in his speech. I've already used some colourful language adjusting some letters. But we've got a $1.8 million project that there was a nice photo in our back area council chambers with Councillor Allard and the chair of this committee posing between...around three bins. One was a recycle bin, one was a garbage bin, one was a compost bin. The challenge we have is, you know, we should be leading by example as council. We have…we have the organic waste bin, but yet, we continue to use these single-use pods at City Hall. Throw my prop down so I don't get called of order, but you know, I know there are some motions coming forward about single-use plastic straws and such. I've got a recyclable bottle that I'll be using. I got a single-use cup. We do have a lot of waste here at City Hall, but the challenge with report specific, is the fact that it appears in there that there is $1.1 million to contracted services. But does not include the cost consulting services to deliver public engagement, date of collection, communication, education and resident support, annual inflation and project contingency. So I would assume that the $1.8 million isn't in the actual budget, but only a forecast and we don't have the actual true number of this budget. So I'm somewhat concerned with regards to the fact that this is in front of us today as an ask to go forward, when we don't seem to have the full budget. There also seems to be a bit of a gap with regards to consultation. You know, I read through the report. I don't believe I saw anything specific to what engagement has gone on at the delivery just prior to this report being put forward with the broader community. We do have an Office of Community Engagement. You know, there should be a comprehensive report pertaining to what they did when they went out to engage. If I overlooked that, I do apologize. However, the cost per house, you know, if my math is correct for this pilot, there's projected to be 4,000 homes over the couple of years of this project, with a hopeful or aspirational 50% reduction in food waste, that's about cost of $450 per house. We have 200,000 homes in the City of Winnipeg. Hope the scale of that does come down over time. But I do think that this needs a little bit more refinement and should be also

potentially thrown into the mix at this time when we're talking about turning off street lights. There is possibly better use for this $1.8 million. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Councillor Chambers followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair. I rise today because I've heard from residents in my ward with respect to this organics waste program. Some...quite a lot are very much in support as it supports the environment. Others have questions. So it will be good to go forward with the pilot project. And gather the data, gather the information that we can empirically use to see how we're going to move forward. But while we're doing that, I think there is also an opportunity to go a little bit further and educate the public at the same time. So for those that want to compost in their backyard, we need to educate Winnipeggers that those opportunities also still exist, that they can take the initiative themselves to compost in their backyards. We should also be consulting with restaurants as well, which is a large provider of perishable foods, that again, that they should be taking the initiative to compost their leftovers or their throwaways. When I look and see what the Forks has done in terms of moving towards a zero target strategy with all of the restaurants that are there, purchasing their own BIO…BIOVATOR…BIONATOR? The silver tube that's used to compost the remnant materials. Again, educating the public, educating our restaurants towards moving towards composting their biodegradables. Again, I think it's...it would be a wasted opportunity if in combination with this pilot program that we didn't take the opportunity to educate and as we're moving towards reducing our greenhouse gas emissions. As a father of two teenage kids I know a lot about gas emissions and want to reduce that where possible. So I think this is a good project moving forward. And again, in combination with the education piece, I think we can really move the needle here on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Allard.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Rising to speak to this…much to say. I'm actually, in the end, going to be supporting this moving forward in terms of doing a pilot. But I want to address a bunch of things here. So Councillor Mayes rightly drew everybody's attention to the…whatever you want to call it, the garbage master plan of 2011. And in there, there was a lot of actual consultation in regards to that plan that was moved ahead. And it's a big report and anybody can go and read it. It was saying that there was supposed to be, after we implemented the recycle and whatever, it would be "x" number of years before...well it had to be evaluated first. How we were doing with the existing new implementation of our collection system for recycles and garbage. And in there, there was a plan to look at and move to residential composting, being able to deal with the compostable material that emits greenhouse gas and so on. At the time that the report was...it was passed, I voted against it for a number of reasons. The main reason was how things would get implemented in certain areas in my ward, and other areas around the city, which I'll get in shortly. But at that time, there was talk about…it was like residential compostable material was a big contributor. But since then, there has been a study, Councillor Chambers just referred to restaurants only. However, Madam Speaker, since 2011, I can't remember, I think it was like three years ago, there was a study done about sources of the greenhouse gas and it was determined that the commercial industrial production of methane gas, materials that produce methane is much higher than the residential. Now within this city, we have lots of commercial, which would be restaurants and so on. We have grocery stores. A lot of that, whatever they're trying to do now, they're trying to feed people who can't afford food, but still, there is a lot of waste, compostable material wasted. Every time I smell that mushroom plant out of St. Boniface, I bug Councillor Allard, but it's a provincial jurisdiction, but every time you smell that I am sure there is a level of methane and whatever coming out of that. So that's industrial, okay. There is lots of industrial production of food in Winnipeg. Go to the North End, we produce food. There is a lot of food being dealt with…a number of facilities. But for years, for almost a hundred years, there has been a lot of material, combustible material and production of food. So when you look at that, Madam Speaker, and you think about that, in there…in that plan we passed in 2011, it said we should look at...it was just a mere little note to look at commercial industrial. Just a little bit. But now we find out that it's more important about that commercial industrial compostable waste. So you need to keep that into consideration. I wanted to talk about leaking from a seminar. Listen, that report was there in 2011. And it did say we were looking to move towards some sort of compost curbside pickup. It did say it in there. There was no special information released at that seminar. It was coming down the pipe. Some people appropriately spoke about well, you didn't do the five year evaluation which was supposed to be done first before we moved ahead with the residential composting program and ideas. Just to be clear. There was nothing special leaked. This was what was coming; there is three levels of composting. The pilot…listen, the pilot has already been paid for. All the people who have been paying those fees on their water bill, that's been setting aside the money to do the curbside stuff, so at least the pilot. So it's not like this is new $1.8 million coming out of nowhere. It's already been put...it's in the reserve. It's there because there is a policy that says in reserve, this is what we're going to spend the money on. Now what I like about the pilot…now, actually, I've always...my biggest problem has always been, how do you pay for it? We have a lot of people out there who do their own composting already because they can't afford to go grocery shopping. So they have gardens. We have lots of seniors out there who compost. They use it in their gardens because they're growing vegetables because they can't…they're trying to stay in their homes. They don't have a lot of cash. I, myself, I don't mind paying. I'll pay. It's not a big deal to me, I can afford it, but we do do

composting at my place, too. Okay? We do composting, absolutely, because it's the right thing to do. So how you pay for it though is really what it comes down to. When you implement the full thing, how do you pay for it and will it work? I think maybe in some parts of our city, it isn't going to work. So the pilot is going to try out certain neighborhoods which will be challenged...who were challenged and it was a huge problem with recycling garbage. It's still a problem in some neighborhoods in my ward. But in neighborhoods all around our wards, a number of us have neighborhoods that struggle. And you can try educating. They piloted the recycle and garbage collection in a certain area…my part. It did seem to look good. But right away that wasn't really a pilot because they didn't have a long enough time to study. This is why I voted against the stupid plan in the first place. You have to understand areas of the city before you go ahead. You got to educate. But you got to educate constantly. It's not just a educate one time and find out. You got to constantly go out there and let people know how you're supposed to deal with the garbage system. So you're going to implement the compost…Councillor Browaty is right. There is going to be a big stink in some areas of our city. Big stink. Big. Big, big. Because there are some areas of our city where I don't think you're going to be able to implement it without having huge problems. Huge problems. So the pilot is going to be done in areas where the uptake will be great. And hopefully in areas where they can really find out what the real issues are. And I'm telling you, there are certain neighborhoods in my ward, maybe in a 20, 30 years from now, maybe it will work. But I'll you right now, it's not going to work, this system. Plastics…anyway, I also wanted to mention the funny thing about our plastic bins and carts and everything. It's actually fossil fuel that creates the plastic for these things. If I could have an extension, somebody…

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

Councillor Eadie: So I just wanted to conclude. Like you have to factor everything in. The Province is actually, with their climate change plan, they are supposed to be regulating how much methane gets released from garbage dumps all across Manitoba. We are going to have some requirements. I don't think the Province has quite put in the things yet. And Councillor Gilroy is working hard towards this. Councillor…former Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Gilroy has taken up the march of former Councillor Gerbasi and I think that's good that she's doing it. And it's not easy. It's going to be a difficult thing. But it is the right thing to do for the environment. But I really have to say, you can't compare this to all these other cuts. Please don't give me this cost benefit crap. You know, climate change is just as important as providing library services, recreation to people who aren't...like, we have a lot of problems in this city. They're all equal. It's not a matter of a trade-off between this and that. We have to...we are trusted by the City of Winnipeg, people...there are people who don't have a lot of money to be able to do things, but we have a responsibility to deal with this stuff and I'm glad that the pilot is moving forward. And I'm glad that there is going to be a long enough period of time to study this as to how a full thing gets implemented. The full program gets implemented. But I don't know why we don't use some of that money in the reserve. We should be really looking at what are we doing to deal with the bigger greenhouse gas emitters, the commercial, industrial of the city. Anyway, thanks. I'll be supporting the report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Allard followed by Councillor Klein.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So I'll be supporting this motion. And I want to congratulate Councillor Gilroy, all the members of committee for their support of this motion, the Mayor, my EPC colleagues. I want to bring...just point to I guess a novelty in our reports, page 9. You have the Winnipeg Climate Action Plan Alignment and thank you to our EPC colleagues for acting in support of that. It wasn't actually considered council because it's an EPC responsibility. So I'll just read from the report so "The Winnipeg Climate Action Plan Alignment: the product will align with strategic opportunity number 6; waste reduction diversion found on page 50 of the Climate Action Plan approved by council on September 20th, 2018. Key direction action 6.1; reduce consumption, increase waste diversion from residential, commercial and industry." So bullet one, "Implement direction from the comprehensive integrated waste management strategy to advance priority organic material diversion from the landfill, short-term 18-22. Continue to invest in educational awareness programming to help maximize waste diversion; recycling and organics, short-term 18-22. Advance strategies and pilot projects to deliver and utilize biomass resources for energy production; medium-term 22-26. Explore feasibility of rationalizing waste management facilities with regular partners to manage waste, reduce emissions and increase diversion; medium-term 22-26." So to Councillor Nason who's got concerns about public engagement, it is referenced on the very first page that the public service report back to Council in 2020, prior to the start of the pilot project with an update on project implementation including the selection…selected collection routes and public engagement strategy. In terms of why we're doing this, so the…in our climate change action plan references CO2 versus methane. So as you may be aware, when you bury garbage in a landfill without doing source separated organics, what you get is…you get anaerobic digestion happening inside the landfill which produces methane gas. And I'll just read why CO2 versus methane is important consideration for climate. So this is from our Climate Change Action Plan, so "CO2 equivalent," so CO2E is the measure that climate people use in order to weigh the damage of different CO2 equivalents getting into our atmosphere, so "CO2E or carbon dioxide equivalence is used as a measure of the quantity of CO2 required to produce a similar warming effect as another greenhouse gas. For example, methane CH4 has a global warming potential, GWP of 25 relative to CO2, meaning that it's 25 times stronger from a global warming perspective. This underscores the value in having a landfill gas capture system as methane is a by-product of the

decomposition of organic matter." So that's the science of this. And in terms of the politics of this, some of my colleagues referenced the earlier consideration of the green bin recycling program, the feedback I got from members of the public at the time was tremendous in terms of, you know, don't bring in a new fee, don't do this right now. Ironically, some of the biggest opponents of the program were people who would have been what we might have expected would have been our traditional allies. Those people compost themselves. So there was clearly an education component missing there, because you simply cannot compost at home the same way as you can compost with a modern source separated organics recycling program such as we could implement city-wide in hopefully the next...not this budget process...but looking at future budgets potentially. So why like…why am I speaking 15 minutes after a Jets game started after a whole day? You're probably wondering that as well. Many of you have probably heard this speech before, because I believe that this is the issue of our generation in politics. I'll quote Greta, I mean, Mayor Bowman quoted Greta who's been nominated Person of the Year by Maclean's I think. Greta says...and she's famous on the internet for her how dare you. She says, "How dare you speak to me about your climate actions, you're robbing me for my future." That's not what speaks to me from Greta. The anger of Greta is not what speaks to me. That's what grabs the headline. That's what grabs attention on the internet. When I first heard Greta, she gave a story of what she thinks she might be when she is a grandparent. And she says, "Speaking to you, speaking to you, elected people, elected officials", she says, "I want you", and she speaks to you in the first person if you listen to this video, she says, "I want to be able to tell", she says, "If I am lucky enough to be alive", something like 80 years from now, I don't remember the specific details, "When I'm a grandparent, I envision myself with my grandchildren and I envision myself having conversation with my grandchildren saying, "Grandma, the people in charge at the time, the people who were able to make a difference on climate change, why didn't they act?'" And Greta is talking in conversation with her grandchildren, she's talking about us. She's talking about us three generations from now. And, yes, pools and community centres are important, but having a planet that we can live on is also important. And I'll do another pop culture reference right now. Disney+ is all the rage. There is a Will Smith hosted documentary series called One Strange Rock. And in that documentary, one of the first episodes, they film in tremendous HD and tremendous audio, the sounds and the sights of the glaciers falling into the sea. I'm not making this up. This is actually happening. The earth is actually heating up. The science is there. It's been there for two generations now. Well we're starting to see the effects of that science. And really, I see this as an all hands on deck situation. We have the Climate Change Action Plan. It has a road map on how to act on this. I spoke to our Climate Office. So the big wins, Councillor Schreyer mentioned some of them, so transportation is number one. That's why mode shift is so important. That's why getting out of single passenger automobiles is so important. That's why I keep bringing it up every time. We're talking about transportation policy. Buildings are number two, but this is probably number three. This is part of that low hanging fruit. Organic recycling is something we should be doing. So in other cities they've…I think there are some reasons why we're a bit behind in Winnipeg. One, Brady has a lot of capacity, so the capacity argument is one that it's tough to make because by the time Brady fills up, possibly we'll have figured out garbage all together by then. I mean, knock on wood. Maybe that could actually happen. But the issue is…it's the greenhouse gas. That's why we need to do this. And it's hard to do as a municipality. We don't have party politics here. We're all individually elected from our constituencies. We have a strong mayor model, yes, but that's a temporary alliance. It happens outside of elections. We're all independents here. So I understand how this is as a political argument, this is a tough one to make when we're not forced to do it by the Province, when we're doing it because it's the right thing to do, that's a tough pitch to make. But we need to do this. The Mayor mentioned his kids. My kids tell me the same things. I don't want to go home today and tell Camille, my daughter whose number one issue is climate change…

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

Councillor Allard: And she's younger than Greta, maybe one day she'll be having the same conversation with her kids. And I don't want Camille to say that, yeah, dad had an opportunity to act, but you know, getting elected was more important. That's not why I got involved in politics. This is probably the issue of our generation. We need to deal with it. And this is the low hanging fruit that we need to take to deal with that. So please vote for this report. And if you're going to be voting against this report, please do so with the understanding that you're voting against action on climate.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm sure this will be brief and it will shock some. During the process of discussing this pilot project I did have the opportunity to have a discussion with Councillor Allard, but although I don't share the, you know, statements of that if you're voting for this…if you vote against this, you're voting against climate change. We did have an opportunity to discuss back and forth and where the question did come up at budgeting. I did bring that forward and learned from the committee and the administration folks that were attending, that it is money from the diversion fund. And, hey, this is exactly what these diversion funds were established for to gather good data that we could use to make informed decisions. And shockingly enough I agree with the Mayor. That data is indeed necessary to make this decision. And I look forward to his support for the motion to track winter bike path usage because it is data collection. But this is one of those motions that I also looked at going in, had an opinion going in in a sense that, can we

afford this right now, is it the best use of money? This is for data collection and I think it's important that we understand exactly the cost going forward, the opportunities going forward and it might help us look at alternatives that could give us the same result. So given it is from the fund, that's why I'm supporting it and that's why I supported it there.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further speakers, Councillor…Councillor Schreyer, you did speak already on this matter. Councillor Gilroy to close.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you. Through you, Madam Chair, I want to thank everyone for the discussion. I think it's been a very healthy debate. I don't agree with Councillor Browaty. I think Winnipeggers are wanting and are ready for us to move on climate change and this is clearly one of those things that we need to move on. I did want to talk that this is coming from the waste diversion fund. And you know what, as somebody who believes in climate change, you know, I'm paying into that money when I go to our…to Brady, and I want to make sure that that fund, that money that I'm putting forward is going for diversion. I would be very upset if that money was going someplace else. So it is going for what it is intended for and I think the public and taxpayers would want that. I think that this pilot is crucial for us to build a business case. And I just want to talk about a lot of the discussion that I had, public engagement will be key. It is on page 6 of the report. And this will be key because this is going to be a change to the public. This is going to be a different way to move forward. But there's lots of different things that we can do. We can look at using one truck to pick up all of the items. We can look at using...moving forward, we can look at multiple different pickups. And maybe, you know, organics get picked up once a week and then our garbage can sit there and maybe get picked up every second week, so that this will build that business case to see what kind of model we want to look at moving forward. And so we really do need the opportunity to collect the data, find out about our public engagement. How is it working within different communities? We are going to be working across 4,000 homes. And it's going to be five different collection routes so we can really get concise data on different neighborhoods which I think is key. And we also got to make sure that we are…I know that one of the councillors raised, you know, people can still compost in their backyards. That you know, that is still relevant, but what we're doing is we're picking up bones, meat and dairy and those are things you can't do in your backyard. So it's going beyond some of the items you would be able to compost in your backyard and we have to be able to communicate that to residents. So I think this is a really key step towards our Climate Change Action Plan, towards our diversion targets, which last year we had to actually...when the comprehensive integrated waste management report came through, we had to actually move that we couldn't make our targets yet because we needed to get to 50%. We needed residential food waste program in order to meet those targets. So this is getting us to where we need to go. Winnipeggers are ready. We are talking about climate change. You know what, we have had protests here. Winnipeggers are ready. We just need to move forward. So I'm hoping that all my councillor colleagues here today will support this. And you know what, this is not necessarily about us, it is about the next generation and what we're contributing to that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gilroy. With that, I'll call the question. And there is a call for recorded vote. All in favour of Item 3 – Organics Pilot Project, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Browaty and Nason

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 14, Nays 2.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Item 3 passes. We'll now move into question period under this committee. Any questions for our Chair, for Councillor Gilroy? Councillor Schreyer.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It scares me, the idea that if you're not in favour of the allocation of the limited budgetary allocation that we have, obviously it's limited and we all know we're dealing that, towards composting program, it doesn't go towards composting, then you're not really caring about the environment. I'm not saying any individual does, but the concept, the mere concept that this is the only concern over greenhouse emissions is unfair. Sure. So let's bring this back to reality. If we're concerned about greenhouse emissions, do we want to consider these questions; do we know as a…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, a specific…one question please.

Councillor Schreyer: Do we hope that…in terms of putting all this money into it, all this research at this point before we start the study which is going to be expensive and it's planned that many of us have to do this. Do you think we'll be able to…do we think we'll be able to reduce greenhouse emissions in the Province of Manitoba through the City of Winnipeg by 1% through a city-wide compost program?

Madam Speaker: Thank you for the question. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, through you Madam Chair, for the question, for Councillor Schreyer. We do have a comprehensive integrated waste management strategy that kind of looks at the overall, how we want to reduce our waste, and clearly residential food waste was one of the items we needed to do to meet our targets for diversion. And in terms of the climate change action plan, it is one of the biggest things that we can do to deal with our greenhouse gases. So we do actually have that data that has been given through the climate change action plan in our integrative waste management strategy. And I think I do want to talk, Councillor Schreyer, because I know that you're very passionate about the electric vehicles and all those other different things. There's many different things that we need to move on. So these are just some of the areas that through the data that we've collected that are important that we need to move on, but of course there is lots of different areas. I mean, if you look at...if you look at greenhouse gases, I would have to say transportation is one of the biggest ones. So yes, in terms of making sure we get more people into transit and active transportation, whether we're talking about electric vehicle charging stations, those are all key. But this will be one of the biggest things to meet our diversion targets for the Brady Landfill.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Second question, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Does Councillor Gilroy believe that once this test program is done, we can then compare this and the administration will do due diligence in comparing the cost benefit analysis in terms of how much money we spend on compost and how much greenhouse gas emissions we save compared to other ways of reducing greenhouse emissions for the same amount of money?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I'm just trying to understand the question. Can the councillor rephrase it?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, would you like this restate?

Councillor Schreyer: Well, what would be the point of doing the pilot project if we can't compare it to other modes as we're talking about in terms of how much greenhouse gas emissions you reduce for the amount of money you spend?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: You know what, I think if you want to review the Climate Change Action Plan, that shows us how we're going to kind of meet those targets, residential food waste management strategy would be part of that overarching piece. And also too, when we look at diversion rates for Brady Landfill in general, right, we need to...Brady Landfill, in order to reduce…to divert 50%, would need to do a residential food waste diversion plan. So we're looking at Brady Landfill.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, you know, we've seen media reports from other centres with the change in recycling practises. They put some of the locater chips on them and found that some of the materials they had hoped

would be destined for recycling ended up either being in the landfill or were burned for fuel. I'm wondering if the Chair could enlighten us if there has been any audit with regards to recycling practice and with regards to that, how much may be getting diverted as contaminated plastics?

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you for the question through the Chair. Right now, all of our plastics, whether you're talking about plastics, our paper, it's within the North American market or not. We're not concerned with what we're seeing in terms of contamination, but it is something that we measure. And in terms of some of the studies that they will be doing with the organics, is they do from time to time do audits and they check bins to see what is going in the bins, what are people…what is going through our system. One of the tours I was able to take was to our recycling facility and it was really neat, too. It goes on a conveyor belt. And it really takes all the different items and there is a lot of different stuff that is getting put into our recycle bin that shouldn't be there. So there needs to be continuous efforts on that. But…and in terms of making sure that they empty the plastics when they are drinking a bottle of pop or whatever, that that gets emptied, but those things, we do look at those and we do manage those and we look at that stuff, you know, through our different processes. And it's something we continuously monitor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you Madam Speaker. I've noticed in my ward of Transcona increased significantly from when I started with regards to missed recycling pickups. I'm wondering if the Chair could advise us if that is something that is actively being monitored with regards to increases in missed pickups?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I can get back. I haven't heard that, so I can get back to...if the councillor has an area he would like to be reviewed, I can work with the public administration on that and get back to him.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to ask the Chair of the Water and Waste Committee just a quick question with respect to currently…the current river levels at James Street is 7.14 feet. And St. Norbert, it's still at 11.6 feet, which is down from where it was say a couple of weeks ago when it was 20 feet in St. Norbert and I believe 12 feet at James just some short weeks ago. Wondering of the Chair if she's had the opportunity to communicate to Water and Waste officials or senior members there, if she's in constant contact with them to be updated with respect to potential flooding in the spring and what the City's plans are still realizing that there is many sleeps to go before the spring arrives, but with saturated ground conditions, with potential snow that we may be getting tonight and throughout the winter season, conditions are right for flooding and I'm wondering to the extent that the Chair is in communication with senior members of Water and Waste, and what the plans are going forward?

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Chair. The public service is in constant contact, not only with myself, that's informing me on all the different things that are happening, but they're working collaboratively with the different departments, with Public Works who is involved in a lot of the filling of the sandbags and so on. And they also work with the Province, their forecast centre really closely. They are monitoring things closely. There is a concern with the amount of precipitation that we've had, so this is something that we are continuously monitoring and they do meet regular and discuss these things. And I know that they are trying to keep in constant contact with councillors. I think Councillor Chambers has been one of those councillors that have had issues in their ward where they had to put sandbags, so they are in constant communication with councillors that maybe have certain threats in their ward as well.

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

Councillor Chambers: And I'm wondering if the Chair of Water and Waste Committee would keep me in the loop with respect to any meetings that come forward with regards to high river levels come the springtime.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Absolutely.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Mayes: Could we get, at some point, an answer from the Chair, it doesn't need to be today obviously, but I do want to emphasize how difficult it is as an elected official to sit here with two different reports in front of us on the same project. One of which says the all-in capital costs will be in the range of 42 to 75 million for a city-wide RFW, for an organics program when we also have on the agenda, a 2020 report saying, very precisely, $101 million. Now they use two different base years; 2024 for the higher one. This 42 to 75 is in 2018 dollars, but it's repeated in 2019. Unless inflation is running at 6% a year, that isn't the answer. And if inflation's running at 6% a year, God knows why we just approved a deflationary increase on the impact fee. So that isn't in the answers, there has got to be some answer as to why we're being given, as elected officials, on the same agenda something that says, this is going to cost $42 to $75 million and another report that says it's going to cost $101 million. I don't have that in front of me, I don't expect you to have that in front of you, but could…in the fullness of time, could we get that? Because I…I fear we're going to have a series of these with this 2020 report using one set of numbers and frankly, someone could come forward and say, well it was 42 instead of 101, this thing goes way up the priority list. It's a cost benefit ratio, it shouldn't be number 8, it should be number 5, it should be number 6, do the math. I don't know exactly. But I do think we're owed by the public service an explanation of why we're getting two dramatically different estimates for the exact same thing. Different base years, but again, inflation is not running at 6% a year, which is the easy explanation we've had in the past on things like the North End plant. So if the good councillor could give us that answer in the fullness of time, please.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Through you Madam Chair, yeah, I'll get that information and provide that to council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes, your opportunity.

Councillor Lukes: Sure, it's just a simple question. Just to add me to the list of the updates for the Red River flood potential, and that when you provide that information to Councillor Mayes, that you send it to all of council. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move on to the Governance Committee of Council. Councillor Allard will be moving Item 2 from the report of October 9th, 2019.

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL DATED OCTOBER 9, 2019

Councillor Allard: Yes, I'd like to move the committee recommendation.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary. Carried. Councillor Allard, if you could now move adjournment for our 2019 council session?

Councillor Allard: So moved.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Don't leave yet. Roll call, Mr. Clerk.

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 7:07 p.m.