COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, May 6, 2020

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 Gilroy.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you Madam Clerk. Today marks our very first virtual council meeting of Winnipeg City Council, and I would like to thank our City Clerk, Marc Lemoine, and his team, who have spent many, many hours preparing to ensure today's meeting goes smoothly. Thank you to City Clerks and to Corporate IT under the direction of Glen Cottick for your dedication and your efforts, thank you. Mr. Mayor, with that, I shall turn it over to you for your morning statement.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and good morning everyone, those that are here in-person as well as our council colleagues who are joining us virtually. I want to echo our speaker's comments of appreciation for our Clerk's Office. To have our first ever virtual Council meeting is really a testament to the innovation here in our Clerk's Office and at city hall. I want to also thank, of course, council colleagues for their efforts over the previous month in terms of the committee process that has also been virtual. The month of April was a busy month even though we were not able to attend many events and festivals and meetings in person. In the month of April, we recognized Easter, National Organ and Tissue Awareness Week, Volunteer Week, Holocaust Memorial Day, Earth Day, which was 50 years, Ramadan, the 100th anniversary of the Winnipeg Falcon's Olympic gold medal victory, the first Olympic gold medal for hockey, and also the National Day of Mourning. In the first few days of May, we've also recognized Palliative Care Week, National Child and Youth Mental Health Day, and of course, happy Mother's Day to all those mothers around the council chamber as well as throughout our city. Madam Speaker, as we flatten the curve and look forward to more reopening of the provincial economy, I want to say thank you. I want to say thank you to our public service at the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba as well as the Federal Government, our health care workers and each and every one of you who are assisting during these unprecedented times. The last month has been a very surreal and unique experience for all Winnipeggers, but we have come together and we will continue to do what we always do, which is weather any storm. Madam Speaker, I'm going to close just on recognizing the fifth National Day of Remembrance for Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls. I'd like to quote from the final report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls which found that, "Persistent and deliberate human and Indigenous rights violations and abuses are the root causes of Canada's staggering rates of violence against Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQIA people." As a council and as a city, we know that there's more work to do to help prevent violence against women, and in particular, Indigenous women and girls in our community, and when the final report of the National Inquiry on Missing and Murdered Indigenous Woman and Girls was released last year, council asked the public service to provide and develop a plan for implementing the calls to justice as well as provide an overview of the work already underway. I won't go into length today, but I want to acknowledge the work by many people at the City of Winnipeg; the Winnipeg Police Services Counter Exploitation Unit included, the City of Winnipeg's Indigenous Relations Division, the City's U.N. Safe Cities Committee, and the Winnipeg Committee for Safety, who continue to raise issues to help keep women and girls safe in public places. The establishment of the Winnipeg Indigenous Accord, which encourages partners to set goals towards reconciliation and implementing the calls to action. Our Community Services Division continues to work to provide services, some of which are rooted in the fundamentals of crime prevention through enhancing social supports available. And of course, Community Services has partnered with the Canadian Centre for Child Protection, among other collaborations. Madam Speaker, as a city, we're going to continue to find ways to enhance the safety of Indigenous women and girls through implementing the national enquiry's calls to justice. I commend the work of the City staff and my council colleagues and departments, including the City of Winnipeg's Police Service, who have dedicated their energies to crime prevention and safety as we see in the Police Board's strategic plan, which is on our agenda today. I'd like to close by remembering that far too many Indigenous women and girls have been victims to violence throughout Canada, and I once again call on all municipal governments, all levels of

government to recommit themselves and their energies to preventing violence against women and girls in our community. Thank you Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you Madam Speaker. I'd like to echo, first of all, and thank the Mayor for his words with respect to the national inquiry and the day of recognition that happened yesterday. The paradigm shift that he speaks of really must come from all levels of government and public institutions, and it's important to remember that the ideologies and instruments of colonialism, racism, misogyny, both past and present, really must be rejected and worked on on a consistent basis by all governments. Yom HaShoah is a Remembrance Day for the Holocaust, often known as Holocaust Remembrance Day. As we remember the atrocities of the Holocaust earlier this month…or last month, we also must remember the incredible individual stories, including the stories of Winnipeggers, their resilience and survival. I want to end my morning announcements by really thanking public service and our first responders for the incredible leadership, the cool under pressure, the organization, the mobilization, and the courage that they have shown that is so reflective of this great city of Winnipeg. The first responders, Madam Speaker, the public service has displayed such compassion, has displayed such civic duty and such courage, and I believe the spirit is infectious in every sign that is up on a barricade that says be like the barricade, in every whimsical effort by the public service to make sure Winnipeggers are safe and at home. We are a better city because of them. I am profoundly proud of the public service that has been displayed, including that which was recognized by the Clerks to make sure that democracy continues in the city of Winnipeg. It's not always reported on, Madam Speaker. It's not on a television screen, but for those of you that are working in the city of Winnipeg to take care of us, I'm so very proud of you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Rollins. Moving on, Councillor Gillingham, will you move that the minutes of the meetings on February 27th, 2020, March 20th, 2020 at 9:30 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. and April 3rd, 2020 be taken as read and confirmed.

Councillor Gillingham: So moved Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Point of order, yes, before this vote, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Yes, given the advice of Clerk, Carlos Gameiro, in terms of how to deal with the changing of the minutes, as is the process here at city hall, Madam Speaker, the minutes of the April 3rd, 2020 meeting of Council show me as having voted in opposition to recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 of Item 1 of the Executive Policy Committee which is regarding a temporary waiver of penalties and administrative fees on business and property taxes and financial implications to the city. Madam Speaker, as you may recall, on April 3rd, like today, I was not sitting in my usual seat. In fact, they had moved me from that seat to this seat, so in that unprecedented meeting, I sat down prior to my name being called in favour of the package, and for the...for the yeas, when the vote was being called. When my name was then called, presumably by default and being in opposition, after my name was called, I then stood up to indicate that I was voting yea, not nay, but that obviously was not clear. I had no idea, having felt I had rectified that at the time, that I would be on record as having voted nay, especially given the speech I'd made for ten minutes.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Schreyer, so you're request…thank you. I think you've made the point. There will be a vote to suspend the rules to allow Councillor Schreyer to rectify his vote to yea on Item 1 under EPC from the last meeting, and that is in order. It'll require us to vote on suspension of the rules. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Just for clarity; so are we voting to consider whether we allow Councillor Schreyer to change his vote on the record now or are we voting on whether or not we're changing his vote?

Madam Speaker: It's just one vote, and it's to allow...and to allow to have his vote be changed from nay to yea. As he said, a mistake was made because of his seating.

Mayor Bowman: Can I ask for some clarity from the Clerks on this, please? I've never…sorry, I've never seen someone try to change their vote after the fact.

Councillor Schreyer: Point of order, I'm not changing my vote, I'm just trying to change the record of my vote. By no means did I vote in favour…against the package. I voted…I spoke in favour of it. And I voted in favour of it. I stood up after my name was called to indicate my preference.

Madam Speaker: It was a recorded vote, just to remind everyone that particular day. A member of council had asked for a recorded vote, and I had put that on the record and asked everyone to rise. Mr. Clerk, any clarification to add on that?

City Clerk: I can. In the draft minutes of April 3rd, we recorded the vote in question as 15-1, with the lone objection coming from Councillor Schreyer. The minutes have not yet been adopted. There's been a motion to adopt the minutes from April the 3rd, so this would be the opportunity if there were a mistake in the minutes to actually correct so. As I understand it, Councillor Schreyer is moving to ask to make a correction in those draft minutes before they are adopted. He is asking to have his vote changed from nay to yea, which we recorded. One of the procedure by-laws, section 47(4) says, “A members vote shall not be rectified or changed except with the consent of the majority of the members present in council, but same must be done before any other business of council is undertaken”. As this request comes after, you know, that point in time, two-thirds vote of council is required to suspend this rule to allow the vote of Councillor Schreyer to be changed in the record.

Councillor Allard: Are we debating this now?

Madam Speaker: No, there's no debate on the matter.

Mayor Bowman: So for the record, was everybody...because I recall everybody was in different seats at the time. I was sitting over there; it was a different chair.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer...yeah, thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I just want to make a point of order. You've expressed what we need to do.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: I don't think the two people who are speaking should be debating at the moment. I believe you have to call the vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yeah. I will call the vote, and I’ll…we’ll have a recorded vote, just to make it easier. All in favour?

City Clerk: Recorded vote, everyone rise.

Madam Speaker: Pardon me, all in favour, please rise. And if you are with us remote, please raise your hands.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Klein, Mayes, Orlikow, Gilroy, Nason, Lukes, Schreyer.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillor Rollins, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, Councillor Allard.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you, the motion passes. Moving on, Councillor Gillingham, you were going to move the minutes of the meetings that I had read out.

Councillor Gillingham: Yes, Madam Speaker, point of order, do…

Madam Speaker: And it would be as amended.

Councillor Gillingham: Okay, I was going to say, so as amended then. So do we just need a simple majority vote for this then, is that correct? Okay, thank you.

MINUTES

Councillor Gillingham moves that the Minutes of the meetings held on February 27th, 2020, March 20th, 2020 at 9:30 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. and April 3rd, 2020 be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move into delegations. We have with us via telephone Ms. Lea Ledohowski. She is the president of Canad Inns, and she is in opposition to Item 8 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated February 3rd, 2020. It's regarding the List of Historical Resources – Nomination of Somerset Building – 294 Portage Avenue. Madam Clerk, will you please admit our delegation into the meeting at this time.

Clerk: Good morning Lea, you are live with Council now. If you're following the meeting on YouTube, please mute the audio and proceed with your presentation. You have ten minutes beginning now.

DELEGATIONS

Lea Ledohowski: Good morning everyone, it's Lea speaking. Can you confirm that you can hear me?

Clerk: Yes, we can hear you.

Lea Ledohowski: Okay, thank you. Good morning and thank you very much for allowing me to speak to you today and I'm sorry I can't be there in person. So I'm here to speak to you on behalf of Canad Inns. We are the owners of the property located at 294 Portage Avenue, commonly referred to as the Somerset Building, located on the corner of Portage and Donald Street immediately across from the main entrance to Bell MTS Place. We are also owners of the two adjacent properties; the Radison Hotel which fronts Portage Avenue and the Metropolitan Entertainment Centre which fronts Donald which is also a nationally recognized historic site. By-law 55/2014, Section 13(1) stipulates, "That a nominated resource should be listed if the resource…only if the resource is of outstanding architectural or historic significance in the heritage value it embodies." Once again, I want to reiterate the importance of the by-law's articulation of the word "outstanding". It does not say (inaudible), outstanding architectural or historic significance. This building does not meet those criteria and should not have been nominated. The property is of neither outstanding architectural or historic significance, and several of the character defining elements are not original and are in fact unattractive and detract from the overall appearance of the property. Since its construction, the property has undergone more than 80 permitted alterations to both the interior and the exterior, some of which have been substantial and have significantly changed the architectural and heritage qualities of the building. To quote the City of Winnipeg Building Synopsis on page 5, "Today, many changes have been completed to the exterior. The ground floor has been completely altered. The original wind room units replaced, the entablature, which is the combination of decorative columns and horizontal members of the front have been removed, and an overhead pedestrian walkway has been attached to the west side." Once again, to reiterate, the main floor has been completely altered and no original elements remain. All of those elements which gave the building its style and character and which connected the main floor to Portage Avenue, visually and physically, are now gone. What is there in their place is an unattractive, blank stone wall that disconnects the building from the street and creates a very unattractive backdrop to a very public corner of Winnipeg. In addition to the changes already mentioned, in 1962, the original and very beautiful roof line cornice was removed and replaced with a relatively unattractive plain concrete one. The smooth cut stone base, the main floor entrance and display windows, the plain cornice of the roofline have each been identified as character defining elements, but none are original to the building nor are they in keeping with the spirit of the original building. Section 18.1 stipulates, "In determining whether a resource should be added to the list, the designated committee may, in addition, consider the economic viability of conserving the resource." The protection of the incorrectly identified character defining elements, particularly the ground floor, has a very negative impact on the building and arguably to the surrounding community. Historic resource will (inaudible) subject to a number of limitations, including requirements for additional permits, subjective interpretations of design requirements, approval processes, among others. Each of these encumbrances has a negative impact on the property value and a negative impact on redevelopment opportunities. I want to take a moment to politely reiterate that we have firsthand experience with the rehabilitation of designated properties. The redevelopment of the Met not only demonstrates our commitment to this city's truly outstanding historic assets, but also allows us to speak about the encumbrance of the process with firsthand experience. The rehabilitation of the Met, which had been dormant for more than 20 years, due in no small part to its historic listing, took substantially longer and cost substantially more than it needed to specifically because of the encumbrances of the heritage process. In addition, we have specific experience relative to the purchase of the Somerset where there is a document that has been agreed to by the City, but in over two years, we are still waiting on a simple signature. Representatives can say that processes are clearly outlined, but the reality is that things sometimes do not move along with a sense of urgency, and for a business like ours, that time is money. The Somerset Building is located in a conspicuous corner of downtown Winnipeg in the SHED District. I believe the true value of this building lies in its potential, not in its past. As owners of an important corner of downtown Winnipeg, we would like the opportunities to connect, improve, and enhance those properties. We want to make the buildings better for us, for our tenants, for our guests, and for the community at large. Once again, we respectfully request the

building not be added to the list of historic resources and be added to the commemorative list, where it belongs. Thank you very much for listening.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Lea, for your presentation. At this time, we'll see if there's any questions from Council. Please raise your hand. Councillor Santos, followed by Councillor Eadie. Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: I just need some clarification; so in the report, the character defining elements are…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Santos, if I could please ask you to rise as you address Council. Thank you.

Councillor Santos: Sorry, it's been a while. In the report, there's a list of the following character-defining elements. Lea, I was wondering, could confirm that the list they have there you have actually changed already? They're not the original to what the list shows in the report?

Lea Ledohowski: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. The elements that are defined as character-defining elements in the recommendation, I haven't...are you asking, have those building elements been changed?

Councillor Santos: Correct.

Lea Ledohowski: Yes, they have, some of them have. And that's specifically the cornice that has been identified, the entire main floor. I'm just sort of going through my papers. I mentioned it earlier in my presentation. The smooth cut stone base, the main floor with entrance and display windows and recti linear openings, and the plain cornice of the roofline; those have each been identified as character defining elements, none of which are original to the building.

Councillor Santos: Okay. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Ms. Ledohowski, for making your presentation. And Madam Speaker, I'm very…I have intimate knowledge of 294 Portage Avenue, going back to when I was 13 years old and checking out the new crosswalk, although it wasn't quite that new at that point. This building, and I...I just want to confirm, and I rise...I confirm that the front has totally changed. I worked in that building from 1990 to 1995. I also have been involved with the Canadian…sorry, Council of Canadians with Disabilities who's on…I think they're still on the ninth floor. A number of organizations that I've dealt with in that building, and I want to confirm that that front has totally, totally changed. And it was changed back in about, I think it was the late '90s where, that whole front entranceway and stuff was changed. It used to be a big open space, a bigger open space, and as she said. But my curiosity is, I thought it was still owned by a company out of California. When did Canad Inns or Ledohowski's purchase the Somerset Building?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Lea?

Lea Ledohowski: We purchased it about two years ago.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question is from Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. We have several considerations before us as councillors when we contemplate...thank you. When we contemplate…my apologies, Madam Speaker. I'll echo Councillor Santos' comments. We have several aspects before us contained within this by-law that pivot on historical considerations, but we also have economic ones. And Madam Speaker, I'm wondering, you know, through you to Leo Ledohowski…Lea, that during a period of pandemic, you know, we did not delay this, but it's had some impacts on an industry that she is a leader of and represents. My question pertains to business investment and economic development in the downtown. Does it strike her as odd, I'm wondering, that we're contemplating this at this particular juncture given that many of us will also leave the chamber considering economic development and stimulus within the city?

Madam Speaker: Thank you for the question. Lea?

Lea Ledohowski: I could probably spend a significant amount of time talking about the economic reverberations of the COVID-19 pandemic not only for our industry but for the economy of Winnipeg in particular and downtown Winnipeg. I will try and keep it very brief, understanding the limitations…time limitations that we're under right now. Our industry was among the first to feel those impacts, and we felt them immediately and overnight. And there has been a devastating economic consequence for the hospitality, tourism and entertainment industry. Be reminded that Bell MTS Place is among those which will be most significantly impacted in the short-term in particular. So to have any conversation of

redevelopment and economic development in a post-COVID-19 era necessarily requires an appreciation for the fact that we are just beginning as a city and as a community to really understand the true economic impacts of this. And speaking personally, I do have to admit that for the last 60 days, or since March 12th, when the WHO made their announcement, my industry, my business, my priorities and objectives have been solely focused on crisis management and moving forward with the hope of a sustainable building in the post pandemic era, but I do think it is critical that everyone recognize the economic impact will be significant particularly to Winnipeg's downtown. And it does strike me as perhaps not the greatest use of our time and energy to be fixated on historic detailing when we really need to spend our time and energy, I'm speaking about my organization and our community at large, needs to be focused on how we're going to economically recover from this unprecedented crisis.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further questions for our delegation today? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you. My question is, was there any indication before the current owners bought the building that there was any consideration or designation by the City in terms of this being considered in any way a historical site or historical building or if there was any aspects of it that were designated officially as historical?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Lea Ledohowski: I'm sorry. I'm having a little bit of a hard time hearing. Are you asking did we know if there was any possibility or if any elements were designated prior to our purchase of the building?

Councillor Schreyer: Yes.

Lea Ledohowski: So there was something that came up during the due diligence process that suggested that the building had been nominated, but our understanding at the time was that that nomination had expired due to the conditions of the by-law. We did not realize that the by-law had been extended and that the building had been nominated. We thought that it was said and done and there was no risk to the property. It absolutely would have impacted our decision to purchase the building had we recognized the potential, and certainly, moving forward, the domination of the listing of the building will have a significant impact on the value of the property.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Okay. Seeing none, I thank you Ms. Ledohowski for your presentation today. You may continue watching on livestream if you wish. We'll be addressing the item shortly. Thank you.

Lea Ledohowski: Thank you very much, everyone.

Madam Speaker: We'll now move into reports of the Executive Policy Committee. Mr. Mayor on the report dated April 28th, 2020.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED APRIL 28, 2020

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 and 2.

Madam Speaker: If you wish for one of the items to be stood down, please raise your hand. Councillor Eadie? Yes, thank you. Seeing no others, I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 2...Item 1, Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Interim Council and Committees of Council Schedule of Meetings and Delegation of Authority

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I'll wait to hear from council colleagues. Before doing so, was the last matter unanimous?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Mayor Bowman: Okay, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie to address Item 1.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I just rise...I'll be voting for this report. A lot of...we've had discussions about it, but I just...I wanted to rise and raise a concern. While I understand that Legal has created this by-law, and it's…I guess it's done in such a manner, Madam Speaker, that it allows for an easier adjustment if there needs to be if...for example, if there is a need to go beyond the end of August of 2020 in regards to allowing the director of P&D on C class conditions and variances. And as I understand it, I don't think there's an appeals process. And we do have to do that. I understand that, we don't want to expose anybody to potentially getting sick that could lead to someone's death. As we heard this week, another individual's passed from COVID-19. But I just wanted to say, I've never…I can't recall anywhere where...you know, and I've been here for ten years, and I've read lots of other by-laws, they don't usually refer to the report. In this circumstance, I understand that for expediency purposes, if we do need to change, it's there, but you know, I feel more comfortable when a by-law is very specific and clear within it because it's been my experience that people lose the concept of what the intention of the actual by-law was. And you know, in this circumstance actually, it makes you refer back to the report that indicates what the intention is, which is great, but again, I just...a by-law is very...actually, most of our by-laws, our administration takes it very seriously. And if it doesn't specify a date, very specific, you know, hopefully they'll go back to the report to remember…because I don't know how long this is going to go on for, but you know, our administration follows all our by-laws very specifically. And anyway, I just…so I have that concern. I didn't think it was that difficult to actually put in the end of August, and you know, this by-law, if you think about it, we're going to give it third reading today, I believe, and it will pass. It shall be done. So what that means is it's not that difficult to pass another by-law if we have to extend it. So it's my understanding in this one, all's we have to do is vote on a report and not create a by-law in order to extend the time. I don't see either process being overly difficult, so I really don't understand why they didn't just put in August 31st, 2020. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Speaker. And I'll echo…pardon me, I'll echo some of the comments of my colleague, Mr. Eadie. But the other question that came up in reviewing this and the report is that there seems to be little clarity on the ability to appeal and when. I think that when we are doing a by-law, especially because many people have spoken about how certain by-laws are vague, and we're trying to, you know, give those proper attention and make sure that there's clarity that we also need to have that clarity in new by-laws we're putting forward, And on this by-law, I would also request, or if we could put a friendly amendment forward, if Council so agrees with me on that or not. But the issue of having a date in there, and the issue of having clarity on the appeal process I think is vitally important to ensure new by-laws we're putting in place are clear.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't think our previous councillors are nitpicking. We vote on these things for a reason. And so the motion itself, the wording of the motion itself, talks about specific dates, and my concern is that the by-law...corresponding by-law does not. So I'm not sure if that's a mistake, I'm not exactly sure what the intent is. What I'm saying is that we have to be vigilant on this and take responsibility for what we're voting on today, and as the days go, stay in contact with the Clerks and with our administration in terms of how we deal with the fact that the by-law, in terms of dates, isn't as indicative…isn't indicative at all in terms of any end date as the rest of the motion is. I think this is really important, and I'm glad that Councillor Eadie brought this up.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? Okay, I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Allard will be noted in opposition, and Councillor Klein. Councillor Allard, are you in support?

Councillor Allard: I'm in support.

Madam Speaker: You're in support, okay. Then we'll just say yea. Raising our hands…raising our hands is for questions and to stand down an item today. Again, I'll call the question once again. All in favour?

Mayor Bowman: Record it, just to be clear.

Madam Speaker: You'd like a recorded vote, Mr. Mayor. Okay. All in favour, please rise. If you are with us remote, please raise your hand.

Councillor Allard: See, that's why I got confused. I'm raising my hand, like I did last time.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillor Klein.

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

Madam Speaker: Item 1 passes. Yeah, just to clarify once again, for…if you're here with us remote, raising your hand is just for a recorded vote. Thank you. Moving on, Mr. Mayor, or pardon me, we first have a notice of motion. This is from Councillor Klein and Councillor Nason. It's from our February 27th, 2020 Council meeting, and it's regarding voting requirements for budgets. The motion is included on the agendas on your computers. Councillor Klein, will you introduce your motion?

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTION

Moved by Councillor Klein,
Seconded by Councillor Nason,

WHEREAS the Voting Requirement By-law No. 123/2003 details the categories of matters which require approval by a 2/3 vote of the members present at Council;

AND WHEREAS the adoption of the capital and operating budgets for each fiscal year requires a simple majority vote of Council;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Voting Requirement By-law No. 123/2003 be amended to require a vote of 2/3 of the members present at Council for the adoption of the capital and operating budgets for each fiscal year, beginning with the 2020 budget.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much. The motion is a request to alter the voting requirement By-law 123/2003 to require a two-thirds vote of members present at Council for the adoption of the capital and operating budgets for each fiscal year. This motion did say beginning with the 2020 budget, but it was held over. The reason that I'm putting this forward, and I just wanted to quickly let you all know why. Politics matters, ideas matter, democracy matters, because all of us need to be able to make a difference. Not my words. Those are the words of the late Jack Layton. I agreed to run for office to make a difference. I came ready to roll up my sleeves and get to work. But I can't do that. Because of the current model, my vote doesn't have a lot of meaning. Decisions are made often before we sit down here. It's much like a scripted reality show. There will be circumstances, of course, where my vote will have some meaning, and I appreciate that, but we know the majority of time it will have no meaning. It often becomes a political manipulation tool to be used against those who question the plan or attempt to hold decision makers accountable, hence why we see a lot of recorded votes. I've been told you have to put your time in then you'll get your chance. I'm not looking for that. I feel that many of my colleagues feel as I do, that every member of Council be treated equally, and that every member of Council has a meaningful vote. Now I know some will say we're open and transparent more than we ever were. We're going to have to agree to disagree on that statement. Being elected officials, I can't imagine voting no to democracy.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Any further speakers? Councillor Eadie, okay, followed by Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this motion to change the budget vote to a two-thirds vote, Madam Speaker, and I'm basing my decision on actually a lot more...well, we're all equal, Madam Speaker, absolutely, but some of us have been around a long time, and I have to say, Madam Speaker, there was a lot more...and maybe it's, you know, trying to avoid work, but we have EPC plus two, Madam Speaker, there's no doubt about that. And I've always felt and I've decided not to take it to court, or anything like that, because I have…I don't have enough time, Madam Speaker, nor do I have the office resources to dedicate somebody in my office to research and

challenge what's been going on for the last…basically, what is it, six years now, almost...five years. And so I'm really concerned about that because I don't think that it's really a democratic vote on the budget, and we have to remember about the budget. It's like an omnibus bill, because what often happens with our budget, it doesn't reflect our policy at all. It is its own policy unto itself, and it seems to trump everything that we say we stand for, Madam Speaker. It's easy to rise on a specific report and say you support all these things, but the reality is when you get to the budget policy, and the budget by-laws, that's when it comes down to what you really mean regarding all these other policy reports we get. And so I think that actually the budget does deserve to have a two-thirds vote. And even if it wasn't an EPC plus two situation, I still believe that a two-thirds vote would be appropriate. As a matter of fact, my first year here, there was a financial management plan brought in with, at the time, Councillor Fielding, working with our current interim CAO, Madam Speaker, and there was…and there are some particular clauses that we do, not only to suspend rules our two-thirds, there are some two-thirds votes required for other items that we deal with on a sort of monthly…or Council based…meeting…meetings and decisions that we do make. And my first one was that I felt that there should be a two-thirds vote in replenishing the reserve, I think it was at the time, and people thought I was playing games, Madam Speaker. But these are serious matters that really need to heavily involve all of our councillors. And so I appreciate Councillor Klein has now been here two year…going on two years. He's had a good sense of how things roll. And so has Councillor Nason. I notice Councillor Nason, I believe, was the seconder on this motion. And I think, you know, if you really think about it, what...like, two-thirds vote on a budget, let's be serious about it. It's over a billion dollars. It does deserve that level of a vote, and I don't understand why people wouldn't support that position. I'm not playing politics here. It's, you know…we all need to be involved. Yes, our head of the budget process has been more consultative, has considered a lot more from all of the members of Council, but again, it has a long way to go to get to what I would call a more...a better democratic process. And so that's why, Madam Speaker, I support this motion. Thank you.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. Can you hear me here, just wait.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, great. Thank you. I'll be wholeheartedly supporting this motion for many of the reasons Councillor Klein has stated, and also Councillor Eadie. Since the removal of the roles of Deputy and Acting Deputy Mayor from an EPC members role, the addition and the addition of pay for these roles, it has resulted in now nine members of Council meeting on a weekly basis privy to extensive briefings from the public service and knowledge on many, many issue that are…involve huge decisions that impact the lives of many Winnipeggers. Even this morning, EPC plus two met to discuss today's agenda and game plan. Months and months of meetings by EPC plus two occurred to prepare the budget. Countless presentations, discussions, opinions and viewpoints are determined in these months. A two-third vote of Council encourages more discussion with a broader membership. We are all elected by voters. Our voters expect us to be at the table, not to receive the budget the same day that the media receives it. If we look back and reflect on the 2020 budget, we saw how...I only had the opportunity to focus on one real issue, which was the U-Pass. And the scrutiny that I put on it and then engaged with others and the public saw how we had a multimillion-dollar savings. So I truly believe that a two-third vote will encourage much more discussion and scrutiny on a budget over a billion. So I'm wholeheartedly supporting this motion of Klein and Nason's, and I thank them for bringing it forward for this time to have a conversation, also.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I, too, would like to start with a Jack Layton quote. He often said "I've always favoured proposition than opposition", and you know, entering City Council as I did, and concerned about our conflict resolution processes as I was, concerned that we needed to be re-engaged in the everyday work of doing democracy to really sustain our city. This is an important motion perhaps to consider in particular on a day that seems to be thematic where we are getting up and wondering if our deliberative processes of a recorded vote is indeed being recorded properly and effectively. So to that end, though, I have a suggestion. We have a governing body of Council, Madam Chair, that you, yourself, are chair of, in terms of the Governance Committee, and I would move referral.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Mr. Clerk, just for clarification, the referral was moved after the member spoke, so I believe it's out of order, yes. Okay. Moving onto the next speaker, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: I'll move referral.

Madam Speaker: Moving referral to?

Councillor Schreyer: To Governance.

Madam Speaker: Okay. So we now shall vote on the referral of this item...yes?

Councillor Klein: Because it has already appeared before Council has a Notice of Motion, and it's back. I'm wondering if the Clerks could clarify whether or not this motion is actually able to be referred to a governing body. Further to that, does that Governance Committee effectively have the power to change the number of votes required through their powers?

Madam Speaker: Yeah, those two questions, Mr. Clerk. And also, does the mover have the opportunity to rebut why it should not be referred, if you could clarify that as well.

City Clerk: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Orlikow: Point of order. We're not going to be debating something that we're not allowed to debate, are we? My understanding is the referral's too late, so there is no notice of referral, my understanding is.

Madam Speaker: The referral is not too late. Referral was made by Councillor Schreyer. There's some clarification on making sure it's an appropriate committee, and also if Councillor Klein can in fact rebut the referral. Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk: Madam Speaker, in terms of Councillor Klein's questions, once the item appears on the agenda as a notice of motion, it is the same as every other item on there. It can be voted upon, it can be laid over, it can be referred, so the motion to layover…to refer is in order. In terms of referral, Council can refer it to the Governance Committee. It requires a by-law change, so Governance would simply make a recommendation and it would have to come back to Council for a final vote. And in terms of debate, the motion is to refer, only the mover of the actual motion can rebut for three minutes, so that would be Councillor Klein could rebut the motion to...

Madam Speaker: Yes, we'll go to the vote momentarily. Councillor Klein, do you wish to rebut as to why we should deal with the item today?

Councillor Klein: Absolutely. We've put forward a number of motions to deal with the inability to have a vote of meaning, especially when it comes to the budget process and to other processes. I believe that we put forward five or six motions specifically trying to become engaged in the budget process. This was a notice of motion. We've had lots of time to think about it. People have had lots of time to share comments, share thoughts. I didn't receive one, and I can't speak for Councillor Nason. I didn't get a phone call from anyone on Council, and there was no discussion. I would simply say that we were democratically elected, and I don't know how we can sit here in the face of democracy and speak against it.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein. Thank you. So you've addressed dealing with the item today. We'll now have the vote, and it's a majority vote. Councillor Schreyer has moved referral to the Governance Committee. All in…all in favour? All in favour? Okay, there's a call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise. If you are with us online, please raise your hand.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Schreyer, Gilroy.

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Klein, Santos, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, Councillors Nason, Lukes and Allard.

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

Madam Speaker: The referral is in order. It passes. It will appear on the next agenda of the Governance Committee. Thank you. We'll now move into by-laws under Executive Policy Committee, 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 46/2020, By-law 47/2020 and By-law 48/2020.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 46/2020, By-law No.47/2020, and By-law No.48/2020.

Mayor Bowman: Sorry, was the unanimous?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Mayor Bowman: Sorry, I didn't hear…there were a number I didn't hear, so thank you. I move that the by-laws No. 46/2020 to 48/2020, both inclusive, be read a second time, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: When I speak, I'm going to take some delays because there was a delay for our councillors online hearing what's being said. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 46/2020 to 48/2020, both inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, and I presume once again it was unanimous. Thank you. I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 46/2020 to 48/2020, both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And if you do not hear any nays, the vote certainly is unanimous. All in favour of the suspension and the third reading. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. It may be that remotely, our councillors have themselves on mute and are quickly trying to unmute themselves, so maybe if you don't have any background noises, remote councillors, please feel free to unmute yourselves. Okay. We'll now move onto question period for the Mayor. Any questions for Mayor Bowman? Councillor Klein.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. Through you, Members of Council received a media summary that was prepared by the Public Service, April 30th, 2020, through our city email and it arrived about 5:03 p.m. It was a summary of media inquiries and releases of information handled through our Corporate Communications department for that day and there were several items on that report. I have a copy here. It was probably the most information I've ever received while being at Council. It was clear, it was thorough, it was beneficial, and it showed how quickly the Public Service head responds to inquiries from certain people. I was very excited to see this communication, but alas, I have never received another one since. And I know that I will be told that this concern should be taken to the CAO or the Director of Communications, because some of the people aren't aware of it, aware of the item, and something along that line. But the reality is that you have to go through a system, it takes 14 days, you have to go to a general inquiry email. But the Mayor is the De facto CEO of the operation, so my question through you, Madam Chair, is will the Mayor direct his executive team to include all Members of Council on these daily media briefings beginning tomorrow?

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

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I would suggest that Councillor Klein may want to read the Charter, in terms of, my understanding is there's no Chief Executive Officer, and this inquiry may want to be forwarded to Corporate Communications. I do want to take this opportunity to applaud the work of our Corporate Communications team and our Public Service. The response to COVID-19 has been professional and it has been responsive. I appreciate the fact that unlike any other time, certainly since I've been Mayor, we have full Council briefings every week for 2 hours, during which, Councillor Klein is in attendance. I do appreciate that level of openness and transparency that's provided to all Members of Council, and so I would suggest that he may want to follow up directly with his request to Corporate Communications.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Mayor inform Council when he or his office was made aware of the most recent plan the Provincial Government is launching to deal with or study of noise levels specific to the airport vicinity?

Madam Speaker: I'm going to ask the Clerk if that question is in order, given that it's referring to a public hearing item? Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk: Thank you, Madam Speaker. No new information should be presented regarding this item as it is a subject of a public hearing. Only any points of clarification can be raised.

Madam Speaker: I'm going to rule the question out of order, at this time. Any further question, Councillor Klein?

Councillor Klein: (Inaudible)

Madam Speaker: Okay. Any other questions for the Mayor? Councillor Nason?

Councillor Nason: Yes, through you Madam Speaker, it's COVID-19 related. There were some comments that were relayed through media that the, with regards to Impark and parking that, with regards to 30-day cancellation policy that has not been removed and comments around them, were that, you know, we need to be as flexible as possible. I'm wondering, through you, Madam Speaker, if the Mayor would commit today to perhaps work and direct the Public Service to rescind retroactively our own Winnipeg Parking Authority 30-day cancellation requirement for those who have been impacted most greatly as a result of COVID-19?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I was asked to provide comment from one of our media outlets in Winnipeg, with respect to a specific business. The Councillor has just referenced them. I did not provide direct commentary on that specific business's operations. I understand the Councillor may have interrupted otherwise. My understanding is he has provided commentary on some requests to changes to Winnipeg Parking Authority. I have yet to see a motion or any legislative action to try to affect that change that the Councillor's desiring, and perhaps in his preamble, he can let me know at which time he has introduced a motion to that effect, and if so, then I'd be more than happy to review it.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any further questions? Councillor Nason, second question.

Councillor Nason: Of course, it's not a question of the question of the question period, but the matter that I brought forward and you know, we've done many other things without motion, we've laid off staff without motion you've brought forth…

Madam Speaker: The question, Councillor Nason? Your question?

Councillor Nason: …So, will the Mayor let the community know if he is supportive of suspending a 30-day cancellation policy with regards to the Winnipeg Parking Authority?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I'd be more than happy to consider any motion that the Councillor would be like to bring forward and if the Councillor has also conducted any due diligence on this matter or considered it. Clearly he has, in his preamble, perhaps or in his follow up, perhaps he can allude to any information that he's been able to research. I'd be more than happy to review it and of course, as a Member of Council, he is within his rights to bring forward a motion for consideration by all Members of Council and I'd be more than happy to review that, when it rises to the appropriate committee.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any other questions for the Mayor? Okay, seeing none. Councillor Nason? Okay, I'm sorry I didn't see your finger.

Councillor Nason: Thank you. I put it up, but I know there's a lot of sunshine in here. The challenges, that I'm getting challenged with regards to putting forward motions, but without having community committee, very hard to move motions. However, on a new topic, did the Mayor inform us what the status of the Photo Radar Enforcement Trap, I mean program, contract renewal is, if he's aware?

Mayor Bowman: This may be a question for the Chair of the Police Board. If it's something that I can provide some assistance to you afterwards, I'm more than happy to try to facilitate Councillor getting a response. I would suggest that he may want to direct his question to the Chair of the Police Board, or of course, the Police Service itself.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any other questions for the Mayor? Okay. Seeing none, let's move forward. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. We'll hear from our chair, Councillor Rollins, on the report dated April 22nd, 2020.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED APRIL 22, 2020

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think one of my fellow councillors may want to pull Report No. 1, but…which is the Winnipeg Police Board 2020-2024 Strategic Plan, so I will move Items 2, the agreement to share Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service response data with Dillon Consulting Limited, and 3 and 4, the review of patio smoking and the appointment as we do annually of the weed inspectors and of the Noxious Weeds Act, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: So you've moved everything but 1?

Councillor Rollins: That's right.

Madam Speaker: Okay. I will ask now if Council wishes for any items to be stood down. Item 1, Councillor Klein. Any other items? Thank you. Madam Clerk...I'll call the question, first of all, on Items 2 through 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Winnipeg Police Board – 2020-2024 Strategic Plan

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

Councillor Rollins: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce an item that Protection, Community Services and Parks Committee, really deliberately…and thanks to the administration, really deliberately placed it in the context of not just the Winnipeg's Police Service but the context of the Community Service Department and all that we do on prevention with respect to protection in addition to the Winnipeg Police Service. I think this is really important to underline, given the priorities of this council to really prevent those calls that are going to the police service that need not be there such as mental health and social services calls, and I want to once again thank His Worship Mayor Brian Bowman, with respect to leading the Harvard Bloomberg Committee on this. Jason Hildebrand…or Jonathan Hildebrand, pardon me Madam Speaker, came to the committee to really talk to the committee and to all of Winnipeggers about that effort, as well as Cindy Fernandes, who has been giving grants to community groups on community safety. So with that, I'll wait for questions and comments from my colleague, Councillor Klein.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just stand to support this motion, but I want to take the opportunity to thank all the board members at the Winnipeg Police Board, including my colleague, Councillor Chambers and our staff, Shawna and Gwen, who are having more and more robust conversations which is really giving us the ability to learn more and become more engaged on the governance of the Police Board and what the Police Board is and is not responsible for. I would be happy...when you see this report...happy to have discussions with anybody to explain where it comes from, how it's put together because the strategies are a joint recommendation, if you will. The strategic plan has to be agreed upon by both the service and the board. And you can read all of this in the Manitoba Police Act. It's there, it's available to the public and I'd be happy to bring in officials from the Manitoba Police Commission to do a seminar, but the staff has done great work on this. They have been, you know, working during the pandemic at getting reports done and answering questions that we are permitted by legislation to answer and we are trying our best to arrange some town halls or like gatherings as we had done in the past and had agreed to do in the past with community groups; much more difficult, of course, given the current restrictions. So I do thank all the members of the board. We do have very open and honest discussions. You know, there is a lot of back and forth, which is really nice to see. It really wasn't there when we first started. I also want to invite all my colleagues to…and the Mayor to join us on June 8th when we will be bringing forward the Winnipeg Police Service business plan, and that's at the next public meeting for the Winnipeg Police Board.

Again, you're all welcome to attend. I just would urge you to read the Manitoba Police Commission and the Manitoba Police Act so that you're prepared for when you come in what can be answered and what cannot.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I, too, want to begin just by thanking everyone who participated and contributed in this version of the Police Board's strategic plan. All members of the Police Board, including the Winnipeg Police Service that have provided assistance in its development, I want to take this opportunity to thank the men and women of the Winnipeg Police Service for their incredibly important work in our community. What I appreciate certainly around this council chamber during my time, when I was first elected, there was a lot more discussion about the Winnipeg Police Service developing or assisting with crime prevention through social development. What I've seen over the last numbers of years is a greater appreciation for that burden on social development goes far beyond policing. It is part of the reason why this council has increasingly looked to support initiatives that deal with the root causes of crime in our community so that we can provide that support so we can reduce the demands on calls for service to the Winnipeg Police Service. And so for that, we all have a shared and collective responsibility to help build a safer community. It doesn't fall solely on the shoulders of the Winnipeg Police Service and their members whose efforts we are grateful for on a daily basis. I appreciate that this strategic plan is being, I believe, received as information today, and was supported unanimously by the Police Board as well as Councillor Rollins' committee that she chairs. So I want to thank her for her efforts. I know this is an area of particular concern for her, in terms of crime prevention through social development in our community and the work of the committee that's bringing this forward, and each of the members that serve on that committee is deeply appreciated. I will note for the record, of course, this will be approved by a simple majority, as well, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. We have other speakers. Councillor Schreyer...Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, I will rise, and I will be supporting this report. I want to echo the comments of the Mayor and Councillor Klein, as well. What I want to just comment on...I appreciate this report being before us...is that when I had the privilege of being the chair of the Police Board, we seemed to face the same thing I think that the board faces now and that is the board consistently made efforts to get public involvement, public engagement, public feedback, and I know that the board, and it's reflected in this report, continues to do that. So I just wanted to encourage members of the public who may be listening and all of my council colleagues that when there are opportunities for input to the board and to give comment on what policing priorities they deem to be important, please take those opportunities so that when there are…post-COVID year, once we get through it, when there's opportunity through other town hall meetings or e-mailing in responses, going to the website, whenever feedback is solicited from the public, it is important that members of the public have their voice heard. And so when the Police Board does continue to, you know, provide those opportunities, I just would encourage my council colleagues to prompt the members of the public in our respective wards to please give input because this is...this is a public service. The Winnipeg Police Service is the citizens of Winnipeg's service, so I will be supporting this report.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm rising in support of this motion, as well. Again, throughout the last two years that I've been sitting on the Winnipeg Police Board, we've had really good interaction with the public, whether it's with the Manitoba Islamic Association, whether it's with the community group that was at Councillor Gilroy's ward after that very sad incident that took place in her ward with that young gentleman that was protecting his grandmother. Again, the community came out to voice their concerns and register their concerns about feeling safe in their neighborhoods, and the Police Service was on hand to work with us as a board to find out what we can do to work together as a community to reduce crime in our communities and reduce the stigma of crime as a city in whole. There are many opportunities that we as a board try to put together to engage citizens, whether it's at Polo Park Mall, whether it's at the Kildonan Mall, to have a neutral ground and an opportunity for residents to come out and voice their concerns. Again, His Worship had spoken about crime prevention through community development and that's one of the aspects that I'm really looking forward to working on in terms of this strategic plan and how we work together with community stakeholders to build those elements in crime prevention. And, again, you know, organizations like the Bear Clan that are doing such great work in keeping our community safe, again, working with all of those stakeholders, working again with the service itself where we're dealing with aspects of traffic safety in our residential communities. Again, it's great work that's being done, and it's necessary work that's being done to reduce the overall calls to service from the police in terms of some of the issues that, again, post pandemically, when we're back, you know, to our regular activities, again, hopefully, there's opportunities to work with the Police Service as we've suggested through this process to ensure the safety of our communities. So again, I'll be supporting this report.

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

Councillor Rollins: Yes, thank you. And thank you very much, through you, Madam Speaker, to my colleagues for speaking to this. I...the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls recommended that the Federal Government establish robust and well-funded Indigenous civilian police oversight bodies to really prevent police negligence and misconduct in rape and sexual assault cases in particular, but more was found during the national inquiry. Aboriginal Justice Inquiry found the same need for an Indigenous oversight body. The Winnipeg Police Board provides civilian governance and oversight to the Winnipeg Police Service, but it is my opinion that they should not be alone in this. The work is not complete. And so in closing, Madam Speaker, I just want to say that I've reached out to Grand Chief of Assembly Manitoba Chiefs. I concur with Chief Jerry Daniels in requesting more robust oversight on the police with respect to an Indigenous specific body. We don't need to be doing this work alone. This legislation that is oversight is incomplete, and it needs to be worked on not necessarily just within the city of Winnipeg but in...with our own board, but with other boards. So I want to close in this way, Madam Speaker, by acknowledging that the work isn't complete; that we really must not deny the safety, security, and human dignity of all citizens by really reaching out into the community. I want to acknowledge the work that has been done on this strategic plan, but in no way do I think that it is sufficient until a body is built, and I'd like to close in that way, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. With that, I'll call the question. Okay. Call for a recorded vote on Item 1. All in favour, please rise. Raise your hand if you're remote.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 16, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: The motion passes unanimously…the item. Thank you. Moving on, we have no motions, no by-laws under this committee. We'll now take question period for Councillor Rollins. Any questions? Councillor Browaty, Councillor Nason and Councillor Lukes, do you have your hand up? No. Councillor Browaty.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Last week is part of Manitoba's re-emergence from the COVID-19 program. There was some discussion, or there was libraries were listed as one of the services that could reopen. I was wondering if the Chair could provide us with some details about possible versions of reopening of our libraries?

Councillor Rollins: I welcome that question, Madam Speaker. I, too, have heard from residents really wanting libraries to be reopened, really feeling that it's been months since they've been distanced from their only access to technology, the computers in our public libraries, the beloved services and the really real relationships that they've developed with our staff at the libraries. So I, too, have looked to other jurisdictions, Madam Speaker, on in terms of the car and the pickup. But like everything during the pandemic, our staff has been really diligent in really examining what the evidentiary basis is, the science behind the disease that we're COVID-19 that we are constantly competing with our own selves to learn about. That being said, we have a Provincial Government that did indicate that libraries would be opened, but I, myself, as Chair of Protection, Community Services and Parks, as all councillors know, have been really emphasizing the slow and methodical approach to safety because I think it is the most cautious way in considering opening up services and it's that's caution, that abundance of caution, that has literally been saving lives during the pandemic. So that has been the number one priority, however we have had a Library Board meeting last night, there has been discussion about looking at it in the next month, but, and I'm really happy, Madam Speaker, to provide updates as they come about and I want to acknowledge also, the uptake and the busyness that has happened while Winnipeggers have taken advantage of some of the electronic means at the libraries too; and I see Councillor Allard, Madam Speaker, shaking and nodding his head because perhaps he's taken advantage of the electronic means that our library staff has pivoted to during the pandemic. That pivot, of course, is what I want to acknowledge in my opening comments today, in terms of the Public Service. They are really looking at what grocery stores have already implemented in terms of those stickers on the floor. They're really looking at how to stay metres away from each other. And so, I can report that all of that is happening to bring back Winnipeggers in a methodical, slow way to the services that they know and love in the Winnipeg library system. So, as I get additional information, I'll come back to this forum and email my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question, Councillor Browaty?

Councillor Browaty: Just the one follow up question is, it sounds like there is (inaudible) operations to have some versions of libraries somewhat open. I was wondering if the Chair has any time frame as to when more additional information may be coming forward?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins?

Councillor Rollins: At this time, I would say in May/June, but you know, the emphasis is on the safety and security of Winnipeggers and our staff. So I would hesitate to give that timeline, but other than the May/June corridor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question is from Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, I'd like to say that since we just appointed persons to enforcement of weed control and I know, residents in the ward specifically in Southland Park can attest the City's been doing a pretty poor job in managing weed control. I'm wondering through you, Madam Speaker, if the Chair can respond and let us know what more will be done in 2020 to improve the quality of the grasses in our parks and our fields to rid not only thistle but other problem weeds?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins?

Councillor Rollins: I neglected to celebrate the movement that we did just now, as a Council, on the noxious weed attention that we give each and every year. It was an agenda item that since becoming Chair of Protection, Community Services and Parks, I certainly look forward to each and every year, passing what we did just earlier today. I think it's important to recognize some of those noxious weeds that must be controlled on our properties less they spread. And so, I will endeavor to look at and report back to Councillor Nason on the noxious weed issue and what different or more enhancements there has been made to that program, and Madam Speaker, knowing that this is likely going to be a little video beam at the end because Councillor Nason, Madam Speaker, oftentimes just records me and puts me up for everyone to see, I want it really noted for the record that he will get his information on noxious weeds through an email, because he likes to Tweet oftentimes after women respond to his questions so, Madam Speaker, I'd just like to...

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, that I believe is out of order.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason.

Councillor Rollins: You can go ahead and rule, Madam Speaker, on the Point of Order he said.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins, do you wish to retract your statement or?

Councillor Rollins: No, Madam Speaker, because I was clarifying how Councillor Nason, through you, Madam Speaker, would obtain the information on noxious weeds he's asking and just making a point that it wouldn't be through Twitter, that it would be through email.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further questions, Councillor Nason, any more?

Councillor Nason: Yes, Madam Speaker, and it's involving the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service and equipment being used at St. Boniface Hospital for a COVID-19 patient. I'm wondering if an investigation has been concluded and what the outcome of that was?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins?

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I first want to stand and really express all my condolences to those Winnipeggers and Manitobans and Canadians that have lost loved ones due to the pandemic. It's very serious for families across the country and around the world that have been in mourning and really struggled with loved ones in the hospital and not being able to see them in really their dying moments, Madam Speaker. So I really want to, you know, frame the Councillor's question in that way, Madam Speaker. It is not up to me to provide answers on what might be an investigation, Madam Speaker, but I will say this. There is no one who will not have a tear in their eye when there are flyovers in hospitals across the country. There is no one that doesn't want to cheer on our First Responders; and there is no one who doesn't feel heartfelt sentiment at the sounds that the sirens have been making across as our Fire Fighters and Paramedics have been driving by hospitals to show their support, not only for our First Responders, and the medical officials in those hospitals, but also for the patients that are alone, not able to see their families. So I will endeavour to

report when there is something to report that is publicly available from an investigation, but it isn't mine to do today, that's for Chief Lane.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move forward. The next is the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. We have Councillor Allard, the Chair, with us remote and it's the report dated February 4th, 2020.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED FEBRUARY 4, 2020

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you very much. So, I understand that with the…normally, I'd take the opportunity to speak in French. I understand some of my colleagues may not have the benefit of interpretation who are joining remotely, so I'll be speaking in French and English, and I'll try to keep…I'll try to get the information in both languages.

So on the traffic calming initiatives, this is a...this is a great report in my opinion...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, if we could just move consent at this time and then we'll come back to introductions.

Councillor Allard: Oh, right, I'll move consent, that's right, sorry, my apologies. I move consent agenda.

Madam Speaker: Does anyone who wishes to stand down the item? Yes, Councillor Lukes and Councillor Eadie. Madam Clerk, Item 1.

Item 2 – Traffic Calming Initiatives

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard, your opportunity to introduce Item No. 1.

Councillor Allard: Yes, so I think this is a great report of our public service. We had a traffic calming policy that I think was mostly…needed time to be looked at. We had a situation where the one...the one type of traffic calming initiative that could be considered by a neighborhood was speed humps on streets, and in those cases, you can see the numbers in the report. Basically there were a whole lot of petitions happening. Many of them did not meet the threshold of 70%, but many of them did, and of those who…that met the criteria for installation of speed humps, many of those did not meet the Public Works criteria. So this report not only cleans up that part of it by having a specific process to consider traffic calming initiatives, which you can see in the report, it's a step-by-step process, and it also adds a whole new suite of tools to traffic calming based on best practices in other jurisdictions. So if we do pass this report today, city council and our public service will have a set of new tools to address concerns from residents regarding traffic calming. And I can say, on a political level, you know, I think the '14 election was…it was about accountability and fixing our roads. When I knocked on doors in '18, I found that traffic was definitely a very important issue and probably in the top...you know, I think it's the second issue I heard when I was knocking on doors. Roads are still there, but people are also concerned about speeds on their streets, and perhaps that's…you know, perhaps that's something you hear more on arterial roads than local streets, but certainly it's something I think that's growing. More and more people want to see more action on these types of issues, and this report will give more flexibility and more options to our public service, Council and Winnipeggers.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: So briefly in French, I would like to make note that I believe the report is excellent work done by the public service. It's a report that suggest how to go forward with vehicular initiatives. I think that it's an excellent report because it clarifies the process, it shows that there is communication with the residents and the Public Works Department in regards to the initiatives for traffic calming. It will also offer a totally new…totally new tools to Council and Winnipeggers for traffic calming. Finally, I would like to end my remarks by saying that I believe it's a concern that's becoming more and more important for Winnipeggers. I know that in the last election when I was going door-to-door, people frequently addressed the question of how can we calm the traffic situation on their roads and there wasn't much of an answer that people could ask for to make a (inaudible) installation and with politics we had lots of petitions even when there wasn't 70% support. Frequently, the Public Works Department determined that intervention was not recommended. So I think it's a report that is going forward with the concerns about traffic calming and I believe it will be well received if it's approved by Winnipeggers.

Councillor Allard: So with that, I'll close my remarks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Next, we'll hear from Councillor Lukes, followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. So I would just like to virtually rise and speak to this report. I'm challenged in two directions on this report. I am supportive because the actions will bring Winnipeg into the 21st century when it comes to many traffic calming initiatives. There's many new approaches to traffic calming, approaches that many cities throughout the world are using to calm traffic. I'm very appreciative of the department's work on this, the many conversations we've had and understanding there's still a lot of work to do. Over the years, prior and since being elected, I've had the opportunity to work with the Public Works Department on making streets safer for the vulnerable road user; for pedestrians and cyclists. I've had the opportunity to pilot a variety of traffic calming initiatives, and it's been an incredible learning experience. One of the things that I've learned is traffic calming is a very labour intensive and time consuming and very expensive investment…expenditure. From years gone by, many of Winnipeg's streets were designed in an era where the vehicle was at the top of the transportation pyramid and so now we're retrofitting and traffic calming many of these streets and expenses are being incurred. But even today, in the new ward of Waverley West, many of our streets are still being designed in a manner that do not encourage traffic calming, and then, once built, brand-new, have to be studied and have traffic calming infrastructure applied costing hundreds of thousands of dollars. Like Councillor Allard noted during his last door knocking elections spree, speed is an issue. In my almost two decades of working on active transportation initiatives, I've never heard more public outcry than I have in the last few years in my ward but city-wide to have traffic calming on our residential streets. So while this report is good, I'm very appreciative of it, it does cause frustration because a simpler and much more cost-effective method to applying traffic calming is to simply lower the speed limit on residential streets. Of course, there would be some initial investment for signage, but overall, not anywhere near the cost that it is going to be to implement many, many different pieces of traffic calming infrastructure. Cities all over the world are lowering speed limits on residential streets. It's astounding the amount of money I've had to put in to…that taxpayers have had to put into brand new streets in Waverley West to try and calm the traffic. I long for a time that we have the leadership here in Winnipeg to move forward on lowering residential speed limits and really, really getting a handle on traffic calming. In the meantime, I will be supporting this report and grimacing on the hundreds of thousands of dollars that will be spent for many different pieces of traffic calming infrastructure. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to say, like the previous speaker, madam...or like the previous councillor, I, too, am somewhat caught in two directions, but I will support this report and the appendix which lays out a process, which I think is very important, Madam Speaker. There's going to be a lot of problems with this. You know, there's problems with what we do and what we've done in the past. There'll be problems with what we're going to do into the future, so that's why I support it, and they're going to...Public Works will spend a fair bit of time to consider the process, but Madam Speaker...and I think they're doing it now. I can't say because, of course, councillors aren't making decisions. We don't actually do the study. We have our administration do the studies. And one of the things that I think is very difficult to communicate in which many of the accusations of speeding...of people speeding on the local roads in Mynarski are impressions of people who can't really tell how fast the vehicle is moving, and most of the studies that get done, Madam Speaker, in terms of the speed study, yeah, there's a couple of...and usually, you know, depending on how far or who's coming from high school with their hot car, you know, you'll get the odd speeder, absolutely. You'll get the odd person who disrespects and doesn't understand that it's a privilege to drive a motor vehicle, not a right. It's not a right to violate traffic rules, but you know, the odd time. But generally, for the most part, they're going to look at different…when you look at it, it's the 80th percentile or whatever, look at it in usually the test phase. And then you find out that the average speed is, you know, not that close to 50, it's actually closer to 40, and people have an impression it's fast. But in terms of communication, so I've had streets that are being renewed. So in our old neighborhoods, as Councillor Lukes has referred to about the building of streets and how they were built and wider cars or whatever, although it's nice to have a wider street where you can accommodate a bike lane...that's usually helpful...but, Madam Speaker, the...there isn't a communication between a local renewal and studies that have been done. So one of the items they talk about here is street narrowing, and you can narrow it, say as at an approaching intersection, which is a great idea, but I don't…I can't stay on top of everything, and so you recommend a local road to get renewed, it gets renewed, and then all of a sudden you're too late to say, well, you just reconstructed this street, and you'll know this street, Madam Speaker, that would be Hartford from the railway tracks to McGregor, and Hartford from the railway tracks to Sinclair, of course, is in your ward. And technically, the condition of the street dictates how fast people are driving. Our streets, Madam Speaker, are so bad that nobody's actually speeding. They're not speeding because there's…I guess you could call them natural decayed speed bumps. It's called potholes all over the place. But I digress. I just wanted to say I hope that through this process and communication, local road renewal, these kind of considerations where we've had traffic issues. So if we're reconstructing a street, it's great to be able to say narrow it at an intersection so, you know, to cause those drivers to think and slow down, and I think that's important. Oops, sorry Madam Speaker, too much technology. The...anyway, my problem is going to be this: the issue is that we have a…we have this with

secondary plans for neighborhoods. Secondary plans are a great thing, Madam Speaker, but if you're doing a community study, and this city is spread out pretty wide, there's already controversy in which neighborhood because how much money do you have for secondary plans? I would love my neighborhoods to have secondary plans so that when things move forward, there's guidelines to follow, and there isn't as much controversy, because you've got them. This'll be the same thing with...they talk about the community, if there's community traffic issues. Who's first, Madam Speaker? Who's first, because this is going to be a problem that they're going to have to work out, and I'm very concerned about it. When it comes to an individual local street, you know, I have people who want a speed bump on a street where nobody's actually speeding. Maybe somebody sped, one…somebody who doesn't care or follow the rules sped once, but for the most part, there is going to be somewhat of an issue. 25%, councillor, that's good. We'll work it out, but if they're looking at the study and considering it, I think that it's very important that the public consultations do happen, but we need to ensure that people who are making commentary are educated about...like, a stop sign is meant to manage traffic flow. It is not for managing speed, and so when we consult and when they go forward, they're going to have to do a lot...and us councillors are going to have to do a lot of explaining because a lot of people don't understand these things, and they demand to have them, but they don't know that that's not what's going to work. And then, they get angry at you, because they say oh…you say, well, yeah, but if you look at the traffic engineering manual that gets updated across Canada, these different speed controls and stuff, you'll note that it does say that a stop sign is not a speed control, it's a traffic flow control if you get streets with too much traffic happening and so on. So these things need to be understood. But I like the idea that Public Works is moving forward, as Councillor Lukes says, moving into the future and dealing with it. Anyway, and what's the…if you're going to set a speed limit, like, I don't know what to say, but it's very controversial. And if drivers...you know, the problem is this, Madam Speaker, and I'll conclude, right away. The biggest problem is, that you have drivers who decide that they don't have to follow the rules.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, that is the problem; drivers who decide not to follow the rules. And I'm not just going to blame drivers, Madam Speaker, there are cyclists who don't follow the rules of the road, and they cause problems for everybody, as well. I want to make sure that pedestrians, of which I am, but, you know, I've driven...I've been in cars, and I do have a tandem bike, and I know there's a lot of drivers out there who are really bad. But, you know, the problem is everybody needs to follow the rules and do things appropriately. Don't keep your head down when you're crossing a street, keep looking both ways. As I always said to my kids, stop, look, and listen...and listen. Stop, look, and listen. Pay attention when you're travelling on the streets, especially when you get to those busy, faster streets. Be careful, and I'll just conclude by saying drivers, follow the rules. It's not a privilege…or it's not a right, it's a privilege, and, you know, it's very annoying. The Police Service can't be at every street on every block in this spread out city. I don't know how many streets there are, but if you go online, you'll be able to find how many kilometres of local and regional streets we have in this city and it's a lot because we're spread way out. Thank you Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Rollins: I just rise really quickly to, Madam Speaker, to reiterate the cost-benefit analysis here that seems pretty simple to this councillor, former school board chair and school trustee, that 30 kilometres is just a real cheap alternative, but given some of the discussion that went on in Council back in 2002, it was really interesting read for me this report on discussion, debate and procedures related to speed humps. I just want to acknowledge the budgetary reality that need not be if we just reduce speeds on the road, but I will be supporting the very good work that is contained here in this report, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be definitely supporting this one. It's part of a larger package of issues that we have to deal with as we, I believe society, and people in general are looking at ways of looking at alternative transportation models rather than the dominant car model. But I just wanted to respond to a few comments regarding…this is really a critical part of the puzzle for two folds; one is, if Council decides to lower the speed limit, bottom line is, people drive to the road that is built. So that is our main concern. We can arbitrarily say we should have it at 10 kilometres, 30 kilometres, whatever, but the problem is we're going to have to do some road modifications if we don't want to have people driving at those speeds. It's just the way it has to happen. People drive to…Councillor Eadie's point, people drive to the road conditions. Councillor Lukes is facing this right now where she has large open stretches of roads that are empty, so therefore since there's less cars there, people drive super fast. That's why you drive to the conditions of the road you're given. Wider roads, less cars will mean cars, regardless of the speed limits we put up, are going to go that fast. So to arbitrarily say we're going to change the speed limit and everybody is going to be happy and kumbaya, I would love that to be so. I have had some very robust arguments and discussions with certain people in my community who are very keen on lowering speed limits, and I asked them the question, well, if we lower the speed limits to whatever, how do you know the cars will go that fast, you know, because the road is still the road. We're already

having problems right now in the River Heights Ward with these long linear roads, why will cars slow down? Because we told them to? Well, you know, there's been some good arguments saying, well at least it's something. I go, absolutely, I agree with that But again, the question is, I think to make it, you know, fair, more appropriate...I'm not sure how we're going to do this, because as Councillor Eadie pointed out, we have a lot of roads. How are we going to be…we can't modify every street. I've seen some neat ideas of planter boxes being put at the corners, huge operational issues on doing that, I've looked at that one. Bump outs, curb bump outs, pinching, a whole bunch of ideas. Again, so this allows this opportunity to bring some of these ideas with neighborhood consent to come forward. So I think this is really a long-term plan going forward, but again, the simple solution of just putting up a speed limit that's way below what the street is built for, I believe that's disingenuous and I actually do believe it's fairly dangerous. If people believe that cars are only going 30, but the road…they're actually going 50 a lot, I say that's dangerous and I'm concerned about that even though I'd love for everybody to be following the rules and the laws, it's just the fact of the matter is there is the reality of traffic engineering and so we have to be very careful on when we do these kinds of things. But this model here that's being presented by Councillor Allard's committee is a very good step, one piece of the puzzle. And I do believe it will help myself and my neighbourhood to be able to support lowering the speed limit because we also have these negatives in place. So I will be supporting it. I do wish people could slow down, especially in these residential streets, but until we actually get into some road modification work, that is just my hope. But again, if I'm going to be going telling schools and playgrounds, and everything, don't worry about it, everybody's going to go 30 now, again, unless I see some road modifications, I'm going to have a hard time saying that. So we're going to have to look at that going forward. So this is again, speed limits, safe streets, street modifications in the new builds, traffic calming measures, it isn't a simple one-shoe-fits-all kind of model. We have to have many different facets to it, but it is a serious issue that Winnipeg is facing. We've seen it through the recent time of how people can really enjoy our streets, they're not just for cars, but we also know that we need to move people around. So finding that balance will be interesting, and I'm pretty excited about it…journey for this council in the next couple of years, but at this point, I think this is a great piece of that puzzle, so I'll be supporting it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Orlikow. Any other speakers? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I'll be very brief. I just want to thank Councillor Allard for his stewardship, pretty passionate views around traffic calming measures throughout our city. There's some pretty mobilized advocacy groups that I know spend a lot of time and a lot of time on social media and elsewhere lobbying members of Council, and I want to thank them for their advocacy. I want to thank everybody for the engagement on this. But most notably, I want to thank our committee chair and members of Council for the collaborative manner in which this has proceeded, and I echo Councillor Orlikow's comments, there is much more work to do proceeding or in the coming months and years. But I do obviously think that adopting new processes for triaging, for analysing and implementing requests for traffic calming measures is entirely appropriate at this stage, so I just wanted to say I'll be obviously supporting this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. And with that, Councillor Allard, to close on the item.

Councillor Allard: Yes. Thanks to my colleagues for their interactions. I'll try to respond to a few things that I've heard. Councillor Lukes, in terms of this being an either-or of traffic calming or speeds, I think that's the wrong way of seeing it, considering we have the residential speed report coming probably…maybe this month, probably next month, so that will be a report that we can debate as a council. And you know, I don't believe that is a one-size-fits-all solution. Heard from subject matter experts that you…if you do reduce the speed limit, you get...you get somewhat of a reduction in terms of speed with drivers, but the reality is that engineering's also important, and the way the street is built will inform the way that drivers use that street. And I mean, I'm just going to…Councillor Lukes, you were a little critical, I think, of this report. You were talking about the money has to be spent on retrofitting roads after the fact. I…you know, we both sit on the Planning, Property and Development Committee. I would be pleased to co-author a motion with you, Councillor Lukes, to...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, I'd just like to remind that the comments will still come through the Chair. If you could address the councillors through the Chair, thank you.

Councillor Allard: Different format, but good reminder, thank you. So Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Lukes, if you are interested in pursuing new standards for road construction for private developments, perhaps we can team up and we can use your network. I know you've got some significant connections in the developer community. Perhaps you and I can team up, and we can come up with a motion to look at that...at those constructions when the developments are getting built because I think that's also a matter of debate...or a matter where we could do some more work, and so I mean, I think we're doing tremendous work on road safety. We have $2.5 million for road safety initiatives, which was…which is a prior authorization. Those reports are coming up. We have the speed...residential speed report. That report's coming up. We have this report on traffic calming, and so those are just some of the reports that are coming through the system, and so I think councillors, Winnipeggers are asking for more in terms of road safety

and traffic calming and livable communities and I think we are delivering. This is one of many reports, but I mean, in terms of other priorities, you know, please support this report for what it is, which is a report on traffic calming. And yes, there are other issues. Yes, we could build roads differently, but that involves development agreement parameters and specifications with our development community. There would be a lot of work to be done there. There's a debate to be had on residential speeds. We're going to have that debate There will be reports coming up with how to use that $2.5 million in road safety. So please consider this report, and the big picture is being handled by a number of other motions that are working their way through the system. So this is just the…this is the beginning and there are other reports coming. So thanks for those interventions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. With that, I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Allard, on the next report dated April 21st, 2020, under the committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED APRIL 21, 2020

Councillor Allard: So I'd like to move the consent agenda, but I understand some of my colleagues may want to pull some items.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Allard has moved Item 1 through 4. Councillor Gillingham? 2 has been pulled. No other items have been pulled, so we'll call the question on Item 1, 3, and 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk, Item 2.

Item 2 – Council Initiated Local Improvement – Asphaltic Concrete Lane Pavement

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard, to introduce the item.

Councillor Allard: Yes. I'll be supporting this report, and I'll wait to hear from my colleagues in terms of their statements…their comments on this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to rise today to say, certainly, I'll be supporting this report. It has to do with back lanes in St. James that have had needed significant work for the last several years. In fact going back, I know that the councillor previous to me in St. James dealt with the issues of these back lanes that are in the report before us. The councillor previous to him dealt with the issues related to…to these back lanes, so there's a long history with need for these back lanes to have a permanent solution. I do want to express my appreciation to the members of Council who were before me that were here when the local improvement program for gravel back lanes was put in place, and I know that several councillors...certainly, Councillor Mayes has championed this consistently, the gravel back lanes, and so we are going to hopefully take advantage of this local improvement program. Back in 2018, Council extended for an additional six years the pilot project whereby the City of Winnipeg finances asphalt lane paving local improvements to a maximum of 50% of the total improvement. And so this is an opportunity for residents to get significant service level improvement to their back lanes at…really at half the cost. And so I do ask my council colleagues to support this...this motion, and I do again want to express appreciation to those who had the foresight to put a program like this in place.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Madam Speaker. My photo in the newspaper running and praise from another councillor for work on gravel back lanes, maybe it is time to retire, I don't know. Maybe it won't get better than that. This is a good program. It is beginning to wind down now, but it has been a tremendous success. I want to thank Jim Berezowsky who was, I think, the author of this before he was Director of Public Works and Councillor Wyatt and Vandal both helped get this going along with me in November or October of 2013. It certainly has been a big success. Councillor Allard has been another great champion over the years. And many lanes…this is people voting, this is people putting money in toward a specific infrastructure improvement in their own neighborhood, so the vast majority of the work has been in the Riel Community Committee. So I'm very pleased to see another one coming along here. I don't think we've done another one in St. James yet, maybe one. Certainly some I think in councillor…I think three of them in Councillor Rollins' ward, I think three in the border of Councillor Schreyer and Councillor Browaty's ward. But very pleased to see Councillor

Gillingham pushing this forward, and we'll have a few more of these, I think, before the program finally winds down. But it is…thanks for the kind words from Councillor Gillingham. It has been a great success. The asphaltic program, as Councillor Allard has trained me to say. And it's hopefully something, maybe in future budgets we can revisit and see if we can keep the funding going.

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

Councillor Allard: Thanks. Excellent comments by my colleagues. I would point out that the asphaltic back lane upgrade program is a fantastic deal for residents, as Councillor Gillingham has pointed out, but I do want to point out that it's actually an even better deal for the resident because the City covers the drainage portion of the upgrade, so it's actually more than half that the City puts forward. But you know, what other program do we see so much in terms of private dollars leveraging our infrastructure? I can't think of any program in Winnipeg that's as good for our infrastructure as the asphaltic back lane upgrade program. So it's an excellent program. Congratulations to Councillor Gillingham on moving it forward in his ward. And yeah, hope to see this move forward. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. With that, I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Allard? Councillor Klein, followed by Councillor Lukes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair, the Chair reached out to me the day that they were announcing the additional of new Active Transportation routes. These were the streets that were being blocked off, and I thank the Chair for that. One of the roads that was indicated in Westwood was the Assiniboine road, that was going to be used for an ATR. I did ask that the Chair to give me a day to speak with residents and I could notify them, make some phone calls and make sure I hear their concerns and their feelings. I emailed the Chair back the next day, that there was some concerns raised by many of those that lived on the street and they weren't safety concerns of too many people walking on the street that you would think would be more along the lines of personal choice, they were safety concerns because we really haven't reminded people the proper way to walk on a road, like you walk towards traffic, they're walking all around. We've seen instances there, last night, families or bikes are taking up the entire road and a bus slowly behind them until they got to their destination. It is a major feeder road for transit and I had mentioned in my discussions to the Chair that we were concerned, because there are 13, no less than 13 bus stops along Assiniboine Road between Bedson and Westwood. That also limits access to a very major feeder road, Rouge Road; and I sent that off. We had a conversation via email, he quickly replied, again, I thank the Chair for that. He took the issues to the Public Service…

Madam Speaker: Your question, Councillor Klein?

Councillor Klein: …Almost, yeah, trying to give him the picture, so we all remember. Took it to the Public Service and came back saying that he didn't feel, the Public Service felt there was going to be no issue and that Transit didn't see a problem. Yesterday, the barricades went up and we immediately had problems. A 60-foot bus wasn't able to turn on to the street, so the bus stayed there for, I think it was 25 minutes, a Supervisor had to arrive, they didn't know about the barricade so the bus waited there. It's always a 60-foot bus because it is a very busy route and now neighbours, of course, are complaining because they, you know, they're worried for kids, they're worried for everybody, because they do park along the street, so you basically have one lane. So my question, because apparently Transit didn't know or they didn't get the memo, my question would be to the Chair is asking him if he would partner with me in the next 24 hours to work with Public Service to select a less-intrusive route so that we can protect people's safety along there while also respecting a route that can be used for Active Transportation during this time?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: I'm happy to offline with Councillor Klein. I had heard about the bus. I did send that to the Public Service for consideration and response. Yeah, so I'm happy to keep talking to Councillor Klein. My understanding from the Public Service is that every one of these holiday cycle routes had to be looked at a little bit differently and that there would be an implementation that considered local conditions. So I'm happy to look into that further with Councillor Klein, and we can see where it goes with the Public Service.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question?

Councillor Klein: Through you, Madam Chair to the Chair of Infrastructure. Thank you, I appreciate that, I look forward to having that discussion and I'm wondering if in the future the Chair can work towards implementing more of a collaborative approach when certain lanes may be selected to be cut off, so that we can make sure that the Councillors have an opportunity to go and get the engagements so this could all be considered with a little more time to think it out, to reason it out? I realize that they were acting quickly in responding to calls, so I'm hoping that we could, the Chair could look at a way to implement more direct contact with the area Councillors?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: I mean, I reached out to Councillor Klein immediately. Councillor Klein, I'm not sure how much more collaborative I could have been, given that I contacted you immediately. I indicated to you I was going to work with you if you had any concerns, questions, concerns. I addressed your question regarding what I had heard from the Public Service. You know, I'm not quite sure how much more collaborative I could've been in this instance. If Councillor Klein could indicate that at some point either offline or in another question, I'd be happy to hear how we could be more collaborative, especially in a situation where with COVID-19 there are limitations, in terms of how we can do public engagement these days.

Councillor Klein: Through you, Madam Chair, thank you. That's a wonderful offer and I do acknowledge that he notified me immediately. The unfortunate part was the [inaudible]. My question is more, could we work towards, or could the Chair work towards having a 48-hour notice so that we can have these discussions?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: I don't really understand the question on terms of 48-hour notice. I communicated with Councillor Klein immediately, the information I had from the Public Service. If Councillor Klein has issue with you know, decisions made by the Public Service, that's getting into outside of my jurisdiction. I'm not the CAO, I'm the Chair of the Standing Committee of Public Works and Councillor Klein has access to the CAO line and can email directors in the same manner in which I do and I would encourage him to keep doing that. I communicated with Councillor Klein immediately, I hadn't heard anything from Councillor Klein since the original communication, so I'm not really sure what he is suggesting in terms of notice for collaboration given that I believe Councillor Klein had access to all of the information regarding this holiday bike route in his ward, as I did.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question is from Councillor Lukes. Councillor Lukes, if you can unmute, and we'll get to Councillor Nason following that. Councillor Lukes, did you have your hand up?

Councillor Lukes: I did. Can you hear me?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Lukes: Okay. This is a question through you, Madam Speaker, to Councillor Allard. It's more of a "did you know". Did you know, Councillor Allard, that there is a new development in Waverley West called Waverley West B and that the developer has come forward and we're in discussions on innovative approaches to designing a street that will traffic calm? So we actually have this sort of pilot that we're discussing going on right now. So I am acutely aware that there's not one solution to fix all for traffic calming. But I just wanted you to know, that we are looking at what we can do with the streets before they're being built, because that is obviously engineering a street and how it's designed is a huge component of traffic calming, so it's a "did you know".

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: I did not know. Thank you, for the update Councillor Lukes, and I hope and I think I will have a partner in Councillor, or Madam Speaker, in Councillor Lukes with moving this idea forward. The pilot is great. What I've heard from folks in departments and the public is that, a city-wide approach would be interesting. I understand that there could be work done in terms of defining what a street is, you know, what it should look like, how it should be built, and I don't think we've ever had that discussion in a really thorough way as a Council, so I commend Councillor Lukes for her work with building a traffic calm street in her ward. I think, if we could escalate that and have a Council discussion on whatever learnings are happening there and what should a street look like? I know that in my ward, in Windsor Park, for example, you have many streets where many people use Active Transportation and Transit that don't even have sidewalks and I wonder about that and I wonder about the safety of that and these are on roads that are 50 kilometers an hour. And so I think it's great to do a pilot in Councillor Lukes' ward, and I think we also need to have this discussion and have it as a, you know, as a Council and city-wide and I'm not aware of a motion having come to Council to look at how we build streets in Winnipeg, but if Councillor Lukes is interested, I would be interested in working with Councillor

Lukes on that and we both have the benefit of sitting on the P&D Committee where this question would likely be entertained, and so, I look forward to these discussions and let's see what we can get done.

Councillor Lukes: Perfect.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason?

Councillor Nason: Oh, was Councillor Lukes done? I think that was two questions? Okay. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you, you know. I worry, we've heard so much from the ATU and from Transit officials in the lens of regular transit service and the 70-plus per cent of drop in service, but those that rely on Transit Plus seem to not be getting much in the way of, you know, attention to some of the challenges they may be facing as part of COVID-19. I'm wondering if the Chair, you know, if he's not able to right now, if he'd be able to provide a written up [inaudible] within the next 48 hours specific to, to what impacts COVID-19 has had on the service availability of the Transit Plus service?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: I mean, thank you, Madam Speaker, to Councillor Nason, I can do better than 48 hours. I can write an email today to the CAO line and ask that question on your behalf, but Councillor Nason, you have access to that same email line as I do. I'm happy to do it on your behalf, but you know, that information can easily be asked from our Public Service, but I'm happy to do it on your behalf.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason, is there a second question?

Councillor Nason: Yeah, through you, Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if the Chair can inform Council specific to our one that he's most familiar with and that's our designated construction zone at Fermor and Lagimodière, if as part of the 2020 construction season, we'll see a better focus on signage, be it the electronic digital signs to avoid some of this needless perception of speed entrapment that we've been seeing over the past 6-plus months?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: So we just approved the Construction Manual; we all voted for it, I believe it was unanimous. If Councillor Nason would like to see changes in how construction is staged in Winnipeg, I'd be happy to have those conversations, perhaps a council motion. Councillor Nason indicated previous it's hard to move motions because community committee is not going on; however, you know that is rebooting and I'd be happy to entertain a motion from Councillor Nason if he wants to see a change in how we are doing things.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions, Councillor Nason? No. Seeing none, we'll move to Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. Madam Speaker, this is just simply "did you know". I had heard a comment from the Chairperson, who I think is doing a great job, and I've lived in Windsor Park, Madam Speaker, in the past, many years ago. Many of those streets are not designed to get up to 50 actually, because they wind around and you got to pay attention and I think that's great. But I'm wondering, Madam Speaker, if Councillor Allard remembers the need to put in a sidewalk by École Howden, so that people weren't out on the street because schools, of course, there's lots of motor vehicle traffic? So I was just wondering if he remembers that one?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: I do. Thanks for the question, Councillor Eadie. That was actually one of the first things I got to do as a Councillor. The original École Howden sidewalk had been a proposal had been met by the then Councillor with a petition, I understand, to be in the thousands, or perhaps in the, or anyway, there was a significant amount of opposition to building a sidewalk on a street where children were walking on the street because they had no sidewalk and that was like a daily occurrence, and when Public Works asked me what my feedback was as the area Councillor, I asked them to proceed immediately because I understood, you know, the support that there had been from organizations and unfortunately it looks like there had been a petition that had gotten out of control and so that's why it had not been proceeded with originally. But I was happy to, as one of my first acts, as an elected official to give the green light, as the local rep, to get that built and it has been built and well used by students who no longer have to walk on the street on their way to school.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And that concludes our question period under this committee. It is time for lunch recess now, and we shall now take a break and reconvene at 1:30. That's the desire? 1:30. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
May 6, 2020, at 1:36 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I'd like to reconvene our Council meeting of May 6th, 2020. We are on the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. We will now have question period for our Chair, for Councillor Gillingham. Any questions for Councillor Gillingham? Councillor Klein.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a question regarding the budget issue that we're facing right now. We have been, you know, we've heard some calculations and I appreciate the rough estimates that with the current layoffs and some of the savings that have been seen like Transit, it will save roughly $1 million a month. But that still leave us possibly with a $5 million-a-month loss, and I had previously asked during some of our sessions and made the request through the CAO and the CFOs and such to, and through Transit and those meetings to receive a more detailed report week over week, and I saw that memo that went out, we talked about earlier that we were able to turn around week-by-week comparisons. I would ask that we see, if we can again, get that back on the table and all of Council receive a week-by-week revenue projection, what it was last year, what it is this year and so on, so we have a better picture of how Transit is coming along?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: Through you, Madam Speaker, I thank Councillor Klein for the question. I certainly will speak to our Corporate Finance team to see if that is possible week by week. I don't know if, for example, the Transit numbers are, can be, you know, all of them turned around that fast. But certainly, the information that we do receive on financial updates related to COVID-19 will be provided to Council, we will try to get it to Council on as a regular basis as possible, when the numbers are available. We do have the Standing Policy Committee on Finance where we have asked for regular reporting. I do realize that's a month at a time, so sometimes, it takes a while. We do continue with updates from our CAO, but certainly, when information is available, financial information related to COVID-19, I relay to our departments and make sure we try to get it to our Council colleagues.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you, I have recently found a job posting on LinkedIn for the City of Winnipeg and I understood that the City was given an immediate hiring freeze, and I'm just wondering if the Finance Chair could provide us information on the position? Is this just put out there? Are we actually away from the hiring freeze now, or are we back to hiring?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, thank you through you, thank Councillor Klein for the question. I would suggest that Councillor Klein direct his question to the CAO, if it's related to the hiring of Public Service staff.

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

Councillor Nason: Okay. Through you, Madam Chair, and I believe the Chair will recall, I was trying to secure a line of credit amounts. If you have a house and you go to the bank, you're looking for a line of credit, the bank will tell you, you know, generally what you're maximum amount of borrowing power is. I was trying to get from the Acting CFO what the City of Winnipeg's was, because there was a part of our presentation was a discussion of looking at doubling our line of credit from $75 million to $150 million. So I'm wondering if the Chair could inform Council, what is our credit ceiling for lines of credit at the City of Winnipeg?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, through you, I thank the Councillor, virtually for the question. The City's current line of credit is $75 million; we have not accessed that facility, we have not, there's no balance owing on our line of credit right now, but as the report that came to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance does indicate, and as Councillor Nason has indicated, one of the levers that may be pulled in dealing with COVID-19, would be to look at the

possibility of increasing the City's line of credit that would have to be made through an arrangement with our lender. And so, what we're looking at is the possibility of doubling that to $150 million line of credit. But currently, the City's line of credit is $75 million and we're not into the line of credit as this point.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Nason: (Inaudible)

Madam Speaker: Councillor, second question.

Councillor Nason: What is the total amount the City can borrow for a line of credit?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. Through you, $75 million. Currently.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Third question?

Councillor Nason: Yeah, last question. Has the Chair had a meeting virtually or over the phone, with Standard and Poor's, and Moody's to discuss budget 2020 as has been the practice in prior years of attending in New York?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: Through you, Madam Speaker, no.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Moving on to Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Yes, thank you very much, through you, Madam Chair. I'm just wondering if the Chair of Finance could give us an update on any discussions he's had with the Province, if he's involved with any provincial financial discussions or is that only the Mayor who's involved with provincial financial discussions?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. Through you, Madam Speaker, the Mayor is the intergovernmental lead, so any discussions related to provincial funding to the City of Winnipeg officially is through the Mayor's Office.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Is there a second question, Councillor Lukes? No? Seeing none, any further questions? Thank you. That brings our question period to a close.

Next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. We'll hear from Councillor Gilroy remotely on the report dated April 23rd, 2020.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT DATED APRIL 23, 2020

Councillor Gilroy: Move adoption of consent agenda.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Mayes, you wish to stand down Item 1? Hearing that, I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Award of Contract for Jefferson East Combined Sewer Relief – Contract 5 – Semple Trunk Sewer

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

Councillor Gilroy: I'll wait to hear from my council colleagues.

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

Councillor Mayes: I thought maybe Councillor Gilroy would just give my presentation because she's heard it a couple of times now, but I'll try and be brief. I support the report, I don't want to delay it further. I know that's been a concern of Councillor Eadie's. You know, the Mayor said at the…when the last budget concluded, the most recent budget, he was pleased…part of the reason he was pleased was he'd never have to listen to Councillor Mayes talk about the 500 metre rule again after six years of listening to that, so I need a new hobby, basically. So I'm onto the green infrastructure issue which is indirectly part of this, or its absence is what's notable here. As you'll remember Madam Speaker, we, as a city, are obliged to do combined sewer relief. It's a condition the Province's regulator imposes on us. We had to give a preliminary proposal by 2015; tons of work done by our staff, four different options given. The Province, to its credit, Minister Squires at that point, then Minister Squires said yes, do the least expensive, but do it more quickly than you're proposing it, do it over 27 years, not 40. So it's over $1 billion price tag in its original estimate, now almost $2 billion, the combined sewer work, but within that…within that…all in the pre-1960 neighborhoods of the city, so none of this into Councillor Lukes' ward, none into Councillor Chambers' ward, almost none in my ward, but $2 billion worth of work. In that 2015 proposal, there was a passage at page 234, "A green infrastructure approach must await a public policy decision rather than be based on a technical or economic evaluation." The Province said, hey some of your proposal has to have a green infrastructure element, and so in 2015, we said a green infrastructure approach must await a public policy decision. You'll, of course, remember the exciting debate we had about green infrastructure and Councillor Gillingham and Klein together composing a poem about the delights of bio-swales...actually, you don't remember that because we never had that debate about green infrastructure. There was never a public policy decision made. Our staff, facing a deadline of August 2019, put in a 10% figure. So 10% of the over billion, easy math, $104 million in green infrastructure over the next 23 years roughly. So while it was said in 2015 it must await a public policy decision rather than be based on a technical or economic evaluation, my submission would be it's a very technical evaluation. We took 10%. Now is that right? Is that low? Is that high? I don't know. We should be debating that. So it's an exciting opportunity. I'm not against it. I'd probably rather see more of this green infrastructure spending. I don't even really know what a bio-swale is, but I know we're committing $104 million to things like green back alleys and to bio-swales and rain gardens. Save our Seine did a very good rain garden project in my ward. So I really do want to get on with that debate. You'll see this, the two biggest combined sewer districts, as you'll remember, Madam Speaker, there are 54 in the city in various different configurations. The biggest one, the one heading for the most work, is in Councillor Eadie's ward, it is Jefferson east. Councillor Gillingham with Riverbend, I think, is in that number two. Over $17 million to come on combined sewer works in Jefferson east. Terrific, but 10% of it's supposed to be green infrastructure. Actually, 152 million, sorry, this is 17 million. So there's to me, $15 million worth of green infrastructure work in Jefferson east area. Here we go, we're onto sort of step number one here with 0% green infrastructure. So we need to get going on that. We need to have that debate. The staff have indicated there will be some sort of presentation to Councillor Gilroy's committee and I thank her and her committee members for asking for that report from staff, but it's not a bad news story. I think it's good we're going to be spending money on green infrastructure. Wish more of it was in my ward, frankly, but that's okay. It's going where the problem is, where the combined sewer issues are. It's just, we need to get our staff to present the facts to us. We need to have a debate. Maybe it should be more than 10%, but we need to get on top of this, because we're starting to approve projects, which is good, it's in the budget. We've got to spend over a billion on this in the next 20 years and we're picking up the pace. So I hate to repeat myself, and I am, but we do need to get this green infrastructure debate in front of Council and to get some more information and some priorities and make some decisions. That was the vision in 2015. I don't really know what happened, but I continue to agree with what the staff said in '15; it should await a public policy decision. So let's have that briefing, let's have that discussion. I'm all for it. Let's vote for this today. No problem at all, but I don't want to see less money going to Councillor Eadie or Councillor Gillingham's ward, I want to see more money going in as part of this green infrastructure initiative. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm rising, of course, to support the report, and I had a happy meal for lunch, so I won't be hangry. I'm glad that this is now moving on to a stage, I think everybody's comfortable with it now that they understand a lot more about this specific trunk project in the Jefferson east combined sewer area. And just around it are some smaller ones like the Newton, and actually they're all sort of combined together up in the north. In Councillor Browaty's ward, just on the other side of the river of Jefferson east, there's a combined sewer area in which the piping of the combined sewer comes underneath the river and heads its way over to the…what I like to call the north Winnipeg sewage plant because well, for example, all that sewage from North Kildonan's coming across the river into the north Winnipeg sewage plant. You know, I did a little more reading because…you know, Councillor Mayes, Madam Speaker, brings up some really good points about green infrastructure, and yeah, the Province talks about it. So the report, Madam Speaker, that was finally decided on on the Province, there was an evaluation done by some consultants for each CSO area, and in there, there's some discussion about green infrastructure. There's not a lot of detail, but there is discussion of it for each one, and then, there's also decisions as to whether or not to do anything in a particular combined sewer area or not because there are a number of the areas that have no projection to spend any money, hardly at all, if any, other than to update controls and stuff that people can't see. What I will say about Jefferson east, it goes all the way to McPhillips, from down Scotia all the way up to McPhillips, which is quite a distance, actually, as you

would know, Madam Speaker. And actually, Garden City is part of the Jefferson east combined sewer area, but there's not a lot of plans to do anything actually in Garden City as there is a lot of…I wouldn't say there's a lot, but there's open space there with school yards and different things that are not paved, and so when the land...when the water comes down in rain and stuff, there is a lot of places to soak it up. But when you get close to McPhillips, where you have commercial development, you have a lot of parking lots, and basically all the water is going right into the sewer. It's not being soaked up by the land. And so indicated in the Jefferson east area and the Jefferson west, because Jefferson west abuts it to the west, and along McPhillips, they talk about…and there are ideas, like green roofs, that absorb water, and you have some pretty big buildings there, like Super Store, Madam Speaker. You know, that's a pretty big building. If you can green that somehow and retain the water so it's not going down the parking lot and into the sewers, I think that's a good thing. There's a strip mall right across the street...anyway, I could go on and on. So there is opportunity, and they do talk about opportunity for green going into the future, but there's no specific recommendations because they're probably having to study it. One of the areas where they talk about a great possibility for green rooftops is actually Osborne Village, where you have huge amounts of density and you have a lot of roofs…rooftops, but you also have parking lots all over the place too, because you have a lot of density there, and so there's all that to deal with, Madam Speaker. So I'm going to conclude just by saying that Councillor Mayes does bring up a very good point in that, in that the green infrastructure. But if one went through those reports, which was made available to me, they would have seen and been able to read in the areas where…the combined sewer areas where they were talking about possibilities for green infrastructure, if they were going to do any kind of mitigation at all in terms of trying to keep the land water out of the combined in the sewage lines and...well, actually, I'm going to conclude one other thing. So there was a lot of sewer separation done east of Main in the area where I live in east Jefferson, and currently, it's a system that's ready to go to, like, a standalone land drainage. But at this point, it's just...it's a place to store the land drainage water, try to hold it back, and I invite anybody to ask Mr. Wardrop or whoever you need to ask, to get a hold of that report. It's like…it was 98 megabytes where it has the individual consultant reports on every one of the combined sewer levels. So I invite all of you, try to have a look at it, at least you can find out what's going on in your ward, and as Councillor Mayes said, there are some wards, they decided that combined sewers were not the thing to do for a long time. Back in the day, I know in West Kildonan where Jefferson east is, they used to have…they decided to go to combined sewers originally because it was cheaper than laying down two sets of pipes and all that kind of stuff and there was no place to build a retention pond anywhere because it was already built up, Madam Speaker. So anyway, I'll leave it at that, and I'm glad that this report will move on, and I thank the Chairperson for keeping me informed about the status on how things are going.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Pleased to see that this motion has come back to Council promptly. I did sympathize with Councillor Eadie's frustrations over this not being passed in the last Council meeting. My concern was just about process and precedent in terms of this being on the Council agenda before it could go through standing committee, so I just wanted it to go through standing committee, as it did, and it's all good. Pleased to see Councillor Mayes talking about the green plan and his concerns over of this, and to remind us about the issue of the 10% green fund that is meant to be combined with infrastructure projects such as this. So the issue is, as Councillor Mayes raises, how does the 10% green fund apply? And so that's what I'm looking forward to in terms of greater discussion and understanding here at City Hall in terms of how we apply that. Bear in mind, I just want to make the point, one could argue that in this case it would be $1.5 million related to this $17 million project for combined sewer in the Mynarski Ward. I'm not trying to detract from the issue of 10% green fund. Having said that, the reason we do combined sewer is for environmental reasons. That's the point. If there wasn't an environmental reason, we wouldn't be spending $17 million on combined sewer to relieve sewage going into the Red River…Red River and Lake Winnipeg. So I'm not trying to take the money away, but nonetheless, I think it's an important point to add to discussion given exactly what we're talking about today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein followed by Councillor Chambers and then Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. And Councillor Mayes had brought this up in his delivery about the poem Councillor Gillingham and I were working on. That was back when we both had longer hair. Bio-swale, bio-swale, bio-swale was the start. Oh never fail, sweet green infrastructure dollars rain into my ward. That's as far as we got. So thank you, thank you. I want to…I appreciate what Councillor Mayes presented. I certainly appreciate what Councillor Eadie and Councillor Schreyer has said. I believe, though, an issue and a project of this magnitude, there's a lot of moving parts and a lot of excitement about it. There's a lot of like minds on the Council right now about working towards a better, greener Winnipeg. I would like to ask...and I'm not sure if I do that through you, Madam Chair, or through you to the Chair of Water and Waste, that we schedule a Council seminar where we can get into that discussion and have a more robust discussion about that because I think that that's very important at this time with a project of such magnitude.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Councillor Chambers followed by Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Klein: Point of order.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Klein: Who do we ask for the Council seminar?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein, this was your opportunity to speak to the item. Question period is during question period or you can certainly ask questions offline. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this motion, this report. Again, the opportunity to send it back to the Standing Policy Committee for further discussion was the right thing to do. Councillor Mayes had called in on delegations that morning and spoke about the green infrastructure programs and the utility of having this project subject to those rules and having green infrastructure as part of the equation in terms of how we deal with wastewater. So again, I'm very happy that we had the full discussion with the public service. Water and Waste came…or, Water and Waste came in, both Moira Geer and Jeff Patton came in to discuss this project at length and provide us with an understanding of why it needs to happen and the selection of the contractor that's going to perform this work. So again, I'm in full support seeing that this will go forward in help mitigating how wastewater is diverted into the separation of the sewers and reducing the potential for untreated sewage to go into our precious Lake Winnipeg. Thank you.

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

Councillor Rollins: So we've seen cleaner air, Madam Speaker, we've seen returning nature. I myself heard owls back in my neighborhood last night, and I was very frustrated when this was not passed. I did not agree at sending it back…that it was the right thing to do. I was very concerned about the intervening time period and rise in support of it today again. My primary concern was combined sewer and basement flooding mitigation, and I didn't want to see any time elapse. I do believe though that the business that is most pertinent in addition to the significant short-term rescue measures that our administration has been doing during the pandemic is turning to the economy and the environment. And so, I want to build back better in Winnipeg and in keeping with many of the sentiments expressed here and through you, Madam Chair, I want to thank Councillor Mayes and other councillor colleagues, Councillor Eadie in particular, that we do have that generational opportunity to incorporate climate criteria into our plans, discuss green infrastructure, prioritize it moreover for our economy and our environment, and I will turn to Councillor Gilroy, Madam Speaker, to do just that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Councillor Lukes. Just have to…

Councillor Lukes: Yes, thank you very much. Thank you very much. I just wanted to reflect back at the point in time that we made that decision to lay this report over. We had not seen it before at all. We were entering a very uncertain period in time. We did not know what the next 20 days would bring with COVID and the financial implications. At that point in time, no one had an answer to the significance of if this project were delayed or not. Anyways, I'm glad to see that all those discussions and decisions were made and that we're moving forward on this report. So I will be supporting it. But I think that if we look back at the window in time, at that moment in time that we didn't know...you know, 20 million is a lot of money, and at that point in time there was uncertainty, and I want to thank everyone who did support laying it over, and now, we're moving forward. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Are there any further speakers on this item? Okay, seeing none, Councillor Gilroy to close.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. And I just…I think Councillor Eadie said it best when he actually came to our committee to talk about this project. This is about flood mitigation, and it also is about important infrastructure work that needs to be done in wards, and in a lot of our older neighborhoods were waiting for this important work to happen. There's been a lot of work that's already started that led to where we are with this project, and if we need to move forward, this project needs to happen. So I'm hoping that we can get the support of Council on this. I think it's a much needed project. And in terms of the green infrastructure part of it, I'd like to thank Councillor Mayes. He's been a real champion of green infrastructure, and we do need to move forward with it. There was a project that we heard of in January that went through our committee, and it was in Councillor Mayes' ward and it had to get moved to Councillor Orlikow's ward and at the time our committee heard about some of the challenges that we have here in the city with some of the green infrastructure projects. So we are having a report that's coming back next month that's going to be looking at this a little bit more and having kind of a...how we're going to move forward with it, and I think it's something that I'm hearing from all councillors that they're excited about and want to move forward with it. We just want to make sure. These projects cost a lot of money, so we want to make sure that we work within the context of Winnipeg.

If our soil isn't that great in one area, we have to find a place where we can do these projects that make sense, and that we're not putting…spending good money where it won't work. So I think it's really important that we wait for the report that's coming forward from our administration. And I want to thank Councillor Mayes because he really has been a champion on this issue and this is something that's important as we move forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gilroy. With that, I'll call the question on Item 1.

Councillor Nason: Recorded vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Item 1 passes. We will now have question period. Yes? We will now have question period under this committee. Councillor…any questions for Councillor Gilroy? Councillor Klein and then Councillor Eadie.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't this will come as any surprise. I'm wondering if the Chair of Water and Waste could have a conversation with the CAO to schedule a Council seminar, so we could have more robust discussion about the Green Infrastructure Plan?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy?

Councillor Gilroy: Well, I don't really set the schedule for Council seminars. I know that on at times at committee, we have asked through committee, and hopefully it gets supported through our administration. So I'm more than willing at committee, if the Councillor wants to bring forward a motion he can do that. I'm more than willing to look at that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thanks, Madam Speaker, I'm not expecting an answer right away, but in reviewing the CSO areas and, in actually trying to accomplish and try to figure out what's happening, as I explained, we have local road renewals and these…a lot of the roads can't be done until we look at the sewer separation and all that kind of thing, and one of the things that I discovered is that, the underground assets that have been changed or divided and stuff, it seems that it's not being updated that quickly and quite often will have individual case work for a specific house and we need to know what kind of underground infrastructure is there in order to help the residents make their things, and I'm wondering if the Chairperson could find out about if there is a, what length of time it takes to update the maps, so that when you put the sewage filter on, you're able to see what infrastructure is there, when it was changed, because some of those sewers are so old, they don't even know the age, but, if there…and find out if there are any problems that they're having, in terms of getting the updates, so that when we use our iView in our offices, our Executive Assistants can find out accurate information. So really, I'm just asking is Water and Waste having a trouble updating their portions of the iView mapping system?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy?

Councillor Gilroy: I want to thank Councillor Eadie for the question. I'll definitely forward that on to the administration. That's a very good question, just because we share the same [inaudible] neighbourhood, so I will definitely ask the question.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Next is Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. Just as the COVID-19 lockdown was taking hold, there was some serious discussions about the agreement with CUPE and the multi-family garbage pick-up in East Winnipeg. I'm wondering if, through you, Madam Chair or Madam Speaker, if the Chair can provide us an update on this matter?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy?

Councillor Gilroy: I would have to review that matter with our administration. I have not had an update on that. So if the Councillor would like, I can see where we're at with that and maybe chat with him after.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, through you, there's been a significant uptake as we all know in people using our trails and pathways. With that, comes an increase in garbage in the containers along those trails and parks. Is there extra attention being paid at the collection in these areas, if the Chair can update us on that?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy?

Councillor Gilroy: I want to thank Councillor Nason for the question. This is a challenge because I know we're all feeling it right now. Unfortunately, there's multiple different departments that pick-up the garbage, so I'm not sure if he's talking about parks staff picking up park garbage; or what we're getting the intake at Brady, but if he wants to offline with me, I can maybe try to find that information out. We might have to connect with the Parks Department as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Nason: Thank you for the response, Madam Speaker, through you, my last question, you know and again, it may be a confusing matter as to who's actually the person responsible, but it's related to garbage. Is there an opportunity to increase the receptacles that we have? Apparently, you can't increase the number, you can only relocate. So I'm trying to understand if there's an opportunity through the increased use, if there's additional opportunities for receptacles along these great popular routes?

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Councillor Gilroy?

Councillor Gilroy: That's a great question, Councillor Nason, and those are budgetary concerns. So that would be something that we would bring forward at budget time, because those are, you know, if we're going to add more receptacles, there's a cost to that, there's somebody picking that up, it has to another plan for it. So there is added costs, because I have done this myself into my own parks, looked at increasing garbage intake, so very good question, but yes, there is always a cost to that, so it'd have to be looked at.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next on to Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair, to the, or sorry. Thank you, Madam Chair, to, Madam Speaker to the Chair, now that the flood is, or the potential for flooding in Winnipeg is over, I'm wondering if the Chair could provide us with information on what the costs were to the City of Winnipeg for the homes that were diked as a result of high waters or potential high water event around their homes, and if that information is possible? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy?

Councillor Gilroy: I'm not sure if we have that information at this time. But I can ask the administration and follow up on that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the chair? Seeing none, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Innovation and Economic Development. We have no reports today, no motions, and no by-laws. We'll now have question period for our chair for Councillor Orlikow. Councillor Klein.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. Through you, to Madam Speaker, now we're all doing it. Madam Speaker, through you to Chair Orlikow. Can he provide Council with a report detailing the discussions and attendees of the Economic Development Working Group that he's been responsible for during the last six weeks? Because I think these matters are important to gain information on so that we're able to pivot and meet the needs of our business community.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow?

Councillor Orlikow: Well, thank you very much. I believe that the Councillor's referring to the Business Task Force. It had been mentioned before, and I appreciate all of your support for me leading the charge on this one, but I am not. This is actually through the Mayor's Office. I'm one of the members of, who sits on that, so I guess that question should really go to the Mayor's Office.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Any further questions for the Chair? Seeing none, next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Mayes on the report dated February 3rd, 2020.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED FEBRUARY 3, 2020

Councillor Mayes: I'll introduce item number...which we have only the one number, No. 8.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour?

Councillor Mayes: Well, yeah...somebody. I expect some people…

Madam Speaker: You've moved consent? Okay. So the question is, we would like that Item 8 stood down, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Sure, yes, please.

Madam Speaker: Madam Clerk to introduce the item...to name the item.

Item 8 – List of Historical Resources – Nomination of Somerset Building, 294 Portage Avenue

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is an interesting item, one where we had a 4-3 vote at EPC. Good evidence we don't always vote together as a block and I doubt we'll all vote the same way again today. It's important to look at what we have in front of us though in this structure, the Somerset Building. We often are told here to follow the staff recommendations. Here, we have a chance. I sometimes feel that we don't have enough leeway to make a vote individually. Here is one where we do. Everyone's a free agent who you can vote as you see fit. We're often told we have to use evidence-based criteria for a vote. That's a little harder on these heritage things. To some extent it's a matter of interpretation. It was said at EPC by one of the speakers, I think we take each building on its own merits, and there is certainly some truth in that, but I think that it's also important to take a look at the principles we've used in evaluating the different buildings over time. I want to thank Councillor Allard, in particular, for the amendment he moved at the original committee and again, I think, at EPC which was to say, let's leave out the interior elements, and let's just designate the north and west façades of this structure. So that's really what you have in front of you, is the compromise suggested by Councillor Allard in which I certainly voted in favour of at PHD Committee and again at EPC. So it's important to remember we don't vote for heritage status based on who owns or has owned a particular building. This is clearly owned by the Ledohowski's. No secret about that or one of their corporate entities. No one distrusts the Ledohowski's. It's not a vote on that. We recognize the importance of heritage that they have preserved at other structures like the Met. We appreciate the economic driver that comes from investment from the private sector. All of that is important, but we've heard arguments from building owners in the past about, well, this will impact me negatively, this will slow down my ability to do renovations or to resell the building, and we've said well, we'll try and work with you here, but we're going to designate some aspects of most buildings. And so that's really what you have here in front of you. You don't have to go with the original recommendation, but I would encourage you to seriously give consideration to the compromise developed by Councillor Allard. It's…think of the other buildings nearby. You heard the presentation this morning that it's a corner building in the SHED District. Well we have in…just in January, we designated the Singer Sewing Building, just down the street. It's at 424 Portage. They made…if you go back and look at the minutes, the Dresslers, who were smaller-scale capitalists than the Ledohowski's, but still people have invested. I know they've invested in heritage because they owned the building across from the building that I owned when we were both operating in Brandon on…in downtown…in heritage area. The Dresslers had a commitment. The Dresslers weren't looking to tear down, but we said well no, we're still going to designate the façade of your building, because that's a

heritage element of your building, and they made economic arguments about their ability to renovate or about their ability to resell or even to lease and those are serious arguments, but just in January, we had those in front of us, and we said well no…you know, we're still going to go ahead and designate part of your building. Look a little further down Portage to the west, still in the south side; Power Building, which we designated in March of 2017. That's, I believe, on a corner in the SHED District like the Ledohowski's building. Look just further west, the massive Bay Building, which we also designated the façades. We took out the interior elements, or most of them, and just designated the façades. And I think it's important to keep consistent in this and I think it would be consistent. I know the Ledohowski's have argued against it and said, well, their building isn't outstanding, and that the by-law says outstanding, but to me, it certainly stands out more than the little Singer Sewing Building or the Power Building. Now the Bay, okay. The Bay's a pretty outstanding structure, but I don't think they fall outside the ambit of the by-law here. I think they've talked about a big proposal that's coming, and that may yet come, and some may say well, we'll need all the construction we can get in the wake of COVID. That project appears to be some time away. We don't have it before us, so we're not voting on the campus plan or renewal. I would love to see that. I would hope to support that. Here we're just saying we need to preserve some element of the façade. Is there a arch…walkway into the westerly façade? There is. On the other hand, and I had to get Councillor Orlikow to confirm my memory, there is a walkway that goes into the Bay exterior. We designated the Bay's façade not long ago. So I think if we're being consistent with what we've done over the past number of years, we need to say thank you to the Ledohowski's for their investment, and their investment in heritage, but this isn't about asking if we trust somebody or if there's going to be a tear down, they're not tearing down the Manitoba Club any time soon and we designated the exterior there. I don't think this building's coming down any time soon, but I think it is important that we have a heritage designation. That is what the staff has recommended and Councillor Allard, I think, has come in with an amendment that works saying, well, the north façade and west façade, those are the most visible. I think this makes sense in the context. I like what was said at EPC. We take each building as it comes to us, we consider each one, and that is fair. I voted differently than other councillors here on some of these matters. But I think what's important is to say, it doesn't matter how famous you are or wealthy or your track record. We have to have some consistency in our application here, and I think it would be consistent to say let's designate the west façade and the north façade. We designated portions of the Bay. We designated portions of the Power Building. Just in January, we designated the façade of the little Singer Sewing Building just down the street. So I appreciate the owners and what they've done, and what their plans are, but I think if we're being true to the principles of heritage here, we would designate the westerly façade and the north façade. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do agree with my colleague on many of his points, Councillor Mayes. During my time on that committee, I rarely supported any designation that put limitations on the internal assets of a property without agreement and discussion with the owner, and I've heard many times that the City grants owners…has grants available for owners and they can apply for these things, but these grants average $10,000 for the work that has to be done and it's not sufficient. My question is, and that's why I appreciate where Councillor Mayes was going, is what is the vision? I'm struggling to understand if we have a vision for our historical buildings downtown or if we are just doing them one at a time. Do we have a vision for exactly how many buildings at our core area do we want designated heritage buildings? So are there…have we set a number, a maximum or a minimum, and are we having strategy discussions and making it a little easier and more economical for developers that come along and take on a heritage building, to repair that façade, to live up to that…the expectations that are there? We did talk about the Bay Building for a few moments. That's a mixed result. We did, as Councillor Mayes allude to, required some internal structure be held to as it is, and then we've heard from the company and the executives of the Bay that that wasn't…they can't live with that, so they are making other plans for the building, and we all saw the reports where they were quoted saying it's worth $1. Unfortunately, we had a staff member from CentreVenture who agreed with that and said that sometimes strict regulations on historical buildings as a designation do make it very difficult for development or change. So I...I appreciate Councillor Allard's approach, that we keep the, I believe it is the north and west façades, and that we'd be a little more reasonable if they have to make a couple of adjustments for windows or whatever, because I think that is starting to develop a more reasonable approach and one that maybe we can start saying what that vision is. I don't know...we should have done that first. That's okay. We didn't. Maybe we should be doing that now. All of our…many of our Council colleagues were in Quebec City, and I spent time there, speaking to one of their council members, and their main street with all of the very historical buildings. I mean, that is one of the most historic places in our country, and they allow anything on the inside as long as they maintain the façade because they want that street, character of the street to stay the same. So you have a very beautiful façade, a very classic façade for a McDonalds, but on the inside, it's a McDonalds. So again, I think it's about finding balance, but I think before all of that, we need to really sit down and establish, what's our vision? What do we want downtown to look like? How many of those buildings do we need; the max, the minimum? So I would be supportive of Councillor Allard's approach of the two façades.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So in speaking to this report, I want to note that for the past almost year and a half I've been a member of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Many, many buildings have come forward to this committee for consideration as a heritage building. Committee members have had very big, robust discussions about heritage, the significance, what merits a designation, the costs associated with a designation, the challenges, and the positive impact heritage preservations can have, and of these many, many buildings that have come forward to be considered for nomination, the committee has approved some of the department's recommendations and has declined some of the department's recommendations. Not every recommendation that came forward has been approved because the committee felt that a building didn't meet criteria, and I'll tell you, one of the things we don't consider, and we shouldn't, in this whole process is who the owner is. It has nothing to do with the Historical Resources By-law and the decision making process related to have heritage aspects. So from the information presented on the Somerset Building, from both the City and the proponent's perspective, I don't believe this building meets the criteria as per the City of Winnipeg's Resource By-law, and shouldn't be recommended for the list of historical resources. The alterations alone, over 80 alterations to the interior and exterior have fundamentally changed the character and historic value of the building. There's been so many alterations in the façade that it doesn't meet the criteria. That's a primary reason that I don't feel any owner should be burdened with restoring something that has been changed so dramatically, which would essentially be a rebuild. As noted, the original cornice was removed, put back, it's not historic and so why would it be granted historic preservation status? We feel the developer does not want to demolish it, so we know we won't be left with a parking lot. I just really feel that it's important to consider all the alterations that were made to the building and because of that, that it doesn't meet the criteria, and for those reasons, I won't be supporting the report or the amendment that was in it. I just do not feel this building merits heritage designation from the information that I've been provided.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Next is Councillor Eadie, followed by Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Eadie: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I rise, actually, in opposition of any heritage historical status to 294 Portage Avenue, the Somerset Building. Madam Speaker, today, all's I can tell you is about the feel of that building and the feel at the ground, and I could also talk about the Power Building too if you want. I know I have a bit of history with that building as well. I am supportive of maintaining our heritage and history in terms of architecture, and the feel of streets. I think that's very important. I believe we've maintained, and there was status given to the Avenue Building, a very distinct, descriptive building that over time, as far as I know, wasn't changed as much as the Somerset Building, but I can tell you, from a pedestrian perspective, it's totally changed. Like, if you just look at the...like, you're talking about the north. North is the front of the building, and west is the side of the building where, as Councillor Lukes pointed out, to be at one point the old Woolworth's, and I remember when it was the Woolworth's, and actually, I remember eating at the lunch counter in Woolworth's there too as well as going shopping with my mom, and so on. And as I mentioned to the current owners of the building, you know, I've known that place since 19...well, actually, anyway, early 1970s, not too long after the walkway opened up between Eaton's and the Somerset Building, and there was a lot of modifications just made to the second floor. When they built that in there, they turned it into like a little mall thing and you had all these different shops, and I've been getting my hair cut at Somerset Place for…well, he's retired now, he still cuts my hair, but he's retired, but for years, since like 1988, I believe, I started getting my hair cut at Somerset Hair. It doesn't exist anymore, as far as I know. But, Madam Speaker, the front has changed completely. I worked in that building for a number of years. I attended the disability advocacy organization. At the time, it was Copal, going way back. I believe Legal Aid was in there for a long time. Manitoba Housing was in there for a long time. Don't know if they're still in there, but a lot of modifications on the inside, so I get the inside, but I don't think anybody around here is understanding what the changes to that building have meant in terms of how it looks, 'cause I could see in 1972-'3, and I know for sure it has to look way different. I know that I worked at the Independent Living Resource Centre, and I know that they changed a whole bunch of windows on the north side. Now I recall the medical…Mall Medical at the corner of Vaughan and St. Mary, where they talked about oh, we can't find the parts for the windows, this is not going to be good for the building, oh, you're going to cause us great grief, but those windows are already changed, which changes the façade. That's why the Mall Medical Building looks the way it does. Everything's been changed on this building. It has no heritage status. It's different. It's not the building that this architect, who has some historical significance, it's not the building that he built. Even the entrance has…what is it called now? Is that a Dollarama? Whatever it is now, I don't…I don't know. Both the entranceways into that store have completely changed too. They've changed. It doesn't look like it did historically. I don't get it. Like, I support heritage, but this building, I'm sorry, I don't think it meets the criteria. I don't understand why we're even considering it given that the past owners, over the years, changes in the '70s, changes in the '80s, changes in the '90s. Like, it doesn't matter who the owner is, they've been changing it forever. When was this by…I can't remember when this by-law came in or whatever. But you know…and it does have a…and there was a list of historical resources made. The Merchants…actually, the Merchant's corner, the old Merchants Hotel, is an interesting one in that really, the façade never really changed over the years, and I'm talking years and years and years. So you had the same façade, that's why it has heritage status. It has that look. But this building right now, it doesn't look like it did when it was built. Why are we doing this? I don't understand it. Somebody put it on a list, okay, but it's changed so much that I don't

understand it and I'm not going to vote for this report. I don't think it should be...heritage status should be put on it. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins, followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do not support the nomination of the property to the list of historic resources, nor do I...although I'm grateful for folks, fellow councillors wanting to create compromises, and typically, that is very welcome, Madam Speaker. I don't support the nomination of the property. The Somerset Building is on a really distinct corner of downtown Winnipeg in the SHED District, and this is, to my recollection is the second time, and I think this is important to note. I believe it's around the second time that I've voted against heritage, and I'm usually a reliable vote for administration on heritage, and so, I want to premise my comments that way. It's one thing if this was the best example of really pristine, Chicago style historical details, but unfortunately, it's not. Our great champion of build heritage, the unfatiguable Cindy Tugwell, while she was discussing other buildings at committee, provided the most lukewarm, the most tepid defence of this building. I don't know if it could be characterized as defence, Madam Speaker, and this is remarkable, this is absolutely remarkable given her typical enthusiasm for build heritage. Ms. Tugwell instead, echoed exactly what the president of Canad Inns has said. Without her typical vim and vigor, Ms. Tugwell did not talk about preserving this build heritage, per se. She simply acknowledged the fact that it was a building with Chicago styling, and what time she did spend, though, was the vigorous defence of the beauty of the Metropolitan theatre. The beauty of the Met, the heritage processes that these owners had adhered to and that they were in fact experts in this regard. Winnipeg has benefited from them. Canad Inns, I believe, is making an economic argument. The climate, economic temperature, the growth potential of this city, is at issue and this is language that is built into this by-law. The analogies within the context of this debate with respect to consistency, I do not believe is accurate, Madam Speaker. This is not analogous to other buildings like the Bay or the Manitoba Club. This is not that, and why, like an auditory appendage, a skywalk is attached to this building. Like Councillor Eadie remarked, it has been irreparably changed. The street level windows are not in keeping with the Chicago-style. The roof has been altered not in keeping…on and on and on, but the owners, on the record, did agree to preserve, following a question posed by colleague Councillor Gillingham, Madam Speaker. It struck me during the onset of a global recession when and where the owners in the hotel sector had come to the City to consider constraints on their business, investment plans, is important. Yes, of course, the economic development and growth in our downtown Winnipeg is really important to consider. I'm more often across the streets for concerts, to hear former President Obama than I am for hockey, but I know it is home to our Jets. The Portage Avenue and Donald Street within Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry is really a pivotal intersection. To think that heritage is the open door to which an investor at this particular time should consider with their city an investment, I believe, is wrong headed, Madam Speaker. And for all those reasons, and a little more, I don't support this nomination.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Looks like we have an interesting split in the vote. Looks like I will be voting against Councillor Eadie in this one, but it's not my job. I wasn't elected to vote with anyone or against anyone, and we all have to make our decisions, as I always do, and in this case, it happens to be a building I know. I've been going to that building for 20 years...over 20 years. Eighth floor, as a matter of fact. So on the interior, I have to admit that it's a lost cause, and had...I don't think I would have been in support of the original motion. Having said that, what is the intent of this? As Councillor Klein pointed out, often, when it comes to issues of heritage, sometimes, we deal with the façade only, and in this case, I believe that Councillor Allard came up with a compromise that I can live with. Having been on the standing committee for heritage, I don't know, I'm batting 990 or something in terms of voting in favour of the recommendation of the specialists that come to us regarding the proposals for designations for buildings in Winnipeg, and I have to say, I don't think I would have voted in favour of the original motion, but I think this is fair. I think the intent in this case is to go with the, sort of a spirit of the façade, and on that basis, I'm willing to vote for this compromised motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today…my vote today will be consistent with my position at EPC, and I will not be supporting the recommendation to add 294 Portage Avenue to the list of historical resources primarily because when you take a look at the synopsis report that's included in this report, and you take a look at plates 9 and 12, you see what the building once was at street level. And it's…my comments are really similar today to Councillor Rollins, Councillor Eadie, Councillor Lukes, particularly to point out, once again, that so much has changed on this building. So many changes on the interior, so many alterations certainly to the main floor of the exterior of the building and we did hear from...in questioning the owner of the building at EPC that there, you know, there was a commitment to make no changes to the upper floors of the north and west exteriors, thus retaining the brick as it is and I think that's the...to me, the historical features that may be left. When you take a look at the synopsis report that I just mentioned a moment ago, you take a look at plates 9 and 12, you see how the street level of that building is animated,

and perhaps once again, if we allow this developer to make changes at street level, perhaps they can restore it to something like that. They can look at the report that's before us and the amendment that is before us, it talks about…with the following defining elements: A) the exterior. One and then sub-2, it says, its main north façade with smooth stone cut base, main floor with entrance and display windows in rectangular openings. Similar to what Councillor Eadie said, I don't believe those are defining elements anymore. I mean, those are add-ons. Those are late additions certainly years after the original building was built. What we have there right now is many, many stone walls. You know, the members of the public that walk by or drive by, they're staring into kind of a grey wall that has been…that is a result of a modification, a significant alteration to the building from its original design. Notwithstanding the fact that on the west side of the building, there's a walkway that juts out. Certainly that walkway over the street was not part of the original design. I don't see that as a feature that needs to be, you know, deemed a defining historic characteristic in any way, and that's on the west side of the building. So for those reasons, I will be maintaining my position and not supporting that this property be added to the list of historical resources.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to follow-up on a couple comments. We are actually coming to the end of our heritage buildings list that this developer realizes, they explained that they missed that when they did their due diligence. They thought that had passed, no, the list is still there. They knew they were on the list, but that due diligence…they didn't do the due diligence fine, we're still working through that list. So we actually are on the end of that list, thank goodness, and we do have to start talking about the next phase of what we're going to do with the heritage. I do find it quite amazing that people are saying today the reason we should not designate this building as heritage is because it's been modified so much. Well, if it was designated back then, it wouldn't have been modified so much. So it seems it would be really counter-intuitive to say, don't designate it now because it's already been modified. Well, I think if you just take a look at the picture, I don't know if anybody could do that kind of masonry work anymore, it's incredible. Now, take another picture in your head, because we're not going to protect this building, we just rip it down, put up a nice stucco building, something that's easier. Again, that's what we're saying today; you don't want to help designate this, again, it's not about the people. I'm actually not that pleased about how far we backtracked on what we should be designating. I actually like the back lane. I think it's incredibly interesting feature of an old part of Winnipeg. But again, I'm willing to compromise; the two sides. Why am I willing to do that? Well, because I think we have to find some common ground because these are controversial and they are difficult decisions for us all. So I'm willing to do that. The idea that, oh, well, the brick on that horrible barricade, I guess we'll call it a main floor, well again, the developer, whoever that may be, you know, this is a very tough industry for Canad Inns right now, who knows if they sell the building tomorrow. They could. I'm not sure who would buy it. These are very difficult times, so I do respect that. But I'm not here to talk about the developer. I'm here to talk about the building. And if anybody walks downtown and takes a look at that building and says whoa, that building is so normal, that no other…every other building looks like that one. Well come on people, it isn't. An incredible amount of brick work has gone into this. The main floor, absolutely, I've talked to the heritage planner, there's lots of room to work with them to redo it. If anybody's driven by the Pollard Building or I guess the one on Main Street there, where we actually didn't do a hotel, we actually sold it for heritage building to the Pollards, and they've done those insets on the front doors, incredible. Again, that wasn't part of the first design that they had there, but they were allowed to do that because it was keeping in the heritage theme of the building, so it will be allowed to happen. So again, it's just they'll have to work with us a bit to figure out how it works, but they said they want to do that anyways, so there will be no problem there. I think that's…but we also get to protect the façade, that brick façade that is incredible. So you have…what we're saying today if you vote against this heritage designation is...and again, don't talk to the people, because we don't…I've been caught before where you don't designate it because the person's good, but then, two years later, the building's gone, because things change. So what we're doing today is…people said, okay, this building keeps getting modified too much. Okay, let's stop that. Let's designate it heritage and leave the façades so again, they can't paint it lime green. They can at least make sure the façades…they can't stucco over it. You know, maybe they're going to find out that the insulation's bad inside, it would be really just cheaper if we just, you know, stucco the whole thing, and then we can insulate. Again, that would be their right to do that unless we protect it, so we as Winnipeggers can all enjoy it. Councillor Mayes has made the most fine points...I wasn't even going to speak today because of Councillor Mayes' points at the beginning. The Bay, it has a walkway. I heard Councillor Gillingham talk about, oh, the walkway is connected to it. Okay, yes, so is the Bay and many other buildings downtown that we've designated heritage. You know, that's a fact. Although, the development application, that may or may not be coming in the future, we don't know if there is or not and we will work with them to make it work if they actually bring a development application. But what we are saying today is this is the minimum, just two sides of a building that has incredible brick work that stands out in a prominent corner of our…you know, in our corner. I would love it if the developer decides to go the way the Pollards, and brought…if you've seen those beautiful cornices they brought back in from original days to that building. It's incredible. Again, we're not making them to do that, but again, this is what we're trying to protect at least the brick work that is such an incredible feature of our downtown, our heritage downtown from the…you know, the Chicago style, they call it. Yes, it's missing some pieces, but just because it's missing pieces, we shouldn't say, well then we should let it all go bye-bye then. If that's your philosophy

about how to say any heritage building that we're nominating, if it's being modified too much or at all, I don't know what, has a walkway in it, therefore we shouldn't designate it at all. Well, people, it's been 100 plus years, all these buildings generally have been modified. So we're just asking for two sides, two sides of beautiful brick work, an incredible display, for me of what Winnipeg of the day, of the merchants how they used to run. The architect is still the same, John Woodman, well known architect. We know that J.A.M. Atkins was the property owner…Atkins, huge family, huge merchant in the day of Winnipeg. The brick, the built brick with stone accentuating, that is…you can't deny that there are heritage values in this building. You can't deny it. If you can, then I don't understand how you can actually vote for other heritage buildings because we're talking about a minimal protection for two sides of a building. And yes, we have done it in the past. We will do it again if a development application comes forward. I've never seen one. I've never heard of one. The planners have never heard of one till later. Again, then we will work with them to make it so they can put this building back up like the Met and how they've done in the past. But I agree. I'm not sure if every member of Council here, you know, we had a robust discussion about this, but every councillor in here hasn't worked in this building. I as well have worked in this building, and the insides, I agree are meh. But that outside, I would be so sad to see if I was walking down the street that there was a parking lot there, or a one-story stucco building there, because it got too expensive and too costly to maintain the big old building. And we just don't want it, we want to get more value out of something different. I don't know and I'm not making this personal because it should not be personal. It's an asset for all Winnipeggers who enjoy today and tomorrow, and we have a duty, also working with the landlord, make sure it's not too cumbersome, that we can protect that asset going forward. So those councillors today who were saying, well look, if we modify it so much and therefore it's really not a heritage building, well, I say you've actually answered your first…you've answered yourself. We should. We should actually protect the remaining heritage value of this building because you know what, you may be here two years later saying, well, I wish we protected something in that building because now it's all gone. So I'll be supporting the motion from Councillor Mayes and Allard.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy followed by Councillor Santos.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you Speaker. I just want to…I do…I am in support of keeping this as a heritage building. I'm struggling to find out…find why we're here and why we're not designating it. This is to really protect this building as it moves forward. It's not just about today. So not just about the owners that are in front of us today, but who might own it in the future, so it's really important that we keep our heritage destination…our heritage designations going because they're critical. I mean, they're what people come to the city to see, is our heritage and our Exchange District, and our beautiful buildings, and you know, there's not too many cities that have kept that up, and maybe it's in the eye of the beholder. Some people like different art, but to me, the outside of that building is beautiful. And I think we worked really, really hard with the owners to try to...to try to see what is going to be heritage and what isn't, and I think we really worked hard to make sure that we're collaborating that, but this is what our experts have suggested, and, you know, I think that it's critical that we listen to those suggestions and understand that in most cases we do have the people that purchase these buildings come back, and they don't want it put into heritage designation. So I think that we need to move forward, we need to be strong on this. I mean, we need to make sure that we're keeping moving forward in terms of our heritage designations as a city because it's a critical part of our city's features. So I hope that that helps. I don't know if it's changed anyone's votes, but it really is critical and I just want to appeal to everybody because it's just the outside, and I think a lot of speakers spoke really good about, you know, all these buildings have been modified before, so it's just that beautiful outside that I would hate to see go. And so that'll be my vote today.

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

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Chair. I wasn't going to speak to the item, but I felt some comments from my other councillor colleagues, I wanted to kind of support some and then kind of reiterate and remind some of the other councillors. I did sit on the committee, as well as Heritage Winnipeg, for my first year and learned and appreciated some of the work that those committees have done. Representing the Exchange District, I have much appreciation for heritage buildings and character defining elements. So this one, I will be supporting. I want to echo Councillor Orlikow's comments. He made it very clear, but one example that I noticed that had major, major renovations that did such great work was the Fortune and McDonald block at 226 and 234 Main Street. If any of you remember, that one is the High and Lonesome Building with the chicken on the front. So that one, you know, if you look at it...I'm pulling it up. There's a picture of it. September 9th, 2015, it was in dire constraints. Beautiful façade but the main level was definitely, definitely different. Now if you look at it in Google Maps, it's beautifully restored to what it originally looked like, and that work, we know can happen. It's my understanding we do have the Gail Parvin Hammerquist Fund to kind of assist developers, if they need to, to bring façades back to their original condition, so there is options there available to owners and property owners. So I want to commend the work of the Heritage Committee. They do great work, and like Councillor Orlikow had said, we're almost at the end of our list, and it's good to keep our heritage because that is kind of what we are known for. We're nationally recognized and therefore that's why I'll be supporting this recommendation. Thank you.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I'd like to start my comments by thanking the volunteer members of the Historic Building Committee. They spend a fair bit of time looking at these reports, meeting, reviewing these buildings all for the benefit of, I think, maybe they get a lunch bought by the City at Christmas time. So otherwise, they spend a fair bit of time and energy reviewing these buildings. I spent some time on the committee, and definitely a passionate group of individuals, but you do get the opportunity though to see some really neat buildings in our city. You go throughout the Exchange District and you get to see, you know, what's behind the walls of some of these buildings that have hundreds of years of stories behind them. It's really fascinating stuff. At the end of the day, one of my key metrics in the designation of historic buildings and different levels comes down to the consistency and makeup of the block that it's in. Like if you go, as we went out for a walk today at lunchtime, I was standing at the corner of Albert and McDermot or Bannatyne, I mean, it hasn't really changed much in hundreds of years…Arthur or whatever. Regardless, on Portage Avenue, the building in question is located across the street from the Bell MTS Place, the old MTS Centre, next door to the old Northstar Hotel, which is not the most significant building, kitty-corner to Centre Point across from Mountain Equipment Coop and the Dollarama. It's not really the most…context-wise, all that sensible. To be fair, it is next door to the Metropolitan Theatre. But again, even that visual has changed with the skywalk being there and being across from Bell MTS Place. So again, there has been significant change over the years. It's important but not, in my mind, hugely so, in terms of its significance, but again, it's the context of where it is exactly. If you remember, there was...again, Councillor Santos was just talking about the building on Main Street at St. Mary Avenue, I believe it is, where the High and Lonesome is and a neat block. There was a proposal for a huge development there and I did support not listing that building as heritage because again, it wasn't contextually all that significant. Beautiful building, they did a great job, but again, if you're investing that kind of money in heritage designation, I'd rather see it, you know, on blocks where buildings are at risk and there's…you know, the context around them is there's a lot more there. Again, they're private investments, not for government to say necessarily, but in terms of putting these super heavy restrictions on it, I'm not supportive here today, so I'll be voting against. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers?

Councillor Allard: I'd like to speak, Councillor Sharma.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yeah, so thanks to all my colleagues for their comments. And we've been talking about this one a lot. I know I started considering this item when I was lobbied by the landowner. I don't know how many of you had the opportunity to sit down before the meetings with the landowner, but I certainly did. You know, I think there's no doubt in my mind that this is a historic building. The inside, the outside, we have subject matter experts that have done the work to look into whether or not this building should be historic. And I'm...you know, I'm feeling very uncomfortable right now with, you know, not knowing the way this vote's going to go. Just in terms of our historic designation process, if…you know, I worry this is the thin edge of the web if...and just some…many people have said it today, we need to look at the application itself. We shouldn't be considering the ownership of the building when we're making these decisions. Yeah, I mean, it's...I really do think, if you read the report, that this is a historic building, and should be protected with our historic designation. I'd also like to clarify a couple of things; my recollection from Cindy Tugwell at the meeting was that she did support this motion. Essentially, she had recognized that there's a lot of damage to the inside, and that we should still proceed to protect the façades. That's my recollection of Cindy Tugwell, Heritage Winnipeg's feedback to the committee. And again, I was surprised to even hear the piece about giving up the inside, but you know, this is...this is politics and the art of compromise as I thought we had achieved. And in this motion, also heard, I think Councillor Gillingham said the owners' intent is to preserve these anyway. Well, why don't we just…why don't we help them out using our City processes that are there for exactly these reasons? Another correction I'd like to make is, you know, in terms of the risk of demolition, I found out through another...through another piece of land in my ward that commercial building owners don't need to go to public hearing for a demo, so unlike residential buildings where Council gets to say yes or no, this building should be demoed or not demoed, we will not have that opportunity. If there's no designation here, all the building owner needs to do, to my knowledge, is go and get a building…a demo permit and no Council oversight, building demoed, end of story. And then just in terms of COVID-19, you know, this is…and the economy, if there is an application coming, then...then that's great. If there...we've heard from the owner. They want to preserve these façades any way. I don't see why we wouldn't…I don't see why we would take the tool out of our toolkit. We can always revisit this designation again in the future. The Public Safety Building that's coming down right now, we did not end up nominating it, but we did hear from the public service that, yes, it's a historic building, so we made the choice to demo that building as a council with the knowledge that that was a historic building, and I don't think anybody disputed that, and we made the decision when we were ready to as a council. So I'm just…I'm not comfortable with the direction that this is going. I can't recall us not supporting the historic designation as a council since we've been elected, so it's...you know, this building is just as historic as…as the...I don't know how many. John mentioned that we're getting to the end of the list but we have designated so many buildings based on the expert advice of our public service and you know, many of the same arguments were heard about those other buildings, and I don't see how this building is different than all of

those other buildings that we've designated. And so I'm left wondering why we're having such a huge discussion on this designation, when it's so clear to me that it should be designated, and it makes me fear for all our other historic resources in this city. You know, if this building were to come down as a result of our choice today, who knows which building is going to be next? And then in terms of adapting the project or in terms of if there is an application coming, there is certainly every opportunity to work with the public service and the historic buildings people to build a project that has…that integrates old and new. So I don't think designating these two façades...and my original instinct was to designate the whole thing as per the recommendation from our public service, but, you know, there's nothing stopping a landowner of respecting the building and building something new and beautiful as part of...I have another example in St. Boniface, 210 Masson Street. For years, the community discussed what should happen there and we ended up with a landowner who put in an application, went through the public hearing and is going to be maintaining the historic elements of the building. Not everything could be preserved in the building, but the pieces of the building that made sense to preserve, like the façade, are being preserved. So that's another case in my ward where the building owner was able to do...was able to get an approval for something with this not being a major impediment on their project. So if the landowner's already willing to say they want to preserve these façades, I don't see why we shouldn't be going forward with a designation formalizing that intent. Like Councillor Orlikow says, things change. You know, we're in a difficult fiscal environment. I certainly don't want to start seeing…start losing these beautiful historic downtown buildings because we failed to designate them as per the advice of our subject matter experts. I'll leave it at that and thanks everyone for their contributions to this discussion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Are there any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Mayes, do you wish to close?

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Outcome's still in doubt here, so I will try and make some arguments to try and convince those that haven't spoken, perhaps, or for those who have. Four things leap to mind; four arguments that were made against designation. Councillor Browaty says, well, I tend to take a look at the whole block. Well, remember, we voted here in January, voted unanimously to designate that Singer Sewing Building at 424 Portage right next to the BIZ there. The old Clifford's Furrier Building is about ten yards to the east of that. So if we were always guided by what's the state of the whole block, we should never have put the Power Building, and we should never have put the Singer Sewing Building in unless you feel Clifford's and their use of the Carpenter's theme song music was, you know, somehow historical, because that building is on that same block. So I don't think you have to have everything on the block of a historic character to vote for something being historic. There was the argument made, well, this isn't the most outstanding example of Chicago style architecture, there's others like it. Well, what did…what was the report in January in front of us about Singer Sewing? Singer Sewing Machine Building was built to match three other buildings to the immediate west including the Power Building and the Hudson's Bay Company. So if we were being consistent, we've already designated Hudson's Bay and Power. The owners of Singer Sewing objected to designation. We voted unanimously to designate. So in that instance we didn't say, well, we already got two that are just like this just to the west in the same block for the Power Building. So we weren't persuaded for the little Singer Sewing Building to waive criteria just because there were others that might be better examples of the same style of architecture. What else was in that report in January on a building we designated? The phrase from our own staff, not from the objecting landowner, many changes have occurred over the years. Buildings do change over the years. This Somerset Building is not unique in that some things have been changed. Things have changed at Power Building. Things have changed at the Singer Sewing Building. I would submit the Bay parkade was not there when plate eight or nine, I think it is, of the Bay exterior, when that shot was taken. We designated the Bay's façade. Pretty clearly that's changed over time. The parkade wasn't there originally either, so that argument that, well, it doesn't look like it did in these old historic photos, doesn't look exactly, that's a fair point. Of course, one could have easily made that argument about the Bay. There was no parkade, there was no walkway in the Bay in 1925, but we didn't say oh yes, we better not designate the Bay. We did the right thing and designated the façades there. The argument was also made, well, there's…you know, there's an economic argument made by the proponents here, the building owners. Here's the final sentence from the landowners at Singer Sewing, and again, we designated this building just in January, south side of Portage, just west of the one we're debating today. So Singer Sewing owner said, "The lack of actual historical significance relating to the building should be weighed against the financial and economic burdens that this designation will place upon the building." So there was an argument from owners of another smaller, I would argue less significant building, saying this will place economic burdens on us. We did not adhere to that. We did not adopt that. We did not adopt that and say yes, that is correct. And in so doing, we designated that building as a heritage structure. I think if we're being consistent, we have to say, well, look, we haven't accepted these arguments at other very nearby structures. We have designated Power, we have designated Bay, we have designated Singer Sewing, all on that south side of Portage, all in the SHED. Some of them on corners, some of them not on corners, admittedly. But I think the arguments that have been made have a certain appeal, but they've been made before in front of us quite frankly, and we haven't adopted them because we've said, well…Councillor Allard spoke pretty well to it. Look, we can always revisit this, but the reason you do this is as a safeguard, to try and safeguard the heritage. If our standard was, well, as long as we've got one example of each then we certainly don't need these districts, we certainly wouldn't have an Exchange District, we'd just have like

annex…there's a building that's called the Chicago Style. And there's our one for neoclassical, and there's our one for modern. We don't do that. We try and preserve districts. We try and preserve different buildings. There will be disagreement. It's been a respectful debate. I want to thank Councillor Orlikow for his comments. The economic arguments, to me, do not carry the day here regardless of what plans might be coming and maybe we would need to revisit this if we ever got a specific plan. But we have a building here...as Councillor Orlikow says, this does stand out. This does not look identical to Alt Hotel or anything modern. This has a heritage feel to it and a heritage appearance. So I would urge those of you who have not spoken, who might still be weighing this up, to weigh up your vote in January of 2020, you stood to designate Singer Sewing despite the fact there were economic arguments from the owner. Despite the fact it was on a block with some non-heritage stuff, despite the fact that there had been changes to that building. Despite the fact that there are other nearby examples like that building. We didn't adopt those arguments. So to be consistent colleagues, I would encourage you here a few months after that January vote on Singer Sewing, to be consistent, to say, well, we've reached a compromise. Good compromise authored I think by Councillor Allard. Councillor Orlikow has indicated that he's not even entirely comfortable with the compromise. He might like to have saved some other interior aspects. But that is the attempt I think here at compromise is to say, well, let's designate those two façades. You know, on instinct you want to say well, it looks different. There's a walkway. Well, as said before, there's a walkway at the Bay. There are other aspects of other buildings that we've said, you know what, we're going to look past that and still designate as heritage. So I think if we're being consistent with the value we place on heritage districts and heritage architecture, the vote here is to vote for the compromise suggested by Councillor Allard and to say, you know, thank you to the Ledohowskis. Thank you for what you've done. We want to keep working with you, but there's a counter-argument here. And I know Cindy Tugwell was at the committee hearing, and she didn't say no, lukewarm might be an adequate description, I'll give that to Councillor Rollins. But she did say yes. So if that is what is weighing, ultimately, she did say to go ahead and designate. So I think if you're hanging in the balance here colleagues, I would encourage you to vote for the compromise and be true to the way we've approached heritage at very nearby structures. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. With that, I'm going to call the vote. It will be a recorded vote, Councillor Lukes has requested that. All in favour of Item 8, the recommendation from EPC, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Mayes, Orlikow, Santos, Schreyer, Gilroy and Allard

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Klein, Rollins, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, Councillors Nason and Lukes

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. Item 8 does not pass. Moving on to the same committee, Property and Development, and it's the report dated April 20th, 2020. Councillor Mayes.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED APRIL 20, 2020

Councillor Mayes: Sorry. I'm still back with the Singer Sewing report back in January. Here we go. Okay. Sorry, Madam Speaker. There we are. As I know a number of items had to be pulled, so I will move...I think it's Items 1, 3, 4, and 7 and 9, I'll move. I think the other ones...I'll be pulling 5 and 6, and other councillors have made requests for 2 and 8.

Madam Speaker: Sure, okay.

Councillor Mayes: I think I've got that. My apologies if I don't quite have that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Item 5 and 6 have been pulled. Others…items that we wish to pull? Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Item 2 and Item 8.

Madam Speaker: Item 2 and 8. Any others? Okay. Seeing none, I will call the question on Item 1, 3, 4, and 7 and 9. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 2 – Delegation of Authority for Approval of Contract Over-Expenditures (Change Orders), Tender No. 230-2019B – Project No. 2016-117

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

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, this was amended at...at committee and then was not changed at EPC. Thanks to my colleagues on the committee, Councillor Lukes and Allard, who I see virtually, Councillor Rollins. We kind of worked together on a compromise here to amend the original recommendation to lower the limit and to ask for more frequent reports back to the committee. Certainly, there were some concerns about the dollar value that we would be delegating if we did go ahead with the original recommendation. So with that, I'll wait to hear from others.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just rise to commend our colleagues on the...on the committee for requesting more detail as opposed to just simply handing over our chequebook or our credit card. I think that having some more facts as we go forward, we can learn from this. This is an opportunity, surely, to re-evaluate our estimation process, and I was pleased to see this group, the committee, make those certain requests of the administration. So I wanted to thank them for that and acknowledge that that is exactly the way I would have done it, so thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on Item 2? Seeing none, Councillor Mayes. Councillor Nason, sorry. Go ahead.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Sorry for my late hand rising. The challenge I have in looking at the report is that we had a bid that came in at what seems to be nearly half the cost of what it's actually going to result in. This does not give a lot of...a lot of faith in Class 1 estimates. When we come in with a forecast with contingencies of under 10 million, the bid was under 7 million, and now come back with more money, and a possible cost of upwards of 12 million. You know, this building, as I understand, I don't know the full history of it, but as I understand, there was asbestos remediation done to the building prior to it decommissioning several years ago as part of an upgrade. It is definitely a hardened concrete building, which I think is lending itself to the cost of demolition being a little more higher than expected. If a Class 1 estimate doesn't uncover asbestos, I don't know what will. So I just…I'm puzzled and I'm troubled with what seems to be a continued legacy of challenges with decommissioning the Public Safety Building and the move to the new Winnipeg Police headquarters. This just, again, is…seems to be a comedy of challenges with the pain being suffered by the taxpayers of Winnipeg. Those are the comments I want to put on record. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Councillor Mayes, back to you.

Councillor Mayes: Now I have to reply. Fair comments in some respects by Councillor Nason; a) I think the decommissioning of the old police building and the building of the new one has been the subject of at least two audits, a quantity survey, legal investigations. Yes, there were certainly problems with that. I could point out which votes I was here for, and then Orlikow was here some, but you know, it's different people elected at different times and some stuff extending back into the '06 to '10 Council. So fair point, there were obviously issues there. I think we can separate that from the demolition. At first blush it may look like we estimated X, and it came in millions below and then we still left that money in there, what's going on? I can hear John Kiernan saying, no, we expected the unexpected. We knew there would be things we couldn't foresee in that demolition. We knew there would be asbestos. We knew there would be issues. We knew there would be problems. We set aside that money to deal with these sorts of problems. Now, what the committee said was, we're not giving you all sorts of leeways, Councillor Klein has pointed out, we said, we want reports, and we'll give you some leeway, but we're not giving millions and millions. So I have to say, in my experience around this place, dealing with Brent Piniuta and Brad Erickson and Kiernan and some of the staff who do these sorts of demolitions and constructions, I mean, this has been a relative pleasure compared to a lot of the other projects I've worked on over the years. So that's sort of the same lineup that got the expansion built at Dakota Community Centre, some of which Councillor Lukes and I lived through a lot of that, frankly, and then Councillor Chambers has been there as well. I mean, that was a…the staff really were challenged and came through on that one. So I get the point of what Councillor Nason is saying, but the demolition isn't over budget, it isn't out of control, it isn't lacking in foresight. I think it's a tricky site. It's complicated. It's…we knew there was asbestos in there, so if you...if you read the reports, yeah, it's...the bid was less than the original estimate, but it's not out of control. It's coming along, it's going to take a while, and hopefully, we will, in this term of office, see something new arising there. I think we would all like to see that. But I just

want to put in a plug for the staff there. I think they've been doing a pretty good job on this project and have done a good job. That's why I know Councillor Nason's not naming names and calling for terminations or something. But I do think we've been kept up-to-date on this, this project and I feel very confident about the information I'm getting on this project. So I'll close with that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. With that, I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? That was Councillor Nason. We'll record you in opposition. Thank you. That's right. Thank you. That is carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 5 – Secondary Plan Amendment – 1485 Portage Avenue, 600 Empress Street, 875 St. James Street and Lot 2 Plan 54622, 42 St. James (former stadium site) – SPA 1/2019

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Madam Speaker. I'm going to move this one and I assume I'll have to do No. 6 separately, that this would be laid over to the next meeting of Council. I understand if a layover motion is made I have up to three minutes to speak, and then there's no debate, ideal really. Wish you could do this all the time. Three minutes to speak and then we would vote on the layover. Why a layover? It's a big ticket item. Much debated, closed votes. I do feel I jinxed this one because I said, well, we had three different results at the three lower-levels. We had in favour of the developers, we had tie, and then we had in favour of the airport and I said, well, there can't be a fourth different outcome. Unfortunately, I was wrong, apparently, there is a fourth outcome. Yesterday, we received from the Winnipeg Airport's Authority a letter indicating that they were invoking…they were invoking on behalf of the federal government, the statutory right under the Winnipeg Charter, to object to this matter proceeding, and it would therefore be referred to the Manitoba Municipal Board. Unique in my eight-plus years here to have this, but it is in the Charter. These matters pertaining to the airport, that the province, the feds, as Councillor Gillingham reminds me, the adjacent municipalities could refer this prior to the second reading of the by-law. That would have been in front of us if this vote had gone through today. No guarantee it would, but the parties have...the airport has filed in time to make its objection. The interesting legal concept...and in defence of our oft-maligned Legal Department, oft-maligned by me, I supposed, and others around here, but on this one, I've got to say, the Legal Department has said to me the right thing. It is unclear the airport does not have the statutory authority to object, but the federal government does. And the airport's written us a letter saying, "On behalf of the federal government, we're invoking our right to object under section 270", I believe it is… 271(1) I think. We need some time for our Legal Department to say, is that the right course? Is that actually a legitimate invoking of the right to object? The downside risk, if we proceed today here, is big and is probably obvious, but I'll state it any way; if we go ahead and proceed and do that second reading, the language is imperative, it says, you must refer it if you get this objection for second reading. So we'd be taking a pretty big chance if we went ahead with the second reading in the face of that. We would have to say that we didn't get proper notice. I think our Legal Department has not had sufficient time to review this. I think they're doing the right thing. I want to thank the Clerks for alerting me to this last night. With respect, I'm sure it's a big ticket item for the developers, for the airport, for the public, but I've got to move layover on this one and the next one eventually because we don't know if we can proceed, quite frankly. We have to get our Legal Department to tell us if that was a valid and legally binding objection.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Mayes has moved layover, and there is no debate. No further…

Councillor Klein: Point of order. It's my understanding that when something is put before Council...very well said, by the way, but it's my understanding when it's before Council, we are not to consider any new information that's been brought forward. This wasn't received, from what I understand, on Government of Canada letterhead, and it wasn't signed by an officer that has that authority for the Government of Canada. So are we allowed to even consider this?

Madam Speaker: Yeah. Councillor Klein, thank you. Mr. Clerk, if you can respond to the process.

City Clerk: Thank you, Madam Speaker. When the objection was received, we consulted with our Legal Services Department. They advised that the objection itself was not new information but rather was related to process and advised that we should share the objection with Council.

Madam Speaker: Okay. And that was shared yesterday, correct, with all members of council. With that...with that, we will vote on the layover. All in favour?

Mayor Bowman: Recorded vote?

Madam Speaker: We are doing that. The Mayor has called for a recorded vote on this. All in favour, please rise. If you are remote, please raise your hand.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Klein, Schreyer and Nason

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The layover is approved. It'll be on next Council meeting agenda. Councillor Mayes, Item 6? Madam Clerk...yes.

Mayor Bowman: Point of order. This is for the Clerks. The hearing continues then to the next month?

Madam Speaker: Yes. Actually, just to that point, Mr. Clerk, could you just maybe reiterate some rules around Council's expectations on communicating with the public, proponent, the applicant, any member of the public on this item for the next 30 days or so?

Councillor Schreyer: Excuse me, Madam Speaker, were we not supposed to understand that before we had the vote?

Madam Speaker: It's standard operating procedures. But we're just asking…I would like for it to be reiterated in this chamber.

Councillor Schreyer: So you're saying that Council didn't know what it was voting on?

Madam Speaker: No, that's not what I'm saying. Mr. Clerk.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, sorry, I was just asking for a simple yes or no whether the hearing is ongoing, that's all.

City Clerk: Thank you Madam Speaker. Yes, the matters are the subject of public hearings, and the same rules in the Development Procedures By-law do apply. No new information should be considered by any member of Council until the vote takes place.

Madam Speaker: Okay, and that's normal procedure for any public hearing, correct?

City Clerk: That's correct.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, Madam Clerk.

Item 6 – Rezoning – 1485 Portage Avenue, 600 Empress Street, 875 St. James Street and Lot 2 Plan 54622, 42 St. James (former stadium site) – DAZ 210/2019

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes. Ditto?

Councillor Mayes: As much as I'd love to, yes, same motion to layover. In the interest of time, same rationale as provided under No. 5.

Madam Speaker: Same item as previous. So with that, we're going to have a vote to layover the item. And it's a call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise. If you are remote, please raise your hand.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Klein, Schreyer and Nason

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

Madam Speaker: The layover passes. Item 6 will appear on next month's Council agenda. Madam Clerk, next item.

Item 8 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 5610, 5628 and 5630 Roblin Boulevard – DASZ 42/2019

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

Councillor Mayes: Yes, I think I was by this site when I was out checking out the Eric Coy running track. So I rarely get out to this part of town, but it was a good experience so I look forward to hearing…I think Councillor Klein pulled this. I believe this is in his ward so I await his comments on it.

Councillor Klein: It was…thank you, and through you, Madam Chair, it was nice to see Councillor Mayes out in the Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood Ward. I'm glad we could work out his passport issues to get him there. So I stand proud today to support this motion. I'm proud of the residents and I'm very proud of the family who applied to develop this particular parcel of land. Prior to any application, they agreed to meet with residents before that to hear them out, to have a discussion and to then connect with community members all again prior to any kind of application. The family who wants to develop the building, they also took time to speak with members of the Charleswood 55 plus group and other residents in the 55 plus category. And originally, the bill that the condo unit was designed for something else, but I understand after discussions with that group, it quickly changed to being a 55 plus facility. And during the last several months and going back to the election, we had heard an awful lot from residents of Charleswood and Westwood and Tuxedo, that there is not enough availability for them to sell off their larger homes and downsize into a condo because they want to stay in their neighborhood and I think that can be said for every neighborhood throughout Winnipeg. So I'm proud that these residents got involved. They did indicate there was some lively discussions, I'll be honest, and they indicated they were opposed to parking access from the back lane. That was changed. They didn't like the idea of where the tree lines were going to be, how close they were to the tree lines, that was changed. They asked for more trees, that was agreed to. So I really believe this is an example of how we diffuse what has the potential of putting developer against developer or developer against resident. They had many opportunities to talk. Now, is everyone happy? I'm sure they're not. There's always going to be those people that are not happy, but we did hold another kind of a town hall required meeting and it was great to have all the stakeholders there and all of them now in a more generous tone in what was acceptable and what wasn't acceptable. So I truly just wanted to stand and thank the residents impacted by this area. I want to thank the residents of Charleswood who came out. There was a number of gatherings for this. They all were heard. They…you know, some came in and spoke, so it was great to have that involvement and I really do hope that in the spirit of this…of how this came together, that my colleagues would stand unanimously and pass this motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, any further speakers? Seeing none. Councillor Mayes. I'll call the question on Item 9. All in favour? Contrary? Item 8, yes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move onto by-laws under this committee. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Sorry, Clerk first?

Madam Speaker: Go ahead. Councillor Mayes, yes.

**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. 42/2020, By-law No. 43/2020, By-law No. 44/2020, By-law No. 45/2020, By-law No. 50/2020 and By-law No. 52/2020.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 42/2020, By-law No. 43/2020, By-law No. 44/2020, By-law No. 45/2020, By-law No. 50/2020 and By-law No. 52/2020.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move that By-laws numbered 42/2020 to 45/2020 both inclusive and By-laws numbered 50/2020 and 52/2020 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 42/2020 to 45/2020 both inclusive and By-laws numbered 50/2020 and 52/2020.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 42/2020 to 45/2020 both inclusive and By-laws numbered 50/2020 and 52/2020 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. Councillor Eadie.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Chairperson just recently on Reports 5 and 6 recommended a layover and so what I'd like to know is if…if the chairperson could answer this question. He's…is he aware of anything that was identified in the letter that was sent to all councillors from Mr. Rempel from the WAA, if he did not introduce any new information…

Madam Speaker: Councillor…Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: …new information, no.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I'm asking a question about new information in a letter we all received.

Madam Speaker: Right, but the questions you are asking, it's pertaining to a public hearing and that was also done earlier today and that is not relevant…

Councillor Eadie: Yeah, so we were unable to…Madam Speaker, then I will challenge the Chair because this letter talks I think some new information that Mr. Rempel has provided.

Madam Speaker: If you have…

Councillor Eadie: To all the councillors, besides the process issue, which we had a ruling on, there is new information in this letter that was sent to all councillors.

Madam Speaker: I'm going to have the Clerk reiterate what was said earlier and add anything new. Mr. Clerk, you had made some comments not too long ago about new information related to this letter. Is it considered new information? What is the opinion of our legal department?

City Clerk: We consulted with the Legal Services Department who advised that the letter did not contain new information, but rather only process information as any Letter of Objection would, and they advised that we should share the objection letter with Council.

Councillor Eadie: At the end of the letter, invokes the process, but in the letter itself, there is new information that he's presenting us and why we shouldn't proceed.

Madam Speaker: Okay, any further questions, Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: No, I just thought I'd make it clear.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Councillor Nason followed by Councillor Klein. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Chair. Through this COVID-19 crisis, a few negative decisions have come down including (inaudible) a property development matter and several months ago, some of us on Council asked for council seminar but nothing has happened in that regard yet. The problem is still looking at taking the property development planning responsibility and right from the City now. For this dispute of property and development, I guess I'm asking the chair if they'll be looking at it or will it be left to us, to the community committee that's been held and kept at the court be task would be an impartial body to hear it.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: A couple things there. Yes, the Province still has Bill 48 pending. It may well pass. That should lead to a good debate here about how we want to go forward it. I don't think it's quite right to say it's taking away. It's adding an appeal level and a regional planning level, as you just heard from that rather complex debate about…I read this thing, but it might be new information so I'm going to…I can't read this email even though it might not be new information because then, like we're in a very difficult process sometimes this…this airport decision has high-lighted that. Am I ripping it…law school…the Mayor and I…and people talked about the Old St. Boniface, the Australian prof…St. Boniface, not St. Boniface…the leading decision was a Winnipeg City Council decision that talked about pre-judging things and here we are 20 years later still trying to figure out what we can do and who we can talk to and these months' long appeals go on, but A. Province hasn't passed that legislation yet, but that will force us to take steps if they do, and obviously we have…we can be part of the lobbying around that legislation. B. for clarity as far as I understand it, the members of the community committee in question were not individually named in any litigation, there was not…is not held they were in contempt, that said, the City was held in contempt. There was a quite exceptional request to revisit the matter to the same Queen's Bench Justice. She issued, as you said, the second decision saying, no I don't think I'm wrong in essence that, therefore, we will be going forward with a hearing at PHD Committee on the Parker matter. I think it's coming in May. The decision…the directive from the judge was difficult in that it was to do this with all haste, but I'm aware that there is pandemic so a bit of flexibility there. So we'll have to nail that down, but the intent is let's get on with it, let's hear the matter. Third part of the question was said around council seminar. As you know, we don't…I would've directed a lot over the years if it was in my power, but it's not in my power, but how to avoid such matters in the future, I think is a fair question. And I would hope that CAO and COO are listening to that request to give us, all councillors a briefing to make sure that this sort of thing doesn't happen in the future. But…but for clarity, it wasn't the fault of, I don't think it was anything biased or any unprofessionalism by our three colleagues on that…that particular community committee. It was more a decision that was made about how to proceed, the staff recommended, went to the courts, didn't work out our way. We're going to have to keep going with a hearing on the matter. I think if there is more clarity that's needed, I would probably need to ask our legal staff but that's…that's my understanding.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question, Councillor Nason, no?

Councillor Nason: I think, I'm good there. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any other questions? Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. In 2019, when I was fortunate enough to sit on the PP&D Standing Policy Committee, I moved a motion that required largest notice, larger notice of development signs as opposed to the little yellow ones. At the time, two of my colleagues quickly revealed at a later in the EPC meeting that this…that this is something that they were asking of similar…a few years ago, I don't know if it was three or four years ago and that a plan was in the works. Over the last year since my request was submitted, nothing has come forward and I'm wondering…you can see lots of examples from Kelowna and other places now, I'm wondering if the Chair will provide all of Council a detailed report of the implementation of these new signs, the larger notice signs, and provide us that date that they will be required and used.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Councillor Allard will be upset with me if I didn't mention that he had raised this some…some years ago trying to get bigger and clearer signage possibly along with other councillors, sorry if I'm missing anyone. I know Councillor Rollins at the committee and possibly Councillor Lukes both wanted to go forward with the clearer signs of some…as a pilot project. I'll get back. I don't know where that stands. It's a fair request. I know there was some concern about legality again. If you post a sign that doesn't quite fit our by-law, we had a crazy one where the sign appeared to have been moved on one property in St. Boniface Ward and we had to cancel a hearing and the sign got moved back to

where it's supposed to be. So there's a lot of by-laws. There's a lot of detail here about posting. So it's a fair question and something that I know our staff have been working on where it stands, I don't know. But I'll endeavor and get back to everyone on Council. It's a fair question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question?

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair, through you, I know four years might not be enough time. So I'm wondering if the Chair could provide Council with another update on the status of the July 2019 sale of Portage Place and the March 2019 sale of Pantages Theatre.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I don't have that right away, I can certainly get back to Councillor Klein. I know there were, there was a time clock on Pantages that hadn't started to run due to the would-be purchaser dealing with the vendor and then complexities there and Portage Place, also a lot of complexities. I know our staff have been in meetings there. Difficult times, I'm not sure if one or both deals are still current. I don't want to publicly suggest that maybe those aren't going ahead. I'll try and find out from the staff where things stand.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm referring to the November 21st regular meeting of City Council. I can't change history, and the fact is we dealt with the issue of the rezoning of the Polo Park St. James area during the November 21st meeting, we had delegation from Winnipeg Airport Authority as well as Economic Development Winnipeg who were in opposition to the zoning at the time on November 21st when we had our first vote on this. They were saying that we were looking for more information before we could make a decision, and that we would be provided with that information from them. And I asked the question, and the representative for the Economic Development Winnipeg said the information to be precise, finally since I asked was a noise study. This was November 21st in the morning. So my question is, in this case, a couple of questions. First one is did we have any official communication with the federal government regarding this zoning…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: …since November 21st?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, you're asking about the public hearing item as well, correct?

Councillor Schreyer: Regarding November 21st?

Madam Speaker: It's all pertains to the public hearing that's in front of us at this time. So I am going to rule the question out of order. Okay, do you have another question on another topic?

Councillor Schreyer: Am I not allowed to speak about the November 21st meeting?

Madam Speaker: No. I don't believe this is the correct format for that. Seeing no other questions.

Councillor Schreyer: I have another question, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Schreyer: Well, I don't think I'll be able to get away with it, given I'm trying to deal with the issue…

Madam Speaker: Then sit down.

Councillor Schreyer: …of November 21st when we voted on the issue of changing the plan for the St. James Polo Park area. I guess I'll have to wait to next month.

Madam Speaker: Good. Thank you. Any further questions, last call? Okay, seeing none, we will do that in a moment. I just wanted to thank everyone very much and Mr. Mayor, yourself and Councillor Allard for moving the motion to have the virtual Council meeting. I think it was a very successful day and I want to thank everyone for your participation. And also the councillors that are remote, thank you very much for your cooperation. And with that, Councillor Browaty, will you move adjournment? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Roll call, Madam 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 3:48 p.m.