COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, May 29, 2020

The Council met at 9:39 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 Klein.

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. You would have noticed that roll call started today with the online members first, and we're doing that in order to follow the same process for recorded votes today. And the reason is this change is going to help ensure that votes occur in an orderly manner and that there's no confusion. We'll now move into morning announcements. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and good morning to everyone here; those that are watching. Good morning to my colleagues. I want to just make a couple of brief opening remarks. Firstly, I want to thank all Winnipeggers for continuing to do their part to flatten the curve. Winnipeggers are by and large doing remarkable…a remarkably good job of maintaining physical distancing. I want to thank all of the business owners for all of their efforts, medical staff, our provincial and federal partners, Winnipeg community heroes who are many. And I want to thank all those that are growing a row to help support the efforts of Winnipeg Harvest. If you haven't planted a row, if you have the means to do so, it's never too late, I would encourage all Winnipeggers to do so, if they can, this weekend. Over the last month, we recognized a number of important dates including Manitoba Day where we celebrated Louis Riel and the Manitoba resistance, our Indigenous peoples and Winnipeggers of all backgrounds who have helped to build Manitoba and to help build our city. We celebrated EID, and we also are currently recognizing this week, Tourism Week. We're encouraging all Winnipeggers, and I will add my voice to encouraging all Winnipeggers, provided it's safe to do so, get out and explore the beauty of our city, the beauty of our province, and do your best to support local tourism as you can. This is also Paramedic Service Week. We know our paramedics are doing invaluable and lifesaving work throughout the year, and I want to take this opportunity to thank them for their efforts. We recognize International Nurses Day, Mother's Day, and International Day against Homophobia, Transphobia and Biphobia. And I want to thank all of my council colleagues for their efforts to celebrate many of these days as well. Madam Speaker, I'm going to wrap up just by making a few brief statements regarding the events that are unfolding as we speak in Minneapolis. Minneapolis is our sister city. Winnipeggers including many businesses and organizations have very strong ties to Minneapolis. I have gotten to know Mayor Jacob Frey over the last year as a result of our participation in the Bloomberg Harvard Civic Leadership Initiative. We have spoken about racism, active transportation and many other city building efforts. I want to offer condolences to the family and friends of George Floyd. I think many Canadians, many Winnipeggers, have been deeply disturbed by what we have seen on our television screens over the recent days, and I want to offer our support to all of the people of Minneapolis during a very difficult and turbulent time. I want to offer strength and wisdom to Mayor Frey as he helps navigate also a very difficult period in the history of Minneapolis. And I want to offer strength to the citizens of Minneapolis as well. On the topic of racism, racism is something not confined to any community. We have battled racism here in Winnipeg, and we have more work to do as other communities around the world have more work to do. I have reached out to Mayor Frey to offer my support and to continue to have a positive dialogue with him, which I expect to have when the time is appropriate for him. But I just wanted to begin by acknowledging that our thoughts are with our friends in Minneapolis right now. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to start by recognizing a significant milestone birthday that Councillor Eadie had in the past week. Councillor Eadie welcomed me with open arms to this chamber and this city hall, and we had a good track record of working before I got here, but I want to recognize his birthday today and the contribution that he continues to give to Mynarski as well as some difficult times that he and I have gone through with

respect to the poverty in this city and how he's always there leading and to be such an excellent listening ear. Today, hopefully, this council passes the bike by-law and interrupting the proceeds of metal sales of crime into the doing business in Winnipeg by-law. And that was a motion, I believe it was my first motion, that he and I did together in my rookie year. So I want to recognize his birthday. I want to also recognize an upcoming milestone date, June 3rd. This is an anniversary of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls. And I want to recognize that city hall has two commitment sticks from the closing ceremony of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls. One is located in the office of the Mayor and the other in my office. The commitment sticks of course symbolize a public commitment to addressing violence against Indigenous women and girls and gender diverse peoples. Reconcili-action took hold as a really important turn of phrase on reconciliation to underline the deeds over words when implementing the calls to action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The calls to justice require similar attention, action and accountability. I'm glad that this council has worked on that structure, but there is a lot more to do before the anniversary of June 3rd, especially on Treaty 1 Territory and the Homeland of the Metis Nation, and really, thanks to the Manitoba Coalition of Indigenous Women that this was the ground that launched that national inquiry and convinced a nation that they had to do something about genocide of women and girls and gender diverse peoples. Thank you Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, today I rise to express my sympathies to the many…to the families of the many that have been lost over the past several weeks. The pain is still very raw. From the violent murders that took the life of RCMP officer Constable Heidi Stevenson and so many other innocent lives back in April. The loss of seven members of the Cyclone Helicopter station on the HMCS Fredericton while on approach to land back aboard, then only a few short days after saluting Winnipeg, our world famous Snowbirds lost team member Captain Jenn Casey. The heartbreak is many, but our military and first responders will soldier on, and we shall and must remember them.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason.

MINUTES

Councillor Gillingham moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on May 6th, 2020, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move into delegations. Mr. Clerk, is Mr. David Grant on the line?

DELEGATIONS

City Clerk: No, Mr. Grant has not contacted us, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay. He had registered to speak but no longer on the line. Let's move onto the next delegation. Mr. Patrick Stewart is on the line, Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk: Yes, Madam Speaker. He's just joining now.

Madam Speaker: Okay, he's online? Mr. Stewart, welcome. He is here on behalf of the Independent Living Resource Centre. He's in support of Item 2 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, the report dated May 19th, 2020 regarding wheelchair priority spaces on transit buses. Mr. Stewart, you have ten minutes, and welcome online with us here today.

Patrick Stewart: Thank you very much. I'd like to thank all of the...everybody present for their public service and for the opportunity to speak.

Madam Speaker: The clock, please.

Patrick Stewart: On this important motion. Am I good to go?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Patrick Stewart: Yeah? Okay, good, still getting used to this technology. Yeah. So my name is Patrick Stewart. I'm here representing the Independent Living Resource Centre. And as an organization, we would like to come out in strong support of this motion requesting the Winnipeg Public Service to begin investigating multiple means to create more accessibility on our fixed route transit system. As the report indicates through its...I guess its six requirements, this is an initiative that has multiple aspects to it regarding not just policy but the physical design of buses as well as the physical accessibility of our public environment, so access to, you know, transit stops and clearing the sidewalks et cetera. But it's not as complicated as it might appear, and I'd like to take the opportunity to direct Council to a couple of other jurisdictions that are really getting it right presently that have developed a very advanced but also common sense policies that are creating greater accessibility under public transit systems for people with disabilities. So the first requirement in this report is that the public service look at other jurisdictions regarding strollers, priority courtesy seating, as well as requirements for bus operators to help the individuals that need access to priority seating areas on a wheelchair locking basis. I'd like to say that, you know, Winnipeg is a real outlier right now with not having policies in these areas. I think it makes it very challenging for bus operators to know how to respond to situations when people aren't able to access those priority seating areas, when individuals need assistance using the wheelchair securement stations. We really don't have any guidance presently for operators on how to respond to these situations and I believe the Amalgamated Transit Union representative is going to speak to that as well this morning. As well, Winnipeg has no stroller policies presently. Myself, you know, when I had young children, and they were in strollers, I frequently used, you know, public transit not, you know, to get around the city but also to do essential things like grocery trips, and I can appreciate the necessity for, you know, everybody in our community to be able to access, you know, public transit. But the fact of the matter is when it comes to, you know, collapsing, you know, strollers, moving other seating, you know, parts of the bus for seating, these are options that people with disabilities who use mobilities like wheelchairs simply don't have. And if they don't have access to these priority spaces, they simply don't have access to public transit and don't have access to the community. Most other cities in Canada; Vancouver, Montreal, Toronto, Calgary, Edmonton, they all have policies, you know, on the books that write some guidance for the size of strollers as well as, you know, requirements to vacate priority seating areas that should be designated for people with disabilities. The number of pass-ups every year is also a very impressive part of this report. I think this is a very important aspect. You know, presently thousands of individuals who use wheelchairs are left at the curbside every single year, in the winter as well and in a heavy presence in situations. Pass-ups simply can't be standard operating procedure for Winnipeg Transit. We need to come up with some common sense policies that are going to, you know, improve accessibility and not leave people in dangerous situations. The physical accessibility of the bus itself I think is something worth looking at. The report is intended to also look at, you know, possibly removing one of the flip-up bench seats at the front of the bus. I think this possibly could represent the very common sense solution, minimal cost as well to improving the physical accessibility, as well as maybe reconfiguring the poles at the front of the bus is something that people use, you know, wheelchairs and mobility aids have to navigate around, and they do create an unnecessary barrier. I would like to, you know, maybe underscore you know with the time that I have left, and I kind of can't see the clock right now, I think that the real importance to get ahead of this issue right now. The Winnipeg Transit Master Plan, which has been delayed several times, but I believe right now is slated to come online in 2021, it is…when it comes to Transit Plus, the...you know, paratransit arm of Winnipeg Transit, the centrepiece of its recommendations is that it adopt a family of services model in which Transit Plus would, you know, greatly reduce the number of door to door trips. And so picking up individuals at their home, dropping them off at the, you know, at the entrance of whatever their destination might be and replace it with a model in which people would be dropped off at Winnipeg Transit bus stops, and that, you know, a significant part of their journey would take place on fixed-route buses. If this is something that is to be, you know, dropped on the community without the necessary precautions going into place, it really I think creates a potential to not only create confusion and conflicts but also could really put, you know, people in jeopardy...in physical jeopardy. I would encourage Council to include in this motion a requirement or some way of recognizing that the Winnipeg Transit Master Plan's design as it relates to Transit Plus, that it is, you know, creating I suppose a context in which this report to improve the accessibility of fixed-route buses takes on a heightened level of importance. Finally, I would like to recommend to Council and anybody that's interested in seriously improving the accessibility of buses to look at the city of Denver, to look at their policy that speaks to all of these issues, that has requirements for, you know, where strollers can navigate the bus, who, you know, should have priority to the accessible portions, to the areas in which the wheelchair locking bases are situated, and also very detailed instructions for bus operators, for how to respond in situations which that part of the bus is not accessible. Requirements that people vacate that area, requirements for operators to contact dispatch who need guidance in certain situations, and also provide, you know, back-up transportation services for people that aren't able to access the bus because that part of the bus is, you know, being…you know, presently occupied by people that actually need it. This is the detailed approach that the City of Winnipeg really needs to improve the situation and to create a context in which the Winnipeg Transit Master Plan might have a chance at being successful as it relates to Transit Plus. And also serve as the baseline, really the template for the Accessibility for Manitobans Act Transportation Standard that exists in draft form right now with the Provincial Government that you know, I had the privilege to be part of that committee, along with members of Winnipeg Transit. So I would, you know, recommend to move this report, you know, direct the public service…direct you guys not only the requirements to make the Winnipeg Transit Master Plan successful, but also recognize Article 17 that's online right now for anybody that's interested, the Accessibility for

Manitobans Act that really creates I think an out-of-the-box solution for the City of Winnipeg to address this very important issue. I thank everybody very much for the time to speak this morning, and I'm available for any questions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Patrick. We will come back to you momentarily for questions. We do have Mr. Grant back on the line, but I'm going to proceed at this time with the next delegation. We'll come back to Mr. Grant because the next delegation is on the same topic. I'd like to welcome Mr. James Van Gerwen. Mr. Clerk, is he with us?

City Clerk: Yes, Madam Speaker. Mr. Van Gerwen is just coming on the line now.

Madam Speaker: He is here in support of the same item Mr. Stewart just spoke of. And he is the Executive Vice President of the Amalgamated Transit Union. We'll have five minutes on the clock. I don't see Mr. Van Gerwen. There you are. Welcome, James. You have five minutes for your presentation.

James Van Gerwen: Hello? Hello. Yeah. My name is...can you hear me?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

James Van Gerwen: Hi, my name is James Van Gerwen. I am the Executive Vice President of the Amalgamated Transit Union. Just like Mr. Stewart said, the ATU is in strong support of this. I have been a bus driver for 15 years plus now, and you know, it was always disheartening for me to inform somebody who's in a wheelchair that, you know what, we have no room for them to get on the bus. May it be that it was an overcrowded bus where they had no room on there or may it have been that we have already had two wheelchairs on there and we can't take a third or just somebody refused to get up off that seat and we're technically first come, first service, so there was no reason for us to force them out of that seat. You know, there is...you know what, there's situations there that have to be addressed in my opinion, and you know what? Again, when he was stating with the master plan, if they want to start having it to integrate the Transit Plus system to be with the regular service, this really has to be addressed because the amount of wheelchairs that are…be getting on is going to be overwhelming, and we're going to need to have some kind of solution for that. I've done a little bit of research in the last two days with other transit agencies across Canada through the ATU network and yeah, there's definitely better options in other cities that I feel and I think if we work together as a team, we can actually come up with solutions that will be beneficial for every party. You know what? The system's been getting busier, and there is an aging population where the needs for priority seating has to be done. You know, I'm just...this will be a short report for me, but I'm willing to take suggestions, and I'm willing to work with you to find a solution for all parties regarding policies for our drivers to help the handicapped people or any situations like that. You have any questions or…?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Yes, there are questions. Councillor Eadie...now, can we have both delegations...yes, I see them both on the line. Councillor Eadie to start, Councillor Nason, Rollins and Mayes.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This question is for Mr. Stewart. I just wanted to start off by saying, you're doing a great job advocating for the cross disability independent living movement of the City of Winnipeg. And I've been listening to you present a number of times. And given the…I experienced the problems regarding people who use wheelchairs, people use walkers, just persons with disabilities, and there are the unseen disabilities as well that people don't really understand the need of those people that use the front space. And people...organizations like the Independent Living Resource Centre, many people back in the early '90s, I was involved...we got the low-floor buses, and they were…it turns out they're just a universal design and everybody loves them, right? So we do have the wheelchairs. But specifically, I have a...I was just…there's some ideas in there to look at, like removing one of the flip-up seats, which is interesting because in some buses, that flip-up seat is for three people to sit or…and some, it's just one flip-up. But when you were considering this, did you have a cross disability perspective in the idea of supporting that kind of thing as we know the space on many buses and the pass-ups are...they're not...I don't like them.

Patrick Stewart: Thank you very much Councillor Eadie for the question. It's a really important question, a really complicated one. As I mentioned, I had had the privilege of representing ILRC on the Standard Development Committee for the Accessibility of Manitobans Act. And coming up with a policy and sort of regulate this part of the bus, this was maybe one of the hardest things that we had to do because there was really just innumerable configurations and situations which different people require access into that bus. What Ontario does to begin with is they do so much between priority and courtesy seating. So you know, courtesy seating being for maybe individuals with small children, individuals that are, you know, older, sort of etcetera and then priority seating is specifically for people with disabilities. And you're entirely right, that people with disabilities represent a very diverse cross section of our population. Disabilities, you know, can be physical, sensory, invisible, episodic, there's many people that need access to this front part of the bus. So whether or not the solution is to remove a bench or maybe not necessarily on every single route. When we look at pass-ups, the number of pass-ups really are congregated around, you know, busy routes like 11, 16,

you know, stuff like that. I believe the idea around this is that it would be a low-cost way of creating a standing room only space at maybe half of the front of the bus. And if somebody is standing there then, you know, they obviously would be able to move to allow somebody access to that wheelchair locking base. It's just one idea I think in this report. I think what is, you know, really important is that we have, you know, a policy here. I did mention the city of Denver which really, you know, for me served as a template when looking at developing that aspect of the AMA. And what it does, you know, primarily, is it doesn't treat a pass-up as standard operating procedure. If someone isn't able to get on the bus, uses a wheelchair, the operator stops and gets directions from, you know, their dispatch. The operator, you know, encourages anybody that's able to vacate that area to vacate that area. If it's a person with a stroller or with baggage, stuff like that, they're not able…legally, they're not able to occupy that space if they are creating a barrier for a person with a disability. But certainly for somebody that has an invisible disability or any sort of disability that requires sitting in that area, they're not required to leave. The AMA doesn't…is a (inaudible) right now also. But there do need to be contingency plans in place so that, as I said, not standard procedure if somebody is left at the curb. And if they are left at the curb, that there's back-up transportation that is provided. You're right that our buses are designed to be universally accessible, but I sort of caution the...maybe being overly optimistic with that. You know, our buses are perfectly accessible to everybody. When we're talking about June, when we're talking about getting onto a bus that is, you know, half full. But when we talk about February, you know, catching a bus, you know, in the winter downtown during rush hour is a completely different situation, and we really need to have a transit policy that addresses that reality.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. There are a number of other questions. Councillor Eadie, second question.

Councillor Eadie: In terms of your consideration of the Denver policy, I'm just wondering, have you actually had discussions with users in Denver because policies sound good, but have you talked to users that say it works really well?

Patrick Stewart: I haven't had any conversations with anybody in Denver, but I've certainly had, you know, plenty of conversations with first-hand experiences, you know, with people here in Winnipeg. You know, I've been working, you know, in the community for about 25 years. And you know, I've been a transit user myself, and have experienced, you know, first-hand, you know, pass-ups, you know, situations which an operator, you know, wasn't sure if they were able to help, you know, should help, kind of directed people who use wheelchairs to, you know, call Handi-Transit to pick them up instead. You know, I've witnessed conflicts in front of the bus between people who use strollers, people that are trying to access, you know, those locking bases as they use wheelchairs. And sometimes, you know, those conflicts, they do get, they get nasty, and it's really unfortunate. I think, you know, at the end of the day, you're not…it's impossible to come up with one policy that's going to meet the needs of every single situation, you know, on the bus. But when the City just sort of steps back and has no policy at all, it's just first come, first serve, the operators aren't really given any direction or guidance in how to, you know, resolve some of these situations or just to create a more accessible environment, we just are really kind of letting chaos rule and allowing pass-ups to just really be standard operating procedure. And as I mentioned, the Winnipeg Transit Master Plan as it relates to Transit Plus, the real centrepiece of that plan right now is to eliminate door-to-door trips, be dropping people off at a stop. And if we don't, you know, get ahead of this and develop a policy, you know, we are really going to be creating an aggravated situation. I would just…

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Patrick. There's a few other questions.

Patrick Stewart: Sure, go ahead.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you Madam Chair. Patrick, Mr. Stewart, I want to thank you for working with me on moving this forward and correcting the prior attempt at addressing this. I failed to properly articulate it, and I appreciate you working on this. My question, and either of you can answer on this, but I'm wondering, would New Flyer have, as the manufacturer I believe almost all, if not all of our buses, have a role to support ensuring that this is accurate and what we can do to better implement some of these reconfigurations?

James Van Gerwen: I'd like to speak on that. Regarding the last question, too, like 15 years ago, I used to drive a majority of the buses...there was no schedule of low floor on the number 60 run, so every run there had a high floor. And I witnessed people dragging wheelchairs up a flight of chairs just to get on the bus. I'm glad to say we're no longer at that state, and the buses that we have now are all low floor buses, which have wheelchair access. But also, I've witnessed even buses that we have that are low floors that don't have proper locking mechanisms or things like that. I've witnessed as a union, watching horrible things when a bus has to take a turn, and a wheelchair flies sideways and lands on the ground which is a need to have a locking mechanism for all the wheelchairs on there. And it's something that we will progress. Flyer does have the abilities and when we do a bus build, we build the buses. We have…they sit there and then they check the configurations. And they say, do we want to have air conditioning? Do we want to have, you know, a

certain kind of button to be pressed? Or you know what, what kind of seating do we want? They have different configurations that we can look at and we can build a bus built to make a better bus. New Flyer supplies buses throughout North America, and we can go down there and we can make the best of it, you know, have maybe even a third location for a wheelchair setting. You know what, maybe have them lock in a different direction or something like that. There's always something we can work with, and that's what we do is we strive to be a better service, and let's build a better bus.

Patrick Stewart: Yeah, I would like to just start with…

Madam Speaker: Excuse me. Just procedurally, Councillor Schreyer moves extension because we're out of time. Extension of…is it two minutes? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Nason, do you have a second question?

Councillor Nason: Madam Chair, I believe Patrick had some redirect that he wanted to respond to.

Madam Speaker: Patrick, there's two minutes on the clock left, and there's a few other questions. Go ahead.

Patrick Stewart: Okay. I won't need two minutes for this. There is one thing I think that can be done that would really improve the accessibility, especially when two individuals that use wheelchairs require that space. There's a pole, kind of a grab bar when you enter the bus on the right-hand side, next to the first set of flip-up benches. That pole is a huge barrier especially for individuals who use power wheelchairs. It would allow them to access that space and turn around so that they're facing forward. Simply removing that pole I think would make a huge improvement. You know, I have witnessed situations where one space is occupied and an individual with a wheelchair has to actually vacate the bus so the other person can get on first, take up that space, and then, they can get back on and, you know, then they're both ready to go. So there are policies definitely needed, but there are some really kind of small adjustments maybe that we can make that would help.

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

Councillor Nason: Yeah, it's a very quick question directed towards Patrick. With regards to accessibility standards, do you see this as something that's a requirement as opposed to just something to look at?

Patrick Stewart: I would say it should be a requirement as all of your requirements. The community, especially, you know, individuals with disabilities, are often used to waiting a very long time, you know, for improvements to happen. Right now, the city is going through a process at improving the Transit Plus system, but it took the Manitoba Ombudsman to write a report, and you know, outlining all sorts of, you know, deficiencies and ways in which the service could be improved, and would be from a parallel system of extra transit, which the City has, you know, has pledged numerous times. You know, that is what the intention is. And also...

Madam Speaker: Excuse me, Councillor Chambers. Excuse me, just to pause, Councillor Chambers, do you move extension of two minutes? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Patrick.

Patrick Stewart: Sure. Maybe I can sum it up really quick. The community knew, you know, for a decade, maybe more, that there were huge deficiencies with Transit Plus that needed to be addressed. And rather than get in front of it, you know, the City waited for the Manitoba Ombudsman to write a report that, you know, made these things, you know, a requirement. I think this situation is very similar. The Accessibility for Manitobans Act Transportation Standard, it's already been written. The draft is sitting with the Provincial Government right now. You know, what I would encourage the City to do is to get in front of it. You know, not wait for that requirement to come out and that for, you know, another jurisdiction instead of making a requirement for the City to do the right thing. We want to do the right thing, you know, first other than, you know, wait for a problem to occur, wait for, you know, more human rights, you know, complaints, you know, to go forward. And you know, also the City has an opportunity, you know, to do itself a favour. You know, we've mentioned the Winnipeg Transit Master Plan, you know, numerous time, you know, why wait for the bad press? Why wait for the horror stories? Why wait for another body or public opinion or the news media to, you know, really force the City's hand? There's a lot of just really common sense things that we can do, a lot of them just relate to policy. You know, wouldn't necessarily come, you know, with a price tag, and there's many other jurisdictions that are getting it right right now. You know, we don't have to reinvent the wheel. I think we should really see this as an opportunity rather than wait for it to become a legal requirement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Patrick. Councillor Nason, anything further? Councillor Mayes, 14 seconds. Councillor Rollins has stood down.

Councillor Mayes: I'll just thank Patrick for his work then on getting the 500 metre rule abolished along Fife. And I want to thank Patrick for his help on that. And James has been there for I think seven years talking about safety on transit. So my thanks for that. I'll waive the other.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for that. And that brings our question period to conclusion. Thank you gentlemen for your presentation today.

Patrick Stewart: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: We'll now get back to Mr. David Grant, who is on the line with us. He is in support of Items 9 and 10. He will be participating via telephone, and it's regarding the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated May 22nd, 2020. It's regarding the audit of procurement for the pedestrian and cycling strategies and the review of the employee code of conduct the status of audit recommendations from 2019 quarter four and 2020 quarter one. And Mr. Grant is in support of these items. You have ten minutes, sir. Go ahead.

David Grant: Okay.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Grant?

David Grant: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Can you turn off the YouTube video, please. That may help on your end.

David Grant: Thank you. Yes. Very disconcerting with the time shift on the...anyway, moving on, the topic of ethics and code of ethics and so on has been of interest to me. The regulars in general imposed codes of ethics on professional members of and other regulated industries, every member can expect a complaint if they violate the intent of one of those codes. If not for this fact, violations would be more common in those areas. Deterring misbehaviour requires more than a static set of rules. I think Council in 2015 recognized that. The way I see it, Winnipeg has nothing more than that right now. I see no effective deterrence in this behaviour. City government should have an expert, in my opinion, whose job it is to look over how those rules can be gained to the benefit of those at city hall and the premise; this could be a councillor or an employee. City hall operates under a cloak of near perfect secrecy, in spite of the fact that politicians often say that when I get to city hall, it's going to be transparency all the way. The snippets of information that are revealed to the public indicate that far more may be happening there than what would happen in a privately housed company. Most people seek to do what would be to their advantage. Many want to get rich. Some of them will be aware of the rules and will conspire to violate them. They may have…they may lay out a plan to profit in violation of the intent of the rules but have a strong case that the rule was not actually broken, I've seen a few of these. We keep hearing about City staff, often at the senior levels, who act to benefit friends and relatives. Until Council can bring in a system which actually deters such connivance, scandal and the waste of public funds will continue to embarrass City officials and all those who care about Winnipeg. So I am in favour of the…this report, the audit report and all the previous audit reports. I think that's a very important function. But I think that there is a need to do more because as with any misbehaviour, it's important that the rules actually deter and not just catch 1 in 100 that's actually done something wrong. If I may be permitted, I have spoken already on the topic of temporary seating on buses, and I've been using transit for more than 60 years, here and other cities. Every time I've seen a person in need of those spaces, the temporary…

Madam Speaker: Mr. Grant?

David Grant: Yes.

Madam Speaker: That is not a topic that you registered for today. The rest of your presentation is done, I assume? And I thank you for your time. Mr. Grant? Thank you. Let's move forward. We have a report on the Executive Policy Committee dated May 22nd, 2020. Mr. Mayor, on the report.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED MAY 22, 2020

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 through 14. I'd like to pull Item 4, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The Mayor has moved consent. Are there any items that Council wishes to pull, please raise your hand. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Two.

Madam Speaker: Two and four have been pulled. Okay, okay. Councillor Klein, three? Okay. Okay. Any other...

Councillor Eadie: Through this, which is the one…the Auditor's report on…the discussion was about measuring overtime and so on?

Councillor Gillingham: That's Item No. 8.

Councillor Eadie: That's eight?

Madam Speaker: Yes, eight has been pulled.

Councillor Eadie: And has the…is it Bill 41 and 48's recommendations, are those...yeah. What number is that?

Madam Speaker: Forty four and 48 has been pulled.

Councillor Eadie: Okay. They have already?

Madam Speaker: Just the two, not Bill 49. Okay. So we have everyone's responses. Item 2, 3, 4, 6 and 8 have been pulled. I'll call the question on the remaining. Councillor Mayes, was it one of those you wanted to be recorded in opposition? I'll call the question. Okay, thank you. I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk, Item 2.

Item 2 – Reversal of Amendments to Winnipeg Police Pension By-law

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Given Council's previous direction to make amendments to the Police Pension By-law and the subsequent arbitration and a decision not to seek judicial review of that, the amendment is appropriate to respect the direction from the Arbitrator. And so I will be supporting this and look forward to hearing comments from my council colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Who would like to speak to this item? It's Item 2. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We made a decision on this by Council to change the pension plan a few Council meetings ago. It was an issue that had some debate. It wasn't a unanimous decision, but a decision was made here at Council. Thus, it went to arbitration, and we decided then to reverse it. I think there's good reasons for why it's transpired in this way. Bear in mind, I guess, you know, we at city hall, we have to try and find efficiencies. We have to try and make the budget work. And in this case, I can't...I can't comment for the motivation for every city councillor in terms of why they voted for or against changing the pension plan. I do...I am aware of two motivations that were made...were made officially in terms of why we should try to amend the police pension plan so that we'd have more money for the city budget. One was we need for money for the city budget, so at this time, in the life of Winnipeg city hall, some felt that this would be a good source of revenue. Of course, it's more than that, that it was justified, given how much the pension was, how much police officers are paid including their pension, and that because it was a sub-separate item from the contract, that it could be done. Some of us like myself felt that you can change the rules, that's why we have negotiations, but it's dangerous precedent to change them in the middle of the game. And it was my opinion that changing the pension plan at this time was arguably feasible, not obvious to me, and to do so was…it created a dangerous precedent in terms of what then could City Council could do in terms of dealing with other pensions when we're not at the point of negotiations. So those are my concerns. As well, we heard right here in the council chamber in the morning in which we made our decision a number of months ago that the problem with municipalities…municipal jurisdictions in the United States, where we've seen municipalities go bankrupt, we've heard this here in the council chamber, was because of the pensions of emergency workers. So I wish to reiterate why I'm relieved that Council's reversing this decision, basically because of the arbitration where we believe that would lead us. But that I believe why this is a good decision this time. I'm all in favour of fair negotiations and tough negotiations at negotiation time, but I do wish that we considered this because it's really important. Because it's been brought up, the idea that emergency workers' pensions caused the bankruptcy of other municipalities, and I want to reiterate again my concerns over that simplistic comment…that simplistic perspective. Bear in mind, the City of Detroit was mentioned in

that case, and I want to go over this again, it's not just about Detroit. But bear in mind, let's consider the nature of Detroit. Detroit is one city, and then it's a bunch of cities around it. And I mention, as I mentioned the 50th anniversary of the first NDP government ever elected in Canada, was right here. And they kept their promise and amalgamated the 13 municipalities and the 13 cities into one great city. And that affected the…sort of the budgetary security of the City of Winnipeg for a few reasons. One is, well, we got…we had greater efficiencies and public services. We didn't have 13 different police departments, 13 different fire departments. We created efficiencies by getting rid of 13 different municipal administrations and got rid of metro council, and we created one great city and streamlined our bureaucracy. As well, we secured a greater tax base for all those that essentially that used the city, and they'd all be contributing to the greater city. So let's talk about bankruptcy, which was mentioned in this council chamber that morning which we've made a contrary decision to what we're making today. It was really important, because believe me, you think we've seen bankruptcies in municipalities so far? How many have we seen? A handful. It's just scary when it happens, eh? But bear in mind, is this a trend? Well, it certainly could be because we didn't see this 30 years ago, but we saw it in the last decade. Is it over? Have we resolved these problems on a municipal level? No, I don't think we have, Madam Speaker. Things are getting tough. Things are getting tougher and tougher here at the City of Winnipeg. We know the financial constraints we have now that we didn't have 20 years ago. I've spoken on these things, Madam Speaker. And I just want to talk about this again, with two minutes and twenty two seconds left. Madam Speaker, the reason Detroit went bankrupt...one of the reasons, it's more than one factor, and bear in mind, Madam Speaker, that all the people that worked, made their money, had their appropriate headquarters in downtown Detroit, they didn't live in the City of Detroit, they lived in the cities around it. And they didn't pay their taxes to the City of Detroit, Madam Speaker, they had their own police departments and they had their own fire departments, why didn't these municipalities go bankrupt? Why didn't other municipalities go bankrupt? Well Detroit did because for decades and generations, the population was leaving the city of Detroit and forming cities outside of the City of Detroit and not paying taxes anymore, not paying their taxes into the City of Detroit, paying their taxes to their own cities, and then leaving the responsibility of paying the tax burden for the downtown City of Detroit on the people that were remaining there, the less empowered people, the poor people. Well, guess what happens to a city when you do that? It's a form of ghettoization, and that's what happened, Madam Speaker, and that's why Detroit went bankrupt. That's not Winnipeg. We amalgamated our municipalities, so we don't know what would have happened. Luckily though, the North End is in the same city…always was in the same city as River Heights. So thank you to the representatives…the people that John Orlikow represents as well to help us out for those of us in Elmwood North and the North End because it actually makes a better city, a better tax base. However, you know, it's great that we have 13 municipalities to do this. They didn't have that in Detroit, Madam Speaker, and it's really important. A city went bankrupt and that's because they couldn't figure out, Madam Speaker, what it really takes in self-honesty to sustain a city, a downtown with an impoverished community that's left there while everyone else leaves. So Madam Speaker, that's why Detroit went bankrupt. That's part of the problems they have in the United States, it can happen here,as well, but make sure just don't blame the pensions of the firefighters and the police officers. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise…you know, we're here today trying to un-ring a bell. We're trying to reset, go back to what it was. I'd like to take a moment to apologize to the police members, to their families for this added stress that they did not deserve. Our city is in crisis. We have murders, we have stabbings, we have people that are living in fear, yet our members answer the call. They go out there day in, day out, and I thank them for that. I hope...there's remuneration I believe that police officers are receiving as a result of this poor decision making by this council, one that I didn't support at the time. But I hope that the officers will consider the remuneration that they're going to receive, that they may think if they're able to do so, and perhaps consider donating it to one of the many community organizations that are suffering right now. That is my hope. That is my ask. And I'd hope that they consider that. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll try to be short. I told you so. Anyway, I'll be supporting this motion though to change the things back to whence they were, Madam Speaker. And it is interesting in how the general public, when they hear about what people might consider, you know, extravagant pensions and so on, and Councillor Schreyer talked about, you know, blaming these kind of things on bankruptcy, which it's not. And I appreciate what Councillor Schreyer had to say, which I think would have been a great speech for Bill 48 coming up. But I just wanted to say that it is my hope that there are supposedly some ideas with the Winnipeg Police Association. They think they know how we could work out things so that it would save us a bit of money. They are commitments. It's negotiations, and it's how you go about negotiating. It's very clear that you just can't unilaterally change something that's been negotiated over a number of years. So I'll leave it at that, and I support it. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on Item 2? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close?

Mayor Bowman: Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. So one of the things that the last council and this council I know have been grappling with has been the sustainability of the funding that's provided to the Winnipeg Police Service, and I think there is a general consensus that the sustainability of the police pension is something that does need to be addressed as Council directed the changes to be made and the subsequent arbitration, which is being respected. These changes are necessary, but ultimately, it's my hope that through dialogue with the relevant stakeholders that we will continue to be able to do our part to ensure the overall sustainability of not only the police pension but the Winnipeg Police Service. As Winnipeggers who follow our proceedings will know, the funding to the Winnipeg Police Service is at record levels. It continues to grow, and I have supported that growth, but of course the level of growth is something that many members of Council…I want to thank Councillor Gillingham, Councillor Morantz and many other members of Council around the floor have supported, ensuring that those increases are happening, but they're at a more sustainable rate. And we have that continued objective of making sure that we're managing taxpayer dollars in a responsible way, and we're ensuring that the growth in the overall size of the budget relative to our overall operations and operational and capital budgets is one that is focused on the long-term health and sustainability of the service. We want to make sure the resources are there for frontline policing. And we want to thank as we do today and every day, and I appreciate the comments of support Councillor Nason and others have provided to the members of the Winnipeg Police Service. We do appreciate the work that they continue to do and we'll do our work in terms of the overall sustainability of the budgets accordingly. Thank you.

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

Item 3 – Bill 44 – The Public Utilities Ratepayer Protection and Regulatory Reform Act (Various Acts Amended)

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think the report speaks…speaks for itself. There is I think some thoughtful and reasonable requested amendments that I hope Council will support and ultimately will be supported by the provincial government, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Speakers list, Item 3? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I appreciated the informative seminar that we were provided, Madam Speaker, some time ago. And I appreciate some of the difficulties that are to be faced, having to go to the Public Utilities Board, which is kind of interesting in that Manitoba Hydro gets to take a five-year hiatus away from it. But Madam Speaker, I do support the Public Utilities Board working on the rates. As a councillor in the past at standing committee debating and discussing water rates, there's a lot of aspects, Madam Speaker, that are very difficult. And I appreciate that the Public Utility Board does have the time to scrutinize and ask some really pointed and good questions. So I think that's important for the bill payers in this city. It's interesting in that I don't know if the Province is doing this, and I did not hear anybody discuss this issue at EPC when some amendments...or some recommendations going to the Province about what would be important, Madam Speaker. But you know, in listening to the Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development, we are voting on an item that's coming up, and there's a lot of controversy and discussion about what is an interceptor sewer. And we have Bill 48, which basically is taking the development process kind of out of our hands, especially when it goes to the Municipal Board. But there will be a regional plan that may have effects related to what infrastructure and who pays for that infrastructure that goes in there. So with the Public Utilities Board...so with an interceptor, the City pays for it, an interceptor. And yeah, there's some description about what is an interceptor, but I kind of...I do understand Water and Waste's thing. But if the City has to pay for it, it's the water rate payers that pay for it. So here we go. So you've got a development agreement going forward. There's an argument about what's an interceptor and what's not, and who has to pay for it. And then…which is outside of the process of the Public Utilities Board, right? The development thing is going to be a board of directors, and then an appeal to the municipal thing. So Madam Speaker, you know, I don't think our…the Province that created this city through the charter and legislation, I don't think they've really thought things out properly here. I'm really concerned about it. And I will go and speak. Even though I support what's here today, I still reserve, Madam Speaker, the right to go to those committee meetings and express my serious concerns. I just also want to conclude right now that I mentioned this during the budget. This is an opportunity folks, to totally separate out…the dividend I never agreed with, And the Public Utility Board didn't agree with it in the past. People are already paying that bill, but they're also already paying on their property taxes for solid waste. I think this is an opportunity and what we should be doing ourselves...not quite sure if we are legally able to do it, but we should switch up what that dividend is because people are paying on two sides. Use the dividend, so called, use it to take all of solid waste off of the property tax, use the difference in the property tax to give a property tax credit to people with homes valued at $350,000, and then, you still have enough money leftover that you might want to call savings. That yes, the $30 what million that comes into general revenue is used to offset many expenditures and things…unforeseen things and because of COVID that dividend has provided,

that we do have a contingency fund there that has a sizeable amount of money in it. But to build that up again, it will be difficult Madam Speaker. But this is the opportunity now. I'm sorry that I didn't have time to write up the motion in regards of separating water and waste, but re-identify the dividend. It's still coming from the water bill payers. And as my colleague Mr. Chambers has mentioned in the past, when I mentioned it, people would be paying for solid waste according to their consumption of water in some manner. It is directly connected to what utilities are required...and we've already identified that solid waste is a utility…it's basically kind of like a utility, right? It's all about being good with the environment. It's all about all those good things that we consider when we look at our water and our sewer systems. So Madam Speaker, I think at this point, this...it provides for an opportunity, but I really don't think anybody was thinking about this whole thing about when it comes to developments, who pays for what sewers and on and on. It will have an effect…Bill 48 will have an effect on what's going on with Bill 44. So I'm just saddened that we didn't get to put that in there. But I put it on the record, and I support the recommendations for Executive Policy Committee and the utility, and I look forward, hopefully, to maybe next month, discussing a plan to totally make water and waste separately. And maybe we can have a deal with a separate credit rating because the Public Utilities Board is going to have an effect on the credit rating of the City if it's directly related water and waste and to us. It will, and that's problematic as well. But any way, I support what we're moving forward here, and I thank EPC and the administration for working on it. There's a lot...ay-yay-yay. All the by-law, oh, it's going to be…it's going to be difficult, Madam Speaker, but I know that we can get it done. And it really is too bad that it is going to be…there will be a cost, and I don't know why the water bill payers wouldn't be paying for it. But if there's a huge cost to go to the Utility Board for a four year water rate increase and so on, I'm thinking, where's the money coming from, right? So hopefully, they allow those expenses to be formulated into the bill payers of Winnipeg because this will be costing those bill payers. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. The…I recognize what the Province is trying to do here, and I've heard them on occasion talk about how they're responding simply to residents' concerns. Now, from the start of our recent four-year balanced budget approach, that I did not support, this would be a good example of why we need to be careful when we put plans together and commit to adhering to those and talking about the great success of them. Any operation must be able to pivot and make corrections to their budget, their expenses, and should always prepare for the unknown or critical events. This may be a critical event because I see this bill as nothing more than notice that we have failed residents and that we have failed as managers of these funds. The NDP government back years ago also did not want the use of dividends for the City of Winnipeg. They were opposed to it. Over $180 million over the last decade has been siphoned from Water and Waste to general revenues. We have asked for details, we have never been given details of exactly why we would have taken those funds and where they went. The cost of repairing the facility has I think almost doubled in the 18 months that I've been here with no definitive answers as to why we continue to ask for other levels of government to pay for it, however, we want to continue to siphon the profits from this utility and not have to worry about the managing of it. In 2020, some of us on this council increased the rates for water and waste for four years. Some residents, when that increase was approved by some of them here on Council, rose 30%. That's unacceptable. When will the Mayor direct the public service to provide members of Council factual data that would support the need for such an increase on this one portion of rates for water and waste? It's a massive increase. It has impacted people already. And I can't imagine how much more it may impact some of our residents given COVID-19. The bill being proposed is a relatively common practice across the country. I don't know what we're afraid of. I believe residents will voice their concerns to the Province if they feel this fare is not fair and it's not reasonable. I don't support sending a letter, but I do applaud Councillor Eadie and any of those that will take the time to go and speak and advocate on behalf of their belief during the public hearings for this bill.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Councillor Schreyer followed by Councillor Nason.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Councillor Eadie was wishing he could do...make a motion or amendment to ensure separating water and waste. Well, I sure do hope he's right, and we do do this because I sure hope we separate water and waste before it gets to my kitchen sink. Having said that, Madam Speaker, four years ago…that was a joke. Four years ago, Madam Speaker, about four years ago, I did bring in a motion to try to get City's water and waste, to direct them to the Public Utilities Board of the Province of Manitoba. My motion didn't pass, but the reasons I did, as I expressed, and at the time, Tom Nevakshonoff, the Minister for Water Stewardship or Natural Resources had made the point, as well, you know, as is the purview of any citizen...responsible citizen that the City's really got to take a second look at how we're dealing with our water rates. Madam Speaker, I don't think there's another municipality in Manitoba that takes so much...so much of a dividend or a profit from the rates that people have to pay for their water and put them into general revenue. I don't think there's another comparable municipality in Manitoba. Having said that, one could say there isn't a comparable municipality in Manitoba to the City of Winnipeg. But Madam Speaker, let's deal with a few things; the City wants to ensure now that there's proper process and I agree. In fact, that is why I felt it should go to the Public Utilities Board because we're all conscious sort of of the process we have there. We're talking about going there. We're talking about making amendments to their process. We're talking about, you know, Ross Eadie

being commended by Councillor Klein and others in terms of making our statements to the Public Utilities Board process. It's been said, Madam Speaker, one argument…one argument four years ago or so here in council chamber against my motion that it should go to Public Utilities Board was that we already have a process here. Fair enough, Madam Speaker, but it's good to see that now the City now it looks like it might go to the Public Utilities Board and it's good to see that the City's been vigilant in ensuring that the provincial process would be adequate. That's great, Madam Speaker. I suspect with the Public Utilities Board and their well-known process for public participation, including if the City's appoints or we're…hopefully we move today, are included by the provincial bill that the Public Utilities Board will have, obviously, a superior process for public consultation. Madam Speaker, I think it's really important. I also want to make a point. The difference between the dividend...City of Winnipeg, through our water rates...which I consider a tax on the poor. The difference between that and Manitoba Hydro, bear in mind, Madam Speaker, I know this is a little...it's not convoluted, it's just a little bit of a long story. I know I'm the first one to mention this in this chamber. I haven't seen it mentioned publicly. Bear a few things in mind. Madam Speaker, back in the '80s, we signed a free trade agreement with the United States. Canada's the first country, I think, in the history of the world to volunteer…voluntarily give up sovereignty over its rates and exports over its…over its energy…rates and amounts of its energy exports. I don't think there's a country in the European Union that has done this. Nonetheless, this is what we've done to sort of guarantee…do our part to guarantee a stable economy within the North American context. Having said that, Madam Speaker, it's not perfect. Remember, what we've done, no other country has done: give up sovereignty over our…over our pricing and amount of our energy exports. But Madam Speaker, therefore, we can't…we can't charge more for our hydro, which is going to become more and more of a valuable commodity in the decades to come. We can't sell it at a higher rate to the United States than we sell it to ourselves, okay? So I'm just mentioning that. I'm making a judgment call. But bear in mind, Madam Speaker, when we do raise our rates, if there is surplus for the Province of Manitoba, then we are in a position...and that includes from the profits from our exports, Madam Speaker, so there's a difference. Manitoba Hydro receives profits from their energy exports, approaching…depending on the year or the decade because of fracking right now, a short-term solution right now where there is sort of a glut in American oil, notwithstanding right now during COVID. That's another story, I'm not going to go there, just to simplify. Therefore, we can have real profits...not arbitrary profits from water rates because we say we're going to take a dividend from people…you know, from people paying, you know, more of water rates than is going to sustain their water system in the City of Winnipeg. We actually get profits from Manitoba Hydro, and then, we can use that to offset any projects within the Province of Manitoba. Madam Speaker, that's not the same as raising your water rates and then using it as a dividend, pretending it's profit. Do you see the difference? It's not a profit from an export. It's just profiting because we're just charging ourselves more. There's a difference, Madam Speaker, so that's been my concern. That's why I've…that's been my perspective on this the whole time, why you can't exactly compare it to Manitoba Hydro. Sure, look, you can say that Manitoba…that we can make more profit from public…from water rates just by charging more. But Madam Speaker, it's a charge…it's a…primarily a tax on the poor. They've had to increase our rates because people have been reducing their water consumption slowly but surely over the last generation. So they've had to increase the rates just to keep up with having the same amount of income. That I understand, Madam Speaker, but then they've had to increase it again to use it as a tax to go into general coffers. That's different from Manitoba Hydro actually receiving profit from energy exports. There's the difference. It would be kind of like, I don't know, Winnipeg selling water to Headingley or another municipality. Well, we can't do that, it would be kind of like that, but not really. So I just wanted to mention theses points. I'm glad to see that the City wants to ensure that the Public Utilities Board public consultation process is better, and I agree. I always felt it should be. I understand, it's been pointed out by Councillor Browaty that there is room in here that we can still increase the dividend for general income if we want to. It's still possible, it's just that it has to go through Public Utilities Board and that consultation, and I think this process is fair, and I believe the City's contribution to...through this to try and make that a better...a better bill is a good thing, and that's why I'm in favour of this yet again. Thanks for everyone finally coming around, four years later. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you Madam Speaker. Who knew that what goes down the sewer systems is such a great topic to talk about. Let's talk about, you know, the fact that the fees are taken and that dividends are taken, that fees are raised not as part of the budget but before the budget process. I'm challenged by that. You know, I'd like to see it on a more open and transparent basis as part of budget deliberation. I believe the City of Winnipeg is the only municipality in Manitoba that isn't part of a PUB review for water and sewer. I can be mistaken. Perhaps members of the standing policy committee can correct that, but regional disparity in fees is a huge concern. Many of our wards that are not in the core of the city are surrounded by municipalities that are growing, that are taking advantage of their close proximity to the City of Winnipeg, and some of the advantages of that are the disposal fees. The RM of Springfield itself charges $7 to dispose their poop, whereas residents that are on septic tank or holding tanks in the City of Winnipeg are charged $80; $7 versus $80. If we're all in this together, and, you know, we have the metropolitan region, why do we have such a huge disparity in those fees? It's a competitive disadvantage, not a partnership, right? We see the businesses cropping up just at the edge of our municipality, and I think a good reason why we're seeing that is that it's so darn expensive to do anything in our city. Perhaps, yes, our sewers have mandates that might not otherwise be impacted by those on the

outside regions, but that's a different argument. Our competitive advantage of working together is one that we need to sit down with the metro region and maybe look at how we have such a huge disparity. What can we do to bring ourselves in line with the fees that they charge? Why are we charging so much more? Yes, we're an older and more established city. Our combined sewer overflow, that bill gets larger and larger year after year because we're not doing enough to change it. We need to address these outstanding issues. We continue to grow out, but we're not fixing within first. We need to look at that and we need to look at working with the Province, working with the federal government, get our priorities in line, and help fix these long-standing issues and get us all on the same balance sheet. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll try to be brief. I hadn't planned to speak, but I just want to clarify a couple of things. I'll be voting against this motion. Not terribly concerned about the request for a four year delay, it's more, I actually have come around to Councillor Schreyer and Councillor Eadie's view. As expressed in the debate, Councillor Schreyer referenced April of 2016, there was a terrific debate here about, in many ways, this very issue, about referring consideration of rates to the Public Utilities Board. At that time, I said, there's something Orwellian to get out and say, I'm for more accountability and openness, let's give it to an unelected board and to present there, you need to get intervener status. I have come to believe that with some reluctance, I think I was wrong on that. In most cases, and certainly in Bill 48, there's some Orwellian aspects there I would argue, but here, the budget, in its complexity and its sheer size is so large for our utility that I do think it's proper, as Councillor Nason said, and as was said by Councillor Allard and others back in 2016. Other municipalities all voted to PUB. So there's a great John Maynard Keynes line which is, "If I see new facts, I change…if presented with new facts, I change my mind. What do you do, sir?", when someone criticized him for changing his position. So, I think the fact of the matter is, we have tried and I don't want to fault in any way the Mayor or Councillor Gilroy. It would sadden me if anyone took this to be any sort of criticism of Councillor Gilroy who has done a very good job and took over at the Water Committee after I left. It is not a criticism of them. It is, I think, a reality that the complexity and the size of these budgets is such that it does make sense at this point in our history to have the Public Utility Board look at it. I think Councillor Wyatt, or perhaps Councillor Allard, someone speaking to this in '16 said, yeah, we're…in essence, yeah, we're going to have to have a few more staff or at least one more to prepare, but that's a very small cost when you look at the hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars that's being debated in some of these big projects. You've heard me, Madam Speaker, speak at enormous length about the $104 million green infrastructure program that we've never debated here. We didn't have a chance to talk about that policy decision before. It was presented by the Utility to the Province, and the Province accepted it. I actually like the idea, my ward won't get much out of it, but I like the green infrastructure idea, but it's an example…it's an example of the sheer size of these programs that are being put forward without Council's scrutiny, $104 million, think of that. So I think, with some reluctance, I'm going to vote against the motion. And I'm going to say, I've changed my position since 2016. I think the time has come where it does make sense to refer these issues to the Public Utility Board. I have a very different position, and I will let Councillor Allard enthusiastically support the motion on Bill 48, and that does trouble me that that scenario where we'd be giving…where decision making authority would be given to an unelected body. But on this matter, I have to say, I think the technical nature of the questions and the sheer enormity of the dollars at stake have convinced me to, as Keynes would say, to change my position when presented with new facts so I will not be supporting the motion. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise, I will be supporting this report going forward. I think what is important, as I see it here, is the recommendations that are included, specifically that our staff be working with the Province of Manitoba in active collaboration in the creation of the regulations around Bill 48. If Bill 48 is inevitably enacted, certainly, yes, it has complications…several complications for the City of Winnipeg. And I do note, the report also indicates at the very…page 6, the implications and risks, and several of my colleagues have raised specifically the matter of the potential impact on the City's current dividend policy. I think it would be important is when we have opportunity as administration from the City to be speaking with and hopefully working with the Province of Manitoba around this matter that if, indeed, the Public Utilities Board wishes to take over, and if, indeed, they called upon Winnipeg to look at ending the dividend policy, then, we should be looking at a phasing out approach. I think there could be collaboration around that if that's indeed the case that happens. And respectfully, you know, there was a comment made by, you know, Councillor Klein related to the multi-year budget, I think one of the…certainly, one of the advantages of a multi-year balanced budget, is it does allow the City to pivot. It does allow the City to react to cost drivers or revenue drivers because what we have done is we have eliminated four years of deficits. By doing the hard work of eliminating those deficits in future years, it provides the opportunity for Council to be in a better position to weather matters like COVID-19. You know, some other potentially shock that they comes the City's way, financial shock, had we not done the hard work of balancing four years of budget, and we were faced with these unforeseen...some unforeseen financial pressures, we would be in a much…it would put us in a much more difficult position to respond and ultimately ensure that our budgets are balanced annually. So I do think that there's opportunity here with the Province of

Manitoba and our ongoing dialogue. If…you know, if inevitably, they're making these changes, and Bill 48 is enacted, then I think what's really important is to be supporting this report and this motion that would see our staff and the Mayor and his roles, inter-governmental lead, working with the Province on the implications of this new legislation.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. I believe it was in 2016 when I was chair of IRPW and initiated request to the Mayor to remove the Water and Waste Committee from the Public Works and Transit file, there were three very big files. It was virtually impossible to provide the level of scrutiny required primarily because of the technical specifications of the projects and the utility. I recall we would sit around on the EPC committee meetings and receive presentations from the department, and the hundreds of millions of dollars of the projects, and there were no questions asked. No one asked questions. I appreciate that the Mayor did remove it and create a committee of its own. It does allow more scrutiny and I think that we've seen over at least the duration that I've been here in the last six years that a lot of things have been brought to light with a few audits and reports. I still do believe that this utility is not receiving the scrutiny that is required, the work and the projects are in the hundreds of millions of dollars. I know that it…I know that the dividend does provide, obviously, a funding source, but I think that the time has come with the projects that are on the table that the Public Utility Board is the one to be the decision-maker and rate setter, so I won't be supporting the motion today…the report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr.…

Councillor Gilroy: Sorry, Councillor Sharma.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah, sorry. I didn't unmute myself fast enough. I guess I am in favour of this motion that's here for us today. I just wanted to put my thoughts on the record that I don't agree with the province's move. I think this is the responsibility of us as Council, and I don't like that we're being taken away that authority, so I just want that on the record. Having said that, I don't know if this is not really an option to us, so I guess what we do need to do is be prepared if this is coming down. I think it's going to be a huge added cost, and there's going to be more staff that's going to be required. We're going to need to figure out how that's going to impact our department, and we're also going to have to figure out how to manage the changes that need to occur within the department to make this happen. So I support the changes that are in front of us here today, but I do want to make it on the record that I believe that this is the role and responsibility of councillors. And as you can see here today on the agenda, a lot of things are being taken away from us and our responsibility and I don't agree with that aspect of it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Mr. Mayor, to close on the item.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and appreciate all the comments by my colleagues including our committee chair. And I want to thank her for her stewardship and leadership in the portfolio. A lot of references to finance as well, and I want to acknowledge and applaud the diligence and the hard work of our Finance chair who continues to provide leadership to this council and the City of Winnipeg. I also want to just take this opportunity to thank members of the public service including members of our Water and Waste Department, our director, and the individuals who provide us with clean and safe drinking water each and every day should be thanked and appreciated for their ongoing efforts. I would just refer to what we are voting on today. Councillor Gillingham highlighted it, and I fully appreciate the fact that there'll be different views on whether or not Bill 44 should proceed or not as a whole. The approach that was taken and the recommendations coming out of Executive Policy Committee were intended to build as much unanimity amongst Council on things that we could agree on. And so rather than simply asking that the bill to be scrapped, the approach was deliberately taken to, among other things, seek clarification of the content of the bill and anticipated regulations, request the Province include the City in active collaboration in the creation of regulations with respect to Bill 44, request the Province to endorse the City's current 2020 to '23 Water and Sewer Rate Plan and enact the necessary regulations under Bill 44 to allow for the first water and sewer rate period to be reviewed and set by the Public Utility Board to begin in 2024. That was done in order to keep the balanced budget whole for the time being as we transition to a new framework as prescribed by the Province. Again, what I feel are thoughtful and reasonable amendment requests, asking for active collaboration, I don't think is unreasonable and I think should be supported by Council. I keep in mind that a lot of discussion, as there has been for many years, certainly predating my term in office and others around this council chamber about the use of the water and sewer dividend. When it was first introduced by then committee chair Scott Fielding, now Manitoba's Finance Minister, it was controversial then and continues to be controversial. And I'm pleased that, certainly in our last year's budget, we reduced the rate. I think…I don't think anybody...well, I don't hear too many people around this council chamber arguing that it should remain indefinitely, and so we will continue to do our part to manage that responsibly. I note, of course, the Province continues to take hundreds of millions of dollars from Hydro in terms of a dividend. The current government, for example, has pulled well over $1

billion right now, and of course Finance Minister and others would know that well in their budgets. They're pulling hundreds of millions of dollars away from Hydro. And so, those issues will remain controversial both at the legislature and here. I think the level of openness and transparency and scrutiny that's provided towards the department as well as our budget, which all members of Council were provided with general ledger access, first time ever in the history of the City of Winnipeg. So I trust all members of Council will be able to do their due diligence and their scrutiny, given the new tools that were afforded to them and afforded to all of us. And I want to again, in that respect, thank our Finance chair for leading the charge to make sure that that scrutiny and that accessibility has been there for all members of Council. That being said, these amendments or requested amendments to the bill, I believe are thoughtful, are reasonable, and will help position us to work collaboratively with the Province on ensuring that the implementation of the Bill 44 doesn't aggravate the balanced budget that we currently have for the next four years, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, we'll call the vote on item...yes?

Councillor Nason: Can we vote on the item directly and record it?

Madam Speaker: Vote on them separately, did you say?

Councillor Nason: Yes.

Madam Speaker: I just need to pull it up. Mr. Clerk, I don't have it on my screen at the moment. Just let me pull it up here.

City Clerk: Yes, Madam Speaker. The procedure by-law does allow for the items to be voted on separately.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, I'm just looking at the clauses here asking for the separate clauses.

City Clerk: There are four clauses...four recommendations.

Madam Speaker: Yes. And did you also ask for a recorded vote?

Councillor Nason: Yes.

Madam Speaker: All right, I will call the question on Item 1. All in favour, please rise. Raise your hand if you are online. Madam Clerk, you'll start by calling the vote.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote on Recommendation 1, Yeas 16, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Clause 1 passes unanimously. All in favour of Clause 2, please rise or raise your hand if you're online.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote on Recommendation 2, Yeas 16, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Recommendation 2 passes unanimously. Onto recommendation 3; all in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote on Recommendation 3, Yeas 16, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: I'm sorry, we still need to do the opposition. My mistake, Mr. Clerk. All those opposed…yes?

Councillor Klein: Can we read out the motion? I think we just said Item 3.

Madam Speaker: Sure. Item 3, Madam Clerk, if you can read it out for the record.

Clerk: That City Council requests the Province of Manitoba to endorse the Winnipeg's current 2020-2023 Water and Sewer Rate Plan and enact the necessary regulations under Bill 44 or alternatively delay amendment to section 210.5 of the City of Winnipeg Charter to allow for the first water and sewer rate period to be reviewed and set by the PUB to begin in 2024.

Madam Speaker: And those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason

Madam Speaker: Okay, Recommendation 3 passes. And the vote, Mr. Clerk.

City Clerk: The vote on Recommendation 3, Yeas 12, Nays 4.

Madam Speaker: Okay, and that passes. The last recommendation, Madam Clerk. All in favour, please rise. Recommendation 4.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Klein and Nason

City Clerk: On Recommendation 4, the vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 14, Nays 2.

Madam Speaker: Recommendation 4 passes. Moving onto the next item, Madam Clerk.

Item 4 – Bill 48 – The Planning Amendment and City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment Act

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Bill 48 has been a bill that was introduced and has certainly raised eyebrows province-wide. I've been having significant dialogue and ongoing dialogue with counterparts in other jurisdictions outside the City of Winnipeg, other municipal mayors and reeves. I want to thank Councillor Browaty for his leadership and the ongoing collaborative dialogue I'm having with him in terms of his efforts with AMM. I also want to thank our Council representatives at the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region, Councillor John Orlikow and Councillor Scott Gillingham. We've been…we've had excellent dialogue and very collaborative dialogue with our capital region partners, something that I tremendously appreciate. I think there's more dialogue now than certainly there was previously with our capital region partners, and we want to see that continue. Bill 48, however, and the manner in which its been introduced certainly is of significant concern, and again, like the last recommendation to Council, rather than simply asking for Bill

48 to be scrapped, the amendments that are requested of Council are again, what I think are thoughtful and I think are reasonable, and I'm going to highlight them briefly. The first, and I think the most troubling aspect of the content of the bill, is the fact that local residents that are impacted by land use planning decisions will not have a right to appeal to the Municipal Board. This disenfranchise is significant…a significant number of residents and would only allow the landowner or the developer with the right of appeal. This is something that would be a significant step backwards when it comes to providing greater openness, transparency, and more importantly, accountability to the residents that we serve. And so I know as part of our current processes, you know, we have delegations appear regularly on the floor of council, it's something that is a bit of an anomaly. You don't see that at the provincial or federal levels, and I can only imagine if members of the legislature or parliament took…you know, took the time and had the opportunities for members of the public to appear on the floor at the legislature to express their views on matters, what a different legislative experience that would be compared to what we do, and I appreciate the processes that we have to allow for that democratic input. Curtailing the opportunities for local residents to voice concerns about land use planning, to take...to not allow them that right of appeal, is just a...it's a huge step backward, and it would be very different than what is enjoyed in other parts of the Province. So the request is to amend the bill to provide local residences…sorry, local residents impacted by a decision, in addition to the property owners, with the right of appeal to the Municipal Board on municipal land use decisions. The second request is to provide a criteria for the Municipal Board to consider in adjudicating appeals. My understanding is based on the bill, as it's currently drafted, that criteria does not exist. And so having an open and transparent criteria again I think would improve the bill and ultimately the legislation. Thirdly, ensure the required timeframes for decisions on applications covered in the bear…bill are fair and reasonable for all stakeholders including the property holders, so to make sure that they are in fact fair and reasonable. Fourthly, maintain the role and autonomy of local governments by providing them with an opportunity to revisit and make new decisions on land use applications based on the findings of the Municipal Board made following an appeal. So as it's currently structured, the Municipal Board would make a decision, and it would end there. They would ultimately be able to rule. The request here would be that the Municipal Board would weigh-in and would send it back to a respective city council where you have elected members of council that could obviously review and consider the appeal. And lastly, and I want to thank my council colleagues for this addition; Councillor Gillingham, and I know Councillor Rollins and others had input here, to provide further detail related to the sharing of cost, revenues and other benefits associated with land use planning, infrastructure investment, service sharing, and economic development by municipalities and First Nations governments within the capital planning region. There is an opportunity here with what is occurring with Bill 48 to better align the costs of building the capital region with all of the capital region partners, and that detail has not been provided right now by the provincial government. And so the request is to get that detail so we can scrutinize and discuss it, certainly amongst our capital region partners. You know, not since the forced amalgamation issue have I seen the municipal leaders outside Winnipeg raise concerns like they're doing with this bill and the manner in which it's being introduced. And I know other councils have reviewed and considered through administrative reports and their own discussions and debates their views and I know that their views are being made available through AMM and directly to the provincial government. This adds our voice to the voice of other municipalities in Manitoba with again, what I think are thoughtful and reasonable requests for amendments, Madam Speaker, and I'm hopeful Council will support them.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I support the amendments, in particular, having worked on Treaty Land entitlement in previous jobs, and several revenue sharing frameworks as an Indigenous policy analyst for mineral resources, I'm encouraged to do that work again at the City of Winnipeg. I want to say...put some highlights of Bill 48 on the record and start by the theme of driving certainty and timelines, and a good place for business growth that you can find in Bill 48. The legislation really considers permits and what the City must give to owners of real property with confirmation of date of their application, when it's received, and that, within 20 days, determine its completion. And should city hall fail to issue that permit, owners are entitled to compensation for damages. And I support what we've put on the record through subsequent committees, in particular, EPC amendments, but I'll say this: that on the one hand, while I support our changes that I hope passes unanimously here today, I want to acknowledge that it really affirms the direction of Property and Heritage and Downtown Committee through many council briefs with respect to concerns in the permit office. I continue to have concerns in the permit office, which is why I have mixed feelings about this legislation, good and bad. There is still room for improvement with respect to this. We should have best practices from across the region, but we shouldn't support needless delays on economic development. And so I...I...I'd like the legislation for that reason. Written submissions on the record; I think that conscientious denial is important, and good governance is, too, and I welcome this being confirmed in legislation, in particular, where you need to put comments on the record for or against. All too often, I don't hear that enough. And whether I…whether I was a school trustee or whether I was on Council, I don't hear that conscientious denial enough, and I like that in term so this legislation. Servicing capacity…and I won't talk about that too much. There is a really important framework presented in the act; compensation of the City, joint plans for the city, it's important. The shared benefit clause; as a city councillor that wants us to grow up and not out, this is a really good first step. It will allow us to consider what many of us have considered on how we get income from those that drive out of the city. They work here, but they drive out of the city. They go home, and they pay, yes, lower

taxes, and yet are otherwise heavy users of this city and city infrastructure. So I like that this legislation acknowledges some of that, and if it's done right, if it's implemented right, if there's really continued good legislative writing, which we have a role to play in ensuring that, and with these amendments, I support of it. In terms of the shared benefit clause, it will continue to enhance the work of…with Indigenous governments. And in this manner, I absolutely recognize it's a…it's a reconciliation governance structure, and a structure necessary in realizing the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous People at the municipal level. And I'm encouraged by that. We, again, have to be vigilant in the implementation to realize that, as always, normally and in an enduring way, but that is really critical. The legislation presents the City of Winnipeg and all other municipalities with this challenge that all boats should float. And that evidence should really matter. When we upgrade our infrastructure, the value of property taxes should go up, and we do this…if we do this right and together, there is an opportunity here for sure. Infrastructure like water and sewer upgrades are really key to my ward, and downtown in real terms. In other wards as well where it is lacking, literally developers cannot develop, and that is a problem. For sustainability, I will continue to be in favour of growing up and not out, like I say with all deference to my colleague, Councillor Lukes. But the metropolitan area, that census, we know in data can be really different in terms of housing, poverty and Winnipeg proper. And in terms of housing and affordable housing, two priorities for me both as chair of Protection Communities, Service, and Parks for this council and as ward council, this is a really important data point, something that our folks on the Collaborative Leadership Institute really, really need to know in order…and I thank my colleagues, Councillor Gillingham and Councillor Orlikow who know that data well and can see the differences. But again, that is a challenge for the continued vigilance on this legislation, which is why these amendments are a good first step. It really does require collaboration and working together. So I want to close in support of the amendments by asking I think a critical question: will this usher in a more collaborative era between capital planning region, Winnipeg metro area, and I sure hope it does. At the time these bills came forward in the Manitoba legislature, that we were contemplating the City budget and giving a zero year increase in the multi-year budget to our City Planning Department. Councillor Lukes and I had a really good discussion at Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown where she came forward with an amendment saying 50% more, 50% more; we should give the department 50% more. It's a critical, critical economic engine for the City. And while I couldn't support that, I do think it is infinitely understandable, in light of this legislation, I still want to wait. Similarly, Councillor Klein forwarded the motion on the planning commission. I as a councillor am not uninterested in a planning commission given my concerns on planning in this city, urban design in this city, and critical steps we continue to need to take, enhancements to permitting. But I want to say that my political mentor, former Chief Jim Bear of Brokenhead, he wrote me really excited about the collaborative leadership initiative that he helped start, and the capital region partnership. Winnipeg and Manitoba will both benefit from the wise implementation of the act. We are the only capital city, we are the largest city, but we have to do our part. That's critical for economic development. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise today, I'll be supporting this report and the amendments that the Mayor brought forward at Executive Policy Committee that are now before us. I'll just simply state that first of all...restate what I stated at Executive Policy Committee. I'm a strong believer in regionalism. I believe that coordination is the key to unlocking the potential of the capital region, and to maximizing future opportunities for each municipality and for all municipalities within the capital region. I believe that working in silos as contiguous municipalities limits the capital region's potential and is detrimental to our individual and collective effectiveness in matters of growth, economic development resource management and strategic land use. And I believe that Winnipeg capital region has the potential that will only be realized by a coordinated capital region plan. Put simply, as Dr. Bob Murray put into his...into his report that all council had access to, "Collaborative regions attract the investment and economic development that drive growth. A collaborative region manages growth better. Shared services provide efficiencies and effectiveness across the region." As the Mayor mentioned, I have the privilege of serving on the Capital Region…the Metro…Winnipeg Metropolitan Region Board and serve with Councillor Orlikow on that board, previously with Councillor Lukes, and for the last several years I've had the privilege of co-chairing the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region with Rosser Reeve, Fran Smee. As Councillor Rollins highlighted as well, one of the highlights for me of my work in the…with the capital region is the collaborative leadership initiative where Indigenous leaders and non-Indigenous leaders of municipalities and First Nations governments are working together on really solving shared problems and working in collaboration. And it's been very, very rewarding. And we've just I think begun that process, so there's a long way to go, but the potential is great and I certainly look forward to its future. I want to acknowledge the good work of Colleen Sklar and her team from the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region who are working tirelessly to fulfill the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region's mandate which is set out by provincial legislation. The WMR was established in 1998 and is legislated through the Capital Region Partnership Act in 2006. And that legislation gives the organization its mandate to set priorities in areas for planning, growth…pardon me, planning, growing and servicing the region. And currently, as many of us know, the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region is focused on the development of the regional growth management and servicing plan with a focus on objectives and policies that will ensure the long-term economic competitiveness of the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region. A coordinated plan will be critical to the future success of the capital region. Which brings me to Bill 48, and I'll limit my comments specifically to kind of one aspect of the bill. Section 8.1 of Bill 48 sets out the establishment of the capital

planning region and though there is great potential, there are many hurdles to overcome. And many of my colleagues and I and others that have talked about some of those hurdles that must be overcome and matters that must be addressed. These are hurdles that have to be overcome on the road to developing that capital region plan. It's going to take work. It's going to take compromise. It's going to take time. It's going to take effort. And there will be and there are issues. The issues must be identified and addressed, not the least of which are financial matters related to the establishment of the capital region plan and the implementation of any plan and working together. In the draft of Bill 48, the financial matter section of 10.14.1 and following speaks only to financial matters related to the regional board annual operations. It goes onto speak about financial matters related to costs associated with appeals. But the bill is currently silent on financial matters as it relates to revenue sharing and cost sharing and benefits sharing related to regional land use planning infrastructure investment and so on. It's a glaring omission, I believe, that needs to be addressed in the bill. And so I certainly appreciate the Mayor's motion that we have before us, and I appreciate his support and my Executive Policy Committee colleagues' support for an amendment at EPC to the Mayor's motion that we have before us. And it's there in…before us, in recommendation 3E, and the Mayor did read it out. And I appreciate also Councillor Rollins' catch to make sure we include the First Nations governments in the wording of this amendment. And I'll read it out again, "That to provide further detail related to the sharing of costs, revenues, and other benefits associated with, but not limited to, land use planning, infrastructure investment, service sharing and economic development by municipalities and First Nations governments within the capital planning region." The capital region plan will have cost implications. It will have revenue implications, it will have benefits that will be shared or should be shared, and that will have impact on each municipality within the capital region. We can't put all of the other things first and say, well, we'll talk about the, you know, the financial impacts later. Those will come in due course. No, we have to get the financial realities of this plan at the front end, and I would believe, in some manner, codified within the bill as it's, you know, inevitably enacted to be legislations. So once again, I will be supporting this report. I'm supportive, certainly very supportive of regionalism and the capital region, but there are hurdles to overcome. There are issues that have got to be identified and addressed and dealt with. And just because there are issues, significant challenges, doesn't mean that we should in any way shy away from regionalism. I'm not saying that anyone here is, but just because something's difficult doesn't mean it's not the best thing to do, so I'll be supporting this report.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. Interesting that we sit here today to talk about Bill 48, especially given the other motions that are in front of us, and I'll note my colleague had mentioned needless delays. I think we have developments that are six years in the waiting. I see this bill not as everyone else does. I'm not sure why, but let me share my feelings as to what I see. I see the intent of the bill to establish accountability, which is long overdue, and we've heard it for years from residents and those in the industry. When you read the proposed changes or when I did, and I compared it to the current legislation, I failed to see where it states the City will not continue to follow the same processes in place today. I fail to see where it says you cannot have a community committee. I fail to see where it says you won't have SPC. I don't see that right now. If I go to the bill, which it is right here, it talks about the mandate of a planning region. You know, facilitating and promoting regional considerations in providing infrastructure and services. Exactly what we're saying we're asking them to do is right there. You can go on, related activities. It talks about the zoning by-law of a municipality for the purpose of carrying out the mandate, a planning reasoning has the capacity and powers of a natural person. This just goes on and on. It talks about the fact that the Municipal Board must have public hearings when it comes to the establishment of the planning of this capital region. It talks about that. Now, yes, does it take away a little bit of power from those of us that sit here today? Maybe, but I don't see the fear when you read both of the…both the current legislation and proposed, other than yes, we should advocate to make sure everyone can be heard, but they will be heard with us. And that can happen today. I don't know if a resident…they can certainly come to us and appeal, but they couldn't take it to the Municipal Board as some probably will, we'll hear it later today. Look, this is a time to sit down and just talk about everything openly. I understand that we want to send a note to the Province and ask them to provide us with details so that we can scrutinize them, and I sure hope the Province responds to that request from an elected official better than this institution does. I think that we should welcome the oversight. I think we should welcome the opportunity to change for the better of Winnipeg and for Manitoba in developing a thriving and flourishing capital region. And get into these discussions and work together…I don't want to think that we're just saying, it's a great idea, but only if you do it our way. I don't want to think that that's what we're doing. We're...you know, we're not included in the discussion is what we hear a lot. We're not included in any…in a collaborative way, but we are, and we've heard that we are. And if I go to 10.3 of the agreement...of the new bill...proposed new bill, it says, "A regional plan must contain plans and policies respecting the physical, social, environmental, economic and fiscal objectives of the region for at least a 30-year time span." We don't do that today. We're not doing that today. That's what it's saying. I think that we hear different items at different times, but we don't do that today. I would just ask that we think about what we're doing and look at this as a new opportunity to start a new relationship with our colleagues, that, you know, border the city and with the provincial government and really read into the bill...and please. I'm happy to hear from my colleagues where it clearly says that we cannot have community committee, we cannot have SPC, where does it say that? I want to see that in there. I want to see where we're taking away the rights of residents. And if we are, I'll stand

with you and I'll fight it. And yeah, maybe…we should be suggesting that if it's going to go to the…a resident has the opportunity to go to the Municipal Board. They don't today as far as I know. But if they did…we should have that there. Again, I believe we're being...we're certainly being eloquent in our presentation, but it seems we're being combative at the same time, and we're claiming we're not involved when I clearly believe this process will involve us. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Well, Madam Speaker, I'm not sure how I'll follow with as vigorous of a debate as Councillor Klein just did. But Winnipeg is the economic engine for the province, there's no debating that matter. We're also in a partnership with the metro region. I spent a decade in southern Ontario, living in a municipality in and around Oshawa which at the time was part of Durham region, still is, but it also was part of, at that time, the expanded Greater Toronto Area. There was a lot of fear at that time of what that meant as far as independence of the community. Many decades later, it's…you know, these are all flourishing communities. Toronto's growing. I believe Vancouver also has a regional view of things. We shouldn't be afraid of working in collaboration with other levels of government and in our area. We can only look no further than this own council being found in contempt when it comes to planning. We have these challenges. We have matters before us that we'll be discussing later today that also are looking to get laid over or deferred because of legal disagreements and invoking of clauses that were referred to a municipal board. So you know, what we're discussing here is basically, you know, the fear of what's being proposed by the Province is what we're having to do in other matters because it doesn't seem like we're doing enough of the dotting of the i's, crossing of the t's. We need to balance voices. We need to plan longer, not the narrow vision that we seem to have for municipality. And you know, hopefully, we can move forward as an even stronger city and province. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Councillor Mayes, followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll support this motion. I have a number of concerns about the legislation, a number of them have been addressed already. I'll limit my remarks to the provision that, as I read it, certainly there's some debate in here. But I certainly read it as saying, only the land owner, only the applicant would have the right to appeal to the Municipal Board. That I think is very troubling. I think it's possibly in breach of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms as distinct from the City of Winnipeg Charter. And you know, having been there in Ontario, having gotten active in city politics because I got concerned…decided to go to a meeting about a condo building that was planned in the park near where I lived and to…that basically took over my life for the next couple of years getting involved with a group of citizens who were concerned about that development. There was always the right for either side to appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board. And maybe we thought we were the underdog, and we'd have to fundraise if we lost the vote at council, which we did, but at least the right existed for people to appeal. We...on another matter, I remember being subpoenaed to go to the Municipal Board because I had been part of a group of residents. It's a provision, if you believe in the rules of natural justice and hearing both sides of the debate, I think, to reference what I said earlier, the Orwellian prospect here is that only one side, and that is the development side, would have the right to appeal. And I find that very troubling. I think the group I fought with in Toronto made things a little better on St. Joseph Street so future residents like the mayor, who ironically lived down the street about six years later I found out, had a little better development in the neighbourhood than would have existed if the citizens hadn't had the right to go to the Municipal Board. So I do think that is something that could be very easily rectified by the provincial government. It doesn't really affect our powers so much, but it affects the rights and I think freedoms...perhaps freedoms is too strong. It certainly affects the rights of the citizens we represent. If they don't like what we've decided, they should be able to appeal to this Municipal Board if indeed there is going to be a right to appeal to the Municipal Board. So I very much am pleased to see the drafting here says that both sides…if we're going to have this Municipal Board oversight, and I don't really think we need it, but if it is to come as part of Bill 48, then it should certainly come with the rights for both sides. And maybe one side is less resourced, that is true, but at least there's a chance to go and argue your case in front of a body and try to get your side supported by the Municipal Board. I just find it, frankly, very troubling that there would be a right to appeal for only one side in...in a quasi-judicial manner like this. Thank you.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. A little over a year ago, Premier Pallister spoke at a Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce breakfast suggesting that the City of Winnipeg was slow in some of its development and missing opportunities for economic growth that perhaps could have been going to other communities. So based on that, this Bill 48 came forward in March at the start of the pandemic, actually, and I think there was sort of three sort of main objectives to the legislation that came out. The first one was, timeliness of decision making; making sure things didn't get stuck on desks, making sure that layovers forever politically didn't occur. Making sure bureaucracy came up with their reports and that more quickly. That was, I think maybe, we'll call it objective one. Objective two was the quality of decision making. Again, when we are a hearing body, a quasi-judicial hearing body, it's not supposed to be your feelings about how you think this fits in with your neighborhood, it's supposed to be adherence to our master

planning…our master plan, OurWinnipeg, formerly Plan Winnipeg. And then, the third part, being thinking regionally. We're Winnipeg, but we have bedroom communities around us. How can we best work with those communities to logically and strategically grow as not just our individual municipalities but as a region. So on all three of those, I have some comments. In terms of timeliness, there seems to be some challenges with what's being said out there right now. The whole process now of being able to appeal to a municipal board if an applicant doesn't like a decision, adds a lot to the timing of things. Our current process also allows for concurrency of different types of applications to happen at once. Rezoning, plan amendments, there's various things that can happen together. If going forward, there's big hammers if we don't meet our time frames both in terms of costs to the city, if we have to appeal things to, you know, different parts of it to the Municipal Board, if you can't do that concurrency, we're actually going to slow the process down, so that's I think a part of the Bill 48 that, you know, we need to look at and make sure is fine-tuned. In terms of quality of decisions made, we'll call it, we are an elected body. You know, we are here to represent our own residents. We are here to represent all Winnipeggers, so I have a little bit of a challenge to suggest that, you know, even if there is some inconsistencies that there is the quality issue. But allowing only applicants to have that extra level of appeal, I think, maybe slants the tables a little bit in one direction and I'm not really particularly...I don't think that's quite fair. Regional planning I think is absolutely necessary, although the bureaucracy that's being set up there, we have to make sure that it's not, you know, so large and so cumbersome that it slows everything down. Again, you know, there's some types of development that make more sense to not be in a super urbanized setting like the City of Winnipeg proper, but it makes sense to be in Headingly or West St. Paul. And I'd much rather have those economic investments in those communities versus them going to Strathmore County or Nisku, Alberta, you know, in the Edmonton capital region. They are better aligned. They have their stuff together, and sometimes they're getting some of those investments that we're not getting in Winnipeg because we don't have our act together. So being in position to better compete because, again, the people that move into those communities are…that move into…those businesses that move into the West St. Pauls and the Headingleys and the Rossers and all of that, they're going to shop in Winnipeg. They'd be eating at our restaurants, they're going to be shopping at our stores, they're to be cheering for the Winnipeg Jets and the Blue Bombers unless you're coming from Saskatchewan, but anyways. They never change those green folks. So there's lots of details that are missing. I very much support the requested amendments that have come forward to the Province through EPC particularly part E. You know, there's going to be shared costs, there's going to be shared benefits. The legislation already talks about this new planning commission will have the ability to incur costs to make development happen. You know, I think it was…you know, talking about things like sewage lagoons and stuff, but you know, maybe you need to do a big new regional road. Maybe you need to pay for an intersection if you're building a new hockey arena in McDonald, and it radically changes Kenaston and McGillivray, there probably should be a mechanism to have that cost shared because there is a benefit to McDonald. On the other hand, they need 24-hour fire protection. Maybe that can be worked into that whole puzzle as well, and it helps orderly, thoughtful development throughout the capital region. That shouldn't be an add-on later. That's not something we should consider much later down the road. As point E points out here, we should have that discussion right now. I'm not going to go on at super great length today, let me make sure I have everything here. I mean, yes, there's going to be some significant costs in this. We need to figure out what those are upfront and realize that, you know, that may be, to some degree, you know, an impediment to development going forward. So again, you know, whether or not, you know, this changes our processes with community committees or whether we choose to bring in the planning commission, that's a separate discussion. I don't think it does preclude our current general processes. It may change our ability to lay things over. There may be, you know, challenges to, you know…and sometimes, layovers are a mutually agreeable thing to do. Sometimes they would rather have, you know…an applicant would rather have…take an extra month so that, you know, something very important can be figured out between either the public service and the applicant or even just consultation with the public. So there should be triggers in there that allow a mutually agreed upon extension of time to be considered by all parties involved. But again, that's just...again, there's still some room for time to I think have a discussion with the Province, but there are some big red flags, and I think we're on the right track here with the fact that we've asked our public service to work with the Province, to attend the public hearings, and some very specific changes that I think are…that are positive here. So again, I'm going to be clear here. I'm not against change. Our processes are not perfect. There's plenty of room for improvement, but again, let's not rush this through. Let's get this right, and again, I think the Province's intentions are good. I'm not thrilled with maybe perhaps some of the decision making power being taken away from this elected body and moved, but I will be supportive of the recommended amendments to the Province that we're forwarding.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Seeing the hour, we do have a motion from Councillor Gilroy to recess, but just for one hour, till 1:00 p.m. So that will require the consent of Council. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Thank you. We'll now recess and reconvene on this item at 1:00 p.m. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
May 29, 2020, at 1:04 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I'd like to reconvene our Council meeting of May 29th, 2020. We were on Item 4 – Bill 48 – The Planning Amendment and City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment Act under the EPC reports of May 22nd, 2020. Councillor Lukes, you're the next speaker on the list.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In regards to Bill 48, for those residents who really follow process at city hall, they will notice a similarity in the manner in which these bills were introduced. A similarity of what occurs at time here at city hall with certain reports. They appear on the agenda in very busy times, no meaningful consultation, discussion or explanation to almost half of Council involving decisions concerning hundreds of millions of dollars and our future, 2020 infrastructure report incorporated into the four-year budget planning comes to mind. Is this process right? Of course it's not, for either government to participate in, but the City's governance model allows this kind of behaviour to occur towards almost half of Council, and the Province's legislative abilities also allows this kind of behaviour towards municipalities. Not good, but I am glad to see the Mayor and his Executive Policy Committee are doing what almost half of us here on Council do to attempt when we see these surprise reports appear. Put forth amendments with the aim of increasing meaningful discussion with the end goal to make the results better for all citizens. So specifically in regards to Bill 48, without a doubt, there's a dire need to establish a clear and consistent framework for development, reviews, and appeals. Winnipeg has been on a relatively fast-paced growth trajectory. All of Council has been involved in some form of land development and has been part of reviews and appeals. I've only been here a short time, but I've seen processes and decisions made related to public hearings and appeals and know that an overhaul of the City's process is long overdue. And I believe today we will see some quite incredible movement or lack of movement on reports coming forward from Property, Planning and Development. I welcome movement on Bill 48, but I welcome further refinement of Bill 48. I had the privilege of co-chairing the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region with Reeve Smee for four years, which provided me a broader insight into how the economic engine of Manitoba operates. And while we are so very fortunate to be living in a diverse economy like Manitoba with many natural resources, we still have limitations, and we are limited because we aren't focused with one vision and one plan. There are unlimited opportunities to collaborate on within the capital region municipalities to leverage what resources we have even further and to drive economic development and work together in the spirit of collaboration. There are many positive aspects in the bill. I see the intent of the bill to do just that, to facilitate economically stronger Manitoba, but like this bill or often City reports introduced with little or no public consultation or input, there are some good points, and there's some serious flaws, as we've heard of earlier today. I'm just going to note on a couple of the short comings that concern me. I'm not supportive of the appeal process presented. I've sat on enough appeals to understand that both sides have very valid positions and both sides must have the basic right to put their case forward. It's not acceptable to have one side to have the right to appeal and not the other and that there's very serious shortcomings if only one side appeals. I think it's critical for the Municipal Board to have clear criteria when considering appeals. Again, I reflect on my experiences here at city hall, where the success of appeal is dependent on who's on the committee making the decision. Including criteria that is clear, concise and followed will be critical in the success of the capital planning region. And I do have concerns about how the regional plan will tie into and not override OurWinnipeg, because I've been a fan of OurWinnipeg, I'm supportive of the direction we're going, at least, I haven't seen the draft yet, but the discussions for OurWinnipeg. I appreciate Councillor Gillingham's and Councillor Rollins' friendly amendments regarding financial implications and the recognition of the many Indigenous land owners in the region. I appreciate all the work of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities and the time they've invested in providing feedback and perspectives. They've been very good at that. And I really want to commend Colleen Sklar and Reeve Smee in the metropolitan region for all their hard work. I am optimistic that the Province will seriously consider all recommendations brought forward, the amendments brought forward, whatever AMM brings forward, and I hope through much more dialogue together that we can all make the vision of the capital planning region a reality. Through these amendments, I do believe we have the ability to better inform and have open dialogue and more collaboration on planning in the region, so I will be supporting the amendments brought forward, and that's what I'd like to put on the record.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It looks like if you take a look at the last two motions, it's a reaction. Not to say we've not been proactive in this. It's an interesting dynamic in terms of what I believe we're trying to be proactive in a reaction to provincial government legislation. Not a bad thing. Madam Speaker, when I came here, my first…very first Council meeting, I was pleased to what I felt we were going to do on the issue of homelessness which is a very challenging issue. The issue of challenging each other, trying to work together, and challenging each other to try and bring about the best results. That's what I said with tears in my eyes when we talk about homelessness in my very first Council meeting five and a half years ago. Madam Speaker, in this case, what I believe we're having…what's taking place is we are having a change in provincial legislation, and the City, even though we might not like it or not all…all of

Council might like it, it's challenging us to be proactive in trying to bring about the best legislation that the provincial government can bring about as we see it as a council or at least those that are presented…the motion as it is today. And basically, I'm supportive. So let's take a look at this dynamic. First of all, I don't want to say I'm working out of despair, but I want to work with whatever I can. I'm pleased to see, you know, four or five years after bringing forth a motion that lost, looking at the City bringing forth a motion regarding how we would deal with the Public Utilities Board being the...the board in which makes the decision over our water rates. I could not have written this better myself...well, I guess I could have. I could bring some amendments to this, but I supported the last motion, Madam Speaker, in terms of what EPC has brought forth, in terms of what we're going to bring forth to the Province. In this case, Madam Speaker, we're talking about a change in planning as we go about looking at the larger regional planning. And in my last speech regarding the last motion, I talked about how an amalgamation of cities creates a better urban system…creates a better system for planning, taxation and a sustainable budget, Madam Speaker. In this case, well let's not pretend including St. Andrews in our regional planning means that we can, you know, have city water and main go all the way to Winnipeg Beach. But having said that, Madam Speaker, I do have some concerns, and I'm going to raise them here. I believe I'm going to be the first to raise them publicly. That when it comes to our planning and how we deal with regional planning, how we deal with it building out and up, and how we deal with densities, my concerns, as I've raised them with the administration...and it's important...so I'm not going to ignore it. I didn't say it merely for show. When we deal with planning, when we're talking about our concerns over density and lack of density, I do want to make this point as this motion and the provincial legislation affects the issue of the…of OurWinnipeg, the City's overall planning in that at the point that it was presented to me in terms of how the City would judge itself, in terms of how environmentally sustainable we are, we're judging it primarily on density. And I'm not saying density isn't a big factor, okay, but I ask these questions. When judging how environment...environmentally sustainable Winnipeg will be in the next 20, 30 years, where do we have in the plan the conversion of heating of our homes and buildings, factories, industry from natural gas to electricity? They didn't give me an answer. And Madam Speaker, given that's the largest fact, and vehicles are the largest contributor of natural...of greenhouse gases from the people of Winnipeg, from the City of Winnipeg, that and vehicles, I asked where do we factor in the conversion in Winnipeg, the conversion of people's vehicles, from fossil fuel burning vehicles, from greenhouse destroying…greenhouse gas emitting gases, and the conversion of that to electricity, and I didn't get an answer, Madam Speaker. So I'm saying that right now because it's really important. We're talking about density, and we should. Madam Speaker, if we're talking about environmental sustainability, and if we as a city are trying to figure out what we can do to make us most environmentally sustainable...and I would say in this case, economically sustainable, Madam Speaker, there is no way that we can look at density as being the only factor. In fact, I daresay it is not the primary factor. It will be, mark my words, judge me in the years to come; that it will be the conversion, primarily, the conversion of our city from what's remaining on using oil, fossil fuels, natural gas in terms of heating our houses and buildings and fuelling our vehicles and the conversion of that in the next generation to electricity…to hydroelectricity...not any electricity, Manitoba hydroelectricity because we're not like any other jurisdiction. I mentioned this last meeting. And as I said, when you put a factory or a house or an apartment building on Manitoba electricity…when you put it on the grid, it's coming 99...essentially 100% renewable, non-fossil fuel, non-greenhouse gas emitting hydroelectricity. When you charge an electric car in Winnipeg or Manitoba with an electrical charge, it's 100...essentially 100% renewable, environmental…100% environmentally, non-fossil fuel, non-greenhouse emitting energy. If you were to do the same thing in Alberta, we're talking 90% fossil fuel for charging your car. You're charging with fossil fuels. You're charging with greenhouse emitting gas to create the electrical current to charge…to charge your car. Same with the buildings. So Madam Speaker, we have a special obligation here to convert to hydroelectricity more than any other place in North America. If I'm wrong, let me know and say it in this chamber and tell me how I'm wrong. So Madam Speaker, we cannot continue with our Plan Winnipeg talking about environmental sustainability of our city merely on the issue of densities being the primary component. It is an important component, but if we think we're really going to become a sustainable community…a sustainable society, and an environmentally sustainability society without dealing consciously with the issue of conversion from fossil fuels, greenhouse emission…emitting energy sources, finite to electricity, we're not doing the right thing. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Orlikow, followed by Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. That's hard to follow. I definitely…I seriously appreciate Councillor Schreyer's passion for climate change and converting it. And actually, it does have a little bit…look at the regional planning, some of the sustainability things that's in our regional plan mandate. So I appreciate that, But we're going to talk a little bit more about Bill 48, and I'm going to roll in kind of my comments in a general fashion as well for the other bills. So during this pandemic, we had this bill come through. So most people that I've talked to about these bills are completely unaware that it's even happening, but that's just the way it is. You know, we're having some...communication's a little more difficult at this time, considering the pandemic and people's work lives being all up and down and kids at home. So I do respect that, and it is unfortunate that the Province decided to push it through now. Again, the time sensitivity, I think it could have waited, but again, I'm not the Pprovince. That was their prerogative to do and they've done so. I'm also very…we have some big words that have been used today, I really quite appreciate that. Big word is collaboration. You know, we're really hoping that this is part of the collaborative…well it has not been

collaborative to this point. So let's…I look more at the reality of what the situation is, not what I actually hoped, and then kind of put them together. So of course, we hoped this would be a collaborative process that would stimulate the economic…the region economically, would provide more consistency in decision making, would improve the timelines, would also better coordinate regionally. I think those are admirable goals. I also think Councillor Schreyer's, his are very admirable goals. There's very, very…there's many, many admirable goals, but again, that's how we start and then we look out at what's happening. So what we look is happening right now is these bills are coming through as is. We have…the Province has the majority to push it through. That's the reality, okay. So what that does mean is that there'll be unelected members…again, unelected members of different bodies deciding on matters that relate specifically to Winnipeggers. The council will have an input at the beginning, but right now, the councillors or the residents do not have a say at the appeals body. Again, we can say, well, hopefully, they will get a say. Yes, and if they can drum up $10,000 to make an appeal, that could work, because we don't know that either. There is a…so again, I do appreciate that it's in there. I will be supporting that as well. Who is on this Municipal Board? Right now we talk about the nimby councillors going out there and you know what, nimby councillors or not, or what's the other one? There's a couple of different acronyms now for different styles. And we are representing our residents and we are elected. We have conflict of interest guidelines. We have many, many different checks and balances on us. I'm not…now this will be the Province will be appointing the Municipal Board. What qualifications? Who knows. Is it just going to be a row of developers? Well, that's not going to be very fair. Are any municipalities going to be on this board? Have a rep? Maybe Winnipeg Capital Metro Region will have a rep. I don't know. But at this point, we don't know that. So that's quite concerning for me, as well. The public hearing, we talked about accountability. Well again, I just briefly talked about what I think is accountability is, you know what, we are elected, that's a pretty big accountable tool. If we don't do it properly and people…and we felt it before, I've gone through two terms now. There's been some times when you really get a beating down from the residents when things don't go right. And we deservedly deserve so. At the end of the day, who are they going to complain to, the municipal council? The Municipal Board? Well, that's who they'll have to. No matter what decision they make. So I really do appreciate the criteria part. We have to know what they're deciding on and how. Again, I do think we do…I do appreciate that, that if we have a clear criteria. But let's be very real here, people, land is not simple. You don't…A piece of land is not the same as B piece of land. There are all so many variables fly into it and that's where this council...I'm very proud of the sugar beet lands that's developing well. You know, you have The Forks is coming along very well. We have 300 Main going downtown. We have a whole bunch of revitalization that's happening in Winnipeg. Not all the developments are working out. Some people just blame the City, some people blame the developer, again, so having a third-party to help, you know, resolve those issues, fantastic, but they should not be the ultimate authority. So again, I think the idea to have the opportunity to come revisit it. There's some very scary things in here, for example, in this bill. The Municipal Board can get rid of service agreements. That means the City is going to pay for those services that that development will need. That to me is millions of possible problems…dollars of problems. We don't have a fair…we don't have a fair playing field. We can't do…we can't do the same things as the other municipalities outside of Winnipeg. So we need to put these together. If one person can do development cost charges, the other person should be able to do development cost charges. And if we're doing something that the other municipalities can't, we should have that process. So again, we're hoping to get timelines done. Councillor Klein mentioned, you know, we…this will be no problem. Well, there is a huge problem. The timelines, we're going to have to radically change our methodologies on how we get these things to that group. Again, so we're going to have to radically change how we do development proposals both in the intake and on how we do it politically. So there will be some dramatic changes. The quality of decisions, again, I think we could do that a little bit more here and thinking regionally. Again, thank you to Councillor Gillingham. We always talk about regional, and how great it would be to cooperate together, and you know, that would be wonderful. Absolutely, but I represent Winnipeggers, so if I'm supposed to collaborate with a municipality that is going to cost Winnipeggers a lot of money and I don't see any benefit for, I'm having a hard time supporting that idea, and I still do. I've dealt with this regional board, I think it's wonderful, but however, it should be collaborative, it shouldn't be punitive. I find this motion that's coming down with Bill 48, it's more of 'you shall', and that will happen, well one thing Metro Region Board is a collaborative board and we're going to have some issues trying to figure out how we're going to manage that. Again, the collaborative part does take more time. Councillor Lukes said, it takes more time, it takes more input, but this process does not allow us for that. This process has incredible short timelines to get, you know, a whole region…this has been tried year after year, and now we're going to have this quick timeline to get everything through. We're very lucky because OurWinnipeg, which is a 25-year plan. OurWinnipeg is a 25 year plan. The other municipalities, they don't have these plans. They're going to have to really spend a lot of time and effort to catch up. So again…and the big one is still out there, and Councillor Gillingham has hit right on the nail on the head, it's really where…where…who, how, what is going to share the revenues. I am…I agree, a pulse plant is not something we want in downtown Winnipeg. But again, if a pulse plant is going to go into the RM of Rosser that we have a service agreement that's going to have a very large impact on our treatment plant, well we should have a say in that still because right now our North End treatment plant is taking a lot from Rosser. So maybe we should look at that as well. So again, the concepts are very good, but also, the actions speak very loudly. And so as Councillor Lukes has said, you know, I'm willing to be optimistic and hopefully and this process will work, not so much for city council. So hopefully, I'm wrong. I think what we're doing, I don't believe that this process is going to be collaborative. I don't think it's going to be in the best interests of Winnipeggers, but working together with my colleagues, I think

these…I've addressed these four points…five points have addressed most of my concerns and leaves us in a hopeful manner that they'll listen. Again, I'd be more than happy to be proved wrong, that the Province will actually listen to the municipalities around us, and we'll try to work together so this works for everyone, and that's it.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I actually texted Councillor Orlikow and asked him not to use all my words because I knew I was speaking just after him. But to quote former president Harry S. Truman, he stated, "It's impressive how much work can get done when you're less concerned with who gets the credit." So on that basis, I am supportive of this plan to move forward with Bill 48 if it does create efficiencies in our planning process and has greater accountability in terms of how city planning gets done in development. I'm hoping that it'll attract investment as developers see the ease in using our systems and the consistency in our decision making processes while they're adding value in terms of the design of their developments that are coming to our city. I'm hoping that it's in the best interest of our city as we grow sustainably towards a million people, and as Councillor Schreyer's indicated, it balances the interest of our environment and making sure that we're doing development in a sustainable way ensuring that our environment is protected. The City must have meaningful discussion in this process going forward and work collaboratively with the stakeholders to ensure that our voices also are heard. So I support the motion, and I support the amendments provided by Councillor Gillingham and Councillor Rollins in this regard. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And now let's go remote to Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Hi, everyone. Can you hear me okay? Can you hear me okay, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Just going to turn the volume up a little bit if possible on our end.

Councillor Allard: I'm going to do it. Is that better? I jacked up my mic.

Madam Speaker: That's perfect. Too much.

Councillor Allard: Too much? Okay. I'll bring it back down. Is that okay? Sorry about that. So I'm speaking in support of the proposed…well, the proposed report going up from EPC. I'd like to thank Mayor Bowman and my EPC colleagues for having brought this forward to Council. And I'd like to speak, hoping that this could be a unanimous vote, and what a beautiful symbol that would be, all of councillors getting together and working with the Province. And I think this is working with the Province. This is taking an approach that yes, the Province wants to make this change, and I believe that they will likely go forward, and make some changes. So this is really our opportunity to inform what those changes look like. I had the opportunity to have a meeting with Minister Squires where I was not able to speak on behalf of Council, but I was able to speak as a ward councillor, and that's how I identified myself in the meeting. And one of the concerns I had, and it's been mentioned a few times already today, and…is that, if this does go forward, it really does stack the deck in the favour of landowners and developers where if we would look at our own City Council processes, we do have fairness built into our processes where, you know, you essentially…you have…you have two sides. You have the people who are for, you have the people who are against, and both those sides get an opportunity to be heard. And I think I heard my colleague, Councillor Mayes earlier say that this is probably even a human rights consideration in terms of our Canadian laws. And being the representative for St. Boniface, Councillor Mayes likes to mention his time spent in law school where the landmark case was referenced in land planning decisions of the Old St. Boniface Residents Association versus Guy Savoi, then councillor of the day. So you know, I mention this because I don't see that this in any way will reduce red tape. I think it's adding another layer of red tape. So I mean, currently, we have the City approval processes, we have the city councillor appeal body, and then after you're done at Appeals, you're done, that's the final decision. Well in this new proposed model, after appeals, you'll have situations where only the landowner or the developer can go to the Municipal Board and experience in other jurisdictions like Ontario has been oftentimes city council decisions were completely put on the wayside, completely put on the side. And what I really like about the approach that's being proposed here is that I think it's...it proposes a model to the government that's much in line with the revised model that we found in Ontario. In Ontario, they started with the Ontario Municipal Board, and that board created all sorts of issues for the municipalities in Ontario. One example, former Toronto planner, Jennifer Keesmaat, appointed one time to an OMB, Ontario Municipal Board, decision to approve a 35-story condo next to an elementary school, so that's one example. Another example was when…where a municipal board decision overruled a council decision. Council was trying to follow its own planning documents in terms of heights and densities, and the Ontario Municipal Board made a ruling saying that it would reverse the council decision that was in line with the council endorsed plans, and that as long as there was "an element of wow," that that building should be approved. And that led some Toronto city councillors to say that Toronto was not a "wow factory." So you know, I'm sure we don't want that type of dynamic here. I have a development that was approved in St. Boniface. It's on Beaverhill, it was…it was done by Sherwood Developments. One of the great things about that development is that it integrated a community amenity,

Gym Kids in Southdale. And I think part of the reason why it had so much community support was that the developer was motivated to find a solution that was endorsed by the community and by Council. I fear that if we do have a higher level body where residents are not able to appeal, that those types of developments would not happen, essentially. That we would basically just through a one stroke of a pen, we'd be losing some of the amazing developments that can happen when Council, developers and communities work together. And we really do...you know, that final say being at Council does allow us to do things like that, to add conditions. One development in my ward, I added speed humps to a street opening when it was clear from residents that the primary concern was going to be speeding. So potentially, the proposed model would do away with things like that. So part of what I like about the proposed motion is...is that it seems to model what was the improved framework in Ontario, so there's the before and after in Ontario. There was the original Ontario Municipal Board that was problematic. Catherine Wynne came in, and she had proposed a number of reforms. And basically, there was…there was…I'm reading from a document here, "Before the OMB would hear arguments from both sides and make decisions based on what they believed to be the best planning outcome, at times, overruling decisions of local councils. Now, the LPAT will answer simple yes or no legal: does the proposal follow the city's official planning rules? If not, the matter will be sent back to municipal councils to issue another decision. The tribunal will not make planning decisions itself." So I like this motion because it's in line with what is already known to be best practice in Ontario where there was a flawed municipal board prior and there's an enhanced, better process. If it has to happen, it should happen in a way where residents and councils are able to hear a why their decision was not in line with city planning documents and then make a decision that fits for the local neighborhood. And then I'll speak briefly to costs. You know, having a regional planning approach I think has many benefits. One challenge, I think, and that's what's captured by the motion is that there are costs. There are costs and there are costs to running a board, there are costs to infrastructure and city services when an exorbitant development is approved. And if we're going to be part of a greater planning region, and there's no new revenues, we know that growth doesn't pay for growth, exorbitant growth definitely doesn't pay for growth. And so I think we need to have a conversation about if we are going to have a regional planning region, how are we going to share the benefits, not just Winnipeg ending up with more costs with no new revenues. So those are some of my reasons for supporting this motion. I'd also like to mention that I think the chorus of voices growing…is growing to have changes to this bill. I was at a meeting of the Association of Bilingual Municipalities of Manitoba yesterday where I moved a motion asking the AMBM to support Winnipeg and AMM's quest to work with the government in terms of finding appropriate changes to the proposed legislation. So I think that's another…yet another organization that's going to add their name to the list of organizations demanding change from the government. But I mean, fundamentally...

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

Councillor Allard: Oh, thank you. I should wrap up, we're going to have a long day. Fundamentally…thank you. I see this still as fundamentally undemocratic if it is passed as is by the Province of Manitoba. This proposed…this proposal from…flowing from EPC I think is a consolidated opinion, something we can all agree on. I hope Council agrees as well because if we don't ask for any changes, we're going to end up with a very bad piece of legislation as was the case in Ontario. And we're basically going to be losing the power to say, to add conditions, and to say no to some developments that...that really don't fit the community. And just maybe one last point; when I spoke to Minister Squires, I talked about the newly minted North St. Boniface Secondary Plan. One of the appealable items on this list for the Municipal Board is secondary plans. So you can have a brand-new plan, brand-new minted with a community, with support from the community, and then a landowner can come in and say, I want to amend the secondary plan. I don't agree with it. Municipal Board then hears it, reverses the secondary plan, which leads to the question, why even have planning documents if you're going to have an unelected body that can just arbitrarily overturn the decisions of council? So I'll leave my comments at that. Thank you for the extension. And we've got a long day ahead of us, so I'll leave it at that for now. I really hope we can all support this proposed motion. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. There's kind of an irony here in which the current provincial government has decided to create another level of government when they're trying to get rid of other elected forms of government, from my understanding. So it's kind of interesting, and I do believe it will ask…add another layer of costs that the municipalities will end up being paid…paying for rather than the Province of Manitoba helping out. We've kind of...well, okay. So I…I again, I'm going to reserve…I agree with the report, and I'll be voting for it and the recommendations that EPC moved forward, and some additions. They're all good, Madam Speaker. And so...but I do reserve the right, and I will speak my mind when they have open committee meetings because at least, you know, when that happens, there'll be at least some kind of democratic process related to this. As my colleagues have pointed out, this is not exactly a democratic thing that the current provincial government of Manitoba is foisting on us. But I do agree that there needs to be a regional planning board, and I believe that the municipality should be appointing that board because what they're coming up with, it's a government, right? And I think it's important that we, the City, are the ones…municipalities are the ones that recommend our appointments and are just merely accepted to that regional planning board because they're

unelected, and…but I think that that's a fair way to represent it, because I believe that the Province itself and the current government has a view about what they want to see happen. And as an example, because we're talking about regional infrastructure, and we know that the Province has already decided...and not that it's not needed, they've already decided that the south perimeter highway is a couple of billion dollar project that they want to do, and that's important. But there are other parts to the City of Winnipeg as well as north, east and west where we need infrastructure where it doesn't even exist at this point, Madam Speaker. So and they, of course, are appointing the Municipal Board. Whose perspective are they going to be reflecting? Have a lot of concerns with that, Madam Speaker. Again, they're unelected. You know, over the time that I've been around and involved in politics, the code of ethical conduct for politicians has really improved. And the conflicts, I don't think that necessarily those who are public servant because basically the directors of this board are going to be public servants, and it's very important that the Province review code of ethical conducts for them as well. Because, you know, we talk about Ontario, but in BC they have planning districts, and there's some problems there that I hear in where different districts and you know, you're going to have something on the edge of the regional plan that doesn't quite fit in the Winnipeg metro region or whatever, those kinds of things. So these are things that are very important, and they need to check and balance and make sure they're there. But again, I like the idea that the municipalities are working. Councillor Schreyer made a great speech when it came to the police thing, but you know, with the regional planning board and the regional strategic plan, like, a similar plan to OurWinnipeg it will be, but for the region, I think it's a good way to avoid what happened to Detroit because we all hope that 30 years or more down the road that, you know, we will continue to grow, and the people will be able to experience a better...a better life because they're able to share and be a part of the whole economics as well as the social fabric as was mentioned. This bill, when I read it through, it's huge, and it's moving along too fast. You know, we have a 25-year plan, and it does talk about the social welfare. It talks about the different things. I'm kind of offended, Madam Speaker, to hear that somebody thinks that somehow we don't have a plan for that kind of thing. Read OurWinnipeg. Read complete communities. Read those things. Those were all…we went to the public. Our public service went to the public. They came to us as councillors. The revamp of OurWinnipeg, talking to councillors, they've had open meetings, discussions about planning, about development, all this kind of stuff, Madam Speaker. All these issues, they've been doing that. That's a consultation. I don't know, and I agree with Councillor Orlikow, how…how we're going to...this planning...regional planning district's going to come up with something when some municipalities don't even have anything, how they're going to come up with something in two years and have done a public consultations and discussions with the people who live in the region to understand what we need to grow into the future. So there are problems. I support the thing. But and I…you know what? There's no time in ten minutes or 15 or 20 minutes...I don't know how much time they give you at these provincial committees…hearing committees, but hopefully, you know, you get more than ten minutes because there's a lot of various aspects that we have to be concerned about. Some I pointed out when we talked about the water bill. You know, the Municipal Board, you know how these development agreements are. The issues are, you know, who pays for what, and what's regional. And you know, I have to admit, and a lot of the developers are supportive of this, as far as I know. And part of it is, because, you know, Madam Speaker, I have to say, in the years that I've been running for politics since 1998, different developers get different deals all around the city. So Madam Speaker, when we heard some hearings that have gone by a long time ago already now, but there's no consistency where a developer's representative tells you that no other development pays for regional road. Then I find out, some years later, there's no consistency here, Madam Speaker, because you find out that yes, there was a developer who paid for some regional road construction down in the Waverley West area. So you know, I'm hoping this whole development, there will be consistency, and I think consistency is very important. And...but you know, like even with the...you know, the infrastructure, who's paying for it. Developer doesn't want to pay for that because they say it's this kind of thing and this person says it's that kind of thing, our planners say it's this. You know, how…they've got to make sure it's all balanced, and I will be...when I go to the committee, whenever those hearings are, because I haven't heard yet when they're going to have those hearings, but I will present. And I'll just conclude by saying I wanted to thank people for their amendments that they did. I didn't have time to propose a number because I like to make connections and think about things.

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

Councillor Eadie: The last thing I just wanted to mention, when I was reading the bill, it talks about special planning districts. And Councillor Rollins makes a good point in the First Nations. The First Nations have a right to urban reserves, and that's all about planning and all those things. So these things…aspects are very important. We've got the airport vicinity secondary plan and there's provision that's a special planning district. There's CentrePort planning district. So how they're going to interact is not really all that clear to me in this bill, and that's going to be one of my focus points when I do speak to it because we've got to make sure that everything works, and that, you know, there's a plan and then we have to be consistent, Madam Speaker, in how things go forward into the future under this regional 30-year plan, which hopefully, they'll borrow from our updated OurWinnipeg, which, I don't know when we're going to finish that. Going through some emergency times here, but thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm in support of a planning board district, and…region. And I'm good with the proposed amendments, and I'll have some more suggestions for the Province when I speak to that committee. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Back to you, Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Bowman: I think enough has been said on this topic today. I'd just like to thank all my Council colleagues for their input and I would ask for a recorded vote, please.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 4, there's a recorded vote...yes? Okay. Let me pull that up. Go back to that screen. There are four recommendations. All in favour of Clause 1, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker on Recommendation 1, Yeas 16, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Recommendation 1 passes unanimously. Recommendation 2, all in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker on Recommendation 2, Yeas 16, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Recommendation 2 passes unanimously. Now Recommendation 3, all in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Klein and Nason

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker on Recommendation 3, Yeas 14, Nays 2.

Madam Speaker: Recommendation 3 passes. The last recommendation, Recommendation 4, please rise if you are in support.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Klein and Nason

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker on Recommendation 4, Yeas 14, Nays 2.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Recommendation 4 passes. Thank you. Let's go on to the next item, Item 6, Madam Clerk.

Item 6 – 2020 Urban Agriculture Project

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I'll be brief. I want to thank the Province of Manitoba for their efforts with respect to the funding for community gardens. I want to thank many of my council colleagues. Councillor Brian Mayes has been a champion for food security matters and the Food Council. Councillor Rollins has also added her strong voice to food security and related matters since she was first elected here on Council. I know many members of Council are also taking steps to lend their voice in respective wards and city-wide to help enhance food security. And I will simply conclude by once again getting the plug for all Winnipeggers and all members of Council, if you have the ability to grow a row for Winnipeg Harvest, it's not too late to get those seeds in the ground this weekend if and when this meeting ever ends. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any speakers for Item 6? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I pulled this one just to, as the Mayor did, to thank the Province for its contributions if we get this nailed down, and we do need to get this through in order to create the possibility of getting this funding. A number of people have worked hard on this. When I first got to Council, Councillor Browaty I think said to me, you know, you're going to get no credit for stuff where you do a lot of work, and sometimes you'll get credit for stuff where you don't do much work. This falls in the latter category. For me, I think…I don't think I did a whole lot to make this happen. But I did want to say two things; I did put in a lot of work to get the $50,000 to get a Food Council Coordinator and through the efforts of the Food Council members and our coordinator, Jeanette Sivilay, it looks like almost got 4:1 return on that investment with $190,000 flowing out of the Province. So I wanted to thank Jeanette as I have done on a number of occasions now. A number of other people from the Food Council, Andy Sharma, Lavon Harms, Councillor Schreyer have all been working hard on these sorts of issues. So it is an important step that we're taking on food security. We have to work out details on things like the availability of water for community gardens, but a lot of good faith from coordinator Sivilay and the other members of the Food Council. I won't take credit, but I do want to give some credit to the public service as well. Lindsey Mierau and Karen Kliewer have done a lot on this, and up there in the top, there's this great F.R. Scott poem about the judges three glared down at me and there's Michael Jack up at the top, looking down at us. Michael's put in a lot of work in one of his eight or ten different jobs that he's doing here. Michael's put in a lot of work to try and make this happen with the Province on food security and has certainly gone to bat for community gardens and food security. And so I want to particularly thank Michael who's I think helped make this possible. We've got to get this thing passed. As the Mayor says, if this meeting does end, we will then get this meeting going with the Province and hopefully have some form of announcement. But I do want to thank members of the Food Council for their ongoing work, and hopefully, we can have an announcement sometime very soon and be able to thank the provincial government in person. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Councillor Mayes said I'd been working hard on the committee. I've been on the committee as the Mayor's representative. It's been my pleasure to do so for two and a half years, and I'm going to give a commendation in this case. I don't often commend my fellow councillors. They don't often commend me, either, so that's fair Madam Speaker, but in this case I won't say I've learned…that I've worked hard on the committee. I've thoroughly been...found it's...I think it's been my favourite committee that I've been on in my time at city hall. So on that basis, I do commend His Worship for creating the Food Council and for allowing me to be his representative on the Food Council. I'm learning a lot. I've felt I've always known a lot about food. I've felt it's always been very important, intrinsic to society. It is the alpha and the omega of life and society, economics, environmental sustainability. Any way you look at it, food...you cannot look at society in any era of history including now and how we plan to the future without thinking intrinsically about how food plays into it, and in fact, what we can do as a city to do what we do here. I haven't worked hard on the Food Council. I've just been very pleased to be on that Food Council, to attend these meetings, and the people appointed to this committee, oh, my goodness, what an excellent committee. I feel that my obligation, like other things I've been doing at council, it isn't my contribution...I'm going to say that now...it's not…I've not made a great contribution to the Food Council. Oh, I've contributed, I've participated, and there's been some great conversations that I've been part of and sometimes initiated, but it's a great committee established by His Worship and chaired...really, hey Brian Mayes, hat's off. He's been a great chair for this committee. Really, the committee doesn't always agree. Well, what committee doesn't? It's got diverse perspectives, and we're talking about things that are really important. We might not think about in terms of like a city council, but in terms of a society, you can't get any more important. But how do you deal with it as an urban area when we're dealing poverty? We're dealing with lack of education. We're talking about lack of access. We're talking about the issue…empowerment, disempowerment, homelessness, all these things play into this

and there's no way out. You have to deal with the food issue. So at least what I can say is this Food Council has been, in its own way, acknowledging the issues, acknowledging the challenges, and in our own way, dealing with them. It's a new committee for the city. And I don't expect any one institution, any one committee to solve these things. What it is, is a committee in which people can bring forth real knowledge, understanding of what the problems are, and have an understanding of what the solutions can be, and that's been its great virtue. And in this case, again, to echo Brian Mayes, yes, congratulations…thank you to the provincial government for this funding. And I have to admit, this is a very future oriented committee that Councillor Mayes has been chairing, and I feel that my obligation is not merely my attendance and conversing and learning, participating with the committee members and the projects we're on. But once you're on a committee like this that I've been…had the pleasure to be appointed to, it's the obligation of taking this information and making use of it in the future. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you to His Worship and Councillor Mayes.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close on the item. I'll call the question on Item 6. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 8, Madam Clerk.

Item 8 – Continuous Monitoring – Advisory Report

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll wait to hear from Council colleagues. I do want to thank the Auditor for the Auditor's ongoing efforts including…with respect to this report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Eadie first, okay. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I asked for it to be stepped down. Madam Speaker, I'm rising. I'm actually in support of this report, and I must say we...the office of the City Auditor and the people that are working out of that office do great work, and I appreciate the report. I only ask to have it stepped down. I do support it, but I just wanted to add something that I didn't hear in the dialogue when it was presented to the audit committee, which is the Executive Policy Committee, is the fact that if we're following overtime, continuously monitoring and ensuring that we understand the aspects of what's driving overtime and so on, the Winnipeg Police Service, along with the Winnipeg Police Board, developed a continuous monitoring of overtime in aspects of their police service operations, Madam Speaker. But one of the things I didn't hear a discussion about, and I would have asked the question, but I wasn't actually able to make it to the actual meeting, but I just wanted to point out that vacancy management also causes overtime. And so I didn't hear any discussion or questions of…about that in terms of vacancy management and what affect that is having on overtime for the various departments across the City. And so, if we're continually monitoring to make sure that...because a lot of overtime…because you're understaffed. And once you hit a certain level of vacancy management, you're causing a problem in terms of putting too much pressure on employees to produce overtime. And we know, and I heard a good discussion about that about the effects of working too much overtime on one's mental health and physical health, for that matter, Madam Speaker. So all's I was trying to say is that that should be part of the continuous monitoring and it should be a line that reports how much overtime is resulting out of vacancy management. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker, and I appreciate Councillor Eadie pulling this. I rise just to simply say, this is one of those reports that perhaps would, you know…as Council, we read it, but there wouldn't be a lot of attention drawn to it because it seems like a smaller matter considering some of the larger matters that are on our agenda today. But I just rise to point out it's indicative, I think, of some of the good work that results from the work of our Auditor and his staff. And I know that at Executive Policy Committee, we were able to ask some questions specific to this report and our CAO and our CFO at the time did indicate their…the support of implementing this continuous improvement. And this process will assist the City in better managing risk on a continual basis. This is, you know, one of the ways that the City is looking for opportunities to strengthen processes to identify irregular or unusual transactions and the implementation of this process, and I'll point out by utilizing not a brand-new system. It's not something we have to purchase or acquire, but by utilizing an element or component of the PeopleSoft system, which the City already uses. Basically, taking that tool and better utilizing the capacity of that tool, it will assist and should assist in achieving the goal of just some continuous improvements. So this is a good news story, and it seems like a small thing, but it's a good news story and I wanted to rise just point that out. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? I'll call the question on Item 8. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Moving forward, that was it Madam Clerk for this committee, I believe?

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: Okay. We'll now move into motions under Executive Policy Committee. We have Motion 1. It's moved by Councillor Klein and seconded by Councillor Nason. It's regarding tax relief for restaurants. This will be an automatic referral to Executive Policy Committee. Okay. Next is Motion 2. It is moved by Councillor Nason and seconded by Councillor Klein. It's regarding in-camera remote meetings. This will also be a automatic referral. Councillor Nason.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Klein,
Seconded by Councillor Nason,

WHEREAS on May 27, 2020 the Province of Manitoba announced that effective June 1, 2020, restaurants will be allowed to reopen indoor spaces at 50 percent capacity;

AND WHEREAS as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic restaurants are experiencing significant loses in revenue;

AND WHEREAS the Manitoba Restaurant and Food Services Association has indicated that "the potential is high that 80% of Manitoba independently owned restaurants may not survive";

AND WHEREAS temporary Business and Property Tax relief will provide restaurants support to remain open throughout the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg reduces Business and Property Taxes imposed on independently owned and operated restaurants by 50 percent, until such time as the Province of Manitoba removes the 50 percent capacity restriction on restaurants.

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

WHEREAS COVID-19 has resulted in many new measures being undertaken in support of the continuance of City business from Council and Committee meetings;

AND WHEREAS due to the confidential nature of certain matters some of these meetings may be required to go in camera;

AND WHEREAS as a result of COVID-19 some members of Council are not be able to attend in person to observe the in camera session therefore resulting in limiting their ability to fully and effectively participate in the work Council;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg presently provides a link to the meeting for Committee members and the Public Service who request to participate remotely;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Clerk be directed to provide all Members of Council with a link to view in camera meetings that are being conducted remotely.

Motion No. 9
Moved by Councillor Nason,
Seconded by Councillor Klein,

WHEREAS COVID-19 has resulted in many new measures being undertaken in support of the continuance of City business from Council and Committee meetings;

AND WHEREAS due to the confidential nature of certain matters some of these meetings may be required to go in camera;

AND WHEREAS as a result of COVID-19 some members of Council are not be able to attend in person to observe the in camera session therefore resulting in limiting their ability to fully and effectively participate in the work Council;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg presently provides a link to the meeting for Committee members and the Public Service who request to participate remotely;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Clerk be directed to provide all Members of Council with a link to view in camera meetings that are being conducted remotely, upon request of the Member.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, I've withdrawn Motion 2 and amend it with Motion 9. I'm seeking suspension of the rules to debate it today.

Madam Speaker: Okay. So I see Motion 2 is replaced with 9, and you're asking for suspension of the rules to deal with the item today?

Councillor Nason: Yes, Madam Speaker. I think it's a timely matter.

Madam Speaker: Time sensitive, okay. We'll call the question on Motion 9 regarding in-camera remote meetings and just process for that. All in favour of the suspension? Contrary? Okay, yeah, I'll ask for a recorded vote. All in favour of the suspension, please rise.

Clerk: Councillor Eadie, Nason, Schreyer.

Madam Speaker: Just a moment. I think there was some confusion, Madam Clerk. It's Motion 2 has been rescinded and replaced with Motion 9. Okay. Yeah, it's just…we're just asking for suspension of the rule.

Councillor Browaty: Point of order, Madam Speaker, since this motion was tabled, there's been correspondence from the City Clerk indicating that the request is actually going to be accommodated as practice and this is really not necessary. I don't see why this is before us today. I don't see why Councillor Nason doesn't withdraw this entirely.

Madam Speaker: Madam Clerk, Motion 9, could I just ask that you read it into the record just so we're sure and people know what's in front of us? Thank you.

Clerk: Therefore be it resolved that the City Clerk be directed to provide all Members of Council with a link to view in camera meetings that are being conducted remotely, upon request of the Member.

Madam Speaker: Okay, great. And Mr. Clerk, could you just clarify, is that our current process? Or I did see an e-mail come after lunch.

City Clerk: Thank you Madam Speaker. We saw the e-mail from Councillor Nason advising that he wished to suspend the rules to hear this matter today. So I took the opportunity to respond to Council that our concern with the motion was only upon providing the link to all members of Council, but that we'd be supportive of the motion should it be changed to be, "Upon the request of the member", which Councillor Nason has done in Motion 9.

Madam Speaker: Right, so I guess it's just clarifying our new process a little bit. Anyways, the motion is in order. Councillor Nason asked for suspension of the rules to deal with the item today. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Klein, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillors Allard, Gilroy, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillor Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Lukes, Mayes, Santos.

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. So the suspension is lost. This will be an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. Yes?

Councillor Chambers: I just noticed on the dates of all of these, they're May 30th, which is tomorrow. Is that applicable or is that a concern?

Madam Speaker: Okay. I'm looking at…the one I'm looking at says May 29th. Possibly you're looking at an older…

Councillor Chambers: But all of these, from 1 to 8.

Madam Speaker: There were some incorrect dates, I believe. So those are being corrected just as we speak. Just probably hasn't been circulated. But thank you for noting that, so the date is May 29th.

Councillor Chambers: Correct. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Maybe to save paper, we'll just leave it at that, thank you. Next is by-laws, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law 53/2020, 54/2020, By-law 55/2020 and By-law 56/2020, Madam Speaker.

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

Clerk: By-law 53/2020, By-law No. 54/2020, By-law No. 55/2020, By-law No. 56/2020.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I move that the by-laws number...sorry, the By-laws No. 53/2020 to 56/2020 both inclusive be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By laws No. 53/2020 to 56/2020 both inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 53/2020 to 56/2020 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. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period for the Mayor. 50 minutes on the clock? Thirty. You're still awake? Thank you. Any questions for the Mayor? I see no one. We're moving on. Councillor Klein, you just put your hand up. Councillor Klein.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Klein: Thank you… Thank you, Madam Chair. That used to me a lot as a child, sorry I didn't see you. At the last council meeting, Madam Chair, the Mayor redirected me to the administration to ask about receiving certain information, and would not take it upon his committee as EPC to direct the City or administration to do that themselves. Specifically, I was then talking about the daily briefing. It doesn't make much sense to me because what I hear that we continuously have to ask for certain things through CAO, a 1-800 number or email. I did some more digging into this and drilled down. So what I discovered, the facts are, is that the Mayor and EPC actually control the CAO and can direct him or her exclusively. And we moved…

Madam Speaker: Your question, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: I'm allowed to give the preamble. That's what I'm doing right now. I found By-law 7100/97, that states "The Executive Policy Committee shall have jurisdiction in the following areas" which is…was amended last year, for "Audit Matters, Capital Region, Corporate Communications, Financial Management, Formulation of Policy, Human Resource Policies, Inter-Governmental Affairs, Labour Contract Negotiations, Legal Services and matters under Litigation, Plan Winnipeg and Alignment of Department Strategic Plans, Policies related to Materials Management" and I can go on. So based on this new information that, in fact, they can or the Mayor could direct the Public Service, I'm

wondering if he would stand today and agree to direct the CAO to provide equal access to the Directors and Executives as well as information to all elected officials equally.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, the Charter is not new, perhaps the review by Councillor Klein is. I'm glad he's reviewed it and, of course, we'll continue to support the compliance of the Charter for all of our committees.

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

Councillor Klein: Okay, maybe I'll get my first question answered another time. I've asked a few times now, will the Mayor as Intergovernmental Affairs person investigate and report back at the next council meeting on the status of a motion that passed in 2014 under then Mayor Katz, that said EPC would be elected?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Perhaps, so if I understand the question correctly, the question is whether I will investigate and contact the former Mayor? I'm… I'm a little confused about the question. I know Councillor Klein knows him much better than I think many of us on Council. Perhaps he could…he could ask him…

Madam Speaker: Can you…

Mayor Bowman: …himself, if that's the question.

Madam Speaker: Can you re…thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Well, I'm sure there's some here that know him much better than I do. My question I though was very clear. There was a motion passed in 2014 by the former Council that EPC would be elected…

Madam Speaker: The question.

Councillor Klein: …After it was here, it would go to the Province. Whereas, have you heard back from the Province? Is he looking into it? What are we waiting for and when will it come back?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I'll…perhaps the former Mayor can speak for himself and Members of Council at the time can speak to the matter that was approved by Council at the time. I'm not going to weigh in on speaking to matters that predated my term in office. I'm happy to have further dialogue on this with Councillor Klein if he so chooses though.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Will the Mayor direct that Corporate Communications…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein, that was your third question already. We can come back to you.

Councillor Klein: No, it wasn't. It was my second.

Madam Speaker: I didn't ask you to restate the question. The Mayor did answer it. Anyways, we need to move on.

Councillor Klein: I thought he said perhaps he could restate... I could restate it.

Madam Speaker: No. I'm sorry. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: All right, Madam Chair, with the negative impacts of COVID-19 being felt in so many different ways in our community and our local economy, I'm interested if the Mayor could provide more details on the 2,300 jobs that are being created from the Capital Budget, specifically the number of hours these jobs will incorporate.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Now that's a great question because it talks about something that I like to talk about, and we want to increasingly focus, which is job creation and economic development. So I thank Councillor Nason for the question. We have a number of outstanding professionals in the Public Service including our Economist. Tyler Markowsky has been doing an incredibly positive work, working collaboratively with Councillor Gillingham. The economic scenario analysis that's been made public proactively by the City of Winnipeg is something I'm really proud that that work has been conducted and that information has been made publicly available. I know there's additional information that has regularly made available by Economic Development Winnipeg and I would suggest that Councillor Nason may want to follow up directly with our economist and I can also help facilitate making that inquiry as well. It's a great question. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Yeah, I thank the Mayor for his response. I've had the opportunity to engage with the economist in the past. But as our intergovernmental lead for Council and the City, will the Mayor engage all of Council on any potential federal or provincial economic recovery funds prior to making decisions?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, Council is ultimately supreme and of course, when and if there's additional funding available from other levels of government that would be welcomed. That's something we're lobbying for right now and joining Mayors across Canada including the Big City Mayors Caucus with…sorry, I'm just getting distracted by discussion. The… I'm continuing to work collaboratively with my council…with my colleagues from across Canada, Madam Speaker, to advocate for support from other levels of government. If and when funding is made available, of course, I would support and would do as I've done before, seeking Council direction on any…on any decisions that would be appropriately made by Council at that time.

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

Councillor Klein: Point of Order, Madam Chair. I'm just wondering if we can get a ruling of some sorts on whether or not the Chair, herself, said to reinstate that question.

Madam Speaker: I don't believe I did, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: I know.

Madam Speaker: I was just calling on you for the second round. Do you want to take the second round or would you like to challenge me?

Councillor Klein: …If we answer that other. Well, I would challenge that maybe. The quip that you did start to say, "Can you re" and that's why I thought I was restating.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, I think we're moved on from that. I don't know that you can challenge the Chair now. We've already had another speaker. Would you like to do your second round of questions now?

Councillor Klein: Sure. If fact, you want to do the second round that's absolutely fine.

Madam Speaker: That's why I was calling on you.

Councillor Klein: That's why you were calling on me?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Klein: Okay. Well, will the Mayor now direct the Corporate Communications Director to provide the daily briefing email to all Members of Council?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Oh sure. Thank you, Madam Speaker. This certainly, I'd be willing to have further dialogue with Councillor Klein on his request. Of course, as he's cited there is authority under respective committees and I would expect that he would support EPC fulfilling its mandate as he cited.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: No.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Good answers, so.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you. I didn't have a third, but I do now. In the lead up to his successful election in 2014, and subsequent re-election in 2018, there was a commitment to have an elected EPC. Do you still stand by that?

Mayor Bowman: I'm…I know…I know Councillor Nason followed both elections. I know he worked very hard at the time, I think, for the Federal Conservatives and then the Provincial Conservatives. He's been a political actor for many years and I know he and many of us followed the elections very, very closely. Of course we welcomed him to Council in…after the last election. With respect to the question that he's asked, I've spoken to that numerous times since the 2014 election; ran on a renewed mandate in 2018, and was really proud to have received a stronger mandate from an even greater number of Winnipeggers that I'm currently serving. And so, I now get the pleasure of serving with Councillor Nason and many others on Council and have meetings like this, which I do enjoy. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Any further questions? Okay, seeing none, we're going to move on, and I'll say that once again, seeing no further questions, we'll move on. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Mayes, on the report dated April 20th.

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

Councillor Mayes: All right, on to the planning section of the agenda. This is…I will be moving layover on Items 5 and 6. I don't know if I can do that concurrently or if we need a…two separate, very good. I'll be moving layover on No. 5 then. This is on the agenda dated April 20th, 2020 so I have three minutes…moving indefinitely, where I have three minutes to speak without fear or foe.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, we'll just…excuse me, we'll just…I missed asking the Clerk to introduce each item since we're going to deal with them separately, just part of the process. Item 5, 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 Street (former stadium site) – SPA 1/2019

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes, now onto to you to introduce the layover.

Councillor Mayes: All right, I'll be moving an indefinite layover. All of you around the table, I believe, have had correspondence from the City Solicitor clarifying the issue at hand. The issue at hand is this; an unusual item in that it was voted on to proceed at community committee, then a tie vote at standing committee. Then, a vote to reverse at executive and remarkably, we're on to a fourth option now, which is the Airport Authority, roughly a month ago sent us correspondence invoking their right. They stated to…under Section 270(1) of the City of Winnipeg Charter, to request a referral to the Municipal Board. An unusual provision in the Charter in that it allows on matters related to secondary plans related to airport certain players, adjacent municipalities, the airport and some others to have the right to refer to the Municipal Board, and that right, its states is, "The City must, before Council, give second reading to the proposed by-law, refer the proposed by-law to the Municipal Board". The issue at hand was did the airport have the legal authority to act as an agent or on behalf of the federal government? We've now had clarity from the federal government that yes, due to the lease agreement with the airport, the airport is invoking its legal right to refer the matter to the Municipal Board and therefore, some very good legal advice from our staff, I think we must defer the matter until it goes and is heard by the Municipal Board. So I think everyone got the same correspondence. I think everyone has had a chance to review that, so I will move then on No. 5 an indefinite layover as one of the eligible parties that being the airport, acting on behalf of the federal government has invoked their right to refer to the Municipal Board.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Point of order, is that layover debatable?

Madam Speaker: It is not. Councillor Gillingham.
Councillor Gillingham: Could the Clerks provide...I know the Clerk did communicate to all of Council, but just I wonder if the Clerk could provide for us, perhaps, on record whether this is treated as, in essence kind of...is still treated as a bit of a live hearing and whether or not councillors in any capacity can speak to us, speak to others about it? Just if we could have clarity on that, that would be helpful, please.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Clerk, if you have that information today.

City Clerk: Thank you Madam Speaker. Through you to Council; yes, the item is the subject of a public hearing and the public hearing remains live. The by-law is now being referred to the Municipal Board as per the Charter, and the Charter calls for the Municipal Board to report back to Council with recommendations. The public hearing remains live until then, and as such, Council should not be debating the item outside of this chamber, and we'll have the opportunity to re-debate it once it comes back from the Municipal Board.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: One more question for clarification. You may not know this answer, but I guess I could…it could be answered later. Is the City allowed to appear at the Municipal Board to present its case, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk.

City Clerk: I would have to confer with Legal Services and get back to you, councillor.

Councillor Eadie: Okay. Thank you. This thing is going to be delayed before…

Madam Speaker: Okay, now moving on with the vote for Item 5, Councillor Mayes has moved layover. All in favour? Contrary? Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Klein and Nason

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 5 is laid over. Next item, Madam Clerk, Item 6.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: As you may remember, there's a provision under our Charter, Section 270(1), the federal government does have the legal right to file a letter of objection, and if they do in a timely and correct manner, then we must refer to the Municipal Board. Our legal staff indicates that the airport, by filing that letter, they have the authority to act for the federal government. So they have filed. The letter, as indicated, I don't know that it will take four years as some have suggested. I don't know if it'll take four months. It'll take what it takes, and that's why we're indefinitely moving…we're moving to indefinitely layover. It will...there will be a decision at some point by the Municipal Board, and I assume in some fashion this will come back again before us, but in the interim, we are bound by the Charter which is passed by the Province, not us, and the federal government has invoked their rights under that Charter as they are legally able to do. And so, the motion then is to indefinitely layover due to the referral to the Municipal Board.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any speakers…or no speakers on this. I can call for the question now. Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise. Raise your hand if you are online.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Klein and Nason

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

Madam Speaker: Item 6 is laid over indefinitely. Moving on to motions…I'm sorry, just a moment. Yeah, the report on the same committee dated May 21st, 2020…Property and Development Committee. Councillor Mayes.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED MAY 21, 2020

Councillor Mayes: All right. We're on then to the second meeting's agenda, and I will inch through the items that I'm going to move so that there's no confusion. There's a number of them, staff or, well, councillors have indicated they wish to pull or should be pulled. Away we go; I will then move No. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7...I'm pulling 2, but yes...again, I'm moving 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13. Full stop. Seventeen, I don't think can be debated, Madam Speaker, as Councillor Gillingham deftly laid that over at EPC for further discussion, but I don't know if we need to pull that or not. Again, I will move 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, inclusive, 8 and 9 are pulled. 10, 11, 12, 13 are before us for the consent agenda. The remaining items would be pulled.

Madam Speaker: Okay. That's clear as mud. Okay. Thank you. Okay. If you wish to have an item pulled, please raise your hand. Okay. I just want to restate the ones that are just pulled, to be clear. Item 2, Item 8 and 9. Okay. So you want to pull 6? That was not pulled. Okay. So Item 2 and 6 are pulled, 8 and 9, 13 and 14, 15 and 16. Seventeen is just here for information, EPC has laid it over for 30 days. It's not debatable. Is that correct Mr. Clerk, we've got the numbers right? Okay, so I'll call the question on 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12 and that's it. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 2 – Single Source Negotiation and Award of Service Contract Extension for the Operation of the St. Vital Centennial Arena at 580 St. Anne's Road for an Additional Five (5) Years under the Terms of Bid Opportunity No. 577-2004, Materials Management Reference No. 98-2020

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes to introduce Item 2.

Councillor Mayes: I will take some time on this and may again on close. There were more questions on this, to my surprise, than on some items involving multimillion-dollar items also on the agenda. This is a renewal of the lease at St. Vital Arena. St. Vital Arena, as we will all know, was opened in November 1970 by a young Ed Schreyer and is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year. It is one of three arenas that is City owned but is operated by a private…well, by a community group. The others being, of course, Allard, which is confusingly not in St. Boniface Ward, but rather, in Councillor Klein's ward. And West K, which I believe is still in Councillor Eadie's ward even post-ward boundary reorganization. A number of questions about the terms of this lease at lower levels of committee, so I'll try and speak to that at some length. Going back to 2013, '14, '15 and '16, we've debated this arena and capital outlays. Those of you who wish to go for a smoke break and aren't interested can feel free to do so, but I was asked to provide details about the arena, so be it. So in 2013, the capital budget was passed for 2014. In that budget there was $200,000 for capital expenditures at St. Vital Arena. I think the gist of the questions at the lower level committees was, well, if they're leasing it out, why are we paying anything toward capital? Well, we do pay toward capital at community centre arenas, of course. Councillor Allard very generously putting in quite a bit at Notre Dame, recent history, and essentially we were contracting out here the operating, not the capital requirements for the arena. Just to make that clear. So St. Vital Minor

Hockey has been running this arena, now 50 years old, St. Vital Minor Hockey has been running it for a couple of decades. 2013, we passed by Council $200,000 in capital improvements; $100,000 coming from my ward funds, $100,000 coming from the centre, coming from general funds. 2014, we passed the 2015 budget. That added another $200,000 from central funds, creating a fund of $400,000 to do capital upgrades at St. Vital Arena. I was asked at the committee, how did those break down? You asked, I will provide: 216,000 for the lobby and dressing room HVAC, 120,000 for the ice resurfacer, which I believe was a Zamboni, although we're not supposed to call it by the trademark name Zamboni. I believe this particular ice surfacer was a Zamboni, $24,000 for dressing room doors. $8,500 for shower upgrades, $32,000 for various other plumbing upgrades. So all of that detail was requested, I'm happy to provide it. Additionally, this matter and this lease has come before Council twice in the last term, where the lease itself was not questioned. You'll remember, of course, Madam Speaker, March 18th, 2015, the debate about whether to provide...whether they could use some of the funding for a Zamboni or an ice resurfacer. Councillor Browaty to his credit assisted with a motion that indicated that St. Vital Minor Hockey Association has stated in correspondence with the association may not be able to continue operations of the arena due to delay of grant approval and whereas the City having taken over operation of the arena could incur additional operating costs of over $100,000 as…when compared to operating deficits at Bertrand. And therefore, the motion was made that the association could use some of the previously approved capital funds to purchase a Zamboni rather than using it for other HVAC repairs or other capital outlays. The wording there, which probably will be of interest to Councillor Klein and others was to say look, if these guys forfeit on the lease, then we could…then the City would have to operate it. Some of the arenas such as Bertrand, that we operate, we lose 100 to $150,000. We don't lose money at St. Vital Arena. We didn't then and we wouldn't under the current lease. So to be clear, in 2015 we considered a matter pertaining to the lease, we said full steam ahead. Thanks to Councillor Browaty for his assistance on that. And while we're on Councillor Browaty, in 2016, we returned to the matter of the St. Vital Arena and its inability to get funding under the water provisions that Councillor Browaty introduced as part of the 2014 budget, thus the motion at 2014. One of the better things I worked on with Councillor Dobson, in fact, who then had Allard Arena. Council stated that in 2016 that, "Whereas in the 2014 budget, water for City pools and arenas is to be provided by the Water and Waste utility at no charge due tax supported budget". The City's Water and Waste utility identified 105 locations that are defined to be within the terms "City pool and arena". However, three arenas were left out, namely: Allard Arena, West Kildonan Arena and St. Vital Arena. And they were not defined by Water and Waste utility to fall within the terms City pool and arena despite the fact that the expression of interest from the City of Winnipeg in 2011 had provided an inventory and map listing St. Vital Arena as City of Winnipeg owned and operated. So quite frankly, a lot of work was put in by Councillor Eadie and myself and Councillor Dobson to get equal treatment for three arenas that should never have had to go all the way to Council to get that. I've had to ensure that that provision wasn't taken out of this lease, and I'm pleased to say that it wasn't, so the arena will continue to receive the same treatment on water as the other City owned arenas. So perhaps at some mind-numbing detail, that is the capital situation and the water situation for the St. Vital Arena. Want to thank the Minor Hockey Association for all they do. Can't say I've had any questions in the years about the operation. Like the Mayor, I was returned in 2018 with a higher share of the vote than in 2014 and we certainly put in hundreds of thousands of dollars into that arena, proud of it. Councillor Pagtakhan came with me to open up the Zamboni. I remember that when we funded that. So this is a group that's done a lot of good work for St. Vital, for the arena, and I look forward to standing with them post-COVID and Minister Squires as well in November of this year to celebrate 50 anniversary…50th anniversary of that arena being open. So having had all sorts of questions at lower levels, I'm providing, I think, all the requested detail about what has gone on at the arena over the last number of years. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you to the Chair, Councillor Mayes, for that very detailed presentation of what the agreement is for St. Vital. And I stand in full support of this motion. It was a little bit shocking and disappointing that some of my colleagues voted opposed to a motion that I put forward asking for all community groups to be given the same opportunity as opposed to having the arenas be, you know, allowed to be bid on by a private sector. But this is exactly the motion that I was asking for. This is the use St. Vital Minor Hockey as the example, as they stood when we had a little announcement about the opportunity for community clubs to be involved. Nowhere did we say every arena had to be taken over by communicate…community group. Nowhere did we say that the City had to pay for everything because grants could come from different places. So I stand in support of this agreement. I hope that this could be used as a template for other community groups if they so choose to become involved. St. Vital has had success, Varsity View has had success, and if we continue to lose money in the arenas we operate, don't know why we would keep doing that. So I fully support my councillor, who has done an awful lot of work, and the other is Councillor Eadie, and Councillor Browaty for bringing this item forward and fighting for good management of these facilities.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I of course support…this is an agreement that our city's public service has come up with the community run St. Vital Arena. And I…Madam Speaker, I wanted to...you know, I'd hate to have to

go through all the detail of the West Kildonan Memorial Arena, but you know, Madam Speaker, as you know, the community led and run ones, they do struggle at times with their ability to take care of and have the money to take care of ice plant items, things like that. It does have an element of difficulty to it. And the tradition of the West Kildonan Arena is it is...it's done okay. It's had some surplus, but it used to maintain and improve the building, but they also required community incentive grants and land dedication reserve grants to keep it running smoothly, Madam Speaker. And as a matter of fact, the West Kildonan Memorial Arena being in my ward, I'll say at this point publicly, I'll thank Madam Speaker for helping me meet the needs of the West Kildonan Arena temporarily, mind you, but nevertheless, it was required in order to keep that facility open for West Kildonan and the people who use it. I just, when...apparently, Madam Speaker, when discussing and asking questions of our administration, apparently, you don't really need to move a motion in order for a community group to look at taking over an arena. Apparently, if there is a community group that believes they have the capacity and the long-term wherewithal to be able to manage it, I think that's interesting. And so there are some provisions apparently. Like, there's nothing stopping a community group from making an inquiry and having a discussion and a dialogue. But you know, not every arena...some arenas are probably more important to be run by the City in various areas. And other parts of the city, you know, it can work. There's all kinds of different social and sport dynamics in different areas, and to a certain level, these areas require, as I said, City run and maintained buildings. And we also learned some detail, Madam Speaker, in that when we talk about who's actually doing the maintenance work and stuff, we also got clarification that, just to be clear. But any way, I'm going to be…I'll be voting for this lease. The community and the councillor and everybody are good with it, and I think that the St. Vital Arena is lucky to have a city councillor that stands up strongly for them. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie, and back to you, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thanks to you, Councillor Eadie. Two things; I wish to thank minister squires, who allocated some funding to match some funding that I was pledging for the St. Vitale arena, and I should thank Brad Erickson from my staff. Everybody has been terrific around the table on a number of project. So pleased to support the arena, and hopefully we can move forward on this item.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie. And back to you, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thanks Councillor Eadie for that. He, of course, has gone to bat for West K and a series of councillors have gone to bat for Allard. I think I finally figured out where the thing is when I was out on my tour de track. I think Councillor Klein pointed out where Allard Arena is. Two things; I wish to thank Minister Squires, actually, the provincial government just this past week announced some funding to match funding I was putting in from LDR for the St. Vital Arena, so we'll be able to do some exterior work there, put some people to work this summer, very pleased with that. And I should thank Brad Erickson from our staff who will be familiar to probably everyone around the table who's been terrific on a number of questions and a number of projects at this arena. So pleased to support the arena and hopefully we can move forward on this item.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk, Item 6.

Item 6 – Sale of the Vacant City-Owned Property located at 595 Beecher Avenue

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Wait to hear from, I think it was Councillor Eadie who pulled it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak on this issue in your ward, and I totally support this proceeding as I believe, from the net proceeds, there is going to be an allocation to doing some sidewalks where piecemeal planning in the past has happened. And not related to any other budgets related to doing sidewalks and so on and so forth, this is an…I have a couple of these things laying around in my old neighborhoods as well, Madam Speaker, where, you know, if some of the net proceeds can do a local improvement, I think that's really important. And so I...but I just want to be clear because some people think that somehow this is jumping the budget queue in terms of priorities in the IRPW. And so I just want to make it clear for everybody and for the Chair of that IRPW Committee that this is about, you know, putting something into local improvement, which there's an opportunity to do with the net proceeds of this property. Hopefully, it gets developed nicely, and whatever gets built there eventually by the private sector, it will be using accessible sidewalks on Beecher, so thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. One of the interesting things in this touring around the city looking at different running tracks is you get out to some places you haven't been to before and I knew there was a lot of growth in Councillor Nason's ward, I knew there was a lot in Councillor Lukes' ward and the stuff I took over from Councillor Allard; Sage Creek, Bonavista, but I don't think I really realized how much growth there is up in the northwest there, how much the growth is in some of those areas. I was looking at lunchtime through my school file, and I found a letter from Councillor Rollins when she was then school trustee board chair talking about Castlebury Meadows and all the planning issues there and we've talked about that in recent weeks at this committee. But there are certainly a number of...there are some gaps up there as Councillor Eadie I think has alluded to, so pleased that we were able to try and address some of that through this one little item and look forward to hearing more. But it was eye opening, at least for me personally, to see that that northwest part of the city, there has been new schools, new…all sorts of new development up there, and with it challenges like the Castlebury Meadows situation. So we live and learn and move on and I'm happy to support this item.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. With that, I'll call the question on Item 6. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk, Item 8

Item 8 – Amendment to Council Policy PD-023 Railside at The Forks Concept Plan

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

Councillor Mayes: This is the second or third in our suite of layovers. So I'll be moving layover to the next Council meeting, which I think is in less than 30 days, Madam Clerk? June 26th. It's in some number of days, so roughly four weeks. So three minutes to speak. I won't take all of that. No one debates the value of The Forks in this city. There is no urgency that I'm aware of to move forward right away on this. There are a number of serious questions that I continue to have that I'd like The Forks to clarify. This is an area where we have a TIFF grant. That is, we have agreed that the property…the people who move in will be keeping property taxes local for some 20 years or so. What do we get in return for that? The people who move in will be using City services. They will call the police, the ambulance, the fire department. They will flush the toilet. They will do all the things you do when you move into an area. We will not get the taxes. What's in it for the rest of us? Then, the answer is some public realm benefits, and we voted on that in the past. The troubling thing to me is that this seeks to amend those public realm benefits, to reduce the commitment to green space, to reduce the commitment to geothermal, to reduce the commitment to community gardens. I'm troubled by that. That said, I look forward to sitting down with our staff and The Forks and other councillors who might have these similar questions and trying to get clarity about this document and just make sure that everything is still online for the public realm benefits. It is a troubling precedent if we are going to have TIFF agreements, and we do have them. We have them at True North, we have them with Siloam, we have them with other players, and if we then start amending the public realm benefits without looking at the other side. So I seek a simple layover to the next Council meeting, which is what I think what we are doing with No. 17, and then hopefully at the next Council meeting, the concerns I have and that others have will have been dealt with and we can move forward. But I would respectfully request a layover for that period of time just to clear up some of the conceptions or misconceptions that may exist around…and if you read the document, it certainly states that commitments…legal commitments that are "shall" would be shifted to "should", and it certainly reduces the percentage of open space, and that to me, I need some clarity on that before I'm prepared to vote for that provision because it does seem to amend what was really part of a TIFF agreement with The Forks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, we will vote on the layover. Councillor Mayes has moved layover until the next Council meeting. It's not debatable. All in favour? Contrary? Just Councillor Rollins and Councillor Allard, we will record you in opposition, thank you. Moving on, Madam Clerk.

Item 9 – Leasing Space to The Women's Resource Centre

Madam Speaker: There is an amending motion with this item. And Councillor Mayes, if you wanted to introduce the main item and the amending Motion No. 6.

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Sharma,

BE IT RESOLVED That Item 9 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development (PDHDD) be referred to the Winnipeg Public Services to report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and within 60 days on the mandate of the Women's Resource Centre, the programing it provides, its space requirements and the extent to which the vacant Grace Cafe or any other vacant city space could suit this organizations needs in the future.

Councillor Mayes: No. 6, thank you. Yes, I will…I'll move No. 9 as amended by the Motion No. 6.

Madam Speaker: Or you can…you'll move the amending motion…we'll vote on the amending motion separately of course. Yeah. So you can speak to the main item and the amending motion.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move…I'll speak to both then. I think a good faith effort by everyone concerned to try and deal with this issue. Councillors Klein and Nason, I believe, brought forward an idea. I think there was a good faith effort to refer it to Governance Committee. I'm not sure who first e-mailed me with concerns about that, not being in compliance with our usual procedure. It might have been you, Madam Speaker, it might have been Mr. Lemoine, our Clerk. In any event, the suggestion here, the motion here rather is to refer it to the public service to report back within 60 days. This is the space formerly occupied by Grace Cafe across the courtyard. I know, Madam Speaker, to your credit, you have put in a ton of work over the years on things around this campus, and I thank you for that, and I know you've had concerns about this Grace Cafe space, but we should get a report back from the public service about what can be done. They ran one request for proposals, that I think either nobody applied for or it was…it was…there was nobody in conformity. So that may be the answer, I'm not sure, but within 60 days, we can get some decisions back from the public service about how to proceed.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. And I will thank my colleague, Councillor Mayes. I do want to just remind everybody of the original motion, which was that the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development be requested to direct the public service to explore an opportunity to formally lease the space formerly occupied by restaurant/café in the west wing of the Susan A. Thompson building. This was not a motion that came up overnight. It was not something that happened out of the blue. This has been a year in the working because we had to put together...Councillor Nason and I had asked a number of leaders across the city to help us understand how to be better involved with vulnerable residents and how to help. I really truly wish the Mayor and other members of Council would have attended and participated in the meeting that we put together including those who were supporting of...supportive of this idea outside of government, one of the young women that have gone through the program and as well as a pastor from our Indigenous community here in the inner-city. I've talked about this motion several times. I've talked about the positives of this motion on three occasions now, and you've all heard them. You've seen public support. You've seen the discussion had you attended the session include food services. I've heard it be referred to as many different things. I believe some people called it a fishbowl. Not the intent. This is important for our city. This is a...this is a way to show we care, to take action, enough talk, let's do. I'm happy about the new motion. I believe that the redirection to a committee, no disrespect to Governance, that has no authority, to direct the public service on such a motion, was even thought, was even considered, was even voted on. I'm extremely concerned by that. I think we know, you know...again, let me just say this because it actually does kind of get to me. We know, myself, and many of you around this council right now including the Mayor know that there was a conversation about this motion of mine to a certain extent, and we know that it was back and forth with a different motion, talks of a different motion. And we know that it was said, it was said that we can't let Klein be the loudest voice on this issue. And we know that it was said, we can take him down. This isn't about me. If those are your feelings, if those are your thoughts, I'm right here. I'm happy to discuss them, especially when it comes to domestic violence, given what happened to my mother. Especially when it comes to, you know, Indigenous feelings and beliefs and fears because of my mother. But to do what they were trying to do, I'm dumbfounded. I cannot believe that in today's day and age, where we say we're welcoming, we're collaborative, that people allowed that discussion to continue, it's wrong. And it's wrong because it wasn't based on facts. I would think by now you know I don't give up on something I believe in. I think you would know by now one of my favourite songs, and Councillor Mayes will appreciate is 'I Won't Back Down' by Tom Petty. This is important, not because it's my motion, because it's time to take some action. A space is sitting empty, and I think it is appropriate to welcome our residents into a building they paid for. I think it's appropriate to say you are a part of our community despite what happened to you. We are here for you. We want to help. And then we grow…we grew that idea to be an incubator, like a change whether it's every year or every two years. That's why the motion clearly states to direct the public service to explore the opportunity to formally lease this space. They ran the RFP. I spoke to the department, nobody applied. Nobody responded to the RFP. How can they? Especially right now. What restaurant would want to go in there and spend money right now? It's not going to happen. So I appreciate the motion. I would love to see one of my colleagues stand up today and support me by supporting these women and send it to them to...send it…reword the new motion and have them explore the opportunity to formally lease the space, which was the original intent of this motion. I know, I moved it. Why would want to agree it? We have to change it some way. Apparently, that's what we talked about in these meetings. I know we're also a United Nation city, and I know a lot of people around this table have passion about domestic violence and our vulnerable people, and I support you on those passions, and I appreciate those passions, and I'm asking you just to support this motion, please, to have the public service explore the opportunity to formally lease the space.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Councillor Orlikow, followed by Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I still…I guess we're all just a little bit amazed by certain aspects of this motion. My aspect of this motion that I'm just most amazed with is that we're trying to say that if you don't support this, you don't support women, you don't support aboriginals. What I don't support is single sourcing contracts, leases. I think it is a good idea to meet with an RFP and just…I just found (inaudible) that it hasn't worked out, but yes, I think we should look at an RFP for all groups equally to have the opportunity to bid or to come forward and say these are the ideas I have. To have a councillor to come here to advocate for one group that no one has any idea who they really are...they may be fantastic. I'm not disputing that. But again, not to provide that same opportunity to all people of Winnipeg and even around Manitoba, to also have that opportunity to provide their own ideas, what they could see with that space through a proper RFP program…process. That's how we do things. We don't say hey, I like you, so I'm going to advocate for you exclusively to have this public space. Well to me, that's where my issue with this motion is. It's not the group itself as much as we want to try and make it out to be that, my issue about is fairness. It's about a public space, that we…if we are choosing to go down this path, which Council should choose and I agree, I think it's a great opportunity…daycares. There's lots of opportunities to fill that space with good community needs, but again, it should be open to all, not just because one councillor knows some group that wants to bring it forward and does that. And then pits everybody else, if you don't go for this, you're against me that way. That's not at all what's happening. What's happening is we don't allow single sourcing, and that's what this is being asked to do. So again, think what you may. What I am thinking is it would be a great idea to do a proper RFP, which I hear is actually in the works. Not sure what the content is yet. I haven't had the opportunity to actually delve into it, but here it is in the work, a second RFP. And we could look at all these groups including this group to have the opportunity to come forward under the RFP equally with all groups. So as much as a rage I'm hearing around here is about, I would say, you know, a little bit on the side of…a little disingenuous to the council because that's not what the topics were about. It was about…for me, it's always been about a single source. A councillor with the best intentions, and I have seen this in my years, and I'm not…they come forward with the best intentions. And they really believe this is the right way to go, that's fine. And then you know what will happen? That group will come to the top, but not to allow other groups to have the same opportunities as this one group, to me, that's a problem. So in the motion, it does clearly say to explore the opportunity to formally lease the space, that's fine. We're already going through that. But then it says, in the end, because motions are important, the words, to the Women's Resource Centre exclusively. That, I do not support.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker is Councillor Gilroy. Councillor Gilroy?

Councillor Gilroy: Can you hear me okay?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Gilroy: Sorry, I had to un-mute. Okay. Well, first of all, I want to thank Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein for your passion about this issue. I think it's a very important issue, and we need men to champion it. So I just want to really thank you for taking this initiative and, you know, being at the forefront. I do appreciate that. I'm somebody that's been on the UN Safe Cities Initiative that looks at violence and sexual violence towards women in public spaces for…ever since I was elected and it's been something I've been pretty passionate about because in my former work, I worked with women that had been sexually exploited and exploited in many different ways. So this is something that I'm pretty passionate about and something that, as a woman, and as somebody that has disabilities and knows that many women from the disability community are greatly impacted from violence and exploitation. And so, it's something I'm pretty passionate about. So I want to thank all my male colleagues who care about this issue because we need you to stand up and we need you to be a part of coming to some of the problem solving. So we need you at the table. So I do want to thank you and all of my councillor colleagues who have always taken this initiative forward and listened to us on Council when we've talked about the UN Work and Safe Cities towards women. So I just want to thank you for that. First and foremost, I'm hoping that if the motion's supported here today, they will talk to the UN Safe Cities Initiative. We have a core group of people that actually work in this field; the West Central Women's Resource Centre, Ka Ni Kanichihk who runs Medicine Heart…Medicine Lodge that, you know, when they first started, it was women that were victims of violence and victims of exploitation and they had no support within the Indigenous communities so they came together and they started this. And when this program started, you know, it started with just a few people, now there's like waiting lists for people to join. So there's really, really great work that is being done within these communities, and some of these places have the locations, they have the abilities, they have the staff. You know, so it's...we need to make sure that when we need to do this, we listen to the people that are impacted, the people that serve the people that are being exploited are victims of violence. We need to make sure that we're really, truly listening on where they are best...where the services are needed. So I just don't want to lose that piece because I think it's a very, very critical piece to this discussion. And I think this is important discussion. I think the more we have this…I think the more we bring it to light, the more we'll see how much support services we need. And I just want to remind people like today I just found out that Daniel McIntyre St. Matthew's Association is closing their doors because they don't have funding from the Province.

They work with exploited women in my community and now they've lost their funding. So there are groups that are right in the community that are doing really, really key stuff that we need to support, and so we need to hear where they need support, and what type of support is needed. We've talked about a 24-hour safe space, that is key. Women are couch surfing, and they're vulnerable and they're not safe. They're not safe to…for violence, they're not safe for exploitation, and you know, we need to do what we can, but we also need to know is what are the supports that are needed, and where are they needed? A 24-hour safe space at night is really, really a key factor that's needed. I just don't want us to lose sight of some of the work that we've already done in this community with women that have been exploited and with these groups that have done such tremendous work. So I think that this debate is good because I think we need to keep light of it, we need to talk about it. And I appreciate Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein for you being passionate about this. And I know, Councillor Klein, you've got, you know, personal feelings about this. And I think that, you know, that there needs to be collaboration and working together, and I agree with that. I don't agree with you on the location, you know, just from my experience and from where I come from. But however, I think there is opportunities in the community to support what we need to support. And I think that that's what you're trying to overall…you're trying to achieve, so I appreciate that. And I just want to thank all of my councillor colleagues, and I know Councillor Rollins has been a tremendous support in this, too. And I just want to thank all the different groups, and I want to talk about a few of them because I don't talk much so now you have to listen to me. But in terms of the North End Women's Centre, North Point Douglas Women's Centre, Ka Ni Kanichihk, Ray, Spence Neighbourhood, 24-Hour Safe Spaces, the West Central Women's Resource Centre. I'm probably like leaving people out. Ka Ni Kanichihk, Daniel McIntyre St. Matthews, we have central neighbourhoods that are working. We have people that are working…that are trying to get out of gangs, and it's all interconnected, so I just really want to thank all the work that they're doing. Street Connections. I know that we have an exploited...we have police officers, an exploited unit that goes and tries to work with women that are being exploited and trying to help them out of the situations when they can. They're doing really great work. So I just want to make sure that with the work that the UN Safe Cities' been doing, the work of all these other community organizations that are trying to put a plan forward in coming up with what they feel is a safe space is happening, right. And we're doing that with End Homelessness, and we're doing that with UN Safe Cities, and we're doing this with the Murdered, Missing Indigenous Women. There's lots of different pieces that are kind of coming together. Poverty reduction strategy will be a piece of that, right. So it will be this council that will kind of be bringing this altogether at the end. So I want to thank all of my councillor colleagues that have been passionate about this issue, and I'm really glad that we're having this discussion today. So if anything comes from this, we need to talk about women's safety in the city, we need to talk about violence towards women, we need to talk about sexual violence towards women and we need to make sure that this is at the forefront of our discussion because we haven't been having those discussions. So thank you again to Councillor Klein and Councillor Nason, and I do support Councillor Nason's motion. And I hope the administration is hearing me that I would like to make sure that UN Safe Cities and all those core organizations that are servicing, the supports of people that are in poverty, that are in addictions, that are being exploited, are all...are at that table. So I hope that you'll hear me and say that if that is a thought, you'll listen to what people have to say on the matter. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. So United Nation's principle is nothing for us without us. So I was very surprised having worked at the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls, having worked with sexually exploited women and girls and gender diverse people, to see two men on Council in front of 510 Main Street pointing to a glass building and saying, this is where we're going to answer community's needs with respect to sexually exploited women and girls. Absolutely in glass, absolutely not standing shoulder to shoulder with other women, just two men at a press conference on a Friday. And I was working, Madam Speaker, and I started getting calls from Manitoba Coalition members, saying what is city hall doing? And I, in fact, got early notice, and I want to acknowledge Councillor Klein and giving me a call. I didn't quite understand the plan. And while he gave me, you know, ample opportunity, I still fundamentally don't understand it. Is it an NGO incubation space? Is it...is it what? So I was very surprised, too, that these two gentlemen got a free ride by the media because the number one priority for a safe space, a safe and inclusive space for human…for human beings that have been trafficked is that you don't identify the address, that you don't put them in a space that their johns can identify them through glass, and you sure don't advertise it as 510 Main Street. So I was very surprised at the free ride, absolutely surprised. So this is going to be referred, and it's going to be referred at the Council meeting in advance of the June 3rd anniversary of the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls National Inquiry reclaiming power and place. But I'm going to echo Councillor Orlikow's comments with respect to the fundamentals of the motion substantially saying we're going to single source this. And what ensued in good faith was an attempt to maybe consider that non-governmental organization incubation aspect. And so around we went, and here we are. So I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this motion, get some words on the record of concerns. And I do want to acknowledge that my council colleague has lost his mom due to sexualized violence, and I want to acknowledge that. Like Councillor Gilroy says, we absolutely need men at the table, and we absolutely need women and gender issues to be prioritized at EPC or in this council. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thanks Madam Speaker. Wow. I did listen to the meeting, and it was kind of tense. Madam Speaker, I was actually participated in about oh, the last third of the presentation. I had trouble logging in with the group who was working with Councillor Klein on the idea, and all that was happening there are best intentions. You know, that's the thing, Madam Speaker, there are best intentions, and we all want to make a mark and try to help…well, not make a mark, we want to help people. And the only considerations I was giving in this is, and the idea here is that I believe it was that we'd be leasing it out for full cost recovery. That's my understanding. And Councillor Gilroy has named many women's organizations trying to help women with the vast amount of domestic abuse, and there's a lot of it. And actually, probably missed a couple of places, I know the Mount Carmel Clinic works with a couple of other places and trying to support women who are trying to get out of domestic abuse situations, so there's a lot of people out there, trying to do their best. You know, I don't know if there's any best place to deliver a service, a public space, like. I do whatever I can to support the North Point Douglas Women's Centre. Everybody knows where it is. Everybody can see who's going in and out. Actually, I like…they've got a program there, they got men and women going in and out of there, men learning to be men and not to be abusers. It's a good thing. It's excellent because it involves both sides, right. And it is a serious problem, we know that. And of course, the North End Women's Centre, they have their incubator bid. Actually, they have their business, right. They've got the Up Shop there. So you want to buy some clothes and stuff, there's some women in there trying to get their lives back together, learn a bit of skill, earn some money to pay off some bills, so on and so forth. That's a chance for them to build independence, Madam Speaker. And I think, you know, there's a dependence...you know what? I'm not even going to get into the whole domestic abuse thing because there's a dependency, and it's an awful, awful, ugly thing. And so those kind of efforts that build that independence, which is what I understand this was about. This was about sort of women once they've gotten past a certain point, they'd be able to do things that helped them build independence that they need to get on with their lives. So I think it's great. But you know, Councillor Orlikow brings up an excellent point. You know, if you look at the past and how this city has done things…actually, we had auditor reports still coming out of different things because some people got…they were sole sourced and they shouldn't have been. Or they got the work because, why? All kinds of claims of misdoings, Madam Speaker. And I know, not-for-profit groups, Madam Speaker, they're not really, you know, in that effort. But you know, at the same time, we have, you know, seniors groups and other groups in City owned buildings who can't afford to pay the cost but they're working with vulnerable seniors or what-have-you, Madam Speaker. So it is a way, and the concept behind this original motion was that it wouldn't really need to be subsidized. The idea is that they could pay their way, which was a cool idea. You know, maybe a bit more of a business plan should be called for in this amendment, but you know, if we RFP this out to many groups, many of the groups don't have the money to do what they need to. Actually, North Point Douglas Women's Centre needs a much bigger space to deliver their programming because they're just, like...it's not the best facility, so they don't have the money to go ahead and do stuff because well, frankly, you know, we voted for a four-year budget where we're cutting grant money, like, to groups that are trying to help people, which...and young girls. You know, I just learned something today. I can't believe it. There are people who are coming in and abusing...getting kids in grade five hooked on drugs. Grade five, Madam Speaker. You know, everything has to start much earlier. Like, we have to be there. These groups are out there, and they're doing that. So you know, it's all a perspective we want to do. I'm going to...at this point, I think I'm going to support the amendment only because I love the idea...I've heard the people make their presentations, and there was a young woman there, some very clear and concise, had a good idea of the direction they want to go. But, you know, one of the things when you start talking incubator and stuff, well, now you've got to start putting together a business plan and ideas about concepts, how that's going to work. Councillor Klein and I will have a meeting with the United Way because just down the street, there was an NGO try to start having NGO incubator over here at...what is that, Alexander and Main Street? Anyway, so I'm going to…at this point, support the amending motion, but I think Councillor Orlikow brings up a very good point in terms of how to proceed with these various aspects. And if there's a need for women who are trying to get away and build independence away from domestic abuse in this area if there's a need for it, then that's the way to go, just saying. But again, maybe we should look at it that way. Sixty days, I believe is given here, to look at stuff. Maybe a little more discussion about kind of what the business plan is because even if you're not-for-profit, I mean, you have to have planning and stuff. All of these women's centres, they all have plans. They all have business plans. What they need to do to try to meet the needs of the women that they deal with every day. So I'll leave it at that, and I'm going to support the amending motion. I think it was from Councillor Mayes and Sharma. Anyway…

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Councillor Klein is a survivor. His brothers are survivors of domestic murder. It's a challenge, and I applaud his efforts and his drive to move this forward. I have my own journey. It's one I choose not to share, but I appreciate where he comes from on this. And just because I'm a man shouldn't discount my want and desire for better. You know, Councillor Orlikow mentioned about single source. We just voted on a single source. That was for an arena. I can probably go through the history and find other single sources that we've done. An RFP went out or expression of interest or whatever it may have been, there wasn't any qualified bidders. So this was an opportunity of a group that involved a former police chief and a very strong advocate for a better Winnipeg being at the front and centre of this caring network that Councillor Klein put together. We're trying to build a better city and instead of

just doing the talk, we're trying to walk the walk. Maybe we're taking corners that aren't the way of the United Nations. We're the City of Winnipeg, and maybe we'll take a small-town attitude with regards to it, Madam Speaker. This group isn't seeking public funds. I worked as the Mayor mentioned in our question period, calling me an actor. I worked for the provincial government in 2016 when they took office and they started looking at ways to save money because the prior administration, there was, be it right, wrong or otherwise, there was a proliferation of not-for-profits. Lots of organizations doing lots of good work that all have executive directors drawing salary which make it difficult to fund all those organizations. This organization is not seeking public funds. They're looking to lease space to run programming on a stage that, you know, much like addictions, there will be stumbles, there will be falls, there will be resets, it will give an opportunity when they're at those final stages of the program to be able to come out and speak to others, to be able to move forward. That is what hope in a good, strong city, a strong community will deliver. It's a fresh start. I think we need to look at some of these innovative approaches and not get stuck in the quagmire and some of the process and stuff that drags stuff down. We can be better. We need to be better. Our city is crying right now. I'm emotional as well. I get emotional a lot, but we need to work to see this through to see what can be when we work together. Thank you.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank everyone today for speaking on this very difficult, very sensitive, very emotional and close to home topic for some people in the council chamber. I would like to support the motion because I have…the amending motion I guess the one from Councillor Mayes and for you, Madam Chair…or Madam Speaker, because all of the discussion of what the purpose is going to be or proposed to be for, I do have to say that...and I'll just put on my ward hat, I have only one $1 lease of any facility. I have many, many groups looking for space. I'm not saying they're going to come down here and they're going to bid on this one, but whenever there's city space available, I think…I do think that it should be put out to the broader public. And for that reason, I'll be supporting the amending motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wasn't going to speak on this issue, but important for us to think...at least to say a few words on what I think is a very sensitive issue on a few levels. One, the issue of the violence and exploitation is, in and of itself, one of the most important issues we have to deal with. And in terms of placement, a sensitive issue, and as Councillor Rollins made the point, just in terms of location and the sensitivity of that. There are other issues involved that I think make it a sensitive issue. Councillor Klein made the point in terms of he's been singled out as concerned…that he'd been singled out in terms of leading on this issue and what others might think of that. And Councillor Orlikow said that wasn't his motivation in terms of why he's going about the supporting the amendment that he is, and fine. But I do want to mention a few things just in terms of these sensitive issues. One, I can't dispute what Councillor Klein is saying in terms of how his motivations might be impugned because I've seen it before, and I've just reviewed it again, and it's not really for dispute. I'm just going to say some facts. You know, last year, the issue, when we were on the Standing Committee for Water and Waste and Riverbank Management, and the issue came to us criticisms of us as members of the standing committee, to bring forth a change. That we did the wrong thing, we dropped the ball when we didn't look for an interim solution for phosphorus into Lake Winnipeg. And it was incumbent on us to do something, so Councillor Klein came up with a motion supported…seconded by Councillor Nason. And I said as a member of this committee for which I'm responsible, I'm on the hook, as the phone calls that I got from people told me, Jason, you made a mistake. So I was supporting Councillor Klein's motion. But then the administration…and I'm not going to…look, I'm not going to put the administration under the bus because I think it's a little more complicated than this. But nonetheless, the administration came to…that…the administration said it wasn't feasible. Councillor Klein's motion wasn't feasible. And then even right here in the council chamber and it is on video, so it's not really for dispute, there's a question and answer exchange here saying is Councillor Klein, is that motion relevant or feasible? Is it necessary? And, you know, the response to the question was, well no, it's not. Well, low and behold, you know, some things sort of…just please watch the video and if you have a problem with this, come to me personally or since I'm declaring this in council, mention to Council when you get the opportunity, if there's any way I'm exaggerating anything. But this is a really sensitive issue and I don't really want to exaggerate anything. But the fact is, low and behold, two months later or so, the motion does arrive at Council and essentially Councillor Klein's motion passes because it was the right thing. But I did notice that, you know, whether the motion was a good one or relevant or necessary, you know, or the motivations behind it were even questions, and I know it for a fact that by councillor…by phone calls I got. And so the reality is that it's unfortunate that these things end up taking part in the council process. Yes, because we have politics. And it's happened to me all the time and I don't even go there because sometimes it's just good to get things done, but it is strange where we do want to put the credit…but that's human nature and that's politics. But it does detract from what we're trying to do and the motivations of any individual in trying to do the right thing. And on this issue, you know, bear in mind, you know, intrinsically, the lifelong insight that Councillor Klein has on this issue and bear in mind, there are real good issues why people may disagree with this motion put forth by Councillor Klein and Councillor Nason. Especially as Councillor Rollins made the point just in terms of location, things like this. Now, I just wanted to point out

that it has been in very recent days because of the sensitivities of these issues, I don't go around talking about my knowledge of location of homeless clusters, like I…because of the very nature of its sensitivity but then the idea, because I don't do that, my understanding or my sensitive…or concern over the issue is impugned or denigrated but I mean you know, I'm just mentioning this because this is a really sensitive issue and I don't think we need the motivations of our fellow councillors questioned on this. So let's get to the point. I appreciate Councillor Klein…in my…just in my case, I appreciate Councillor Klein's motivation on this as I have in the past. In this case, unlike the phosphorus one which I think was right on, we ended up doing the right thing despite what was said along the way. In this case, I will go with the amendment on this given what other councillors have said. And I hope we've learned a little bit in terms of process, why some councillors can be sensitive about the process and why there's distrust in terms of process on these things. And I hope I've, you know, in a way that's not as sensitive, when I brought up the point about the Riverbank Management Committee and his motion regarding the interim solution for phosphorous filtration, that's just a fact. It's on video. The whole thing, it's in the media, everything, so bear that in mind. And I do appreciate the insights from other councillors on this issue as we go forth trying to make the best decisions. And I just kept having an open mind on this. There's always more to learn when it comes to these issues, just like homelessness issues, just like the whole…these…all these issues. Bear in mind where I live. Bear in mind we're talking about, you know, my neighbourhood and my background, it's not…these are not PR issues for me. In fact, I hardly talk about it. And so I'd just like that to be considered as we go forth on this and other issues here at city hall, maybe we're getting better at it.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to take this time and opportunity to thank Councillor Klein and Councillor Nason for presenting this motion a few weeks back. I sat in on the call. I can appreciate the lived experience that Councillor Klein has on this matter, losing his mom to domestic violence. I, too, have my own experience when starting with the provisional government, I was in Family Services, serving in the capacity of an Income Assistance Officer with the provincial nominee program…sorry, with the Employment and Income Assistance Program where one of my clients was abducted in the middle of the night, taken out to Gimli and asphyxiated, herself and her husband, leaving three children to be raised by their grandparents. Deeply affected me at that time and it's something that I'll never forget, getting that phone call from the RCMP. The night of my birthday, as a matter of fact, on how it worked out, asking if I had seen this young woman and then finding out the next day that she had been murdered at the hands of her husband. I concur with Councillor Rollins in the regard of the need for isolation, the need for this base not to be public. Again, working in the capacity of an Income Assistance Councillor and having women that had come to us leaving their abusive partners, we put them in second stage housing. I as an Income Assistance Councillor did not know the address or the location of those facilities on the basis that it was to protect those young women that had been abused. And again, a car parked down the street on King Street can be an intimidation factor for a young woman that is at 510 Main Street. The assailant or the john or the perp doesn't need to be physically there, but just on the street to be that intimidation factor will reset that individual's inner feelings back to being scared, back to being victimized. So having that isolation and having that place where they can go and work on the hierarchy of needs of feeling safe, I think is fundamental to the recovery and to them being able to work on the skills that they need to be empowered and re-emerge into the community on a larger scale. So I will support the amendments that have been brought forward. I think it's a great idea for these two councillors to present this. And I'm happy to support something like this that keeps our community safe and Councillor Nason alluded to building a better city. We also need to build a safer city and these are some of the actions that we can take in terms of keeping our vulnerable population safe in an isolated place where, again, they can work on the things that they need to work on to be confident and to come out re-emerged, empowered, to get the jobs that they need and provide for themselves and their families. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: I'll speak briefly and I want to thank all members of Council for their input on understandably a very difficult topic. Sadly, domestic violence is not…is something…is a topic that affects far too many families in Winnipeg and throughout our country. And I'm sure many members of Council and their families sadly have experienced issues relating to domestic violence and my heart goes out to all members of Council and all members of our community for having to…having to deal with such terrible issues. The issue of this…of Council's support for building a safer community is one that I hope members of Council can show and can feel a sense of pride in some of the work that we've been doing. I applaud the efforts of many members of Council that have stepped up to do their part, to build a safer community for all Winnipeggers including, of course, some of our more vulnerable women in our community. The work of Councillor Gilroy with the UN Safe Cities is something that she has been steadfast in her work for many, many years, and I want to thank her. The advocacy and the actions of Councillor Rollins in particular lead to the inclusion in the most recent budget of the $1 million for 24/7 safe space and I want to thank her for her ongoing leadership. That is real action and I regret that not everyone supported those dollars flowing for 24/7 safe spaces and it's something that I'll continue to support. The issue of the Women's Resource Centre, the way that I read this amendment, and I'll be supporting this amendment for a couple of reasons. One, I would like to get more information about the Women's Resource Centre. It's

not an organization that I'm aware of. I know Councillor Nason referenced the executive director. I'm not sure who…I've never…I don't recall meeting the executive directors, so I'm looking forward to the public service providing Council with some information about this entity. And hearing about the good work that we're hearing that they're conducting. The issue of the space of the former Grace Cafe, I certainly in supporting this am not necessarily supporting any specific organizations leasing of that space. I'd like to know from the public service as this motion is indicating what their views are on it, but I would expect when and if another RFP is issued that this or any other organization would have to go through that process which I would expect and support that process so Council could do its due diligence. And so for my support of this, I don't see in here that there is a decision for any particular organization to bypass that RFP process but rather, for us to get some more information about this organization that we've heard about through the media. Thank you, Madam Speaker…as well as through the committee process as well I should say. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, back to Councillor Mayes to close.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You could hear it in people's voices. You could hear it…and you don't often here real emotion around here but I think you could hear it today in people's voices on different parts of this. So I do think the amendment…the amended motion is a good compromise to try and keep the issue under study and to keep…get some recommendations from the public service. I should thank in that phone call that Councillor Klein mentioned, they talk about Jeff Manchuck from Sport Manitoba and Sport for Life Centre and the support that had been given there, so that's an organization we've certainly done a lot of work with over the years. And also, I should thank chief…former Chief Clunis who was on that call as well. He could be resting somewhere, playing golf, doing any number of other things as a retired police chief, but he chose to spend his time talking about this and I appreciate that, but there are a number of concerns raised by people who have well, Councillor Gilroy and Councillor Rollins have certainly spoken about the issues of domestic violence here over the years and I think this is one where there's a lot of passion and a lot of desire to do something on this file. So I think the landing spot for now, at least, is to refer it to the public admin. So I will be voting in favour of the amended motion. And Madam Clerk, if you could just clarify…Madam Speaker, if you could clarify, are we voting, is it one vote, is it a vote on the amendment and then the motion?

Madam Speaker: We'll vote on the…thank you…the referral motion and if that passes, there will be no other vote of course. Thank you. So now voting on the referral motion, Motion 6 as presented. All in favour? Contrary? Okay, Councillor Allard noted opposition. Councillor Klein noted in opposition and Councillor Nason, that's three, okay. Councillor Allard…we had Councillor Allard. You're on mute. Councillor Allard, would you like to be noted in opposition?

Councillor Allard: No.

Madam Speaker: Okay, you had your hand up, so I just wasn't sure. Okay.

Councillor Allard: Sorry, it was my mistake. Can you hear me now?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Allard: Okay, yeah, so I would like to support the motion. My apologies.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason and Klein recorded in opposition. Okay, and Motion 6 is carried. Is that the will of Council, a break for 15 minutes? And we just need the concurrence of Council, no official vote. We'll come back at 4:00 o'clock sharp, if not a few minutes before, please. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
May 29, 2020, at 4:03 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, I would like to reconvene our meeting after a short recess, Council meeting of May 29th, 2020. We are on the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Mayes, we'll continue in a moment. Madam Clerk, could you please introduce Item 13?

Item 13 – Closing – Cadboro Road, Albright Road and Part of Formby Avenue for Incorporation Into DASZ 43/2019 – DAC 6/2019

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

Councillor Mayes: Yes, No. 13 is the poor cousin of No. 14 as it were. No. 13 is the road closings that are necessary in relation to the bigger ticket item that's coming at 14 and I'll save my grand speech about Waverley West and Councillor Lukes' good work until No. 14 and merely say 13 I think is uncontroversial, 14 maybe not so much so. But 13 I think is a necessary part of getting going with the larger project at Waverley West B, so I would encourage councillors to vote for No.13. However, No.14 may see us run into some heavier water, but 13 I think has not been the source of any difficulty at other levels.

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

Councillor Lukes: So this is 13, correct?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Lukes: So 13 is tied to 14, so we had to pull it. So I would like to speak to 14.

Madam Speaker: Okay, seeing no further speakers, Councillor Mayes. This is 13, Councillor Eadie. Did you want to speak to 13 or 14?

Councillor Eadie: Which is the one that talks about the interceptors?

Madam Speaker: Fourteen. Councillor Mayes, back to you. You're good? I'll call the question on Item 13. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 14 – Subdivision and Rezoning – Waverley West 'B' (Phase One) –Selected Properties Bounded by Lee Boulevard, Waverley Street, Bison Drive and Albright Road – DASZ 43/2019

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: When the ward boundary changes came rolling onto our computers in early 2018 or late 2017, I remember a wise man, in fact it was me, saying to somebody, well, Lukes is going to run in St. Norbert. That's where she lives. She's not going to go out into this new area…not going to run out there in 14…in Waverley West and I was wrong and I think Councillor Lukes frankly wanted the challenge of running in Waverley West. It wasn't where she lived, but it didn't turn out to a great challenge in that there was an acclamation as Councillor Orlikow is probably noting. But I think it's worth noting a lot of work has gone into this area over the past number of years. A lot of planning work, a lot of councillor work, a lot of time. I remember sitting there at the Jonathon Toews…at the Dakota Community Centre, you know, we're having a meeting about the issues in Riel and these people show up and start talking about bus service to Bridgewater and I was thinking, what in the hell…what is that? How does that relate to…and at that point, Riel included the Waverley West community and these people had those sorts of issues. Of course, Councillor Lukes had done her job and gotten them out to the meeting. So I tend to listen to Councillor Lukes I think about matters pertaining to Waverley West and this is one where we are looking at a fairly big subdivision and rezoning that hinges all sorts of items have been resolved and we're really down to one item which is the pipe that's going in and should the developer pay or should the City pay and it hinges on the definition of interceptor and I'll let Councillor Lukes speak to this in greater detail. This is not a clumsy attempt to enrich the developer. We do provide. We've talked about it earlier today with The Forks. There are various arrangements that are made with various different developments. So I don't want this to be construed as some sort of vote on whether to unilaterally enrich the developer. I think the developer here is saying, look, we don't view this as being an interceptor and various examples and Councillor Lukes has spoken to that at other levels and our staff has spoke and said, well, the way your by-law reads is this way and therefore it's an interceptor. It would seem to me, an unfortunate result that quite literally, the developer would be further ahead here to buy the grand mosque for $2 million and tear it down. That would be the economically incented position here if…we used to talk a lot about law and economics at law school. That is what we would be encouraging them to do because due to the presence of the mosque, which is an older…not that old, it's an older structure here, that somehow complicates the whole issue of whether this pipe is an interceptor or not, even though the mosque, which is great, and which we've all been to, or many of us have been to multiple times, they're doing a great job. But it seems, frankly, a little incongruous that the developer would have to pay because the mosque, which it pre-exists the development might hook up to the pipe. I'll let Councillor Lukes get into more detail. And it's fairly mind numbing at times, I have to admit, on the interceptor. But I will just say, you know, Richard Mahe is one of our City Planners that got up at a meeting and said, you know, we've got to build up and we've got to build out, it's how you do it that matters. And I've always liked that. And we do…we'll never accommodate everyone who wants to live in Winnipeg by simply building up. We have to think about how we build out. So there's this understanding or perhaps misunderstanding that, oh well, it's Waverley West and that all these, you know, 50-foot-wide lots and single-family homes and that's all it is from mile after mile. Not at all. Go out there. Councillor Lukes has talked about this a bunch of times. There's a ton of density out there. There's more density in parts

of Waverley West than older neighbourhoods like some parts of River Heights probably. Councillor Lukes has talked about this. There's been a good effort made here to densify. Councillor Allard, when he was councillor for Sage Creek I think put in a lot of effort as did Councillor Vandal before him, to densify that development. I'm trying to continue that. We're trying to densify some of these newer suburbs. I think the suburbs of the last 10 years are somewhat different than say the 1980's and 1990's. I think people like Richard Mahe and others in planning have had us think about this. We can't…we're not just going to discredit these suburbs. Once you start the precinct, I think you have a duty to try and densify some of those newer areas. And we've done that, I think. Some might think not enough, but I know there are a lot of big buildings and Councillor Lukes has shepherded through a bunch of them in the Waverley West area. So this is part of that whole development out in Waverley West. It isn't fair to just call it sprawl. It's a planned…there's been a lot of planning here around this community. There are schools, hopefully there will be a community centre. You know, people say, oh, it's bankrupting the city, all these new community centres. There's been one new community centre built since 2000. There have been new campuses of old ones. We've fixed up a bunch of old ones. We fixed up the burned one that was in Elmwood but only new one since 2000 is Red River and I figured out where that was when I went to see the track at West Kildonan Collegiate. It was great. I figured, I wonder where Red River Community Centre is. It's the only new one. So we have had massive growth in the city, massive growth in certain areas. We're going to have to catch up. So yeah, we're going to have to do a community centre to be fair in Waverley West. But this is I think an opportunity to keep that subdivision, that rezoning, that neighborhood going. The schools need to be done. The Province has indicated support for that. The Province has also faulted us in the past for slowing down school constructions and daycares and I still take offense at that because we haven't. But here's an opportunity I think to try and move this forward and get some progress in that neighborhood. And making some more general comments, I'll probably come back to the narrow issue that really is still in dispute, the interceptor issue, but Councillor Lukes is more conversant with that than I am.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, I'm going to ask, Madam Speaker, that we refer this item along with the associated one back to the standing policy committee to allow for further clarity from the department. I have three minutes to speak to this and I'll never be able to get into the details of an interceptor in three minutes. I ask that it be referred back to the committee so we can seek further clarity on what denotes an interceptor pipe and what doesn't. This pipe that's being discussed connects to an interceptor pipe and while many of us here have a decent understanding of say, a road cleaning, road construction, pathway construction, sport's field construction, I dare say many of us here could not carry on a ten-minute conversation on what makes a pipe an interceptor and not an interceptor. And I would also note in some cases the determination of an interceptor is based on the surrounding development conditions. It's not black and white. Like Councillor Orlikow stated earlier today, land development is not simple. One piece of land is not like the other, one area is not the like the other. Different situations require discussion and collaboration and it takes time. You know, it's a referral back. Everyone gets worried about referrals. This project's in the ward I represent. It's not in anyone else's. I've been working on this file since 2014. So let me assure you, I'm not asking for a referral solely to cause delay. Thirty to 60 days to seek further clarification from the department will not impact any of the new projects proposed because not one single one has an RFP out the door. Clearly, if I felt it would delay projects or would jeopardize any projects, I wouldn't be asking for a referral back, but I do ask that we have a discussion or that it be referred back to the standing policy committee.

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

Councillor Orlikow: I believe a point of order is that referral with instructions, it's required to be written.

Madam Speaker: She has three minutes to present and then the referral. Pardon me?

Councillor Orlikow: Will there be a written?

Madam Speaker: No, it's not with instructions. No.

Councillor Orlikow: It's not instructions? To refer it back to the committee, is not instructions?

Madam Speaker: It's not with written instructions. She did have…she does procedurally have three minutes as she used it now. So we'll now vote on the referral, Mr. Clerk. Councillor Mayes, do you wish to rebut or speak to that at all?

Councillor Mayes: I'll be voting in favour of that. I think that's…

Madam Speaker: So I'll call the vote now and this is all in order. Councillor Lukes has asked for this item to be referred to the…okay. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Just a point of order just for clarification, this particular Item 14 was a hearing, right? So…all right.

Madam Speaker: Because it's just a point of clarification…

Councillor Eadie: I'm voting against it. I'm voting against it then. Because I can't even go to speak to it at committee and I think there's a lot of people around here that should be asking the right question of Water and Waste, not the wrong question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. With that, we're going to vote on the referral as Councillor Lukes presented. All in favour? Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Chambers, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillors Allard and Gilroy, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillor Browaty, Eadie, Gillingham and Orlikow

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

Madam Speaker: Item 14 will be referred back to committee.

Councillor Lukes: It has to go with 13 to the…don't they? Go together?

Madam Speaker: Clerks will take care of that. But the question…okay. That's fine? It's good. Back to the agenda here, Item 15, Madam Clerk.

Item 15 – Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site Secondary Plan – SP 1/2018

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes. Yes, we have…that's Item 15. So we have a layover motion with instructions, Motion 7.

Motion No. 7
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

BE IT RESOLVED That Item 15 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development (PDHDD) dated May 21, 2020 be laid over until such time as the parties clarify the process outlined in Justice Grammond's order on this matter dated May 14, 2020.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, dated May 30th, because we thought we would be here after midnight as did the Mayor, but we're making wonderful time here. So I will move to…I'll move the motion that you see in front of you then. I assume, Madam Clerk, this is debatable because it's written layover, just for clarity for everyone. We've had a…okay. So I shall then speak to the motion, Motion No. 7 and separately, then, 8 would deal with Item 16?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Mayes: All right. I won't take ten minutes. Kudos to our Legal Department who has come through I think as we requested with a definitive position on this matter in time for this meeting. Earlier would have been better, perhaps, but the idea was to get it in time for this meeting and we can't write the federal government's letters for them. So we are…that matter was of course on the airport, this is the Parker Land's matter. Getting late in the day. So Parker Lands matter, again, our Legal staff will come back to us prior to this meeting, I think, expressing a plan to have the matter laid over until we can get back in front of Madam Justice Grammond with the other party or parties because I think it's two numbered companies, to discuss the earlier ruling and the instructions. As you'll know Madam Speaker, there was the original contempt order, there was then the request for reconsideration and that created an order that was dated March 30th of 2020, issuing from Madam Justice Grammond. There seems to be some dispute as between the City and the other parties as to how to proceed. We're in sort of unchartered waters here I think with the court order and further complicated by the fact that you have both the secondary plan and the subdivision rezoning. So there are certainly some

questions about public hearings. There's some questions Councillor Klein raised in correspondence earlier this week. I think good questions, questions I wish I had raised, in fact, at some of the earlier hearings. So I think there are a number of procedural issues in play that we need clarity on. Better to do it this way I think than to go down a path and find out later that maybe we didn't go down the path as instructed by Madam Justice Grammond. So in the interest of some brevity, the motion is to lay this over until we are able to get clarity on the order that was issued. It's a bit tricky in that the decision is March 30th. And then you have to work out a specific order arising out of that. So the decision is 70 odd paragraphs long, but the order is much shorter; a page sometimes, sometimes less. So we need to get clarity, I think, from Madam Justice Grammond about what was intended. Are we on the right path, if not, what instructions are there in terms of talking about the substantive issues. That was part of the written decision that came out March 30th. So…and I think some good work done by our Legal Department here to try to get us back in front of Madam Justice Grammond to make sure we're on the right path. There will be time enough for debating this down the line, I suspect. But before we get there, I think it's smart to pause and get in front of Madam Justice Grammond and say, this is an unusual procedure, are we complying with the court order. Better to do it that way than to get through this whole process and then find out we have to go back several steps. So sorry for the earlier comments, Madam Speaker, about the federal government. That, of course, has come and gone earlier in the agenda, but this one is simply on the two matters. This is Nos. 15 and 16. This is the secondary plan at 15, the subdivision and rezoning at 16 Parker Lands and this is of course, trying to get some guidance from the court before we go further just to make sure we're on the right procedural path. So I will move number…Motion No. 7.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, I've been calling on Council for a seminar on this for several months. You know, when the first ruling of contempt of court was brought forward and following the second upholding of it. And you know, in baseball, you get three strikes, you're out. Basketball, you get five fouls and you're out and. I think in this matter we may be in the five fouls perspective. I think the time for this to have been laid over was at standing committee when it was there. But they moved forward. They actually went in camera, I don't know if it was in regards to this. I know a councillor recused herself from it. You know, everything that has been said to this date is on record, it's been in the courts and I stand again to say that, you know, Winnipeg, if we're going to be doing development, we need to have assurance in the community that we're open for business. We've seen another matter today that we're laying over because in the fourth quarter with 20 seconds to go, we received correspondence, shades of grey correspondence, through a different matter, of course, but still correspondence. And our Legal teams brought forward recommendations in the matter that, you know, we've got other recommendations with regards to police pensions that were not quite right or didn't quite lend itself to the right legal arguments. We've got two lawyers on Council. I think we've got enough brains around the table that we can make these decisions and do so in a way that's fair and honest and open to give confidence to those that want to invest and build for a better Winnipeg. You know, what I'm seeing of late does not lend itself to that. And I think need to do a better job. You know, we're looking…the Province is now looking at us very closely on the job we're doing. The public is judging us very harshly on the job we're doing around this table. Confidence from the community is waning over the job we're doing as Council. We need to do better. I know I will try. I'm trying to learn. I'm a lay person. I don't understand law. It gets kind of convoluted and I ask for simple yes and no's and I get ten paragraphs of response. We need to do better. Give us clarity, quit mumbling this stuff up with verbs, adjectives and big long strings of words, give us the plain facts so that we can work with the business community and we can work with our communities and have a strong Winnipeg.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, speaking to the referral and not the actual report, the non-statutory secondary plan, which is interesting in terms of concepts of hearings. But Madam Speaker, I heard the Legal representative at committee explain the situation and I have to say, I understood it. There's…I don't really think I need a seminar to understand this whole thing. And what I understand is, once you start launching legal actions, it takes much longer to get anything done. The referral with the instructions here I think is good and only for this reason because I do understand law. It's only an opinion until the judge makes their decision and so our Legal was asked an opinion and she described it. Her opinion of what we may or may not appeal, but…and it was pretty clear to me. I understood it. However, it doesn't matter if you get a legal opinion or not. It's only when the judge tells you and decides if you have interpreted it properly and so that's what this purpose is, as I understand, Councillor Mayes' motion and so I will be supporting it. It's a shame I don't get to debate either two non-statutory secondary plans because it's kind of interesting in that, they hold no water apparently legal. Anyway, I'll be supporting the referral with the instructions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. And I guess my only question with respect to the moving to delay motion is that it says until such time as the parties clarify the process outline in Justice Grammond's order. Is it the

process I've outlined? That's my question though, is that really, because if you look again at the…as my colleagues have all seen the email that I sent, it's pretty clear that it says, shall…doesn't say 'shall', 'will', 'must' sit down and talk. So should we be delaying it to say that we need to meet with the other side and actually follow the directions of the order? Or are we…because this seems very vague to me and that's my only concern with the voting on this motion that has been moved today.

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

Councillor Mayes: It's interesting. For clarity, we did get a legal briefing at PHD Committee that was in open session. This was not dealt with in camera. There was an in camera agenda, that was that, this is this. We dealt with it in public session and got a briefing from our legal counsel about developments to date. Since then, there's been correspondence between the parties that have created some doubt about process and whether we're following the correct process or the process as directed by Madam Justice Grammond. I think the questions Councillor Klein raised were some…those are some questions that are…additional questions that hinge on public hearing and the process. So I think it's clear that the order was directing to come…it was to come not to the community committee but to come to standing committee. Beyond that I think we need some, frankly, some guidance from Madam Justice Grammond about next steps. So I think those are the matters that have been raised. I hope I've addressed those. It is not substantive issues we are looking to get guidance on and I think Madam Justice Grammond has been extremely clear that ultimately this is going to be our decision, not the courts decision on the substance. But the process has caused us, well, let's be honest, it's caused us difficulty to date. I think it's wise to do what our counsel recommends here, try to lay this over, try to get clear that we're going in the court directed way and then move on from there. Lawyers don't always agree. The Mayor and I don't always agree on some of these legal questions and we're both lawyers, but I think on this one, we do need to…I think we agree and I think our counsel has given us good advice which is to lay over and to try to get clarity from Madam Justice Grammond on the correct process.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question on the referral…on the, sorry, on the motion laying the item over. All in favour? Call for recorded vote. All in favour of layover, Motion 7, Item 15.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Klein and Nason

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 7 passes. Item 15 will be laid over. Item 16, Madam Clerk.

Item 16 – Subdivision and Rezoning – North east corner of Hurst Way between Asquith Avenue and CN Railway (Parker Lands) – DASZ 12/2018

Madam Speaker: Over to Councillor Mayes, we have Motion 8 to present.

Motion No. 8
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

BE IT RESOLVED That Item 16 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development (PDHDD) dated May 21, 2020 be laid over until such time as the parties clarify the process outlined in Justice Grammond's order on this matter dated May 14, 2020.

Councillor Mayes: Basically, same again except I'll not confuse matters by talking about the federal government this time. This is a same…this is a companion to the earlier one. I mean, there are some slight…there are some differences in that that one is a secondary plan and this is a subdivision and rezoning, but the same basic set of issues arise out of that same order from Madam Justice Grammond.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, any speakers on the item? Seeing none, shall I call the question, Councillor Mayes? All in favour of Motion 8, for the layover? Contrary? Two opposed and we will note that in opposition, Mr. Clerk. Councillor Nason, Councillor Klein. Motion 8 passes. We'll now move on to by-laws for this committee. Councillor Mayes. Go ahead, Councillor Mayes.

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

Councillor Mayes: Two different sets here, slightly different. One is just first reading. So I'll move that By-law No. 100/2019 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 100/2019.

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

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 57/2020, By-law No. 58/2020.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 57/2020, By-law No. 58/2020.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move that By-law Nos. 57/2020 and 58/2020 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 57/2020 and 58/2020.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 57/2020 and 58/2020 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. Any questions for Councillor Mayes? Councillor Klein, Councillor Nason.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Last Council meeting, I had asked the Chair to provide us an update on the sale of the Pantages Theatre and Portage Place. I'm just wondering, I haven't received anything by email, if we have any update on the progress.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I believe that matter is coming in the very near future back to Property, Heritage, Downtown Committee. I don't think that report has been public yet, but if that hasn't happened by the next meeting, then… well, I'll update Councillor Klein if we don't have some progress within the next 10 days or so. It's a fair question and has been a long, running matter, but we'll... I'm expecting that matter to be back on the public agenda at the next meeting.

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

Councillor Klein: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. I know that there's been many changes that have been talked about and implemented with the permitting process and changes that were made because of COVID-19, and we hear that it's getting better and better. So I'm wondering if the Chair would get a report for all members of council that can you give us the actuals of March 19, April of 2019, sorry for clarity, and April 2019, and compared to March 2020 and April 2020 of permits… permits that have been issued and projects that have been approved so that we can see for ourselves just how well our changes have been implemented.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I will get, what I can get, I think Ms. Crocker over there who's running our permits operation these days has been doing a great job and been very accessible, very good to follow up with me, personally, at least. So I will see what kind of reports we have. So just… I'll ask Councillor Klein after the meeting to just give me those dates again, and see what we can do in terms of year over year comparison. Certainly, the staff are doing a whole lot of online things and I know, worked really hard to get that temporary restaurant permit up and running on (inaudible], thank you, patio license up and running on pretty short notice, so… I think… I think change is being made, I think there's more online activity happening. But I'll certainly try to get that report, that's a fair request from Councillor Klein.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Chair, and through you I'm going to ask, I hope a relatively simple question. I know last year we suffered some embarrassing situations with regards to inspectors that resulted in eight of them being terminated, seven others were suspended. I'm curious if we can restore the public confidence, if the Chair is aware if those individuals, they've been returned to their same role within his committee, PP&D, as inspectors or if they were promoted or redeployed in some matter?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'm fond of saying that's a fair question. On this one, maybe that's not a fair question, because that's a Human Resources matter. I'm not… there were a lot of grievances filed, I'm not sure how that has resolved if it's resolved. I can see what we can find out from Mr. Kiernan and get back to… to Councillor Nason. That… that may not be to the extent to he would like, but rather clearly it's a Human Resource matter and… and certainly I'm aware that some grievances were filed, but we'll see where things stand I guess. I can...I can certainly undertake to do that basically here.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Nason: You know what, I appreciate the response and I know he'll do what he can. With all the procedural layovers that we've had with regards to last minute legal opinions and knowledge gaps, does the Chair have a checklist with regards to make sure the I's are dotted and T's are crossed, so that in the future when these things come forward that we know what we're doing?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I've been wanting to clarify something from earlier in the meeting too, which was councillors and council were never held in contempt on anything that… that was raised by Councillor Nason earlier, and I should've clarified that a couple of hours ago. There was the City, was held in contempt, but not any of the community committee councillors or anybody in here. The question is a bit general. We…we have had a number of layovers here today. I think some of that is not on, we couldn't...we couldn't have foreclosed the federal government from, I knew I'd get back to that, the federal government from exercising it's right to refer that airport to business to the Manitoba Municipal Board. We got the notice with one day in advance from the airport before the last meeting. I think the counsel was…the legal counsel was right, saying, "We don't know if they're the agents of the federal government, give us some time to figure this out." We figured it out yesterday. So and on the Parker matter, it's…what…what did Councillor Orlikow say? Nine years on his desk at the last meeting. So this has been going on for some time and has been probably the most complicated planning matter we dealt with during my years here. So I don't know what's next necessarily, but I think it's smart to go back to the court and say, "Rather than going off on this tangent or filing an appeal of the contempt or whatever, let's just try and make sure we're doing the process that's directed by the court." So I don't think we need to apologize for that. On other matters, I don't think we've got…I think it's a bit difficult in this environment to always have the chance to review something the way you would in the non-COVID period. I think The Forks matter, I probably would've gotten earlier frankly, in the non-COVID period, I think some of the questions I had, could've been answered.

So it's a fair question to that extent. But we're trying to deal with the COVID and the limitations of that. We'll have The Forks matter back before us next time. People can vote as they see fit. But you know sometimes I think it makes sense not to rush things through and to lay over and have more questions, and try to get some clarity. I mean that's part of what we do here. So I don't have a checklist unfortunately, but I do think we're getting some good legal advice of late on how to handle these matters.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: This is an "are you aware" because I just became aware of it at my last Historical Buildings meeting. And so this question is, are you aware that out of 130 buildings that we had on our Historical By-law, we are at 128? The final two are coming forward shortly. Are you aware of that?

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I wasn't aware of that. Part of me would like to revisit a couple of those, quite frankly. We may at…have the Bay and Singer, so again in front of us, but it is good news from, thank you, Councillor Orlikow, a lot of work by staff marching us through that and you know, some contested votes along the way. But I think, by and large, we've got most of them right. But it has been a... it's been a journey. But I wasn't aware of that and yes, we can…I think all look forward to getting to the end of that list.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. We did at the last moment receive the federal government's perspective on this 1996 Lease Agreement that they have here in Winnipeg with the airport. I found it very interesting in reading the letter that it was requesting the City of Winnipeg to change the Charter section that's been invoked, Madam Speaker. So I'm wondering what… what the Chairperson's perspective is on our potential to change the Charter that is an Act of the Manitoba Legislature.

Councillor Mayes: I will say, I don't think personally I don't fault the airport or the federal government for invoking their right. Maybe they read the newspapers or read the tea leaves and thought they weren't win the vote and said, "Well, we got this…we got our ability to invoke referral to the Municipal Board. Let's do that." I don't know. But you can't really fault…another level of government for invoking their right to refer. To be blunt, there's been enough going on in the last 24 hours Councillor Eadie, that I haven't thought about that, and after a glass of red wine tonight, perhaps I will. But in terms of amending the Charter, it's not ours, it's the Province's. But it's been busy enough that I haven't turned my mind to that, but I certainly will in with all deliberate speed.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: Will the Chairperson or whoever…will the Chairperson have our City Administration send the federal government a letter that if they want that clause changed, they should inform the Manitoba Government?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I will discuss that matter with our CAO and Legal Counsel, and move forward from there. It was a bit odd, I have to say, it's a fair point from Councillor Eadie, that… that the federal government would seek to change the Charter on a provision that probably comes up once every, well it may come up again actually, we don't know, there may be more development in or near that… that restricted zone. So yes, it probably makes sense to think about this, so we aren't having this debate 15 times in the next five years or something and waiting for them to invoke their right to…at the last minute. So it probably does make sense to clear that up, but again, it's as you know, Councillor Eadie, it's ultimately provincial legislation.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions, let's move on. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. We'll get right into the by-laws for this committee. Councillor Rollins.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. I would like to move that By-law No. 49/2020, a by-law of the City of Winnipeg to amend…sorry. To amend the doing business in Winnipeg by-law to include dealers in bicycle parks in the bicycle

dealers licensing category and to include dealers in scrap metal in the used goods dealer licensing category to be read a first time. I did your part, didn't I?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins, it's By-law No. 49/2020 be read a first a time.

Councillor Rollins: That's right, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: So moved. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 49/2020.

Councillor Rollins: I move that By-law 49/ 2020 be read a second time.

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

Councillor Eadie: Record me as opposed please. This is the one regarding metal recycle.

Madam Speaker: Noted, thank you.

Clerk: By-law No. 49/2020.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins, last one.

Councillor Rollins: I move that the rule by suspended and By-law 49/2020 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. Okay, noted, thank you. We'll now have question period under this committee. Councillor Chambers, question for Councillor Rollins.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair, to the Standing Committee Chair. I would like to ask whether or not the winter storm of October…of October 11, 2019 was catastrophic on our tree canopy. And I'm wondering if all the debris from the damaged trees have been cleaned up. Second part to that question, has there been a full and comprehensive assessment of the damage done to Winnipeg's tree canopy? And the third part to that question, has our Forest Tree Division been able to revise their schedule and resources to prune trees as well as assess the health of our Dutch elm trees and our ash trees?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Chambers, is that one big question? Or many…

Councillor Chambers: One big question.

Madam Speaker: Okay, one question. Is it clear?

Councillor Chambers: All pertaining to trees.

Madam Speaker: I was conferring with the Clerk. Councillor Rollins is good.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. So yes, and in part is the answer to the first and second question. The majority of the…

Madam Speaker: I'm sorry, I was conferring with the Clerk on something. Councillor Chambers, could you restate your question? Yeah, thank you.

Councillor Chambers: The catastrophic snow storm of October 11, 2019, had a devastating effect on our tree canopy. Has the damage to the trees been cleaned up?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. So Madam Clerk, I assume that's a new question and he'll be asking it in a few other parts or else, I'd be happy to answer the first one or the second one. But the majority of the storm clean-up has been completed. There's a very strong caveat, when we have wind, we do see additional damage and branches fall due to the storm. So…so we are addressing that as well. So…which impacts the overall count, right? Some of that damage, Madam Speaker, still continues with what is weakened branches. So we're still reviewing data from the storm, we're still complying that information, why? For the Disaster Financial Assistance Claim to the Province.

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

Councillor Chambers: Which is partially asked and answered. But if I could restate, has there been a full and comprehensive assessment of the damages to Winnipeg's tree canopy to date?

Councillor Rollins: So again, right and during this period in addition to the complexity of what we see whenever there's a strong winds, is the City remaining diligent on, and I promised myself if I had an opportunity I would say jumping tree lice, Madam Speaker, but really the Dutch elm disease, the Emerald ash borer and the Cottony ash psyllid, much easier to say, jumping tree lice, and that we're that trying to do that within existing resources. So still a challenge, very much still a challenge, very much still addressing it and complying that information for the Disaster Financial Assistance Claim for the Province.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question.

Councillor Chambers: And so last part to the question, has the Forest Tree Division been able to revise or change their schedule up so that they can address tree pruning on a more timely basis and assess the health of our Dutch elm trees as well as our ash trees?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: So I don't know if you had the opportunity to hear the really wonderful or, through you, Madam Speaker, the really wonderful debate that City Centre Committee had when Councillor Orlikow walked on a Protecting Our Tree Canopy motion. Winnipeg's urban tree canopy is a real priority and that motion did consider the multiple threats including the storm that we had on trees, and it allocated up to 3 million of the Disaster Financial Assistance Program disaster relief to a 1 million per year to the City of Winnipeg's Foresting Branch. And in part, that was a move to address the damage. So happy to offline to talk about that. It was unanimously supported at Community Committee. It was a great motion on trees, and really, recognizing the significant portion of the City's cost resulting from the disaster that were forestry-related expenses, Madam Speaker; and considering all that you need to do including how critical pruning is, to the elimination and protection of our urban canopy from diseases. So I really thank my council colleague, through you, Madam Chair, for the opportunity to talk about that very important protection file I share with many councillors, the protection of the Winnipeg's tree canopy.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Yeah, Madam Chair. I know this is called question period, but I'm also starting to think that it's non-response period. Last month, I asked this particular Chair, after we had approved hiring a pest enforcement or pest advisory people whatever, that needed to be appointment…appointed for the Province. And residents of my ward do have concerns with regards to problem thistles. We now have had an explosion of dandelions and I asked the Chair if they would respond to me with what the plan is…is to control some of these problem weeds. It was indicated that that chair would respond to me only by email. Here we are at the next council meeting, I've yet to receive any sort of response. I'm wondering if she could possibly get me a response today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and it is true. I did not get back to Councillor Nason through you, Madam Chair. There has been really significant work in my ward with respect to poverty and I did though understand that dandelions are really critically important to his ward and so for sure I have that answer today, Madam Speaker. In addition to the measure we did last time we were together at Council, I want to put on the record that dandelions are handled through our regular mowing cycles, there are a noxious weed level three. So not the level one noxious weed, not level two, but really, level three. They…I appreciate some folks find them a nuisance, it's controversial, some folks, Madam Speaker, think that they're really critical for bees and butterflies and…and the like. So the public is… is really often surprised sometimes that the number of dandelions at this time of year, that they're growing, once they're cut the concern is usually reduced. There are many others with respect to dandelions that are making delicious tea and harvesting them. So I want to recognize that too, not everybody…there's not a strong consensus and my assistant

alerted me that…to Councillor Nason's social media, Madam Speaker, and he found out the real controversy over that level three noxious weed. The provincial Non-Essential Pesticide Use Regulation is found on the provincial website and the City and the general public is really not allowed to use prescribe herbicides except in really, very specific circumstances. So I will put all of this and more into an email in the fullness of time, there's just been some really critical priorities that need to be addressed in terms of poverty. And once again, Madam Speaker, through you, I apologize that my councillor colleague has been waiting for which is… that which is on the provincial website and our website.

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

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, several months ago we had a dangerous dog situation, in which resident or individuals were attacked by a mixed-breed dog. We subsequently…and I understand that there's some sensitivities and potential hearing on a matter. But I'm wondering if the, you know, another dog attacked a senior dog, which tragically had to be put down. I'm wondering if the Chair has any indication that, you know, will take some action pertaining to our breed-specific legislation and perhaps…

Madam Speaker: Your question.

Councillor Nason: …modernize it.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: So with respect to modernization and breed-specific prejudices, there has been really good work and dialogue with the Winnipeg Humane Society, and I want to acknowledge that work. As opposed to considering a breed of dog, there is...there is a community that wants us to contemplate small, medium and large dogs. And Madam Speaker, there…there is also a really important logic to…instead of considering dangerous dogs, considering that which endangers animals to act in a manner of which they do. For instance, if there is a guard dog situation, that is an endangered dog. For instance, if there was a known house with drug activity and it looks like there's a guard dog that would be deemed an endangered animal. And so there is really important policy work with respect to dangerous dogs, dangerous dog legislation and other jurisdictions, you do see quite a more robust approach to what the conditions in which animals may find themselves in dangerous situation as well as the concomitant ownership guidance and guidance for owners and compliance that we might want to see for a city. So yes, there has been several meetings with constituent groups including the Winnipeg Humane Society, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That was question three already I think, Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Question two, Madam Chair.

Madam Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Nason: Question three, Madam Chair, through you. It will be a relatively simple one. If a dog kills, should that dog remain in the public domain?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: I'm…in the public domain. So Madam Speaker, when a dog kills or manes to the point that surgeries are required, that dog is deemed dangerous and in many jurisdictions including ours, the dog is euthanized.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the chair? Seeing none, let's move on. The Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. The report dated May 15th, 2020. Councillor Allard, via remote.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED MAY 19, 2020

Councillor Allard: I move the consent agenda Items 1 and 2, please.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard's moved 1 and 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have motions that we need to draw our attention to; Motion 3 is moved by Councillor Nason and seconded by Councillor Klein. It's regarding the refund of…refund of costs of the 2020 permits to street food vendors. This is an automatic referral to the standing policy

committee. Motion 4, also moved by Councillor Nason and seconded by Councillor Klein. It's regarding refunds of monthly parking fees by the Winnipeg Parking Authority. This will be an automatic referral to committee. Motion 5 is moved by Councillor Rollins and seconded by Councillor Mayes regarding extending the timeframe for active transportation routes. This is an automatic referral to the standing policy committee. And that is all of the motions I have.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS COVID-19 has severely and negatively impacted street food vendors due to closures of offices, cancellations of festivals and low expected tourism visitors in 2020

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg is still charging the full permit fee to the vendors in spite of a significant reduction of business

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Parking Authority be required to refund 30% of the cost of the 2020 Permits to those vendors that purchased permits prior to June 1, 2020.

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

WHEREAS COVID-19 has severely and negatively impacted many downtown business and residents that rent monthly parking but due to mandated closures no longer had access to their ordinary place of business;

AND WHEREAS the Winnipeg Parking authority did not provide support or flexibility to suspend the policy requiring 30 days advance notice to cancel parking;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Parking Authority be required to refund the full monthly parking amounts to customers in either of these specific circumstances:

1. *Customer did not utilize reserved monthly parking for the month of April, 2020*

2. *Customer cancelled the reserved parking starting the month of May, 2020*

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

WHEREAS on May 5, 2020, in an effort to assist with physical distancing requirements during the COVID-19 pandemic, the City extended its annual active transportation route schedule and expanded the temporary routes to include additional streets;

AND WHEREAS these active transportation routes limit vehicular traffic from 8 am to 8 pm, 7 days a week until July 6, 2020;

AND WHEREAS these routes have been well received by the public, encouraging greater physical activity and creating a safer environment for cyclists and pedestrians;

AND WHEREAS it is appropriate as part of the COVID-19 recovery efforts to consider continuing these routes throughout the summer on a pilot basis and explore possibilities to continue them beyond 2020;

AND WHEREAS it is important that the local Councillor have input on any changes to the active transportation routes that are located within their respective wards;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Public Service be directed to amend by-law 91/2014 and take all other necessary steps to extend the annual active transportation route schedule from the current expiry date of July 6, 2020 to September 7, 2020 for the following streets:

Lyndale Drive - Cromwell Street to Gauvin Street
Scotia Street - Anderson Avenue (at St. Cross Street) to Armstrong Avenue
Wellington Crescent - Academy Road (at Wellington Crescent) to Guelph Street
Wolseley Avenue - Raglan Road to Maryland Street
Assiniboine Avenue - Bedson Street to Westwood Drive
Churchill Drive - Hay Street to Jubilee Avenue
Egerton Road - Bank Avenue to Morier Avenue
Kildonan Drive - Helmsdale Avenue to Rossmere Crescent & Larchdale Crescent to Irving Place
Kilkenny Drive - Burgess Avenue to Patricia Avenue and Kings Drive

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the public service be directed to consult with local Councillors to determine if any changes are required to the above noted active transportation routes that are located within a local Councillor's ward;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Public Service be directed to report back to the appropriate standing policy committee in 120 days with the results of the extended active transportation route initiative, and the feasibility of establishing permanent year-round active transportation routes;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Proper Officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I just…can I just get a little point of clarification? There's…there was two or three motions there about refunding fees and so on. How come that wasn't a referral to EPC as it has an effect on the budget?

Madam Speaker: I'll ask our Clerk to respond to that.

City Clerk: The actual subject matter falls under the jurisdiction of Public Works so that's why it's being referred there. It may have to come back to EPC or Council if there's other considerations.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers. Okay good. Moving on, we'll go on to by-laws under this committee. Councillor Allard.

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

Councillor Allard: Yes, I move that By-law No. 60/ 2020 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 60/2020.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I move that By-law No. 60/2020 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 60/2020.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, I move that the rules be suspended…sorry, the rule be suspended and By-law No. 60/2020 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. Any questions for Councillor Allard? Councillor Nason.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Nason: Yeah, through you, Madam Chair. Last month the "Manual of Temporary Traffic Control on City Streets" was approved. In my ward of Fermor and Lagimodiere, which is directly adjacent to the Chair, construction started and for some reason, no safe crossing was initially provided for residents in that area to cross either from crosswalk or Active Transportation as there is a significant trail there. Does the Chair know if this document is actually being used by city staff and project managers?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, I understand, this is…this document is used by contractors and City staff, and that there is also an enforcement component to it, which I'm sure Councillor Lukes would be able to inform you. She's been asking questions about that. But certainly, there...you know, the manual is there for a reason to be followed and if there's any issues that I'd be happy to take any correspondence and get it to the public service so that they can take appropriate action.

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

Councillor Nason: I thank the Chair for that response. In this particular matter, I did take swift action and got swift response as well. So I appreciate that. Could the Chair explain how a nearly three-quarter drop in service in Transit Plus had, you know…has only resulted in savings of a little over $90,000 between the contractors and that of City service in savings?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: That's a good question. It's a detailed question. I'd have to ask the Public Service to expand on that. I mean, on a high level I'm confident the Public Service has taken appropriate measures to reduce contracts where appropriate. There needs to be a balance between service provision and the cost savings associated through using those contracts, so if there's additional detail required or wanted, I would be happy to take correspondence and get it to the Public Service for further detail.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair, and through our… Madam Speaker, through you. We have now confirmed that the City is using special cameras on the newly appointed Active Transportation routes to collect data on the usage of these groups and that's a great thing because if you don't measure, you can't manage. I'm hoping that the Chair, now that we know from By-law 70/197, directs the Public Service to provide all Members of Council and taxpayers with the totals, accurate totals, not percentages, accurate totals on a weekly count from the Active Transportation routes that have been added to the list, that would first be helpful for dialogue during the review of the motion that has come forward today that will be heard at the Standing Policy Committee.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, so in the motion that we just sent to referral there is a request for a report, which we will debate. I'm happy that it's been referred to committee that way we can flush out this motion and asked pertinent questions. If the information is available for that time, I'd be happy to share it, I will have to make the request to the Public Service and I mean, I can share some anecdotal information that when I visited these Active Transportation routes, I had the benefit of visiting Egerton in St. Vital Ward and Lyndale Drive in my ward a few times. I can say that they are excellently attended. There are lots of smiling faces, lots of people from all ages benefitting from the brand new Active Transportation facilities that are provided through these holiday bike routes, and you know, this seems…this seems to be a tremendous initiative that's been…that's been made possible through the delegated offer of the Public Service and look we're having a debate now in terms of this political motion to see if we could extend them into the Labour Day long weekend.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Through you, Madam Speaker, thank you to the Chair for his opinion and with all due respect, I'll wait for the data on the ATRs. I sent a question earlier this week to the Chair, allowing him time to prepare for the information that I would be asking for. Will the Chair provide Members of Council and of course, taxpayers, the actual number of people who have signed up and are participating in the low-income bus pass?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you, Councillor Klein or Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Klein. Thank you for the email. I had received the email. I did forward the email to the Public Service and I did get a response, which I can share now. So in response to your request below, the Transit Department provide the following information, "To-date we have received 155 WINNpass applications and 82 have been approved...approved. The remainder are in various stages of the application review process and the Public Service is happy to answer any further or…further questions or concerns on this issue."

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

Councillor Klein: Yes, through you, Madam Chair, I thank the Chair of the committee for that response. And just for clarity, 182 have signed up and 80 are…have been approved? Did I hear that correctly? And that would be my third question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, I'll re-read the email from the Public Service. I don't want to adlib this and give inaccurate information. So from the email, "to-date we have received 155 WINNpass applications and 82 have been approved. The remainder are in various stages of the application review process."

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That brings our question period to a close. Next committee is the Committee on Finance. There's to report today. We will now get into question period right away. Any questions for Councillor Gillingham? Councillor Mayes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: At the risk of trying everyone's patience, I do have a question for Councillor Gillingham, which is a school division matter that came up, I think, Councillor Rollins may have raised this back when she was a School Board Chair. But certainly, the Louis Riel School Division has continued to ask me about an issue pertaining to assessment, which is Section 22 of the Municipal Assessment Act, grants an exemption for school properties…an exemption from paying municipal property tax. However, the French version of the Statute and the English version of the Statute reads slightly differently, it's very Canadian. And there's been a series of legal cases I think this dates back to 2014, some advice I received from Mr. Jack, thank you to him. Manitoba Court of Appeal held that there was a…you were allowed to rely on the more, whichever version of the statute you wish. So the school divisions have been taking a more broad and liberal interpretation of their exemptions. It's my understanding that we've had a number of court cases on this, so our referrals to the court. I think it is frustrating for all concerned and would frustrate taxpayers to know that the taxpayer funded school divisions are arguing with the taxpayer-funded City Council over whether or not one level is exempt from the other in paying property tax. I wonder if we could perhaps at some point, if you could update me on what's going on and it may be somewhere where we can ask the Province to try and clarify this or maybe there's a quicker appeals route rather than taxpayers paying lawyers to go in front of the Court of Queen's Bench numerous times because it…it's entirely two different levels of government arguing over whether the St. Boniface, St. Vital example is the former school at Monterey and Monaco Bay in Windsor Park is used for storage by the Louis Riel School Division, and whether that's exempt is…hangs on your interpretation of the French versus English. So it's an ongoing concern that's been raised with me again and I wanted to raise it with the Chair of Finance, who was surprisingly illiterate and aware of this when I talked to him earlier. So if he could just speak to that legal issue and what we might be able to do to try and clear this seemingly long running battle with the school divisions up.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, through you Madam Speaker, I do want to thank the Councillor for his question. Yes, this is an ongoing matter of differences of interpretation, where one will use it seems the French version, which is, you know, of legislation and others will use the English, and there somewhat different. And so, the dispute goes on

related to assessment on several buildings, and ultimately the Councillor makes a good point, ultimately what it really comes down to is do we take the money out of the right pocket or the left pocket of the taxpayer is what it really is. But nonetheless, there are real indications obviously for the City of Winnipeg and our Taxation and Assessment Department, our Legal Department, and so I will thank you again, thank you, Councillor for the question. I will get some information from our Public Service and bring it forward or email, I guess a response to the Councillor's question. I'll include all Council, so that everybody has the answer related to Councillor Mayes' question. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Yeah, thank you, Madam Chair. Questions I have today is with regards to core services. Is the Chair able to provide an update on this report, along with if there's a weighting measures pertaining to it?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. I want to thank Councillor Nason for the question. Yes, there's been a lot of discussion, you know, back and forth, leading up to and including some discussion around the establishment of a multi-year budget. But specific to an update I'll… again, I'll speak to the Public Service just to find out where that's at and again, will do if Councillor Nason's okay with this, I'll distribute to all Council just so that everybody has the answer. But thank the Councillor for the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Yes. Nearly eight months have passed since that October storm event, yet we're still working on estimates for the financial impact. Can the Chair inform Council when actual and real accounting for this event will be provided?

Madam Speaker: (Inaudible) Councillor Nason.

Councillor Gillingham: I want to thank the Councillor for the question. Yes, if I got my dates right, back in the Fall, we did ask that at the January reporting schedule that the finance…the Corporate Finance Department bring forward the numbers from the storm event. We do have the first quarter financials for 2020, will go from January, February, March, and that report as a standard, will come to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance in June. So if there's any residual numbers, you know, costs associated with the storm, I'm confident those will be captured in the first quarter report. But certainly, if…I would suggest in fact, if the Councillor doesn't see them there, if we don't see them there, that that's a great place to ask Corporate Finance for any…if there's any outstanding costs related to the October storm that have not been captured and reported to this point.

Madam Speaker: Thank you…

Councillor Nason: …And this is number three.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Nason: Through you, Madam Chair, can the Chair of the committee inform Council on when detailed written financial updates including actuals specific to COVID-19 will be provided?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Yes, I believe that…and again thank the Councillor for the question, I believe first of all, that anything related to impacts within the first quarter, of course, will be captured in the first quarter report, which will come as I said, to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance in June. I do believe we do have, of course, the regular reporting at the Standing Committee on Finance on COVID-19 and its impact on our financials that comes every month. Of course, we do also have a regular Council briefing discussion that…and our Chief Financial Officer is involved in those discussions, and so communicating the financial impacts of COVID-19 to Council on a regular basis and, of course, any questions that Councillors have, they can communicate those to our Chief Financial Officer as well, and he's certainly looking, you know, or willing to get information to everybody. I do believe a lot more information coming forward in June, again, it's…I think what's going to be, as we probably most…most of us all know, it's going to be really interesting to see, and important to see, is the…is the impact on whether or not businesses defer their taxes, business taxes are due at the end of this month. We will know very quickly in early June, you know, how many businesses have chosen to defer in some manner or another, and then, of course, subsequently at the end of June, property taxes due, we'll know early July, how many…those who pay property taxes, how many of those have deferred in some manner or another their

property tax payments, as was made available by Council in our Council decision. So the numbers are being watched regularly, they're being communicated to Council, they'll continued to be communicated to Council and I think all of us are really, you know, hopeful that…that our economy opens up and things begin to get back to some semblance of normal, realizing of course, that we're not out of the woods yet. We watch what's happening in other provinces and so…and see the struggles that they're having. So certainly, when it comes to the financial impact of COVID-19 on the City of Winnipeg, it's being monitored regularly and Council will be updated accordingly. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and through you, we can acknowledge that the CFO has been answering some questions, not all, but some with respect to our budgeting issues and so on. I did ask a question about some money that we recently borrowed through a debenture. I got a little bit of an answer back on that, but what I did read in there, and I thought was interesting, was the fact that if the City has, you know, budgeted to borrow money a year ago or two, that they can then call on that now and bring it forward if it wasn't used, not…it doesn't depend on the reason why. So with that information, I'm wondering if the Chair would provide all members of Council now, a full accounting of approved borrowing that has not been activated for the last six years.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you, I thank Councillor Klein for the question. Certainly, we'll take that question back and provide an answer to him and to all of Council as well. Of course, in our recent budget process is part of the budget, both vote, there was a recommendation within there to cancel some unused borrowed authority from previous years. I remember, I think it was $50 million, I believe was the number, and so that will be an example of where Council provided borrowed authority over previous years, but some of that borrowed authority was not used or needed. And so, from time to time, the Public Service will bring forward a recommendation to cancel unused borrowed authority. But certainly, I'll take the Councillor's question back and provide information to all of Council on that thing.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Through you, Madam Chair, thanks to Councillor Gillingham, Chair of Finance, for the response and for looking into the matter to provide some information. Reviewing the budget again, Appendix 8 of our budget between 2019 and 2020, the City's liabilities appeared to increase by $370 million and the liabilities were pre-COVID, of course to increase by an additional 122…I apologize 112 million in 2020. This would mean that in the last two years, the City of Winnipeg has increased liabilities by almost a half a billion dollars. COVID aside, I'm wondering if the Chair or the Finance Committee would work with the…or direct because now we know under the certain by-law that EPC has the authority to direct the CAO and administration to hold a council seminar, so this can be discussed and more information can be learned because I believe that's going to be a hefty bill that's going to have be paid back.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, through you, Councillor…Speaker Sharma, thank the Councillor for the question. Certainly again, we'll gather that information and get a response to the Councillor specific to his questions around Appendix 8 of the budget.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, the next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. Councillor Gilroy, joining…with us remote.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT DATED MAY 15, 2020

Councillor Gilroy: I would like to move adoption of consent of agenda, Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: Okay, that's on the report dated May 15th, 2020. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. By-laws, Councillor Gilroy.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah, I move that By-law No. 51/2020 be read the first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 51/2020.

Councillor Gilroy: And I would like to move that By-law 51/2020 be read the second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 51/2020.

Councillor Gilroy: And I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 51/2020 be read for the third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period under this committee. Questions for Councillor Gilroy? Councillor Nason.

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

Councillor Nason: Madam Chair, excuse me again, on the question, not answer period. It's been a month, and I don't believe I received a reply to my question last month. It's regarding just as COVID-19 lockdown was taking place, there were some serious discussions about breaches of an agreement between CUPE and multi-family garbage pick-up in East Winnipeg. Does the Chair have an update on this matter for me?

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Councillor Nason for the question. I'll have to go back to the administration. I don't have an update at this time, and I'd be happy to provide an update as soon as I hear from the Public Administration on this. As you know, I think they're still trying to figure things out, so there might not be an update as of yet. But I will take that question back, but thank you very much for the question. And if he wants to put it in an email too, we can make sure that we can kind of follow up.

Councillor Nason: Actually my follow up email will be in particular, Madam…or Madam Speaker, is to when communication was sought for clarity on this matter.

Councillor Gilroy: Sorry I didn't quite understand the question.

Councillor Nason: I'll rephrase it. When did you ask for clarification from the Public Service on my question?

Councillor Gilroy: No, sorry, Councillor Nason. I'll have to follow up with the Public Administration on this matter. I do not…I do not have an update at this time, and so I know that this is a complex problem that they've been working on. So I'd have to follow up with the administration in order to provide you with that feedback.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Yes, Councillor Gilroy, I was informed by a resident that the…in the storm water drainage ponds, the storm water retention basins that the aeration fountains weren't operating. And I since have spoken to some individuals in the department and I understand the fountain esthetic maintenance work was eliminated in the budget for the next four years. So there was a fountain that was repaired in Whyte Ridge that requires no maintenance because it was repaired last year, it's fully operational and fully functioning and I'm just wondering why that fountain isn't turned on.

Councillor Gilroy: I thank Councillor Lukes for the question. I will connect with the administration on this. I know she is correct, in the budget book there was elimination of…of esthetic maintenance of storm water retention basins and fountains, and so she is correct on that. What was…what was maintained in that budget though, was maintain the

harvesting and herbiciding storm water retention ponds. But I will connect with the Public Administration because I think what she's asking me is, you know, that…that the fountain that is in question is in full working order, so there's no maintenance of it, they just want to run it. So I will have to go back to the administration and get some clarity on what they refer to as maintenance.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair, and through you, to Chair Gilroy, I have a similar question with respect to the fountain in King's Park that is not operational, and whether that will be turned on and functional again this summer.

Councillor Gilroy: Again, I'll…yeah, I'll have to find out from administration. This was something that was eliminated from the budget. However, the question has been raised about maintenance and what does that mean. So I will get back to…back to Council when I have clarified that with the Public Administration.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions, we'll move to the Standing Policy Committee on Innovation and Economic Development. Councillor Orlikow, on the report dated May 13th, 2020.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DATED MAY 13, 2020

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to move consent to Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now we'll have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Orlikow? Councillor Klein.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you to the Chair, I recognize he just put through the report from CentreVenture. I'm still struggling a little bit and I'm hoping for clarity either today or over the next couple of days, I'm happy to sit down and collaborate with him and other members of that committee if they wish. But I'm struggling to understand that this is the best use of taxpayer money. We have also heard much about the, you know, success that they had, I read the report and it refers to a couple of True North projects, which I'm not sure if that was a CentreVenture project, or if it was a True North project. But we're paying as taxpayers right now for Economic Development Winnipeg quite a bit of money. We pay a little for YES! Winnipeg, we have our own internal Economic Development Department and we have CentreVenture. And I don't believe that any of these entities are required to provide a cost-benefit analysis, but every year we hand out money and we hand out more taxpayer money. So in these challenging economic times before us, I'm hopeful that the Chair will request more information from these entities because I think it is important that we ensure every project, every entity, every arm in the City, every purchase that we make is scrutinized to ensure it has a positive net result for taxpayers. I know again, that this report was for information. But I believe that if you look at the economic storm clouds that are hovering, we need to get prepared for when they arrive. So it would be nice to see, at the very least, a cost-benefit analysis for every dollar that we put into these various programs.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Sorry, there…there was a question?

Madam Speaker: Yeah, Councillor Klein, a specific question?

Councillor Klein: There was a question, sorry if I lost you there for a few minutes. I know it's been a long day, but it's only just after five. I would just like cost-benefit analysis then for each one of these entities that I mentioned.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much, Councillor Klein. No, it wasn't lost. It was the question that was very odd because we have policy about what the business plans are supposed to come back as. If you wish to explore the idea of changing what the requirement is for them to report back, that's by all means fine. But I won't be directing them to arbitrarily change how they're supposed to be reporting, that's a Council decision. So that's that. So there you go.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair, and through you, Madam Speaker, I keep calling you, Chair, my apologies. Through you, to the Chair, thank you. So I guess what I'm hearing then is that a motion has to go forward.

Madam Speaker: The question though.

Councillor Klein: I am. I'm asking. Does a motion have to go forward then to require these entities that we give money to, to provide us with a cost-benefit analysis?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions?

Councillor Klein: (Inaudible) question.

Madam Speaker: That brings this committee to a close. It's been a long day, I just wanted to thank our City Clerk's team for running a very successful meeting once again, live meeting combined with our virtual meeting. And I see our public service as well in the gallery, our CAO, our COO, thank you for your support and Mayor's Office staff and councillor staff. It's been a long day. We know who's going to beat us home though today, I think. Anyways, enjoy your weekend. Councillor Lukes, could you please move adjournment? And we'll have 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 5:30 p.m.