COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, July 23, 2020

The Council met at 9:38 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Mayes.

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. We'll move into morning statements. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good morning to everybody that's here in person; my Council colleagues, those that are joining us remotely, Councillor Nason, who is also joining us remotely. I'm going to keep my comments fairly brief. I know we have a long meeting today. Compliments to my Council colleague on his Albanian from memory, that's very impressive. I want to acknowledge the ongoing efforts of our provincial and federal government partners, and in fact, all Manitobans and Winnipeggers to flatten the curve and deal with COVID-19. I note phase 3 of the provincial government's move to restore services commenced June 21st, Madam Speaker, the week of last month's Council. As with the previous measures announced by the province during the pandemic, the City took time to review and consider how the measures in place at the City would be affected. And as a result, I was happy to see outdoor pools and wading pools open during the first week of July. I was also pleased to see, as I know many Council colleagues, approximately 195 community service staff welcomed back to work in preparation for the resumption of additional library and aquatic services. With ridership numbers increasing, the decision was made to restore summer transit service, as well. Was also pleased to see the recall of approximately 120 Winnipeg Transit operators and 41 operators in training who were temporarily laid off, to prepare for the resumption of summer transit service. It was great to get a recommendation from the province of Manitoba so that we could recommend the use of nonmedical masks on transit, and I want to take this opportunity to remind all transit riders to please take that recommendation to heart. If you can, please wear a mask while riding transit. I'd like to again encourage all Winnipeggers in that respect to be respectful of each other's decisions on masks because there are many worthy reasons as we've heard from health officials, why individuals may not choose to wear a mask. Madam Speaker, the Mayor's Scholarship for Community Leadership has just been announced in somewhat of a unique kind of reception; we did a virtual presentation, Madam Speaker, to this year's deserving award winners of the Mayor's Scholarship for Community Leadership. And I want to just, once again, congratulate each of them. Lastly, I want to also just acknowledge, of course, before we prorogue for the...and unlike the parliament or the legislature where they sit for such a small period of time, this chamber, city hall, works very hard and sits for 11 months of the year. Of course, the one month where we don't sit, where we prorogue is the following month. And I want to wish all of my Council colleagues, in fact, all those that help bring these meetings to fruition, including, of course, our Clerks, all the very best. I hope while we have much work to do today, I want to wish everybody and our families all the best over the month of August to stay safe, stay healthy and hopefully get some much needed rest with your families. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: I'll try to be brief, Madam Speaker. I want to just give a tribute to…one of the things that we're doing here that I think is a good thing, is the Million Tree Challenge. There is a group in my ward, Kingston Crescent Residents Association, that took some initiative. I gave them some money, they got some other money and they planted a number of trees in three different parks and along Kingston Crescent. It's small, but it's important, I think, as part of that. And reminded me of my political hero, a guy I volunteered for, 4 times in Indiana in my younger days, a guy named Jim Jontz – J-O-N-T-Z, though he used to say; don't use zed, when you're spelling my name in the US, say zee, because then they'll think you're an American, not a Canadian. But Jontz was a great man. Passed away, but he was very much ahead of his times in terms of his love for forests and he said of the trees in the US, "They're a national treasure much as the Grand Canyon, Yosemite and the Everglades are." And he also said something we can identify with, which, one of his supporters said, you often talk about the outdoors, but you never do any camping or hiking because you're too busy with politics. And

John said, “I plan to some day and I want to know that trees will still be there when I’m ready to enjoy them.” I think that's a pretty good guiding philosophy on our efforts with the Million Tree Challenge and hopefully, we'll remember those words. We're going to in coming months talk about the Simca Forests, the Lamay Forests. I hope we can keep former Congressman Jontz, and the Million Tree Challenge in mind. Thank you.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. On Saturday, July 18th, the world lost a true pioneer of civil rights movement, and a champion for human rights in congressman John Lewis. Representative John Robert Lewis was the third of 10 children to sharecropper parents in rural Alabama. In 1961, John Lewis became the first…one of the first freedom writers who rode from Washington D.C. to New Orleans, in an era where southern laws prohibited blacks and whites from sitting next together on public transportation. 1963, John Lewis became leader of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, dedicating himself to passive movement, that the likes of Dr. King had taught. By the time...by this time, in 1963, he had already been arrested 24 times. He was instrumental in the march on Washington where Dr. King gave his famous "I Have a Dream" speech. John Lewis also spoke at that rally and he was the youngest to do so at age 23. Recently, representative John Lewis's life was brought to the Hollywood screen in the movie ‘Selma’. And specifically, that day that would be known as Bloody Sunday, when 600 people marched across the Edmond Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama. As John Lewis kneeled to pray, he was struck by a club of a state trooper and suffered a fractured skull. John Lewis was elected to the Atlanta city councillor…as an Atlanta city councillor; serving nine years before being elected to the House of Representatives, where he served the fifth district for 20 years. Legends don't die. They pass on the torch to the next generation. John Lewis will forever be remembered. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker. I rise today to congratulate Major General Kenny, who has become the new commander of One Canadian Air Division in a formal change of command ceremony that took place on July the 6th. I was not able to attend, but I know our mayor attended. I appreciate that he did. Also want to say thank you to outgoing commander, Lieutenant General Pelletier, who has served our community and One Canadian Air Division so well, over the last couple years. One Canadian Air Division is located on 17 Wing in St. James, and it’s…there is a lot that goes on inside that building that most of us don't understand probably, on a day-to-day operation. It's also the home for the Canadian NORAD region and the joint force air component. And perhaps, it gives me an opportunity to mention at this point also, which I know the Mayor and others around Council have noted; during this time of COVID, Winnipeggers may see licence plates from out-of-province. In fact, you may see licence plates from the United States. It could well be that some of those individuals driving those vehicles are serving with the Canadian Armed Forces. We have American partners in the US Air Force that serve here. US Army as well that partner with our forces and they're here on somewhat of a permanent basis, doing work on our behalf. And we have, of course, Canadian Forces members from across Canada, that also work here in Winnipeg, specifically most of them in 17 Wing. Just keep that in mind. I think everyone should keep that in mind when they do see plates from out of province, or out of…that they may be in fact men and women serving with our Canadian Armed Forces. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Our last speaker, Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much. I want to stand and recognize that we're, you know, we’re in summer for most of Winnipeggers. And this week, the Life Saving Society designates the third week in July as National Drowning Prevention Week. Too many times, too often, our fire paramedic service has to really focus not only this week, but on the drowning problem and drowning prevention. I want to really remind all Winnipeggers to remember that if you're not within arm's reach of your children, they've gone too far, you've gone too far. Always supervisor your children. Really, boat sober. Alcohol consumption is a factor in many boating accidents and fatalities, more importantly. And always wear a life jacket. For more information come to the City's website on drowning prevention. Have a safe summer, everyone. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins.

MINUTES

Councillor Lukes moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on June 26th, 2020, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: We'll now move into delegations. Madam Clerk, would you queue the speakers up, please.

DELEGATIONS

Clerk: First up is Howard Paskowitz, together with Glen Hirsh and Josh Kaufman on behalf of Starlight Investments in opposition to Item No. 9 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee, dated July 15th, 2020 regarding request from Starlight Investments for financial contributions to Portage Place Revitalization Project. I believe all three speakers are online, and if you are listening to the audio on YouTube, just please mute your audio player prior to speaker. You can begin your presentation now.

Madam Speaker: Madam Clerk, I'd just like to note, I do see two speakers online. Not the third.

Clerk: Looks like Josh is still joining.

Glen Hirsh: Oh, there he is.

Clerk: There we go.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Welcome. Welcome to Winnipeg City Council. And we have 10 minutes on the clock for your presentation today.

Glen Hirsh: Thank you very much. Good morning Your Worship, Council and staff. I would like to acknowledge that we're speaking to you today on Treaty 1 Territory, and the traditional homeland of the Metis nation. My name is Glen Hirsh and I'm Chief Operating Officer of Starlight Investments. Starlight is a North American asset, investment and development manager. We've operated in Canada for over 25 years. Starlight manages 14 billion of assets under management, across Canadian multi-family, US multi-family and our commercial business. I'm joined today by two of my senior colleagues, Josh Kaufman, who is the head of development and construction at Starlight, and Howard Paskowitz who is our director in our development group. Please know that if it were not for the travel restrictions imposed under COVID, the three of us would have been in Winnipeg presenting in person this morning. The revitalization of the SHED District and the Portage Place redevelopment is an important project for Starlight and we have dedicated meaningful resources for well over a year, seeing this through. You will hear from my colleagues this morning on the components of this transformational development in the city of Winnipeg that speak to community, inclusivity, safety and sustainability. You will also hear about the positive economic impacts of this transformational project. We really appreciate your time this morning, and I will now pass it over to Josh Kaufman from my team.

Josh Kaufman: Thank you, Glen. And good morning Your Worship, Council and staff. As Glen said, my name is Josh Kaufman and I'm the head of the development and construction for Starlight Investments. I'm here today along with my colleagues to discuss a transformational and pivotal project that we are keenly interested in bringing to fruition in downtown Winnipeg. Starlight is the passionate developer behind the revitalization of Portage Place. This is a necessary project that has been designed with top of our industry-leading consultants and well accomplished local Winnipeg team, active voices within the community and associations, like, Community Voices Collective, downtown safety and business partners, Downtown Business Association, community and business stakeholders and is a project for the city, province and country that will, upon completion, be something that we can be proud of, that helped change neighbourhoods, behaviours and, built on the new successes of the SHED District in downtown. US council have committed to the change on your policy and direction. This is about execution and partnership. Portage Place Shopping Centre is situated on approximately four acres and was built with approximately 400,000 plus square feet of commercial space occupying an entire city block, down by Portage Avenue, Carlton Street, Vaughan Street and Ellice Avenue, and Central Park to the north. Most of you were likely around at the time that this mall was approved and constructed. And kudos to you all for having the vision to develop the project during a time of urban renewal. Though much has been learned over the years through great study of urban design, architecture, (inaudible) relationships that likely would have produced a different forum than what we have today. We all know that Portage Place is promise for the future, but in a substantially different form. Portage Place is home to retailers, businesses and cultural tenants like our city gem, the Prairie Theatre. It is a meeting and gathering place for the community, a parking garage for the surrounding buildings, a link between the city's +15 skywalks, and in some regards the epicentre, and heart of downtown. Portage Place is also a place that suffers from urban decay, lack of investment and operational challenges in addition to significant safety and health concerns. Portage Place is currently interpreted with existing tenants turning their backs to the streets which creates a suboptimal urban presence with minimal eyes on the street. The mall's mass amount of city block make it an impenetrable barrier for communities to the north and the south of Portage. Starlight has spent months, almost years, studying and understanding this building, its operation, its importance to the community and its redevelopment potential. The proposal that you're evaluating and voting on today in approving this funding commitment, on behalf of the City, is a multi-phased, new mixed-use development that will include approximately a million square feet and consist of almost 150,000 square feet of new retail, 350,000 square feet of office and cultural use, 10,000 square foot dedicated community space for 24/7 publicly accessible washrooms and a 530,000 square foot residential space, composed of a mix of 550 residential units. This project will be built over 5 to 7 years

following closing. I want to be clear and on the record that this is an inclusive community development intended for diverse incomes, ages, businesses, communities and cultural space. We aspire to not leave anyone behind. And we'll include the Prairie Theatre in our redevelopment plans. Our key components in development goals are many. We involve community stakeholders in planning, design and programming process and development. Our aspirations for our complete community for existing and future residents of downtown Winnipeg. We want to extend the Edmonton Street corridor through the site, provide pedestrian linkages, connecting the city, to bring back a human scale to Portage Place. We have an urban square and courtyard transformation. We want rental units for a broad spectrum of incomes in sizes, including affordable and student and family-sized housing to accommodate 1000+ downtown residents. We have community focused programs. We're a catalyst for live, work, play current model. Adaptive reuse of a major downtown facility. The proposed mixed-use development went through several measured benefits to the city. A new housing stock will help the city meet its goals for 10% of anticipated annual population growth. Through expert design and construction, will fit a high quality build form with walkable safer places and contribute to the city's urban revitalization and neighborhood vibrancy. There will be an introduction of a range of much needed high quality rental options for people and families wanting to live downtown. The development also represents the single largest introduction of new rental units in Portage-Ellice and south Portage in the past 10 years. Residential begets retail and commercial and we anticipate that the new rental stock in the downtown core will help to accommodate a flexible labour force for the downtown core. Portage Place aims to rejuvenate and revitalize. Various elements of Portage Place redevelopment will exhibit the principles of CPED. For those who are not familiar, that is crime prevention for environmental design. We have a high density urban investment with well-lit walk-full areas and public spaces which in turn will be to lower crime rates in the immediate vicinity. Portage Place redevelopment will help support development goals and policies of OurWinnipeg and inherit to many of your principles that you have preached in the Complete Communities Plan. The built form and proposed outdoor (inaudible) seem to create a vibrant, healthy neighbourhood and improves the quality of life in the area. We will create a new 10,000 square foot community space known as P3 Commons; correctly named for the names of our collective partnership. Portage Place will integrate residents with the existing community with connections to the SHED District and provide a residential anchor that patronizes many existing and new retailers onsite and in the surrounding areas, and also attract existing residents and employees of surrounding establishments. The new office space will be built on the successes of Artis REIT and True North Square, and together, we will help to make downtown the location of choice for both the private and public sectors. In addition, we'll see a boost in property values and business taxes in the surrounding properties. The construction of a new mixed-use community in the Portage Place Mall property in downtown will generate substantial economic benefits in terms of jobs, GDP, incomes and tax revenues for governments. The construction development activity associated with the redevelopment of Portage Place will generate the following benefits: 698 million economic activity, 325 million in GDP growth. Approximately 3,300 person years in employment. 200 million in labour income. 130 million in business earnings. 83 million in tax revenues generated across all levels of government. The operations will generate a range of all sort of other benefits. 360 million of economic activity. 260 million in GDP growth. An additional 3,000 person years in employment. 122 million in labour income. 100 million in business earnings. $55 million in tax revenues generated across all levels of government. Business to business tax is to the tune of 484,000 annually and a business improvement levy of approximately 230,000. The future residents of Portage Place will likely generate some 12.4 million in annual retail expenditures with an estimated 222 retail jobs across the city and province. And at least 50%, or 6.2 million of that spending will support economic development in Winnipeg's downtown core. I don't think we want to think about the alternative if Starlight is not at the table and development plans are stalled. What will happen to Portage Place? What will happen to downtown and this community that is desperate for improvement? Starlight has requested support from three levels of government. The project requires 60 million in addition to a TIFF. This council has been asked to support our request for 20 million of the 60 million. As of today, we have yet to receive those commitments that coincide with our ask and we are frankly all running out of time. This request has been tabled for months...and with a waive of due diligence…

Madam Speaker: We're just going to pause for a moment, Mr. Kaufman. We're just going to pause for a moment. Do you need more time? I have an extension from Councillor Klein. Councillor Klein moves extension of five minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Josh Kaufman: Thank you very much. This request has been tabled for months with a waiver of due diligence fast approaching, decisions need to be made that will allow this project to move forward or not. The motion has been drafted to be moved by Councillor Gilroy and Mayor Bowman highlights many of the conditions and commitments Starlight is prepared to accept in support of public benefit and the provision of housing both market and affordable, yet the financial commitment falls short. The motion is in fact an increase from staff's recommendation and recommendation by EPC of 5 million to now a maximum 11.3 million or 80% of the incremental increase in property taxes and annual rebates for a period of 20 years. Starlight has reviewed the motion in detail and find it is insufficient and cannot be accepted without significant modification to the built form, community benefit and performance. Starlight is not interested in doing a partial build, as you will not be able to (inaudible) satisfy our development goals outlined in this brief. A second motion has been drafted for 18 million in cash payments and waiver of municipal fees up to 2 million by the City phased over six years in addition to other conditions with commitments that are taken by Starlight leading to housing and public benefit. We're encouraged by the second motion and if approved by this council, we believe we can bring this project to fruition with

additional support by the province and the federal government. In closing, the community has spoken. And we have received by now several phone calls, letters of support from businesses, community leaders and community partners. The community wants this development to succeed and I know you all want the same. This is for the safety of the community, betterment of our residents and businesses necessary for success of downtown of Winnipeg. We can do so much better than what we have to date and we are asking for your commitment and vote for this project. And now my colleague Howie Paskowitz will now review the project details. Howie?

Howard Paskowitz: Thank you Josh. Thank you Mayor, Council and staff and thank you Speaker. I will be walking you through the slide deck that we sent out. On page 4, you see here that we have a national development portfolio which encompasses residential, mixed-use and commercial. We have 20 million square feet of proposed development, 20,000 residential units and 2 million square feet of gross square area in commercial space. Focusing specifically on the Portage Place Shopping Centre, and I'm on page 7 now of the deck that I believe was distributed to you, we've identified some of the major issues here that we think has led to today's situation, and that starts with the fact that you've got a pedestrian walkway that is on the inside. You've got retail that has its back to the street. That does not allow for any sort of incorporation between the street and the pedestrian realm and what is going on on the inside. There is not enough density in the downtown to support the retail that's there now, which is why our focus on rental housing is a key piece of what we're proposing. You also have a lack of walkability that has created spots around the mall which invite crime and obviously, without eyes on the street, there are some serious issues there. Probably one of the largest issues that I think Portage Place Mall and that we think is created is this major wall between north and south. If you're out on Portage, you don't even know that you've got, you know, beautiful Central Park just north of the mall. So, we've tried to come up with a plan that addresses these issues. Skipping to page 9, you have the rendering up by now, I think you have all seen. It shows you the very well-lit skywalk which goes across the front of the street, overlooking Portage Place, encouraging activity and eyes on the street. Retail that is now outward facing, but also sort of spreads out onto the street. You've got the two residential towers which are probably a very big part of what we're trying to propose here to create that sense of community. Something that I'm excited about and we're all excited about, is how this project has evolved over time based on what we've heard from the community and we continue to reach out to the community. For example, when we first started, we weren't aware of the issues that there was no grocery store. We heard that there was lack of a community space. We understood the lack of permeability between Portage and what's going on north of Portage. So the project has really evolved. What we're calling this is a complete community. And it's a complete community because it's got a revitalized urban street presence. I'm onto page 10 now, almost a million square feet of space. A 10,000 square foot community space which is a highlight to...the jewel in the crown. You've got retail space. The state-of-the-art mixed-use complex. All of that information is key to us. That public space, the improved access to Central Park and really one of the big points, I'll move on to the complete community on page 11 slide, we're opening up Edmonton Street. As we get to the drawings a little bit later, you'll see what I'm referring to.

Madam Speaker: We're going to take a pause, Mr. Howard. Councillor Rollins moves extension for five minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Howard Paskowitz: Thank you very much. I will try not to go past those five minutes. We set up these development goals which we think really helps guide exactly where this project is going and what it needs to achieve. On page 11 of the deck, the highlight at the top there is development of a complete community for existing and future residents. It's not about who is there now. And it's not only about who is going to be there. It's got be both. And for that, we have got a 10,000 square foot dedicated community space we're calling P3 Commons. 24/7 we'll have accessible washrooms and that will be again continuing as that evolves as we engage with the stakeholders. That's a key piece of what we're trying to accomplish. You've got involving the community and the stakeholders, we've started that process. There is still a lot more to do. We want to create a mixed-use landmark here. It's going to have inclusivity, welcoming spaces and amenities. Toward the bottom of that slide, we talk about local markets, pop-up programming, seasonal events. All of those things can either take place inside or on what we're creating on Edmonton Street, which is this brand new, sort of public-private space that combines retail and all sorts of amenities. On the infrastructure goals on page 12, a lot of, and you can see on that slide, if you're looking north toward Portage on Edmonton Street, you can see that we've opened that up. We've created an opportunity to take what is happening south of Portage Place Mall and continue it north, and really bring those two communities together. That pedestrian linkage is creating permeability and its also creating a place for people to come to. We're taking this massive structure that has really broken apart two sides of downtown and we're bringing that together. That urban square, we'd love to have that programmed year-round. We think it could be a great amenity. The elevated skywalk which brings the circulation from the inside of the mall to the outside at the second level, that creates eyes on the street. It makes an active space. It takes away those dark spaces that lead to stuff you don't want to see. We need transit to be strong. It's very important for us in a complete community that we are utilizing the existing public transit, helping to improve that, creating bike infrastructure, all sorts of, you know, e-bike charging stations, electric vehicle charging stations. We want this to really be a forward-looking complete community. On to page 13 where I talk about the development goals of mixed-use. Over 500 new rental units. We've talked about this and we know this is important. We've heard from the community and we continue to try to get a better sense of what the community needs. But, this is for a broad spectrum of

incomes and sizes. We'll have affordable student and family-sized housing. When we first came out, we proposed...the initial plans was for smaller student housing which is kind of typical. But what we heard from the community and we heard from the universities, is that there are family-sized units required for students. You've got Indigenous families that want to come to the universities that need a place to live. Those micro units don't work for them. So we've modified our plans based on what we've heard. The community will include nearly 500,000 square feet of commercial space. You've got retail at grade, you've got office above. It will be a phased development. It will take some time. And the importance of the needs-based purposeful programming, in response to community consultation, we can't stress that enough. That is important to us and we remain focused on that. On the amenities, we talk about the 10,000 square foot community space. The grocery store which would serve the community and help to be a key retail anchor. Provision of child care, elder care. We've met with the YMCA. We've met with the Prairie Theatre Exchange and we want to work with them. We want to improve their existing spaces, possibly expand those spaces. Those are important to us. And again, that's something we wouldn't have known if we weren't coming out. And I think my colleague Glen mentioned, we would have been there in-person today. We've been coming out on a very regular basis. Unfortunately, we haven't been out there the past few months to meet with you face-to-face because of the travel restrictions. We talk about the community gardens, but really, it's a catalyst for all new retail in downtown Winnipeg. Safety is key. I don't think we can stress that enough. We thought of putting a student, you know, closer up to the top, but really, it's key. It's about activity, it's about diversity, illumination. Opening up those spaces that right now are not visible. And the ground-oriented, and pedestrian accessible retail does that. The eyes and the ears on the street make a huge difference. That illuminated skywalk that's now overlooking the street and almost meshing with the street completely changes what Portage Place looks like and how it will function. We'd like to create some spaces either within the renovated mall, or within the community centre, that could help to work with the Bear Clan Patrol. We've spoken with the Downtown Safety Committee. We'd like to work with them. This project...

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

Howard Paskowitz: Thank you so much, Speaker.

Madam Speaker: They need to be louder.

Howard Paskowitz: On to the sustainability strategy, which is on page 16. All these things are very important to us. I don't want to minimize this, try to get to the end of the presentation. The idea that we would have reuse of a major downtown facility, rather than a massive, you know, teardown of what is there and rip out the concrete, which is, you know, all sorts of issues in terms of our carbon footprint. It's a walkable city model. It's a complete community. It takes advantage of existing infrastructure that already exists downtown and it improves upon that, and it creates the critical mass that you need, in order to officially put in place and make the most of the infrastructure that is there. Because we are across the country, we are familiar with best practises of all kinds of environmental and sustainable practises; recycled rain water, grey water, electrical vehicle charging stations, locally sourced materials, and obviously, now more than ever, high quality indoor and outdoor air. To show you the pictures, page 17 is the existing mall. As you can see, it creates this massive barrier between north and south of Portage. If we move to slide 18, you've seen this, this is the proposal before you today. This is what we would like this to look like and obviously it's continuing to evolve. The current view from Edmonton Street on page 19, I think, really demonstrates one of the highlights of what we're proposing. Right now, you look at this big, massive...it's, you know, great '80s architecture. On page 20, though, you see what that could look like. It's opening it up. It's modern architecture. It's past due on Edmonton. We see that it's being pedestrian and bike. We see that as being, as I've mentioned, an amenity space, a gathering space. Whether it's farmers markets, performances. But again, how do we create this permeability between south and north? The street view from the west end, again, you can sort of see the way the mall is, it has its back to the street and doesn't really create a nice pedestrian environment. This is what we think it could look like. You've got the market, you've got the office space. And it's, again, well illuminated and obviously the community that is there from the rental units, that's huge. And that's what you need for that critical mass. Edmonton Street courtyard, on page 23; this is an artist rendition, obviously, that will evolve. But what we think could be huge here, is the retail is sort of right there within the public space and how that sort of creates that the public-private interaction. On the plans, as you can see, these are recently updated, we now show we have the community space of about 10,000 square feet. The rest of the ground floor is retail. On page 24, we've got access to both of the residential towers. You see the Edmonton port right-of-way demonstrated there. Page 25, the key piece there, besides the office space is that, you have that new +15 pedestrian length at the exterior of the building. The rest of the floor plans, if there is any questions on those, we're happy to discuss them. But we've really honed in on what we think is required to create this complete community. I've been asked the units, the apartment, the apartment housing, the rental housing. Earlier in the presentation, my colleague Josh really focused on the economic benefit highlights of this, so I'm going to leave that aside. With that, I will wrap up and I think it's...

Madam Speaker: Just over one minute left. Just over one minute left.

Howard Paskowitz: Okay. You know, obviously, this is…we want to make this happen. I can't say enough. I've reached out to Council. We've been out there a lot over the past couple of years. We're excited about this project and we look forward to working with you to make this happen.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Alright, we'll now take questions from Council. Starting with Councillor Nason, who is remote.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Chair. On the amending motion from Councillor Gilroy, are you satisfied that 8 million for the improvements on the community spaces, transit, is sufficient?

Josh Kaufman: Through you Mayor, to the councillor...

Madam Speaker: Mr. Kaufman, the comments from delegations will be brought through the Chair, that would be myself. Thank you.

Josh Kaufman: I apologize. Through you, Chair, to the councillor; are you asking if the first motion, if the conditions are satisfactory?

Councillor Nason: Yes.

Josh Kaufman: The conditions other than the financial commitments, and I'm referring to the first motion and if we're referring to all that it contained, we don't have any issues with those conditions and those are all commitments that we're willing to do. The issues that we have relate to the quantum. The fact that it is a TIFF as opposed to a capital expenditure commitment are the primary issues, in addition to the term.

Councillor Nason: In other cities, have you received likewise incentives on your projects?

Josh Kaufman: Through you, Chair, to councillor, in response, absolutely. There are several examples of partnerships that occur with three levels of government. And we have some very successful projects. As I mentioned before, this is a huge undertaking. In some degree I wish the rents were there to help to bolster the development out of the gate. And there wouldn't be the subsidy requirement, our partnership requirement. But that is the circumstance that we're in. And there is a shortfall. So that subsidy is necessary to go ahead and create the value of what a revitalization project will be.

Councillor Nason: So, with regards to the motion that Councillor Gilroy has put forward. As I understand, it's, I guess, 8 million and 11 million but over a 20-year period. Is that what you're looking for? Or are you looking for front-end money?

Josh Kaufman: So, it's always been our...sorry, through you, Chair, to the councillor in response. There are two components to the partnership. There is a capital expenditure which relates to, a, for all intents and purposes, cash commitment, in addition to a TIFF to offset operational expenses. Those are the two components that we're dealing with. The ask of the City is for 20 million in addition to TIFF, TIFF being largely, obviously, driven by the province, from the education tax. But in reality, we're dealing with a cash commitment. The way that the motion is drafted, it appears that it's all on the operational expense side.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now move on to Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thanks. I suppose I should thank you for not asking for more since we seem to have unilaterally bargained our way up to the 20 million in the past two days. Thank you for not asking for even more, although that may yet come. In our budget debates, I was one of the people who pushed for a fair wage for some employees. Unfortunately, we just couldn't afford it. We couldn't afford the $300,000, I was told repeatedly. We can't afford that for our worst-paid employees. I just want to make clear, so you managed…you managed $14 billion in assets, I think that was your figure?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. The question has been posed.

Josh Kaufman: Yes, that's correct.

Councillor Mayes: Second question I had. You're using the term, "community space." The advocates here are using the rather grandiose grander term, "community centre". Most community centres cost tens of millions of dollars. I don't know why we're using that to describe this, but to your credit, you're at least being straightforward and saying it's not a community centre, it's a community space. Are you undertaking to fund the operating costs on that community space? Or is that on us? So what is the plan with that?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes.

Josh Kaufman: Through Chair to the councillor, the anticipation is that space is to be provided. There will be operational expenses that are required for that space. It is not a grata space. The way we look at it, there will be a sharing of opportunity that comes with that. We believe that there will probably be some operational subsidies required to help to operate that space. When you look...when you review our presentation, I think what you need to take from it, there is a provision of it, that we're carving out 10,000 square feet that is dedicated to this community facility. It isn't a community centre. It is a community space that will be programmed. And that programming will be inclusive and we've heard about 24/7 washroom and 24/7 access. That's the intent. But being inclusive, we think that will be important, with lots of different groups in mind.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question.

Councillor Mayes: The latest draft amendment, though, I just got this morning. As I read our newest proposal is that Starlight would execute a minimum $400 million purchase in redevelopment as per Starlight's business plan. I didn't hear anywhere in there, the term 400 million. I'm not sure what the proposed investment is. Good news for you folks, since the purchase price is 69 million that would count against the 400 million total that is being demanded of you. So what is the proposed investment? We don't have that in front of us and it wasn't in your presentation, though, it sounds like it doesn't need to be 400 million, it needs to be more like 330 now in order to get all of these benefits.

Josh Kaufman: Through you, Chair, to the councillor, the investment is 400 million. To get everything that we're doing, this is a $400 million venture.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Gentlemen, thank you very much for taking the time and also for considering Winnipeg for this investment. I have a couple of questions because I just want to make it clear. I'm just looking for clarity. There is a new motion that is being brought forward today; you probably have not seen it as it was handed out to councillors earlier this morning. It's offering 11.3 million, that's over the 20 years, similar to what was offered in the first motion, that you would have seen the other day. That will be over 11…20 years. And it's suggesting $7-8 million in some construction costs and $400,000 towards some permits. Is that acceptable? Or is it preferred to say $18 million over the time of construction, which is the motion that...the other motion that you're aware of that provides you also up to $2 million in permits. Will one make a go? Will one make the other one not go?

Madam Speaker: Thank you for the question.

Josh Kaufman: Through you, Chair, to the councillor, I did state earlier that I'm familiar with that second motion. I'm not aware of the third motion, if there is one, but as far as the second motion related to the 18 million in terms of cash, so towards cap x, in addition to the 2 million related to municipal fees, with a phased payout over the life of the project, up to six years, that is acceptable to Starlight. And I think alongside of the provincial support, as well as the federal support, we will get to our ask, assuming they can get there.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, in the third alternative motion that replaces the other one, it's very confusing, but it kind of...it commits Starlight to finishing the construction within four years. Is that possible?

Josh Kaufman: Through you, Chair, to the councillor. We want to…this is a shovel-ready project. That's how we deem it, obviously, subject to getting through design and getting through development and permit development agreements. We want to move quick. We have a team. We've got equity. We've got the willingness, desire, passion and, I think, that there is going to be...we see the 12 months of engagement here with different groups. We've mentioned a few of them that we've been in conversations with and lots of engagement already. But we're at the beginning of that and I think we want to make sure this is a project that everyone is happy with, that is designed right and we get all the voices heard, and we make sure it's interpreted properly in design. I guess to answer your question, I do see four years as tight. You know, in our estimation, five years to seven years is more likely in terms of where we see from the last phase to a point of stabilization.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We have a motion to extend time from Councillor Schreyer. All in favour of a five-minute extension? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Klein, your final question.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Gentlemen, again, this is just for clarity for my colleagues and people who may be watching at home in the media and gallery. To the best of your knowledge, are you the only organization that made an offer? I've heard that over 20 people were approached or organizations were approached and this is the only offer that's come through. To the best of your knowledge, are you aware of that?

Josh Kaufman: As far as my knowledge, we're the only group that has come forward. Glen, you may have some other information on this, but as far as all my sources have told me, we're the only credible offer.

Glen Hirsh: Just to...through the speaker to the councillor, yeah, that is consistent with my knowledge as well, is that we're the only potential purchaser to the table.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now move on with Councillor Eadie, is the next speaker.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Very appreciative of Starlight's offer and idea of what should and can be done with this project. I just want to understand one thing that is very interesting from a number of our councillors who are very concerned that we don't have enough affordable housing in the city of Winnipeg. And I was just wondering from Starlight's perspective, do you believe that...and would you be, if you're proceeding with affordable housing, do you believe in rent geared to income? Or do you go by the rental value set by CMHC, in terms of what they call affordable? Which...what is Starlight's perspective on affordable housing?

Madam Speaker: Thank you for the question.

Josh Kaufman: Through you, Madam Speaker, councillor so there are different models in different locations. We want to get a better understanding still of what the community needs are and what the programs are that are available. I participated in both rent-geared to income and other specific city programs, as well as in some situations where CMHC has programs geared toward median income. There is a few different definitions. It's somewhat vague, but it's something we're committed to, we just need to get a better understanding of what the needs are of the community and how best to provide them.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, Starlight has been in the rental business now for a very long time and is a big corporation, what is the preferred Starlight affordable housing methodology?

Josh Kaufman: Through you, Madam Speaker, so I think a lot of times it depends on the need. And while I apologize I don't have a more direct answer, one of the programs I participated in was at one point there was a government program that specifically needed units for victims of domestic violence. And so we were happy to provide those. A later program that I participated in that was a federal-provincial-city program was geared towards seniors. But the key really here is meeting to work with the local housing advocates and making sure we understand what those needs are so we can best provide for those.

Councillor Eadie: Final question, Madam Speaker. In this final iteration that EPC has come up with, they still maintain a TIFF for about 11 point something million. And the expectation is that you provide affordable housing. Given that...I guess my question is, would you meet the expectations of what the City is saying is affordable housing given the proposed offer towards your request?

Josh Kaufman: Through you, Chair and speaker, to the councillor, as mentioned prior, I mean, I'm not sure you're referring to another motion. We've only seen two motions that have been advanced. And one motion talk about 10% of affordable geared to income. The other one indicated 5%.

Madam Speaker: Excuse me, Councillor Rollins moves extension of five minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Glen Hirsh: Thank you, speaker. So we haven't seen any other proposal, that advancement, but would love to get the details of those. But essentially, there will be affordable units. In terms of, as I said before, we don't have an issue and we're supportive of having a commitment of even 10% that works towards the affordable. In terms of definition, I think we need to work in terms of what that is. Whether it's a federal standard, whether it's a local standard. I think it also just…we have to understand what is involved. In terms of a discount or rent adjustment based on income, if that's the definition of affordability, then we are in support.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Could you rise in the chamber, thank you.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much for your presentation. Could you just elaborate again please; you can invest money anywhere in North America, why are you choosing Winnipeg? Why are you choosing Winnipeg?

Josh Kaufman: Through you, speaker, to the councillor. This is a phenomenal opportunity for a city. This is an opportunity where we can change neighbourhoods, together. Honestly, I've been at this business for, and I'm showing my age here, but I've been at it for the past 25 years. Rarely do opportunities come up like this, where you can be in the centre of a municipality in a downtown, on a large parcel of land that has an adaptive reuse and has an opportunity to introduce mixed-use and really be received well. So, we think that Winnipeg is at the right time for this, I think. Again, just going by memory and knowledge of the market, I think if we were talking 20 years ago, 15 years ago, I think there may be a little bit of a different sentiment. I think there has been some great successes that we want to build on. I don't see us as necessarily a pioneer. I think you've done phenomenal job as a council and as a municipality of starting that change. You've approved of some amazing developments, that are up and running and are operational, that I think that my industry peers look at that and take their hats off to that. So here's an opportunity to take four acres and to do an adaptive reuse. Introduce residential that in some regards was thought of at some point, 30, 40 years ago, when Cadillac Fairview first built this development, by at least putting foundational support on either end of the building to accommodate some towers. So we're just taking...we're not writing the book here, we're just trying to turn the page to the next chapter. So phenomenal opportunity to sum it up. One that we're at the table and eager to work with you on. And one that I think all people from Winnipeg as well as the province and the country will be happy once this comes to fruition.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, anything further Councillor Lukes? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. To each of you, thank you very much for not only your proposed investment in the city of Winnipeg, but also for being here today to answer our questions. We do appreciate it. I'll try to stick to the three questions, of course, and I'll have more to say when we get to the matter later this morning about why I'm supportive of it and been working with my Council colleagues into the wee hours and early morning today and of course continuing here on the floor today to find something that we can build support around the council chamber for. I can appreciate your job is to ask for support from all levels of government. You're advocating as forcefully as possible. We often go to the provincial government, many groups do, to ask for support. Simple question; I know you've got some pretty well connected folks with provincial government working on the ground, advocating on your behalf as best they can. Question is, I know you asked for 20 million from the province. They came out with $28 million...over $28 million. I know you applauded that publicly. The timeframe was a 20 year TIFF. Question is really, how did you get them to commit to more than you even asked for? Because I've never seen it happen. And if you have any tips for us, that we can apply to other asks that we have, we would really like to get that on record right now. So perhaps we could just ask, how did you land that?

Josh Kaufman: Through you, speaker, to Your Worship, I must have seen something different that has come up publicly. The commitment or the, that we've seen has been for a TIFF. The ask remains the same, which is for...

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

Josh Kaufman: Thank you, speaker. It's a $60 million ask cash and then there is the support TIFF that comes along with that. So I don't think that we're there yet to be honest with you. And I think that's the misinformation that is out there. But TIFF relates to the operational expense once…and based on incremental growth of the current asset and once tenants are in place and stabilized. There is a requirement to go ahead and fund this project. There is cash contributions to be able to fund the construction. That is what we're talking about right now and that's what we haven't seen. So what's in front of you today is a 20 million, our ask, to the city, 20 million to the province, and 20 million to the federal government.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thanks very much. Was the...I know each of the shareholders were asked to sign off on the initial transaction; unique legal structure where the shareholder of the Forks had to sign off on it. Was the $60 million ask presumed that you would get when that signoff happened? I don't believe that 60 million was made public by you. I just want to know when we voted on that, if that already built into your business plans and, if so, why it wasn't shared publicly for everyone?

Josh Kaufman: To my colleagues, I'll take this on and please feel free to jump in as well. Through you, speaker, to Your Worship, the acquisition was first conceived and contracted. We entered into a period of due diligence. Due diligence is to understand the asset, understand in terms of what we're dealing with. We wouldn't have done any investigation of the building. We really wouldn't have put a lot of thought into the design at that point. We were looking at the existing asset. And we had to work hard, again with community groups, and we mentioned a few of them, community groups as a collective in addition to downtown association, to understand what were the necessary attributes for this development. We worked with a team of architects and consultants to really study the project. We brought in a lot of local contractors. I say local, local Winnipeg contractors and well regarded and names you're all familiar with that are probably watching this session right now, keenly interested in terms of whether they have a construction project to go ahead and bid on. To

answer your question as simply as possible; no, we didn't know in terms of what the requirements would be. That all came out in the process for design, and as we value the project.

Glen Hirsh: If I may add something to Josh's point to Your Worship. I mentioned earlier we've been coming to Winnipeg for well over a year. Each time we come to the city, we conduct consultations and we meet stakeholders, as we'll call them. And we start to develop a sense of what are some of the necessities and what is missing in the community? And that also shapes our design. This is an iterative process and it's common for these types of projects to evolve. And as we start to accommodate, and that's something that is common with these large mixed-use developments that we do in other communities, where, we hold consultations, we meet with various stakeholders. We understand their needs, we understand what's missing and how do we better the community. That's what created the menu of items, that how we referred to initially, and what Josh alluded to, and that forms the design. Just want to add one more thing; I mean, the dislocation, the housing dislocation that we're seeing across the country is very tangible, its very palpable and it's no different in Winnipeg. Initially, when we came in, we had to understand what is the residential dynamics. What is the supply and demand dynamics and the dislocation in the city of Winnipeg? And that also drives the need for housing; hence the two towers that we're proposing for multi-family.

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

Mayor Bowman: Super. Thanks very much for the clarity on that. The last question I have is, you know, we're being...it's a substantive ask, right now, especially in the context we have a lot of demands. And I have to ask this on behalf of taxpayers, if you get what you're asking of all levels of government, and I appreciate you're asking for a lot from each, can you provide with us assurance today, that you will not come back at a later date, you know, let's say in an election year or at a time when it is more difficult for members of Council to say no, for an additional ask? Can you provide us with just some assurance, this is it? And you can work with it?

Madam Speaker: We're going to pause for a moment. There is several speakers left. Councillor Rollins moves a 10-minute extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Next speaker is Councillor Rollins. Pardon me? Yes. Thank you. I'll put it over to the delegation to answer the last question the Mayor posed. Thank you.

Josh Kaufman: Thank you, speaker, through you to Your Worship, I'll take this on for my colleagues and feel free to jump in as well. We spent a lot of time on due diligence. We engaged contractors and general contractors and CN firms to help us. We really value this project. That said, we're in a functional design stage. We're not in the detailed design. Having done this before and the way that we value the projects is, we make sure that obviously we account for some contingency for the unforeseen. That is going to happen. We also went to the brokerage community to make sure that we had a good understanding in terms of rents, incomes, and understanding in terms of how the revenue will perform. So I do not see a return. The ask, if it is there, we are a stand-up company, we have a solid reputation. We're not here to…this is not a bait-and-switch, this is not a foot-in-the-door technique. This is through careful work that we've done to determine in terms of what the needs are and we will sign agreements to that effect.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins, you have the floor.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm not known for my brevity. I'm going to try to ask this in one, and one and only question. First of all, Mr. Hirsh, Mr. Paskowitz, Mr. Kaufman, welcome to Winnipeg virtually through the Chair. You've had a unique Winnipeg welcome with what I'll call, our advance team. I appreciate that you said you're not here to rewrite the book, but instead have, I think, artfully reflected Winnipeg's authorship in our downtown. Mr. Hirsh answered in part the question that I was going to pose with respect to the consultations you've been conducting. So, to Mr. Paskowitz, in terms of the concerns I've had to connect Portage and expand, but I'd like to ask the question on community consultation. You've done some substantial engagement. What is next for that engagement from the community, Mr. Hirsh, Mr. Kaufman and Mr. Paskowitz? How are you going to successfully reflect community considerations going forward, the welcoming spaces, the amenities, what needs to take place to quote Mr. Paskowitz, "inside and outside"? So with respect to community consultations? Please.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins.

Glen Hirsch: So through the speaker to councillor. I'm glad you asked that, because we have an ongoing project currently in western Canada where we are more advanced than where we are in this project and we held several consultations with community members. And I'm going to ask my colleague Josh Kaufman to speak to this in a moment, but he's smiling because we both know exactly what we're referring to, where we held several events for local community members to come in to this space and literally voice their preferences. There were scale-able models. There were boards of, you know, of needs and wants. And what they don't want to see and what they do want to see in terms of greens, concrete, high-rise and mid-rise, and type of retail. It's very consultative, it's very inclusive. And I attended several of these. It's amazing the

type of feedback you get. So to the councillor, it's very collaborative. And it's very effective because then what we do is we take away all the feedback of what the community wants to see and then we put it back to them. We say, hey, here is the design, and here is the schematic or renderings of what you told us you want to see. Can we confirm these are the key elements in this project that you would like to see? And then you really have a lot of this collaboration and two-way communication. And that's exactly what we intend to do here. This is not unilateral. This is going to work both ways, where we're taking feedback, we're delivering concept and we're delivering design and it's going to be consultative. I'll ask josh to give real life examples, because he lives it several times, but I see us doing that similar process.

Josh Kaufman: Thank you, Glen. Through you, speaker, to the councillor, Glen, you said it perfectly. And I think the one thing I would probably add within that process is we hire consultants, yes they are paid by Starlight, but they have essential role; which is to make sure they're there as a coordinator and manager and they're speaking for the community. This isn't a one-shot deal. This is not just one meeting and we're done. This is over a serious time. When it was Councillor Klein asked us about the timeframe, about four years. And I mentioned it was probably about a year of design initiatives we have to do. And that's what that time is for. Ultimately, it breeds the best success, anything that would have been adversarial from any group at the beginning, becomes a collective toward the end. We've seen that happen. I will say one thing that's very important, these are non-statutory meetings and charettes that are being held. These are being done to make sure we have the best project. We're not, and I know Glen hasn't said it, but I think he meant to allude to it in the beginning, we're not a merchant developer. We're not here to develop and skip town. We're here to develop and hold. We're going to see everyone's face as we come through town. We want to make sure there's smiling faces and make sure we do the best job we can. If we haven't and there are some groups left behind, then we haven't done a good job. So, I don't know how to say it, councillor, is that it will be an involved and process, and as Howie's said, it will be to the interior, the exterior, the programming, all will be included and it will be done over a span of about a year.

Glen Hirsh: Through you, Madam Speaker, can I add to Josh's response?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Glen Hirsh: Thank you. So, through you, Madam Speaker, I think it's important to mention this: community voices collective that we formed; we have the first event already planned for August. It's a real engagement process. It's not just to make it look like we want to hear from the community. I think Josh's point about not being a merchant developer is huge. This isn't a project that we're going to drop into the city of Winnipeg and then be gone. We have to stick to what we're saying we're going to do and we have to deliver on that promise. It's not just the engagement. The community needs to be involved in the design, planning, development, programming and even the execution. Because we will be held accountable if in three years or four years from now we haven't delivered on what we said we would based on our community engagement. And that is an important piece, I think, and that is what sort of differentiates the rental…what we're here to build community, we need to work with the community and as Councillor Rollins referenced, I've said before, it's not just about what is happening within the four walls of this development, it really will only work if we also focus on what is happening outside of those walls.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Since its development in the late '80s, Portage Place Mall has struggled to live up to its billing of drawing people to the downtown area. Over the years, there have been several projects to support Portage Place Mall, to increase foot traffic to the mall and increase viability. Manitoba Hydro, for instance, was one of the projects that was built to increase foot traffic to the downtown area. The connecting skywalk was built to increase foot traffic to the mall. The concept of the SHED District was designed to increase traffic downtown and to the mall. Can you comment and provide specific reference to why this project will snatch victory out of the jaws of defeat and finally increase vibrancy to the area and to the mall?

Josh Kaufman: Through you, speaker, to the councillor. It's important to know the fundamentals of good mixed-use developments. And mixed-use development doesn't stop at commercial tenants, retail tenants, and institutional tenants. We believe that downtown for this mixed-use project to work, we need to add other elements to it. Yes, we talk about the 10,000-square foot community engagement space called the P3 Commons, but the most fundamental part, I believe that I think is going to help success is going to be by putting some life, some 24/7 life, into this location. How we do that is by introducing 550 residential units. You heard about a thousand new occupants that are going to be downtown. That as I said, and again, it sounds cliché, but residential begets retail begets commercial. That is what is lacking right now. The more eyes, the more inhabitants are on the street and above this location and this redevelopment is going to breathe the success here.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Excuse me, Councillor Schreyer moves extension of 10 minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Josh Kaufman: You heard of the concept called eyes on the street, and that is critical. There are, unfortunately, there are no eyes on the street right now for this mall. The eyes are actually the reverse. It's in the inside of the mall. We need eyes on the outside which is what we're going ahead and doing. That's the new format of retail. We're also creating retail spaces that are designed for the modern day. We're creating spaces to accommodate a grocery store and have other uses. The current layout as it exists today is not going to attract the tenants long-term that we need. When you bring in an anchor tenant, such as a grocery store or large office user, that in itself has both the employment and labour draw, but is also a catalyst for other things, such as other development. Being across the street, and again, not that we own the properties across the street or contracted by, but that's going to be something to its success. Across the street from a grocery store. Across the street from something that has eyes on it, across the street from a marquis for the Prairie Theatre, is going to allow for this opportunity for adjacency to happen. And, again, it will be a significant investment. You heard in the numbers, there are opportunities that come not just from our development, but will come from the surrounding area. I hope I addressed your question.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you. You mentioned increasing housing. 550 units. Is there also plan to try to try to potentially increase parking to address the needs of the community in that regard? I know there is an underground parking available. That might not be an option. But has parking been considered in terms of addressing the 550 units that you plan for this project?

Josh Kaufman: Through you, speaker, to the councillor. That's a great question and not a question that I think anyone has asked me in a while. But I'm going to do my best and with full transparency to offer this. There are sufficient...significant issues in terms of developing below-grade parking. We've done a series of evaluations and analysis and we've determined that the best thing to do in terms of managing cost, and longevity of this new development, is to maintain the two levels below-grade. What we do see is going to happen by nature of other developments happening that have parking, you're going to see a transfer. You're going to see a lot of parking that is occupied and rented by tenants of surrounding areas, or surrounding businesses and buildings, they're going to move away. You're going to see a lot more of the ingrown tenants that are going to go ahead and utilize it. I see a transfer. As the more residential comes in here, the residential tenants will start to go ahead and utilize the parking that is there, in addition to the new office and the retail tenants. But again, because of the growth that you've already approved in downtown, and the significant amount of new parking that is already coming on, gives us the opportunity to what we have today without having any added cost. I like the fact that we can go ahead and manage the cost and the numbers associated with it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Chambers. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you Madam Chair. Are you aware that there is a new motion that was worked on last night and into the morning this morning that does say that we would provide 11.3 TIFF, is what you heard in the media yesterday, as well as 11.3 TIFF that we would be asking...that we would be also paying for a $2.1 million for community centre? And up to 5.6 million for the streetscaping? And 600,000, 400,000 and another 200,000 for transit improvements? And also, the City would reimburse up to 400,000 in permits and planning fees? Are you aware these are new changes and these would add up to the 20 million that you're asking from the City of Winnipeg?

Josh Kaufman: Through you, speaker, to the councillor. I'm not aware of that motion. So it has not been shared with us. We haven't had a chance to review. I'd like to review that to understand the details. Again, I'm hearing it for the first time. And converse with my colleagues on this.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy, second question.

Councillor Gilroy: I think it was just e-mailed to you so…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy, I just want to caution that this is not an opportunity to introduce your motion; that's during regular process in the meeting later. Second question, if you wish.

Councillor Gilroy: My second question is, you talked about in your report, you did indicate that the city makes 5 million basically off the economic benefits of the project. And it also indicated how much the province and the feds make, which is quite a bit more than what the city makes. In terms of your discussions with the province, I know that you said you wanted more than just a TIFF. The city is now looking at providing more than just a TIFF. Any discussion with the province on them supplying more than just the TIFF? And what were their thoughts in providing you some of the upfront costs that you're asking for?

Josh Kaufman: Through you, speaker, to the councillor. There are ongoing conversations. And again, not trying to be hedgy of this, but we have not seen any commitments come forward other than what's been out there publicly related to the TIFF.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Part of the original request from Starlight to the City of Winnipeg had to do with affordable housing. Councillor Eadie made the point that affordable housing in Winnipeg would be lower than other cities such as Toronto. When it comes to that request regarding the cost of affordable housing, how is that being calculated in? And I will provide in this case, a general estimate. I'll go forward to say that affordable housing in Winnipeg might be something like half the cost of Toronto. How does that affect, now that you consider an estimate like that, how would it affect the original request for funding for the affordable housing aspect of the project?

Josh Kaufman: Through you, speaker, to the councillor. I'll take this on and maybe my colleague Howie can also jump in afterwards. We're not going to shy away from it. There is a commitment to affordable. We want to do the best we can. We also want to make the project work. In terms of what percentage that is, I don't have an exact number for you. In terms of what the rent will be, I don't have that either. I do know if we're comparing to Toronto, I do know, of course, that the market rents that you would see in downtown Winnipeg are a significant discount to what we have in Toronto. That's just the reality in terms of what it is. I'm not in any way defining that as affordable for Winnipeg standards, but I am saying there is a significant discount. Which is...herein lies part of the problem in terms of the development. The revenue and for new development, is significantly less than in other markets which makes new development difficult. New construction. I don't think construction materials in Winnipeg are any cheaper than when we do work in BC or Ontario. That's my experience within this. Part of the issue we've been going ahead and trying to do adaptive reads. So that's the one of the ways we're trying to keep the costs down, by trying to utilize the existing building. It's not under any heritage preservation, so a developer could come in and flatten the site and build brand new. We didn't take that approach. We took the approach of there is something there, it's worth saving. There is a value to it. We're going to go ahead and take the skin off this and we're going to go ahead and open it up and invert it and put new steel in and spend the time to go ahead and work with the existing foundation is really what is...as well as some of the bones, so to speak. So again I'm...best way I can answer is, you have a commitment. There are two motions I've seen. One at 5% and one 10% in terms of affordable. I can tell you that there is…you don't have us shying away from either condition because I do believe that there is a commitment that is there. We little make sure that we are introducing affordable housing within this. And we're going to make sure that it is geared appropriately to the correct income. I don't have other specifics other than that commitment.

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

Councillor Schreyer: In their long-term vision of creating Portage Place back in the '80s during the Pollee administration, Mayor Norrie, my understanding is, they created the foundation for Portage Place with structure so that two towers could be built. In the vision of this, in creating a long-term strategy for downtown Winnipeg, how much does this save the project for the fact that the foundation, the structure is already there to create the towers?

Josh Kaufman: Through you, speaker, to the councillor. I can't give you an exact number, but I think you are correct. Actually, I know you are correct. It is public. There was always a design for towers at the corner of Portage and Carlton and Portage and Vaughn. I believe, and again I haven't spoken to anyone at Cadillac Fairview, but I think the vision was probably more along the lines of probably commercial...

Madam Speaker: Mr. Kaufman, if you could wrap up, the question period time is over. If you could just wrap your statement up. Thank you.

Josh Kaufman: Yes, sorry. These are towers proposed. There is a savings of utilizing some of the structure and unfortunately, the elevator cores and some of this will have to get replaced. But I think, ultimately, what we've seen in terms of structure, it can be reused. I don't have a number in terms of what that is…

Madam Speaker: We're going to pause for a moment here. Councillor Klein has moved extension of five minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Okay. We need 11...we need to suspend the rules and I'm going to ask for recorded vote because I can't tell which direction people are leaning in. If you're in favour of a five-minute extension, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillor Allard, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Gilroy, Orlikow, Rollins.

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

Madam Speaker: Extension is lost. That will conclude the delegation's opportunity for presentation. We thank you for your time today.

Josh Kaufman: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: We'll now move on to next delegation, Madam Clerk.

Clerk: Steve Snyder in opposition of the Item 14 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated July 13th, 2020 regarding detached secondary suites – five-year review. Steve is online. And Steve, if you are listening to YouTube, please mute your audio player now, you have up to ten minutes.

Steve Snyder: Sorry, I'm muted talking to myself here. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Mr. Mayor Bowman, members of Council, I'm here today to talk about detached secondary suites. A concept that could help the city of Winnipeg with their affordable goals, but for a lot less cash than $200...$20 million. So, on the agenda today is the five-year review of detached accessory dwelling units, also known as ADUs. While I'm happy that the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development has asked the public service to look at making ADUs permitted, I do believe that we could do more to make them easier to construct....an option to be constructed. Despite the match from the provincial government of up to $35,000 only 26 detached ADUs were built in the past five years. So I…you have to ask, why is it so hard to convince people to invest in their homes even with a direct cash incentive? Well, I believe it is because of the restrictions on what can be built. In appendix B of the report, it outlines all of the use specific standards for the detached accessory dwelling units. Of the 26 units built in the past five years, 20 of them required variations. And of those 20, 16 were specifically for floor area or the lot coverage, or both. Zoning laws are there to establish clear expectations for land use, certainty of investment and minimize conflicts, but when 80% of the development type requires variances, there is no longer certainty and investors are no longer comfortable with their investing. Variances increase risk to investors, add costs, create potential construction delays and if the plan...and deter homeowners from even attempting the process. As one example, in the report, it says two applicants were anxious about the $3,000 expenses accrued even before receiving approval to build. While this is feasible for a developer to offset these costs on other projects by offloading some the costs into each individual project, a homeowner isn't able to do this with their private residence because they don't have the luxury of doing more than one project. And the report specifically points out that the two applicants that were worried were homeowners rather than contractors. I believe it's imperative that we leverage as much infrastructure that is already in the ground, especially considering the financial burdens that the city is seeing right now, and adding ADUs is an option for people to invest in community, is a great way to increase property values without the need for additional investments. That's why I'm asking Council to consider further changes to the use specific standards. And that's…I'd recommend starting with the two that required the most variances, the lot coverage and the floor area for the accessory dwelling units. Other ones that I would like to see changed would also be the need for two off-street parking spots. Especially if in the urban infill areas of the zoning code. Thank you very much. And I'll answer any questions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Snyder for your presentation. Are there any questions? Seeing none, thank you very much. We'll be now moving on to the next delegation, Ms. Trudy Turner, that is here with us. If she could please come down. She is here on behalf of Housing Opportunity Partnership and she's in support of Item 16, of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. It's the report dated July 13th, 2020 and it's regarding the sale of City-owned residential land to Housing Opportunity Partnership and Purpose Construction. Welcome.

Trudy Turner: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Ten minutes on the clock.

Trudy Turner: Thank you. Good morning, Mayor Bowman, members of Council and administration. My name is Trudy Turner. My day job, I'm a realtor, but today I'm here as a long-serving volunteer board member of Housing Opportunity Partnership which you may know as HOP. So HOP doesn't have employees. We're all volunteers other than the construction people that we hire under contract. I'd like to thank you for your ongoing support for your efforts to ensure that you continue to have a role in the provision of affordable housing and in the revitalization of inner-city neighbourhoods. HOP has a great track order of improving the neighbourhoods we target. Over the past 20 years, we've renovated or built new, a total of 94 homes. On the back of the handout that is coming around to you, I provided the addresses of these homes and you will see that they are all in the areas that are most in need of housing stock improvement. In the beginning, we would start by buying old homes and fixing them up, but that became far too cost prohibitive with having to retrofit them in order to meet current building codes, et cetera, so now we build brand new homes on mostly empty lots. So, the homes that we build are very attractive, two storeys with three bedrooms, two bathrooms full basements that are ready for development. They meet the visit-able standards when we include the ramp package and they're also fully fenced. They're beautiful homes. They have great curb appeal and they're assets to the communities that we build them in. The homes are built presently with funding from the province and others and then they're sold to low-income families at below market rates. So the families must meet qualifying conditions of family income and they have to qualify for a mortgage. The big thing is they also must commit to living in the home for a minimum of 10 years. No rentals are permitted. So most of the families buying our homes would not otherwise be able to afford a home at today's pricing and bidding processes. I don't know if any of you have tried to buy a home recently, but it's pretty crazy out there. And I can tell you that our homeowners are very greatly appreciative of the opportunity. And they are very house-proud. So they have...they work hard on maintaining their properties and they also encourage friends and families and community members to join them and buy neighbouring houses. So it really acts as a virus within the community where it starts with, you know, maybe one house that has been totally done on a block that maybe has some challenges and before you know it, there is two or three other homes that have been renovated and other things that have happened. People are starting to put fences up and mow lawns and plant flowers. And it is a beautiful little virus to watch. So...but the benefits of these new homes, aside from all of that, is that it allows homeowners to become part of their community. The children become involved in their schools and in their playgrounds, their community centres. And they also, which should be of interest to you, provide a very good steady stream of property tax revenue once they're built. So these are vacant land that right now doesn't earn the city anything. But with a brand new house on them, the homeowners are able to pay their taxes and it helps a lot with the funding. I'm here to speak in support of the standing policy committee recommendation and to ask for your consideration to amend or remove condition B of the report. Condition B is what is stating that the City administration can't sell the lots below 50% of appraised value. Hundreds of infills have been built by HOP and other non-profits over the past many years with success in due part to the City selling us their land at $1 per lot. The development of affordable housing has become more difficult due to the cost of the land, construction...the land and the construction, which is increasing at a much greater rate than the funding. And in fact, over the past few years, non-profits have seen a reduction in financial support from all funding partners. So we're very fortunate at HOP, that our most recent funding was approved from the province to provide us with the ability to subsidize six new builds, which means we need six lots. This would actually allow us to have a great celebration having built our 100th home, but aside from that, it's another six families that would otherwise not be a homeowner. So we cannot...depending on the location of the lots, HOP cannot afford 50% of the assessed value. And as a result, we will risk losing the funding approved by the province. So we're here to ask that the City give the administration the flexibility to deal with the acquisition by HOP of up to six lots at less than 50%, but preferably to keep it at the $1 rate for these six homes. We are committed to developing in centre...centrally located neighbourhoods, inner-city neighbourhoods. And as you can see on the addresses. But we work with local neighbourhood associations in helping these communities achieve their housing goals. We will promise to be transparent with our project proformas and in all instances offer the city the maximum amount for acquisition that can be supported by the budget and affordable housing program funding restrictions. So, I really appreciate you giving me the opportunity to address you today and I sincerely hope you'll consider our request, or our plea, and I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Turner. We'll now move to the next delegation and we'll call you back for questions. If you'd like to remain on the floor. Our next delegation on the same topic and also in support is Mr. Sean Hogan. And he is here on behalf of Build Inc. He'll be here momentarily. You can sit on the bench if you like. And following that, we'll take questions. Welcome.

Sean Hogan: Thank you. Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor, amazing Council members, my name is Sean Hogan. I'm the social enterprise manager from and organization called Build Inc. This house build that is happening with a partnership between Purpose Construction and Build Inc. is a unique opportunity. We are two construction companies that are very inspired by HOP, HOP's model. The difference with us...between us and them, is that we are also non-profits. So any profits that we make on any project that we do, which is mostly interior renovation and mostly working on the inner-city, we take it and we reinvest in the community. We hire about 50 individuals from the community who have multiple employment barriers. People who are a net loss fiscally to our communities. Gang members. Former gang members. Former drug dealers. Single mothers trying to get their children out of care. These become our labour force. They work with our professional builders. And they work on our projects with us. And become a contributing members of society,

increasing their citizenship and improving our communities. We've been doing this for 14 years. For 14 years, we have been working with the people in front of us, thinking about how can we improve their lives and how can we decrease crime and poverty in their lives with a house build? We are thinking about how can we improve the lives of their grandchildren. I know when I bought my first house it was because I wasn't wealthy because I was a young man coming up, but I did have access to wealth in my family and I was able to enter into the housing market that way. The individuals that we work with, they do not have that access. And a model like HOP's model and the model that we're working with, these are models that can propel people into a significant asset management...asset ownership that they can capitalize on further changes in their lives. And it can also be really, really healthy for the community. So we also are here in support of removal of condition B. The challenge that we are having at the 50% assessed value is that, when we are crunching our numbers, it becomes a challenge to keep the homeownership accessible for individuals of low income. So right now, the funding that we have, it requires...it requires the purchaser to have a maximum gross income of, I think it's around $75,000. But with the rising costs, some of it due to COVID, rising costs of material. There is a big bump in lumber coming up. If anyone is doing some DIY stuff, go to the lumber store now. And on materials, and on labour, that becomes a real challenge on the construction. And we don't want to give up on this project and we won't give up on the project, we're going to find a way to do it, but the City is an excellent partner and there is some really creative and amazing people here, so we're hoping you will find it in your hearts to think generously on our significantly smaller ask than Starlight Construction and find a way to help us build some homes for some families that are going to change real lives. And thank you very much. I'm sorry I didn't take the five minutes. I think that's all I need to say.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Hogan. We'll now go to questions. Councillor Chambers, followed by Councillor Eadie. And I'd like to call Ms. Turner back, as well. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to express my...my gratitude in terms of this project. Projects like this that help build community capacity. Can you just go over the community benefits in terms of HOP and build. I know that Sean, you do a lot of work, through the speaker, do a lot of work in terms of social purpose enterprises. Can you just expand on the community benefits of individuals who have gone through your program and again, relate it to this project?

Trudy Turner: So what we find with our homeowners, is first of all, they never really expected to be able to afford a home and now they're in a beautiful home. The front of that brochure is an example…an actual photograph of one of our builds. So they are feeling incredibly blessed and inspired to be more successful. So we find that they are much more motivated to find great jobs, to get involved in their community, to talk to their neighbours that may being having struggles. And it really does plant a little seed that grows throughout the entire community. So I mean aside from the monetary benefits to the city, there is the benefit that when good people move into struggling neighbourhoods, the crime rates do have...it has an impact. The yards are fenced. People care. They walk...they watch out for each other. And we find that we have changed homes that were gang houses, that were drug houses, that, of course, are now brand new beautiful homes. And those people that used to visit that area no longer do so. So it does seem to have an effect that way. But I think the biggest effect is the people in the community…that when we do a lot of new homes for aboriginals, for people of different ethic backgrounds as well as our local Winnipeggers, and we...I also work on another board called Opportunities for Employment. It is a tie-in that way as well, so the we get people off the...it's hard to get a hand-up or a leg-up when you don't have a place to call home. So it changes lives.

Sean Hogan: So for 14 years, Build has been employing individuals that no one is going to give a shot to. And the changes that we've seen in individuals' lives are significant. A lot of that has to be market-based. The biggest portion of our budget is paid for through by our businesses. Each one of these houses is going to, we predict, create 10 jobs in the inner-city. So, three houses for our project, that's 30 jobs in the inner-city. That's an amazing thing. And we're taking…I have women who work with me, who have gotten five children out of CFS care that were predicted to be out of their family for their entire lives. I have individuals who...we don't shake hands anymore...but shake my hand on their last day and say I'm not going to deal drugs anymore. Which is an amazing thing. I see employment, supportive employment as one of the strongest anti-gang strategies. A place like Winnipeg can ever have. We have a problem with gangs here. I know it because probably 70% of the people who work for me are people who have been in gangs. And they tell me about the lives, the horrible lives they've had to lead. I have a guy who used to work for me, he's now off to work for our competition, which is what usually happens. He told me his name was Scott. He told me the thing that he loved working at Build, is that when he left his house in the morning, he didn't have to go like this out the door anymore. Which is for anyone typing, looking back and forth. Because he could hold his head high and leave his house knowing that he's not up to anything bad. He doesn't have to watch for the police or someone that he's mouthed off to or rival gang. He can just be part of the safety that all of us really take for granted and he can contribute to society rather than take. That's the kind of work that Build does. These houses are going to be a significant portion of that growth. This is the first three. This is only a pilot for us. We're hoping to be a lot like HOP and in a few years have a 100-house celebration ourselves.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, the motion that was presented at PP&D, by Councillor Gilroy is a very good one. This is the reference I believe to the one that would follow the William White Pilot Project which seems to have been a success for builds in my ward and affordable builds. My first question, though, is...it was based on half the market value of the property. I'm wondering if that still poses a little bit too much of a cost and given that in the past we've sold the lots for $1 to organizations like Habitat, is half the market value an issue for you?
Trudy Turner: Yes. We are finding that if we have to come up with that kind of money to pay for the lot, then we exceed our limits as far as what we can offer as a subsidy to sell the properties at below-market value. So with HOP, the program is about $50,000 of the market value of the home is put into like a second mortgage, Manitoba Housing provides that funding. And it's put into a second mortgage that the homeowner works off over a period of 10 years. So by the end of 10 years, they don't owe anything. So it's a way for them to get into a new home without having to come up with that extra money which basically means that they don't qualify for their mortgage. So there aren't a lot of inexpensive homes on the market anymore. So what's happened is, if we have to pay $50,000 for a lot, then we can't offer that subsidy, because we are beyond our funding. And if we can't offer that subsidy, then we're not going to be...we won't qualify for our grant from the province which is what is allowing us to do these builds.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'm wondering how our delegation would feel if the lots were sold for what it costs the City to obtain and maintained it to the point that they do sell it under this program? Would they be okay with paying the value of the costs to the city…for that property?

Trudy Turner: I'm...I can't really speak to that, councillor, because I don't know what those costs would be. So, I mean, if the costs are relatively low, then, yes, we could do that.

Councillor Eadie: At times we have to tear down the house which is about $10-12,000, things like that.

Trudy Turner: Yeah.

Councillor Eadie: I think that you would have to do that if you bought lot that had a house. My final question is, the people who achieve ownership that is affordable, is there a need for them to submit a down payment? Or how is the whole, like, 10...I guess it's 10% they have to put down. Like, how…

Trudy Turner: Yes, it's 5% now. The 5% down payment and the legal costs are covered by Manitoba Housing. And so, they can get...they have to qualify for the mortgage on their own, but we basically provide them up to $9,000 for 5% down payment and legal costs. So it doesn't cover all of it anymore. It used to, but it doesn't cover it all anymore. But they still qualify for the mortgage. They make the commitment that they will not rent the home out. And they make the commitment that they will live there for ten years. Otherwise, the subsidy is repayable.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. There was a time when we built something approaching thousands of affordable housing units per year, the city of Winnipeg. That was back...given the statistics, I hope people understand, I call it a progressive era. I'm not blaming the city of Winnipeg for that, it's just the era we're in. Its nice to see that there are organizations out there, that could help us approach 10-20% of what we used to do. I would think 20% of what we used to do, but none the less. Organizations like yours. For the purposes of people understanding what it is you do, if I could give a reference point so people understand Habitat for Humanity. Could you mind to explain how you compare to Habitat?

Trudy Turner: So we are a little different in that...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham, excuse me, moves two-minute extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Trudy Turner: Thank you. We are a little different than Habitat, in that we build the homes to specs. We have a design. The Winnipeg Regional Housing Authority provides us with administrative help and project management skills because we're a small board of...I think there is six of us. But we acquire the lots, we build the homes and then we work at finding the right people. So we right now have a very long waiting list of people that would love to have a HOP home and of course there aren't any available, but there are six hopefully coming up.

Councillor Schreyer: You're requesting omitting subsection B of Section 1 of the standing committee recommendation, that being that the property be sold at no less than 50%. How did it work before? Sorry, could you clarify what the difference is?

Trudy Turner: So, it's a huge difference. In the past, the city would have lots in areas that really weren't marketable. A lot of people don't want to live on some of the streets that we have purchased lots on. And so, the City would sell them to us for $1. And with that dollar then we would build...we would tear down what was on there, we would build a new home and move a family in. So we're populating areas that are challenged in the city with better lots. We're not asking for lots in St. Vital or Lindenwoods. We're asking for core areas, inner-city lots that aren't in high demand in the consumer market, but that are high demands for our folks.
Sean Hogan: Unless you wanted to give us lots in St. Vital.

Trudy Turner: Which would fit his mandate, but not ours.

Madam Speaker: That concludes our question period. Thank you for your time today, to both of you. Our next speaker is Ms. Kate Fenske. She's the Chief Executive Officer of the Downtown Winnipeg Business Improvement Zone. She's here in support of Item 3 on the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks, the report dated July 10th, 2020. And it's regarding places to go public restroom strategy. Welcome to you.

Kate Fenske: Thank you, speaker. And good morning Council. Thank you for this opportunity today. You know, often we come here with an ask, a request. I felt it was really important today to come here in support of what's before Council. I think there's been a lot of great work done. And I know you have a long day, so I'll try to keep my remarks brief. I want to start with a little bit of a story. Approximately 10 months ago there was a woman in her late 30s who was seen walking several blocks in downtown Winnipeg. It was the middle of the night. She was with a few others. It appeared she was going to be on the street at least a few more hours. It was 3:00 in the morning and she was almost a half hour walk from her spot at a shelter and she had to go. She hadn't thought about this possibility or had any clue there would be no options to find a restroom at 3:00 a.m. When you this about it, it makes sense, its obvious. Businesses, libraries, anywhere else you may be lucky to find a restroom, are all closed. Her only option was a downtown hotel. The restrooms are reserved for guests, for the hotel. But fortunately, she was a blond tall woman who had business cards in her pocket and was wearing a t-shirt that showed support for the fundraiser that she was participating in, that was raising awareness and money for those experiencing homelessness in the city. So, you may have guessed it, yes, that woman was me. I was participating in a sleep-out fundraiser and I committed to better understand what life on the streets might be like if you don't have a safe place to call home. Before that night, I believed that public restrooms were important and I absolutely supported the position that we should have them downtown. But until you're faced with a reality of having no place to go, it's difficult to really understand what that actually feels like. Yes, it's important to have public washrooms downtown and other parts of the city, too, as it really is such a basic need. No matter where you come from, what you do, who you are, everyone simply just needs a place to go. Providing clean, safe, and accessible public restrooms is a core feature of a safe and comfortable downtown that is welcoming to all. Therefore, seniors coming down for appointments. For expecting parents, for little ones, for people living with health conditions, for vulnerable individuals including those experiencing homelessness and yes, for you and for me. I could share with you all of the great work the Downtown Winnipeg BIZ has done over the years trying to make public restrooms a reality in our city, but I'm sure you've read the reports. You've seen the orange pop-up toilet and you heard about our idea to partner with local businesses. All of these have been pieces of a puzzle to get us here today where you have the opportunity to lead a policy decision and say that every Winnipegger deserves a place to go. This is about human dignity and offering a basic service that meets a basic human need. After all of our efforts and research, it's become clear that providing public restrooms that are safe, accessible and available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, is critical. And there are ways to do it so it's financially sustainable. I would like to especially thank Wins Bridgeman, from BridgmanCollaborative Architecture who has championed this advocacy work for years in partnership with the Downtown Winnipeg BIZ. I also want to recognize former BIZ staff. They got the ball rolling long before I joined the team. Including Melanie Andrushko, Jason Savitskaya, Tinaka, Erica and of course, Stefano. I'd like to say thank you to the others I'm sure I've missed and our team currently working at the BIZ who continue these efforts to find a way to provide washrooms and to our enviro team who clean up downtown every single day. As you've seen in the report, public restrooms has been a discussion point to the city for over ten years. It's exciting today and promising to think we finally might move the needle on the issue and put Winnipeg in the category that cares about everyone and their basic needs. The pandemic has shown us that downtown Winnipeg has an even greater deficit of reliable freely accessible washrooms than we could have imagined. Moving forward quickly, to fill the void, is a no-brainer, especially given the fact that external funds have been made available to support vulnerable individuals impacted by COVID-19. In closing, I would like to thank you, Mayor Bowman, for consistently stating that supporting vulnerable individuals during the pandemic along with business is a priority. I would also like to thank you, Councillor Rollins, for pushing the places to go strategy forward so we're not still just talking about it another 10 years from now. And thank you to the public service for their efforts to provide sound data and recommend viable solutions. And thank you to all members at EPC who voted unanimously to support public restrooms moving forward. And to all of Council, thank you for taking the time to review, discuss and see the value of meeting a basic human need so everyone has a place to go in Winnipeg and that they can do so with dignity. Our team at the BIZ very much looks forward to the positive results we expect once public restrooms are made available downtown as it will make their job to keep downtown clean and safe, a little more manageable. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentation. We'll now go to questions, if there are any. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: My question was going to be how important it is to thank Wins Bridgman. Thank you for situating this in a human rights frame. You had invited all of councillors to come with the team to clean up downtown. Tell me what they would have seen first thing in the morning? And then tell me what your ambitions are. And I don't mean to bury the lead, of what they'll no longer be seeing on your team, what other work can they be doing if they're not cleaning up the downtown in the way they are doing each and every single morning.

Kate Fenske: Thank you. We have a street team of approximately between 12 and 16 people. It spikes in the summer, during the summer months, that are out on the street every single day, including weekends, cleaning up our downtown. It includes things from cleaning transit shelters, removing graffiti. In the winter we're removing snow. We try to be the first clear sidewalks in the city, so if people come downtown to work that's obviously shifted. But that's what we were doing last winter. The other thing that's really challenging for our team is, they are responsible for cleaning up any biohazards. That could include public urination, that includes needles and anything that falls under that category. It is a regular occurrence and it is a real challenge for them. You think about the dignity of my team and having to go clean that up, but at the same time, if there is no place to go, what else are people supposed to do? So they're pressure washing. And it's not a fun job. We're trying to provide a great work environment, the best we can with a reasonable wage. That is really important for us, because this is a job that they do that most people in Winnipeg, I don't think, would want to do.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Anything further? Seeing no further questions…Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I just wanted to ask a question. I think we amended it. But from the downtown business perspective, how do you feel, there are other...the streets go through downtown, but they also go into neighbourhoods just outside of the downtown. How does the Downtown BIZ feel about trying to approach and having public places to go outside of downtown?

Kate Fenske: I'm in full support of that. When we're talking about that every Winnipegger needs a place to go and deserves a place to go, that means all of our city. What that looks like, I don't know, but we're absolutely helping…open to helping with the information, the data we have, about what are key locations and what might work for downtown and providing and sharing the research and the data we have with neighborhood and other BIZ's that we work very closely with, especially in the central part of this city and share all of the information we've collected and the research we've done over the last few years.

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

Councillor Chambers: Madam Speaker, just wondering how this will fold into the recently announced downtown safety partnership and how this will develop going forward?

Kate Fenske: I think when we're looking at public restrooms, it really is foundation. It is a basic need. So when we're looking at how do we elevate the service, how do we enhance safety? How do we create a more welcoming and inclusive downtown where everyone feels safe and welcome? Public restrooms is sort of the bare minimum. When we're looking at the downtown safety partnership and the outreach that is part of that and really involving the community, I think it's a great opportunity. It's really difficult to connect with individuals, to work with them, to get the supports they need, if a basic right like just finding place to go can't be met. So I think that's the first step. And that will help us do the work out on the streets, really be mobile and connect with individuals and get them some help.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions, we do appreciate the presentation today, thank you. We'll now hear from Luz Lammatao in support of Item 2 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated July 7th, 2020. It's regarding the speed limit review the process of residential speed limits. Welcome.

Luz Lammatao: Hi, everyone. Good morning to the Mayor. Good morning to the respected Council members. Ladies and gentlemen. Actually, this is my first time to be here in the city hall. And I may admit it's a bit intimidating to be with you respected people.

Madam Speaker: Don't be.

Luz Lammatao: I need to read my request because I may not finish this because I may cry or sob or burst into tears without you letting me know my request. So I'll be reading this. First of all, thank you. I've been given a chance to speak. This is about my daughter who passed away last year because of an accident at the road. And it was like July 31st of last

year that she was hit on her way to Tim's. And after like six days, she died on her hospital bed. So with this, I am taking courage to speak about her before this honourable Council about a tragedy and her untimely death. So this incident which up until now shattered my soul to pieces, as there is no tragedy in life like the death of a child. All the sadness kept welling up inside me and I deeply yearn for my daughter's love as I'm longing to give my love to my daughter. So my pain and grief is still here. It's not ending. I'm a mother who somehow lost the drive, and need, to life. And I need and sought the help of the grief counselling services. So Jillian is one of my first beautiful experience of motherhood. I always look and stare at her photos for this child I prayed and thank god with all my heart. And I also thank god again for giving me another beautiful daughter, but she's not here now. I'm technically new in Canada. We migrated back in 2016 under the provincial nominee program. And we chose the city of Winnipeg to settle and aspire for a better life. Just everyone else, we have the feelings of excitement and grand plans, however, such joy was short-lived. And as I mentioned earlier, it was July 13st of last year around 1:55 when my daughter is trying to go to on her way to work at Tim Hortons on Isabel. She was able to...I don't know if you've seen that video that was circulated in social media last year about her being hit at the corner of Sargent and Simcoe. She was trying to cross the street. She pushed the button. The first car heeded, but the second car did not. So it hit her. And then it was like thrown up in the air and there is like...she end up on the windshield of that car and then it was...she was tumbled on the floor. Broken her ribs and shoulders. And then after that, she was taken to the Health Sciences Centre. I was at work and then my other daughter called me and it was so devastating. I was to go and rush to the Health Sciences Centre. And I was like, I don't believe it was happening. So she was trying to, you know, be a law-abiding citizen by you know, trying to be, like, doing the safe crosswalk rules, but then this driver was...did not heed and was, you know, I don't know...if you know that incident, he was like 89-year-old driver. And some said that he was involved in another incident this year early May or April. He hit another guy who eventually died. I don't know what happened already. So come to think of it, she would not survive from that accident from with a speed of 50 or 60. And it was captured in CCTV in our apartment. And it was also uploaded in social media platforms. But it was eventually removed out because it was so horrific and shocking. She was only 23. And she'll be celebrating her birthday on August 2nd that week. However, she celebrated it in the hospital and then after four days, she died. So it was so painful. She didn't even live a quarter of a century. And only about two or three years aspiring her dream here in Canada. She is like very sweet, young, you know, funny, always smiling lady. And summer is very different now cause, you know, it's like this time of the year last year she was still alive, but now, it's been like passing through without her anymore. So I don't think I can get over it, the death of my daughter. And I can't stop thinking that Jillian was on the ground, but justice is not yet laid on her. I can only integrate the loss in my heart. How I wish I could reverse the time. How I wish the driver was conscientious and had taken the necessary precautions. How I wish my daughter was able to reach the other side of the street. And how I wish she was still living now. And I hope the driver is not over-speeding. So at this juncture, before you, this honourable members of the Council, I'm pleading with you to make resolutions that would protect the public, because what challenges would you take for the common good of our children and seniors and the general pedestrians? I applaud the city in taking a step toward the safer roads with the 30 km/h in some neighbourhoods as a trial. And support any progress toward 30 km/h speed limit. But small pilot is not enough. I think can we possibly adopt a normal 50 km/h to 50 km/h default speed. And a request also, could you also focus and spare attention to the research and best practises for setting speed limits and making our choices. If you could just listen to me and consider, you know, others, with this trauma, what is happening outside on the roads and every street and what might as well think of our children safely crossing the street. You know, excited to reach home. Think of your child not as dead, but living with you happily. And may I ask that, honourable Council, whatever your choices and commitments and discretions, and observances. May your, sorry, if you have to be resolute, decisive and critical of your find, can you also like...a little compassionate. But within your power and authority over the public, the greater good and concerns, I think we should be like giving more. Again, I deeply thank the honourable members of the Council for this opportunity to hear my sentiments and plea to #love30. I would like to thank Denay...Denay. And the persons behind the advocacy of Safe Speeds Winnipeg. I wish to thank especially Ms. Malaya Marcellino, our MLA for Notre Dame for her entire assistance during my situation back then and until now. My family's gratitude also for many others who in one way or another helped as process of grief and heartaches over my loss. And I can only take courage to voice out this statement for a parent not to experience the loss of a daughter, son, or loved one, or what could have been an avoidable accident. And personal appeal to the community to support safe speeds Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms. Lammatao, for sharing your thoughts with us, we appreciate that. We're going to have time for questions, but first, I'm going to call up Ms. Eliza Chubb to come forward and join us. Welcome, Ms. Chubb.

Eliza Chubb: My name is Eliza Chubb. We're coming to supporting safe speeds Winnipeg. To all the members of the city Council, good morning. I am thankful to be able to speak to you about my personal experience with the hope that my advocacy for safe speed will save lives. I am a senior citizen in my golden years, not always...not always golden years. I was living alone at 800 Beverly Street for 15 years when the accident happened. On May 5th, 2020, about 1 p.m., I was struck by a vehicle while crossing Notre Dame Avenue on my way to the TD Bank. It was very clear to me that I still have nine seconds to be able to cross the street. I was in the middle. Then I saw something, a shadow from my left, and I got hit. It was very clear to me that I still have nine seconds to be able to cross the street. I tried to run, but the vehicle was too fast, too quick. This number was reflected at the pedestrian light. Due to the collision, I had to undergo surgery at Health Sciences Centre, but first at emergency, I was examined and there was large contusion at the back of my head.

And I had to wait for that result, that CT scan. And after it came back, the result was normal. So I went straight to surgery. And the surgery took two hours. And I was in the recovery room for two hours. Due to the collision, I had to undergo surgery at Health Sciences Centre. I was diagnosed with left tibial lateral fracture. The doctors made the surgical procedure called open reduction internal fixation, left tibial-plato. In common parlance, my…around my knee was shattered, was damaged. It's slowly healing related to physiotherapy. There was a four-inch inserted into the bottom of my knee, the tibia. It was fractured. And the humerus was fractured like on top of the knee was not fractured, but there was a humerus...my humerus bone, that was fractured also. So I was hospitalized from May 5 until May 20. It was a very traumatic experience to be a victim of a vehicle collision and speeding. I have difficulty sleeping or I would have frequent nightmares that a car is hitting me again. One time when my friend gave me a ride to pick up my mail from my apartment, I saw a car coming beside us really fast. I screamed in anticipation that the car will hit us. I'm so sorry to feel so paranoid. I screamed because the car would...I thought it would hit me and my friend who was driving. It's very difficult to feel...I told the doctor before the surgery, doctor, I'm fear of the unknown. But the fear increases the intensity of my physical pain as if there is a synergic pain I fear. With this incident, I feel I'm aging more rapidly. I also have nightmares every now and then. It's not just physical pain, but emotional and psychological suffering. Sometimes I feel sad, depressed and angry, however, at this point...

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

Eliza Chubb: I'm trying to work on my occasional, and the hard truth of my life, that...being close to my own, to support, mortality. And after two weeks, I was thinking about will I ever walk again? Will I ever work again? And to this day, I forgave the driver, because I want to have a balance of life to be healthy in my mind, body, spirit and emotions. That's what I did. And now I'm getting healthy again. With the exercises, I'll be able to walk. And every so often I go see the surgeon that did the surgery. I also have to embrace my disability and increasing limits of my bodily functions. Because before the accident I used to go for daily walks, every day, even in the winter. And I was a nurse for 34 years. And I had an extensive working experience in our public health sector. As a nurse, I assisted medical doctors attending to patients who were victims, sometimes the victims wouldn't speak English, so I had to translate for them. One time, there was a four-vehicle accident on a highway. I was a student nurse. And one victim became my patient. I was training at the Health Sciences Centre then. I was a student nurse. And I can graphicly recall the scenario...

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

Eliza Chubb: And the faces of the victims. I think a certain quote is true as advertised, by street smart. You cannot fix a pedestrian at the body shop. Actually, I entered the memorial of Jillian Lamattao after she was killed in a collision near my place. I did not know the family, but I went. Personally, but as a member of the same community, I poured out my sympathy and condolences to the bereaved family. Who would have thought I would likewise encounter the same mishap? A couple of days before the accident, I started working as a casual employee at law courts. I was hired as a translator...I don't know if I want to mention this...I was...I was earning salary of $55 an hour, but it's just a casual. Last July, 13th, 2020, I went to the Notre Dame constituency to request the MLA, Malaya Marcellino, to sign my document necessary filing my claim with MPI. She learned what happened to me and asked if I could speak before this council. It was actually my first meeting with Malaya. And I believe now it was a proposal...meeting and I'll be volunteering with them. I did not hesitate to speak, though I'm not really confident to speak before the public, but I'm so willing to do this as my way of support to see safe speeds Winnipeg. Undeniably, seniors and children are the common victims of speeding and vehicle fatalities. Since...I'm sorry...since I encourage the drivers to slow down from 60…from 50 kilometres to 30 km/h in residential areas and watch for pedestrians. I support all steps the city of Winnipeg can take in setting 30 km/h speeds for our streets, including a pilot of safe speeds. As well as asking the province to simplify the process of setting safe 30 km/h speeds and funding a robust communications plan to show the public importance of a slower plan. To show the public the importance of slower speeds for everybody's health and well-being. To the city government, our city Council, I wish you health and clear-mindedness in carrying out your duties and inspire hope to our society among the myriad of issues at the table of this Council, I hope the work of safe speeds Winnipeg dedicated community members and other advocates will be given appropriate resolution or ordinance. And let this be considered an accomplishment and achievement during your term. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms. Chubb.

Eliza Chubb: I used to drive. I had a driver's license since 1979 and I gave it up when I was turning older. I gave up my drivers license in 2008. Thank you very much for listening.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms. Chubb. We'll have questions in a moment. Councillor Browaty, will you suspend the rules to go beyond 12 noon just so we can finish this delegation?

Councillor Browaty: Sure

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Are there any questions for either of our delegations today? Seeing none at this time, we do appreciate the both of you coming down today. Thank you. Is the it the will of Council to recess now until 130? We have one other delegation on the docket. Okay. Is it the will to hear the next delegation? Okay. Madam Clerk. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Clarifying; we see two on our list, but you're saying there is only one remaining.

Madam Speaker: Yes, Mr. Rudy has withdrawn. So you're correct. Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Madam Clerk.

Clerk: Sarah Phillips to be heard in opposition to Item 2 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated July 7th, 2020, regarding speed limit review process and residential speed limits. Sarah, I can see that you're with us, you have up to 10 minutes, and if you're listening to the audio on YouTube, please mute your audio player now.

Madam Speaker: Welcome.

Clerk: You're still muted, Sarah. If you could unmute yourself.

Sarah Phillips: Good afternoon, Your Worship, Council and staff. I'm mindful of my time, so I'm going to read my submission to you. My name is Sarah Phillips. I'm a mother of two young boys, a dedicated federal public servant and resident of Norwood Flats. I'm grateful to have this opportunity to voice my opposition to the IRPW report, specifically Item 2, speed limit review process and residential speed limits, as it has been presented. Thank you for taking my thoughts into consideration. The report recommends that the Winnipeg public service conduct a trial of 30 km/h speed limits on a limited number of existing neighbourhood greenways proposed in the report and in addition, consult with councillors to determine one street in each ward, to conduct a trial of either 30 or 40 km/h speed limit using funding from within existing resources. I firmly oppose this specific recommendation. Please do not conduct a trial of reduced speed limits. When would the trial begin? In a few months? A year or two? The time to act is now. There is a sense of urgency. Please trust the experts, the science and reduce the residential speed limits immediately. The safety of all road users, regardless of their mode of transportation, should be a priority for the city of Winnipeg, right now. Extensive research states that 30 km/h on residential streets is the safest speed. One death as a result of speed is too many and we have seen several unnecessary deaths in Winnipeg over the past few years. The city and its residents have worked hard to keep our COVID numbers low. As a result, we're fortunate to start the process of slowly opening our city. But we are living in a new normal and we have to think differently about transportation. In just over one month's time, our children may return to school. With the uncertainty of the school bus options, I'll be forced to find alternate means to get my boys to school. We are a one-car family and I'm not in a position to drive my children to and from daycare and school every day. I work full-time and I want the option to safely take my children to school by bicycle. Perhaps you're thinking there is no way she's going to ride in the winter in Winnipeg. Well, you would be incorrect. I have and would if the conditions were such that it were safe. The distance from my home to the two elementary schools, is a reasonable bike ride. However, my only route is through residential streets all of which have a speed limit of 50 km/h. Please think about a 41-year-old woman, an 8-year-old, and a 5-year-old, riding down the residential street and the vulnerable position we will constantly be placed in. I cannot ride my bike on the sidewalk and according to the law neither can my young son's as their bicycle tire sizes exceed that which is permitted. We are forced to share the road with vehicles. On the days that I drive, I want to know that those who are not as privileged and as fortunate as I am to be able to make a choice about their transportation and safely walk or ride and vehicles will use a safe speed around them. One day in the coming months when it's considered safe, I will return to my downtown office to work. I want to be able to commute safely to work whether it be by bicycle or on foot. While the city has many active transportation paths, they are disjointed. As a result, I have to ride on residential streets. I'm a confident woman who abides by the rules of the road at all times, however, when there is a motor vehicle driving past me at a speed of 50, my level of confidence and my commitment to following the rules are meaningless. I'm inherently vulnerable and a vehicle, regardless of its size, could end my life in a split second. Within the first week of actively commuting to work a few years ago, I was thrown from my bike by a speeding truck. I travelled on a bicycle route until it was disconnected and I was forced into vehicular traffic. I used appropriate hand signals and respected the other vehicles on the road. The cars whizzed past me, at the posted speed limit of 50 km/h, a truck cut me off and knocked me off my bike. It was incredibly frightening. Had the speed limit been lower, the situation could have been different. Although I continue to ride my bicycle, this experience has left me feeling unsafe riding on our roads. My experience is not unique. I'm relatively new to commuting by bicycle, just a few years in fact, and have already had some scary experiences. My father-in-law, a professor in psychology, who passed away just two years ago, commuted by bicycle year-round for his entire 35+ year career. He encountered the same unsafe situations that I know you've heard before. The evidence has already been presented to you over and over through the years. How many times must we conduct studies and hire consultants before you decide that enough is enough? Please do something now. As we enjoy a beautiful summer in our city, I want my children to spend as much time as possible playing outside. I want them to feel safe in our neighbourhood and not have to worry about cars rushing past them down our streets at 50k. My youngest son has a hearing impairment. And while as parents we have

taught him how to look both ways before he crosses the street, he is still vulnerable. He would not be able to react quickly enough to step out of the way of the vehicle moving at 50 km/h. At 30 km/h, he would likely be able to see the vehicle coming and could react accordingly. A speed limit of 30 protects him and others with disabilities. I want my elderly neighbour to feel safe walking in our neighbourhood. I want my father to feel safe walking in his community. My friends and family in other wards of the city to feel safe regardless of their mode of transportation. A reduction of speed needs to be addressed in every neighbourhood immediately. Please decide that enough is enough and reduce the speeds to 30 km/h on our residential streets now. This should not be a matter on if we should proceed with the reduction of speed, it should be a question of how we're going to do this to the benefit of all, right now. Please do the right thing. The work that you do for our city is incredibly important and I'm thankful that we have such solid leadership in our city. Thank you for your dedication to the citizens of Winnipeg and this opportunity to speak to an issue that impacts us all. You do not have an easy job. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Ms. Phillips. Are there any questions for our delegation today? Seeing none at this time, we appreciate your presentation and you taking the time. Thank you. We'll now have our lunch recess. Councillor Lukes? Motion on the floor to recess for one hour. We begin our meeting at 1:15. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
July 23, 2020, at 1:33 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I'd like to reconvene our Council meeting of July 23rd, 2020. We are on the Executive Policy Committee reports dated July 15th, 2020. Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 15, 2020

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Sorry. I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 through 12. Obviously, I'll pull 9 as well as, I believe we have to vote separately on 12...if it's necessary.

Madam Speaker: Okay. So 9 has been pulled. 2. Councillor Mayes, I think you wanted to speak to 12. Yes, so we've pulled three items. I'll call the question...2, 5, 9 and 12 are pulled. Yeah. I'll call the question on 1, 3 and 4, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11. All in favour? Pardon me? So not 11. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam clerk.

Item 2 – Standing Policy Committee Composition

Madam Speaker: Thank you. This was stood down by you, Councillor Klein. Go ahead.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you to my colleagues, of course, this motion I understand is...has, you know, kind of been pushed aside through the process now, but I wanted to take a moment just to explain to you where this is coming from. We have more EPC members today than we've had in the past, previously, in the previous leadership. Sitting on a standing policy committee is the only chance we have to ask questions of public service. And, of course, non-EPC members can't take up an entire standing policy committee. And now, we have EPC plus three as I've learned this morning that there's now three other members included in that EPC meeting. I'm just asking you for an opportunity for those of us not on EPC, because we're not forming a party, but to have the chance to sit on the standing policy committees equally so that we have an opportunity to ask questions. Now I realize that probably when you met this morning, the EPC plus three, you probably discussed this one and decided it may not go forward, but I'm asking you to reconsider that and take this opportunity to start new, start fresh, that come November, we put this forward. As I said at EPC, I'll say here, I'm happy to see the deletion of Deputy Mayor and Acting Deputy Mayor from that motion. I understand the need for that. I accept that. That's, I think, a good compromise. That's my hope, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, any further speakers? Councillor Eadie...pardon me, Councillor Allard followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Allard: I'd like the opportunity to speak French. I think we have the translator.

Translation of French Spoken:

So thank you for the opportunity from my Council colleagues.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker? Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes?

Councillor Nason: I do not have the capacity on remote to follow along en français.

Councillor Allard: I'll be sure to speak French.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, I can appreciate that, but we're going to continue with our practise. We do have a French translator. Unfortunately, we don't have the service for you remote today, but we're going to allow the speaker in French.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, point of order. I do believe Councillor Allard is in a position to translate for himself.

Councillor Allard: I'm going to speak French and English in my remarks.

Madam Speaker: So you've heard that Councillor Nason? Councillor Allard will give his message in both languages, French and English.

Councillor Allard:

Translation of French Spoken:

So, it's my honour to address the Council today. It was me who, at the level of Executive Policy Committee, proposed to the Mayor to take this as information. So, that is what is recommended today. I think that us, as councillors, we have an enormous opportunity in November to meet in private and discuss who should be on which committee. Right now, myself as a councillor of six years, I've had the opportunity to participate in these meetings six times. And so, I think there are lots of opportunities. I have run many times, I have lost internal elections at the level of councillor. I think there's lots of opportunities within the internal elections at Council level. I think there's a lot of opportunities for anyone who is interested in lobbying at a colleague level if we are interested in a specific post.

Councillor Allard: Maybe in English. I was the one that EPC who motioned to take this as information. It's been my experience that we all have access to the process in November in our organizational meeting where we can indicate if we want to sit on a committee or not. I have run. Specifically, I recall running a few times for the P&D committee. I recall losing some elections and that's how it goes with elections. And the way we have it set up, is we have our internal meeting and then we have our formal meeting with Council. I think this has worked very well over time. So I don't see the need to be prescriptive in getting into who should sit on what committee. Council decides. And if certain members of Council are moving this motion, perhaps they're not satisfied with what Council has decided in the past. I can think of the last internal election where I think I ran for P&D and Councillor Klein lost the election to me. So perhaps that is what is motivating the motion today. I'm not sure. But I think the system has worked well in the past and I don't see why it needs reform.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak to this. The effect of EPC plus three is an interesting concept. And I do understand when informal meetings have to happen, that Deputy Mayor and the Assistant Deputy Mayor really need to know what is going on in case they ever do actually have to take full responsibility, heaven forbid anything might happen to our mayor. But, you know, if it does, we have a deputy mayor and they need to be up to speed on all the portfolios in order to be that leader of Council if that was ever to happen, Madam Speaker. This EPC plus three-thing is really troublesome. Yeah, they're only informal meetings that these people have together, Madam Speaker, but ultimately, EPC plus 3 is 10. They're almost at the point of informal meetings where they have two-thirds vote of Council when they're considering the things that they consider at these informal meetings, Madam Speaker. That is totally anti-democratic. Totally. Totally. It's not transparent. It's not accountable and it's not democratic. When it comes to the selection of the committee in this report, I'll be voting for the recommendation of the EPC because we do, as councillors, have an ability to decide who is on what standing committee and, you know, there is...it is a political process, voting and all that sort of thing. So it does get kind of political. We do end up with committee with three people on the standing committee, but one of the things that I would point out, though, is even if there are three EPC plus three members on a standing committee, Madam Speaker, the one person who isn't has an ability to still publicly express any concerns, difficulties or...because it is a debate as you know, Madam Speaker. We don't vote on anything in standing committees without some sort of

discussion, unless there is total agreement and we're going to move by quickly, but there is always room for public democratic debate. So I'm not quite concerned that, you know, we just received this as information, but...but with 10 people involved in informal meetings, there is a potential that the vote is already done behind the scenes, okay, Madam Speaker. That's all I'm saying.

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

Councillor Mayes: Yeah. A number of factual inaccuracies, not with what Councillor Eadie says. A) EPC is not bigger than what it was. The difference is the deputy and acting deputy who were formerly people on who were on EPC and various chairperson jobs, I've never done it, but Councillor Browaty did it when he was on EPC and chairing other committees. And various others, too. So it's not that EPC has expanded in a strict sense. Also, Councillor Allard saying, well, you can just go and run. A bit like saying, if you say to somebody from the Manitoba NDP, you can bring something up and we'll have a vote on it. Well, yeah, if there is a majority on the other side, then it really isn't a fair and equitable process. So the assertion was being made that people were going to be told what committees they were on, that's not the goal here. I do support it going to governance. The goal here is to limit the number of EPC members on committees. I've been on EPC longer than anyone else here. Often when people come to EPC, they're told you should have asked questions at committee. They're told that when a matter comes to Council. Well, in order to make that more possible, you have to allow people who aren't on EPC to be on committees. When I first got here, as I said with EPC, everyone sat one seat on one committee so there was no mathematical way you could get a majority of EPC on a committee, which we now have for the first time. Exceptions, the downtown committee used to be made up of certain designated chairs of other committees. So the downtown committee, now defunked, did have majority of EPC members, it had almost exclusively all EPC members. Second potential exception, the old…what was…we've gone from Innovation and EPC, Dev, before that was Innovation, before that was the Alternative Service Delivery. The Alternative Service Delivery which had three members appointed by the Mayor could at any given time, could have had a majority of EPC members. I think Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Browaty sat on that with Councillor Nordman back in the day, and that would have been a majority of EPC members. Those were different days in terms of those weren't full standing committees. Now we have full standing committees. People can sit on a couple if they wish and can run. But I do think it's a little much to say, that well, we're going to tell people what committees they sit on. No, I think what we're trying to do here is say, look, there should be a number of spots open for people who are not on EPC committees. I'm not really sure what the problem is with that. We'll still have up to two EPC members on each committee, plus, you could have the deputy, in my view, plus you could have the deputy or ADM sit on these committees. I do support it, bringing it to Governance. I do think it's an important item in its way in that If we want to be open and transparent and we say we do, then it's important that we have the ability for people to ask questions of the administration. If you sit on a particular committee, you get a chance to do that. So I think it's important to keep open some spots for non-EPC members. Certainly, in an era prior to 2014 which is often been criticized as not being transparent and open. We didn't have a majority of EPC members potentially dominating the committee. So I don't...if we're going to be true to the ideas of openness and transparency, I think this is a good place to start.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Just a couple of words with regards to this item. C, the recommendation from EPC, that putting forward recommendation to Governance, 50% representation is a good step. You know, Councillor Mayes just mentioned about the days gone by and the, I guess, I would refer to it as a super majority on some of these committees. Just prior to the budget being passed, there were two meetings, one of Water and Waste and one being of finance, where the Acting Deputy Mayor was placed in both of those meetings. One to assure quorum. The other was to assure having a 50% vote. So no motions could go forward without the support. There was a 2-2, unofficial EPC vs non-EPC. The challenge is having, you know, appropriate representation outside of the voting block. We're much different thought individuals around the table of Council. We should come together and build consensus. We do have, and continue to have, a significant divide of membership with regards to the around this table. I know the Mayor has mentioned many times, Council will decide. The challenge is much like motions that came forward today. I know myself I'm trying to get better with putting forward motions, are walk-ons, to be delivered in advance so that we can be better informed of what is coming at Council. And I hope that when we have these matters that are being brought forward and changes and amendments, that we are all included, that we all have a voice, because much like the matter before us a little bit later, regarding Starlight, we need to have all voices represented at the table. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you Madam Speaker. I'll support this going to Governance. I think that recent FIPPA requests revealed that the Mayor and his Executive Policy Committee, and deputy and acting deputy mayor met 58 times in the last 10 months behind closed doors, averaging about six times a month. For initial two-year period I was part of these closed-door meetings where the public services summoned to briefings to provide information and perspectives, to

provide…freely provide insight. These private meetings enable the opportunity for the EPC councillors, Deputy Mayor and Acting Deputy Mayor, to influence, make deals and have discussions that others are not privy to. So if you're a member on a committee where there are 3 members who have been part of these meetings and discussions, many times decisions have been made, perspectives have been influenced. I don't feel that's a proper way to do business. I don't feel that offers the proper scrutiny that is required on many of the decisions that come before us on committees. So I will be supporting this going to Governance and hope that something better comes of it, where we have more of an equal balance.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. Yeah, we've seen before during my time on Council, where, yeah, I felt was unfortunate that EPC members, I guess, voted disproportionately in November for EPC members to positions on standing committees. You know, it's sort of a grey area. These people are good councillors and if they want to run, I'm not surprised that they would have the support of the majority of Council members. And in the case of Councillor Markus Chambers on his very first week as a city councillor, in all his enthusiasm and gusto, who ran and got elected for every position, I certainly don't blame him for that. I don't think he realized what he was getting into his first year. He was on three committees and I voted for him. I mean, hat's off. I did warn him at that meeting that he may not know what he was getting into, but nonetheless, he did fulfill his duties and his time commitments. And there's no question about that. This is about something else. And it is about processing the ability for Council to work best as a council. And that's our job. As we all say, as we all know, at least by the charter, the council is the ultimate decision-making body here. Therefore, how can we make Council make better decisions? And on that basis, I believe we are in a position here to give consideration to just that. At this point, we're not talking about whether we should have EPC members only 50%. We're talking about bringing this to Governance and having further debate. And on that basis, I can say that I'm inclined towards the intent of this motion in terms of how we can vote, because I believe it will make Council a better decision-making body and that's what counts. Now, it was mentioned as well, the idea that decisions would have already been made. Yeah, I believe that. So on that basis, I feel sorry for EPC members that might feel beholden to decisions that would have already been made. Because the idea that decisions are made before a standing committee meeting, well, I would say that often those decisions can be premature, because they don't have the advantage of that standing committee meeting. Now I understand they may be meeting six times per month as it has been pointed out. Something like that. But nonetheless, let's face it, there is, you know, other councillors, other delegations, a different dynamic at standing policy that makes the decisions better. And on that basis, we're missing out by not maximizing the decision-making process which includes those standing committees. It can be...it's human nature, not going to blame any individual, but for members of a certain group if they feel threatened to circle the wagon, and that's human nature and that's politics. But it doesn't make for a better council. It doesn't make for a better city hall. So I'm glad we're going to be giving this some consideration. EPC will still have its extra decision-making mechanism through the EPC meetings. And even so, even if they...a decision wouldn't pass or would be an otherwise different decision were it to have one more EPC member, it is still often the case that it merely goes to EPC without recommendation. Something like that. So bare in mine, this doesn't stop EPC and EPC members from doing their jobs as members of EPC, which is what they're supposed to do. Let's face it, we're going to be doing EPC a favour, and on that basis, we're going to be doing Council a favour. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Mayor Bowman: I do, Madam Speaker, thanks. I'm going to be supporting this motion. I think, you know, having the intent behind this motion, as I understand it, to ensure that there is...there is ample opportunities for everybody to be on committees I think is something worth supporting. For those that may be following these proceedings and may be confused, let me clarify. These are for the formal meetings. It's interesting because in my capacity as mayor, I have the responsibility to appoint the chairs of committees. There is an informal meeting that is yet staffed by Clerks every year that is...that does take place out of the sight of cameras and councillors, all members of Council decide who populates the committees. I don't attend those meetings. They are staffed by Clerks. That might be one area that Council may wish to consider reforming to make more open and transparent, if that really is in fact the intent. Informal meetings, however, take place all the time. And you know, Councillor Lukes was part of briefings before she was removed from EPC, I've had briefings as well during this term with the former chair of the Police Board, certainly attended a briefing that we had on the police pension. I thanked him for attending that along with EPC members. I know I meet regularly with Councillor Chambers, the new chair of the Police Board. And try to have dialogue informally with as many members of Council that are willing to collaborate as possible. That is not what we're voting on this afternoon. I know some are obviously wanting to raise some of those issues about folks meeting informally. I think that's a good thing. I think the dialogue is a good thing. But let's be clear, when it comes to committees, Council ultimately decides who is on the respective committees. My job is to appoint chairs. I want to thank both previous and current chairs of committee for their ongoing work. In terms of the composition of the committee, that is done at a private meeting that councillors attend, staffed by Clerks that then results in an omnibus motion that comes to EPC, which that I've always supported, the collective will of Council, in terms of the determination about who wants to sit on respective committees. I see no reason to change that so I'll be supporting this so that it can go to Governance and then we can go forward from there. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

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

Item 5 – Update on Infrastructure Projects for Federal and Provincial Funding under the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program and 2020 Provincial Capital Funding Allocation

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. This has been…I'm pleased with that we're discussing this one. This is a pretty substantive matter for discussion right now. There is some projects that were approved by Council. We had requested to our provincial government partners that they make a request to the federal government to support some things. One of which I fought an election on and I'm very pleased we were voting on it today. It was the Winnipeg South Rec Centre. I've been a champion for that. I've been advocating for it and I'm very pleased that we're on the cusp of finally delivering a much needed recreation amenity in a growing part of our community. And so, it was one that I fought very hard for in the election against others who didn't have campaign commitments for it. I know the provincial government has recently requested that we include a daycare and a vocational building to the South Winnipeg Recreational Campus. Definitely a novel approach by the province to ask us to build something for them in their area of jurisdiction. I think it's a recognition of the confidence and the management of our team at city hall, to bring in projects on time and under budget. So that confidence by the province, you see is being reflected in their confidence and the request to the City of Winnipeg to build something that is within their area of jurisdiction. We have worked diligently. I've had dialogue with many cabinet ministers on Broadway over the last year to advocate for these projects. There is other worthy projects that I know will be commented on, but I think this is definitely a win for the city of Winnipeg and it shows what we can do when we work together. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Who would like to speak to this item? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I ask to have it stood down. I, of course, am totally in support and I appreciate the amount of work that our leader of Council, the Mayor, has put into this because when one becomes the mayor, intergovernmental negotiations and workings, it falls to the mayor's office, not to individual city councillor offices. I know that Councillor Lukes pushed very...well, she didn't have to fight an election on it, but she has been pushing very hard to get a recreation centre for Waverley West. And, Madam Speaker, definitely the people of Waverley West deserve to have a recreation centre. And it was always part of what needs to be done. The biggest issue is finding the money to build such a thing in the face of...well, other debates we've had in over a number of years. The way we've worked with property tax. The way we worked with development standards. The way we've, you know, tried to bring in revenue through the impact fee. And I mean the city has to fund this and the people of Waverley West deserve it. One of the reasons I stood it down, all of these projects are great. The Civic Centre. It's all intergovernmental. I think it's very good, EPC members and others have worked on it. I support all these projects. I have no problem with that because it is about Winnipeg and we do have to find the money to provide the services that we all need to share and expect to have wherever we live in this city, Madam Speaker. The only thing I wanted to point out and I'm happy that the Mayor expressed that the province is putting all confidence in the city to build a vocational school as well as the rec centre daycare. Well, daycare is interesting, but what is interesting, Madam Speaker, I still don't understand, though, I believe, and I haven't seen any details, but, Madam Speaker, when it comes to school divisions and building, what happens is the public schools finance board and finance people are the ones who are actually work with the school divisions and say you can put this in the building, no, there is all kind of evaluations back and forth. I, Madam Speaker, as you more than likely know, I was on the school board and worked quite diligently to build the West Kildonan Collegiate that exists, is in Councillor Browaty's ward now, today. That was built right on budget. Based on the process that we used. When we decided on the budget, we had enough detail before we decided on what budget we needed. There was a lot of back-and-forth, Madam Speaker. I don't know how much autonomy we're going to have, necessarily with the vocational thing, but I think there has to be an opportunity because the school division that will be utilizing this vocational school, if it's at the school division level, Pembina Trails, I believe, you know, there is a need. There is classrooms needs, all kinds of various needs that may differ from the kinds of buildings we normally are involved in building like recreation centres and that sort of thing. I know the construction companies and all that stuff will go out. But I just wanted to point out, I think it will be interesting to see how our...how our people who work towards putting out contracts to build and putting together the specs of what this vocational school will need, it's quite clear to me that our city people are going to have to work with the public schools finance board administration people, who help decide what gets built. But, I think it's a great opportunity for...I can't remember who is representing...who is liaison with the schools that the Mayor appointed, but I think this is a great opportunity for the city to work with the school systems to really...so they can both understand each other. I think it's a great thing. So anyway, I appreciate all the work that our admin did and the Mayor and everybody for all these projects actually. They're all very important to Winnipeggers, including the head works and all the stuff in here. Thanks.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'd just like to rise to speak to the portion of this motion regarding Waverley West Recreation Campus. I would like to thank all the councillors who hopefully will be supporting this. Before a shovel was put in the ground in 2008, the southwest quadrant of the city of Winnipeg had a recreation deficit according to the Ralph Policy. So over the last...since 2008, 12 years, Waverley West has grown faster than anyone ever projected or anticipated. It's actually grown twice as fast. I want to thank all the councillors that have come out and gone on a tour with me so that they could see the type of density and development that is going in there. I still don't feel over the last six years we've got a real handle on growth in the city. There are many, many challenges that I don't feel are being dealt with. I feel I have some ability to say that because I'm dealing with an area that is the fastest growing in the city, Councillor Sharma, yours is the second fastest growing. And it's a challenge. And we don't have a handle on it. But in regards to the Southwest Recreation Campus, I'm very pleased to see this coming forward. I'm pleased and have been challenged in the relationship between the province and the feds in getting this together, but it seems like we've got it all together now. With that, thank you very much and encourage you to support the motion.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And it is with gratitude in my heart that I stand up today as your very proud chair of community services in support of this motion. And in support of the leadership of Councillor Janice Lukes and His Worship Mayor Bowman, who have been standing and working together. And, I, for one, like to see that on behalf of the community services that we want and need. There is a very small budget that Councillor Santos and I are responsible for in terms of the recreation strategy and the investments that are needed for community services, for assets old and emerging and new. And this is our newest asset. It will be. And my hope, the newest public asset. It is through the work of…great work by Councillor Lukes and His Worship Mayor Bowman standing shoulder to shoulder with the province and the feds at every turn. And I believe, Madam Speaker, that is going to be the story arc, of this, our last Council before we prorogue, the story of us pulling together on behalf of Winnipeggers with our provincial and federal and territorial colleagues. That's going to be the story. That's how Councillor Santos and I are going to build more with that $50 million budget that we have, but I'm going to need the partnership and the enthusiasm of the Council. Madam Speaker, and in particular, my colleague Councillor Lukes, who I think will never abandon community services, will always stand up for Winnipeg and I believe that will be the story arc for today, how we are working shoulder to shoulder with all of our political partners in the federal and provincial government. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I'm not sure what that budget was that Councillor Rollins was talking about that she and Councillor Santos have, but I'll have to talk to them in the wake of some recently approved further. We're up over 100 lost votes now, over 300 units.

Councillor Rollins: Read the mandate letter.

Councillor Mayes: People are told you'll have more friends, but for some reason they want more than that. We'll come back to that later. Good work by a number of people, fed, provincial, Terry Duguid, provincial reps, and Councillor Lukes. Mayor had put in a pledge to try and to get this going in his collection platform, which I appreciated and endorsed. You sit here on this job if you're in the suburbs, you're told day after day how your areas are the problems and all the money is going in there. One of the examples that's been used is we can't afford all these new community centres in the suburbs. We built one in the last 15 years. Councillor Browaty's ward, Red River, up on north Main. If we're having financial trouble, I don't really think it's because we built one 15 years ago. I really don't. In the interim, we've had roughly 120,000 people move into this city, grow this city by that amount. We haven't built new facilities. Councillor Lukes has an area that will at some point soon be about the size of Brandon, so I would support putting in a new community centre there. We used the term community centre earlier today, rather loosely, I thought for a development that is going to have perhaps 1000 people, some say 500 units. I don't think we built one for every thousand people. I know we haven't gotten 10 in Sage Creek, we have 10,000 people there and they don't have any community centre despite the presentation we had a few years ago where it was stated that the problem was we were spending all the money on rec centres in places like Sage Creek and not Mayfair. Ironically, we just spent 6 million on Mayfair. And I know there isn't one in Sage Creek. I do support this. This is a cost however, we're getting partnership from other levels of government and I think given the number of people who have moved into this neighbourhood, paying taxes, who I know have been harassing Councillor Lukes and harassing me over the years, sitting on that community committee when she was still on the Riel Community Committee, I think it was a good step forward. It's fair to these people to invest this kind of funding given that there are roughly 40,000. And hopefully, if we move on this one, we'll take a look at your ward, Madam Clerk. Take a look at Councillor Nason's Red River project, that he's probably going to speak on next, and keep recognizing where there has been significant growth in the city. We need to have some recreation facilities. I think that's fair to the taxpayers of Winnipeg. Where we have had substantial

growth, we need to be looking at basically taking care of those folks. I'll come back later, obviously with the impact fee being, at best, on hold right now. I've had developers already calling seeing the TIFF that's being proposed for a community centre downtown. I've had developers from my ward already talking to me about, great, why don't you give us a TIFF, too, and then we'll get a community centre built out in the suburbs. I'm sure that's something we'll seriously consider as we move forward if we do approve the TIFF later today for the community centre on Portage.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Next, we'll go remotely to Councillor Nason.
Councillor Nason: Great, thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, being a former basketball convenor, I had the opportunity to attend a couple of community centres. I believe they were new ones. Besides Red River, there was Lindenwoods and I believe Glenwood behind the Dairy Queen was another area of renewal in a more established area. We do see some renewal. And yes, there is the Red River…

Councillor Mayes: I talked about a lot about Glenwood. Glenwood Community Centre has not been renewed in decades despites the hundreds of new units going in there. I think Councillor Nason maybe…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, you can talk offline about that, thank you.

Councillor Mayes: Well, I'm not going to have people speak…make statements of fact that aren't (inaudible).

Madam Speaker: Back to you, Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: As I've indicated, the one just off of St. Mary's behind the Dairy Queen. I apologize if I got the wrong "G" name of it. But there have been a couple of new facilities built, is what my intent is, besides Red River. The impact fee has left a big hole with the Waverley West project. I will not dispute the size of Brandon without a community centre of its own. I did not attend with Councillor Lukes on a tour, but the area MLA, Jon Reyes, was kind enough to take me along for a drive and I did get to enjoy the sites of that area. I also have familiarity in my former role, as a political actor, as the Mayor refers to me, with provincial government. Manitoba Housing is one of the key developers of that subdivision, and I'm well aware of impacts in that area and the benefit this will bring to the table for the area. We have had a history of kicking stuff down the table, renewing what will be 100-year-old waste plant at the north end of Winnipeg is long overdue. Saving Lake Winnipeg is a critical item to do. I am concerned about class five and class four estimates going forward looking for help from other levels of government while we still have such a variable with regards to cost. I believe the cost for the Waverley Rec Complex is in the range of $105 million. That's a big pill to swallow. We've got a $10 million gap with impact fees and I believe that's what the Mayor has indicated in his election commitment to it, but I will be supporting this, and I do believe that Winnipeg will be better when we see renewal in all areas of the city, so that all members and residents of our community can enjoy them. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise, I'll be supporting this. Glad to see these four projects be put forward. And after such...many months of discussion with the province of Manitoba, obviously, we can see some of the changes they were hoping to see. I'm not too keen on the city owning a vocational school or a daycare, but nonetheless, the province and it's outlined here in the report, is committed to fully fund the construction of those and the operational costs of those items. I just want to point out one thing for my Council colleague from Transcona, Councillor Nason just did indicate or reference to impact fees being used for the Waverley West project. I just draw his attention, again, to appendix A; clearly, the capital budget page proposed for the South Winnipeg Rec Campus lays out all the funding sources. There is no impact fee funding contemplated on that project. And so, I just wanted to make that clear for anyone who is listening as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker. Okay, seeing none. Mr. Mayor, back to you.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Councillor Nason may want to also just read the report in terms of the total dollar figure that's been allotted. He's tens of millions of dollars off. But notwithstanding that, I'm pleased to hear he and others are supporting the amendment and partnership with other levels of government. I want to thank the provincial government as well. The discussions have been pretty extensive and difficult at times on this particular project. I had concerns initially when they had asked us to build something for them. That was certainly outside of our jurisdictional responsibilities. I believe those concerns have been addressed. I want to thank the public service both at the province of Manitoba as well as at the City of Winnipeg for their efforts to get us to this stage. And I will join councillor...Councillor Rollins in the request for strong vote of confidence for this, where...you know, I know in a few moments we're going to be debating and discussing another investment in our downtown. One of the dynamics in serving as mayor is that my ward is the entire city. I want to see what is best for our residents in the south, the north and the east, the west and in downtown. And try to work collaboratively with my colleagues and other levels of government to see investments go where they're

most needed. In terms of the investments in the North End Sewage Treatment Plant, St. James Civic Centre, of course, for the Winnipeg South Rec Centre, these are needed investments in our community and where we can leverage dollars from other levels of government. That is obviously a plus. And we've been able to collectively work as a team as well as with our public service and other levels of government to bring this forward today. So you know, I'm going to be obviously voting for the investments in a growing part of our suburban life in our city. I think it's a worthy investment. In a few minutes, you'll hear me advocating for investments in our downtown as well, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer, that was the Mayor's close, so we'll move on to the vote now. Yes, thank you. There is a call for recorded vote. Item 5, all in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 5 unanimously passes. Next is, Item 9, Starlight Investments. Madam Clerk.

Item 9 – Request from Starlight Investments for Financial Contribution to Portage Place Revitalization Project

Madam Speaker: We have two amending motions. Motion No. 2 is moved by Councillor Gilroy, seconded by Mr. Mayor. Motion 3 is moved by Councillor Klein and seconded by Councillor Nason. So this will be the Mayor's opportunity to introduce the item. Councillor Gilroy, we will move to you then, to introduce your motion. Then onto Councillor Klein. Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS on January, 17, 2020 Starlight Investments Ltd. (Starlight) provided a letter to the interim CAO outlining its plans for a $400 million purchase and redevelopment of Portage Place mall (the Revitalization Project), as well as a request for $20 million from each level of Government ($60 million in total) to support the community benefits associated with this project;

AND WHEREAS the Revitalization Project will be a transformative investment which is expected to include key features such as a community centre, over 500 rental apartment units, almost 500,000 square feet of retail and office space and a rejuvenated pedestrian walkway on Edmonton street;

AND WHEREAS on July 15, 2020 Executive Policy Committee recommended that Council approve a grant of up to $ 5 million to Starlight, based on 80 percent of the projected incremental municipal taxes generated by the Revitalization Project over 10 years;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba has committed to provide a rebate of up to $28.7 million of the projected incremental education taxes generated by the Revitalization Project over 20 years;

AND WHEREAS there is an opportunity for Winnipeg to increase its total municipal property tax rebate to $11.3 million, when combined with the Provincial rebate totals $40 million, which is the dollar amount of support that Starlight is seeking from Winnipeg and Manitoba for the Revitalization Project;

AND WHEREAS any further municipal support may be conditional on the Revitalization Project including key public amenities such as a community centre with washrooms and an affordable housing component that is consistent with previous City downtown housing incentive programs and current federal housing support programs.

WHEREAS on January, 17, 2020 Starlight Investments Ltd. (Starlight) provided a letter to the interim CAO outlining its plans for a $400 million purchase and redevelopment of Portage Place mall (the Revitalization Project), as well as a request for $20 million from each level of Government ($60 million in total) to support the community benefits associated with this project;
AND WHEREAS the Revitalization Project will be a transformative investment which is expected to include key features such as a community centre, over 500 rental apartment units, almost 500,000 square feet of retail and office space and a rejuvenated pedestrian walkway on Edmonton street;

AND WHEREAS on July 15, 2020 Executive Policy Committee recommended that Council approve a grant of up to $ 5 million to Starlight, based on 80 percent of the projected incremental municipal taxes generated by the Revitalization Project over 10 years;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba has committed to provide a rebate of up to $28.7 million of the projected incremental education taxes generated by the Revitalization Project over 20 years;

AND WHEREAS there is an opportunity for Winnipeg to increase its total municipal property tax rebate to $11.3 million; when combined with the Provincial rebate totals $40 million, which is the dollar amount of support that Starlight is seeking from Winnipeg and Manitoba for the Revitalization Project;

AND WHEREAS any further municipal support may be conditional on the Revitalization Project including key public amenities such as a community centre with washrooms and an affordable housing component that is consistent with previous City downtown housing incentive programs and current federal housing support programs.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 9 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated July 15, 2020 be amended by deleting recommendations 1, 2 and 3, and replacing them with the following:

1. *That Council approve a grant to Starlight Group Property Holdings Inc. O/A Starlight Investments Ltd. aka. Starlight Acquisitions Ltd. ("Starlight") in respect of the Revitalization Project at Portage Place and that the grant:*

    A. *be an annualized payment for a period of up to 20 years beginning the year after full or interim occupancy and final assessment is attained;*

    B. *be an annual amount to a maximum of 80% of incremental municipal property taxes for the property located at 245 Portage Avenue, and to a total aggregate maximum of $11.3 million;*

    C. *be conditional on Starlight submitting a construction schedule demonstrating that completion of the entire project will occur within four years of obtaining construction financing;*

    D. *be conditional on construction financing being secured within 12 months with permits being secured and work commencing within 24 months of Council approval;*

    E. *be conditional on Starlight ensuring that new housing is a part of this project and that a minimum of 10% of the new housing units be rented at affordable levels defined as at or below the median monthly market rent, for a minimum of 10 years;*

    F. *be conditional on Starlight Investments Ltd. entering into a grant agreement with The City of Winnipeg in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor/Director of Legal Services.*

2. *That the city provide financial support for the following community benefit public amenities within the project;*

    A. *Up to $2.1 million for an indoor community centre with public washrooms, funded from the City's anticipated annual strategic infrastructure allocation from the Province of Manitoba as part of the City's new 3 year recreation and library facility investment strategy*

    B. *Up to $5.6 million for streetscaping - (Portage Ave $5 million, Carlton $400,000, Vaughn $200,000), funded from the Regional and Local Street Renewal Capital Budget, Downtown Street and Sidewalk allocation*

    C. *Up to $600,000 for transit improvements - (Portage at Edmonton $400,000, Portage at Vaughn $200,000), funded from Transit retained earnings.*

3. That the City reimburse up to $400,000 in permit and planning fees.

4. That the City enter into, execute and deliver a grant agreement with Starlight Group Property Holdings Inc. O/A Starlight Investments Ltd. aka. Starlight Acquisitions Ltd. and such other agreements as determined necessary by the City Solicitor / Director of Legal Services to implement the intent of the foregoing (the "Ancillary Agreements").

5. That the Chief Financial Officer be authorized to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of the grant agreement and the Ancillary Agreements, in accordance with this report and such other terms and conditions deemed necessary by the City Solicitor/Director of Legal Services to protect the interests of the City.

6. That the above $20 million support package shall comprise the maximum support from the City of Winnipeg for this project, and the associated grant agreement(s) include a requirement that Starlight execute a minimum $400 million purchase and re-development of Portage Place Mall as per Starlight's business plan.

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

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 9. of the Report of the Executive Policy Committed dated July 15, 2020 be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendations 1. in its entirety and replace with the following:*

    1. That a grant in the amount of $18 million be approved to Starlight Group Property Holdings Inc. O/A Starlight Investments Ltd. aka. Starlight Acquisitions Ltd. ("Starlight") with a payment of $6 being made upon the completion of the first tower, a $6 million payment upon the completion of the second residential tower, and a third and final payment of $6 million upon the completion of the approved Edmonton Court, and that the grant:

        A. be conditional upon the development providing a minimum of 5% affordable housing;

        B. be conditional upon the development providing public washrooms which would be accessible 24 hours a day, 365 days a year;

        B. be conditional on Starlight submitting a construction schedule demonstrating that completion of the entire project will occur within six years of obtaining construction financing;

        C. be conditional on construction financing being secured within 12 months with permits being secured and work commencing within 24 months of Council approval;

        D. be subject to at a minimum matching Provincial and Federal grants and written confirmation from the Province of Manitoba and the Government of Canada of their financial support for the project;

        E. be conditional on Starlight Investments Ltd. entering into a grant agreement with The City of Winnipeg in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor/Director of Legal Services

- *Add the following new Recommendation 2. and renumber the remaining recommendations accordingly:*

    2. That the City of Winnipeg waive up to $2 million in permitting and application costs in lieu of a cash contribution equal to $2 million.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know there is going to be lots of discussion on this, so I'll save my more substantive comments at the close. What I will say is, I want to start by thanking Councillor Gilroy for all of her efforts with respect to this. This has been...and also, I want to thank Councillor Mayes as well. I mean, this is a new portfolio for Councillor Gilroy and a heavy file, at that, to inherit. I want to thank all the members of the Property and Development Committee. Of course, all the members of Council that I know have been part of the dialogue in recent months and certainly in recent weeks. In particular, I know our Finance Chair has also put a lot of time and energy into this as well as pretty much every member of Council. This is an important project for our city. If and when this is built, it has...it will have a very positive and I believe transformative benefit for our downtown. Certainly, I recognize the conditions upon which in Councillor Gilroy's motion there are substantive conditions about what we are getting as a municipality and as a city for

the additional support which is substantive. Obviously, we need to continue to see what happens from provincial and federal governments. But I just want to applaud the leadership and the efforts of Councillor Gilroy and look forward to hearing her speak about her motion which I'll be supporting.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Gilroy, your opportunity to speak to the item and introduce your motion.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you Madam Speaker. I think what you're seeing in front of you today is a really good mix of what we want to see as a city. I think, most of us that I heard from, really want to see this project go forward. I think in what we heard, of the concerns, was how was it going to go forward? What were the costs? Where were we going to get the money from? And what did we want to see with the project? I think the motion I have in front of us here today covers a lot of everyone's concerns. We are making it now to that $20 million ask that they wanted. We have found a way to incorporate and give them some insurance, some funding being up front which is what they requested, with some money from the community centre...for the community centre, for the streetscaping, for the transit improvements and with some reimbursement from permit and planning fees. So we actually have a way of actually paying for this cost and it's here in front of us. Many of you know the importance of this project going forward. I've talked to many of you, so I know that you understand the importance of having more density in our downtown so we can get more people to live, work and play downtown. That's critical. When we take a look at safety and making sure that we have a viable downtown...if you look at other downtowns across the country, and globally, they all have a really healthy, safe and rich downtown where people do live downtown. And one of the things that I did notice with COVID, so many people moving out, working from home, is that it is dead. So we need people to be living in our downtown. And our TIFF was originally started so that we could have investments into our downtown, so that was what the TIFF was for. We also...this is a different project where we take ownership in some of what we're talking about here today with North Forks Portage, we're part owner in it. So we do have to make sure that we're looking at not only the best interests of what we can do to improve our downtown, but also make sure that the public money that we're investing into this project is going to happen in the best interests of the public. And that's what we're assuring here with some of the things we're requiring with the community centre, with the streetscaping, with the transit improvements, by making sure that there is affordable housing. So I think that...I'll save some for the close, but what is important is, in this motion, we have a way to pay for that. They have some insurance for some upfront costs and we're also ensuring what we want to see as a city with affordable housing, and some of the streetscaping that we want to see within the downtown to make this project the wonderful project that all Winnipeggers can enjoy. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Councillor Klein to introduce your motion and speak to the item.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. First and foremost, I'm certainly in support of helping this development go forward. And I'm certainly pleasantly surprised that the leadership went from $5 million to $20 million in less than a few hours. But I don't think it's enough. I think we have to look at the facts. The Starlight group has been very clear that a TIFF over 20 years doesn't work. It just doesn't work. And we need to look at this from a different set of lenses. Development of Portage Place Mall...and I know, you come back, if you don't vote for this, you don't develop this, you're not in favour of that...I am. I'm not in favour of risking the development of Portage Place Mall on a motion that clearly doesn't really give them what they want. We can spin it to say we're giving them the $20 million, but over 20 years on an investment of $400 million or whatever it might be, is not going to be beneficial to any organization. I don't think that we've been clear with them on what happens with combined sewers. You know, have we been open and up front about that and the issues they're going to face with that? There is over $70 million in benefits with this project alone. Upgrades that the city has asked for. Changes to our downtown after years of failing to make real impact. We keep talking about the community centre and we know it's not a community centre. A common area, community area. Still good. We'll take that. But if we're going to do this, and we all believe what you're saying, that we want this to happen, this motion is not going to be enough. And then what do you say? What happens when they come back and say, thanks, but no thanks, we're going to move on? Because they don't have to do the deal in Winnipeg. That's what I'm wanting you to think about. Pretend it's somebody else speaking. Look at it from the perspective that this organization, their executive said, can't do a TIFF. Can't do 20 years, it's not enough. We're going to have $3.6 billion in new economic activity over 10 years from ongoing operations. That's $325 million in GDP during construction and development and we're saying, well, the province will get the biggest bang for their buck. Come on. It's one taxpayer. It's one city. Once that is built, the Bay goes. We'll see people wanting to move in there. We'll see people wanting to build downtown. We'll see more vibrancy downtown. We'll have...we know, there has been over 20 people that the city approached to buy Portage Place Mall and they didn't want it. They walked away. And I know a lot of people will say, oh, we can't give money to billion dollar companies. They're making an investment that if you think they're going to get $400 million back and they're going to make this huge profit in a matter of three or four years, my goodness, come on. That's not going to happen. This is not about bricks and mortar, this is not about politics. They are going to create a new community. We have to be bold. We have to have vision of what that is going to be and what that's going to mean to us when it's all said and done. When we drive downtown. When we see a new life created. You know, we've made deals with companies to attract development downtown in the past. We don't have to mention their names. It was worth a lot more than $20 million. And we've made some TIFF deals with organizations that disappear. And

that's all fine, because we have to do that if we're going to be the major city, if we're going to actually become the million-person city and be a big player, we have to be able to negotiate that. We have to be able to provide incentives for large organizations to come here. We have to. It's the way of the global world. It's the globe right now. You have to be competitive. You heard them say they get incentives. I'm not willing to gamble the loss of this development on the motion. I respect Councillor Gilroy. I've tried talking to her about this. I've gone to her to try and see if we can mend the two together. I've done what I can. But I'm asking you, don't take the risk, because in five or six years, you're going to drive down there and it's going to be the same. But this time, maybe it has boards on it. And then what? And what, you're just going to go to the media? We're going to get the media up here and say, we did give them $20 million. They just didn't like the way we gave it to them. I don't want to do that. I want to be open. I want to be honest. And that's why it's…the way that we've written this motion is that when tower one is done, it's $6 million. The next tower is done, people are moving in, $6 million. When the thing is done, $6 million. And nobody here can tell me that we haven't invested more or given more to other corporations in this city to build downtown or in some other areas of our city. That's okay. It's okay. If there is a benefit. And the benefit...you know, I use the term ROI all the time, and I hear everybody else now, great, but ROI is not always just revenue. ROI can also be the social benefits that you gain. Your investment leads to a return on social improvements. It's a term they use it on Wall Street. We need to be thinking about this from a different perspective. $20 million, this is a risk. The other motion is a risk. And I think we can be better than that. We can put this forward. And we can see this development bring the change that we need to downtown. That we all want. But what we've done...you know what we've done, right? We've created a division amongst our own council chamber. That's what we've done. It's this side for this motion, this side for that motion. Not…not, okay, what do these guys want? We're forced to negotiate a multimillion dollar agreement as a city council we can't even extend the time to ask more questions. Well, we've heard enough. That's great debate. Please don't let this slip away. It's not because of me. If you want to take my name off the motion, please, go for it, do it. But we need to save this development. We need to save this. We need to be able to say to these people, look them in the eye, say, yes, we want you in our city, we're going to work with you to be in the city, we're going to make this happen, because we're going to save money in public safety. We're going to drive more business to our downtown. We're going to see people living in our downtown. We're going to have a grocery store in our downtown. We're going to have 24/7, 365 public washrooms. We're going to have a community area. That's why we need to support this. We don't have to play politics with this one. We can't be foggy on the ROI. We can't. I know everyone is going, where do we get $20 million? I get it. Are you prepared to talk to voters in 2022 when boards are up at Portage Place Mall? And that's...I mean, I know I can talk for hours, it doesn't really matter here. But I'm asking you this time, please, consider what we're doing here. You're taking a gamble on what could be one of the biggest developments...probably the biggest development for our downtown. True North has done a great job. They can't do it on their own. So I'm asking you to consider this project. Consider this motion. It gives a percentage. Let's knock it up to 10% if you want for affordable housing. But please listen to what they were saying and don't think, don't let the public service or anybody else say to you, oh, they're a big company, they have tons of money. It's an investment. Just like you would make an investment. And they're not going to get their money back tomorrow or in five years or 10 years. Yes, they're going to make money on it. That's going to happen. But so will we. But more importantly, look what we're giving to the people of Winnipeg and downtown. So I have all the respect in the world for Councillor Gilroy and this is her ward and I know she wants this. I'm fighting so that we can put this in Councillor Gilroy's ward. I think you're taking a gamble by going with the other one. No disrespect to those that wrote it, to His Worship, the Mayor, or to Councillor Gilroy, but I think they're going to say no to that and then we have something else we have to deal with right after. Because I heard them. Thanks.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Wasn't quite ready. But I didn't get a lot of sleep last night thinking about this whole high noon situation that we're in, Madam Speaker. Before I get started, though, I just really want to thank Councillor Gilroy for really trying to make this happen. It's a lot of work. I'm sure she didn't get a lot of sleep as well. Trying to figure out how an asset...Portage Place is in a way failing. It is part of north Portage. It's not just north Portage unto itself. This construction and investment in a renewal is something that will inspire other private sector investors and things to do things in the north Portage area like other investments have happened in the SHED District and that. But I don't want to get tied up in a debate. I also wanted to thank Councillor Klein for working really hard at trying to work this out. I thought he had a very good idea. It definitely is the one that I'm sure the preference from Starlight would be. But there is issues...anyway, there is a whole bunch of issues and Councillor Gillingham, of course, who worked with Councillor Gilroy, trying to figure out how the money works, because, Councillor Gillingham is the person that the Mayor has charged with trying to figure out finances. So I just wanted to start that Madam Speaker. I'm going to need more than ten minutes. But Madam Speaker, I had to think about back when I supported moving ahead with this deal as Council did, as a shareholder of the Forks North Portage Corporation. A publicly held corporation of three levels of government. In other words, Portage Place, north Portage, that whole project, that whole thing, is actually a public asset. There is...the land is a lease. Cadillac Fairview built it and the original deal was it looked like they were going to be the people who managed the whole commercial mall thing and was going to earn the net profits and stuff on that, but the reason that Forks North Portage, there was a public corporation created, is because three levels of government invested a huge amount of money in it in the first place. And I had great concerns, because I thought, well, we ended up with it, the public, three levels of

government, Madam Speaker, we were ending up with it. And what this is, is actually having Starlight come in and I really appreciate them. They are a very good, very fine, prudent, smart corporation. Private sector. There is no doubt about it. I've had meetings and discussions with them. You know, I don't find them to be shady or anything. They're in business, Madam Speaker. They're a very good business as you can tell with their North American profile. But this is what you call privatization of public land. And where we are at today...and we're talking about this $60 million because there is a public good with what Starlight wants to do, but it's already a publicly good and we, the corporation, actually could move ahead and actually renew it themselves. And put out an RFP for something different for a builder or we have not-for-profit corporations in this city who know how to build towers. To build affordable housing, Madam Speaker. It could be continued to be a publicly held and publicly benefit project. The $60 million is on the table and, Madam Speaker...sorry, I'm getting a little carried away. But, Madam Speaker, the leader of Council, the Mayor, knew about this I'm sure when the first pitch happened. This is an intergovernmental publicly held $69 million deal for Forks North Portage. They are the vendor. We are the shareholders. And the Mayor is the intergovernmental representative and I find it very hard to believe that our mayor, our leader, didn't know about this back in January when the pitch was made to all three levels. And so, what's happened? I listened to the discussion and debate at EPC. We had seminars. And you know, I cannot believe that answers we should be able to get were not even there. I asked what is the expectation of Starlight in terms of when do they need the money? They don't want all $20 million up front, but they want it before construction is finished. But our administration couldn't even answer that. And you know who the leader is. So the CAO and the Mayor, the chief officer of the city of Winnipeg, they know about it. What is the direction? Councillor Gillingham...well, both Councillor Gillingham and Gilroy, Madam Speaker, look at the position our leader of Council has put them in. Desperate to see a renewal where one is needed, Madam Speaker. So when I think about this, that this is a privatization. And I'm looking at the proposals and I think, you know, there is a good intention here by people to come up and meet the request of Starlight and we're only one level of government. I have to say, I don't know if our leader, intergovernmental affairs, has had discussions with the premier at the time who comes out with an announcement of up to 28. You know? Like really? Like, you know, yes, this is economic development. But we could invest public money in a different way and still see construction jobs. We could see affordable housing. We can find all this stuff. This is not the end of the world. And I am so angry that I am put in this position. Questions like, you know, negotiations for these kinds of things that, you know, as I understand in the private sector, negotiations can take a long time. People say they move fast, but negotiations and getting to a contract and a deal is very intensive, Madam Speaker. So I am put in a position, as a councillor...my full-time job isn't to analyze this and negotiate. We're supposed to have a report come back to us saying whether or not, and how, we can meet the request or demand if you want to call it, of Starlight, who has good intentions to provide public good, but there is other financial implications. There is no negotiation after the fact once you said this is what we're going to give them money. There is no negotiation after to say it will be rent geared to income, which is about $270,000 a unit. If we're saying it has to be 10% or 50, that's $270,000, that's $13 million that we would have to give public money to ensure rent geared to income. If I could have five more minutes, that would be great.

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

Councillor Eadie: Two minutes, okay. You know what. I've made my decision, Madam Speaker. I'm voting no to all of this. Because it's not the end of the world. The Forks North Portage, if the city, the province and the feds invest in north Portage, they can build a project. They can renew what needs to be renewed and done better. Because when I go back to 1990...1988 when I was in business administration, we debated this and I thought, you know, this isn't going to last 50 years, this Portage Place, Madam Speaker. And I was right. And I met with Jim August back in 1998 when I was running and said what where we going to do in the future about Portage Place, which is going to fail in more years? I thought 50. Well, it's 30 years later now, Madam Speaker. 30 years later now. 30 years later now. And you know, we're stuck here. High noon. Got to make a decision because our leaders have helped to put us in this position, but we've been put in this position by the private sector. I say keep it publicly held and I'll be voting against all of this, thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'll be speaking in favour of the motion forwarded by the chair of Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown, Councillor Gilroy and His Worship Mayor Bowman. This motion better reflects the real excitement for this project. Starlight, a business from Toronto, who builds for cities and for people, wants to come here. And in their words, they want to come here to enhance community, inclusivity, sustainability, in this pivotal project, transformative, yes, for the downtown. So, indeed, this council has upped the ante. And that's where I hope we end up today. We've upped the ante. Why? Because life, like poker, has an element of risk, it should not be avoided, really, it should be faced. It should be faced by us, Madam Speaker. In terms of faces, I am very grateful that this council had an opportunity to see, maybe for the first time, Mr. Glen Hirsh, Mr. Josh Kaufman, Mr. Howie Paskowitz, who reflected the community desires to this council. And I'm grateful they could join us. And what I'm very happy about is the variety of diverse stakeholders that they heard from that we...a year ago heard from in this council, and that they reflected for us the welcoming space, the 24/7 safe space, the public amenities, the preservation of commercial, including businesses. Their desires were reflected here today to see, in their words, what takes place inside to be reflected outside

and I'm so supportive of that as a move. It is for the homegrown business owners that I represent, business owners like Melanie from Fresh Cut downtown. A beautiful flower shop. One of the many I frequent. It is the reflection that happens inside her business that should be reflected outside that beauty. The beauty and the theatre and the art of Prairie Theatre Exchange, where my friend Raoul Bhaneja, a playwright performer, natural born bluesman from Toronto, ran his play, Life Death and the Blues. If you saw it, what happens inside Portage Place needs to be reflected outside. And I think today we should all agree on that. Three downtown city councillors are going to stand together today I think. Councillor Santos, myself, Councillor Gilroy. We're going to stand together in this project in Councillor Gilroy's ward. And I think we're going to stand together, it's my prediction, because it reflects the mixed-use rental and community spaces that we ran on and that we fight for in this chamber. And I say, Madam Speaker, stand with us. Stand with your downtown. This motion, the new motion that, yes, gets us to $20 million, that, yes, reflects Starlight's ask, but also critically, it reflects what Winnipeg has been telling us. That Winnipeg has people that believe in the impact, on the strength of their economy and the lives of the people that live within our city, within our city boundary and beyond. It's our duty to reflect that as a council. To step up to the challenge of economic and social development, always. And so, there is very real excitement and there is very real responsibility. I agree we must not gamble. This is an ace. I agree. I agree. As my grandpa used to say, aces are larger than life and bigger than mountains. Another gambling analogy. He also said, keep your cool. Keep your cool, because if you lose your head, you'll lose your chips, Sherri. Starlight has understood Winnipeg's authorship. Our concerns. Downtown safety. This motion does, too. It's a beautifully written motion and I'll tell you why. It knits this project, Madam Speaker, to the fabric of us. It knots in to the budget, our multi-year budget, in symbolic ways. Really symbolic ways. The AT transit improvements. Portage at Edmonton. Portage at Vaughan. The livable walkable streets. Streetscaping. The $5 million Portage Avenue. Carlton and Vaughan. Regional and local renewable street budget. And, yes, $2.1 million in a community centre. A neighbourhood centre. In our downtown. That's remarkable in of itself. That investment is a sign of things to come, I predict. Things to come in terms of leveraging community benefit for community services as part of our city's new three-year recreation and library facility investment strategy from my colleagues, Madam Speaker, who don't understand what happened in the multi-year budget, who didn't hear people come to this council chamber in droves to talk about Portage Place as their community centre. I will repeat that recreation and library facility investment strategy, and I hope that you pay attention to the parks and recreation strategy, Madam Speaker, because if not, just leave it to us. This investment strategy, this isn't going to be the first project that leverages more dollars to build more community spaces in the city. Not just downtown, but elsewhere. More than ever, Madam Speaker...now I might need just a tad more time. More than ever residents want their governments focused on public health, community health, wellness; demanding, demanding of us that the status quo change to advantage and privilege livability, walkability. Businesses want us to dismantle artificial barriers and have higher standards on their elected representatives to ensure work, to ensure the business, environmentals are solid. So this motion, reimburses up to $400,000 in permit and planning fees. It enters into a grant agreement that supports $20 million and a package that comprises of very good support. And why? Simply, it is the indispensable role of the city, indispensable role of the city and the resurgence of us, the middle province, us. Winnipeg. We're not just the centre of Canada. We are a centre of stability. Our numbers, our COVID numbers are not just low. Not just for the CFL, but others are relying on us. People, our residents, our NGOs that have been here to talk to us about this project. Our businesses want to see us stand. Stand shoulder to shoulder with ministers in the legislature, with premier, with PMO and with our mayor to work shoulder to shoulder on their behalf. With respect to this investment. I'm really happy that Starlight...

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

Councillor Rollins: I'm really happy that they're uncompromising with respect to community inclusivity, sustainability, transformational…in this pivotal transformative downtown project, I'm really happy that they're uncompromising. There are strong reasons why this partnership, their engagement needs to, for sure, raise off our pages and technical briefs and our motions and get into the board room and get into the job of negotiating. And some of that is because a year ago people marched to this council and demanded successful reflections of the community. The welcoming space. The amenities. And what needs to take place inside and outside in the place that they call home. It's not just a thousand people, Madam Speaker. It's not just a thousand. Nope. Starlight, I believe, in the manner that they've laid out today will successfully reflect the ambitions, what is happening in the north, what is happening south in Portage Place, on Portage. Those pedestrian links. The permeability. They want, we want, bringing our downtown together. So the downtown councillors stand together. I hope other councillors stand, too. And what I also hope is that we reflect in a stronger way what the downtown stakeholders have written us about. It's contained in a package. All the letters in the package. Whether it's the Downtown BIZ, who states for us that they've long recognized this project is an opportunity to transform our community and become more vibrant, inclusive and economically successful downtown. Whether it is Mr. Mark Chipman in True North Sports and Entertainment, who has without hesitation, considered Starlight's project and the magnitude with sincere hope that the City will assist. Whether it's the YMCA…I'll wrap up

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Let us ensure today we're not leaving anyone or any dollar behind. The best we have is that our workers, our businesses, our values, shape our downtown. Please help to shape our city with your vote today.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move layerover of this item, and both motions until our September Council meeting.

Madam Speaker: The layover motion is in order. All in...no, it's without instructions. So seeking layover of the item and the two motions corresponding with it.

Councillor Lukes: Yes, I believe I have some time to speak to this.

Madam Speaker: Up to three minutes. And it's up to the September Council meeting?

Councillor Lukes: Yes, yes.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: I must say, I'm watching this entire discussion about this file and it's giving me flashbacks. I'm having flashbacks regarding the process that Mr. Mayor led the impact fee file on. Yesterday, Madam Chair, the day before the vote, Mr. Mayor seconded a motion with much new information that defered…that differed from the public services report with no discussion at all with members of Council or an opportunity to meet the public service to discuss. Now today, this morning, Madam Chair, the Mayor is seconding another motion with more new information. There seems to be more new information because there are three full pages. Many councillors have not even had the opportunity to read the motion. Many councillors have no opportunity to ask questions of the public service on this new motion, or the opportunity to scrutinize the commitments that are being proposed using, I think...I haven't read it, the $20 million of taxpayers funding on the $400 million deal. I don't know about other councillors, but I did not receive a phone call or a text from the mover of the motion, or the seconder of this motion. Madam Chair, Mr. Mayor was elected to lead this city. To build a team on council and to enable the Council to make the best decisions possible on how to use taxpayer dollars in the most efficient way possible to create a higher quality of life for all Winnipeggers. Madam Chair, with respect, Mr. Mayor's inability to hire a new CAO illustrates how he is not paying attention to the important files of our city. We should not be scrambling on the floor of council with a new motion after new motion, new information after new information. We should have a comprehensive report before us, outlining the metrics that we are using to base the use of taxpayer dollars on. When the Chair of Finance tells me 15 minutes before the Council meeting started today, that this is not the way we should be doing business, I asked all of you councillors sitting around this table, lay this over. Let's do due diligence, the required due diligence on a file like this, and proper scrutiny on behalf of your constituents, to find out what is being proposed. We heard delegation comments on why they're investing in Winnipeg. Rarely a deal like this comes up. I say to Councillor Allard's comment, such a rare deal like this is worth…worth waiting 60 more days to develop proper scrutiny so all councillors can understand exactly what we are committing to. Madam Chair, Mr. Mayor needs to think long and hard about his ability to do this job because the hallmark of good leadership is to build a team, to work together to anticipate roadblocks and obstacles and steer around them if necessary. This third motion today makes a total mockery of everything. It's very hypocritical, regarding the open and transparent mantra so commonly preached. I ask all of you, is this the way you think we should be scrutinizing the use of taxpayers' dollars, voting on a motion you just saw in the last three hours? We need due diligence to occur and that is why I'm asking for a layover.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. We'll have a vote on that. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to rebut? Okay. Wish to rebut? No.

Mayor Bowman: Sure. I mean, I'll just…yeah. If there is...sure. I mean. I'll just say…

Madam Speaker: Timer, please. The clock, please.

Mayor Bowman: I'll be brief. The due diligence period that has been established between the parties to the transaction of which the City is not, is set to expire on August 27th. So the risk, of course, if we lay the matter over is that due diligence period could expire and the City hasn't made a decision. I wouldn't want that to be the reason that the purchase doesn't proceed. I wouldn't want to aggravate that transaction. Obviously, I would, too, like additional time, but again, we're not a party to the transaction and we're trying to provide a response in advance of that August 27th timeline. And I would hope that the other levels of government are trying to meet that time line as well. I would not support a layover. I would like to make a decision today so that we can provide that clarity to the parties in that transaction in a timely manner.

Madam Speaker: We'll now vote on the layover. I believe there was a call for a recorded vote. I heard that. All in favour of laying this item over up to the September Council meeting, and the corresponding motions, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Lukes, Mayes, Schreyer, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Nays

Councillors Nason, Allard, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 4, Nays 11.

Madam Speaker: The layover motion is lost. Continuing with our debate on this item. Councillor Lukes, do you wish to speak, or I can come back to you? We have Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Schreyer, you are next.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A little bit of history. Let's remember how this all started. We had an era where in the starting of the late '70's going into the '80's, an era that we had stagflation, we had a recession at the same time as we had inflation. We hadn't seen that before in the history of modern western economics. And you know, in our case, right here, we had a problem with Portage Avenue. It happened to be, we had a new government, the poly government, the provincial level government working with the other levels of government to try and transform Portage Avenue. Remember the core area initiative? Remember that era? The core area initiative? This was a part of that. This was a major part of that, a major investment. So what we are doing, and this is a continuation of that plan, of the vision of 35 years ago. So much so, some exaggeration, because the structure of the building was created so they could build two towers on it without having to compromise or having to really change the integrity and change the structure of the building. That was the vision of 35 years ago for doing this. That was in the '80s. Then in the 90s, we had a provincial government that sucked the life out of downtown. What you want downtown for safety, is people. In order for downtown to be safe, you want people. But they changed the legislation for nightclubs so that you could double the capacity and the nightclubs were built around the outside of the city, outside the downtown, things like that, to encourage people not to be downtown. That really happened. If you think I am exaggerating, let me know. Let me know on record. These things happen. Ask the cultural industry downtown, the nightclub industry, the challenges that they have had because of that. So, we've got a challenge, we've got a problem with this publicly developed, not just public, Cadillac Fairview was involved, as well. A lot of taxpayers' money went into this. Now we have a situation in which we're told to deal with this now because we have a penalty if we don't deal with due diligence. The Mayor kind of called it a due diligence penalty. I don't want to put words in his mouth but in the same sentence, he talked about having to do this now or else we pay a penalty because of due diligence. So, we falter on due diligence. That is not my fault. That is not Councillor Lukes' fault for wanting to postpone this decision till September. It is not Council's fault but it is a fault, I'm going to call it a fault, because already the primary leadership of city hall knew about this in January. If there is any ambiguity about that, we know for a fact that they knew about it by May, two months ago, because we already had a news release from the province of Manitoba, dated May 16th, that they are already putting money in this because they are already in negotiations. We knew about this for months. Who is we? People in the council chamber? Why didn't they tell me? I've got to vote on it. I've got to show due diligence. Who is stopping me from showing due diligence? Was every member of this Council in a position to show due diligence? No, because some people here at city hall didn't do due diligence, they didn't show due diligence and they sat on this for months. Perhaps as long as six months. Now, we found out about this last week. EPC dealt with this last week. We just had…the councillors just had a seminar three days ago so we don't count in weeks, we count in hours. We count 72 hours, something around 70 hours for us to show due diligence on something that is humongous, transformative. I am not denying that. But I am supposed to show due diligence. But the funny thing is, there is a penalty. I didn't make up these words. We have to show due diligence by August, otherwise we pay a penalty for lack of due diligence. Well how am I supposed to show my due diligence by making my vote today? I can't show due diligence by voting today one way or the other. That is a fact. I don't understand this any more than Councillor Gilroy. Really, she doesn't understand it any more than I do. Now, f that is offensive to Councillor Gilroy, that is offensive to me. Because the reality is, there are questions we asked the administration in the last three days that they couldn't answer. There are questions that we asked Starlight today that they couldn't answer. I really want to vote for this. I think there's some great things. I want something like this, but I am supposed to show due diligence. Due diligence is so important to this there is a clause in this that we pay them if we don't show due diligence by making a decision. Is due diligence an expression of making a decision today? Is that an expression of due diligence? No, due diligence is an expression of due diligence. Making the right decisions. To show due diligence today, according to the Mayor, is that we make the decision today even when we can't get responsible questions answered. I am not saying this is a bad deal. I don't know to what extent the investments are worth it. That is the problem. That is

due diligence. But we're told today, due diligence is voting on it today. I have never heard that before in my life. We're told to show due diligence; we make our vote today or we get penalized. I have never heard that in my life. And if someone has heard that before, let me know. I am sure there are agreements where they say, there is a penalty if you don't make a decision by a certain time. Yeah, okay, it happens. But in this case, Madam Speaker, we didn't do due diligence because we knew…some people here knew for…well, let's count down. How many months? How many weeks? 20 weeks? Over 20 weeks. I am supposed to make a decision in a couple of days. Madam Speaker, I am to supposed to make a decision in a couple of hours. And I asked some questions today. We don't know for the investment…the extra investment, but I am not only creating the taxpayer, creating the infrastructure here, I asked in terms of the investment, the extra investment the City would put in, in terms of…we're talking about affordable housing, what's the equation? It was asked. It was not just me. Didn't Councillor Eadie say, what is the equation? Well, they couldn't answer. But that's in the...the last three days for us to show due diligence, these are the questions we ask and get answers for. The administration's been on this for months. They couldn't answer us. How is it possible that we're in a position to show due diligence when we can't get these simple answers…simple questions answered? I did make the point and tried to help Starlight out this morning by making the point that in terms of affordable housing and the proportional investment from the City, what does the city get for it, in terms of the cost of the public housing units? What would be the rent? They couldn't answer. I helped them out. I'm saying between, you know, the CMHC and Starlight there in Toronto, it often is a standard for these things when it comes to national standards for costs and stuff. I let them know, to their relief, that it could be back the fact that…

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

Councillor Schreyer: It could be. Winnipeg would be half the cost of Toronto. It wouldn't cost as much to have affordable housing in Winnipeg. They didn't know that. They couldn't work with that ratio. They couldn't answer my question, therefore, they did not know how many affordable housing units they'd have and they didn't know how much the rent would be. That is the extent of our…that's a major extent of our involvement here. I am supposed to show due diligence. It was just said in this council that it was a due diligence issue here. Madam Speaker, the due diligence here, in terms of the clauses, we have got for…three days, Council's got to make a decision, otherwise there is a penalty. Madam Speaker, the lack of due diligence is not by me. I voted in favour of Councillor Lukes' motion to delay this, so we can show due diligence. I have to say, I can't. The administration didn't show due diligence to me, and neither did Starlight. I am not blaming Starlight. I should have been able...because you know what? They shouldn't have to answer my question right away. I think Starlight deserves time to answer our question in terms what they think the cost of the affordable housing units would be, because of what they think their monthly rent would be. How many units they would therefore have. We are talking about affordable housing but we don't know. Of course, there is going to be some, because we're going to pay for it – the taxpayers of Winnipeg. The taxpayers are going to, I know that. It is a question to be accountable for that tax money, how much? Well, they can't answer that question. I think they deserve due diligence, Madam Speaker. I think they deserve the time to show due diligence. We have only had three days to ask these questions of the administration and Starlight. That is not fair to the people of Winnipeg. That's not even fair to Starlight or the City Council. The fact that, Madam Speaker, we need to show due diligence and we can't by voting today on something because of what is called due diligence clause. The irony of it. Madam Speaker, let's show some caution, some responsibility, some accountability. Let's show some due diligence, real due diligence, and I think what we can do is not vote for this and inevitably, it would be postponed for another day. That would be responsible, that would be due diligence, and everybody would know what we are talking about.

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

Councillor Mayes: Madam Speaker, I'll try to be factual, I'll try to be calm. I've rarely been this angry at a Council meeting, but I'll try to be calm. The process has been a disaster. The process has been disgraceful. It's been an embarrassment, frankly; but I will come back to that. The three things possibly positive out of all of this; we've got a private sector investor. I don't think we should be more excited that they are from Toronto than if they were from Winnipeg. But we do have a private sector that wants to do something at Portage Place, and I think maybe, there is something that could be worked out over time. Number two, I have always been a champion of downtown vibrancy by trying to keep the Goldeyes around; so some of the same people who are upset by the subsidy for Goldeyes and demanded more disclosure have said that this subsidy for this downtown project is okay. I have been willing to go to $5 million as the staff recommended. I have been willing to go to $5 million. I hope when we get back after have all sorts of…I mean, I've been in five years of negotiations with the Goldeyes and demanded all sorts of financial disclosure, I hope people keep that in mind. That is a local investor who doesn't have $14 billion in assets. We should look then…we could say, oh, we don't subsidize, it's a multi-million dollar subsidy. It would seem here, and this is likely to pass, that this is a multi-multi-million dollar subsidy. The third piece of good news is our financial crisis is over. This is good news for my ward and others, I think, because there is no credibility left in saying to people we are in a financial crisis when we were able to find from $3 million to 11. Yesterday, I had a long run, and ran for an hour this morning thinking about how to talk with that that 11. How to talk about the public art. It all changed and that is really what I want to talk about. So, I am excited by that, that the financial crisis is over. I talked to Councillor Santos a bit about this, as well. That is very exciting and certainly, my ward, which has seen

hundreds and hundreds of lot splits, the minute you approve things you will have more friends. Well, certainly, if we have the localization of benefits, as we have here, I'll certainly look forward to localizing some of the benefits from intensification from my ward. Surely, we don't just have it at this one location. But let us turn to the process. We keep hearing this is what the public wants. The public has not seen this. I did not see this until after 8:30 this morning. Yesterday we were at $11 million, today we're at $20 million. That long analogy about poker playing didn't quite ring true to me because three days ago when we had the Council seminar, we were at $5 million, yesterday we were at $11, today we're at 20. Not very good poker playing when the other side hasn't moved. They are probably going to come back and ask for more. They did at the Forks when there was a TIFF. We didn't ask for anything in return. They'll probably…if we moved three times with nothing in return, they are probably going to come back for more. I can't blame them. I am glad they are willing to invest, but I've been told many times, here over the years, that we don't walk things on. In the bad old days, things were walked on at the July meeting. So, two days ago we were at $5 million. There is a staff report here, if anyone bothers to read the thing. And my thanks to councillor…to Mr. Kiernan, "The reality that the direct financial benefit accrued in this is limited in both its present value as well as its growth potential. An equal level of financial support from each level of government is un-merited." I was willing to go to $5 million with some reluctance, it talked about the benefits and it worked hard, Mr. Kiernan did to find $5 million in benefits. That's where we were two days ago. We then had an hour-long Council seminar with Councillor Klein endlessly saying, should it be 20? Should it be 20? No, it should be five. It should be five. That is what the public service…Mr. Jack did a very good job there. Somehow in two days we have evolved in our poker playing style from $5 million to $20 million. What are we getting for that? Well, it's the exact same thing that was there all along. Staff recommended $5 million. We have suddenly gone to $11 million and now $20 million. As Councillor Lukes says, we are the open and transparency people and we have gone that much, no public debate. We keep hearing, this is what the public wants. How would we know? How would they know? This thing wasn't even made public until 9:00 in the morning. So we've had no public input on this, at all. It is $20 million. Man, I had a guy upset with me that we cut $3,000 from Save Our Seine, a guy in our ward. But it was a financial crisis we had to cut all these grants 10%. Man, he was angry with me. But we found $8 million last night, so I guess the crisis is over. So freedom. Wonderful. I have to say, we really haven't negotiated with any skill here and it is a disappointment. I think something good could have come of this. I'm going to vote no. I would have voted for the 5. The 11, here's the explanation I got yesterday for the 11. We have to get the total up to 40, so if we go to 11 and the province is at 29, then it's 40. They've only asked for 40. 11 plus 29 is 40. Okay. Today we are at 20. We are giving more than they asked for according to logic yesterday, which was, we have to get to 40. That was the logic on the 11. Now it's suddenly, we're at 20. Yes, it would have social benefits. So would projects elsewhere in the city. So would many other projects. These people have $14 billion in assets. We've cut all sorts of things in the most recent budget. We talked about certainty being a part of that budget. Here we are a few months later, we're finding, out of a yet to be approved strategy, $2 million for a community center and let's keep calling it a community center because that makes it sound more grandiose than it actually is. It is a community space, even the investors said that. It is not a community center. What is the operating cost? It'll be on us. Do we know what it is? We have no idea. I am not too sure that fits into our certainty agenda. So, the process has been truly flawed. I don't know if we're above 20 now…I feel there should be a tote board or something indicating what we are at. I had questions about the profitability, couldn't ask as we were cut off during question period. I had questions about their public art plans. Couldn't ask because we cut off the questions. When the process is, the people on the other end don't even know – they don't even know how much money we are proposing. When Councillor Gilroy says, yeah but we're amending it, we want to give you 20, and they go…first we have heard of that. Does that not give everybody a bit of a pause? Does that not concern you? They don't even know how much money we're offering then we end the question period. So no, I don't think that is being open and transparent. I don't think that's being responsible to taxpayers. I have a couple more comments, I will need a brief extension, I think, Madam Speaker. The eyes…well, we are not there yet. I have heard now and I'm going to keep saying it, eyes on the street is a Jane Jacob's concept. It relates to pedestrian-scaled low-rise development from her street. From eyes on the street, she explicitly talked about que-bossiers and apartment towers and how they turn their back. To come in and say, we'll have eyes on the street, because we're building big apartment towers, and that'll drive down crime and therefore drive down your police budget is, I have to say, a bit untruthful or misleading, might be a more charitable characterization. To come in and say as the developers did, and they're willing to in some bring money, and kudos to them, to come in and say, the community has spoken. Well, I've got to say, my community has spoken here many times on intensification in lot splits. Hundreds of names on a petition, request for studies for heritage status, all voted down every time. So, I think we need to start looking at different neighborhoods and try to treat them alike.

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

Councillor Mayes: So anyway, I will be coming back later seeking what transit improvements, public art allowances and community center improvements I can get for my ward because the financial crisis appears to pass because we found $8 million overnight and $9 million the day before. Was it or 9 and 8? I can't even keep track, Madam Speaker. The community has spoken is a nice thing and I envy Councillor Gilroy, and she's done good work here. And she's going to get a pretty good project, it looks like, for her ward. That's great. I just wish and hope and request people pay some respect as well to the people from my ward when they speak. That is all I am seeking. Councillor Allard had some fun with me once saying, well, you're getting all that additional benefit in your ward, you could run a bus line out to Sage Creek. Well, no, it hasn't

worked that way. If people want to start allowing councillors who are getting intensification some return for their wards, that would be great. That would be a good project. There are a number of them, but we haven't been doing that today. I want to conclude with a sentiment from 2014 from then candidate Bowman – and I'm not trying to embarrass the Mayor here. I am trying to make a point. The mayoral candidate said, he announced a plan that would enable city planning staff to take on a larger role in city developments in order to decrease the amount of political opportunism in development projects – ouch! I was a part of that group. We have seen too many times where particular developers or councillors have been given special treatment. So here we are today, we're going to…we're not even going to wait for our strategy on the recreation. We're going to give $2 million. We're not going to wait on the TIFF strategy, we're not going to give millions of dollars under the TIFF. We are not going to wait for any of that. We're not going to ask them how profitable they are. We're not going to wait for the public to weigh in. We've seen too many times where particular developers or councillors have been given special treatment. I kind of agree with candidate Bowman there. So, I'm not trying to embarrass the Mayor. I am trying to say this has been rushed upon us. They've out played us, in a poker sense, very badly and we have completely caved, and I'm going to vote no, because I think we can do better.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I won't need the full eight minutes; or 7:56 or 7:55 - no. This has been one of those conversations that I am glad to see that we are all having the debate and we're all having the conversation here. But we need to get a deal done. This is a $400 million investment needed in our inner-city. It's a partnership between three levels of government. The addition of a new grocery store downtown in a food desert to help those that are buying their groceries at the local 7-Eleven or Mac's store in their neighborhood. This allows them to come together in a space where they can get fresh produce that helps their families. It is also going to spur additional development. When I look at the Bay downtown, and Councillor Klein and I had a quick conversation about this, you know, looking at that asset downtown, perhaps it will spur on additional development downtown as well. That is great for the city. When I look at the Hydro building – and again, I mentioned this earlier, the Hydro building that was built to increase foot traffic at the mall. The downtown arena and the connections in the pedestrian corridor that was built to spur foot traffic to the mall downtown. The addition and upgrade to the Winnipeg Art Gallery, that is coming online within the next year or so, are all assets that will all help bring people downtown. A $400 million investment, including 500 rental suites will bring people downtown. He talked about…earlier about subtext concepts – crime prevention through environmental design. But there is also the crime prevention through social development. Having those partnerships downtown and there are many. They talked about the Downtown BIZ, the YMCA, the True North, Downtown Safety Partnership, Winnipeg Construction Association, which would be involved, all have been consulted and speaks to the virtues of getting this deal done. The signs of healthy downtown is a vibrant downtown. And as we increase our population towards a million people, we need this kind of housing in our downtown area to spur the healthiness and wellness of our communities. This is a shovel-ready project. It's ready to put workers back to work post COVID and help our economy. So again, I implore my Council colleagues to consider supporting this. Yes, there are elements of it that, you know, we are still trying to workout those pieces of it, but I am confident in the report that Councillor Gilroy and Councillor Gillingham have worked on to bring us to where we are at right now. And again, it is an important investment for our downtown and a necessary investment for our downtown. So thank you very much.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker. I rise, I will be supporting motion…the amending Motion 2. I want to thank Councillor Gilroy and the Mayor for their work on that. I will not be supporting Motion 3. I am primarily concerned about providing cash to Starlight upfront with no funding sources identified in the motion. I think we all probably wish that we were at a different place, that the process had been somewhat different. Nonetheless we are at the last Council meeting before we take a break and before the August 27th deadline that we see is part of this project. We have to make a decision. When I was looking through this, I started reflecting on a matter of values and really started asking the question what value do I have? What value does this council have? What value do I place on maintaining the momentum that we see in the downtown? The True North development, the arena, the redevelopment of an expansion of the Convention Center, 330 Main. There are so many other things, even the decision that we made not that long ago, to change the parking rates, to try to get people to come downtown once again. What value do we place…do I place, I won't speak for anyone else, what value do I place on making sure that the momentum that we have seen of investments in downtown continues. What value do I place in seeing that property that is in question - the Portage Place property, redeveloped to something other than it is currently? What value do I place in seeing investors from outside of Manitoba? They could be an investor in Manitoba, like Councillor Mayes said, but this is not. This is investment Mowa Capital, outside of Manitoba, who have an interest in making an investment, a significant investment of hundreds of millions of dollars, over years, into our city. I value all of that and I think probably many of us do as well. Then you start to think what price tag do we put on this particular property? What price tag do I put on this value? Of course, I'm like anyone else; if I can get more for less, I am happy. But we need to make an investment. So, the $11.3 million related to tax increment financing – tax increment financing is, of course, a tool we used in the city many times, and I would refer my councillor colleagues to a September report, of the Standing

Policy Committee on Finance from 2019, where our staff laid out the tax increment financing programs that we have had in the past. They included a list including a TIFF program roll-up of all the different entities and program needs, the terms, the years of grants, the value of each one; and you can see there that certainly we are not in chartered new territory, as Councillor Gilroy said, the tax increment financing program was put in place, really for you know, inspire investment in the downtown. If you take a look at the OurWinnipeg, the current OurWinnipeg guiding document that we have, you'll see several times, it talks about the summer of economic priority areas, and number one, downtown investment attraction. Investing in residential development, addressing the critical gap in residential units in Winnipeg's downtown, attracting investment for residential development projects and it goes on and on to talk about the sports and hospitality entertainment district. It talks about other ways for to inspire investment downtown. Here we have someone who wants to invest; is considering investing in our downtown. What value do we place on that? By looking at this amendment that has been proposed before us, in Motion 2, we have the tax increment financing offer as a grant of $11.3 million that will continue to spur that kind of investment. And then, by taking a look at some of the public amenities that are proposed in this project and by the city assuming the build of those or...the funding of those, it is something that I can defend. I can defend the city spending money to invest in streetscapes through future budgets. I can defend the city investing money to enhance the transit service and transit assets in that area. Those are public spaces. We can defend that. And so, when we take a look at the motion that's before us, Motion No. 2, I remind you…I counted them up, there are 13 clauses in the motion and each one of them has some condition in it, where it's like to a maximum; conditional on, conditional on, conditional on, up to, up to, up to, up to, maximum amounts. Grant agreements put in place, other agreements put in place, to protect interest of the city through the agreements put together, terms and conditions deemed necessary by the City Solicitor, of Legal Services to protect the interests of the city. And finally, the $20 million support package shall comprise maximum support and include a requirement that Starlight execute a minimum $40 million purchase and redevelopment of the Portage Place Mall as per Starlight's business plan. And so, is it perfect? No, it is not perfect but we are at this hour, and we're trying to put something together that continues the momentum of investment in downtown, that I believe, is reasonable that we can defend, and it is something that is reflective of a $20 million package…in the value of $20 million, that I believe this developer…if this passes, this developer, I believe, can work with this and make a significant investment in our city.

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

Councillor Lukes: This is my opportunity to speak on this and I will be very short. I want to make it clear and we have heard today from so many, that I too, believe the opportunity for the rehabilitation and investment in downtown is critical. Without a doubt this building will not be a panacea to all of the challenges that we have downtown. There absolutely are incredible opportunities. I am simply not supporting the use of taxpayer dollars by voting on a motion, that landed on my desk this morning, that I have not even read. I am tired of…enough of this hour, it's the deadline, the end if we don't vote on it today, nonsense. I recall during the impact fee debacle, that we were called back from prorogue. I was at a cottage at a lake. I had to drive in multiple times for meetings. We are voting later on our prorogue due date today. There should be no reason why we can't have more due diligence done on this report and come back and have a special meeting in August prior to the deadline to make an informed decision.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Any further speakers? Yes, I see that. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, I would like to move that this matter be laid over and a special meeting be considered for August 12th.

Madam Speaker: Okay, the only concern I see with that is that we don't have a special meeting slated for August. I'm not certain about that because we don't have a date set. A date can be set during prorogue by the majority of Council, and no date is set, currently. Mr. Clerk, did you want to weigh in?

City Clerk: Agreed. Our prorogue period is from July 24th to September 1st. Our Council is the one who can change that. So Council could vote, theoretically, on the layover but then you would also have to vote for calling a special meeting as well.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, did you have a date? I didn't hear a date.

Councillor Nason: I did mention August 12th.

Madam Speaker: Okay, August 12th. That would be in order. So, Councillor Nason has moved layover of the item and the corresponding motions, to a special Council meeting that would take place on Wednesday, August 12th.

Councillor Schreyer: Would we have to thus explicitly mention in the motion, that we would postpone prorogation until the day after that day?

Madam Speaker: Postpone the prorogue? The prorogue, as I understand, it would be in place. This is just a special meeting on that particular date, that's it. No other meetings would be authorized to take place.

Councillor Orlikow: Chair, if I can ask a point of order. I am not sure, did we already vote to have this motion put forth?

Madam Speaker: We did vote on Council prorogue earlier this morning, but the motion is still in order because Council is supreme. By nine votes we could hold a special meeting.

Councillor Orlikow: Sorry, to clarify; didn't we already have a motion that was to have a layover?
Madam Speaker: To refer, but this is a different motion with different instructions, so it is in order.

Councillor Orlikow: To refresh my memory, if it's with instructions, how does that work?

Madam Speaker: It was a different speaker and it was a different meeting date. This is in order, it's a different motion completely. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Just for clarification, Madam Speaker; it is with instructions so therefore it is debatable, is that correct?

Madam Speaker: No, it's not debatable.

Councillor Eadie: It's with instruction.

Madam Speaker: I'm sorry?

Councillor Eadie: It has an instruction, right? No.

Madam Speaker: It is a layover as was noticed to August 12th. Yes, call for recorded vote. Motions on the floor. Yes?

Councillor Santos: I need some clarifity from the Clerks on the process of a layover with instructions with a special meeting.

Madam Speaker: The motion is on the floor. Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: I can't vote on something if I don't understand the process.

Madam Speaker: Okay, I will explain if you sit down. Thank you. Councillor Nason has called for layover of this item and the corresponding motions, two motions, to a special meeting of Council that will take place on Wednesday, August 12th at 9:30 in the morning

Councillor Santos: I would like to know then, what does gets appeared on that agenda item?

Madam Speaker: Just this item.

Councillor Santos: Just this item? Together with the two amending motions?

Madam Speaker: That's correct.

Councillor Santos: Together with the report? And that is it?

Madam Speaker: That's correct. Well, maybe if there's further amendments to the motions they certainly can be brought onto the floor. Its no different from this meeting that's taking place today, but it is the one item that we would be debating. So the motion in order. Call for recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Nason, Eadie, Lukes, Mayes, Schreyer, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Nays

Councillor Allard, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you, the motion is lost. Are there any other speakers on this item? Okay. Seeing none, Councillor Klein, it is your opportunity to close on your motion.

Councillor Klein: Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. There were some lovely words around the chamber today, some very passionate words around the chamber today. Very good words by Councillor Gillingham and such all about investment and we're dedicated to it. All of which is meaningless if Starlight says no. We've heard from Starlight no. We are hearing now from Starlight, no. Not doing the TIFF, not going to go with the $11 million over 20 years. It is not enough. I want to thank Councillor Mayes, because he is right. I have been…during the little seminar meeting, one hour thing that we had, I kept saying they want $20 million. They are making it very clear. I was told no. I am used to that here. So it went from 5 then to 11 and now its 20, kind of, because now we can stand in front of the media to say we went to $20 million. Not to their terms. How many of you sat at a table and negotiated a multi-million dollar contract? What if it was your money and this is the response you're getting from an organization, you have had the bid in since January. You are appearing before a council or the board of directors, to vote…someone who hasn't read the new motion yet? Listen, again, please I have asked three times – three times – in this chamber and through e-mails. Just like Councillor Allard said, (inaudible). He can send notes to the public service, so could I, and get questions answered. I never got them answered. Not once. You know that. So, you are all so excited, you're all so dedicated to this process and to this development downtown, what have you been doing for six months? Did you speak to the public service? Did you call the people that are putting the motion forward or making the bid? No. You are gambling on this project. Please do not gamble on this project. Just because you say it is $20 million, it doesn't mean it's $20 million if the other group doesn't want a TIFF. Just because you think it's great. What is great is getting this development going. It's $20 million. Grab a calculator and add up what we have given to a couple of other corporations in the city. You'll need time and it will be a lot greater than $20 million. Ask yourself, if you had $400 million of your own money and you went to an organization almost a year ago that came to you and said, please buy this place because nobody wants it. You are sitting across the table and you were notified the day before that, no, we are just giving you $5 million. And then all of a sudden, you hear out of the blue, well, we'll give you $11 million but on a TIFF. And they say, no. You heard them say no. And now, you come back to say, well, we will give you $20 million, $11 million of it will over 20 years and it's going to be on a TIFF. It is still no. What if you were that organization? You had $400 million of your own money and you were going to invest it into a city, and you didn't get a call from councillors or all the councillors, or the mayor. No one cared. Well, you know, you've just got to talk to the public service. They'll come to us at the last minute and, you know, we'll get up there and we'll either support it or we'll make it at least look good at the end of the day so we can engineer the headlines. Please, they have said no. I would put in the motion that we are putting forward that they cannot ask for another dime. I would make them stick to that. Please don't take a chance on this. You are all so excited. I don't get it. I honestly don't get it. You are all talking about, oh, it's going to be great for the community. It's going to do this, it's going to do that. Not if they say no. Are you prepared to do that? Because when you stand, which I know, it will be a recorded vote, because I'm going to ask for one, and you're going to go with the one they've already said no to, that's on you. That is on all of us at that point. We can't blame that on anybody else. We can't say the big bad company, because they've been pretty clear and pretty honest. This is the corporate world, folks. They don't need to come here. Why would they? When they're sitting there saying, so we wanted to invest $400 million and they're talking about it, on the last day? Please, please consider this vote. Please take politics out of it. Don't gamble with the other motion. Not that it is bad, but it's not what they want. If you want to change downtown, if you want all these great things that you have all talked about, you should have started having this conversation with them six months ago. Now we're ignoring what they're saying because it sounds great when we stand up here and talk about it. This is a negotiation. I agree with everybody including the Mayor. Yeah, it would have been nice to have more time, but it is done. This is it. When you vote, that is it. That's it. They walk. Then what? And I know you…oh no, they are not going to walk out. This is \giving them $20 million. We don't know that. We're getting…this motion is offering 6, 6, and 6, all at deadlines, all with conditions. And as I said, I will put it in there now, you cannot ask for more money. You can't. Let's put it in the motion. Let's do this together. Why are we creating this divide, this party system here? Over $400 million. What a great legacy that will be. I know I am probably talking to myself, but, please, you went from $5 million to $20 million. You know they are not going to take it. They're not. And then what? We can just do this together right now. And if they say no after

that, that is on them. If we put in there no more money and they don't take it, fine, that is on them. You know they are not going to take it. These guys are going to ask all of the questions and them all the residents are going to read their stuff or watch their stuff and ask all the questions – what happened?. Please consider your vote.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thanks Madam Chair. Nobody knows how more important this project is than me. It is in my ward. I have dealt with all the many challenges and I've dealt with many of the possibilities. But when it comes to are you afraid to walk away? I am not because we are in charge of the public money. It's our responsibility to make sure that when we are providing funds we have the funds to do that. In the motion that's here today, we have a way to fund this. We have it highlighted in the motion so people know where we are getting the money from. We have a TIFF which we do with many of our different projects. That is not unusual for the City to provide a TIFF. The amount of the TIFF is not unusual when you look at some of the bigger projects that we've done. I do think this is a wonderful project I really hope that it succeeds but there has to be a limit to what the City can possibly give, too. And I know that I've heard that from many of you that…who are leery about even contributing more than what we did today. This has gotten them…this is a fair and reasonable – fair and reasonable – offer. And on a $400 million, this fair and reasonable offer is not enough for this company to stay, then I have questions on that. I have questions on that…why this is not fair and reasonable offer and why they cannot say with what we've provided. I think we all want to see this project succeed, most of us. I think that we need to know where we are getting the money from. What you see in front of us is where we will get the money from. We have a four year, multi-year budget that's been laid out in front of us, we know what we are doing, we understand some of the challenges that we have with COVID-19. We have to know that we have the money to be able to do this project. So, a TIFF is responsible. It is going with the funding that will be coming from the taxes. Paying for the amenities that we will we be having to take care of in the future, as City amenities, that's responsible. That's reasonable. So I think this is a reasonable, responsible approach. I do hope that Starlight takes this. But I mean, it is not about whatever they offer we're going to give. It's what we can afford and what we can contribute as a city, and what is fair and reasonable. And so, I hope that you support this motion. We have a way of paying for it. It is outlined clearly in here. We have a reasonable, responsible approach that looks at and makes sure that we balance it, the that assets we want, the affordable housing, the assets and amenities that this project will bring, but with…we're being responsible to the public funds that are going into this. I hope that you consider supporting this motion. Thank you

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. That would bring our debate to a close. Councillor Gilroy was the mover. And yes, Mr. Mayor. We are still on EPC agenda.

Mayor Bowman: Yeah, thank. Thanks, Madam Speaker. So firstly, I want to thank everybody for obviously expressing some pretty passionate views around the table on this matter. I want to again thank Councillor Gilroy, who I know had extensive dialogue with many members of Council over the last number of weeks and certainly over the last number of days. The reason why I'm going to be supporting the amendment is, I do support the project. I know most, if not all of us, do want to see a $400 million investment in our downtown proceed. I know those that may be watching today's proceedings may wonder, where was the debate in the legislative building before their $28 million TIFF? You don't see it because their process isn't as open and transparent as ours. You may not know how individual MLAs voted on it because it didn't come to a vote. Our process is the most open and transparent process for any level of government. That means that there is compromise and collaboration that happens when there are matters like this that come forward. My preference would be to give no support. That would be my personal preference. But I also want to ensure that we are doing everything we can to see $400 million be invested in our city. There are a lot of unknowns to date. We don't know if the province of Manitoba is going to step up and provide the requested support that we are now hearing from the developer today, that they're looking for, from the provincial government. I hope the provincial government is able to work collaboratively with them, as well. We don't know the level of support from the federal government. And again, I am hoping the federal government will join in partnership and support an important project here in the city. You know, around the council chamber there are many different views. Some don't want to spend any money on the project, some want to write a blank check. We are trying to find a compromise around the council chamber that folks can live with. And you know, in terms of negotiations, if negotiations are simply saying yes to what the other party wants, I tell ya, I want to be on the other side of the table for that negotiation every day the of week. I for one like the fact that the conditions upon which we are placing for the $20 million worth of support are in black and white. They are made public. Unlike…well I'll just say, they are very clear. Things like public washrooms, things like streetscaping, transit improvements, assistance to reimburse for permitting and planning fees as well as a maximum support of $20 million in the support package that requires Starlight to execute a minimum $400 million purchase and redevelopment of the Portage Place Mall as per Starlight's business plan. It is an important project that I think is worthy of support. I want to thank everybody for their contributions that went into this amending motion. I want to thank of course, Councillor Gilroy, who I know heard from a lot of folks on Council in recent days who were willing to collaborate and have dialogue with her as well as Councillor Gillingham, myself and many others around the council floor. I think it is an opportunity to do our part, and I am hoping that we will be able to show that support. And

then of course, all eyes will turn to other levels of government to see what their level of support may or may not be as we proceed. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. And with that, we will vote on the motions in reverse order. There's a call for recorded vote. We'll first vote on Motion 3, which was moved by Councillor Klein and seconded by Councillor Nason. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Nason, Klein.

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 2, Nays 14.
Madam Speaker: Motion 3 is lost. And now we'll be voting on Motion 2 moved by Councillor Gilroy and seconded by Mayor Bowman. All in favour? Recorded vote. All in favour of Motion 2, moved by Councillor Gilroy, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Allard, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Gilroy, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 2 passes, but I'll call the main item as amended now. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Allard, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Gilroy, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Item 9, as amended, passes. Moving on, Madam Clerk, Item 11.

Item 11 – Anti-Racism Initiatives

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce Item 11.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Our journey of reconciliation and our ongoing goal of becoming a leader in human rights is something that continues to require dedication and focus on. I want to applaud all those that have been rallying to support black lives matter. I want to all thank those that have been participating in our new Human Rights Committee including Councillor Chambers who has been there from the very beginning. We have been having some

difficult conversations and we've been looking for ways that we can continue to build a city in which we can all be proud to call home. Madam Speaker, the anti-racism initiatives that are contained in the motion, I'll allow, obviously, folks to peruse them at their leisure, but among other things, it directs the public service to implement anti-racism and cross-cultural competency training among other substantive actions. I want to thank everybody that have contributed to the process. Councillor Rollins has been a very strong advocate for many of the things contained in this report as has Councillor Santos and many others around the council chamber. I just want to say thank you. It is worthy of support and I also want to acknowledge for all those that are watching these proceedings, that our work doesn't end today. It is ongoing and we remain open to seeing what we can continue to do to build a city that is truly inclusive for all of the residents that reside here.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I stood this down just to make a comment in terms of perspective in terms of human rights. I certainly am in support of the motion. As we all are in terms of general intent. In the general intent of what human rights is about, I guess we all have different perspectives on that and there's always discussion and debate. Ideally, as we move forward in challenging each other, in terms of how we best go about it. We have to ask what is it about? It's about human dignity, self-worth, opportunity for self-actualization unfettered by sheer, mere negative arbitrary rules and perspectives put on other human beings. I am sure if I were to explain this an hour from now or yesterday, I would have explained it in a different way just as everyone here has their own way of expressing what human rights means to them and to all of us. As part of my struggle in terms of human rights, in terms of…if anti-racism is to have a greater legitimacy in terms of policy for government is never to ignore the issue of economic justice. We have social justice and not to ignore the fact that social justice without economic justice, we're not really dealing with human rights. I don't think that is much of a challenge to accept. It is the question of to what extent we're willing to incorporate that into issues of social justice. Well, we have to have economic justice. I say this only because I fear that it can be the case. We deal with issues of human rights in terms of social justice, but we disregard the issues of economic justice, which is social justice. We can forget the economic side of it if we forget about the issues of poverty. If we disregard the issues of economic disempowerment, then are we really dealing with human rights? I will leave it at that for now. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor? I'll call the question then, on Item 11. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 12 – Seven Oaks School Division –Running Facility Upgrades

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

Mayor Bowman: I will defer to Council colleagues who I know are going to speak to this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: This came forward back in the period when we still had a financial crisis, so I was told that there was no money available from the center to do this. Seven Oaks School Division in for a million dollars, more money was needed to complete this project. This is really quite ground breaking. Very important for the north end of the city for the rapidly growing area that you represent, Madam Speaker. I guess I sort of lose out because I could have gotten money from this, what's this thing called? New strategy for recreation, that we just found $2 million from. $2.1 million for the new three-year recreation and library facility investment strategy. This is a recreation investment. Unfortunately, I was unaware that we were already taking money out of that fund at that time. So, I was told that there was no money available due to the again, the financial crisis, which I see has past. In short, thank you Madam Speaker for your support for this. It is been a good project to work on with you. I am pleased to see we're going to be supporting the school division. They don't have $14 billion, but to their credit they are making investment in their local community, didn't ask for provincial help, didn't ask for private sector help. But together with your cooperation, and I thank you for that, we are going to find the money ourselves for this one, not from the recreation strategy. So, here we are, up against the deadline as the Seven Oaks School Division is doing this project and has worked very well with us. And I want to thank Mr. O'Leary from the school division and Bob Summers, who has been the consultant on this, who have worked cooperatively. So we are going to have a facility that is going to rival, if not, exceed the one in my ward. I have mixed emotions about that but it will be a great facility. Most of the costs born by the Seven Oaks School Division, the rest out of ward funding and some money I had from the centre, but Madam Speaker can be very persuasive, so we have been able to find some money out of my ward to backfill that money and so the money's going to come from the center from the budget to upgrade this facility. Unfortunately, not able to fund it from the center due to the situation that was in place at that time, but to the credit of you, Madam Speaker, thank you for your support on this. It's a good project. I look forward to opening it with you some time later this year or next.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm just…I think it is a wonderful project, but I'm getting confused because we call out the province, an awful lot, for not giving us enough money. Not giving us enough money and we are in a financial crisis. We've heard it from the Mayor, from the Finance Chair, from the province, we've heard it from others, they're are not paying for bussing but here we are giving them money to put a facility on their property that they will own. So I'm just trying to figure out, like what is…are we getting enough money from the province, or we have so much we are giving it back? Or do we not have enough money from the province? Not that I don't support the idea. I am really kind of looking for reality, because I hear so many different words about this. I am at a loss. I can't support this.

Councillor Mayes: It is ward funding going in to support our project, the lion's share, which is coming from the school division. So just as we all want things in our wards, working with Councillor Sharma on this one, we are using ward funding.

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

Councillor Eadie: Oh, I thought Councillor Orlikow was going to say something about a point of order?

Madam Speaker: No, he's done. Go ahead.

Councillor Eadie: Thanks Madam Speaker. I, of course, support running tracks. Actually, track and field was my high school thing at St. John's but we never did have an outdoor track at our high school. My kids, of course, living in the Mynarski Ward, still today, went to school at Garden City. So, Madam Speaker, this project is…I compliment, actually, Councillor Mayes trying to promote good athletics and the ability for people to use quality facilities for our kids and youth and not to say that after hours adults can't use it as well, Madam Speaker. So thanks to both of you. It would have been my pleasure to contribute, of course, to Garden City Collegiate which…whose catchment area is in my ward as well. I have supported Seven Oaks. They get athletics. So, I think this is a great facility that the people all over West Kildonan, which is actually Garden City and the Jefferson neighborhoods. They all make up what's called West Kildonan. And Old Kildonan is further out by the West Kildonan Collegiate, which is now in the traditional lands of the colonizers, called Old Kildonan. You know, I think it is good that although it is interesting, that St. Vital will be utilizing some ward things. But I, too, have promoted and supported Seven Oaks School Division athletic efforts because they know that education is more than just about books. It is about the whole experience, athletics to keep the mind sharp and so on. And they have helped. I put ward money into and you did, too, as well, to the Kildonan Golf Course to winterize the clubhouse so that the Seven Oaks School Division could help to pay for the tracking, cross-country ski tracking and stuff that happens there, and so in the winter we have a facility there. Madam Speaker, yourself and Councillor Mayes are helping to provide this better weather. Can you actually skate on an asphalt? Can you ice it and skate on it in the winter? I don't know. Anyway, thanks to both of you for this project.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Mr. Mayor, I can call the question then on item 12? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, we now have Motion 4. Motion 4 is moved by Councillor Klein, seconded by Councillor Nason. It's regarding impact fees and it is an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. Motion 5 is moved by Councillor Nason, seconded by Councillor Mayes; it's regarding renewal of the running track at Bernie Wolfe School, and other properties, it's an automatic referral to Executive Policy Committee. Next is Motion 7, moved by Councillor Chambers, seconded by Councillor Mayes. It's regarding school resource officers and it's also an automatic referral to the standing policy committee…pardon me, to the Executive Policy Committee. Pardon me?

Councillor Mayes: Resource officers is being dealt with today.

Madam Speaker: You are calling for suspension? There you go. Councillor Mayes is calling for suspension. It is a time sensitive matter. All in favour of suspension to deal with Motion 7 today. All in favour? Contrary. We'll note Councillor Klein in opposition, okay, and Councillor Nason in opposition. We've got that. We'll have to have a recorded vote then. I am going to call for a recorded vote then. We'd like…Councillor Mayes has asked to suspend the rules and deal with Motion 7 today. All in favour, please rise. To suspend the rules to deal with Motion 7 today.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Nason, Eadie, Klein.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 3.

Madam Speaker: Motion 7 suspension passion passes. It'll be heard today. Councillor Chambers, would you introduce Motion 7.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS Justice James Edmond ruled that the City of Winnipeg impact fee was an "invalid indirect tax."

AND WHEREAS Justice James Edmond further directed the City of Winnipeg to refund developers and builders, including any interest the funds earned while the city held them reserve;

AND WHEREAS Justice James Edmond directed the City of Winnipeg to "refund the impact fees to persons that made the payments;

AND WHEREAS City of Winnipeg officials have not indicated an appeal will be filed against Justice Edmond's decision;

WHEREAS it would be unlawful to back date tax or fee collections;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Chief Administrative Officer be directed to expedite the repayment to residents, developers, and builders the specific impact fees each paid plus interest within 90 days.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Mayor establish a working group within 90-days comprised of senior administrators, the chair of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development and the members of council representing the top five areas of current home development within the last five years and industry stakeholders to determine an appropriate fee for new home construction development.

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

WHEREAS the City staff reported in 2018 that the City/Qualico Joint Venture had returned profits of $18 million to the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS on April 30, 2014 Council approved that up to $2million of proceeds from the City/Qualico River Park South Joint Venture be allocated to the Jonathan Toews Community Centre expansion project;

AND WHEREAS Council approved in the 2015 Operating Budget in Recommendation T up to $600,000 of proceeds from the City/Qualico River Park South Joint Venture be allocated to the Dakota Collegiate Alumni Field Project.

AND WHEREAS Council approved in the 2020 budget an allocation of $250,000 from the City/Qualico River Park South Joint Venture to the St. Norbert/Seine River ward Land Dedication account

AND WHEREAS the City has realized significant profits in the millions of dollars from two joint ventures in the Transcona Ward (namely Edgecorp- City of Winnipeg Joint Venture and Transcona West Joint Venture)

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that $975,000 of the proceeds from the Edgecorp – City of Winnipeg Joint Venture and the Transcona West Ward Joint Venture be allocated to fund the following projects in the Transcona Ward:

A. $275,000 to renew the gravel running track on city property adjacent to Bernie Wolfe School.
B. $200,000 towards renewal of Kildonan Meadows Park South including accessibility features
C. $100,000 towards renewal of Kern Park including accessibility features
D. $100,000 towards renewal of Paulicelli Park including accessibility features
E. $100,000 towards renewal of Cedar Ranch Park including accessibility features
F. $100,000 towards renewal of Victor Valde Park including accessibility features
G. $100,000 towards renewal of Lagimodiere Park including accessibility features

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

WHEREAS the Winnipeg Police Service School Resource Officer (SRO) agreement renewals will occur concurrently, establishing deployment of SROs in all school divisions effective September 1, 2020 to June 30, 2023;

AND WHEREAS SROs provide a visible law enforcement presence in and around their schools;

AND WHEREAS SROs focus their efforts on crime prevention, education and maintaining the peace in schools and the program continues to have positive effects in schools and their connected communities;

AND WHEREAS the attached report from the Winnipeg Police Service dated July 15, 2020, further details the SRO program and the requested agreements.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That the City enter into, execute and deliver a School Resource Officer Program Agreement with each of the following school divisions and such other agreements as determined necessary by the City Solicitor / Director of Legal Services to implement the intent of the foregoing (the "Ancillary Agreements"):*

    a) Louis Riel School Division;
    b) Pembina Trails School Division;
    c) River East Transcona School Division;
    d) St. James-Assiniboia School Division;
    e) Seven Oaks School Division; and
    f) Winnipeg School Division.

2. *That the criteria set forth in paragraphs 2.A. and 2.C. of the School Resource Officer Protocol be waived for the purposes of the Agreements outlined in Recommendation 1 only, in accordance with this report and such other terms and conditions deemed necessary by the City Solicitor / Director of Legal Services to protect the interests of the City.*

3. *That authority be delegated to the Chief of the Winnipeg Police Service to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of the School Resource Officer Program Agreements and the Ancillary Agreements, in accordance with this report and such other terms and conditions deemed necessary by the City Solicitor / Director of Legal Services to protect the interests of the City.*

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you Madam Speaker. I am rising today to ask Council to consider this motion which allows the Winnipeg Police Service, Chief Smyth, to negotiate the contract for the school resource officers in the following school divisions: Louis Riel, Pembina Trails, River East School Division, St. James-Assiniboine, Seven Oaks and Winnipeg School Division. I would just leave it now to my colleagues for further debate.

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

Councillor Mayes: Very unfortunate this had to be walked on, but this was a report received late from the public service, to be quite frank. No fault of the Mayor, no fault of any of the elected folks here. We got this late. It is important. It is pertaining to school resource officers, who are in almost all of the school divisions in the city of Winnipeg. First time around when I was school board liaison, I think we added Louis Riel and one other division, maybe River East, maybe Seven Oaks – can't remember exactly. This has been a success. Former Councillor Paula Havixbec probably deserves a tip of the chapeau on this. In that, she was always a big supporter of this initiative, so I will do that. The idea here is to try to work with school divisions to try to increase safety in schools by having a presence from the Winnipeg Police Service only in the city of Winnipeg, of course. You've got all sorts of different arrangements across different school divisions and all sorts of accrued history and different funding mechanisms. But Josh Watt, who is the Executive Director of the School Association said, when we last did this was, this is the best relationship we have ever had with the police at that moment. Now, I don't know what he would say now three years later. But I know Chief Smyth and others with the police service put a lot of work into making this a better program, so I would encourage us to approve this. It is…apologies for the walk on. It is however, we got it late. If we don't deal with it today, as you can tell, we won't get to it till late September and we'll miss part of the school year, presuming there is an in-class school year. Given that we have got all these different divisions in the city, one never knows exactly what might happen. But it is a good program and I would hope to see it continue. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you Madam Speaker. I wasn't sure I was going to vote. I wanted a chance to refer this. But nonetheless, I can read a report quickly and express the following concerns. The recommendations here, the first one, are that the City enter into, execute and deliver the school resource officer program agreement with the following school divisions. The second criteria set forth in paragraph 2a and 2c, is also recommended here of the school resource officer protocol, that this council waive it. 2a in the protocol states the proposal to renew or expand must be a tri-partied agreement…tri-partied. The third, the third, the third with the school divisions, Council and the province. I'm not going to stand here today in support of eroding 2a. And I am not going to stand here today in support of waiving the criteria in 2a because I recognize the former municipal office that many of us held as school trustees. I recognize that. I am going to uphold that. So I am not going to waive that. I am moreover not going to waive the provincial component. Why? Because as the briefing note addresses, in 2017 the province chose not to be signatory to their agreements. Well, shame on them. That is what I felt at the time. Shame on them. This protocol was built on the third, a third, a third. A municipal understanding, the two levels of politicians and the third. The province chose not to be signatory to those agreements then. Why? Because of basket funding. Basket funding that they claimed covered those costs. So what did we do? As a school division, what should Council be considering? Council should be considering that many jurisdictions fund this as a matter of community policing totally. That should be up for debate that they fund it as a matter of community policing totally. They do not download it on to education and the education tax dollars. They recognize there is one tax ratepayer, and they fund their police service. So I can't support waiving 2a. With respect to 2c, that officers assigned any such expansion shall consist of officers in excess of the Winnipeg public services' existing compliment to avoid depleting front line officers on the streets. I understand the community resource officers to always have come from the community. We as school trustees always wondered what they were doing July, August. Well, they were still on the frontlines. They were still in community, they were still part of the Community Services Division. We understood that we were subsidizing them for the neighborhoods, absolutely understood that. I understood that when I sat on the board of the Winnipeg School Division, including the structural committee. I have said often and before that I had more oversight over the police than I do now as a councillor. I am afraid I can't support this with 2a being in there because that tri-partied agreement is not for this council to erode, Madam Speaker. I don't believe it is for this council to erode. I believe in the police chief, and I did have a conversation with Chief Smyth. I believe in the police chief. I really believe in him, but I can't erode the tri-parted agreement. I don't feel its for us to erode. I hope councillors follow suit and not supported this today.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I actually would like to send my thanks to Councillor Rollins for…I wasn't sure the specific dynamics of 2a and 2b being waived. I'm still kind of not understanding 2b. What I do understand, Madam Speaker, in rising, the only reason I didn't want to debate and discuss this today and make a decision is I just want to understand some of the dynamics that may or may not have changed because, really, when it comes to school resource officers, which is an excellent program - I have no problems with that – and actually the first school division to do SROs was the Winnipeg School Division, I do believe. Seven Oaks came in later, they are being listed here. They are realizing that the SRO program is a very good one. We were actually…I would think I was still on the school board in 2006 when the school resource officer programs were going through. We weren't quite sure if we wanted to set kind of an environment where police officers in uniform are in the school as if our students were suspect all of the time. But the program is not like that at all. It is actually a very good program, so I am not opposed to that. What I am concerned about is that through the SRO program, it was my understanding, that really the police service was providing some in-kind contribution instead of

an extra budget line item. I am not quite sure where this negotiation with Chief Smyth is going and maybe our new chairperson of the Police Board can explain it to me, because it sounds like things are changing quite interestingly and I side with Councillor Rollins. You know, the basket of funding, like, the province was never providing us directly with the money for SROs. They were supporting the school divisions who wanted to have SROs. Now, you know, I don't think we should be forgiving the province. You know, the education system is also a provincial matter, right? As well as a school division matter, and school resource officers just make total sense in what they do and in the work they do with the community. And many of the school divisions talk about, we are community, Madam Speaker. Seven Oaks School Division especially. They don't see themselves just as a school division, they see themselves as part of the neighborhoods just like we as the city sees ourselves part of the neighborhoods in this city. So anyway, at this point I can't support this motion, although it is, as Councillor Mayes pointed out, it is important to move ahead but waiving those protocols, I am very concerned about that. I don't think I will be supporting this motion. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Integrity. You know, the Winnipeg police force I recently had the opportunity to go out and see firsthand what they are experiencing in the North End of Winnipeg. They do outstanding work. They are community partners in the area. Many of the people that I got to see are in it for the right reason. We saw protests at city hall last month where they are calling for extreme changes to the Winnipeg police. Abolish the police was their manta that was being thrown out there. I don't see a need to abolish the police. They have a role. Perhaps that role needs to be redefined. They are taking on more in the community than they need to. We do need the province to step up and help in that regard. But I see, I want to say conspiracy, in some regards. Conspiracy that this wasn't on the EPC agenda to begin with. This report wasn't ready for them but yet it was walked on to Council, not giving an opportunity for people to come and speak to it directly. It's an affront to democracy, in that regard. We can't have opportunities for advocates to come speak for or against. So we are short-changing them on that. We have some hypocrisy because we have members of Council who have been very vocal in regards to the police and providing commentary online that calls into question their ability to do a job and yet, we're voting today with regards to school resource officers – not just for one year – but for several years to come. I think it's to 2023. We didn't get enough time for this motion to look at it, wholly. I don't believe it is appropriate to bring forward today and I will be voting against it.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again, we have last minute motion brought forward that moments or only four hours ago we were arguing against bringing motions forward and I do not blame my colleagues, Councillor Chambers or Councillor Mayes, but there seems to be a pattern and maybe we should bring forward a motion right now saying that this public service has to get us contracts on time, including that of the police service. I can tell you this, and I want to be clear on the public record, I am not opposed to school resource officers. I think that is a great idea. I'm not…if I vote against this process it's not because I don't like children and I don't think they should be safe. It's other reasons. So I want to get that on the record just in case it ends up being spun somewhere. We do not have enough police right now to answer all the calls in the queue. We do not have enough officers on the street to deal with all issues we have and we certainly are not providing any community support with officers within our neighborhoods because we do not have the resources. I think that we have to be looking at this and go back to what I said before. Does the province give us enough money or not enough money? I can see what the chief is trying to do. Saying we will pay a third and everybody else has to. Quite frankly, they should pay for the whole thing. It takes officers off the street. It puts officers into the school, which is great. But that's a funding…but again, it's one taxpayer that they should send the money over and put towards. This is not something for us to go, yeah okay, you don't give us enough money but we'll chip in a third, so that we can continue to say, you don't give us enough money. If we are going to be one way with the province, then be one way with the province. What happens if it comes down to the fact that, well, we said a third, a third, a third and the province says no. Does it really look that bad? The reality is, we're saying they're not giving us enough money, they want this program, we all want this program. They have to pay for part of policing. Ultimately, at the end of the day as much as all we think we have power over the police, the province and the Manitoba Police Services Act, controls the police, quite frankly. That's really the end all, right. Police chiefs can get called to the meetings at the Minister of Justice like that and they got to attend. So pay for it. I would much rather see them pay for that and then maybe we can get more officers on the street to start answering the queue. So, I like the fact that we're saying it needs…I understand the fact of saying a third, a third, a third, but this is their program. Just like we would charge IKEA, Costco, or anybody else. Maybe that's what we should be doing here. So that we don't come back in a week and say, just not getting enough money. Our police budget is going to be over by millions. Pensions, I'm sure we all recall that? Everyone voted in favour of it. It was very, you know, everyone supported it, and now we're $24 million in the hole, and the next was $600,000. Can we let this be added to it? I know it's a third, but it's the principle.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I did have the opportunity, I know people are going to say, it was too fast. And yeah, sure it's fast, but it is a phone call. At least it's not a very complicated document. So, you call the Winnipeg police service up and ask them. Well bottom line, this is not costing the city anything. This is coming from a $500,000 fund that is ear-marked from the province directly to the Winnipeg police service. We do some in-kind, but we are not providing money, we are providing some in-kind support but that is it. I am not sure about the a third, a third, a third, we're just doing it in-kind. Secondly, this is asked for by the school divisions. This is asked for by the school divisions, this wasn't asked for by the City. If the City wants to have debate about SROs that is a different matter. But this is the school division where the local councils have decided that they do support this program and they want it and they see the numbers have grown. Again, we're not paying for it. It is in-kind support. Very clear from the deputy chief, that's how it works. It was a quick phone call. Then I asked about staffing rights. What about the staff? Where are those people coming from? He didn't guarantee 100% that there wouldn't some impact on the community police officers. However, I've actually had it pretty even with, by working together and collaborating with my community police officers, we've actually had some great opportunities to work with them to come into the community. They also do know that they have some time to also go to into schools. Some people have more of a flex-model. Again, that'll be up to the police service to decide how they want to manage those resources. I think we can have the debate, again, it's not our debate though. About SROs, that is really about the school division. They've asked for this. They feel it is very important for their system, they're willing to put whatever funds in, the province has also indicated that they think this program is quite valuable and they're going to fund it, so, I'll be supporting it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Councillor Rollins, you have already spoken. You've already spoken to the item.

Councillor Rollins: I have, Madam Speaker but I am considering whether or not an amendment is amenable to the council to just eliminate 2a?

Madam Speaker: That would have to be provided in writing.

Councillor Rollins: Yes, I've provided it to the Clerk. Just working on it.

Madam Speaker: Okay thank you. Councillor Schreyer

Councillor Schreyer: Maybe Councillor Chambers who seconded the motion could provide that amendment? Just to keep it his work

Madam Speaker: The Clerk, we've already weighed in via e-mail. We're writing it up currently. That is my understanding. Are there any further speakers on this item?

Councillor Schreyer: I would await the amendment.

Madam Speaker: Pardon me?

Councillor Schreyer: I would await the amendment.

Madam Speaker: That is not what we do here. We keep the meeting going. Who is the next…

Councillor Schreyer: Or, if the amendment is not in time, then we have to call the vote.

Madam Speaker: We are continuing with the speakers list right now. And Councillor Allard, you wish to speak?

Councillor Allard: Yes. I don't know if this is the proper time, I would like to know what the implications would be of removing these two clauses and whether or not that would impact the agreement. But I presume that could be answered by the mover of the motion that's coming.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Just to allow for process here. In this case, I will continue to speak so that the amendment can take place.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, I am recognizing you for your speaking time. Go ahead.

Councillor Schreyer: Absolutely. Thank you, Madam Speaker. In order for us to hear the amendment I will speak. Otherwise we'd have to call a vote before the amendment the is done. That has happened before, that's what we do here. So on that basis, I just want to say, give some kudos to Councillor Mayes for bringing this forth. But I must say, in this case, I am impressed with the quick study that Councillor Rollins brought forth on this and her insights in the few minutes that she had to peruse rather intensely this motion to the extent that it looks like we're in a position to, given debate here, have some greater resolution to this by virtue of…

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Folks, we're trying to listen to the speaker. Councillor Schreyer, thank you. Any further speakers?

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, I am still speaking, if necessary. How are we doing here?

Madam Speaker: Go ahead, the clock is running.

Councillor Schreyer: And on that basis.

Madam Speaker: We do need a mover and seconder. Go on.

Councillor Schreyer: Just would like to say that in many cases, I feel that whether I am involved in the process at standing committee or not, at least in Council, I bring forth information that is rather pertinent and one should not disregard the making of the vote. In this case, Madam Speaker, I am rather impressed with the conversation taking place with the points being made, especially Councillor Rollins. Hope it leads to a rather productive amendment that we can consider before going forward. How are we doing with that amendment?

Madam Speaker: That is my job, thank you. Mr. Clerk, do you have a motion to circulate? Okay. Are there any further speakers? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Chambers and Councillor Mayes for bringing this matter forward. It is disappointing that we received it so late and that we're having to deal with it today. And I want to thank Councillor Rollins for highlighting that provision 2a. My reading of it right now, of course, is that it requires a funding commitment from the appropriate school divisions and the province of Manitoba. I would expect that if school divisions and province would provide the support. So, if there is an amendment to that effect to remove the in the "therefore be it resolved" reference to 2a, when we see it all, I'll be supporting that amendment. Hopefully we can ensure the school resource officers are – at least we're doing our part – to ensure the school resource officers are there in September when school returns, notwithstanding of course, the uncertainty that we have right now under the…during the pandemic.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Any further speakers? This is the time to close. We don't have a motion. Councillor Chambers? I'm going to call for the close now. Okay. Councillor Chambers to close.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The school resource officer is a very important program in the schools. It's an opportunity that demonstrates neighborhood safety. It can be enhanced by strengthening partnerships between students and police with the deployment of the school resource officers. It provides neighborhoods with more strategic crime prevention, resources that are currently in place, as I said, it strengthens relationships between the police and the community, particularly youth. Former Chief Clunis, started his career as a school resource officer and often speaks of his time as a school resource officer as one of the best periods in his career, where he was able to build and forge relationships among youth, youth that today contact him to inquire on careers in policing. So, you can see the value that it places when you have an officer in the schools that can build and forge those relationships. It also develops community-based proactive and collaboration in crime prevention strategies and also demonstrates the potential cost savings for justice, education and social services in the school system. So with that, I am okay if there is an amending motion to remove 2c.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Chambers, there is nothing circulated. This is your close.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, may I rise on a point of privilege? Being blind, I think I was requested to second an amending motion and I just had the opportunity to listen to it, because I can't listen to two and three different voices at one time. So, you know, point of privilege. I am willing to second it. I think I was requested to second it. I would second it.

Madam Speaker: Okay, I wasn't aware of who the seconder was. Councillor Eadie, if you're giving those circumstances, then we'll pause and wait. I am trying to keep up with past practice of this meeting. But under the circumstances that you just mentioned, let's circulate the motion. It's probably going to be ready momentarily.

Councillor Chambers: And I do stand corrected. It is the removal of 2a from the motion.

Madam Speaker: It is being signed now, Councillor Eadie. You're just signing it now? Have you signed it? Do you like it?

Councillor Eadie: I just agreed to second it. Now if somebody gives me it….

Madam Speaker: You need to see it or read it.

Councillor Eadie: You don't have to read it. I understand what I am seconding, so I will sign that. There we go.

Madam Speaker: Madam Clerk, you'll read the motion into the record when you have it. Thank you.

Clerk: Moved by Councillor Rollins, seconded by Councillor Eadie: be it resolved that Motion 7, regarding Winnipeg police services, school resource officers programs be amended be deleting 2a in recommendation number 2.

Madam Speaker: Thank you and the mover is Councillor Rollins. Councillor Rollins, this would be your opportunity to introduce the amending motion. We are going to circulate it right away.

Motion No. 11
Moved by Councillor Rollins,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

BE IT RESOLVED that Motion 7 regarding Winnipeg Police Services School Resource Officer Programs be amended by deleting "2.A." in Clause 2.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you Madam Speaker. So, essentially the amending motion addresses the concerns that this is still a proposal that is a tri-partied agreement and it doesn't erode that. It is still a commitment between three levels of government; the province of Manitoba, duly elected school boards and the City of Winnipeg. That's all.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Any further speakers on the item and the amending motion? Because we can open up the floor once again, I like to be fair. Anybody else to speak to it? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: No need to debate it. Let's just get it done.

Madam Speaker: Thanks. Councillor Chambers, you were at 6 minutes on your close. Let's put the clock back on. Yes, Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. Just trying to do some review; in the report it does indicate…and does Councillor Rollins, I don't know if she gets to close on her amending motion? Does she? Because perhaps she can respond, Madam Speaker to this, in the report…because it does state on page 3, under the history section, paragraph 2, "In 2017, the province chose not to be a signatory to the agreements." So, I'll just put that out there.

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

Councillor Mayes: I'll move referral. I was asked to move this. There seems to be all sorts of questions I was unaware of. Councillor Rollins in particular seems to want to amend it. I'll move referral to our September meeting, because when I'm asked to walk something on and then obviously there's a whole lot of questions, so let's just refer it.

Madam Speaker: The motion to refer to our September Council meeting is in order. And that would be the main item and the amending motion. All in favour? Contrary? Recorded vote? All in favour, please rise, to lay it over to the September meeting. The main item and the amending motion.

Clerk: Councillors Nason, Allard, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty…

Madam Speaker: This is not the opportunity to debate. We're counting the votes now. So all in favour, please rise.

Clerk: I'll start again.

Madam Speaker: Yes, so the Clerk can do her job. Please rise if you're in favour.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillor Eadie.

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 7 and the amending motion will be referred to the September Council meeting. I just want to clarify that; was that the September Council meeting or Executive Policy Committee? I may have misheard because there was a lot of talking here at the same time. The September Council meeting, yes, that is what I had said. Thank you. Okay, moving on here into by-laws. Mr. Mayor, thank you, for the second and third reading.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move the following by-laws be read a second time: By-law 38/2020, By-law 63/2020, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 38/2020 and By-law No. 63/2020.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that By-law Nos. 38/2020 and 63/2020 be read a third time, and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor, for all three readings.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks Madam Speaker. I move the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law 71/2020, By-law 81/2020, By-law 86/2020, and By-law 87/2020, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 71/2020, By-law No. 81/2020, By-law No. 86/2020, and By-law No. 87/2020.

Mayor Bowman: I move that By-law Nos. 71/2020, 81/2020, 86/2020 and 87/2020 be read a second time, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried

Clerk: By-law Nos. 71/2020, 81/2020, 86/2020 and 87/2020.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks Madam Speaker. I move that the rule will be suspended and By-law Nos. 71/2020, 81/2020, 86/2020 and 87/2020 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. 30 minutes on the clock. Any questions for Mayor Bowman? Councillor Lukes.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Could the Mayor give us an update please, on the position of the CAO and when a new CAO will be selected?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Sure. Through you, Madam Speaker, I want to thank the CAO Hiring Committee. I've been trying to have discussions with… with all members. I have yet to connect with Councillor Eadie, despite his best efforts. My schedule's been less accommodating lately. But current status, of course, is it was delayed. Right now, we're in the middle pandemic and we…we have had fortunately, during the pandemic, we've had a bit of stability being provided by our Interim CAO, who I want to thank for his ongoing leadership and efforts. It is delayed, due to that reason, initially; of course, we delayed it during, of course, our multi-year balance budget exercise. But it has been delayed as a result of the pandemic, and I hope to be able to revisit with the Hiring Committee, as a group in the fall, and then I can provide Councillor Lukes and all members of Council with a more fulsome update at that time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Lukes, second question.

Councillor Lukes: Could the Mayor give us an update on the Governance Review Process please?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: I can't at this time. But I can certainly endeavor to…to get an update and provide that in due course, either myself or perhaps if the Public Service is in a position to provide an update, I'll make efforts to get an update to all of us, as soon as possible.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any other questions? Councillor Nason?

Councillor Nason: Get my mute off. I do hope the Mayor managed to have time to grab some lunch, I did observe his new press, while I ate mine. During that press conference, he did indicate that he had conversations direct with Provincial Health Officer with regards to masks being used and I'm curious if he's had any conversations direct to masks being used by drivers of Transit Plus?

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

Mayor Bowman: So, if I understand Councillor Nason's question, the…there was direct dialogue between myself, Minister Friesen, Dr. Roussin, and other officials. With respect to the question that we'd ask for some time and it was with respect to whether or not they were recommending or not that face…non-surgical face masks be worn on Transit buses. That recommendation resulted in the recent announcement by the City of Winnipeg that we are in fact, recommending that masks be worn on Transit as well as Transit Plus, Madam Speaker. And I want to thank Transit, as well as Transit operators, for their ongoing efforts. I also want to thank Jay Shaw, he's been providing really outstanding leadership to us during the pandemic. He's…he is someone who I've seen first-hand collaborate with our…with each of our departments, as well as I know have…we have Council briefings every two weeks, where all members of Council are able to have typically about two hours with him and other officials to ask a whole host of questions relating to…to COVID. And I want to thank him and any other officials for their effort in that respect.

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

Councillor Nason: Yeah, I appreciate the fact that he brought up the COVID-19 briefings that we have; and I know, regularly, Councillor Lukes asks questions of the Mayor. Could the Mayor express as to when we should expect one with him, as Council?

Mayor Bowman: Sure, right now.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We've just passed a motion not long ago. The…one of the factors we're sort of pressured into making the vote today was an issue called the "Due Diligence" and in my case, I need to show due diligence when it comes to something as important as this. And I found it difficult to do so, in order to make an

immediate decision today, rather than waiting a few weeks and getting some more answers, and everyone would have more answers including Starway, including the Administration, including this Council. We…I believe we could've shown more due diligence had this been presented to Council earlier.

Madam Speaker: Your question, Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: My question, could the Mayor sort of explain to us what happened the last six months since January, when the Chief Officers of the City were made aware of the proposal from Starlight for an extra $16 million from the three levels of government? What happened with three months, or five and a half months before it hit councillors last week, especially in the last three days?

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I know in terms of our…our new seating arrangement, my back is to Councillor Schreyer, and I regularly apologize to him, I don't love the format of addressing a colleague, I know it's through the Speaker, but with my back to him. The…the activities of the Public Service were reflected in the Public Service's Administrative Report that laid out the appropriate timelines. I know that the Public Service was making enquiries to…to this particular developer, Starlight, that led to the Administrative Report that was forthcoming. And so, I believe that information is largely contained in the Administrative Report that we were voting on today subject to the amendments as moved by Councillor Gilroy.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Do you believe we could've…we would've been able to show greater due diligence had this…this motion, this issue come to Council…come to the councillors before last week and had we had our [inaudible] seminar three days ago, but maybe three weeks ago, or even three months ago, could we not have shown greater due diligence for us to make a better decision on this?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, Councillor Schreyer has referenced due diligence penalty throughout his comments earlier today. I just want make sure that those that are observing these proceedings understand the reference to due diligence that I made was with respect to the due…the legal due diligence period of the transaction that's between the developer and The Forks and the relevant signatories to the transaction, which the City is…is not. So, that was the reference to due diligence. In terms of Councillor Schreyer's question, however, that would I have preferred more time for all members of Council to be able to scrutinize the request from the developer? The short answer is yes, I would have appreciated more time. I know Councillor Schreyer and I think, all members of Council would have appreciated more time. And nonetheless, I want to thank Public Service for their efforts to get clarity, so that it could form an Administrative Report. And yeah, I would have appreciated it much sooner myself. But as we know, we've now voted on the matter today and looking forward to hearing what the Province and Federal Government are going to do with their support. We haven't heard from the Federal Government and of course, we hope to hear from the Province. Of course, their deliberations are not public, they don't typically vote on these things in an open and transparent manner. And so, the scrutiny and the questions from…from the public and the media, typically reflect the fact that we're more open and transparent and I welcome that scrutiny when we're talking about taxpayer dollars, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Could His Worship explain to us what stopped the Chief Officers of the City from bringing this to Council members earlier than three days ago? What was it that Chief Officers of this City from bringing this to Council Members three weeks ago, or three months ago, rather than three days ago?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, you may want to direct that question directly to our CAO or Mike Jack, who I know, was available to answer questions on their efforts. I'm more than happy to help facilitate the Councillor getting responses. But of course, he can correspond directly with them. I'm…they're the best to answer questions or their behalf.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm…it just came to me, while we're sitting here having this conversation and the Mayor talking about how our system is good at open and transparent stuff. Just wondering if the Mayor can let me know that if he feels that having a meeting with EPC and three other members of Council, not including all the Council, behind closed doors, is that open and transparent as well?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: When Councillor Klein was Chair of the Police Board they had…I know the Police Board, according to members that I've spoken with, had numerous meetings that were informal. I'm pleased to hear that they had those discussions and the dialogue to build a collaborate team. Councillor Chambers has now stepped into the role, after Councillor Klein resigned from the role as the Chair of the Police Board and I want to thank him for those efforts. And I…and I would expect that Councillor Chambers would be having the formal meetings, but there'd be also dialogue in between. I referenced…I believe we've had probably around 15 Council briefings; of course, these are much more formal meetings, they're staffed by the Clerk's, all members of Council, including Councillor Klein, typically participate in these Council briefings, and I think that they serve a very useful role for dialogue as well. Of course, they're not decision-making bodies when those meetings occur, I would expect that Councillor Klein and Councillor Nason meet regularly given the fact and the frequency of their…their efforts on the floor and I certainly don't take any issue with that level of dialogue and discussion that members of Council may have to meet informally to have dialogue, in fact, I would encourage it. And so, I'll continue to meet with members of Council in an informal way. I'll also continue to have briefings, as Councillor Klein had regular briefings as Chair of the Police Board. And again, nobody, of course, I don't believe anybody on the floor of Council took issue with that. That's a really important part the work that occurs in between the meetings and I certainly will continue to have informal discussions and meetings and briefings as I deem fit.

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

Councillor Klein: Of course in these days, you have to be cleared to be attending those meetings. So I just want to be clear again, because I didn't hear the answer. Does the Mayor feel having a behind closed door meeting with more than the majority of Council, an open and transparent process?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Councillor Klein regularly attends the Council briefings, which are private meetings. They're not available for the media. I know quite often the contents of those meetings are often leaked, not taking issue with that; I know others certainly have. But look, the Council briefings are for all members of Council, they're not open to the public and we have Clerk's as well as public servants attend those meetings. I'm not sure, perhaps, Councillor Klein is…can add clarity of whether he thinks those are inappropriate.

Madam Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Klein: So again, I'd just like to know through you…

Madam Speaker: Final question.

Councillor Klein: Madam…Madam Speaker, if the Mayor feels that having a behind closed door meeting with a select number of Councillors, which is greater than the majority of Council, is his version of open and transparent?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: I'm willing to have meetings with all members of Council. What I'm not prepared to do, however, is have formal meetings where decisions are occurring, staffed by Clerk's. I know that the Council briefings are certainly structured that way. Councillor Klein regularly attends and I don't hear any issues with those meetings. I know he's attended meetings in the past, in his capacity as Chair of the Police Board in my office, where we did have briefings. Again, I think it's an important part, it's an effort to build a collaborative team. I think that the last one that you attended when you were Chair of the Police Board, if I can speak through you, Councillor Sharma, was in late December of 2018, when we discussed the pension matter. I know Councillor Gillingham will remember, some of the discussion very well from our Council colleague. But those…those are meetings that occur. We spoke earlier today as well about the fact that all members of Council will meet with the Clerk's to decide who populates respective committee meetings. I actually don't attend those meetings, and defer to my Council colleagues to meet privately to have their decisions that are made at those meetings that…that are made, to then come forward with a recommendation to EPC. I typically defer to my Council colleagues on how those are decided, again in his words, behind closed doors. I would suggest, if Councillor Klein has issues with that, perhaps he…he may want to have some discussions with Council colleagues. Again, not

raising it as an issue, I'm pleased to support the will of Council in those meetings. But in terms of informal discussions, the short answer is, I would encourage all members, have some discussions with each other, of course, decisions are ultimately made on the floor of Council and at respective committees and that's something we all participate in.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I'm wondering if the Mayor could let us know at this point if the Budget Working Group will be EPC plus three this year, or EPC plus two?

Mayor Bowman: The…so the question of the budget process should probably be referred to Councillor Gillingham. I'm not sure he's going to have an answer today either. I know the budget process is ramping up for our annual update. And I certainly haven't had any discussions yet, in that level of detail with Councillor Gillingham. I'm hoping that we can continue to make improvements to the budget process, and we've made significant strides to provide an opportunity for members of the public, as well as all members of Council to participate in a meaningful way for the budget and I'd welcome Councillor Eadie's suggestions. I know he's made some good recommendations to me in the past regarding some of our ongoing efforts here at City Hall and I'd welcome his comments on the budget. I'd also encourage him to have dialogue with Councillor Gillingham as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Anything further? Seeing no further questions let's move onto the next committee. The Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment; the report dated July 8th, 2020. Councillor Mayes.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
AND THE ENVIRONMENT
DATED JULY 8, 2020

Councillor Mayes: I will move Items 1 through 3, inclusive, pulling No. 4.

Councillor Schreyer: No. 2.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes, to introduce Item 2…oh, Madam Clerk, first of all. I guess I have to call the question first. We'll call the question on Item 1, 3…Items 1 and 3. We're on Water and Waste. We're going to call the question on 1 and 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll deal with Item 2 but before we do that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, could I call on you to take the Chair, and will be from your position, as we discussed, just so we are not sharing desks. I'll be back momentarily.

Item 2 – Source Separated Organics Pilot Project Update – Residential Food Waste Collection

Deputy Speaker: Mr. Chair.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Mr. Acting Deputy…what are you? Mr. Deputy Speaker? Well, I don't think I ever won a single vote when I was chair of PP&D. We're off to a good start at Water and Waste, here with the two that just got through. So, we are down now to the compost issue and No. 4. So No. 2 is a long running matter – it's the compost matter. This hasn't checkered history starting before I was elected and delayed multiple times. I do want to thank the Mayor for supporting getting this going. If I had my way, we'd now move a little more quickly. As I think I said in the media, I take some of the blame for not moving this more quickly in the past. Not blaming anybody else, not blaming the Mayor. Certainly, under the former mayor and some other former councillors, there was a decision made not to proceed in '14 or '13 with the pilot. There has been some criticism at committee about why were these five different areas were chosen. I want to thank Director Geer, who's been great to work with. Again, for providing a very detailed analysis of why those five areas were chosen; it's to get a representative sample. If you go out to the extreme ends of wealth and poverty in the city, that would give you a different sample, but they've tried to get a variety of different areas into the pilot project. It is, as Councillor Browaty may point out, fairly expensive per door, to run a pilot project, but it'll gives us the data we need to debate where we want to go with this ultimately. I do think it is an issue of where more and more of the public want us to go ahead. I at least get that sense going door-to-door in my ward over the years. So, I do think it is something other cities do. Certainly, virtually all the other major cities do. Some of them do it different ways. I think if we got some provincial assistance on building the pad or the building that's necessary that we might be able to expedite things by a year or so. But I think it is a long time coming but exciting to finally get going. But, a) the five areas that were chosen; it was a lively

debate at the committee and which I took some issue. Councillor Eadie and Schreyer took some issue with some areas that weren't included. I took some issue with characterizing St. George and Lindenwoods as being as suburbs. St. George is closer in age to the downtown than it is to Lindenwoods. I'm going to bet heavily that St. George is closer in average income to the downtown than it is to Lindenwoods. It is part of our difficulty here and Councillor Lukes has spoken about this. Everything built after 1953 is the suburbs, lumped together as if it were a homogenous whole, often to be blamed for the problems of the city. There is a great and vast difference between areas around the city that have been developed since the '50s. St. George is 60 or 70 years old, now. Lindenwoods much less; Sage Creek, much less than that. Different philosophies of planning. Somewhere like Sage Creek is actually really, I think, working toward the goal of being a complete community. So, I think…a step that unfortunately we don't respect it in earlier generations. So I think it is a bit too crude to summarize everything we built in 1953 under one rubric. I'm probably in the minority of making that statement. Perhaps Councillor Lukes and I are in minority in making that statement. I am to believe that rather than demonizing the suburbs, we have a number of different areas that comprise the suburbs, many of which pay substantial amounts into the city of Winnipeg and many of which have a variety of needs. That's why the some of the studies being done in different suburban areas, areas that were developed decades apart. So, its good to move forward, finally, on this. It will help us if we get there eventually on the target that we are…we actually slipped back a bit on our diversion rate this year. And as has been said, we will need to do the compost. It was, I think, clumsily unveiled back in '15, approximately '16, but I think '15 by the staff, right after budget and suddenly we're told, well, you have three options 60, 70, or 80 dollars a household. That's the equivalent of…at the bottom, is 4% property tax increase. The Mayor I think, to his credit, said this is what I promised 2.3% and we are going to stay at 2.3% on the property tax. Councillor Eadie had a robust criticism as well, which is, they shouldn't on a property tax. This shouldn't be a flat rate. That is unfair that the $1 million house and $100,000 house would pay the same. Councillor Eadie has an equity point in that. Councillor Eadie got somewhat unfairly blamed for being against compost when he made that point and he, I think, was unfairly characterized that way. I think he…he was merely talking about how are we going to pay for this? And that debate is still to come. It is difficult because…and the Mayor, I think, has kept to his 2.3 pledge and yet, here we have an initiative that we want to do. We could just say there is a fee for it, but then, as Councillor Eadie has said, why then would we not do that in a more progressive way? So lively debate still to come on how we are going to pay for it, if we decide to do it. But in the short term, at least we are doing it. Kudos to the Mayor for getting us going on this and my thanks to Director Geer who has put in a lot of time on this over the years, I know. And is an advocate for finally moving forward on it as well.

Deputy Speaker: Okay, I believe this item was pulled by Councillor Schreyer. Do you wish to speak?

Councillor Schreyer: Yes I do, Acting Speaker Browaty. I pulled this one down given the concerns I had this…that I had about it. As I mentioned at the Standing Committee for Water and Waste; and that being I don't feel that the sample neighborhoods are representative enough; and I would like to explain that. Yes, Councillor Mayes and I had our discussion last time and it looks like we're going to have that discussion again, over to what extent what neighborhoods are like others. And yes, Councillor Mayes has every right to be concerned that St. George, St. Vital is not confused with Lindenwoods in River Heights-Fort Garry, that they are two different types of suburbs. Well, that they're not suburbs, one is more inner-city. Let me explain what I mean. The resistance that we had in the last term in terms of the feasibility of making this work, not only is an issue of equitable payment, how we're going to pay for this thing, as Councillor Eadie pointed out. But as Councillor Eadie pointed out as well and as I did and others, is the feasibility of this thing. How is it going to work, literally for the back alleys of the city of Winnipeg? Now, I don't think it is very ward-centric of me, I don't feel very ward-centric. Nonetheless, where was I getting the concerns; from Elmwood, from Point Douglas, from the North End and those were our concerns, as we represented them last year, in terms how this would work. So at least they would be part of the pilot project despite those concerns. Some would say, well, we shouldn't have a pilot project, we shouldn't do this. It's not going to work in these areas of the city. But at least they would be represented in the pilot project. So what we have here instead, in terms of the closest; let me explain. I'm not saying thought didn't go into this. My fear is that it was overthought. The only area that's representative of the areas in my specific concerns are...let me explain, for the people listening. There are three – sorry – five neighborhoods chosen for the pilot project for the separate organics, for the food waste collection pilot project: Lindenwoods, St. George in St. Vital, Inkster Gardens in Point Douglas but not old Winnipeg Point Douglas, new suburban Point Douglas, Mission Gardens in Transcona, and Daniel McIntyre neighbourhood in Daniel McIntyre Ward. I would say the only one indicative of my concerns, and those concerns mentioned, was the Daniel McIntyre Ward. But as Councillor Eadie has made the point, it isn't in the most vulnerable area of the Daniel McIntyre Ward. Nonetheless, I think it has some indication of the issues that we might be facing in north Winnipeg, old north Winnipeg. In terms of that area of Point Douglas represented, it's Inkster Garden. Inkster Gardens is a rather new neighborhood as the city goes. It has been around for a few decades. But bear in mind, the question was about the neighborhoods they represented for the pilot project; the concerns being in old north Winnipeg. That area of north Winnipeg, that's been part of the city for let's say over 100 years. Elmwood joined Winnipeg in 1906. I would consider Winnipeg part of old north Winnipeg. That being the North End, Point Douglas, real Point Douglas like old Point Douglas and Elmwood. None of those areas are represented. Those are large areas, Madam Speaker. They are a longstanding part of the city, they're large areas and they are areas where we have our concerns. They're not represented in this, in this sample group. And therefore, what it comes down to, to cut to the chase, I feel that we are not going to get an idea of

how the pilot project, how the organics is going to work; because we are not trying it in old north Winnipeg. Why would it be part of the sample? So how can you have, sort of what they call it, a scientific...I understand you can say if you take each one, you get certain factors that are representative of the city. I guess you can say that, you know. I am sure you can. But having said that, when it comes down to the practicality, what is going to happen, should we bring in composting program throughout the city, we don't know what is going to happen in Point Douglas, North End or Elmwood. Why wouldn't we include it? And I think that is too bad. It didn't have to be this way. We raised these issues in the last term, and it happens to be, interestingly, that magically those very areas that were brought to our attention and raised as specific concerns in this council chamber are omitted. And sure, one can make the argument that these five neighborhoods have altogether the representative factors that one needs to analyze. I really think it is unfortunate that those areas that specifically mentioned aren't represented. In terms of saying Lindenwoods or St. George; all I'm saying is even if his was in my own ward, even if they had included East Kildonan, which was started being developed the 1930's; remember in 1972 we had the city of East Kildonan, that entered into the greater city of Winnipeg. But Valley Gardens wasn't developed until the 1970s, and Eaglemere wasn't even developed really until sort of the 80's and '90s. Now, if they'd represented...had those neighborhoods in my ward been represented in my sample, I'd say please don't. Because you wouldn't learn any more from Valley Gardens or from Eaglemere than you would from old East Kildonan. They are not the same neighborhood. One is newer than the other one. But they really wouldn't tell us the concerns that we were addressing in the first place. It is not a question of shame, that an older suburb is different from a newer suburb. That is not my point. The point is that Eaglemere to Valley Gardens to East Kildonan wouldn't have the same issues that I am trying to figure out, but we as the Council should want to know about. On that basis I am not trying to trivialize or minimize the differences between these different communities. I am just saying that it wouldn't help us nearly as much as putting to these areas that are specifically omitted, that we're specifically talking about. That being real old Point Douglas, the North End and Elmwood. I find that that's unfortunate, and what's going to happen, my prediction – which is why I have to vote against this, because my prediction is, we are not going to learn enough and we're going to be surprised by what is going to happen if we ever implement a full-blown organics program. And that is too bad because we could have done better with this pilot project.

Deputy Speaker: Okay, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Browaty. Speaker Browaty, I'm going to in my speech, refer to the yuck factor that's been expressed by yourself, speaker…Mr. Speaker. So, I will be actually voting for this report. I just, you know, my problem with the whole garbage recycle whatever, master plan that we passed in 2011 and then we began to implement what we passed in 2011 and 2012. We had what I always call the garbage apocalypse in my ward and a couple other wards. We did have a garbage apocalypse where the old big bins existed and we moved in the new system. In those areas where the old big bins used to be, people weren't using them properly but were dumping bulk waste into them, and so on and so forth. When the new master plan and you know, it went out there in the community, there was a lot of consultation. The people who were…the master plan was then invented and there was a number of people that complained that free bulk waste pick up shouldn't happen, everybody should have to pay the fee or not pay the fee. And so today, what we find in at least three to four…you know, we have various wards and neighborhoods where there isn't a big uptake in the proper usage of the system. That is the issue, right? So we look at that and we say well, it used to be, well, actually you can just throw a mattress in the big bin. The point is, is that they implemented something based on people complaining. Well, it shouldn't be free in areas where people are poor and they frankly are not going to pay the money to have a mattress picked up. They are not. They're going to dump it because they don't own a car or truck, and they are not going to take it down to Brady Landfill or out to Rosser where there's a landfill. So, you know, we went ahead with this plan, a system that was going to be the same and operate the same everywhere. Based on consultation, look at this, they looked at the garbage system. We had these debates, Mr. Speaker, you remember them in 2011, when we were having them and talking about the system and how we were paying for diversion and so on. But Madam Speaker…Mr. Speaker, anyway, we have a system that is not being used properly. Now, we're going to go with curb side compost pickup, and there is going to be a number of factors and things that have to work out and how that system is going to work; and frankly, not every household in the neighborhoods that are identified, are going to be part of the pilot. They are going to be picking, I don't know, whatever X hundreds of households in these neighborhoods that add up to I think – and our new chairperson can confirm – I'm pretty sure it's like 4,000 addresses will be part of the pilot spread across the neighborhoods that they are picking. But the real problem is, is none of these neighborhoods are the ones where the current system as it is supposed to work isn't working, Mr. Speaker. Not working. We need to pilot and try it in there, to find out what it is going to take for people to uptake and use the system and collect the data so that when we establish the actual program across the whole city, we're going to know what kind of tweaks we need to do for certain neighborhoods. It is not to say everybody is going to abuse it and not use it properly, but the reality is the current system is not working. What don't you get? Solid waste knows this. By-law enforcement knows this. The firefighters know it. Like really. I don't know why we're not doing, or picking some households in areas where it doesn't…the system doesn't work very well. That's my only problem. I am okay with the pilot. They are going to do this. This is good. It is how you pay for it. Councillor Mayes is correct in representing that my position was, it wasn't so much about going ahead and doing it. Although, again, they had already decided it is either three levels of composting, that's all that was going, and they are going to roll it out and they're going

to do it the same way across the whole city again. That was the problem with it, not just how you're going to pay it. They are rolling out a curb side pickup the same way everywhere across the whole city without figuring out what kind of tweaks we need to do, where the uptake isn't all that good. Another point; I agree and I am not opposed for us taking our environmental responsibility, our climate change responsibility. But since that debate in 2015, we are still waiting for the five-year review at that point because 2011 after five years, after 2011, so 2016 we were to have completed a five-year review of how we were doing. We are not at that point. Since we had those debates, what has happened, Chairperson of Water and Waste, is that there was a study that came out and said that commercial industrial puts the most carbon creating garbage into the system more so than the residents going into not just the Brady Landfill but also the Rosser one, because that is where commercial industrial, most of it, goes. Although, some of it does go to Brady; they still bring it there. I don't know why we are not piloting getting into the commercial industrial composting program, which is where the largest – the studies have now found, there is a very supported – and the province actually acknowledges it themselves, that commercial industrial waste is putting the most bad gases into the air. I don't know why we are not working on that, but that is not what this report is about. Again, I will support this report, but you know, somebody needs to do something. I think there is $5 million after this pilot still in the reserve fund. We should use some to do a proper study. Thanks.

Deputy Speaker: Thanks Councillor Eadie, that is all of the names I have. Councillor Mayes to close.

Councillor Mayes: Here's what Browaty would say if he wasn't in the chair. I feel duly-bound because I know it by now after seven or eight years, which is, taxpayers are upset about all of the costs of things. And we're doing this…and it is unpopular in my ward and it's terrible. Anyway, Councillor Browaty has been remarkably consistent on this over the years. So, that's my little salute on Councillor Browaty on this. I don't agree with that. I don't agree with what that Councillor Browaty just said. I think it is time that we to go ahead with this. It will be unpopular with some folks if we ever get there. Some of them being people who composted for years, who said to me, I've done this since the war. We're going to have to work that out. I do think it is an important item to go forward. It is an important environmental initiative. There is only so much we can do as a city. We can't change the world. I don't know how much we can do on the ag stuff, though we are trying. I don't know how much we can do on the building code stuff. We can do stuff on transit, we can do that and I think we are trying. It would help if we had more help from the province, obviously, but we can certainly get going on this and try to reduce the amount going to our landfill. I will close with that.

Deputy Speaker: Okay. All those in favour? Opposed? Do you want to be recorded on opposition? If you can, record me in opposition as well, please. Oppose Councillor Schreyer…oh, and Councillor Nason. Three? Do we need a vote? Councillor Nason raised his hand in opposition. That requires a vote? Three? Three is okay? Alright, okay. Motion has been carried. No. 4, infrastructure projects for provincial funding under disaster prevention and climate resiliency program. Oh, I'm reading your title, sorry.

Item 4 – Infrastructure Projects for Provincial Funding under the Disaster Prevention and Climate Resiliency Program

Councillor Mayes: It's just No. 4, infrastructure…anyway. Thank you for that. Yes, this may well be a moot point, as our friend Minister Squires announced certain projects earlier today, and councillor…one of which was in Councillor Allard's ward. It is unfortunate that we did not get a chance to debate what we would put forward. It is unfortunate that the public service did not give us any time to consider options. We were given the night before the deadline, well, 5:55 – so perhaps not the night before but very late in the afternoon, 5:55 in the afternoon, we were given an e-mail saying these are the three things we've decided to put forward. When I queried Mr. Chartier at committee on this, it was like, yeah it would have been better if we asked the councillors. Well, let's try to do better than that, shall we? Let's admit that there's some role we play. We have been democratically elected, we have the most contact with the public; there are certainly ideas. Some people on the Food Council were upset that certain items weren't put forward. But they weren't, so here we have the dilemma made perhaps even more stark by the fact councillor…Minister Squires announced some approval of some of our submissions before we even formally approved them. So, my thanks. She invited me to the announcement but I indicated I would be here trying to get Council approval. So I'm not sure what the province has already approved, except for the Lyndale Drive one, but it is to some extent on the Water and Waste one, it's found money because we'd already budgeted for most of that. On the other two, there is a cost to us. We're getting a pretty good return on the dollar. Councillor Gillingham, to his credit, has come up with some creative and commendable initiative to make sure we don't pay this out of debt. So at EPC, there wasn't a recommendation. The thing was resurrected, shall we say, and Councillor Gillingham came up with some solutions that didn't involve going further into debt in order to make this happen. I am somewhat in the dark as to whether the province announced approval for the other two but thank you to the province for approving Lyndale Drive one. I guess now we have to formally vote on whether we want to submit them. That is the background on this one. Thanks to the province for coming forward with the money and thanks to Minister Squires. I think she invited the Mayor and me, but we were here; so we couldn't make it out to Lyndale Drive.

Deputy Speaker: Alright. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Sorry, I'm hearing this one, that one and the other one. Thank you. Sorry, Mr. Speaker, I will rise to speak to this report. The original report that I read that went to EPC that was sent out to us in the last second and then went to EPC, Mr. Speaker, referred to the projects in there and we were looking for 100%. The province said we could get up to 100% funding for those projects. I'm not sure; I must have missed the discussion debate at EPC on this one. I supported the original going ahead with it even though, yeah, it was just presented to us at the last minute but that's just the way the provincial announcement went. It was pretty there. To ensure that there is resiliency environmentally, rivers are so important to Winnipeg when it comes to being resilient to floods and being able to not lose big chunks of property during flood episodes. And actually, with the heavy winds we have now, the erosion of the higher riverbanks is very concerning as well, in this city, on quite a number of rivers: Assiniboine, the Red. I am not sure about the stabilizing of Seine River but I'm sure it has its issues in various spots along the way, as does the river…what's the river that goes through St. Norbert? The Lasalle. And then there's Bunn's Creek. The major rivers. I think this is important but it is my understanding, Councillor Mayes asked a follow-up question, just to confirm. But we were looking at what is the deficit in City-owned riverbank property. It is somewhere in the $57 million when it talks about stabilization of sorts. The full bill is estimated for the rivers in Winnipeg. City-owned property, not private-owned property, but City-owned property is in the order of $210 million worth of work. I know the province owns a piece of property that requires probably 1 point whatever million dollars of riverbank stabilization near the bridge to River Heights, the Maryland Bridge. So anyway, I am just glad that we have an ability to apply to get some money because we're way behind in riverbank stabilization. The council that proceeded me was big on getting riverbanks fixed because it's a big problem, and that was Councillor Lazarenko for years trying to get people to spend money so that we can protect our riverbanks. We need to do something about private. This is a little start from the province, nice. I think there is way more we should be doing to be more resilient to the environment that's coming our way. Because I'm afraid we are not lowering the temperature fast enough. Or lowering the amount of gasses that we put into the thing. In terms of moving ahead with St. Johns Park, I wanted to throw into the debate, I support this. I know that there will have to be engineers, geo whatever, that have to look at the riverbank and they are asking St. Johns Park, when you go north there is at least six houses that are in jeopardy. The biggest cost for them, their concern is to get that kind of geo technical engineer to do the survey and the study. I was asked, and I'll ask behind the scenes, but I was asked to try to find out if they at least could study those, I think it's about six houses along the way north of St. Johns Park. Because they'll already be there doing and analyzing what actually to do for St. John's Park. I will leave it at that. I am voting for this report. Hopefully we're getting 100% of the money where they said we can have 100%.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. No other speakers. Councillor Mayes to close. You are good. All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question period for the Chair of Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. Councillor Klein.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As because we've just gone through this whole Starlight thing and everyone's probably pretty happy with themselves right now. I'm just wondering as the Chair of Water and Waste, knowing that the Starlight project will be in a combined sewer district and that the Province of Manitoba license for the City of Winnipeg forbids the City from increasing the flow into the combined…the combined sewer system. Has there been any work done to ensure that the Starlight development does not increase flow? They're going to have what, a thousand new units? Are we assuming that that will be the same flow that's going into the combined sewer system or have there been any estimates of costs that Starlight would have to bare? Or are we paying that and we're just not…we're just not telling people? Like I'm wondering where we are with the department and that…and that portion of Starlight?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Mayes: Thank you to Councillor Klein for the…I did get advanced notice of the question. Despite best efforts, I don't have an answer. Well I guess I have an answer, I'm hoping I'm not projecting that I'm happy with myself with things in general, I doubt that I am. I don't have an answer. It is a fair question, it is a question I have raised repeatedly as we continue to approve a 100 different lot splits quadrupling the population on some streets in the Glenwood area in my ward and yet, somehow that isn't increasing the flow into the sewer system. I don't know how that can be. I honestly don't know how that can be. But what I was told, was well when big developments go in, such as Councillor Orlikow's ward, you know, there's a whole plan that's prepared and delayed flow and so there's a quite an…an onus. Other places we've had buildings rejected by Water and Waste, that what we're told you'll have to build a pipe out at some great distance to Bishop Grandin to access because where you're building, there's no more room left in the pipe. We had that on Beliveau, we had that on Arden, we've had a number of these. So I don't have an answer at

this point. We don't…you know, we're not…we don't know. So that is a potential cost certainly that unfortunately this developer, who seems to have been very successful in asking for more concessions from us, we may adhere more, I guess that's part of their due diligence, so we'll see. But at this stage, I have no answer to that.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, follow up question to Councillor Klein. And I do see, Councillor…

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you to…

Mr. Speaker: …Nason.

Councillor Klein: …Councillor Mayes, thank you for that answer. And I just, I'm wondering if I'm hearing it right then, are we concerned, is the department concerned, should we all concerned now that if the Public Service and negotiations hadn't disclosed that to Starlight that they probably will now be, given the motion, come back and ask for that to be taken care of like we have with so many other developments and like we do with new developments and like we do not do for, as you so correctly pointed out, infill. So is this going to be a new chapter, is the department prepared? Can you speak to that?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Mayes: I think I would be speculating. I don't know what might have been disclosed to the purchaser…it would, I think, be part of their due diligence. We've…we've had some tragic, comic the developments along the way where the developer's gotten all the way through the Appeals Committee and then been told by Water and Waste there's no room. If you're on the west side of the street, there was still room, this pipe is full, you got a build, and then the development collapses. We've had…we've had the one on Arden and I think some people heard at Appeals where there was a scheme suggested for some sort of grey water that that was bounced by the department and I think by Appeals Committee. We've had ones, it…it can really vary, we had big multi-family approved on the south side of Beliveau and like small little apartment building bounced on the north side of Beliveau bounced in my ward because there wasn't room left in the pipe. I… don't know at this stage what's left in the pipe in terms of room. Nor do I know the combine sewer potential impact here. I guess we're too…still too early for a green infrastructure project because we don't know the details on that yet. But I guess…I guess we'll know later in August because I do think that's part of their due diligence is to look into that and I would expect we would hear before the deadline if that's…if that's going to be an issue because we've moved this along today saying, well, there's this hard deadline coming in August. So stay tuned, I guess and if I do hear anything from the Director, who's been very good on these sorts of things, I will…I will advise.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Klein, second follow up? You're good. Okay, Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you. You couldn't remember my name before, but that's okay. So question for the Chair. I know, actually it was in Councillor Klein ward, he had an innovative grey water development or a residential property it was trying to go, and I did hear the prospective developers of the Portage Place project earlier today talk about rain water and drain water collection. I wonder if there's an opportunity for innovation or new approaches to…to collection and use of these two types of water to help with the CSO?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Mayes: Well, we have said we don't give particular developers special treatments, so I don't know what they're going to propose. You could, perhaps, have asked that question had we had more time, unfortunately, we didn't to ask questions; I had many, myself. I don't know and I guess we'll find out what…what the proposal is. It is a large structure and intensification being proposed and that has its pluses, that has its benefits, social and economic. We should be clear on what a TIPP is, I think, which is the taxes are collected by the developer and used within the project for, in this case, 20 years now. We…we do not get…we, the City are not getting the normal property tax payments from those properties, we…we do not get the advantaged of the revenue to slug against our debt servicing costs, to pay towards ambulance, to pay toward police, to pay toward fire. Mr. Hildebrand, here, recently talked about the number of 911 calls to our town. There's about 1 for every…it's about half a call per person, hundreds of thousands. So here, you're going to get 500 calls (ish) to 911 if…if the statistical average holds out, there will be costs to that. We will not be getting additional funds to pay toward that. So there are costs to the City, your residents, my residents, will be paying for ambulance, police, fire, all of those systems. There are benefits, as Councillor Gillingham has pointed out in terms of social and housing. In terms of what this cost is going to be though, in terms of water, in terms of waste water, I don't know at this stage. Maybe they've already done their due diligence on that. I guess we will…we will see. Certainly it's been said here, not a dollar more the $20 million. I guess we'll see if they come back, if they come back at all. Councillor Klein seems to be convinced the developer is going to walk based on the fact that we've offered them what they asked for, so that's a little alarming, I have to say when…when you're poker hand is you've given it all the other person has

asked for, and they're still asking for more that causes me some concern. But regardless, we don't have an answer at this on water and waste, so stay tuned.

Councillor Nason: Third and filibuster.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Nason, do you have a…you're good or do you want to follow up there?

Councillor Nason: [Inaudible] Second question. Maybe he can help me understand the process, if they are going to exceed capacity is the Province that provides the exemption?

Councillor Mayes: I'll try and be brief. There's a license, licenses don't exceed. We've had various projects nullified due to issues with that. I'm not aware of a provincial exemption. I can undertake to look into that. It would be an interesting exemption given that the license applies broadly across the 47, I think I've got it right this time, 47 different combined sewer districts, where of course, all parts of the City paying $2 billion towards updating those old pipes. Taxpayers from new areas, old areas, all in paying for that. So if there's an exemption to be had, I guess we'll find out.

Councillor Nason: Thank you. That's it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Nason? No, you're good?

Councillor Nason: None.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason? You good? Okay. Standing Policy Committee on Innovation and Economic Development. There is no report. Any question period? I'll have to move the Chair if somebody…okay. I hear none. We'll go to the agenda for the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development, June 16th.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT,
HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED JUNE 16, 2020

Councillor Gilroy: I'll move Item No. 2.

Deputy Speaker: Okay, Item No. 2. All those in favour? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Okay, the report of July 13th.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT,
HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED JULY 13, 2020

Councillor Gilroy: Move consent of agenda 1, 2, 4, 5 is being laid over and 6 to 16.

Deputy Speaker: Okay so for Items 1 to 4 and 6 to 16. Stand down 15 and 16, stand down 2. So we will do 1, 3 and 4, 6 to 14. Sorry? Sorry, 13. You have No. 3, Councillor Nason?

Councillor Nason: We are talking to July 13th meeting?

Deputy Speaker: July 13th. One-three

Councillor Nason: Yep

Deputy Speaker: Then we have reports 1 and 4 and then 6...sorry? 3 has been pulled. 2 and 3 have been pulled. Somebody pulled 3 right? Councillor Nason pulled 3, yeah. We are moving agenda Items 1 and 4. Then 6 through 12 and 14. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Item No. 2.

Item 2 – Proposed Amendments to the Sale of 180 Market Avenue, Pantages Playhouse Theatre

Deputy Speaker: Okay, Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I will wait to hear from my Council colleagues.

Deputy Speaker: Councillor Rollins pulled this? No? Okay, Councillor Klein. My apologies, go ahead.

Councillor Klein: That's okay. People often confuse the two of us. So through you, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to this for a couple minutes only because of what we have been through today. But here we are selling a property that we know has been valued by outside commercial real estate folks to be worth maybe $4 million. Let's just say it's $2 million. We are about to sell for 500 plus thousand dollars. And we believe this is a great sale, but we are going to have to make some kind of a concession it looks like, or a deal and pay to have the streetcar remain where it is, which we knew was going to be there I assume, before we sold it, but we never mentioned it at that time. And we are okay with letting this piece of property go because well, it is financially smart, right? If it is worth $2 million you sell for 500k. Again, I am at a loss for this. It's like we are giving...this is giving them a cheque. To quote the Mayor. That's his blank cheque. Right? Here, you can have it for this amount. We will walk away. A building that real estate people are saying the land itself is worth millions for 500 and some odd thousand dollars is an excellent decision in view of how this is going to pass. I understand that it has the historical value and I've heard that it doesn't change the value of the property. But in this case, I did go back and watch the video where the public service said that, yeah, you have to sell it for less because it's got a historical designation on it. Now I understand that they're going to be changing that. They're going to be looking at changing that. So now, the value of that land does become millions of dollars, but hey, that's okay. I am just wondering how we explain that. I can't see how we justify this. I will be opposed to this.

Deputy Speaker: Okay, thank you very much. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the full…I heard the delegates and listened to the debate for pretty well that whole meeting. In regards to this sale of the Pantages, it sounds like they got a sweet deal. But, the points that Councillor Klein is pointing out, Mr. Speaker, have been actually dealt with by the…from the purchaser's side, who has signed agreements with certain not-for-profit organizations who will be maintaining the heritage of the actual theatre. They're actually taking over title of those properties and the person who's buying. And that's all being moved over I believe it was for $1. Mr. What's his last name? His first name is a good first name, Ross. McGowan! And Kurt Vonegut, whatever, represent the charitable or whatever, organization that will be taking over the heritage theater and those spaces for cheap, and they've agreed to invest the money that will maintain and they'll find the money to do what needs to be done. And, I also heard that…and Councillor Santos was supportive of all of this, that whatever is left over after that, the potential new buyer, once the deal is done, will have just a certain piece to the…left to build on; but actually stated that he felt it was enough to build what he bought the property for. To me I don't see it being a bad thing to vote for report…recommendations of report Item 2 because it's all been worked out. Nobody is getting anything special in the deal. The group that's going to have the Pantages, where the orchestra, or whoever it is, I mean, they are taking on a big bill. And it's good. Anyway, I will leave it at that. It sounds like a very good way to proceed. I think they did the proper kind of negotiations in this particular deal versus the one we were dealing with earlier today.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. No other speakers registered? Councillor Gilroy to close.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, I think this is a good deal. A lot of back and forth went between the purchaser and the City and the not-for-profit group. A lot of great work went in. Kind of communicating and trying to make this work. The City will be maintaining the area in which the streetcar is so…and that was at no cost to the City to kind of do that. A lot of great work went into this. I think it's a really good and exciting project that will also keep a very historical heritage building alive and well and being use in the way it should be. So I think this will be a good move, moving forward for the city.

Deputy Speaker: Okay. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Do you want me to record an opposition? Councillor Klein in opposition. Oh and, Councillor Nason. My apologies, thank you. Councillor Nason. Madam Speaker, the following items have been pulled from this report. This is report SPC Property and Development, July 13th. Item No. 3 has been pulled by Councillor Nason, as well as 13, 15, 16. There is a motion on Item 16.

Madam Speaker: 13 and 15 and 16.

Councillor Browaty: 3 is first.

Madam Speaker: Excellent. Thank you very much. Madam Clerk.

Item 3 – Declaration of Surplus Land – City-Owned Property Located East of Plessis Road and South of Dugald Road

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy to introduce Item 3.

Councillor Gilroy: I will wait to hear from the councillor.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you. Unfortunately, I didn't bring my notes from when I presented at SPC but the notion that I have is still the same. We talk about growth paying for growth inside the city. However, in this situation we are selling off land that is on a perimeter road to development that is not inside the city of Winnipeg. They are going to be building an industrial park, leveraging our road network, that we pay for, that the RN does not pay for. I had this situation occur to the north end of my ward, and I am now having it near the south side of the ward. It is a challenge. I know we have representation. The Deputy Speaker and the Chair of IED is our representative body on them, we have two members of Council, Councillor Gillingham and Councillor Lukes; they're on the Metro Regional Board. They may have differing views on this. I know we are in this together but it is going to cause more challenges, more traffic in an area. It did not come up through community committee so I didn't have an opportunity to bring it forward then. I've had personal circumstances that didn't give me an opportunity to get mobilized with regards to the network of community people, who live on Plessis, who are already seeking changes to transportation on Plessis Road, because there's far too many trucks that are using Plessis Road, and not using Fermor Avenue, east or west, to access the perimeter or other regional roads. It is a challenge in this area. Residents will not like the additional commercial traffic that will be born out of this road. There is no plans to twin this road. There has been no discussion with the RM, to my knowledge. There has been no discussions with the MLA for Transcona, nor for the area that represents Springfield, to my knowledge. I would like to know how we are going to support these extra roads. The road is already starting to show signs of stress from all of the transport trucks. This will only bear to serve more damage without a plan to ensure that the road network is maintained.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Any further speakers? Councillor Browaty.
Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker. I am just curious as to whether or not the RM of Springfield was…I've looked at the report but I haven't studied it in depth. But I was just curious if the RM of Springfield has been canvassed on, whether or not they have needs for this piece of City-owned land that's in the RM.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you. I'll try to answer some of the questions that I heard. This was…this land was required for part of the Transcona land drainage project for water retention basin. Now, further, this piece of land is not within the city, it's in the Rural Municipality of Springfield, so it is not within any city wards. The public service was approached by the adjoining owner to acquire the land, to open it up for right-of-way. The property was circulated to all City departments and no civic need was needed, so that's to answer some of the questions. As far as our City department or our City officials, there is no need. Questions were raised at the committee as if they were to build a road would that impede this, and the administration didn't think so. But to answer any questions in my closing remarks, I don't think that any…the municipality of Springfield was talked to.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for that. I will call the question on Item 2…Item 3, pardon me. All in favour? Contrary? How many recorded in opposition? Two? Three? Councillor Schreyer. Okay we'll have a recorded vote on this. Just before we do that, Councillor Browaty will you move a motion that we go…Council meet past 6:00 p.m.

Councillor Browaty: So moved.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now we will have a recorded vote on Item 3. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Chambers, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Orlikow, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Nays

Councillors Nason, Browaty, Eadie, Klein, Schreyer.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 3 passes. Madam Clerk.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 7, Nays 5.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Item 13 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 252, 256 & 260 River Road and 81 Blackmore Avenue – DASZ 4/2020

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy to introduce the item. Thank you. This item was stood down by Councillor Mayes. Go ahead.

Councillor Mayes: I'll try and be brief. I voted for this, thanks to Councillors Allard and Chambers who did the same. Nothing like voting for something for something…for an infill project that you think is right when there are hundreds of people opposed to it and then getting an e-mail from the City Planning staff saying he is opposed to infill because he did not like complaints. Really, nothing like that to build up your faith in the public service and not to feel like you are being thrown under the bus. For clarity, I voted for a lot of these. Councillor Lukes when she was on a committee can agree. This was a very difficult vote. This is very controversial. Kudos to Mr. Patman for all the work he did on this file. But just for clarity, and I am sorry if our City Planning staff, not the local people who have been really quite good to work with, but some of the higher-ups, seem to feel like I am against infill because it leads to complaints. For clarity, there have been over 100 lot splits approved, quadrupling the population on those lots, in the Glenwood area. This isn't in that area, so I voted for that. But I think if we are going to make wild sweeping crude generalizations about councillors motivations or voting habits, I get the right to correct some of that. So, vote for it? I intend to vote for it but I am not against all infill. I am certainly not going to sit here and be told I'm against all infill because that lead to complaints. What I am against is being told 100 straight times, it's moderate densification, it's moderate densification. It's low to moderate. Then you say, well, what would immoderate be in this neighborhood? We don't have an answer for that. Then I say, you had an answer at Parker. You had an answer at Parker. We knew that was too much. Why can't we say in some of these other communities what is too much? Somehow, we don't seem to be able to say that. So, we know what one side of the scale is but we don't know what the other side of the scale is. So thanks to Chambers and Allard for voting with me on this very difficult project, very difficult vote. A lot of community oppositions. I am sorry if some of our Planning staff take the incredibly crass view that I'm against all infill because it leads to complaints because I think I gutted it out on this one, what I am concerned about and which I would love to have some local benefit on because we have been densifying a great deal with these lots splits, is some local benefit, kept locally. Councillor Allard and I are waiting now over a year on our motion to see, isn't there is some way we can keep some benefit local for these intensifications through lot splitting. Good work with Allard on that. We've managed to get – how much is it? $50 million approved in two days for local benefit. Surely a year long wait for other parts of the city doesn't seem...it seems a bit excessive. So hopefully I will be asking Councillor Gilroy some follow up on this. But I intend to vote yes, very difficult vote. Thanks to my colleagues for voting with me.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Gilroy? No close? I will call the question then. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 15 – Affordable Housing Pilot Project

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

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

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, go ahead.

Councillor Eadie: I rise. I'm going to support this motion but I wish I knew this was introduced by the chairperson during this committee meeting, Madam Speaker. I wish I knew that the motion was going to be moved. I am going to support it. But just wanted to explain that while the William Whyte pilot project, Madam Speaker, worked quite well for the identified residential lots, it didn't work for the mixed-use properties along Selkirk Avenue that were also available under this project. There was no update. It is my understanding that the people who are building the residential…on these residential properties under the William Whyte pilot project, there weren't a lot of them that were multi-family and affordable in terms of rental. Most of them, Madam Speaker, were actual affordable ownership opportunities, which I think is great. I think that is really important, the organizations like HOP and well, Habitat's been able to, through their model, they're able to buy properties for market value. Often actually, Madam Speaker, there seems to be a competition between the HOP and Habitat at times but nevertheless, they are both essential organizations. But, it is my understanding that one of the difficulties as Ms. Turner had spoken of, is even at half the market value there are problems in delivering affordable ownership housing for people who qualify – because they do have to qualify a mortgage and those kinds of things, so this

is calling on the expansion of the William Whyte project to go to the five housing districts, although, you know, one of the other issues though, is interesting in that the actual Dufferin neighborhood north Point Douglas has, William Whyte, Spence, West Broadway...anyway there are five of them…Centennial is the other one? But it is interesting in that Dufferin neighbourhood, isn't one of the housing neighborhoods but we are constantly…I am constantly approving the sale of City-owned lots in that neighborhood. It might be nice to expand. I will be voting for this, but…and I spent a lot of time trying to workout this Starlight whole thing, so I didn't have the opportunity to send what I thought might have been an amendment that might be amenable. Report, actually, 16 kind of gets it. What I thought we might do, because I did this in moving a lot at 281 Selkirk Avenue. There was a cost of the City to rip down an asbestos-filled building, and so on, and at the time we were selling it for the City's cost, to end up with that lot. What Councillor Santos is dealing now too, with the Manitoba Building tradespeople who are going to build what they call the water…the water drum project. But nevertheless, we do, as a city have a cost. If we sell them for $1, that means we're sucking up the cost, say to rip down the building, or to recover what would have been the property taxes owing which you know, in many cases in William Whyte, for example, the property tax bill owed is around sometimes only, to us, I will say $15,000, but the market value of the property is worth much more. It would have been good to be able to try to introduce that but anyway, it is a motion that…an amending motion that would have took a little more questioning of the administration just to determine what the average cost is. I am assuming the inventory cost that's talked about in report 16, which we'll get to, and that can be explained to me a little more. But you know, there is a cost when we end up with this property to dealing with it and I think in most cases in these neighborhoods we are talking about, those costs are not huge. There was a huge cost at 281 because it was a commercial…a former commercial building. Some of these houses that end up vacant or whatever and they had to be ripped down, they're...it doesn't cost that much to rip something like that down. It is around $10,000 or whatever. I will leave it at that. I will be supporting it. Maybe the chairperson can address what I sort of spoke about in regard to her excellent motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, I rise. Perhaps I missed it. Do we need a motion to go past 6 o'clock or do we have that already?

Madam Speaker: That has occurred, I think you just stepped out. Thank you, though, councillor. Any further speakers? Seeing none. Councillor Gilroy, back to you.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will try to speak to the questions Councillor Eadie was raising. I think he was talking more about Item 16 that we are going to be talking about next when it comes to HOP. But, the affordable housing pilot project, I would love to talk to Councillor Eadie more on this because I think he's really passionate about this. What this is, is there was some success in some of that; the pilot project. There were some challenges like Councillor Eadie had talked about. But where we see success is really where we would like to build on. There's other communities within our HIZ zones that could be doing a similar thing. And when we look at an affordable housing strategy that we're trying to put forward with, there are some low hanging fruits that we could be getting done right away. Especially in particular with funding that is available through the federal program. And a lot of these groups are now trying to kind of get those dollars to work, but they need the City to become a partner in that, so this will allow that to happen. So I'm hoping that answers Councillor Eadie. This is kind of where this motion came from and why it's coming forward. And on…yeah, and I think that's it on affordable housing.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gilroy. With that, I will call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 16

Item 16 – Sale of City-owned Residential Land to Housing Opportunity Partnership and Purpose Construction

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy to introduce the item and your amending Motion No. 10.

Motion No. 10
Moved by Councillor Gilroy,
Seconded by Councillor Santos,

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That Item 16 of the July 13, 2020, report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development be amended be deleting Recommendations 1.B. and 1.C. and replacing with the following:*

   "1.B. That properties be sold at cost recovery or no less than 50% of the assessed value, whichever is the lesser of the two."

2. That the remaining Recommendations be renumbered accordingly.

Councillor Gilroy: Okay. I will introduce this one because it really came…came forward from an ask from the different groups because they are looking at trying to get some of that federal money that's coming down for affordable housing. So they really wanted to push forward this before we prorogued. So they could get some of the opportunities with some of the City-owned land. So this is why this is in front of us here today, and I do have an amending motion, Councillor Eadie. And I will be having to pull that one because there was some complications that the administration had mentioned that could arise from that, so I'm going to pull that. But I do hope that we can support the sale of residential lands to Housing Opportunities Partnership and purpose construction. And as we move forward, I will be looking at ways, maybe we could reduce the cost but keeping in mind of what Councillor Eadie is saying, there is a cost to the City, but there may be ways in the future that we can look at seeing if we can make the costs a little bit less. I'll be working with the administration on that. And I heard what Councillor Eadie says and I agree that there might be some opportunities there to help support their work. But I'm hoping today, you will support the Item No.16.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy, do you wish to rescind your Motion 10? And do we have the concurrence of our seconder? Councillor Eadie was the seconder? Who was the seconder? Councillor Santos?

Councillor Santos: Yes, I concur. We can.

Madam Speaker: Your amending Motion No.10 has been rescinded. Next speaker Item 10, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Item 10 or Item 16?

Madam Speaker: Item 16, that's right. Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I was going to bring forth an amendment to this on Item 1b. Sorry, on Item 2. But in preparation for this, I was given for clarification, I was given the same amendment back to me. And that being 1b that the property be sold at a cost recovery of no less than 50% of the assessed value, whichever is lesser of the two; which was not to my understanding. Clear to me that that was within the intent of what I was trying to do, saying no more than 50% of the assessed value. But then because of the clause afterward saying, provided the purchase price of the, or the cumulative purchase price exceed the City's inventory cost or accumulative inventory costs. And because of that, I got back this one, I am not certain of that. So, I would have pulled that or rescind it as well. So, we're stuck with this one without an amendment, which in either case would have had the same intent. I do see a bureaucratic complication just in the sense of potentially, because I don't understand it, so I have to rescind it as well. Having said that, what I'd like to do...I'm not going to ask that we table this for another meeting, but I do hope given the fact that it was the intent of Councillor Gilroy, Councillor Santos and myself, at least the three of us, to look at...look at seeing what we could do to further reduce, potentially reduce, the costs for those non-profit housing groups that are helping with affordable housing in our city. So I do hope we revisit this. If someone wishes to bring forth a motion with instruction during the proceedings right now on this motion, that's fine with me. I just hope in concurrence with Councillor Gilroy and Councillor Santos, at minimum, I assume that we should be looking at this again in September. Having said that, these things are important. I have said, as I've said this morning, we really don't do anything near the amount of affordable housing units that we used to as a province within the city of Winnipeg. I'm not going to say as the city, as the City of Winnipeg…as the government of the city of Winnipeg, because it was never really incumbent upon the City of Winnipeg to take on that vast responsibility as had...as has been taken on in the past. The City has its complimentary role. It's great when the City can do its part in coordinating, in organizing and facilitating, but I do believe that it is primarily incumbent upon the federal government and the province of Manitoba to take on the issue of affordable housing. It's nice to see what we can do. I will say for the record, though, just to challenge the City on this, that the City was involved in more...far more, back in the past, because it was the City's involvement was a function of the other levels of government. Especially the province of Manitoba. I will reiterate every time, why not? We deal with issues opposing here. We talk about issues of affordable housing, so it's worthwhile when we do, to make the point, that we're nowhere near what we used to do for affordable housing. I will say again, since we're talking about affordable housing, I don't to want to give the impression, why would any member of the Council, who cares about affordable housing, want to give the impression? Because we're doing something that we're in a progressive era. We're in an era of actually getting a lot of affordable housing done, because we're not. Again, I'm not blaming the City, but that's just where we're at. There was a time, I'll mention this because this is a marker for us. This is a benchmark, in terms of what can be done. It's important if you care about affordable housing. There was a time that we'd be doing about a thousand affordable housing units per year in the city of Winnipeg. Is that an exaggeration? No, it's not an exaggeration. That's really what happened. Sounds unrealistic. Sounds like exaggeration. Sounds like ah, didn't really happen yet, but it really happened. Check it out. If anybody has any doubts about this, check it out and we can talk about it on the Council floor or otherwise. The fact is, that really happened. That's part of the history of the province of Manitoba and the city of Winnipeg. We're not there these days. As again, I said this morning, I don't even think we're at

20%. I'd love to think we're at 20%. That would be pretty good given the era we're in. I thought we were around 10% of where we were at, you know, over a generation ago. So I'm just going to leave that, food for thought, as we deal with the issues of affordable housing. As we talk about pilot projects. And as we try to do what we can to facilitate working with other organizations and other levels of government to encourage, facilitate and do our part in our investment in affordable housing. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I hadn't realized there was a motion, but I understand it was pulled. I was trying to find it to read it. But anyway, Madam Speaker, it's been withdrawn, so...but...so in terms of selling these properties, it is important, but in here it talks about the market value is the lowest price. So, I don't…it's not saying…like if cost exceed 50% of the market value, is my understanding, the cost, the inventory, whatever. If that's more, there…anyway, it just seems to me that it should be, pay whichever is the lowest cost. Not just setting the market value, because I'm not sure in which market or what the value is. It depends, Madam Speaker, but I do have that concern. They did speak in favour of the report, but again, they were troubled and it makes it somewhat difficult when it's 50% of the market value quite often. So I'll just leave it at that. I don't know if somebody is amending it to change it. We do have the sale of property policies and stuff. And anyway, this actually report sounds quite too complicated. If we were going to not follow the policy that we have for real estate, we should just sell it to them. Those properties to them for a dollar. Like, really? Anyway, I'll just leave it at that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie. Seeing no further speakers, Councillor Gilroy to close.

Councillor Gilroy: The motion that's in front of us here today is vital for HOP and Build to make sure that they do get funding from the federal program. So this was an ask of them. So I just want people to know that, that's key, even as it stands. And Councillor Eadie, the amending the motion was doing what you suggested, but there is some complications with that and so that's why we pulled it, so we'll do a little bit more investigative work and we'll come back with something a little more solid. But in terms of what's in front of us here today, this is a really good opportunity for HOP and Build, even in the forum that we're having today. So I hope that people support it, because it was a request from them to help them get some of that federal money to come down. So I hope everyone supports it here today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. I'd like to call a 15-minute recess, health break. 15 minutes is fine. The Clerks have not moved since after lunch. They don't have the luxury of being in and out of the meeting. Is 15 minutes okay? Okay. Thank you. 15-minute recess. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
July 23, 2020, at 6:41 p.m.

Madam Speaker: I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of July 23rd, 2020. We're on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development and let's move into the by-laws. Councillor Gilroy.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT,
HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2nd and 3rd READING

Councillor Gilroy: 47/2019 be read a third time and that the same…wait, sorry, sorry, sorry, sorry. Wrong spot. I move that By-law No. 47/2019 be read a second time. Am I in the right spot?

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

Clerk: By-law No. 47/2019.

Councillor Gilroy: And I would like to move that By-law 47/2019 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All I favour? Contrary? Carried.

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

Councillor Gilroy: I would like to move the following by-laws be read the first time: By-law No. 73/2020, By-law No. 74/2020, By-law No. 75/2020, By-law No. 76/2020, By-law No. 77/2020, By-law No. 78/2020, By-law No. 79/2020 and By-law No. 80/2020.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 73/2020, By-law No. 74/2020, By-law No. 75/2020, By-law No. 76/2020, By-law No. 77/2020, By-law No. 78/2020, By-law No. 79/2020 and By-law No. 80/2020.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I would like move that By-law Nos. 73 to By-law No. 80/2020, both inclusive, be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 73/2020 to 80/2020, both inclusive.

Councillor Gilroy: I would like to suspend the rules so By-law No. 73/2020 and By-law 80/2020, both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Recently a church in my ward was told they couldn't build on Lavalee Road because it was quote, "too narrow and only chip seal", yet we've had hundreds of now, over a hundred approvals of projects on gravel back lanes, which are narrower and even lower quality. The intensification has occurred, those of you who are here the other day, heard the woman crying about the state of the back lane and how we were actually going to make it worse by approving yet another [inaudible] of the number of units next door, we were going to go from one to four, we're going to make that gravel lane even more heavily used, making it worse. So, can you get clarity from the department on why on Earth, we would veto a church application because it's on a street that's too narrow and chip seal, but we would approve, time and again, with no debate, well, with some debate, time and again, the City staff have approved intensification on gravel back lanes? The majority of which, are between my ward and Councillor Allard, and my share is quite a bit more than his.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. Councillor Gilroy?

Councillor Gilroy: You know what, if Councillor Mayes wouldn't mind putting that into e-mail, I'd love to follow up with the department on that. I just want to make sure I get the precise address that he is indicating and where he's indicating.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Mayes: Over a hundred addresses, so it's…I'm not able to specify each and every one but I will follow up with Councillor Gilroy. Second question, we heard earlier today that the community has spoken and Councillor Allard's talked about his community, la communauté en première, Community Comes First. Now that we've dealt with the community concerns on the Starlight lands, what is the concrete plan to deal with some of the concerns raised, time and again, I think it's 89 different appeals that have come forward, one lots splitting in my ward. I…I have to say that the people who have appeared at those committees, they're Nimbies, they've been told you'll have more friends, and I believe, I think that was Councillor Rollins, but I may be wrong in that. So we haven't actually made any effort I would submit to address their concerns. I'm very pleased that we've addressed the concerns of people in your ward that's quite a…quite a success and I congratulate you on that, Councillor Gilroy. What…what concretely can you say to these people? What…what can we do to bring some local benefit to these people, who've now been down here for 89 different hearings, I think, losing

almost every time. I mean, I'm moved by the sentiment that the community has spoken and I'm encouraged that we're saying to people, we are listening to the community. I guess my question is, concretely what are we planning to do to address the concerns of a different community, the community who keeps coming forward from Glenwood saying, "You've approved these time and time again on gravel back lanes, which are narrow and beaten up already"?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy?

Councillor Gilroy: I want to thank Councillor Mayes for the question. I know that this is an issue he's raised several times and it's something that he's pretty passionate about. He's been a vocal advocate on…on gravel back lanes and trying to get funding for that. And he's also, you know, really been out there speaking up for his community and their desires about lots splits. So I know this is a…this is…this is an issue for him that he's very passionate about. And you know what, it…they're difficult to answer because I think that the challenges is that this is the process that we have. We have an appeal process, we…things go filter through our system. And this is the process that have, so you know, I share some of…some of his challenges in my ward when I have, with my back lanes and all the challenges that I have with…with stuff, so I can understand where he's coming from and you know…you know, we can work with him. I know that I'm hoping that part of the OurWinnipeg and the…and some of the Infill Strategy may help kind of determine how we're going to deal with some of those things. But moving forward, I mean it is…it is difficult, we're in a political environment and it does come to these different committees that…that those people rely on us to make those decisions.

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

Councillor Mayes: There are more. When the community has come forward and I've attempted to assist them, we've had members, fellow members of the Planning Committee vote down the idea of even studying heritage for the Glenwood area. We had fellow members of the committee vote down the idea of a moratorium on these lot splits until there's some sort of guidelines in place. So again, I'm going to ask what concrete…the issue isn't gravel back lanes are bad, I've talked about that for many years, and they're bad in places other than the Glenwood area, the question was what can say to these people that tried different approaches; heritage, which was approved, of course, for Armstrong's Point and approved overnight in the Crescentwood area, they've tried to petition without success? So I am very pleased that we're listening to the community and putting $20 million to our local benefit at Starlight lands. But what concretely can we say to these people in terms of some sort benefit, some way of bringing local benefit? I'm glad that in the last two days, 15 million more was found for the Starlight lands, but I have to say, Councillor Allard and I have had a motion in for over a year requesting some way of having local benefit come from infill from lot split projects. We have not heard back from the department. You'll have to understand the difficulty $15 million in two days, and we've been waiting over a year. So can you tell us please, concretely, what…what can we look forward to for these people who have been trying for so long to get some local benefit themselves?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy?

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. What I would tell your people, is that they have a strong advocate, you're a Councillor that has a fought for them, and your beliefs, and sometimes you win some in Council and sometimes you lose them, sometimes you lose. And what they need to know is that you've been a strong advocate on those issues, and there's no doubt and I will stand in front of everyone and let them know that. But we are a council, and we all make decisions that impact many different wards and sometimes in our wards, we…we get something for our citizens and sometimes in our wards, we don't. And we support other people who get other things. But what I would tell them is that you, as a Councillor, have been a champion on those issues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any other questions? Seeing none, Councillor Mayes, second round.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I have been trying for some years, perhaps you'll have more success than I have. I certainly hope so, you've already had more success than I have, so I wish you well in getting an answer for the following question, which is, every single report that has come out, and there have been close to a 100 of them on these lots splits, and there…and it's as of right lots splits, so it's really just a variance hearing that the developer has to go through. They don't have to go through the cost of a rezoning. So every single one has the same report, which is, this is low to medium…low to moderate densification. Now if this…if after a 100 that's the same answer as after one, you…you'd start to wonder if maybe, there could be some more energy put into…

Councillor Nason: Question?

Councillor Mayes: The question is, if we can say what's moderate, how come we can't say what's immoderate? Every time I ask and say, "What would be too much? What would be too fast?" I can't get an answer. We had an answer at Parker. 1,600's too much, it's 300 too much. Now, we've approved over 300 with no planning at all in my ward.

Madam Speaker: The question?

Councillor Mayes: So can you ask, please, what would immoderate be if this is…if we can define what low to moderate is, how is it that we can't define the other end of the scale? Why isn't there some number that we can be given that is saying, "Yes, this would be too much"?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy?

Councillor Gilroy: Councillor…Councillor Mayes. I haven't been Chair for that long, so you would probably be able to answer some of these questions.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy, you'll have to bring your comments through to the Chair to me.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, that's correct, yeah, yeah. Councillor Mayes, I haven't been Chair that long so I know that you could probably answer some of these better than I. So…but if you want to, send me that question in an e-mail and I can maybe refer back to…to the administration. I know that you know…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, sorry.

Madam Speaker: Your comments have to be brought through the Chair.

Councillor Gilroy: Okay, yeah.

Madam Speaker: But you can look at him.

Councillor Gilroy: No, no. No, fair enough. Through you, Madam Chair, you know, we do have…we are working on an OurWinnipeg, we are working on Complete Communities, we are working on an Infill Strategy. Now where we will align with that is going to be a debate that we're going to have coming forward. So I think that the concerns that the Councillor's raising through you, Madam Chair, I'm hoping that we're going to have some of those discussions and some of those debates as we move forward. And I know that he's passionate on this and I look forward to hearing him because I know that he has been vocal on these issues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, any further questions? Seeing none, let's move to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. Councillor Rollins, on the report dated June 10th.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED JUNE 10, 2020

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, so moved, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: That's Item 3?

Councillor Rollins: That's right.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Rollins, on the report dated July 10th.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED JULY 10, 2020

Councillor Rollins: Yes, Madam Speaker, I'm going to move the consent agenda, if I can.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Okay, carried. It's carried. That's correct. Now, next is a motion. It's Motion No. 1 and it is moved by Councillor Nason and seconded by Councillor Klein. It's regarding a Community Incentive Grant for East Park Lodge. It's an automatic referral to the standing policy committee but the councillor has indicated to all of us that he wishes to suspend the rules. Councillor Nason, to hear the item today. All in favour of suspension? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Nason, if you could introduce your motion, please.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS on June 24, 2020 the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee approved in principle a Community Incentive Grant to the East Park Lodge Inc., not to exceed 50% of project costs;

AND WHEREAS the subsequent application submitted indicated that the applicant is seeking 100% of the project funding from the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the expedient award of funding and completion of this project will enable residents of the East Park Lodge to better enjoy the outdoors in 2020;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. *That the following eligibility criteria for the Community Incentive Grant Program be waived in this instance, namely:*
   A. The total City of Winnipeg contribution is 50% or less

2. *That a Community Incentive Grant in the amount of $10,203.00, funded from the Transcona Ward allocation, be approved to the East Park Lodge Inc., to assist with the cost of the outdoor furniture, barbeque. P. A. system and a shed project, subject to the following conditions:*
   B. Approval of final plans and specifications for the project by the Director of Community Services; and
   C. The applicant entering into a formal agreement with The City of Winnipeg.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's been a long day and I'll try to be as brief as possible. We know in this time of COVID there are a lot of challenges, and none more affected than seniors, that are in care in our communities. We were approached by the East Park Lodge. They were seeking support with regards to outdoor space or gatherings so visits and community can come together. They initially came forward with a 50% ask, but they subsequently came back and needed the entire support for the project. It would be nice you know. This opportunity would be nice if the province came to the table. But as we see with East Park Lodge, they've yet to identify expansion of personal care beds in that region. I know the MLA, Noah Altman, along with MP Daniel Blaikie, both are strongly pushing for this and at some point, we hope that they'll come to the table, but in this regard, I'm looking to try to get an exemption to the 50% costing and allow for 100% to come from the Community Incentive Grant funding, to see this be a reality during the summer season and allow for them to get together and hopefully be able to have some fellowship.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Nason, do you wish to close? Or I can call to vote?

Councillor Nason: Call the vote.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Nason: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: We now have Motion 8 before us. Motion 8 is moved by Councillor Chambers, seconded by Councillor Allard. It's regarding Police Board checks. It's an automatic referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection,

Community Services and Parks. It's an automatic referral. Yes, okay. And next, we'll move into by-laws now, Councillor Rollins.

Motion No. 8
Moved by Councillor Chambers,
Seconded by Councillor Allard,

WHEREAS all provinces in Canada have civilian governance for police services through boards or commissions that provide oversight to their local police service;

AND WHEREAS these police boards or commissions are governed by different provincial legislation and bylaws;

AND WHEREAS jurisdictions across Canada have different requirements, policies, and procedures for completing background security checks on potential public board members;

AND WHEREAS the Police Services Act Police Board Regulation 2 (3) requires that, "Before being appointed to a municipal police board, a person must provide the appointing authority with a signed consent authorizing inquiries to be made into the person's background, including a search of the child abuse registry established under The Child and Family Services Act and inquiries to determine whether the person has been convicted of, or found guilty of, contravening a federal or provincial enactment, or has any outstanding charges for contravening a federal or provincial enactment awaiting court disposition ";

AND WHEREAS Article 12 of the City of Winnipeg Bylaw No. 148/2012 "Winnipeg Police Board Bylaw" requires that "potential Board members must pass background security checks, without limitation, any background security checks pursuant to the [Police Services] Act";

AND WHEREAS the Manitoba Police Commission submitted a report to the Minister of Justice in July 2013 entitled "A Report Examining Security Clearance for Municipal Police Board Appointees" wherein it was recommended that security clearances continue to be provincially regulated and that a person who consented to a background check has an option to request an alternate police service perform the check and if they do so, it is further recommended that it be the RCMP;

AND WHEREAS the current application for a background check states that an applicant can request that the RCMP complete the check;
AND WHEREAS the aforementioned report includes a cross jurisdictional study on the type of background check required for various police boards which provide oversight to their local policing agency;

AND WHEREAS Council, as the appointing authority, wishes to be assured that police board members are capable of exercising their role free of any vulnerability or influence that could bring the administration of justice into disrepute and to ensure that public confidence in the board as a whole and/or as individuals is maintained;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED in order to ensure maximum transparency and neutrality when conducting a background check for the purposes of being appointed to the Winnipeg Police Board, that the Winnipeg Public Service report back in 90 days with an up to date cross jurisdictional review regarding security checks for the purposes of serving on the Winnipeg Police Board that examines:

A. Which Canadian jurisdictions require a background security check;

B. Which agency preforms said background security check;

C. The breadth of the background security check conducted;

D. The intended purpose of the background security check.

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

Councillor Rollins: I would like to introduce By-law No. 84/2020 to amend the emergency management by-laws, small change here, to be read the first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 84/2020.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: I would like to move By-law No. 84/2020 to be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 84/2020.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I'd like to move, By-law No. 84/2020 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period for Councillor Rollins. Any questions under this committee? Seeing none, let's move to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Allard, on the report dated July 7th.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED JULY 7, 2020

Councillor Allard: I would like to move the consent agenda. There is a motion, though. So I don't know how that works.

Madam Speaker: So we'll pull 2. And you'll move consent, otherwise? I'll call the question, 2 has been pulled. And we'll call the question on 3 and 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Dockless Electric Bike and Scooter Sharing

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.
Councillor Allard: Yes, I'll introduce this. This is a report coming out of a motion that came from The Riel Community Committee. The report is…or basically, the motion was acknowledging that e-scooters and e-bikes are a phenomenon that are gaining steam across the world and many jurisdictions. You have varying degrees of regulation and it's a point being these devices are out there and they are proliferating. I talked to local business owner who was looking to…or who was interested in selling these devices. Looking into the legality of it. The bottom line in terms of e-scooters, they are not permitted on our roads and in terms of the electric bikes, they are; as long as they're fitting the right…as long they are…electric bikes are permitted, as long as they are conforming to specific standards with the Highway Traffic Act. So I think this is a report that I'm hoping we can support. It's asking the province to modernize laws in order for these devices to be properly…well, to become allowable to use; and currently, we don't have that legal power in the city of Winnipeg. And so, with that being said, I'll wait to hear from my colleagues and I'll be happy to answer their questions.

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

Councillor Mayes: I wanted to read in an e-mail that was sent to Councillor Allard and to me by former...public health physician, former medical director of population of public health for the WRHA, and current professor at U of M about e-scooters. Inherently dangerous due to their design, small wheels, instability, rapid acceleration, frequent operator inexperience and lack of adequate protective equipment use. There is scientific literature documenting these issues and concerns by the medical community. And a quick Google search would provide ample examples. So I would hope that, whatever trial we're doing – and it appears we're going to do a trial – would have some measurement of the health issues. The writer goes on to say a number of jurisdictions in the US have now reconsidered e-scooters or have outright banned them. So there are some, I think, health concerns, at least whereas by one independent party who has a lot of public health experience. I do think that's important to get on the record and I would hope that that is a part of any study that we do. Otherwise, I think we're simply buying into a project here without looking at all of the potential, social costs that could go with that. So, I'm not going to try and spike this thing at the very end here, but I do have concerns now, that someone from the medical community has said you should be looking into the health implications and the health risks associated with the e-scooters.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason. Actually, first we're going to go to Councillor Rollins…my apologies. I had the order wrong. Councillor Rollins followed by Councillor Nason.

Councillor Rollins: I rise in support of my colleague from St. Vital, Councillor Mayes, who brought forward some of my concerns. I don't like the scooters. I saw them in action in Detroit, Michigan, when I was there last summer and they were dumped, sort of, all over the street. I'm not in support of them. I won't be in support of this motion. I'm glad it was pulled and I don't even want to do a pilot. So that's what I have to say.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Sorry about that. I got an unmute notice and then I actually have to click both. I am just actually scanning and I see that Health and Technologies, which I believe presented at the standing committee, is leaving town. They found their experience in dealing with the City on this issue confusing and disorganized. Questions went unanswered and seems as though the City is wanting to push the decision to the province, about bike paths. You know, it's challenging when we hear businesses like that. I know Councillor Browaty recently celebrated his anniversary of riding on a line scooter in Minneapolis, I believe it was. I myself saw them down in San Antonio, and I actually will find myself concurring with Councillor Rollins, about the fact that they were everywhere. They do get dropped here, there. And willy-nilly. And not in designated spaces. And do become a bit of a blight and potential safety hazard. So I'm not overly supportive of it. I do know on the bike sharing, they do have generally dots where they find themselves back in. I don't know what the program specifically has with that, but it is interesting on the bike sharing. I do know corporate world do like that from one meeting to another, using that. So that is something that I would be interested to hear more of. That's also potential along some of our densification, if we see ever do see Parker Lands come to fruition; a good opportunity for people to use this, you know, several hundred dollars worth of AT and bus infrastructure for what it's built to do. So, hopefully, we'll have more dialogue in the future and we'll see where we go. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, could I move with instruction, that we table this to the next regularly scheduled Council meeting and if it's with instruction, may I speak to it?

Madam Speaker: I'm sorry, Councillor Schreyer, can you repeat that?

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. May I move that we refer this, with instruction, and I move that we refer this to the next regularly scheduled Council meeting in September. May I speak to this?
Madam Speaker: If you refer without instructions, it's in order. Yeah, so you're laying it…you're asking for…lay it over to the September Council meeting?

Councillor Schreyer: May I speak to it if I do so?

Madam Speaker: For three minutes.

Councillor Schreyer: Yeah. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Providing the reasons why, of course. That's in order, yes. Councillor Schreyer, reasons for the layover?

Councillor Schreyer: Sure, thank you Madam Speaker. It's a really important issue, and these are the things we can't ignore. New types of technology and new types of design are creating new types of sort of foot powered or electrically powered active transportation vehicles or mobiles. And as Councillor Rollins and others have pointed out, they can be dangerous. But the fact is that we can't ignore the fact that new types of technologies and designs are coming out. Scooters, we can't ignore these things. It's just that when I take a look at the motion, it's a little vague. As an example, scooters, many types of definitions, and I guess in one case, it can have two wheels, three wheels and four wheels, they're all called scooters. The issue here, I believe, comes…the crux of it comes down to the size of the wheel. The small wheels are dangerous and we also have to consider speeds and things like this. What's meant for streets, what's meant for ATs and therefore, I think we as a council deserve more information on this, in terms of what's appropriate for approval because a three-inch diameter wheel scooter is different from a one foot or a ten-inch diameter scooter wheel, and there's a big difference. Just like a bicycle is a lot safer, and an e-bicycle is not a scooter, but they're all put into the same motion. On that basis, we should have some real deliberate consideration of what we're sending on to the provincial government, in terms of what our request is. Just in the last month, I have seen types of foot powered and electrically powered AT type of vehicles, that did not exist ten years ago, including one wheels. But my brother can ride a unicycle since he's been eight years old. But aside from that, I've seen those, not electric unicycles, having said that, if that's what you're referring to. Having said that, we need to know the difference in terms of what scooter means. Scooter means different things to

different people and in terms of safety, as Councillor Rollins pointed out, we have to deal with the safety issue here. And not deny the fact that we actually have to have some trials on some of these things, but not all of it. I think we should make a decision in terms of what kind of scooters we're talking about, because you know, there's a half dozen different kinds of scooters out there and there is a big spectrum in terms of safety. My son, a year and a half ago, just smashed out his two front teeth on a scooter, but it's a little scooter. And because of the radius of the wheels, that affects most things.

Madam Speaker: I think you've made your point about the reason for the layover.

Councillor Schreyer: But I'm not going to deny that…

Madam Speaker: Because you're debating the merits of the project now, as well. Okay thank you. Councillor Allard, onto yourself.

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you. So, I mean, there isn't a huge urgency to this report. I mean, this is, I think, us leading on an issue. We have, as Councillor Schreyer just indicated, these devices are proliferating and this is a way for us to take control of the issue through licensing, through…there's all sorts of possible scenarios. If we don't do this, then we just…it's laissez-faire and we just wait and see what happens, like Councillor Schreyer, your son getting injured. So these things are…this is already…this is happening and so, this is an effort to recognize that it's happening and take control of that process. Just speaking to the layover; on the layover, we have considered many reports today that were walked on. Some of those were passed, some of those were not passed. I would implore my councillor colleagues to – If they have an issue with the report, please talk to me or the public service. This is Council day; there's been weeks that this has been on the public agenda. There's been ample time to talk to the public service, to myself or other committee members who supported this report. So I really don't see…I mean, on the one hand, there isn't a huge urgency of this report, but on the other hand, Councillor Schreyer, with all due respect, you've had three weeks to read this report and I'd like to see it debated and hopefully passed. If not, I think we've all had plenty of time to absorb the contents of this report and have discussions with committee members, myself, and the public service. So I really don't think this is a good time to be laying a report over.

Madam Speaker: With that, we'll vote on the layover as Councillor Schreyer requested; layover to the September Council meeting. All in favour? Contrary? The referral is lost. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker. I'll be brief on this. I'll be supporting this report. I, too, like many of my Council colleagues, have seen the electric scooters, other types of scooters in other cities and yes, there's been some instances where I kind of see them discarded everywhere. There's been other instances where they actually have a docking station and so, it's kind of…it looks a lot neater. If you take it from one docking station, you ride it, you put it back in the next docking station to get your deposit back or whatever the case may be, it can work. And so, to me this is a prime example of where the private sector, I believe, should be given the opportunity. And let the market decide. Yes, we should put in place regulations around ensuring their safety, ensuring that they're not discarded anywhere. Working with the province, to make sure that they could be used in certain locations. I would hope though, quite frankly, that in moving this, that the province would not delay. Councillor Nason referenced one of the gentleman who was a delegate at the executive Policy Committee meeting from Alpha Technologies that's situated right in the St. James Ward. And Mr. Caselle is very eager to get these e-scooters up and running and make them available to people. And I would hope that we wouldn't drag our feet in seeing this happen and putting kind of some regulations around it and I think that we should be doing that. The suggestions were made…that he made to look at other jurisdictions like Calgary, and others, and just kind of borrow from them some of the policies they put in place, and framework that they put in place. Councillor Browaty and I were dialoguing through e-mail with Mr. Patman, from the department, the City's Public Works Department, who said that's exactly what the public service is doing as they're looking at some best practices and policies from other jurisdictions. So, let's move this ahead, I'm in support of it. And let's let the private sector give space for them to provide this service, or let the market decide and let's put the right parameters around it to ensure safety, but ensure that there's…this is an opportunity that can be provided to the community.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Next speaker, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I wasn't going to speak to it, but there has to be parameters related to safety. Anything that's operating in the right of way poses challenges for people with disabilities and so consideration has to be given to that, as well. Things laying around cause accidents and problems. So I agree with Councillor Gillingham and that, but there's no need to...let's move this forward. Some of the other cities have considered the safety of persons with disabilities and those rules and regulations need to be in place. And so, let's just get this thing going so that, well, the private sector can have their opportunity whether they make money or not.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I want to thank our chair for trying to do his best to embrace innovation and change that we see that's happening around the world but also proceed with caution. I too, have had experiences in other cities, haven't traveled recently, of course. But I've also had dialogue on this issue with mayors from across Canada and they've also indicated some of the real issues that we need to manage as a city. Some of the concerns that are raised here today, I've heard those concerns, as well. I think proceeding in the way as prescribed with the issues identified in the report – excuse me, Madam Speaker – and at committee, I'm certainly happy to proceed, but I think we should all have our eyes wide open about some of the very real and legitimate concerns and I want to thank our committee chair for managing as best he can along the way.

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

Councillor Allard: Yes, I do. Thank you. So, a few things. Councillor Gillingham, thank you for appearing in delegation and asking for a change. I think you had basically pointed out that this is not something the City should be doing itself, and we removed that recommendation from the original public service recommendation; so thank you for presenting then and allowing us to amend the report into something that I think we all agreed on at, well, at Public Works and EPC, and we'll see what happens today at Council. So thank you for that. And Councillor Mayes, to your point on health, you know, I think if you compare I don't know, if you compare this type of issue with other issues, where there's potential for harm, I think we're better off engaging in the process, regulating the process. These machines are there. Councillor Schreyer mentioned some; they are proliferating. There are more and more of them. E-bikes are already legal. Scooters are not. Other companies like Lime and others, that were looking to get into Winnipeg, they cannot. So right now, you're seeing a few devices here and there, and they're not being regulated. And this risk of litter, as well, I think it can be managed through the permitting process, which is another reason why we want, I think, to take a hold of this issue. And in terms of why it's important, micro-mobility is part of the mobility spectrum. It encourages mode shift in that it does fill those little gaps between people's commutes. So I think it is a positive if it can be managed properly. Councillor Nason, you mentioned passing the buck to the province, well we have to, because the province is the owner of the Highway Traffic Act and currently scooters are not legal, so I mean, we have to pass the buck. We have no choice but to do that. Or else scooters will just remain illegal and people will presumably keep using them illegally, as I'm sure some of us have observed. And then Councillor Rollins, I think you were more in line with Councillor Mayes' comments, and to that, I would argue that we're better off engaging in this process to make sure that Winnipeggers can be made as safe as possible because this technology is here, and it's coming, and I think we should take the bull by the horns and make sure the bull is doing what we want it to do. So that would be…I think that would be my supporting comments for the report. I want to thank the public service. They, I think, created a very good report here on how to move this forward and I hope we can support this report here today and I hope that in a near future, we can add electric bikes and e-scooters as a part of our mobility solutions, giving Winnipeggers more transportation options. So, thank you for your consideration.
Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Two have been recorded in opposition…three: Councillor Rollins, Councillor Klein, Councillor Mayes. Moving on…councillor? Okay, we will have to have a recorded vote on this item. Call for a recorded vote on Item 1. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Nason, Klein, Mayes, Rollins and Schreyer.

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

Madam Speaker: Item 1 passes. Next, Madam Clerk, Item 2.

Item 2 – Speed Limit Review: Process and Residential Speed Limits

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, if you would like to introduce the item and your amending Motion No. 9.

Motion No. 9
Moved by Councillor Allard
Seconded by Councillor Rollins,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Recommendation 5 of Item 2 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated July 7, 2020, be amended by deleting "funding from within existing resources", and replacing with "surplus funds from the 2017 local street renewal budget".

Councillor Allard: I do, thank you very much. So thank you to my colleagues, the public service for this report. It was heavily scrutinized. I was heavily supported at committee by many delegations who chose to attend. Thank you to Councillor Lukes, Councillor Orlikow, well, many colleagues who have informed this report. So, you'll see the standing policy recommendation is quite different than what was originally proposed by the public service; that's because, I think, we tried to incorporate a committee feedback from colleagues and from members of the public who presented. So the amending motion, Motion 9, is specifying the source of funding for this, which would be from surplus funds from the 2017 local street renewal budget. And if I'm to speak to the topic generally or maybe a bit of history; so, Councillor Browaty and I years ago, were at A&M asking the provincial government for power over our speed limits and I'm pleased to see…or, I was pleased to see, the province answered the call and they gave us that power and this is what happens when the province gives you the power to do something, as we now have to sort out what we want to do with that power. And I think we have a way forward that is cautious being proposed by the department to…the department originally proposed pilots in greenways. I think part of their recommendation was to try to formalize what our greenways are in Winnipeg; so as we know, greenways are streets where bicycles and cars mix, but they have more of a bicycle focus. So, I can understand the logic of the department in wanting to pilot there. The big issue with the power that has been bestowed upon us from the province, is that they gave us the power on speeds, but they did not give us the power to do gateway or I think, boundary signage, it's called. Which, basically means if we want to have a speed limit other than the posted…other than the default speed limit, which is 50, we have to actually sign, basically, every intersection on a street where we want to do that, which, if you read the report, is pretty excessive and most people, I think you talk to, or most people I've talked to, including people who support the idea of safe speeds at 30 kilometers an hour, I think recognize that it's just too much signage. Sign clutter. If you're concerned about finances, it's close to, if we were to sign the whole city, close to $8 million to have a different speed limit to the 50 default. So I think the department did a good job, I think the Public Work's Committee did a good job incorporating feedback from the public and fellow councillors. I do think this is a cautious way forward. I don't think that there is consensus in the community on what default speed limit should be. Some people think we should stay at 50. Some people think we should go to 40. Some people think we should go to 30. And there's a whole spectrum of opinions. And I think this motion coming from standing committee, EPC, is one that will really be walking before we run, taking it easy, having public engagements. The idea of having a pilot in every ward, I think, with consultation from councillors, I think that's going to be extremely positive, as well, to have this conversation with Winnipeggers. And so that we have basically an open mind. We're listening and I think there's a whole…Councillor Lukes would agree, I think, this whole education piece to this. Some people might think it's crazy to change the speed limit from 50 to 30 or 40, or any other number. But jurisdictions from across the world are moving to look at their speed limits. In many cases, those are going on a downward trend, and I think there's many reasons for that, including some of the arguments we've heard from delegations; that higher speeds means higher changes of injury or death. MPI currently has a campaign, Save the 100, raising awareness of the approximately 100 people we lose per year to automobile collisions. Speed is often a contributing factor to collisions and injury and death. So, there's a bit of a preamble to what I think is a solid recommendation from our public service. And I think we have modified the recommendations in a way that is respectful of public, respectful of councillors, and also brings in, I think, more public engagement, which I think is essential because if you hear the chatter, if you look on social media, there are a lot of very strong opinions and I think a lot of those opinions may not have been founded on a whole lot of research and/or background information. So I think this addresses that. So that's my original pitch and I'm happy to hear from my colleagues.

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

Councillor Rollins: I've said a lot on my love for 30 kilometres an hour but I want to recognize, Madam Speaker, from hours and hours ago, Ms. Lammatao and Ms. Chubb, who came before Council to tell us about their own tragic occurrences on roads and road safety, in particular. In particular, a 23-year-old daughter, who you know, I'm oftentimes asked following any media from the past six years, including when I was a school trustee and an advocate for school zones, you know, if I knew of one child that had been killed on the road. And, of course, those stories are very personal when you do know about them. And you can't experience the full range of emotions at work every single day, so I protect those stories. And so, it was such a moment of bravery to hear from a mom in this Council today, and I really want to recognize that, and really wanted to stand and recognize her during the question period following her presentation. I could not, Madam Speaker, because I wasn't strong enough. So, all I can do is each and every time there's a motion on reduced speed limits, is to think of parents like her, parents that I've met. Far too many that have lost children on the road and keep

acting accordingly as a councillor and dedicating motions, every incremental step towards 30 kilometers on their behalf. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. First, I'll speak to the amendment, which is, there is a need to source some money. But Madam Speaker, I'm not sure how much of our local road program is outside of the local road renewal fund, in which I know we took on $22 million worth of debt, and it's being paid for out of the local road renewal fund which really, if there's surpluses, any money that's related to that has to be spent on local roads unless you get a two-thirds vote to use it for something else, but…and I can't remember how much of the local road…overall city local road renewal was being done under the…not related to the local road renewal fund. It seems to me, if we're going to move…vote…move to find the surplus funding, it doesn't identify in your motion where the surplus is coming from. And so, either we have a two-thirds vote today to do that amendment, to use any surplus to cover off what…I can't remember is the cost, but I just wanted to remind people that those are the financial rules around our local and regional road renewal fund, right? Those funds, the money can only be spent on that, and that's it. And so, I just want to remind my colleagues. So if we're going to move that, we'll do it. Not that I'm opposed to it, I'm just saying there are…you're not identifying surplus from which part of the overall local road renewal program. I just wanted to speak to the report itself. I think it's important. I just want to remind people. I hear people talking about the experts say 30. Yeah, that's true, but Councillor Smith and I, back in my first term, moved a slow down campaign and we wanted to get it down to 40 based on a study that was done in Edmonton in terms of residential speeds. And so, I am clearly in support of 40 because actually, if you look at our residential streets – and we have these traffic studies done where people think people are speeding and we get the studies done, and we find out that, you know, 80% of the people are not – they're driving…they're following the rules, but they're actually, the average speed is like around 43 km/hr – most of them. And then there are some people who do speed and go over 50 but it's a small portion. And it's those dangerous drivers that no matter what you set the speed to on a street, those drivers will continue to be a threat to our kids, to adults on bikes, whatever. They continue to be the threat. The driver who doesn't drive to the conditions, as Councillor Browaty eloquently put it the other day, you drive to the conditions, it's not just about the weather conditions. It's the environment in which you're driving in, that you drive to those conditions. And I hate to say it…actually, on too many of my local residential streets, they're in such bad shape, nobody you know...you don't want to drive more than 30 because you're going to wreck your car. So that's, I don't think that's a good way of dealing with speeds and stuff. But I do support and will be supporting this motion and, yeah, it would be ridiculous to have to the sign thing and you know, an enforcement. Let's say that right now, there's a lot of enforcement that happens and people complain about where the signs are placed and so on and so forth and they end up winning and, you know, we weren't ticketed properly and all of this kind of stuff. So yeah, the whole signage thing has to be dealt with appropriately before we move along, but again, I'm going to try to work with this. I think it's reasonable to slow it down to 40. There's a lot of cyclists I know of who do ride more than 19 miles an hour when they're commuting to go to work. I used to ride over 30 kilometres an hour commuting when I worked when I could see. I didn't own my own car. I rode a bike and I took a bus. So, I just wanted to speak to, you know, it is an emotional talk. I get it. Kids have been killed. I have…we all probably have family members who have been hit by a car, something's happened. You know them. My step mom is a great example. The drivers aren't penalized appropriately in this no-fault system that we have. There's all kinds of issues, but I have to say that everybody has to follow the rules and the speeds. I will say it again, on a residential street, the deaths of a kid, that I know of, involve the driver who was not following the rules of the road. Just changing speeds does nothing, nothing to resolve that. Remember that. And I always try to say to people, we need to do better in educating people on how to use various controls that we have on our regional streets and what actually green light means and what various aspects, what those mean to people. Like, Madam Speaker, there's people who still don't understand, like when the hand goes red or whatever they do for pedestrians now, what that actually means is, it doesn't mean that all of a sudden they're going to be driving the other way. What that means is don't start off the curb to cross the street because you're not going to have enough time to do it. And with the audible signals, you will hear the cuckoo or chirp chirp. When it stops, a person who is blind needs to know that doesn't mean that the traffic's going to start coming the other way. What that means is when the chirp or the cuckoo stops, it means don't try to proceed to cross the street because you're not going to have enough time. And so I constantly hear this from people, if there's a push button near a cross walk, remember, you need to push the button to get enough time.

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

Councillor Eadie: Remember, you need to push the button…when there is a button there to press, to cross, i's not just to turn on the audible signal, it's a push button that you have to push to get enough time to get across the street. So push the button so you do have the time to get across the street. Anyway, I don't want to lecture people, I just…we have to educate people more and more, because even if you slow down to 50 on all regional streets, for example, or whatever, right, ultimately, there are still traffic controls for pedestrians and motor vehicles that have to be followed appropriately and properly. So, I'll just leave it at that, I'm supporting this report, but because I just wanted to end on the thing about using

surplus of local road money is it's not identified here where the surplus is coming from, so I'm suggesting that that amending motion needs a two-thirds to support. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Browaty

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise today in opposition to the report before us here today. Madam Speaker, we all receive calls from constituents. We don't hear about constituents that are following social norms and behaving well. We hear about problems in our neighborhoods. We hear about people that leave too much junk in their yards. We hear about people that litter on the street. We hear about people that have loud parties late at night or they drive, you know, cars with loud exhausts and you know, speed away too quickly from the drive through at the Tim Hortons on north Main on Sunday nights. We hear about people who drive imprudently in our neighborhoods. Heck, we even hear about kamikaze cyclists that drive down the median or the curbed lanes during rush hour, when there's a perfectly good active transportation amenity right beside it. We don't set our policies for the lowest common denominator. There are already protections in our laws that can deal with people who are imprudent in their vehicles. Change screens here. Again, as Councillor Eadie mentioned from my EPC speech – you must slow down when there's inclement weather. You must slow down when there are pedestrians or cyclists on the street. When you're going around parked cars, around corners. Heck, I believe it's important and appropriate to be ticketing drivers when they're driving under the speed limit but imprudent for the conditions that are there. What we're proposing today is a whole mishmash of pilot projects. We're asking for permission to lower gateway signage to the whole community. If we have that permission tomorrow, and we put up a 30 km/hr sign at the border of Winnipeg, every street that's 50, becomes an automatic 30. Major streets throughout our downtown, throughout our neighborhoods. Sure, you know, my local neighborhood bay, I doubt I ever get over 40, but local collector streets that go through our neighborhoods, are they going to pick and choose each and every one of them? If you're in River Heights, you've got you know, lots of parallel streets. One of them is a snow route, the others aren't. So does that become the 50 kilometres an hour road? How much extra traffic is going to go down – I'm making this up – but like you have Oak, Ash and Elm. Three streets in River Heights, if one of them is 50 and the other two are 30, where's all the traffic going to go that's trying to get through the neighborhood? It's going to go down the one that's 50. Is that fair to residents on that street? If you have gateway signage, you're going to end up making tons and tons of 50 km/hr signs for those collector streets. Or is the plan to slow all of those to 30, too? It's simply not right. Again, today we're proposing a pilot. Even there, you're going to have one street that's 30 and all of the others are going to be 50. There's going to be nobody left going down these streets unless you're forced to go there and you're penalized for being there. You're going to pit neighbour against neighbour. One neighbor is going to say I want my street to be 30. I want my street to be 50, I don't want it changed. How is that fair? Right now, by doing these pilot projects, you're going to have all these one offs. And again, even the one offs aren't going to be consistent. Some of them can be 30, some of them can be 40. Both of those are apparently options according to the suggestions before us today. I do support road safety and we have a major exercise that our department is going through on road safety. We're looking at new things that we can do, looking at best practices. We build new communities today; we don't do them the same way as we used to. We do them with, you know, streets that have calming measures built into them. I look at Ragsdale near where I live, it's way too wide by todays standards for the type of street it is. So if you were building that today, you would not build the street that way. I mean, again, I believe we're penalizing everyone. You know, even at different times of the day. There's appropriate speed when there's absolutely nobody on the road, and appropriate speed when there's a lot of traffic. Again, there's traffic engineering standards; the whole notion of 85th percentile, there are visual cues on the roads that have a lot of indication as to how...what the speed limit should be and how traffic should travel on them. Again, it was important to hear, you know, we need to be educating young people to be safe. Accidents do occur, we should be driving towards zero collisions, but again, how many of the accidents that we hear about, are actually on local streets? More of the accidents are on those big major arterials that are, you know, located by schools and that, and you have to cross them. I went to a junior high school on Henderson Highway. I mean, I can't believe more people didn't get driven over because they were being idiots running across to get to 7/11, you know, or on their lunch hours. I mean, I was young and foolish myself; I've probably did it once, too, had a late slurpee run during the noon hour. That said, I mean, we're not going to slow down everything. We need to move traffic. Our streets are designed for traffic. Winnipeg does not have freeways. Winnipeg, you know, for good or bad, you can still get almost anywhere within our city, within half an hour. But we don't want to slow that down further. This fall, we're hearing that perhaps people are going to be encouraged not to send their kids on school busses. We're going to have a lot more traffic out there. If you slow down traffic too far in our communities, it's going to impede the proper movement of people. There's so many local streets in our city – you know what it's going to take away from? Time that people can spend at home with their families in some cases. I mean, that's excessive, it's not going to be huge amounts of time but it adds up. So again, I encourage all of you to vote against what's before us here today. It's not well thought-out. These pilot projects, I think, are half measures and not well considered. Again, my comments back when I did work with Councillor Allard to do away with the Transportation Board that worked on speed limits, I made the comment at those times. We need to keep this based on science, on traffic engineering principles. This isn't about…speed limits should not be set politically. There's a handful of streets in the city, that I think, even over time the speed limits have been set politically. Parts of south Pembina Highway, Grant Avenue. There's no way that some of the streets should be as slow as they are in some cases. Or the streets should be radically resigned if you're changing how it's designed. So anyway…and

I'm not a speed demon. I've never had a regular speeding ticket in the city of Winnipeg. I've had two photo radar tickets going by parks in my 20 odd years of driving, 24 years of driving. So I am not a speed demon. But I just want to say, again, but I'm going to become a criminal, because 30 kilometres an hour is too slow for the most part. So again, this is just a bad idea. People need to drive to the conditions. There's already, you know, again – speed limits are based on ideal conditions. This is a terrible idea. You know, we're often accused of you know, we must be sitting in piles of money because all of the money we get from photo enforcement. You know, we're setting it up to do I gotchas. I don't believe in that, I really don't. However, when we're doing things like this, we're making these speed limits artificially low by politically setting them, and we're going to be accused of cash grabs. Unfortunately, I think the public at that point would be right. Do you want to wear that politically, going into the next election? I don't think you should. We shouldn't. So today, say no and vote no.

Madam Speaker: Motion 12 that's being circulated on the same item. And it's moved by Councillor Allard, seconded by Councillor Gillingham. It's essentially amending Motion 9 that Councillor Allard just introduced. It's quite simple, it sounds complicated at moment, it's not. So just having a look, it's coming across your desks. Councillor Allard, would you introduce Motion 12?

Motion No. 12
Moved by Councillor Allard,
Seconded by Councillor Gillingham,

BE IT RESOLVED that Motion 9 be amend by adding the following to the end of the resolve "and that a new capital budget page be created for this project"

Councillor Allard: Yes, so further to Councillor Eadie's comments, I understood that the motion was in order from the Clerk. I had this conversation with Councillor Gillingham and understand that on the financial side, this motion is required. So I think that's why this motion is before us. I won't reintroduce the topic, because I've done that already, so I'll leave addressing comments in my closing remarks.

Madam Speaker: Would you mind reading it out?

Councillor Allard: Yes. So it's moved by Councillor Allard, seconded by Councillor Gillingham. Be it resolved that Motion 9 be amended by adding the following to the end of the resolved, "And that a new capital budget page be created for this project". So I see Councillor Gillingham wants to say something. Sorry, so I think we're good and I still have the opportunity to close, is that right?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Allard: I'll sit down then.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. With that, Councillor Klein is the next speaker, but those that have spoken, you could speak again if you wish. Councillor Klein followed by Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. And Madam Speaker, I'm going to echo a lot of what Councillor Browaty said today, but I just want to be on the record again that, here we are finding money whether it's cash to capital or from the operating expenses, whatever, when we are claiming that we're hundreds of millions or tens of millions of dollars in financial trouble because of COVID-19, yet, we're doing this right now and I don't think a lot of time and effort has gone into this yet. I think we're on the right path. I believe that you know, we need to have safe streets and I believe that we have to find all the right methods of doing that. It's not, again, that I believe people should be able to go 100 km/h on a residential area, I just want to do this properly and I want to be certain when I cast my vote that we're finding more money for this out of surplus dollars but we're going to be $50 million short on our budget. Or it's going to come from capital. So I'm kind of confuse by all of this. I would just prefer that it goes back to the standing committee and we kind of start over.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. I wasn't going to speak but it seems like Councillor Browaty has a love for my ward, which I do as well. So absolutely, the issue of pushing it from street to street let's call those speed humps, that's exactly what happens now. Street A, gets us speed humps on their street because they meet the criteria which is very onerous. And then I hear from the block over about why are all of these cars coming down my street, flying down my street? So yes, you're absolutely right, Councillor Browaty. That does happen presently, but again, I would be looking at not having one street good, one bad, maybe kind of a common they would have to be generally for all. The Edmonton model that was referenced and I've been following it for years, the Edmonton model, they went through some things where

they tried neighborhood-specific ones. So this neighborhood gets 30, this neighbourhood gets 50, the whole program crashed, no pun intended. It didn't work at all. So then they had to go back and redo it all. They tried it though. Then they found out i.e., they tried it through a pilot. Which is what we're asking for. We're going to have to try it. The River Heights Ward, and I think every other ward in Fort Garry, they are not unanimous on this. There are some people who are very adamant against 30, some are okay with 40. Some are not good with anything. Again, we have to go try. So I'm okay with a pilot to try it out. I'm not saying I'm you know, 100% locked in for the 30 everywhere. I don't know how that's going to work. And what is a residential street? Does this include collectors - major collectors, minor collectors? I don't know. But again, what about road modifications that will be required? Where is the money for that? We talked about where's the money and well, you know, we had one debate today about just go find $20 million in cash. That's not bad, but you know, well you know, that's a lot of money but we could find that somewhere. In this case, I think the road safety and we're getting the pressures all around us right now. We have some serious problems on speed and commuter traffic going down Wellington Crescent right now at very high rates of speed. You know, that's a problem, that's a collector street. So how are we going to balance that off? I personally would prefer road modifications, I think that's the best way. But again, that will be something else we're going to have to address through some other avenues that we already have going on. So this is not the only thing we have going on to try to address and make our roads safer for all; to improve our transportation system. So, I am looking forward to having this. I think the one that they picked the greenway, they picked that Councillor Rollins I will be sharing, this greenway. Mine goes down a pretty significant street on Fleet. You know, this is the greenway, it has a shallow (inaudible) and it has those in there already. It does come to a stop at the tracks, that's the way that it is. I talked with some neighbours already and I do appreciate Councillor Allard, but we're going to have to reach out to that neighborhood before we start it. And if that neighborhood is vehemently opposed in the vicinity area, yeah, I'm going to have a hard time supporting that and we may have to pick another to street. Again, that's why I thank you for adding that in there, and that's very helpful, to make sure that the local content is always brought in. But again, Councillor Browaty brought up the what ofs, and I love when people are doing that, when they don't like an idea. They say what could happen, you know, cows could fall from the sky. You never know what's going to happen. Again, we're just testing it. We're just trying it out. I don't know what's going to happen down the line. And again, if you said 20 kilometers at every street, I'm definitely not going to support that because you're right. The roads aren't built for that and it's just going to be misleading, almost. So again, and on Grant, yeah well, Grant has an enormous number of seniors that walk across where a high school is at. We voted on that numerous times in the past and it's been supported. We also have people say just raise the limit on Grant – okay, that's great. Well let's raise our limit then – we have four...three school zones there and a daycare there where it's already, you're supposed to drop your speed. So now we're going to have more disjointed stuff. So again, I think the whole idea about Grant, I did do a motion back in the day, and I do thank Councillor Allard who is now helping me try to revive it and see what happened to it. And it's like, we need to use photo enforcement, wherever that may be, to identify areas where, obviously, there's an engineering problem going on. That's important. I think we really need to be looking at that and I thank the public service who have helped out recently by putting up additional signage in the median, to remind people that the speed limit is dropping. I haven't seen the data yet and, unfortunately, a lot of that one on Grant is actually our own transit drivers who are speeding through there. But again, we need to be able to look at that function and I support that. And I support, first of all, before we decide to let cars go knock ten down on Grant, we should maybe be looking at some street engineering. Not just obviously, to say go ahead, go as fast as you want. Maybe we should make Grant 70, you know, because we don't want to be a minute late for getting home to our families, but you know, that's fair. But again, 70 is ridiculous. Can we do 50 and not 60 and maybe have some better road modification? Absolutely. So we have to find this balance, but just to sit here and make hypothesis about what's going to possibly happen down the future, without actually doing some work together, I think that's – you know, I not going to go fear mongering out here. I'm not going to say this is just a city cash grab. You know, I think it is about safety. I do have many residents on residential streets who are very concerned about the speed because we have these long linear roads in the River Heights area, that are very long – they're very long and straight. We know with road designs with grid patterns is a problem because cars will see the grid pattern, they'll see the end of the grid all the way down from let's say Wellington Crescent to Taylor, sometimes, and that actually is a problem. Do I – I'm not advocating one way – some people in my neighborhood want us to do one-ways. I keep saying to them, well that's just going to increase the speed. Unless you have cars coming both ways, they have to slow down when the other car is coming. So I don't see why, when they say it's going to make it a better traffic flow, I think it's going to make faster traffic flow. But again, that's not part of this trial period but again, people have asked that, why don't we look at it. Traffic calming measures, you know, we have another motion going right now with traffic calming measures and enhancing and changing them a little bit and making different options available based upon the street. That's another model where we can do it…where we're looking at trying to enhance it. So I don't have the answer on how we're going to make our streets completely safer tomorrow, but I do believe we're on a path – a path of safety, and a path of making sure our transportation system meets the needs. It's not exclusive of each other. So, I will be supporting the pilot because I will be having the opportunity to actually try this out with the neighborhood support. That's why we needed that. And I hope I'll get the neighbour's support, but we have the opportunity for the administration. They have indicated that they are going to be working with the residents to gauge their support for this and what they're going to get. So, for me, it is an opportunity to try. At least try. Again, I hear Councillor Browaty and a few other people's concerns about what the impact will be on the transportation system, but I'm equally concerned. I do not want to just have red light cameras everywhere and that won't happen, especially with a court case coming. But again, I support this idea of at least

trying and looking at it. I'm not 100% locked in. I do have some serious concerns about collector streets and how that's going to work. And even if it's a different collector street, is Harrow Street the same as Stafford? You know, the infill guidelines appear to say so but I would say they're quite different. They're different styles of streets. And so, again, I'm not sure how we'll work that through yet, but again, unless we try, how are we going to know? So again, with the community support, with the area councillor support, we can try.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And that's why he's Deputy Mayor. He's such a statesman. I'm looking at data here, Madam Speaker, the annual population growth since 2010 to 2018. Manitoba's population has grown by 132,000. It was 1.22 million in 2010 and in 2018, it topped out at 1.352. So, a net growth of 132,000 people. 70% of that, Madam Speaker, are living here in the city of Winnipeg according to traditional settlement data on 70% living here in the city of Winnipeg. So our population has grown by approximately 100,000 in the last eight years alone. Having said that, we have to recognize that there are more drivers on the street, there are more pedestrians on sidewalks crossing the street, there are more cyclists on the road. And we also have to recognize that vehicles are designed with more distractions, whether it's Bluetooth, whether it's cell phones, cyclists that are having their head phones on while they're walking or cycling. Again, the streets are full of distractions. We also have drivers, again, in terms of our population growth that are from different backgrounds, different countries, different driving experiences and then coming here, and driving in winter road conditions that are all considerations. So, again, I'm not locked into lowering speeds, but I am committed to doing a pilot and looking at what data can be collected to make our roads safer. These are all factors that we have to consider in terms of our city growing to a million people population and how we're going to move people around our city streets safely, including our residential areas. So having said that, Madam Speaker, you know, I don't want this to be a process of just you know, moving towards reducing speed limits and then it's an enforcement issue, because enforcement is really what's going to drive the change in behaviour to change and adapt to that lower speed limit. And again, as Councillor Browaty has eluded to, I don't want this to be a cash grab. Which is what our residents are going to think if we drop the speed limit and they're still driving the same speed limits. It's going to be higher fines and higher consequences. So it's a matter of doing something thoughtful that informs the process, that we can work with our street engineers to come up with solutions that will help guide the process in making our streets safer. Thank you.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. So after many years of Council learning why a road safety strategy is important, we now have the development of a road safety strategy underway. It took a long time, but we're now in the process. I'm pleased to support this report. I'm pleased that the committee recognized the importance of engaging every councillor in this pilot, and that a street in every ward will be identified. I'm also very pleased that the report directs the Office of Public Engagement to work with councillors, to prepare information for the speed limit consultation process. Surprising to some, councillors have a greater insight on certain issues than that of the Office of Public Engagement, and we can work to ensure a more comprehensive engagement process. It's very important that we understand the data from the speed limit review pilot and the speed or speeds that will be recommended, will feed into the larger road safety strategy. And we must understand that we must look at the entire picture of road safety. We've hired one of Canada's best consultants to conduct this road safety strategy so I'm very excited about this process. This pilot initiative will be one of many, many different tools that we will have, and as Councillor Orlikow noted, road modifications, street engineering will all be a part of it. I secretly think he wants more traffic circles. All of the tools will be based on data and research and that will form an inclusive approach to a road safety strategy for our city which is really what we're aiming for. This is just one step in a much larger process, so I'm very pleased to support it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Interesting comments made today. It's sort of indicative of all the opinions you hear. And people are rather passionate about this issue. People…I give people…to them, it is rather obvious, the answer is obvious. Whether it's obvious to them it's 30 kilometres an hour, or its obvious to them it should remain at 50 kilometres an hour. It's very obvious to them. And so, I like other members of this Council are stuck in the middle in terms of trying to interpret what I see as a notable disparity and perception of what, to many people, is obvious to them. And so, here we are in a position to try out a pilot and try some things out. And yeah, it's going to take some money. This is frustrating to me. But this is the era we are in. And on that basis, the people are speaking, and to me, it seems that there are enough people that are saying that we obviously should reduce speed limits or we obviously should reduce them to 30 or maybe 40 or at least consider it. And so, that's where we are at. It seems to me, from what I gather, from my own neighborhoods, that I represent, to the general conversation, that we can't escape dealing with this issue, so here we are. Having said that, Councillor Browaty makes some very good points. Although, I am in favour of doing this, I'll say at the opportunity if I think people are misperceiving the statistics. That just because you are doing one street and I don't see a way out of this, it is not wrong. But let's make sure we don't over extrapolate in terms of, what we are going to learn from

this. Councillor Browaty made the point, when you are doing one street, you're just going to go to the street beside it. It's pretty obvious. So in many cases. So I want to see what we are going to learn from this, but I am not going to pretend that every statistic you get is meaningful. Because we have to know, when you do one street they'll go to the other street beside it. And the issue of pitting neighbour against neighbour. Putting everybody on the…I mean, as you know my good Councillor Lukes always wants to know, well, what is the difference between putting it on Kimberly versus Monroe? Well, my good Councillor Kevin Klein asks, would it be better to put it on Talbot vs. Johnson – no, I'm being sarcastic. We all have our specific streets and their specific local issues that we have to deal with, in terms where we're going to do this, what the people are saying in our neighborhoods. These are the literally the issues that I've got to deal with as they must contend with their streets. I say this because Councillor Orlikow was saying, you know, was it better to have it on Grant versus on Academy? I'm sorry, I can't remember the streets that he mentioned, but nonetheless, this is every single ward. Every single councillor has to deal with these things. Now, Councillor Browaty says – not just Browaty, he does not have the monopoly on knowledge on this this issue, but happens to make some inspiring points. He says we must be scientific about this. It's about the science of it. Now, I know a fellow from Elmwood, former resident of Elmwood. Kelly Alves, he is my cousin. He made the point. He goes, they use statistics like when you reduce the speed from 50 to 40 you can slow that much quicker, and the distance in braking is that much shorter. These things this are true. But he said, wait a minute, this is physics, not statistics because the issue is…that's true, that's the physics of it. But then how many lives are we saving? What is the accident rate? What is the statistical rate of change from this? So now you see there's a difference between physics and science because science has to take in the statistics of it. Well, you know, I am not sure. Someone might be laughing at what I am saying. I'm not sure about something else. Anyway, the fact is, this is what we have to deal with. And therefore, we have to be scientific about it, we have to take into consideration the physics, we have to take into consideration the statistics, and all in all, people are very passionate about this and the least we can do is try out some things, try out some experiments. And have greater consultation with trepidation, given that it's…the statistics are not that easily, not simplistically interpreted. It is after 8:00. I will sit down. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers? Councillor…Mr. Mayor, of course.

Mayor Bowman: I will be very quick. I echo many of the comments that have been made today. Councillor Chambers pointed out that, of course, our city is growing and the density of our streets, our active transportation corridors continues to grow. And so, certainly there are strong views around this council chamber and there will undoubtably be very strong views about speed limits throughout our community. Councillor Browaty has been consistent and I respect his views. I personally think the reason he hasn't got so many tickets is he doesn't want to part with his money. But if it's motivating him to drive slower, kudos to him because he's probably gotten a lot less tickets than I have. And so, certainly can take some cues from my Council colleague. Councillor Janice Lukes on the other hand has been consistent as well and I want to acknowledge that. She has been a very strong advocate for vision zero and reducing speed limits to 30, and many other members of Council have been pointing out the issues with the speeds that we have in our community. Councillor Rollins, I think from day one, our first meeting, was already talking about it upon her election. Councillor Santos and many others. I do hear from residents increasingly, about speed limits across a wide demographic and age group throughout our city. And I do think the time is now to take a look at this. I'm certainly open to reducing speeds. Like Councillor Orlikow pointed out a few moments ago, I'd like to see the results of that. I do want to, and I should have began my comments by thanking the delegations this morning. Councillor Rollins pointed out, we should all applaud the strength it takes to come in here, a very formal environment, for a parent whose lost a child. I really have difficulty expressing the acknowledgment of the strength that that must take. I know there's many parents around this council chamber. And so that being said, I do want to take a look at the pilots. The councillors around this chamber will be working collaboratively with the public service and the community to get some data. I think the time is right. I think the community is ready for us to at least look at it. Time will tell, of course, what the results will be and what the community feedback and dialogue will be. But I for one will keep an open mind. And I'm certainly looking forward to looking at making reductions once we hear back from the results of the pilot. Thank you, Madam Speaker. So I'll be supporting it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Allard, your opportunity to close on the amending motions and the main item.

Councillor Allard: Thank you. Thank you, to all of my colleagues for their comments, their collaboration, particularly to Councillor Lukes who informed the motion you hear…you see before you today in terms of the amendments that we made at committee. Councillor Orlikow as well. I just want to address some of the comments from those not supporting the motion. So Madam Speaker, through you, to Councillor Browaty. Yes, the 85th percentile has been used for many years. It is, I think, one of many indicators that you can look at. The one report I am very much aware of, is the recommendation from the public service to reduce speeds on Marion Street from 60 to 50. The 85th percentile is one of several vectors of analysis. Other vectors are, what is the surrounding land use? In terms of Marion, there's a hospital, there's a community main street, there's high levels…it's the most dense area in St. Boniface, about 10,000 people are within walking distance. So yes, the 85th percentile is a measure that has worked, I think. I think it's most appropriate on highways, maybe less appropriate in highly populated urban environments. It is still an indicator that I think informs our studies. In terms of this

concept of science, that we should have science decide. Well, I mean, I agree, but I think the science we are looking at is probably social sciences because we can design a road perfectly for a machine but the fact of the matter is, that human beings are not machines and human beings make mistakes. And I think the philosophy of things like vision zero, is basically to change the environment in a way where people aren't making those mistakes that lead to injury and death. And you know, our young people, I think, the line is 35 years old where you have as great chance of dying from any other...under 35, your chance of dying is motor vehicle collisions. Over 35, you have an equal chance of dying from any other reason on earth. So this is a huge policy issue. We now have…we've been given part of the keys to solve it from the province. So thank you very much for the debate today. Madam Speaker, through you, to Councillor Klein. Councillor Klein, we've had weeks to look at this. We've had so many delegations. We've had so much substantive feedback from other Council colleagues. At the 11th hour to suggest, you know, send it back to committee, with all due respect, I think that is not a great answer at this point. So Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Klein, if in the future, if there is a hot topic like this one and you want to get into informing the report or the recommendation, I would strongly encourage you, Councillor Klein, through Madam Speaker, to reach out to your colleagues, to the chairs of committees, to the public service. This has been on the agenda for weeks and to send it back to committee at this point, after we've heard from so many delegations. We've had so many conversations at every level – Public Works, EPC, Council – I think would be really unfortunate at this point. So, just back to maybe part of my preamble that I missed, why are we doing this? I think we're doing this because people are asking us to do this. When I was knocking on doors in my last campaign, this was one of the top two issues, I think. I mean, granted I spent a lot of time on arterial roads, some of the faster streets, but people constantly said, what are you going to do about traffic? What are you going to do about traffic calming? One street in my ward had…you could see the evidence of trees that had been smashed by cars, signs been knocked down and the neighbors will tell me, well, the police is out here all of the time doing enforcement. So clearly, enforcement was not solving the entirety of the problem. It probably helped but it wasn't a (inaudible), more needs to be done. In terms of the cash grab argument; we've just, and thank you to Councillor Orlikow, I think in 2017, you moved a motion on Grant, thank you for the comments today. I didn't understand how busy Grant was in terms of schools and seniors, I didn't realize what the environment was around there. But we just moved a motion at Public Works to look at police enforcement data on enforcement, and linking it to what type of treatments we could from the Public Works side, take a look at in terms of, if enforcement is not working, then what can we do on the Public Works side, in terms of street design, in terms of signage. So, we are on that. On, Councillor Lukes, mentioned road safety strategy. $2.5 million on road safety initiatives. We are working on that. These speed limits, this is part of it. We have for the first time, updated the traffic calming devices. We now have a menu of options open to communities that are looking to traffic calm their streets. So we are doing a lot of work on this. Former city councillor mentioned, one of our Public Works agendas, half the agenda was about speeds, traffic calming and I think there's just more and more pressure for us and more and more pressure coming from councillors, to look at solutions around speed and safety in our neighborhoods. So I think I have addressed most of the comments that I've heard. I want to address, in particular, those who are in opposition, but I think this is a measured approach. I think we have public engagement built in, we have…we are doing a few pilots. We're going to, I think, learn a lot. And I think the public, Winnipeggers, are going to learn about speeds and develop some opinions and some of those opinions are going to become more informed through the process and through the public engagement that we're going to be doing if we pass this report today. I know I am forgetting something, but it's late in the day so I'm going to sit down and ask my colleagues please support this motion. A lot of work has gone into it and I think the way that it is crafted has the support of the public as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Allard, with that, we'll vote on the two motions and then main item. I'll call the vote on amending Motion 12. On all three or the main item? Okay, so, all in favour of Motion 12.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, I haven't been provided any of the amending motions to my knowledge.

Madam Speaker: Okay. We are going to read them out once again. Madam Clerk, Motion 12.

Clerk: Moved by Councillor Allard, seconded by Councillor Gillingham. Be it resolved that Motion No. 9 be amended by adding the following to the end of the resolve; the words, "And that a new capital budget page be created for this project."

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? I heard one. Councillor Nason will be recorded in opposition. Carried. Amending Motion 9. Sure, please.

Clerk: Moved by Councillor Allard, seconded by Councillor Rollins. Be it resolved that recommendation 5 of Item 2 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated July 7th, 2020 be amended by deleting the words, "funding from within existing resources", and replacing with the words, "surplus funds from the 2017 local street renewal budget."

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein will be recorded in opposition. The Motion 9 carries. And the main item…call for recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Nason, Browaty, Klein.

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

Madam Speaker: Item 2 passes. We'll now move to Motion 6, which is moved by Councillor Nason and seconded by Councillor Klein. It's regarding breaks for Transit Plus drivers. This will be an automatic referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Now we'll get into by-laws, Councillor Allard.

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Nason,
Seconded by Councillor Klein,

WHEREAS Transit Plus drivers deliver accessible transit to residents on behalf of the City of Winnipeg

AND WHEREAS Transit Plus drivers presently have no formal agreement to allow for scheduled breaks within their 8-12 hour driving schedule to recover from the physical work requirements of the position;

AND WHEREAS Transit Plus operates on an electronic tablet system that should provide the capability to schedule breaks for drivers during each shift;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to mandate a Transit Plus schedule that provides its drivers with breaks throughout their shift which respect workplace requirements in the same manner as observed by the City of Winnipeg public service and/or Winnipeg Transit.

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

Councillor Allard: The Clerks gave me a cheat sheet and I have put it in the pile.

Madam Speaker: Will you move By-law 85/2020 be read a first time?

Councillor Allard: I do.

Madam Speaker: I'm not marrying you. All in favour? So moved.

Councillor Allard: Thank you for the clarification. Thank you. Okay. Thank you. So to avoid anymore confusion about marital status, I move that By-law 85/2020 to be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 85/2020 and I missed the first one, so I'm just going to; By-law No. 85/2020 again

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard, second reading.

Councillor Allard: Am I doing the second one again?

Madam Speaker: Third.

Councillor Allard: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 85/2020 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period for this committee. Any questions for Councillor Allard? Councillor Lukes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Lukes: Through you, Madam Chair, on November 19th, 2019, the IRPW Committee concurred in the recommendation from the Assiniboia Community Committee and directed the Winnipeg Public Service to install wayfinding signage on both Phase one and Phase Two of the Southwest Rapid Transit Active Transportation Corridor, prior to the official opening on April 2020. That motion was made because I very much felt it wouldn't happen and true to form, eight months later, the wayfinding signage is still not installed on the Active Transportation Corridor. Councillor Allard, I'm asking you why the wayfinding signage was never installed for the grand opening and when will it be installed? I've been waiting since 2009.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Lukes. I am in the process of writing an e-mail, perhaps, Councillor Lukes, I know I think you've copied me on this before, but if Councillor Lukes wanted to follow up with an e-mail. It would be my pleasure to get it to the CAO and the…and the department and ask for an answer.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Lukes: It's more of a did you know. Did you know that I've been working on Phase One of getting the wayfinding signage since the corridor was installed? I've been working on getting the wayfinding signage since the second part of the corridor was installed. I'm not going to be sending any more e-mails. I've sent them to the Mayor, I've sent them to his Chief of Staff, I've sent them to Public Works. I've sent many, many e-mails. Just get it signed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do know now, thank you for the…well, I do know, I think I did know, so I think it's a matter of asking for an update and asking where things are at. I will review my e-mails to see specifically which…what are these phases that you're talking about, if you're not going…or Madam Speaker, if Councillor Lukes will not be sending another e-mail.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Nason, followed by Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Nason: Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you, I'll ask this question. A 2019 street renewal was just completed, or…well, I guess it's completed now on Day Street in my ward; and just to be clear it is 2020, but it's come along because the policy with the Active Transportation Trail. We just discussed about safety, pass pedestrians, road safety for cyclists, on the north end and the south end of this Active Transportation Trail, it terminates on the road of the adjoining roadways without any rumble strips or such of that. So is that approach of not having rumble strips for active transportation ending at collector streets proper approach for active transportation?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Nason, I'd like to follow up on this for a specific answer. I mean, should…I mean, if you…if you use active transportation facilities in the city of Winnipeg, you quickly find out that many of those facilities are disconnected, there's still work to do. We have our active transportation strategies, which we are building every year. But in terms of the specifics of this inquiry, I'd like to follow up with the Public Service. Councillor Nason, if you don't mind sending me an e-mail, so I get the detail right, I'd appreciate it. Perhaps you can, I…I guess this is question period for me. Councillor Nason, if we can connect offline, I'd appreciate it, I'd like to get answers to your question.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you.

Councillor Nason: So.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Nason: Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you, I'll ask this; and I appreciate the opportunity to respond about disconnection. There are several disconnections. Can the Chair inform us on the extension of Transcona pathway from Regent to Panet, when that will ever be done?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I…will it ever be done? Certainly, I think it will be done, as I believe it is part of the Active Transportation Strategies. But for a more formal response, I'd like to get that to the Public Service and our Active Transportation Coordinator to get…to get a better…a better response in terms of what's happening there and when we can expect that project to happen.

Councillor Nason: Okay.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason, anything more?

Councillor Nason: One, yes, Madam Speaker, through you, $1.7 million was earmarked in November of 2018 that was subsequently cut from the budget, as an unaffordable project to go the route that was planned. Has a new route been figured out so that the residents of Transcona can be connected to downtown?

Councillor Allard: Thank you for the question, Madam Speaker, through you. I believe there were issues, in terms of land acquisition with the rail line. However, I don't…I haven't seen that detail for a while, so I'd like to follow up with the Public Service to ensure I'm getting you accurate information, Councillor Nason.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers?

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm looking at Councillor Allard, but speaking through you. Up until recently, Councillors Klein, Councillors Gillingham, Councillors Browaty, Councillor Nason and myself have been receiving lots of calls, e-mails, social media tags, from residents regarding fogging of nuisance mosquitos. The program has been reinstated, or reinitiated effective tonight. There were areas of my ward that do not have traps to collect data. How can I get…have the areas of the former St. Germain, Vermette, and the great neighbourhood of St. Norbert traps, so that data can be collected to inform the process of fogging?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard?
Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Chambers. That's an excellent question. I understand fogging is based on trap counts, however, if the traps aren't there, that is a very good question in terms of how determination is made on whether or not fogging should commence. So I'll have to follow up with the Public Service on that as well.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, thank you. I just rise on a Point of Order, and you know, I'm not offended by this, it's just in the last hour, I've seen, what is sort of a confusing…be confusing to people in terms of the breach in…in protocol or rules of procedure in that, we say we're speaking through you, and then we speak in the second person directly to the individual. I mean, I'm just saying I'll be obliged to bring this to Governance soon, if it doesn't stop, only because that's the procedure. When I was first elected, I was instructed very, very strictly even where to look while I'm speaking and to the extent that I may not even thank the Chair of the standing committee in my second follow up question. I may not even say thank you. So that is what I'm told, but I'm see it's getting really loose. I'm not offended by it. But if we're going to [inaudible].

Madam Speaker: Yeah, thank you for the reminder, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: You're most welcome, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Do you have a question for the Chair at all?

Councillor Schreyer: No. Point of Order, that's all.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. I think we are doing fine. Sometimes there's reminders that are needed from time to time. Seeing no further questions under this committee, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. We'll get right into question period. Any questions? Councillor Mayes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. It's an exciting time to be a City Councillor here with a precedent setting motion we had earlier today involving a TIFF as well as funding for Starlight. I am delighted that the financial crisis is over that we have found $15 million in the past two days and that that we enter a new phase and also we are liberalizing our TIFF requirements that, I find, is a very exciting thing and we obviously have said we're not going to treat different developers differently. So first question is, one of the proposals here was a TIFF for public art, a $1 million, I can't even remember if that's in the final package or not, just the final package, but let's assume it is. Recently, a developer in my ward approached me, who had been doing some public art and wanted some subsidy from me, to do more. Forget that, is my new answer, we'll just find the money through the TIFF or through the centre. So can you just outline for us how we're going to be doing this, very exciting, I know [inaudible] did a ton of public art at their own expense in Sage Creek, so we'll…we'll wrap that up and start in a new. I actually have a favourite public art, wish we hadn't cut it out of the budget, but if we're now going to TIFF for it that's okay too. So how'd we go about, I'm not going to be putting any money in if there's money from the centre for other wards. So how do we go about a TIFF on public art?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: Through you, Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Councillor for his question. As the Councillor is aware, right now, we do not have a TIFF policy. So we are making…we have to deal with each request as it comes in the absence of a TIFF policy. But I, you know, many requests come in, it's…it's up to Council, I guess, to make ultimately, to make the decision, so I'd be glad with my Council colleagues to work with the Councillor on any future requests.

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

Councillor Mayes: In…in the time I've been here today, I actually have a developer, Qualico, talk about if we're TIFF-ing for community centres, they've got an idea for us, which is they're just going to go ahead and ask for an 80% TIFF on the remainder of Sage Creek that would be a community centre for over 10,000 people, not just a 1,000. I don't know if that should be next. It might be Councillor Santos, who should be next up there in Tyndall Park, might be Nason with his Red River thing, not sure. But how do we determine where we're going next for TIFFs for community centres? Should it be, maybe it should be Santos, maybe it should be Nason, not sure. We don't have a policy, but we approved one today for, I don't know, I can't remember how many million. So what's…since we're not, we don't have a policy, but we're approving them, what…what's the protocol for going forward with community centres with much bigger populations where we can do a TIFF? Perhaps, let's start with Councillor Santos, for example, and then we'll go Nason, and then I'll…I'll go behind that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: I'll take the Councillor's question under advisement.

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

Councillor Mayes: Earlier today, I talked about forest, the importance of forests, obviously there's a social benefit to forest. We talked about benefits today, we…we don't have a policy that says TIFF is located…

Madam Speaker: Question?

Councillor Mayes: …in this geographic area. How do we go about getting a TIFF for Lemay Forest? Well, that's maybe not our best example. I've already been approached about a TIFF to save...

Madam Speaker: Your question?

Councillor Mayes: How do we go about getting a TIFF for the Sumka Forest in Councillor Chambers' ward? I've been trying for years to get $3 million, couldn't get it, $15 million appeared in the last two days [inaudible].

Madam Speaker: The questions been asked, thank you.

Councillor Mayes: How do we get $3 million then, for the Sumka Forest?

Councillor Gillingham: I will take the Councillor's question under advisement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes, any further questions? Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, it's just, I was going to ask him another one, but he has no answer. I will want to know in September though. But the one that I mentioned earlier, but Madam Speaker, this is a did you know question. Did you know that Red River Community Centre was a brand new build, for a new catchment area but also, there's a brand new community centre at Sinclair Park, which replaced the existing building that had completely failed? Did you know that?

Councillor Gillingham: Through you, Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Councillor for the question. I…I did not know that but I thank the Councillor for raising that.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. This question is regarding the federal kind of announcement, it's regarding the funding that…that the City of Winnipeg made, expect from the Federal Government. Can you give us a little bit of an update, a status update, whatever you like?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Orlikow for the question. The answer to the question is City staff and the Mayor's Office as Intergovernmental lead, are working on getting the details regarding the federal announcement. They're working with the Province of Manitoba to…to find what out what amount of money, if…would flow to the City of Winnipeg and…and how that would flow, and what time that would flow. What, if any, of the money necessitates matching dollars or just what the case would be around how that money could flow to the City of Winnipeg. Obviously, I think we, you know I would certainly stand to commend the Federal Government for recognizing the need that municipalities have; and I know that the Federation of Canadian Municipalities have been strong advocates. I know our Mayor has been a strong advocate with the Big Cities Mayor Caucus of FCM to advocate for funding for municipalities during…during this COVID pandemic. But related, the specifics on what amount of those federal dollars may flow to the City of Winnipeg and the timeline at which they may flow is information that our City staff and I know the Mayor's Office is working to get at this time. As soon as we have that information, certainly, you know, if I get it, if the Mayor Office gets it, we'll certainly be distributing to Council colleagues and making them aware.
Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow?

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. To the question…just straight to the question. No preamble. Can you, Councillor Gillingham, through you, Madam Chair, thank you. Can you…I'm curious to know if there are other grants that are still pending the provincial sign off that you can make us aware of, grants that we, I know we saw some good ones today, but are there other grants out there from the Federal Government for others that we've submitted but we're still waiting for the province to either okay them, or deny them. Can you give me a little bit of an outline?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: I want to thank the Councillor for his question. I'll certainly take that back and take a look to see what…what grants or other funding commitments, matching funding commitments perhaps that we're waiting on from the Province of Manitoba. I do know that we do get regular updates at our Standing Policy Committee on Finance every month. In fact, our Interim CFO, Mr. Paul Olafson, puts together a report, in fact, it's available online, it's available on DMIS, each one of those reports that talks about the updates…the regular update of the provincial funding in…to our annual budget, both our operating budget and our capital budget. And so, the Council may recall that this year, the Provincial Government because of COVID, they advanced a large portion, a majority really, of the City's…funding to the City on our operating budget. That certainly assisted the City of Winnipeg with cash flow, and also certainly assisted the City with our present liquidity situation, and so, we do appreciate that. The Federal Government, likewise also, advanced funding. But I'll certainly take a look to see what other, if any other commitments from the Province of Manitoba, we will be awaiting. Certainly, obviously we're all going to be watching the timeline and the turnaround now on our ICIP application, which we have just approved today. Those four major capital projects are important to…to the City of Winnipeg. They necessitate obviously, a provincial contribution and a federal contribution, the ball is now obviously in

the…in the Province's court. It didn't take long, I had a text from one resident just to say, "Okay, now where does it go?" Because they were watching and they saw that we, I believe the vote was unanimous, I think, on…on the ICIP applications and update. So, it's not just us, as a Council, that is waiting on this information and…and the timing of the Province's funding but also, you know, others are watching as well, that certainly have interest in the projects.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Orlikow?

Councillor Orlikow: Final question, thank you. Can you give us an update on the COVID financials of the City of Winnipeg right now?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: Yes. Again, I was just looking at, Madam Speaker, I was just looking at that a moment ago, and do you think I could find that again? I can't. But I will try to it as much as I can from memory. There's…there's a report that was a part of the Standing Policy Committee on Finance report. It came to us in early July, and right now with the actions that Council approved at the last Council meeting in June, were…our projected deficit now is $25 million. That's what we're looking at for our projected deficit. Again, with the decisions and the actions, the levers that Council has authorized to be pulled, I believe that we're now looking at our projected stabilization reserve fund balance by the end of the year, to be $95 million. So that puts us in…in really good stead. We talked about the fact, of course, that we don't know how long the pandemic will go. We don't know if we're going to hit a second wave or not. I will note too, that I think it was Councillor Nason perhaps had asked the last Council meeting about you know, Transit and…and the numbers that Transit use in their projections, and we Transit did in early on in March and April, when we were putting out the numbers together, Transit did take into consideration and project that there would be a significant loss in revenue around student passes and U-Passes for the Fall, with just the uncertainty for universities and whether not they're going back to…to in-class classes. So that has all been factored in as well, and we continue to…we continue to monitor, obviously the financial situation. We did have an economic analysis, of course, that informed the Cash Flow Management Plan. We have asked…we, being at the last Standing Policy Committee on Finance, we did ask that that be updated because that plan was put into place back in April, and you know, many months have passed. So the City Economist, under the purview and under the kind of watch of our CFO and our CAO, are right now working on an update considering, you know, recent news that has come out of the Province and out of the Federal Government. They're taking a look at the more recent economic statistics and they're going to be feeding them into the analysis. And so we hope to be getting, and in fact, we will be getting an update on the City's economic analysis in September that will come to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance; and when they did, I should point out one other question that someone has asked me recently, was related to did…did our Economist use kind of a low, medium, or high economic impact scenario in the analysis; and in fact, our Economists, when they put their economic analysis together and we built the Cash Flow Management Plan, used a low economic impact analysis, back in April, meaning that we would expect that the economy would start to open up again by the end of August. Well, as you know, I think the Province just announced phase four, I believe it was of the reopening and so, the re…the reopening of the economy is…is happening sooner than our initial economic analysis, our low impact…low impact economic analysis had…had put in place. So that's…that's good news obviously every one of us hopes that the economy continues to reopen and that COVID cases, you know, we don't see a huge spike in COVID cases. And so, again that update will be provided in September and we're looking forward to having that update come to our Standing Policy Committee on Finance and obviously that report will be made public, we'll be able to share it with everybody and we should be able to kind of adjust the numbers accordingly.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Mayes: We had…when we set the precedent earlier today, passing that motion and…and agreeing that financial crisis to the City is over, one of the things we did was start spending money from the new three-year Recreation Library Facility Investment Strategy. We don't have that strategy yet, but we're spending from it. So I guess two questions; one, well, I'll come back to that. But we also heard a lot about listening to the community and we heard overwhelming support as part of OurWinnipeg for a fair wage policy, and we found today, $15 million for a company with $14 billion in assets, and there's a lot of talk about values. My values include helping out people at the lowest possible end of the…

Madam Speaker: Your question?

Councillor Mayes: …Economic spectrum. So my question is, can we all look forward to adoption of a Fair Wage Policy now that we've got the money, we've got overwhelming public support, can we look forward to that in September, when I bring back the motion to adopt a Fair Wage Policy?

Councillor Gillingham: Of course, any motion, Madam Speaker, that is brought forward by any Councillor, it's really up to the Members of Council, to make a determination as to whether that motion survives and sees another day.

Councillor Mayes: Move for extension?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, that concludes…

Councillor Mayes: Move for extension?

Madam Speaker: Are you moving…

Councillor Mayes: [Inaudible]

Madam Speaker: …Councillor Lukes, moves extension for two minutes. All in favour? I heard more ayes right now. Two minute extension, contrary? Carried. Two minutes, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: You heard…

Madam Speaker: Second question. Second question.

Councillor Mayes: You very commendably, Councillor Gillingham, in approving the Bruce Oaks Centre, agreed to defer the $1.4 million…

Madam Speaker: Your question?

Councillor Mayes: …Your ward was very much entitled to. How are things progressing with that? I think your ward deserved that, I think that was commendable, your actions there. You deserve some of that benefit, you deserve all that benefit, I actually. How are things progressing with that?

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank the Councillor for his question, as…as indicated back in…in that initial vote, was it January of 2018? I think that was the time it was, I…I don't recall, I was…I don't even recall the year, but nonetheless, that there would be public consultation, the public consultation process has unfolded, as was committed and the public feedback was…the public was very engaged, the feedback was good; and what came out of that was a selection, by the public, by members of the public of several projects, those projects will flow over the next couple of years. They've been approved in…in the budget, that…those funds have been approved in the Capital Budget in the 2020, the adoption of 2020 budget. The projects include an upgrade to a wading pool, again these are projects selected by members of the community through public consultation process, the project includes an upgrade to a wading pool. The…the addition or extension of adding to the Yellow Ribbon Trail, taking what is now a dirt path and in fact, kind of putting an active transportation piece in there to kind of…kind of close one of the links; and then also some…some other equipment in…in a recreation equipment in…in one of the parks. So thanks to the Councillor for his question.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. That concludes our question period. Councillor Browaty, for the Governance Committee would you take the chair? I'd like to move consent for Items 1 through 5. Councillor Browaty.

REPORT OF THE
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 17, 2020

Deputy Speaker: Okay, we'll call question. The Mayor is indicating he'd like to vote opposition to No. 1. All those in favour?

Councillor Schreyer: Pardon me?

Madam Speaker: Call the question, I think he wants to be noted.

Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Opposed? And No. 1, Councillor Schreyer and Mayor Bowman. Councillor Gilroy on No. 1 as well. Okay so there's three marked in opposition. All in favour? Opposed? Carried. That's it.

Madam Speaker: You can close off the meeting.

Deputy Speaker: Okay, who would like to move consent for adjournment? I see John Orlikow over there. Councillor Orlikow moves consent and adjournment. All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Madam Speaker: Roll call. 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 8:45 p.m.