COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, November 26, 2020

The Council met at 9:41 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Santos.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor for your morning announcements, thank you.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And good morning to my colleagues and those that are joining us via the livestream. I'm going to start on a lighter note. I want to thank Santa Claus for providing assistance via Zoom, joining friends at CTV and helping us light the annual Christmas tree recently. Of course, it was disappointing that we're not able to come together as a community as we've done in the past physically for the tree lighting, but I do want to thank Santa for joining us and assisting. I want to offer our best wishes to him, Mrs. Claus, the reindeer and everybody else up at the North Pole for a safe holiday season. Madam Speaker, recently we have had to recognize important dates remotely, including National Louis Riel Day. We had a virtual all partners gathering of the Winnipeg Indigenous Accord, very recently as well as the other day, we recognized International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women. In addition to that, many of us, I believe all members of Council and citizens, recognized Aboriginal Veterans Day and Remembrance Day on, of course, on November the 11th. I have been spending a lot of my time, Madam Speaker, doing wellness checks with members of our Public Service, some Council colleagues and members of our community, wanting to convey appreciation for all that everyone is doing in our community to help us weather the COVID storm. I have been speaking with members of the capital region as well as mayors across North America through the Bloomberg Civic Leadership Initiative. And recently participated, Madam Speaker, in the Big City Mayors virtual summit with Deputy Prime Minister Chrystia Freeland; the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Minister Ahmed Hussein; Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Dominic LeBlanc, sorry; as well as many other ministers including Minister Katherine McKenna for Infrastructure and Communities. And I want to thank them for all of their efforts and the accessibility that they've provided. Madam Speaker, I'll wrap up my opening comments today by touching briefly on our communities' efforts right now to combat COVID. I want to thank our Emergency Services personnel as well as all those in the health care sector and throughout our community for all that they are doing to help Winnipeg weather COVID, as well as to get us back to flattening the COVID curve. I want to encourage all Winnipeggers, including members of Council, to demonstrate kindness with each other and with members of our community at a time when we need to be demonstrating that each and every day. I want to recognize and just mention our Employee Assistance Programs at the City of Winnipeg. I want to encourage our staff to reach out if they need assistance throughout this time. And I want to encourage all Winnipeggers as we enter Black Friday and the holiday season, to support local. I also would like to ask, Madam Speaker, I would like to ask colleagues just to join me for a moment of silence to reflect on the lives that we have lost recently to COVID in our community and throughout our province, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'll ask that we rise for a moment of silence, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next is Councillor Klein, followed by Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today to acknowledge November as Domestic Abuse Awareness Month in the province of Manitoba. I have shared my story with many of you and I have shared it publicly for many years now, the murder of my mother. I stand because I think it's important for men to be the voice of domestic violence and not just women. It's important to end the silence of domestic violence and it's important for us to learn as much as we can about domestic violence because domestic violence does not respect the boundaries. It does not impact a certain race. It does not impact a certain generation. It does not worry about your income level. And it does not care about your education level. Domestic violence impacts everyone. And chances are, you know somebody or are close to somebody who may be the victim of domestic violence right now. And it's on us. It's on us to help end the silence. It's very difficult for a person experiencing domestic violence to speak up. I can tell you that. I can tell you that it's difficult because my mother couldn't

and lost her life because she could not do that. Worked in an emergency room as a nurse, still could not approach anybody to say she was being abused. So, this month being Domestic Abuse Awareness Month in Manitoba, I want to recognize all victims of domestic violence and I realize and will also acknowledge it's not just women. Men can be victims of domestic violence as well as seniors, they can be victims of violence. If you feel that someone is a victim, if you have seen someone be a victim of violence, please let that person know it's okay to speak out. It's okay to talk, and it's okay for them to share what's happening because people do care. And most importantly, let them know it's not their fault. So, thank you and please take a moment to, you know, take some time to remember those we have lost to domestic violence and also to help encourage others to stop the silence.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Household food security is pretty much going towards a crisis in Winnipeg and I know councillors around this chamber are very concerned about that. Yesterday we saw Winnipeg Harvest change to Manitoba Harvest and there is cause for celebration in that and there is cause for pause. The volunteer needs, the cold hard cash needs and the community needs have never been greater. Currently, our greatest need in community across the board, whether you are a Ma Mawi or your harvest is for drivers, drivers to get food, hampers, out to the community. Bear Clan also needs support. They can deliver, as they do, four hundred hampers, they could deliver 1,000. They can always use volunteers, too. In the city here, our foodbanks currently in Winnipeg facilities are Mayfair, St. Marks, Weston, Brooklands, Turtle Island, Broadway Neighbourhood Centre and Freight House, and there are more in each and every school division. So, I just want to encourage Winnipeggers, Madam Speaker, to continue to give to their foodbanks if they can at this time, the hardest. Volunteer at foodbanks and really support them now and for the duration. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins.

MINUTES

Councillor Orlikow moves that the Minutes of the meetings held on October 29, 2020 and November 4, 2020, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We will now move on to delegations. Will be…which will be appearing via Zoom. Mr. Clerk, I understand we have Ms. Sara Atnikov.

DELEGATIONS

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, can I move a motion to suspend the rules at this time?

Madam Speaker: Yes, to hear an additional delegation?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I would like to move a motion to suspend the rules to hear an additional delegation on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Developments, Report 'A' of November 16th on Cannabis Cultivation in Residential Properties. And the speaker is in favour, Mr. Ed Kolodziej. I think there has been a communication with his contact information and he is to speak for five minutes, no questions.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Eadie. He has moved to hear an additional speaker, Mr. Ed Kolodziej, for five minutes, no questions, on the said topic. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, the first delegation, please.

Clerk: First delegation is Sara Atnikov, Executive Director of West Broadway Business Improvement Zone in opposition to Item 3 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 20th, 2020, regarding Neighbourhood Economic Development Officer.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Sara, you are joining us online?

Sara Atnikov: I am. You can all hear me?

Madam Speaker: Yes. Are you showing your video or is it just voice today?

Sara Atnikov: I can do video. Sure. There we go.

Madam Speaker: Welcome. Welcome. We have ten minutes on the clock for you.

Sara Atnikov: Great. I don't plan to take ten minutes. I thank you for the opportunity to speak. I am here representing West Broadway BIZ and the other Business Improvement Zones in opposition to the amendment that was made by Councillor Gilroy for 120 days consultation to the Neighbourhood Economic Development Officer funding position. As you all know, this has been something that's been going on for quite some time and it is the view of the BIZs that 120 days is not enough, it's not acceptable, and the fact that the way that the consultations have gone or haven't really, for that matter, to date, sort of has been setting a precedent that's been disturbing to us. We would just like to reiterate our stance that we are not in favour of the BIZs having to foot any of the bill. The amount of 75% was presented to us, but there was no reasoning for that. We're not sure if in the 120 days the discussion of 75, 50, 25, whatever percent it would be is something that would be included in this but really, I'm just here to say that we don't…we're not in agreement with the 120 days. We were supportive when we heard that Councillor Eadie and the group that he represents put forth the amendment to find funding not from the BIZs, and that is sort of where we stand. And I was also contacted by the Executive Director of the Transcona BIZ because in the report it says that there are three BIZs that sent their affirmations for this amendment and she…I believe she contacted the councillor as well. But she just wanted to make it be known that her support was not for the amendment that was made. Her support was for the original amendment that was made that the BIZs do not foot any of this. Thank you for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Sara. We will now have any questions from Council. Are there any questions? Okay, seeing none, we appreciate your presentation today, thank you.

Sara Atnikov: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next, we have Ms. Eddie Calisto-Tavares. Mr. Clerk, is she on the line?

Clerk: Yes, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Eddie is appearing before Council in support of Item 4 of the Report 'A' of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated November 16th, 2020. It's regarding Cannabis Cultivation in Residential Properties. Good morning, Ms. Tavares.

Eddie Calisto-Tavares: Good morning. Madam Speaker, Mayor and Council. Today…my name is Eddie Calisto-Tavares and today I have to muster my courage to present on this very important issue that is happening within our neighbourhoods. Just so that you know, I have lost my father to COVID on November the 11th and I lost my mother in law November 19th, so for me to be here today, it is a very important issue. I have been a resident of Amber Trails since February 1991. My family and I were the third family in this neighbourhood. I care about our neighbourhood. I know what's going on and I am on a first name basis with Ms. Sharma because any time there is something that needs to be done and I always believe that municipal governments it is the closest to the people and where actions need to first be taken. I am here to tell you that these homes, not just in my neighbourhood, Amber Trails, but in Garden City, Seven Oaks Crossing, the Maples and all across our city, are being purchased for the sole purpose of cultivating mass numbers of cannabis. And there is no way, from a business lens, this is for someone's use because they have cancer or they have MS or they are dealing with anxiety. This is criminal activity at its best. And if you want to really delve into this, the I-Team from CBC has done a phenomenal job of uncovering all the links to criminal organizations that's happening in my backyard. This summer, for the first time, I could not have my grandchildren play in my backyard because the smell was horrific. We need to pass a by-law that prohibits these people from buying homes for the sole purpose of turning it into mass production. When a home gets sold in any neighbourhood, the residents of that neighbourhood want to see a moving van where furniture gets moved in. We want to meet those that are moving into our neighbourhood then welcome them. And some of us naively have done so to only find that there is no one living in that home, there is no eye contact with the workers that come in in shifts daily to tend to the plants. I have personally learned so much that I did not want to know about this issue. And working with safer communities where, in the beginning, they tried to do their very best and then to find out that instead of a moving truck, we have an electrician putting in an additional panel. We have three air conditioners running day and night next door to us. It is a crime and we know that we have to do something to change it. So, I plead with you to be leaders, to be pioneers, to drive this forward, under this 120 days because I tell you, there are seniors in Elmwood feeling prisoners in their home. They are scared to go out and they cannot even turn their heat on because the smell is just choking them inside of their own home. Never mind property values, never mind other fundamentals that are going to be a cause of what's happening. And if you look at the numbers within a year, it is unbelievable how many homes have been turned into these commercial scale cannabis grow op. A hair dresser cannot open a hair salon in their home and yet, we allow this to happen? So, I plead with you. Read the documentation that is already…that we've presented, that my colleagues and I have done so much work on this during COVID and during some very difficult circumstances. This

needs to move forward. I plead with you, be a leader, be a pioneer because this is a problem not just in my neighbourhood, it is a problem that affects so many of us in Winnipeg and across Canada. And don't you worry because I believe that municipal government is the closest to the people, but I will continue to work with others departments and other governments to make this problem just disappear. I thank you. I wish you a good day. Please be safe and please stay well.

Madam Speaker: Ms. Calisto-Tavares, thank you for your presentation. Please stay on the line as Council may have questions for you after we hear from the next speaker. Our next delegation is Ms. Carmen Nedohin who is also in support of the same item. Mr. Clerk, do we have Carmen on the line?

Clerk: Yes, Madam Speaker, she is just joining now.

Madam Speaker: Good morning, Carmen. Mr. Clerk?

Clerk: Yeah, she just needs to unmute herself.

Carmen Nedohin: Can you hear me?

Madam Speaker: Yes, we can hear you. Good morning. We could hear you a moment ago.

Clerk: Can you please…

Carmen Nedohin: How about that? Can you hear me now?

Madam Speaker: Yes. We have ten minutes on the clock…or pardon me, 5 minutes on the clock for your presentation today. You may begin.

Carmen Nedohin: Okay, and you can hear me now? Thank you. First of all, I just want to thank you for the opportunity to be here and I appear before you today not only for myself but on behalf of the members of my community. I am here with great hope that members of City Council will hear our concerns and experiences and agree to move forward on by-law changes which would (inaudible) marijuana grow ops to be operated within residential areas. I moved into Sage Creek in 2014. In 2013, the house next door was one of three illegal grow ops operated by the same individuals here in Royalwood and Island Lakes. They were busted, shut down, charged and fines or jail time ensued. $1.7 million in drugs and cash was found at all three properties. This was no small operation. The house sat empty and ill maintained for many years which was an eyesore. Fast forward to 2019 and one of those same individuals was somehow able to secure a legal medicinal licence to grow from Health Canada and set up shop on his licence and the licence of three other people for a combined total of hundreds and hundreds of plants. Soon after, the entire area was blanketed with the noxious smell of a significantly large grow op. The property backs on to a schoolyard and playground and every day the entire Sage Creek Pool population was subjected to this horrific smell. A smell which not only includes the exhaust of the plants themselves but of potentially carcinogenic, toxic herbicides that they use for pest control. We cannot use our yard. We did not have our grandchildren over for months. We could not use our HVAC system or over the range fan as our home would immediately fill with the smell of the grow op. And we could not even consider selling our home and moving because who in their right mind would buy a house next to that stench and why should we move? Neighbours complained of headaches, breathing problems and nausea along with fear. Fear of the people who are constantly coming and going from the property. And worst of all was every day I would watch those little kids playing in the park, being subjected to the stench. And people on our street didn't want their children to be out playing at any time. We were, with the help of Ron Tradwell of Safer Communities Manitoba, able to get him shut down within 3 months but only because he had upgraded the electrical panel, installed four furnaces amongst other things, all without permit. Safer Communities work with the Winnipeg Police Service and firefighters and City by-law officers to confirm that he had a legal licence to grow but the hot house was, "A disaster waiting to happen", according to a deputy fire chief who attended at the home. Had he made all of these changes under permit we would have had to live with the stench and fear of criminal element because the law was on his side to do whatever he wanted without concern for the neighbours and/or the community. But, to him, the cost of obtaining and complying with the permits, which was approximately $40 to $50,000, and the solidarity of the neighbours to shut him down was not worth his while so he shut up shop and moved elsewhere. This does not solve the problem. The problem just moves down the street or to another neighbourhood. I understand that he now has a number of licences and after securing the proper permits was able to set up a number of grow ops within the city. How many Health Canada licences can one person get? Do they not do background checks for criminality? And who are the doctors who issue these medicinal prescriptions? I know the problem is Health Canada issuing licences to legally grow for medicinal purposes when in fact this is organized crime and black-marijuana…black-market marijuana trade. The problem is the lack of rules, regulations and by-laws that deter anyone from setting up shop in residential areas. And while Health Canada seems uninterested in policing this matter, the police service, firefighters, et cetera are all extremely frustrated as they see little to no availability to shut them

down regardless of the health, safety and social impact they have on their neighbours and the surrounding community. Our plummeting property values are another thing entirely, but I just don't have the time to go into this area. The solution now falls onto City Council who must ensure that the safety of our children and our neighbourhoods is first and foremost on this issue. I would like to thank Councillor Sharma and Eadie for their work thus far on this matter, but it's going to take all of Council to implement and enforce non-grandfathered by-laws that will first disallow any and all grow operations in residential areas, disallow any and all grow operations within 500 meters of schools, school yards, play grounds, daycare, et cetera, and implement…

Madam Speaker: Carmen, thank you. If I could just ask you to wrap up your presentation.

Carmen Nedohin: I just have one more sentence. And to implement significant penalties to deter anyone from setting up grow ops. The time for action…it is now the time for action, not more study. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentation. Mr. Clerk, could we please get Ms. Calisto-Tavares back on the line and we'll take any questions. Are there any questions? Mr. Clerk, are you ready?

Clerk: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, first question.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Excuse me. I just want to…I heard our delegations talk about the problems with having these things next door and in your neighbourhood. My question is just a bigger general question, and I was wondering either Ms. Calisto-Tavares or Ms. Nedohin, if they…what is their perspective on that…this medical cannabis cultivation in residential properties that are costing 4 to $500,000, what is your…do you believe that this has gone beyond the reasonable access of individuals to use medical cannabis?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Eddie.

Eddie Calisto-Tavares: Yes. So, Councillor Eadie, in my logic as a business woman, if I was to need medical marijuana for the purpose of my health, I would not be purchasing a home for 400 to $500,000, investing an additional $10,000 on upgrading HVACs and air conditions so that I could grow a few plants for my own personal use. This is not for anyone's personal use. These are criminals that are buying these homes, laundering money, using these homes to then grow large scales, we're talking about anywhere from 100 to 900 plants and that is a fact, confirmed by Safer Communities inspectors. These are not just, you know, stories that I'm telling you. These are confirmed facts. So, this is not for someone's personal use. These are large scale manufacturing business, illegal business obviously, because there is no way someone would have to invest all of this, not live in the home, there is no one living in these homes, paying $1,800 a month in hydro, so they can have a few plants, so they can use for their own personal use? I hope I answered your question.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Basically, I believe answered to Councillor Eadie's question but nonetheless, just so you know, be aware for years in fact since elected in terms of being made aware by people such as Mike Janson and others in terms of this concern of industrial scale grow ops in our neighbourhoods. I'm pleased to see Eddie Calisto-Tavares taking up this concern on behalf of herself and her neighbours. And in terms of Carmen, listening to Carmen for years as a community activist. And I just want to ask I guess point blank for the record; given that…what I don't want to happen here is that we get it wrong. We have to do this properly. Ideally the first time. So, we have to reconcile federal laws, new federal laws, with the concerns and the rights of citizens, such as yourselves. To get it right the first time before this gets held up in courts over, you know, Charter of Rights and Freedoms because of the federal laws that legalize it. What suggestions are you going to be offering this study in terms of what you think will be appropriate? We have talked about the inappropriateness of the mass industrial grow ops. What do you think…what will you be suggesting is appropriate so that we can make this work in terms of reconciling with the federal laws?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Eddie Calisto-Tavares: Are you asking me or Carmen?

Councillor Schreyer: Well, both of you. Either one. Whatever your suggestions, we'd like to hear it.

Eddie Calisto-Tavares: Carmen, go first. She's muted. I'll take the time. So, first of all, we're not talking about infringing on anyone's Charter of Rights. I have taken this up with MPs, with parliament secretaries and there are things in motion right now happening, but we all know that when it comes to the distance between our governments that it takes much

longer and especially in…during COVID on things that will happen with Health Canada and I guarantee you, it will happen. I am very determined and so are my colleagues. So, when it comes to what we're doing here and from a business perspective, as a business owner, I cannot open a shop in my home and have people coming and going every day to do consulting services. My neighbour had to go to Garden City. She is a hair dresser and she opened a shop there. And yet, we are allowing manufacturing. This is manufacturing of large scale. We are ere not talking about somebody growing four plants, they would not need three air conditions, they would not need two more panels…another panel for their electrical. We're talking about reasonable and unreasonable limits here. And so, you can get it right by understanding and reading everything that Safer Communities has done on this, the CBC I-Team. You don't have to do a whole lot of studies. I know that Councillor Eadie has also done a lot of studies in this area. The other thing that is consistent on these grow ops are they are using two agents consistently to look for these properties and that's fact, and I can provide you with that proof. We have pulled titles. Twelve out of 19 of these homes are financed by credit unions which really blew my mind, because credit unions are supposed to be at the heart of family values and community. Again, I can provide you with all of this. These are all facts that we have because there has been some incredible work done by some amazing people in this group. And the fact that you only have 202 signatures, it's only because I was in isolation for three weeks looking at my father and COVID made it much more difficult for us to go door to door. But people are calling me from all over and saying, Eddie, don't give up on the fight because we know that this is not about imposing and going against any freedom of people's ability to use cannabis for their own personal use. This is not what we're talking about. This is illegal activity next door to you and I.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll go on to the next question.

Carmen Nedohin: My apologies, I was…

Madam Speaker: Carmen, would you like to address the question as well?

Carmen Nedohin: My apologies, I was kicked off, so.

Madam Speaker: Carmen, would you like to address the last…?

Carmen Nedohin: Sorry, I didn't hear the question. I would like to address it if it can be re-asked.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure, thank you, Madam Speaker. Yeah, to sort of repeat what I was saying, to get this right, to do this right in terms of serving the intent of what our community leadership is talking about, such as yourself, Carmen, who I have been listening to for years on issues of your take on community leadership and as well, Eddie Calisto-Tavares. People like Mike Janson who has been making this...making me aware of this since very…since I was elected. In terms of getting this right the first time so it sticks, what suggestions do you have in terms of reconciling the federal legislation, the new federal laws, with the concerns of yourself, our neighbours, our families so that it doesn't get tied up in the courts? What do you recommend in terms of what's appropriate? I understand we're talking here and Eddie Calisto-Tavares has been talking about mass industrial scale grow ops. How do we work this out to reconcile with the new federal laws to create by-laws that will stick and won't get tied up in the courts? That's my fear. What are your suggestions in terms of amounts if I can be that specific at this time?

Carmen Nedohin: Well, it's not so much amounts because first of all, I have no problem with marijuana being legal. I have no problem with people, if the law says that they can grow a half dozen plants on their property, I have no problem with that either. That's not the issue. The issue here is really a health and safety issue for the entire community. As I mentioned in my presentation, when an organization, and you said, it is a commercial grow op.

Madam Speaker: Just to pause for a moment. Councillor Chambers moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Please continue.

Carmen Nedohin: When an individual can start a grow op that right behind a school, and the…and then just use the term ‘effluent’, covers the entire area affecting the health and safety of all of those children, that alone, to me, would supersede an individual's right to how many plants they can grow. Number two, Health Canada has to start working with the municipalities and provinces. You know, having three inspectors for all of western Canada is just not appropriate. So, they know that they can get away with it. So, it is incumbent upon the first line of defence which is the Municipal Government, to look at the health and safety of their neighbourhoods. It's not only the smell and the…that particular issue. In our case, when the fire chief came out he explained to us that they had four furnaces going in there, none of which were set up properly, and how, and his words were, "How this place didn't blow up is beyond my comprehension", which would have taken out half of our street, that's how bad it was. So, when you can have an individual with a criminal background who

can grow not only for himself but three other people, have up to 600 plants in one location, backing on to a school, affecting all of those kids, that's why I think we just have to look at it from a health and safety perspective of the entire community.

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

Councillor Chambers: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. And I think some of the questions that I have, some of them might have been answered in your responses and I thank you very much for your passionate presentation this morning. So, what you are alluding to then is that it's more of a monitoring and enforcement issue, be it that there's only three enforcement officers in western Canada. Is this largely…

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

Councillor Chambers: This is largely past the personal consumption usage. Where exactly do you see this moving forward in the sense of those that are using it for criminal enterprises?

Carmen Nedohin: Well, first and foremost, anybody who is growing 150 plants, I don't know anybody who could possibly consume that amount of product no matter what their health circumstances were. What I meant is that Health Canada will put out…you know, will allow these licences, give them out, but then they only have three inspectors to go around and monitor and make sure that they are doing what they are supposed to be doing. In the meantime, all of us in Winnipeg, various areas of Winnipeg, are being affected not only from the smell and the health concerns but the criminality aspect. I mean, the comings and goings from the house next door was amazing. And when we took down licence plate numbers, et cetera, and gave it to Safer Communities who we were working with, it's the same group that is going around to various different grow ops. So, this is why we know it's organized crime. The I-Team did a report that what these groups do is that they grow black market marijuana in exchange for heroin and cocaine and fentanyl that they can sell on the street. So, this is huge organized crime. And one of these days what's going to happen is either a house is going to blow up and it's going to kill innocent victims or there is going to be break ins. I understand that there was already one home invasion to a couple…you know, these individuals thought it was a grow op and it was the wrong house.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thank you both for your presentations today. First of all, I want to share my condolences once again on the loss of your father.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes moves extension of 2 minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Klein: Thank you. And I know from seeing you on the news that it was at Maples. So, my condolences to you once again. And I appreciate your passion, both of you, on this subject. And when I did see the motion come forward I had a conversation with members of Safer Communities. Very intelligent gentleman, great to talk to. They told me how frustrating this situation is for them and how difficult it is for them in Winnipeg and how important this motion is to them, because it's making their job very hard. I just want know and I think it's good for my colleagues to know, have you been speaking to other levels of government as well and sharing your frustration with them on this issue?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein.

Eddie Calisto-Tavares: Yes, I have. Thank you for your condolences. Yes, I have spoken to other…there is very little political will from our municipal…from our Manitoba government, but in a federal…this is what happens when I work out of the home, you've got your dog as the background. My…but I have been working very closely with our MP and other members of…and others, our MP and Garden City's MP and we are going to continue to pursue that regulations within Health Canada get changed. I want to go back to this idea that these plants are being grown for medicinal purposes or that we are by any means infringing on people's Charter of Rights. Let's go back to why someone would spend $400,000 on a home, not live in there. Let's go back to what Carmen said, all of the plates that we have been monitoring and working with Safer Communities and then finding out they are going to multiple homes. And so, they are workers. This is a business that they are running. It is an illegal business so it is not in any way, shape or form, something that is infringing on somebody's rights.

Madam Speaker: Eddie, I just need to interject. The time has come to an end for this topic here but Council does appreciate your presentations today so thank you.

Eddie Calisto-Tavares: Thank you. Stay well, be safe.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Our next delegation is Emeka Nadi in opposition to Item 1 of Report 'B' of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development, the report dated November 16th, 2020. And it's regarding the Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site Secondary Plan SP 1/2018. Mr. Clerk, do we have the delegation online?

Clerk: Yes, we do.

Madam Speaker: Welcome, Mr. Nadi. We have 10 minutes on the clock for you today.

Emeka Nadi: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and councillors. My name is Emeka Nadi, I am Principal and CEO of Nadi Design, an urban planning and design practice based here in Winnipeg. We have offices in Canada, the US and Mexico. Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to once more share my views and professional opinions on the Fulton Grove project. Today I'll quickly go over the following; I'm going to give some facts about what we know about Fulton Grove, so, we'll call those the facts. I'm also going to cover what we don't know about this project, and I've dubbed that the sum of all fears. So, we'll go over the things we don't know. And then I want to talk lastly about the decisions we make today and the legacy that we will leave. But before I start, I want to explain my personal and my professional context. So, I have lived on three different continents and in many different cities around the world. I like to refer to myself as a global citizen who has chosen to make Winnipeg my home. My company was engaged in 2019 to review the Fulton Grove project and to develop an independent commentary on the appropriateness of the proposed development. It's important for me to point out that while Gen Equities hired my firm, we are not part of a development team and the opinions of my firm developed are independent and are not necessarily identical to Gem Equities. So, talking about the facts, I want to establish some commonality and some of the councillors have heard me speak on this before. I have seven points of commonality. Fact number one, Winnipeg as a city is growing. City planners and you, the Municipal Government, foresaw this when policies such as OurWinnipeg, Complete Communities and the Transit-Oriented Development Handbook were developed. Also, many major growth-oriented capital infrastructure projects were approved. Fact number two, over half a billion dollars of federal, provincial and municipal money has been spent on major infrastructural improvements around the immediate Fulton Grove vicinity. Improvements that only really make sense when considered with a project like this at the epicentre. Fact three, the site…the Fulton Grove site has a unique trifecta being identified as the major transformative redevelopment site, as a site that sits completely within a TOD, transit-oriented development, umbrella which also means that it sits along a transit-based growth corridor, and this infill site is the largest and last major redevelopment site within the city's mature or established residential neighbourhoods. Fact number four, from a transit-oriented development perspective, we know that the blue line BRT runs every 5 to 15 minutes. That's currently the highest frequency available in Winnipeg today. The line has been operating at this frequency for quite some time without the revenues from ridership that a project like this would inject. Fact five, professional, civil and transportation engineers working hand in hand with the municipal Public Works staff have confirmed that all the adjacent infrastructure has the capacity to support the project as currently envisioned. Fact number six, all existing policies support and in fact require that this project must anticipate transformative development, must be growth-oriented and must have a compact and high-density form. Fact number seven, my last fact, we know from doing our own independent research that areas adjacent to the Fulton Grove site are currently supporting densities between 61 and 136 dwelling units per acre. So, those are facts and that's kind of a commonly established sort of backdrop to the Fulton Grove project. Now, let's talk about what we don't know and I've dubbed that the sum of all our fears because these are strong concerns. Fear number one may be the most important. We don't know the exact right density. Nobody does. This is a cold hard truth. Personally, as an optimistic urban designer, my firm's model for what the Fulton Grove's density ought to be actually exceeded even Gen Equities. So, in our proposal, in our analysis we had an average of about 60 dwelling units per acre compared to Gen Equities 42 odd dwelling units per acre. And we built our model precisely following the major redevelopment sites and the Transit-Oriented Development guidelines. Now conversely, public service planners have taken a very conservative approach to density. They have cited the same policy guidelines as their reference points. But I have to say, none of us is exactly right. Now, where some of us see a structured leap of faith, others can't help but imagine cataclysmic social, political failure. Fear number two, we're not yet clear on how we will create tiered density within the project. I heard many times in last week's hearings that there is a concern over insufficient checks and balances preventing, for example, a 20-storey high rise building from being erected smack in the middle of the lower density outer edges. So, I personally agree that this needs some kind of structure, but I think we need to start at an appropriate density and allow for market adjustments through future planning processes. The third fear, there is concern about accessibility given the CNR rail line to the north. While transportation engineering professionals have run scenario after scenario and they have demonstrated that this parcel is nowhere near as isolated as our fears may have us believe. My last fear point, fear number 4; now, the Public Service has relied almost exclusively on density recommendations out of the Dillon report. Now, I respect the diligence of the consulting engineers and planners who made these recommendations, but I feel the need to point out the obvious. There is nothing, nothing at all visionary about simply extending the single-family Beaumont neighbourhood density into the Fulton Grove parcel. This scale of density will not support or justify the significant infrastructural enhancements and investments nor is it consistent with the major redevelopment site designation for the project. So, with the time I have left I'm just going to talk about decision making and our shared legacy. So, listen, Winnipeg got the Jets back. Winnipeg got the only federally funded museum

outside of Ottawa. Winnipeg has the largest historically preserved exchange district in Canada. Winnipeg built the largest floodway on earth, built the MTS Centre, built CentrePort and built the innovative Bridgwater neighbourhoods. What do all these projects have in common and what did it take to make them a reality? One word – vision. Transit-oriented development is completely new to Winnipeg and applying a conservative lens and limiting planning policies is like trying to drive forwards down a Winnipeg street using only your rear-view mirror. Now, I appreciate, I really do appreciate that the Public Service has a very important function here, but theirs is not to lead us into the brave transformational future of high-density transit-oriented development in Winnipeg. The responsibility for that vision rests with the folks in this room. Now, will we get it perfectly right? Not a chance. But the risk of not doing anything, especially after the significant investment in planning and infrastructure and the risks of stunting the first significant transit-oriented development community in Winnipeg is far, far greater in my mind than taking a structured leap of faith. Winnipeg is growing. We are in need of new forms of compact transit-oriented development. I urge you to find the political will, find the vision and find the courage to strive for something transformational. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Nadi. Please stay on the line we may have some questions after we hear the next delegation. Next, we'll hear from Mr. Andrew Marquess. Also in opposition to the same item. Mr. Clerk, do we have Mr. Marquess on the line?

Clerk: Yes, he is just connecting to the audio right now.

Madam Speaker: Welcome, sir. We have five minutes on the clock for you.

Andrew Marquess: Good morning, Mr. Mayor and councillors. I appreciate the time you have taken to review the materials in front of you, and consider these applications today. It has been a long journey to get the opportunity to be in front of you. It is unfortunate that it took this long to get to this point but I'm glad we are here and I can share our version of the vision for the development. The Public Service initially were working in tandem with us on the plan and the vision, but that shifted very dramatically in 2016. The Public Service report we have in front of us today has taken a turn and many of the previous concerns seem to have dissipated, which we are happy about, but not sure how it happened. Today I would like to address some of the remaining concerns and hopefully together we can all move forward and build a community that all social demographics can enjoy, live, work and play in. My comments today will be brief as you have volumes of information in front of you and standing policy committee members of Council spent over 9 hours with us to clarify many of the points outlined in the Public Service report. This project is an infill development which incorporates transit-orientated development principles. 1,918 units are being contemplated in the design which is an appropriate density based on City TOD policies as well as ensures revenue for the City, which is a benefit from the over $500 million invested in infrastructure in the area. Council had the vision and made hard choices years ago to approve a transit project which at the time was one of the largest infrastructure projects in the city's history, in order to make Winnipeg stronger and more reflective of the growing population. There were specific considerations and extra expense to create the dog leg route with the intent of the lands in question being a major contributor to population growth in a more environmental manner which is cycling, walking and public transit. I would like to address some of the very good questions asked by councillors of previous meetings. For clarity, we have always endeavoured in the plan to meet all FCM guidelines which are outlined in the FCM manual. We are following the Transportation Standards Manual which addresses concepts like school bus turning radius. And in fact, we did engage a transportation engineer last week to run a model about school bus turning radiuses. I can't provide that information but I am comfortable with the results. We have sidewalks on both sides of the street other than six blocks within the single-family area which have front driveways. The reason for this is previously, the plan had sidewalks on both sides of the street in this area, but changed this design because the Public Service said it was unsafe to put sidewalks in this location. One of the reasons we put front load houses in the development was due to some of the consultations we had with the first responders, it was learned that back lane houses could be a safety concern and that the City may start moving away from this type of housing design. The final point to make is about the surrounding City services. Every engineering report we have completed and the internal City department's confirm that the City has the capacity to add the 1,918 units applied for. So, what does this mean? It means that the City can add these 1,918 units and the corresponding 4,000 to 4,500 residents without spending a dollar to build new infrastructure. The City has used the phrase many times, especially in the growth fees debate, that says, "Growth doesn't pay for growth." But in this case, growth certainly does pay. How many locations in the city can you add 4,000 to 4500 residents and reuse all existing City infrastructure? Council, I took the vision and investment you made in this area very seriously and with our team worked tirelessly to create a plan which we can all be proud of. In 2010 during the formation of Complete Communities, this land was specifically identified as an area of growth and that is the opportunity we have in front of us today. Successive policy decisions have only enhanced that redevelopment goal. Today we have a choice to turn the 47 acres of bare land into a thriving community or we can leave that bare land undeveloped and continue to discuss what a missed opportunity the Parker Lands is. Winnipeg is ready for this type of development. The increased tax revenues and the opportunity to give Winnipeggers a type of development which is available in other major metropolitan centres is going to make Winnipeg a stronger, more vibrant community. The City has done the hard work by investing over half a billion dollars to encourage development along the transit corridor. My partner and I would like to facilitate…

Madam Speaker: Mr. Marquess, if you could just wrap up, we need to get to questions now.

Andrew Marquess: I have one more sentence. My partner and I would like to facilitate a further private investment that will help to ensure these massive public investments are a financial success. Thank you again for everyone's time and effort in considering this matter.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Marquess. Mr. Clerk could you please get Mr. Nadi back on the line with us. And we will now take any questions from Council. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. In terms of the secondary plan in policy, not in a by-law, which is an interesting concept, but Madam Speaker, this secondary plan is calling on approximately 300 more units than recommended by our Planning Department. And ultimately, what I want to know is…and the designer is here and I think can speak to it as well as Mr. Marquess. What effect is the extra 300 units having on the size of right of ways and sidewalks in this proposed neighbourhood?

Andrew Marquess: If I could maybe answer that and then Emeka, you can chime in on this. So, thank you for the question, Councillor Eadie. So, the right of ways have all been put in place in accordance with the Transportation Standards Manual. In the ACG report there was a dimension on the sidewalks that was recommended, so I take it that the Public Service as long as sidewalks are built to that dimension, which they would be, would feel that the population would be able to walk in a manner that is conducive to having a walkable community and the right of way width will obviously be dealt with by the Public Service or the Public Works Department. So, I'm sure that in the design phase any of those issuers that may be there today will be dealt with before construction begins.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further…Mr. Nadi, would you like to respond as well?

Emeka Nadi: Just really quickly. Mr. Marquess has given the most thorough answer, but just to answer Councillor Eadie directly, the 300 units of housing really will not know…no impacts whatsoever on the dimensions of the rights of ways or the sidewalks. There is no trigger point, one to the other, absolutely none.

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

Councillor Eadie: Just on a follow up question, under the secondary plan there is some areas with single-family units. My question would be proposed for the secondary plan. Are these single-family streets cul de sacs or are they like a crescent or what is that?

Andrew Marquess: Again, if I could jump in and answer Councillor Eadie's question and Emeka, maybe you can just follow on. So, this is not a suburban type development as it relates to single-family. Yeah, just for clarification, the amount of single-family homes in this development is around 90 to 93 out of the total 1,918 units. And the design is…the street design is more a grid like design. This is a compact, walkable neighbourhood. So, we don't have any cul de sacs and you don't have the typical street design that you would see in a more suburban location. So, very different design. And Emeka, you can probably speak to that, given your experience of Bridgwater and so on and so forth.

Emeka Nadi: Actually, Andrew, you've given the answer…the appropriate answer to the question. It's a compact development, there are no cul de sacs or that type of suburban development in here. In fact, the layout as it currently is, is specifically designed to be a lot more walkable and compact vis a vis the Transit-Oriented Development guidelines that we've followed.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. My final question is, do you know of all the problems in the Windsor Park neighbourhood where there are no sidewalks and what happens for people walking on the street in that neighbourhood and other neighbourhoods where I think there are some sections in Bridgwater as well, where the streets and sidewalks don't work quite well, are you familiar with those?

Andrew Marquess: Councillor Eadie, I am not familiar with those issues, but I just like to make sure that I have communicated this properly. Every street in the single-family townhouse and multi-family area has a sidewalk that residents can use. So, there are no streets in this entire development that have no sidewalks. So, there is an opportunity for all the residents to be able to use a sidewalk to move about throughout the development. So hopefully, I have cleared up that confusion and I apologize if my communications has led to that confusion. There are sidewalks every where in this development for residents to use.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Emeka Nadi: And to add to the answer, Councillor Eadie, I am familiar with some of those neighbourhoods, certainly, and some of the issues with not providing appropriate pedestrian circulation and sidewalks in other neighbourhoods. I can speak to the fact that compared to those issues and projects, the design and layout for Fulton Grove as we have it right now is completely different.

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

Andrew Marquess: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next is Mr. Ed Kolodziej. He is with us to address Council on Item 4 of Report 'A' of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated November 16th, 2020 and is regarding cannabis cultivation in residential properties. Mr. Kolodziej, welcome. We have five minutes on the clock for you.

Ed Kolodziej: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My name is Ed Kolodziej and I speak on behalf…my behalf as well as over 200 residents that have signed our community petition in favour of the motion before Council today. I also ask that there be no grandfathering clause for existing large-scale producers of medicinal cannabis. I would like to thank Councillors Devi Sharma, Ross Eadie and Janice Lukes for all their tireless efforts to bring this motion before Council. And I would like to thank Councillor Sharma especially for working with the residents of Old Kildonan for many, many months on this issue. Thank you, also, to Mayor Bowman and all of Council for allowing private citizens from the community to bring our issues forward in a transparent and public way. This is democracy in action. Some background; there are three primary types of licences that can be obtained to grow cannabis legally in Canada. The first are the commercial licences and these are heavily regulated. These licences are obtained by for-profit companies. They are required to follow a stringent regulation framework. They also pay income taxes, property taxes, employ Canadians and produce a legal product enjoyed by countless thousands. Recreational licence; these are permitted in eight of ten provinces and they allow individuals to grow up to four plants for their own consumption. And medicinal licences; in Manitoba there are approximately 1,600 medicinal licences. Individuals are required to obtain a prescription and then they can grow their plants. The average marijuana prescription in Canada is for 2.1 grams of cannabis a day. That will allow a prescription holder to grow ten plants. However, if you search online, there are companies that will help individuals of paying prescriptions of 95 grams a day or 463 plants. Health Canada does not require individuals to occupy a home where you are growing cannabis. This has resulted in individuals purchasing homes with the primary purpose of cannabis production. These large-scale operators have an affinity for large suburban bungalows with attached garages. Unfortunately, these properties go from being a place for people to live and call home to an industrial scale production facility in the middle of a residential neighbourhood. Last year, a motion came before Council on this exact topic. At that the time, there were two large scale medicinal grow ops within 300 meters of my home. Today there are six. The problem has tripled in one year. The City of Winnipeg did not create this situation but the City of Winnipeg can create a by-law to regulate it. Odour is a big concern, but my primary concern is safety. A 2016 report in Surrey, BC, on the hazards of commercial scale grow ops found all 314 residences' had problems including mold, dangerous wiring and holes in fire break walls. On April 8th, 2018, a tragic fire in Surrey, BC, killed two people and injured two more in a house fire caused by the heating equipment that was used to dry 188 cannabis plants. A grow op is 24 times more likely to have a fire than a non-grow op. Large scale grow ops use a tremendous amount of energy to produce cannabis. Incidents of power surges and power outages have increased dramatically in my neighbourhood. On the evening of September 26th, a medicinal grow op in my neighbourhood had a blown electrical panel. Multiple Hydro trucks and a Hydro excavating crew were deployed to restore service to the home. On June 12th, a home invasion of a medicinal grow op occurred in the city of Winnipeg. The two occupants, a 17 and a 20-year-old were bound and gagged. Clearly, we are talking about more than smell. Lastly, this is an issue that is city-wide. Last week, the CBC I-Team revealed large scale medicinal grow ops in Sage Creek, Fort Richmond, Elmwood, North Kildonan, Garden City and Amber Trails. We need a city-wide solution. Legal medicinal marijuana is here to stay, but large-scale operators do not belong in our residential neighbourhoods. They belong in industrially zoned areas. Today I am asking City Council to take decisive action. Please pass this motion and pass a by-law with no grandfather clause for existing large-scale operators. Stay safe.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Kolodziej. We appreciate your presentation today. There'll be no questions. Moving forward with our agenda, we have the report on the Executive Policy Committee, Mr. Mayor, the report dated October 20th, 2020.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 20, 2020**

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Item No. 3.

Madam Speaker: Item No. 3 carries an amending motion with it. Mr. Clerk.

Item 3 – Neighbourhood Economic Development Officer

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, to introduce Item 3, followed by Councillor Eadie who will introduce amending Motion 7 which was moved by Councillor Eadie, seconded by Councillor Nason. Mr. Mayor, Item 3.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll wait to hear from my Council colleague and other councillors.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Eadie, your opportunity to speak to the item and introduce Motion 7.

**Motion No. 7
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Nason,**

WHEREAS the Neighbourhood Economic Development Officer (NEDO) is an essential position within the city for many reasons on behalf of the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the business improvement zones should not be paying any portion of the NEDO's salary;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that EPC's recommendation on the original motion from the Lord Selkirk West Kildonan Community Committee on 3. Neighbourhood Economic Development Officer to have the 2021 operating budget remove the following clause:

"1.U. That Council amend the Business Improvement Zone Procedures By-law 8111/2002 to reflect that Business Improvement Zones, commencing with their 2021 budget, must allocate funds to offset a portion of the costs of the Neighbourhood Economic Development Officer and that the allocation of this cost to individual Business Improvement Zones be based on (adjusted) annual rental value."

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the use of business taxes to pay the costs of maintaining the NEDO position and all the duties assigned to this staff position.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am moving this amending motion to move forward the intent of the original motion that came from the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee where we heard from, well, at least one business improvement zone about their perspective in…for business improvement zones to pay a portion of a salary of a City employee. The whereas' are very brief in the…in my introductory motion, but the Neighbourhood Economic Development Officer just, you know, this goes back to the 1990s actually, this position. It existed in the '90s. At the time, Council was making a commitment to business and small business in various areas where they were finding that the Xity wasn't investing an appropriate amount of money to make the business environment more conducive for customers and just the whole look and feel and image of the areas. And you know, to be able to also promote business in these various zones, to you know, effectively in the past it was we were trying to bring these improvement zones, trying to bring the customers back from the malls who were stealing all the customers away. The malls were where everything was going. So, anyway, ultimately, the City of Winnipeg committed and recommitted in the current by-law that exists for the procedures of business improvement zones. And under Mayor Murray, you know, the council was committing, again, to trying to help facilitate investment from the business community in their own neighbourhoods, the neighbourhoods of their businesses. And so, a levy is implemented. The levy is not to be spent dictated by what the City says, although, each business improvement zone is basically an entity created by by-law. And under those by-laws they have a certain mandate to achieve on behalf of the businesses who decided that there is an improvement zone in that area. And so, there is a commitment from these businesses and many of them are small businesses, paying money into improving the streets that the City keeps cutting money in keeping up. The whole street beautification budget, since I have been a councillor, Madam Speaker, has seen constant reductions. The graffiti program, reductions. We, the business, I speak on behalf…I am the

President of the Selkirk Avenue BIZ besides being the councillor rep on there. Because those small business owners don't have the time to undertake the amount of work required as a volunteer to help make sure that things happen for those improvement zones. So, ultimately though, business improvement zones have been having to pick up extra costs because of budgets that this Council has passed and the previous Council and the previous Council, continual cuts. And so, who has to step up? The businesses, the business improvement zones. Actually, there is a capital fund, a commitment that the City made in the past to help build those better business environments on those streets. There is a capital program which is continually being cut as well. And I think that at some point in the four-year budget, it disappears. So, business improvement zones need to start saving more of their money to put towards improvements on the street that are conducive to business and people feeling safe on those streets. Downtown isn't the only place where people don't feel comfortable and safe to do business to come and shop or anything. We have to keep a commitment to the businesses around the whole city. And those 16 business improvement zones are every where. They pay business taxes, at least the ones whose threshold are over the credit threshold, and those business taxes are general revenue. And so, my proposal is just simply get rid of the clause that would establish in the by-law that a portion of the…any deal is paid and maintain the position and all the things that it does and just use the business taxes businesses are already paying to keep that position and commitment in place going forward, way into the future. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor or Councillor Eadie, do you wish to close first of all on your motion?

Councillor Eadie: I would just close and I would hope there are councillors who don't have business improvement zones in their areas which is too bad because it is a way for businesses…it entrenches them into being more of a stakeholder on the streets in which they operate. And if we basically tell them and say that we, councillor, going to dictate how their levy dollars are to be spent, I think that's highly problematic and I would suggest that for some business improvement, smaller ones, it's going to be hard to maintain a commitment from those businesses when they see what the City is doing. So, I implore my colleagues to support my amending motion. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate Councillor Eadie's comments on this as well as his efforts and those of Councillor Nason. Also want to thank the BIZ reps who we have heard from today and we have had dialogue. This is the first I have seen of this and so, I'm just trying to review it in real time to understand it. I will…I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, should I continue?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Mayor Bowman: Okay, thank you. So, I'll…I'm certainly open…I'm open to supporting this. I think we would obviously need to find funds in the upcoming budget update, but certainly willing to work collaboratively with my Council colleagues including Councillor Eadie and Nason who are raising concerns today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on amending Motion 7. Call for a recorded vote. All in favour of amending Motion 7, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Browaty and Mayes.

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

Madam Speaker: Okay, amending Motion 7 passes. And now, the main item as amended. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Mr. Mayor, the Executive Policy Committee report dated November 18th, 2020.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 18, 2020**

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 through 16.

Madam Speaker: We do have amending Motion No. 4 on Item 6. No. 8 is being requested to be pulled. Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: Item No. 2.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: 10.

Madam Speaker: 10. 5. Councillor Klein?

Councillor Klein: 5. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: 5 as well. Any others? Last call. I'll call the question on items 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11 through 16. All in favour?

Councillor Orlikow: Someone pulled No. 4? I'm not sure if that's correct.

Madam Speaker: Was Item 4 pulled? I did not hear that.

Councillor Orlikow: Okay, my bad. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Call the question once again, Item 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11 through 16. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 2.

Item 2 – Winnipeg Food Council Coordinator Contract

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, to introduce Item 2.

Mayor Bowman: I'll be very brief. I want to thank Winnipeg Food Council. I want to thank my Council colleagues for their ongoing support including Councillor Mayes. I want to thank Jeanette for her efforts and those of everyone involved in the Food Council. You know, this began a number of years ago and certainly at the time we weren't talking or foreseeing a pandemic, but, food security, as Councillor Rollins mentioned quite articulately this morning, Madam Speaker, is of particular concern to our community and so, looking forward to hearing from my Council colleagues on this matter.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on this item? Councillor Mayes, followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Mayes: I'll be brief. Thank you, Madam Speaker. We have been very lucky to have found Ms. Sivilay, so I'm very pleased to be able to come forward with an offer to keep her on for two more years. We have done this with some other committees of Council, the advisory committees. Somebody said to me during a pandemic, you know, you were right to try and champion this Food Council. They voted against it at an earlier stage, but I took some solace in that. I do think it's a group that is…we have done well to create this during the Mayor's first term of office, I think we created it and have continued it here in the second term of office. So, I want to thank the Mayor for his support of this. It's been a good initiative. I think we're sort of getting up to pace now that we have somebody full time on staff. And I should thank Councillor Schreyer who, like me, has been on it from day one. And it's been a good run. Councillor Schreyer's been fun to work with on this. He cares, he is into it so hopefully he will be reappointed, I have been reappointed and we can carry on together. But Councillor Schreyer has been a financial supporter of some of our initiatives and enthusiastic participant and it's been a very good run. So, I just want to thank Councillor Schreyer for his work as well on this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be very brief myself. It's just it's…I want to commend His Worship for having created this committee, working with various agencies and specialists throughout the city to create this citizen-based council. In this case, you know, this didn't exist before. Funding for this didn't exist before and Councillor Mayes made the case to fight to maintain some funding for this. It's not a lot of money, but it's real money. We spend money at

city hall to solve problems. I believe this was worth the $50,000 to have a coordinator because the essence of what makes the Food Council work is coordination to have that efficient relationship amongst the various agencies that can help people find food. And it's all the more important. And so, there has been this money to enable the agencies to optimize what they do. I believe in this case it's worth that $50,000 and we may continue with Jeanette and I'm pleased to see it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor would you like to close? I'll call the question then. All in favour of Item 2? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 5.

Item 5 – North District Police Station

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be supporting this report and I want to thank…there's been a number of people that have lended their leadership talents to this report and getting us to today. I want to thank our Chief of Police, our Public Service including our Property and Development lead, John Kiernan, and many others. I want to thank members of Council for their ongoing input. Councillor Eadie has been a tireless advocate for the community and has spoken about this numerous times, most recently at our most recent Executive Policy Committee. And I want to thank him. He has absolutely been a real champion for his community with respect to this report. And you know, there has been new stations built in several locations in our city, this is the last of those pre-existing plans that this Council and certainly I have inherited, but very pleased with the level of dialogue with the community, the protection of recreation space, but also, recognizing that the current North District Police Station is long past its best before date and will be supporting this just because I believe that the community as well as the members of the Winnipeg Police Service certainly could use a more modern location to operate in. So, look forward to supporting this and would ask my Council colleagues to also support it, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. And I appreciate the words of Mayor Bowman, Madam Speaker. It's been a long, difficult road for the North District Police Station and you know, I want to put on record at Council, you know, the issues that happened around this whole thing. Back in…when they decided to go to the new district model of policing and utilizing facilities, I think one of the things that the police service had to recognize is that along with Municipal Accommodations, Property and Development Department, is that it was unsustainable to continue to maintain the number of police station buildings which were getting very old, based on what existed prior to Unicity. And this particular station at Hartford and Aikins, just before, like I think the best before date wore off the building at least 20 years ago. Anyway, the…so for the people in West Kildonan though it was controversial. People didn't want to lose their local. But, Council made the decision long ago to go to this model and to go originally to four district police stations but City administration found a way to combine south and west in a way to still have that building serve those areas. The East District Station, of course, was the first new one built and then in between I just…I have to say this, this project would have been done long before Mayor Bowman came in as the new leader for the City of Winnipeg. The failure, the fiasco, the ridiculous crazy things that went on related to the police headquarters really upset me back in 2011 I think it was, 2012, when this whole thing and the cost escalations blew up and I was calling for the resignation of the CAO at the time because what I knew was this: the North District Police Station is never going to get built because everybody will be too paranoid about spending money to ensure that our Winnipeg Police Service can deliver on the services that they must do. Yes, there are issues to deal with with the Winnipeg Police Service in terms of delivering the service it does to Winnipeggers. And we have a leader at the Winnipeg Police Board and we have a Chief of Police who are trying to correct and make things work better and I think that's important. So, when we look at, yes, in the end we had to use the old Ex grounds to build this new police station. The cost of private property has really escalated and the reality is what is available at an affordable, sustainable price is not anywhere near where a north district station should be located. The ultimate greatest spot would have been the…replace the north transit garage, put in the police station there and it would have had enough property to keep the evidence as well and that. But you know, ultimately, working behind the scenes, that was unmoveable and so, I compromised, Madam Speaker, to try to make things work better and agreed with the chief that we need…a worker is a worker is a worker. We have to have proper facilities for our police service to operate out of. Whether the future means we go to community policing and that more neighbourhood related stuff. The reality is, is that they have to get there by car, somehow into those areas. But community support and that kind of community policing can happen even though you only have one building because ultimately, good support to the neighbourhoods and community from the police service actually has to happen out in those areas. And that's what I'm thinking the police service will continue to do. That is happening and starting to move that way in the downtown area, Madam Speaker. So, the investment, this is…I really want to thank…the chief promised me that there would be an investment in the sport, athletic recreation green space at the old Ex grounds because that's the only way I would agree to that. Because ultimately, when those facilities are providing for our young people, you will see in the longer term, when you invest in those kind of things, you see young people who are not susceptible to addictions, to drugs, to all those bad things in life that we don't want them to experience. To use these

supports like WASA, the Winnipeg Aboriginal Sport Achievement Centre, are working with young people to build that confidence in them. To ensure that our youth and into adulthood don't get into these addictions and then are experiencing life in a way that they shouldn't. And you know, I have seen it happen. It's not just Indigenous kids, it's all of our kids. I see them when they get to be adults, some of the people my kid went to school with in the Seven Oaks School Division, not even in the North End, away from there, where today as adults they struggle with addictions and stuff because somewhere along the line we failed those young people, to help them avoid these really bad things in life, Madam Speaker. And so, this investment of 5.9 million related to the old Ex Arena and site is very important and I want to thank my Council colleagues who must have, as well, pushed to see that kind of investment. And so, the administration is hard work. There are people who still don't like it, but you know what, that's the way it is. And there has been a lot of work in trying to ensure that there are good athletic field, sport opportunities, for our youth and there have been studies, it's not just the perception of that neighbourhood that they don't have enough of that kind of space. There were studies. As a volunteer, we even had our community development manager work on a report that discovered all these issues and I did receive an e-mail from that gentleman who is now retired, Mr. Swanson, who was really kind of angry with me, but I explained to him what the situation was and it was done. So please, everybody, support this report.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise this morning in support of this motion as well. I just want to point out again what Mayor Bowman has mentioned and Councillor Eadie has mentioned, that the facilities at 260 Hartford are well beyond their shelf life and we need to address this critical municipal accommodation in the community, as well as the health…as it affects the health and welfare of our officers and the civilian staff that work at this facility. Repurposing the City owned land is cost effective and it's…and in this time where every dollar is held with a tight fist, this is sound economic judgment. This location is a prime location to dispatch services in the area and is a hub for recreation and now social activity. As a younger man, I spent quite a bit of time in this area playing football at Hawkeye's Field which was located just across the property from where the old Exhibition Arena is. We need to build community capacity and partnerships. That's what's needed to rebuild the trust between our communities and our police service. So, this is a great opportunity for this to happen. With the opportunities that will also be provided for WASAC, I think this is a great opportunity to build and foster those relationships and, of course, community well being. I want to thank Councillor Rollins for moving this motion at EPC and also, Councillors Eadie and Councillor Santos that recognized the value of sport and recreation to provide options for youth in our community, away from activities like gang participation and other activities that contribute to the decline of our community. So, thank you again for your advocacy and support in recreation activities for our youth. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I stand in support of this motion as well. I think it is long, long overdue to Councillor Eadie's point. I know during my time on the board that the service has put forward this opportunity to rebuild and to present their community policing initiative, if you will, by bringing in the community together with a new location for the service for many, many years and it has not been brought forward or not approved for many, many years. So, I'm excited and very supportive that it is finally making its way forward. I actually think that this is just the start. I hope that we will see now a movement to ensure that we have community spaces in our current police stations, that we move to open up some space in our HQ for community use, for some engagement there. The west district and so on, because again, that brings our community back into the public owned buildings and can create a new environment and a new beginning with community policing. I do have two issues, which won't change my support for it, just concerned and puzzled. I'm not sure why this wasn't included in the budget, which apparently will be out tomorrow. Not sure why it wasn't included in that. I'm not sure why we are going to take the step, in moments, to borrow $2 million for this bill. $2 million when we're at the debt level we are at today is not a lot of money. I mean, we're getting close to our ceiling again. But it seems to me that we could certainly reallocate expenses that we have today so that we don't have to borrow $2 million. I just…I think that we have to start thinking about our future generations and councils differently because right now we're making them pay for buildings that we're approving and taking credit for today. Other than that, I think it's a wonderful initiative and I do hope that we can start having the discussions about future space, public space, community space, youth space in our current police service buildings.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think I was remiss in my opening comments not thanking the community for their participation in this matter. There has been a pretty robust dialogue with the community that was facilitated by a number of members of Council as well as the Public Service. I also, while this is a long time coming, it's taken the efforts of a number of people around this council chamber to get it over the finish line, to use the football analogy that Councillor Chambers mentioned. And I want to thank our Chair of the Police Board. This has definitely been a file that has required some navigating and some collaboration along the way and I want to thank Councillor Chambers for having that ability to

kind of see this through, which I think will really benefit the members of the Winnipeg Police Service. And I want to thank our Finance Chair as well for his stewardship and scrutiny on these and other matters. I know, as it was just mentioned, the 2021 balanced budget update will be tabled tomorrow for Council's consideration and, you know, not…I understand Councillor Klein just mentioned that he is puzzled about debt. I would have expected if there was concerns about this that amendments could have been brought forward by any member of Council. But not seeing any amendments from him or anyone else I'll ask for everyone to please support this admin report today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on Item 5. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. I have called the question, Mr. Mayor, I was in the middle…was Councillor Chambers asking as well? Okay, then I did miss that. I thought that I was in the middle of the…recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer. You had counted Councillor Schreyer? Councillor Schreyer, thank you, we did get your vote. Thank you. The vote was unanimous. Next item is Item 6. We do have an amending motion for going with this motion. It's amending Motion 4, moved by Councillor Gilroy, seconded by Councillor Gillingham. Mr. Clerk.

Item 6 – City of Winnipeg Rapid Housing Initiative (RHI) Federal Funding

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will hear from Mayor Bowman, followed by Councillor Gilroy to introduce amending Motion 4. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is an exciting day. I want to thank my Council colleagues. I want to thank the Federal Government for making these funds available to the benefit of our community, Madam Speaker. The Rapid Housing Initiative federal funding dollars here, $12.5 million to support five organizations that have been able to get to this point, to meet the qualifications that the Federal Government has set out is exciting. I know it's going to go a long way to help organizations like Siloam Mission, the Salvation Army, and others that are contained in the report, Madam Speaker. This is as a result of extensive and sustained lobbying by Canada's Big City Mayors and other advocates throughout the community here in Winnipeg and across Canada from coast to coast to coast. I do want to put on the record appreciation of the Prime Minister Justin Trudeau as well as his government for making these funds available. And I also want to just also recognize that there is even with this investment of $12.5 million there are many other initiatives that have come forward, projects that have come forward through this process that I will be hoping to support going forward as well. I want to thank our Public Service as well. They really only had a couple of weeks to really work to meet the timelines of the Federal Government and I think they really demonstrated in the middle of a pandemic their ability to be responsive and innovative in how that call went out to the community, applications came in, of course, within a very tight, compressed timeframe, to get it on the floor of Council today which is necessary in order for us to meet the program requirements of the Federal Government. And so, I'm hoping we can support this. I'm very excited about this. I know there's a number of advocates for housing around this council chamber and I want to thank them as well for all of their work to date. This will impact positively a number of people who need us to support them right now in our community, and looking forward to it these dollars and the new housing units being built in the next year. And I do also want to put on the record appreciation for the amending motion which I will be supporting, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Gilroy, to speak to the main item and amending Motion 4.

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Gilroy,
Seconded by Councillor Gillingham,

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 6 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 18, 2020, be amended by adding the following new recommendations and renumbering the remaining recommendation accordingly:

7. That the Director of Asset and Project Management work with the successful applicants with the aim to ensure that all selected projects are managed and delivered on time and within their respective capital budgets;

8. That the Public Service report to the appropriate standing committee on the progress of these projects on a semi-annual basis during construction and annually thereafter to ensure that the objectives of these projects and the terms of their underlying agreements are being achieved.

Councillor Gilroy: I will be supporting the main item that's on the agenda here today. I was working with different municipalities through FCM across the country, trying to urge the Federal Government to make sure that there is housing investments, rapid housing investments, and now we are seeing that the work that the lobbying between the mayors and all the different councillors, we were able to get funding to come directly to Cindy's to help do affordable housing projects so I'm very, very happy to support the motion today. And do I want to thank the administration. A lot of hard work went in from the public admin. They had to…there was a short, short time turnover and they were able to get the job done. So, I want to thank them. As far as amending motion, the amending motion is quite clear to hear today. It's just allowing us to come back to committee, making sure that we are in line, that the projects are in line, in budget and also that they are being delivered in a timely manner. And it's just making sure that they come back and we are able to have those discussions at the standing policy committee. So, I hope everyone will support the amending motion and the main motion because I think it's a very crucial time in our city to make sure that we have affordable housing and this will help us.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I, too, stand in celebration of this $12.5 million investment worth of recommendations today. However, I think it's really key that we provide our partners in the Federal Government with some very specific feedback. First and foremost, Madam Speaker, we need more money. 12.5 million is great, but we need more. And we need more thoughtful lists of criteria, too. Ones that don't privilege, you know, what I'll call blue chip organizations, but those that address high barrier, high barrier clients and guests. And finally, we need more work to discuss hidden homelessness. The transitional housing projects, the issues that keep people sleeping rough, issues like the fact that children leaving care, too often, go right to the city streets in the city of Winnipeg. Issues that people face with intellectual disabilities who, when they hit the streets, sometimes, often times, tragically, just die. That sudden homelessness they feel when they are kicked out of housing. The transitional housing of addictions and wrap around supports. This $12.5 million is worthy of celebration and the advocacy of councillors around this table, in particular Councillor Gilroy and Mr. Mayor, who advocated for this money, all of you councillors who are going to go forth on a program for housing for the city of Winnipeg because it's just needed. I want to acknowledge your work on this as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Going remote to Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am in favour of this. It's basically a good thing and wish to commend all those who are involved in facilitating, getting the federal funding for affordable housing. And we are talking about…for Winnipeg, we're talking about 12 and a half million for a minimum of 49 affordable housing units, hopefully over 50 affordable housing units, something like that, which is consistent with the point that on a national level, we're talking about a billion dollars for 3,000 affordable housing units. And so, I am in favour of this. It's a good thing, but as Councillor Rollins made the point, we need more money. Now, I think it's important that I offer some perspective in terms of what this money means and the amount of affordable housing that it represents. So, 50 years ago…for the next seven years, we'll be celebrating the 50th anniversary of an 8-year term, the Ed Schreyer government, and it's important to understand that at that time the Provincial Government…and it's important to understand that the City can't do this…we can't do this as a city ourselves. We depend on the Federal and Provincial Governments primarily to take the primary responsibility for affordable housing. And in this case, it's the Federal Government that's coming through with 12 and a half million for the City of Winnipeg. Now, it's important for us to understand, to give some perspective, during the '70s, in an eight-year term, they created 12,000 affordable housing units plus an extra 2,000 nursing home units. So, let's say 12,000 affordable housing units in eight years and, with all of the work that that government did, had a surplus budget, seven out of eight years. Now, they created 12,000 affordable housing units, at least, over eight years which means over 1,500 per year for the province and so that would be you know, approximately 6 to 700, about that, per year, in the city of Winnipeg, something like that. Which means that this would be at about 6 percent if we created 50 affordable housing units every year for the next 20 years or for the next…let's say, for the next 8 years. If we created 50 affordable housing units every year we would be at less than 10 percent of what they were able to do in the 1970s and still having surplus budgets. So, we need to consider that because if we look at the budget here, we're talking about what looks like about a quarter million per housing unit. So, to me, it seems a little steep. That's what it looks like to me. If I can be…if this can be clarified and shown that it's not as much as that, that's good to know. But, if you look at the federal…the federal vision of this, of a billion dollars for 3,000, whereas looking at something approaching about $300,000 per housing unit, that seems pretty expensive, and I hope it

doesn't cost that much. If at the rate and the scale of budgets back in the ‘70s, it was going to be costing that same proportion of our budget? It wouldn't be done. But they did create, in the province of Manitoba, over 1,500 affordable housing units per year. And we…to put that into perspective to…and it sort of explains why Councillor Rollins says we need more money. So, we all need to understand that when it comes to affordable housing and this represents about 6 or 7 percent of what we used to do with provincial funding when it comes to affordable housing units in the city. And I’ll leave it for that. This is a basically positive thing but we need to understand that. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I’ll try to be short. This is fantastic. I only wanted to mention that it's so fantastic, Madam Speaker, and of course I support the amendment from Councillor Gilroy. It's so excellent that I was looking at the properties that will have affordable units rapidly available. There has been this vacant, very old apartment block in my ward that's been nothing less than a pain for case work and other issues. And I note that an Indigenous organization is moving forward with providing some affordable housing units at that particular property. I’m not going to say exactly where it is, Madam Speaker, but wow, finally, this is great. And then there is also another property that's required investment that I think is one that Councillor Rollins for quite a long time wanted to see happen on Main Street. The money is there now, thank you, Federal Government. I just…anyway, I don't know what to say about our parent government down on Broadway, but I am really happy that the Federal Government has saw fit that there is a rapid need to deal with affordable housing for the various cities across the country, for that matter. I believe this rapid money is available to most large cities, Madam Speaker. And I just wanted to say, I appreciate the historical perspective from my colleague from Elmwood. And I wanted to, Madam Speaker, just in concluding on this, thank him for not getting into construction inflation which is actually what's causing part of the problem as to what the cost is to provide these units, material costs and other costs continuing to rise and it's causing great difficulty, actually, for a number of not-for-profit housing groups to get their affordable purchase options built as well, in that the costs are quite steep nowadays. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise. I will be certainly supporting this report. And I thank Councillor Gilroy for her amending motion, I will be supporting that as well. I just rise to explain; this is the example, I think, of where partnerships are going to work. As the Mayor acknowledged, you know, the work of the Federal Government and the funding that comes from the Federal Government, the City of Winnipeg is really, in many ways going to be the conduit of this funding to work in partnership with third party organizations or proponents within our community that are set up to do this very work. I think that we cannot overlook the fact, excuse me, that what is being proposed here with this Rapid Housing Initiative will go towards meeting some of the needs that were identified in the comprehensive Housing Needs Assessment that’s a 235-page document, I believe, that came to Council just earlier this year. And so, we as a city, we have done the analysis to know what the needs are of…housing needs in our community. And it’s…government cannot be all things to all people, no one level of government can be nor should be all things to all people. But what government can do, and in this case, Municipal Government can work in partnership with the Federal Government, proponents within our own community that are working to meet housing needs, to collectively put roofs over the heads of people in our community. And when it really comes to it, that's really some of the basic needs that we have; food on our plate, a roof over our head. And so, I’m glad to support this and I think that, again, this shows the value and the potential of strategic partnerships in our community to meet the needs of our residents. So, I look forward to this. I do recognize that this report identifies some potential risks that are on the City to be involved in this way, but I think Councillor Gilroy's motion will go a long way to being able to, on a regular basis, have our Public Service come back and report to Council on the status of each project and to ensure that all the projects are mannered…managed and delivered on time within their respective budgets and that the appropriate standing committee will be receiving reports on the progress of the projects on a semi-annual basis during the construction and annually thereafter. And I kind of circled back to say that I do trust and hope that our Public Service in their reporting will take a look at how these projects go towards addressing some of the needs that have been identified in the comprehensive Housing Needs Strategy.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As we look at the amending motion in real time that was presented this morning, it does provide a little bit more security. I just want to put some of my past history on the table. You know, last Council I was reminded by the Mayor about my time at the Province which was in the Department of Families which had the oversight of Manitoba Housing. The cost of public sector housing is astronomical. For a two-bedroom unit, and pardon me if the numbers might be a little off, but I believe at the time it was around $450,000 in the public sector. In the private sector that same style unit would be about a quarter million. A substantial difference. So, that's why you have seen consecutively over the last several years the Federal Government has bought into the private sector to buy down rents. We have seen the Provincial Government who has the sector knowledge that is in the business of delivering housing.

They've…under this government, they have moved away from building bricks and mortar but moved into supportive portable benefits to get people into more of the private sector approach as opposed to building legacy buildings that in turn they have fallen, fallen, fallen decades behind in MNI, maintenance and improvements. They are in the hole so far, that's why they are disposing, that's why they've moved away from that approach. Now, I'm not going to vote against getting money from the Federal Government, but these are not immediate solutions. We need a lot more opportunity for immediate solutions to address poverty, to address homelessness, the less than stellar situations that people are living in. We need to find faster ways to get them into that home where they can feel safe, where they can feel secure, where they can go to work, come home. These organizations that are mentioned, many of them I am familiar with and they do do good work in our community, but we've got a lot more problems as was mentioned. 12.5 million, if every stinking dollar goes towards this, it's a start. But I think there at least needs to be 10-fold of that to address the crisis that we have before us. So, I appreciate this federal funding. It is but a drop in the bucket to address the challenges we have in our city and I will be supporting it today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy, do you wish to close on your amending motion? Thank you. Mr. Mayor? Thank you. On the amending motion as well? Call for a recorded vote. I'll call the question on amending Motion No. 4. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: Amending Motion 4 passes. And now onto the main, Item 6, as amended. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: Item 6 passes unanimously. Mr. Clerk, Item 8.

Item 8 – Use of Unallocated Funds from the Future Services Account

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to introduce Item 8?

Mayor Bowman: You know what, I'll defer. I know…I think Councillor Nason will speak to this and I look forward to hearing his comments.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Former speaker Grant Nordman, "Words are all that stands between you and lunch break". I will try not to go on for too long. Thank you, John. The future services account is something of an embarrassment, almost. I don't think I overstate that. None of it is the fault of anyone in this room. The account dates back, actually, to the Ed Schreyer era. There are amounts in there from 1976 that never got spent and still continue to sit there and still continue to sit there not earning any interest. I do want to thank Councillor Gillingham for his support on this effort as well as Councillor Chambers and Councillor Klein have been particularly supportive. So, I want to thank all of them. There was a report, a very good report, a Mike McGinn detailed report that came to Councillor Gilroy's committee in October. Terrific report if you look at it. Detailing all…it really should be called future services accounts, because there are a couple hundred different accounts that exist and these are accounts where either developers or regular citizens have paid money in as required in trust that that money will later be used for a particular civic project; roads often, sometimes sidewalks, sometimes lighting, sometimes water and waste. But this money has been paid in in good faith and millions of it still sits there not earning interest year after year. So, there were two initiatives that have come up. The first one, again, that came to Councillor Gilroy's committee in the report…a portion of that report reads, "Plans for completion of projects are being undertaken as

part of the annual budget process involving three departments: Planning, Public Works and Water Waste." So, the departments I think have gotten going on this and are trying to complete some projects. As has been discussed in many cases, there is enough money in the account to do the work. That's what the report says. This is particularly true in Councillor Klein and Councillor Chambers ward. Hopefully, we will enter the golden age of chip sealing in the next year or two and get some of these roads done in those two wards that are gravel where people have paid in over time. As Councillor Klein has said, you know, people were…people have been told there is no money and they were saying to him, we paid in the money. They were right money. The money has been paid in so hopefully we can get some of those projects done. But then there is another whole group of these projects and that's what this motion, which I hope everyone will support, that this motion is after a different group of projects. We have in trust a whole lot of money and in some cases we have nowhere near enough to do the original project. Plus, we're holding the money and not accruing any interest on it. So, this motion is meant to say, look, if the project predates the year 2000, let's have the administration sit down with the area councillor and the people or developer who paid it in and see if can we do some of the work? Can we do a portion of the work? Should we return some of the money? I think all of that should be discussed as part of this process. It's…I have got one public servant saying, well, you have to be prudent. Well, not really keen to be lectured about being prudent when there is money sitting there from my ward from 1975 that hasn't earned any interest. But it's not being imprudent to start spending some of this money. And the e-mails are saying, well, we have 6 million in trust and there is $8 or $10 million worth of work to do. That is true, but each account is separate. I can't take the $500 out of my account in my ward that's been sitting there since ‘75 and put it towards something in your ward, Madam Speaker, nor can you…we take all the money that was paid in for some project and there are many in your ward, we can't take that and move it over to Councillor Klein's ward. Each project stands on its own merits. An example; 1985, unlike former Councillor Wyatt not to spot this, but 1985 in Transcona Ward, just an example, no aspersions on Councillor Nason or former Councillor Wyatt. 1985, Pandora. 68,000 paid in. Projected cost to do the pavement street lights and sidewalks: 101,000. So, we have got two-thirds of what we need to do something there. Where on Pandora? I don't know. The report doesn't say that, but the area councillor will know. He will figure it out with the administration. Maybe we can do the sidewalks and not the street lighting. Maybe we can do something…the reverse. I don't know. But something should be done with millions of dollars that's sitting there not accruing any interest and is sitting there year after year as the project costs continue to escalate, construction inflation, continue to escalate away from us. So, let's do what we can in the short term and that will be, frankly, probably projects in Councillors Klein and Chambers ward, although, there is one in Councillor Gillingham's ward where we have the money and the estimated cost equals the amount of money we have in trust, I think we should do the project. I think my ward only has one of these, frankly, and some wards have none. But this second group, where we have hundreds of thousands of dollars in trust, it's more than 20 years old, it’s not earning any interest, let's go see if we can do something with the money we've got. Why 2000? It’s somewhat arbitrary and also, since 2000, we do have things. I think some of it’s around IKEA. I think there were some other projects where large amounts were paid in and the staff doing their job. Mr. McGinn, Greg Jasper have said, yeah, that's to connect the different pieces of ward together. We haven’t connected them yet. We’ll need the money. We're going to do it. Okay, but if it's been sitting around since before 2000 I’m going to guess that a lot of these got lost in the paperwork and aren’t going to get done or, frankly, maybe we’ve just given up and said, well, that's now 20 times what we have in trust. So, my thanks to Jim Berezowsky and Mike McGinn for their work on this report, and Greg Jasper. This report is not appended, it’s the one from October, but we really should do something with this account. It's no fault of the Mayor. This stuff dates back to the Steve Juba era. It’s actually, I think, to our collective credit that we're calling the question on this account and saying, let's get some of this moving. Maybe we can do some sidewalks. Maybe we can do some street lights. Maybe not, but let's not just sit there and say, well, let’s just leave it. It's an interest free loan we have been taking from the public for decades in, some cases, and I think we owe it to the public to start seeing if we can spend some of it. So, thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. We do have other speakers but seeing the hour, I think we need to recess now and reconvene. Councillor Lukes? A motion for one hour. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now recess and reconvene at 1:00 p.m. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
November 26, 2020, at 1:08 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of November 26th, 2020. We are on the report of the Executive Policy Committee, Item 8, the report dated November 18th, 2020. Item 8. Councillor Chambers, you are the next speaker on the topic of use of Unallocated Funds for the Future Services Account.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to rise this morning and thank Councillor Mayes for bringing this to our collective attention. While he may have stated that this money has been collecting or has been sitting in an account not collecting interest, it has collected the interest of this councillor as we work towards utilizing some of these

funds for projects south of the perimeter between St. Mary's and St. Anne's Road. Councillor Mayes was the gravel road king before I was elected to Council and had so much input from residents with respect to the road conditions on Forbes, on Fraser, on Krypko and all of the streets south of the perimeter that are essentially farming paths that have been developed into roads and streets now as our communities have been developed in that area. Of the accounts that I have seen, the spreadsheet that I have been able to review and assess, there are many projects within that area that can be…that these funds can be utilized to improve road conditions, improve safety and lessen the calls to my office with respect to the deterioration of those roads which are highly used. We are well aware that not only the city of Winnipeg is growing but the outlying areas are growing as well and more and more traffic, including heavy equipment, are on those streets. So, utilizing these funds to increase the structure…the infrastructure that's there, road safety that's there, Madam Chair, would assist these residents who have made significant investments in their local communities, improve on these conditions. So, thank you very much, Councillor Mayes, for bringing this to our attention and I will be supporting this motion today to move these funds forward. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. I will also thank Councillor Mayes for his efforts on this project. We have been talking about this for quite some time now and it's…as Carley Simons, said it's been anticipation of this coming out. So, I'm happy to see that we're going to have some discussions. Again, I wonder what's happening with the other funds that are in there. There is no talk of that here in this motion, the funds from 2000 up, but I'm assuming that that's going to be something in the budget but unfortunately, we don't know that, that's held from us until a different time. But maybe that will be part of the good news or happy money budget. But, I'm hoping that there will have more concrete information about the future services account tomorrow, and as far as this one is concerned, the motion today, I fully support my colleague, Councillor Mayes.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, I will call the question on Item 8. Pardon me? Councillor Gilroy? Okay, I'll call the question, Item 8. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 10.

Item 10 – Audit Plan 2021

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to…just to speak to this report, the Audit Plan 2021, and to begin by acknowledging the good work that our City Auditor and his team do in their regular audits. There is a set of reports that they regularly audit on an annual basis as is required and then they always have an audit plan to take a look at other areas, other departments, other aspects of the City's budget and the City's operations that they scrutinize. And what's notable about this report is that the department proposes this year, for 2021 I should say, to temporarily suspend the two-year audit planning process for a single year, so that the department can focus on the number of investigations based on the reports that come in to the Fraud and Waste Hotline. And I just raise that to, you know, put on the record for members of the public that we appreciate when members of the public do use the Fraud and Waste Hotline and to show you, as the public, that this is taken seriously. Our Audit Department does investigate and it's to the point right now where they are determining they're going to take a year just to focus on some of the reports that have come in. They have identified here that they are looking at four organizational units and two process-oriented systems that they will be spending most of their time on. They didn't identify them because they obviously want to be able to have a thorough investigation of those respective units. I just wanted to highlight one other thing; the report, Appendix A, talks about the 2019 project status and you will see there that the very last one talks about the Winnipeg Police Board, it's effectiveness evaluation. That review is required every…really, every three years on an ongoing basis to ensure that the Winnipeg Police Board is meeting its mandate, and I think over the years the board has done a good job. I do highlight though, this report. In light of a brand-new report that's come out from the Provincial Government and that is the review…the Independent Review of the Manitoba Police Services Act. I would encourage all of my Council colleagues to take a look at that review. It's available on the Province's website. Because many of the recommendations within that review will have implications if proposed, if adopted, and if amended within the Police Services Act legislation would have a significant impact on the Winnipeg Police Board, on the Winnipeg City Council as well. So, I just encourage all of my councillor colleagues who pay attention to that review because it would, as I said, it will impact the future of the Winnipeg Police Board and then also ultimately would subsequently, impact any auditor's review of the effectiveness of the Winnipeg Police Board. So, thank you, I'll be supporting this report.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be brief. I too want to echo our Finance Chair's appreciation of our Auditor, Brian Mansky, and his entire team. And want to thank them for their ongoing efforts to make sure that we're continuing to provide value to the tax dollars that residents entrust us to oversee. So, I just want to echo those and, of course, I'll be voting for this. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'll call the question on Item 10. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Next, we'll go to motions. We have a number of motions here. Motion 1, is moved by Councillor Nason and seconded by Councillor Klein and it's regarding social procurement. It's an automatic referral to Executive Policy Committee. Okay.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, just a point of privilege. There is the next motion from Chambers, Allard, I can't seem to read the, 'Be it resolved', so if it is an automatic referral I would like to know what the 'Be it resolved' is.

Madam Speaker: Sure. So, the next motion is Motion 2, moved by Councillor Chambers and seconded by Councillor Allard and it's also regarding social procurement. Mr. Clerk, if you could please read the 'Be it resolved' into the record.

Clerk: Therefore be it resolved that the Public Service be directed to 1) report back on what the City of Winnipeg is currently doing to support social and sustainable procurement practices. 2) in collaboration with the social enterprise sector, identify social procurement practices for appropriate City tenders with a goal of establishing a bid value for community benefits, consistent with the practise of other comparable Canadian municipalities and report back to the appropriate committee of Council in 180 days.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. So that Motion 2 is an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. Next is Motion 3. Yes?

Councillor Klein: If I may, with the permission of the seconder and with my Council colleagues, of course, I would like to withdraw Motion 3 and replace it with Motion 10 because there was a clarification line added. So, I would like to do that if that's…

Madam Speaker: Okay. So, with your…with the permission of the seconder being Councillor Nason, we will withdraw Motion 3 and replace with Motion 10 on the same subject matter which is providing grants to small businesses to assist with the current COVID-19 pandemic. This is an automatic referral.

Councillor Klein: Madam Speaker, if I may, I would like to ask that we suspend the rules today given the nature of the…and the urgency of the pandemic and have this debated today. I'm asking for my Council's support to suspend the rules.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein is asking for suspension of the rules for Motion 10 to be dealt with today.

Councillor Klein: Recorded vote, please.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of suspending the rules to deal with the item today, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Motion 10 is an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. Next, we have Motion 5 which is moved by Councillor Lukes and seconded by Councillor Eadie. It's regarding expenditure policies. This is a notice of motion and it will appear on the next Council agenda. Okay. And that is it, Mr. Clerk, I believe? Okay. Next, we'll move on to by-laws under this committee. Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives (CCPA) Alternative Winnipeg Municipal Budget in 2018 recommended that the city needs a strategy to increase the labour market participation of multi-barrier workers;

AND WHEREAS in the 2018 CCPA Alternative Winnipeg Municipal Budget a quote attributed to Mayor Bowman indicating an openness to the idea of procurement policies that bring benefit to the community;

AND WHEREAS the Public has been outspoken on social reform and reallocation of City of Winnipeg funds to support initiatives that better serve those facing multiple barriers and discrimination in Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS a policy in this nature would align with the Truth and Reconciliation's Call to Action number 92.ii: Ensure that Aboriginal peoples have equitable access to jobs, training, and education opportunities in the corporate sector, and that Aboriginal communities gain long-term sustainable benefits from economic development projects;

AND WHEREAS Social procurement has been in place within the Government of Manitoba since 2016, specifically within Manitoba Housing as a building block to provide meaningful work to persons that face complex barriers to employment;

AND WHEREAS the social procurement within the City of Winnipeg would follow other Canadian Municipalities by ensuring that all people have an opportunity to contribute to the success of the City and a sense of belonging while supporting the Public Service to;

(a) provide for the procurement in a fair, open, consistent and transparent manner;
(b) provide for social procurement by integrating environmental,
economic and social considerations in the procurement process;
(c) maintain ethical business practices;
(d) respect all trade agreements and any applicable legislation; and
(e) encourage competitive bidding.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Executive Policy Committee direct the Public Service to report back within 120 days to Council on the following;

1. *The ability to implement a social procurement policy where community benefit can be accurately measured.*
2. *An implementation plan that will*
    a. *apply a social procurement requirement up of to the amount of 30% value towards the specific City of Winnipeg contract(s).*
    b. *prioritize areas of contracting for this approach where current community capacity exists to deliver the service in collaboration with both a social procurement agency and a given industry.*
3. *With the outcomes resulting in market standards for price, quality and time.*
4. *That the Proper Officers be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.*

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Chambers,
Seconded by Councillor Allard,

WHEREAS: social procurement leverages existing purchasing within existing budgets to advance positive economic and social development that achieve broader social and quality of life objectives;

AND WHEREAS: social procurement agreements can benefit industry partners and those participating in employment and procurement opportunities;

AND WHEREAS by considering community and social benefits as a potential bid value in select public tenders, governments can support important socio-economic goals, including poverty reduction, improved labour conditions, and greater equality of income;

AND WHEREAS examples of community and social benefits could mean, but are not limited to, advancement in economic growth, education, training, and equity hiring;

AND WHEREAS: the City of Winnipeg already has demonstrated a history of social procurement, including the Triple Bottom Line concept from the Asset Management Policy (FI-011), working with social enterprises such as Mother Earth Recycling, and including community, social, and environmental benefits on the RFP for food services at 510 Main Street;

AND WHEREAS: as Winnipeg embarks on COVID-19 economic recovery, social procurement will aid in creating a sustainable and resilient economy by providing opportunities for those impacted economically by COVID-19;

AND WHEREAS: social procurement at the City supports several strategic priorities of the City including Winnipeg's commitment to a Journey of Reconciliation and the Indigenous Accord;

AND WHEREAS: social procurement could make a meaningful contribution to the City's poverty reduction strategy and could contribute to complete communities as outlined in OurWinnipeg.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Public Service be directed to:

1. *Report back on what the City of Winnipeg is currently doing to support social and sustainable procurement practices.*

2. *In collaboration with the social enterprise sector, identify social procurement practices for appropriate City tenders with a goal of establishing a bid value for community benefits, consistent with the practice of other comparable Canadian municipalities.*

And report back to the appropriate Committee of Council in 180 days.

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

WHEREAS on November 10, 2020, the Province of Manitoba announced that effective November 12, 2020, numerous businesses would be required to temporarily close their doors to the public or cease operating in order to halt COVID-19 transmission;

AND WHEREAS in an effort to help Winnipeg businesses survive the financial impacts of COVID-19, on April 3, 2020 Council waived penalties on unpaid 2020 property and business taxes for three months, but some small and medium sized businesses have still shut down, or are on the verge of closing permanently;

AND WHEREAS the closing of a businesses not only effects the business owners and employees, but also negatively impacts the City's tax base;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that in an effort to help businesses survive the financial impacts of COVID-19,

1. *A one time "Winnipeg Small & Medium Business Bridge Grant" in the amount of $ 750 be provided to small and medium-sized businesses that were ordered to temporarily close their doors to the public or cease operating effective November 12, 2020, as ordered by the Province of Manitoba to halt COVID-19 transmission.*

2. *That this grant be financed from the Destination Marketing Reserve, given that:*
   - *A. The Reserve is in surplus;*
   - *B. Traditional demand for the Reserve to secure or promote tourism and major events is likely to be depressed for many months given the Covid-19 crisis;*
   - *C. That protecting the diversity of our restaurant, retail and entertainment sector businesses is consistent with the mandate of the Reserve, and*
   - *D. The mandate for the Reserve, which is drawn from a dedicated revenue source, limits its use for other urgent City fiscal needs or priorities.*

3. *That the list of businesses eligible for the Winnipeg Small & Medium Business Bridge Grant be determined by mirroring the list of Winnipeg-based businesses otherwise eligible for the Manitoba Bridge Grant announced on November 12, 2020, by means to be determined by the Winnipeg Public Service. These businesses would likely include: retail businesses not on the essential services list, personal service businesses, gyms and fitness centres, recreation and sport facilities, restaurants, bars, beverage rooms, brewpubs, microbreweries and distilleries.*

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

WHEREAS Councillors office expenditures are governed by the Councillors' Ward Allowance Policy (CWA), which was first adopted by Council on April 28, 1993 and is readily available to the public on the City's web site;

AND WHEREAS any changes to the CWA are open to public scrutiny as they must be vetted through the Governance Committee of Council and Executive Policy Committee before being submitted to Council for consideration;

AND WHEREAS the Mayor is provided with an annual budget of approximately $1,800,000 to run his office but does not have a Council approved expenditure policy to govern expenditures from his budget;

AND WHEREAS on February 15, 2017, Council approved the City of Winnipeg Open Government Policy, which provides direction to continue to move towards being a more open, transparent, and accountable government;

AND WHEREAS in a report submitted to Council on November 26, 2020, the Public Service advised that "Winnipeg is ranked as the second most open Canadian city on the Open Cities Index for 2019"

AND WHEREAS having a Council approved Mayor's Office Expenditure Policy would further increase the level of openness and transparency of the City of Winnipeg;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to work with the Mayor's Office to develop a policy for the expenditures of funds from the Mayor's Office budget, to be submitted to Council for approval within 60 days.

Motion No. 10
Moved by Councillor Klein,
Seconded by Councillor Nason,

WHEREAS on November 10, 2020, the Province of Manitoba announced that effective November 12, 2020, numerous businesses would be required to temporarily close their doors to the public or cease operating in order to halt COVID-19 transmission;

AND WHEREAS in an effort to help Winnipeg businesses survive the financial impacts of COVID-19, on April 3, 2020 Council waived penalties on unpaid 2020 property and business taxes for three months, but some small and medium sized businesses have still shut down, or are on the verge of closing permanently;

AND WHEREAS the closing of a businesses not only effects the business owners and employees, but also negatively impacts the City's tax base;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that in an effort to help businesses survive the financial impacts of COVID-19,

1. *A one time "Winnipeg Small & Medium Business Bridge Grant" in the amount of $ 750 be provided to small and medium-sized businesses that were ordered to temporarily close their doors to the public or cease operating effective November 12, 2020, as ordered by the Province of Manitoba to halt COVID-19 transmission.*

2. *That this grant be financed from the Destination Marketing Reserve, given that:*
   - *A. The Reserve is in surplus;*
   - *B. Traditional demand for the Reserve to secure or promote tourism and major events is likely to be depressed for many months given the Covid-19 crisis;*
   - *C. That protecting the diversity of our restaurant, retail and entertainment sector businesses is consistent with the mandate of the Reserve, and*
   - *D. The mandate for the Reserve, which is drawn from a dedicated revenue source, limits its use for other urgent City fiscal needs or priorities,*

   and that the purpose of the Destination Marketing Reserve be amended as necessary to accomplish this.

3. *That the list of businesses eligible for the Winnipeg Small & Medium Business Bridge Grant be determined by mirroring the list of Winnipeg-based businesses otherwise eligible for the Manitoba Bridge Grant announced on November 12, 2020, by means to be determined by the Winnipeg Public Service. These businesses would likely include: retail businesses not on the essential services list, personal service businesses, gyms and fitness*

centres, recreation and sport facilities, restaurants, bars, beverage rooms, brewpubs, microbreweries and distilleries.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS
FIRST READING ONLY

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Sorry, I was just looking at Motion 6, but I see it's, of course, in a committee motion. I move that By-law No. 107/2020 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 107/2020.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time; By-law 105/2020, By-law 106/2020.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 105/2020 and By-law 106/2020.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. I move that the By-law Nos. 105/2020 and 106/2020 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 105/2020 and 106/2020.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-law Nos. 105/2020 and 106/2020 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period for the Mayor. Any questions for Mayor Bowman? Seeing none, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. Councillor Rollins on the report dated November 12th, 2020.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED NOVEMBER 12, 2020

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to move 1 and I think folks would like to speak to 2 and 3. So, I'll move 1.

Madam Speaker: Yes, 1 has been stood down.

Councillor Rollins: It has. I think they all are probably…

Madam Speaker: Is anyone standing down 2 or 3? And 2? Thank you, Councillor Rollins, you were correct.

Councillor Rollins: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Museums – Special Operating Agency

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins, to introduce Item 1.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Sometimes you get to catch a ball from Councillor Mike Pagtakhan as Chair of Protection, Community Services and Parks, Madam Speaker. And some of what is embedded in Museum Special Operating Agency, you know, you sure do feel the legacy of Councillor Mike Pagtakhan in that. And I had the pleasure of knowing Councillor Pagtakhan before, during and after office. So, there is that. In the main here is a museum that's motion is a special operating agency that didn't hold. And what was left for Protection, Community Services and Parks to do was to contemplate a bit about our City owned museums. Our legacy museums before the city of Winnipeg was built. Those museums that include St. Boniface to Grants Old Mill. Leftover was some recommendations that contemplated a $45,000 committee fee that would look after these museums. With that committee being disbanded, Protection Committee Services and Parks accepted the recommendation here to move $7,500 grants out to the museums in 2020. I would like to thank administration, Madam Speaker, in particular, Destiny Wyatt and the (inaudible) Marc Lemoine for writing the report and doing the consultation with the six City museums. And I would like to thank the museums, Madam Speaker. The museums really hold something of the history of the city of Winnipeg and it is really through them that we can reconcile this great city that is the city of Winnipeg. So, it's good work. Happy to move here today and really want to thank the administration for doing really meaningful consultation with them that sees fundamentally the status quo being held. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: I want to thank the Public Service for the work they have done thus far on this matter. It was a very confusing and stressful time for our volunteer boards. This report was not clear as to what was going to happen and not happen, which led to lots of extra conversations, lots of added stress. Transcona Museum is the only one that still remains with a City of Winnipeg employee as the curator, who does great work, is the heart and soul of the museum. Our board members are very active, they are coming together, they're doing some great things for our community, COVID-19's added additional challenges. The challenge with some of our plans is we put them out there, we caused the stress and then we find out that what was being proposed didn't fit with the DNA of the museums, that the proposal won't work with the agency that was being proposed. I will be supporting this today but its still remains some questions and who knows, tomorrow will be a new day and perhaps there will be more stuff in there, who knows. This could be all moot and we'll start the fight all over again. We know from our last budget that was wrought with errors with financials with some plans to delete services only to turn around and say no, we're going to keep those. We need to do a better job of consulting, there is no doubt in my mind, especially when it comes to volunteer boards. These people are giving up their free time to support our city and we should be thankful for that because it's through volunteerism that we have a stronger city. So, I'm hoping that the committee, the standing committee, with any further plans that come forward do the hard consultation first to make sure they are on the same page. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thanks Madam Speaker. I rise in support of the recommendation from community services and parks and from the City Clerk and Ms. Watt who put a lot of time into having further discussions with our City owned museums. And actually, it's through that process…and actually, our volunteer board at the Seven Oaks House Museum helped to bring to my attention, one thing I was questioning I was…I believed because they are City owned museums, the artifacts were actually the City's as well. But it turns out there is provincial legislation that means artifacts related to the Seven Oaks House Museum or any others are really technically, owned by the Province and then maintained by the volunteer groups who oversee the delivery of our heritage programming out of these and in and around these museums, Madam Speaker. And so, it was a great learning process as well, involved for everybody. I mean, there still needs to be some work about consistent agreements between, I call them operating agreements. I wouldn't call them lease agreements because technically well, for the Seven Oaks House Museum, the whole board is appointed by the City of Winnipeg. It's really a City of Winnipeg entity that has a set of by laws that oddly enough, weren't created until some controversy around Seven Oaks House Museum that has a set of by-laws that, oddly enough, weren't created until some controversy around the Seven Oaks House Museum back in the late '90s, early 2000s. But, Madam Speaker, without going on too long, I just wanted to say that passing off our heritage, the City owned heritage, and sort of steering the board's volunteer boards who oversee and govern and look at these things, it wasn't a good idea. And so, I'm glad that we're going to maintain that. It is the City of Winnipeg's heritage. While the Province helped establish the Seven Oak's House Museum back in, I believe it was the late '50s, it was the City of Winnipeg, though, that took on the ownership of said property. And anyway, I also wanted to point out that now that this is out of the way well, for now, I guess, I don't know. But it is out of the way now, the

grants that our boards receive, especially the Seven Oaks House Museum and Ross House Museum, the grants that we received, we try to maintain and do programming, but with this out of the way, we can move on to what the…actually, Councillor Pagtakhan started the Seven Oaks House Museum on this path which is we are seeking ways of sustaining the heritage and doing the programming that we get our curator to provide and in the neighbourhood. We are looking and continue to look for other sources of funding to keep it sustainable and viable and that is some of the role that our volunteer boards over these museums do. And it's well, from my perspective, I think that our City administration and everybody should support their trying to make our heritage sustainable. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Allard:

Translation of French Spoken:

I would like to explain why I'm changing my vote today. After I have had time to verify with the St. Boniface Museum, I have come to confirm that their report is acceptable for the museum. I would also like to highlight that the original Public Service report wasn't really in the interests of our museums…of our Unicity museums. I don't have a translation for that at the moment. I will maybe ask one day. But, I think that status quo in this instance is better than what we had proposed. We had a discussion where we had lost control at the level of (inaudible), in particular for the St. Boniface Museum. So, I would like to change my vote where I voted 'no' at Executive Policy Committee. I have had the time to confirm with the St. Boniface Museum and now I will vote 'yes', because for the time being, it conforms with the interests of our Unicity museums, but it's clear that there's still work to do. So, thank you for listening to me.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes, Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: I had a notable audio glitch when Councillor Allard was speaking for a few seconds. I just wanted to know if that was just me with my computer or if that was recognized by the Clerks in any way?

Madam Speaker: I didn't see a glitch on our end but we'll certainly look into that for you. Were you hearing the French translation by the way? No, you don't have access to that so you were just getting the regular feed. We will certainly look into that and let you know after the meeting. Councillor Rollins to close.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In addition to recognizing councillors like Councillor Nason, Councillor Allard, Councillor Gillingham, Councillor Eadie all really and more who are great advocates of the history of the city of Winnipeg and their City museums, I want to recognize Vanier Gagnon from St. Boniface. I want to recognize Alana Heraja from Transcona, a City employee who has appeared before Protection, Community Services and Parks on this and other matters. Peter Martin and Jack Moore as well. And Bonita Hunter Eastwood from St. James Assiniboia. All…in the words of Councillor Nason, really important volunteer boards that power the history of these museums and in so doing, really hold up the city. So, I wish to close that way, Madam Speaker, and I will be, of course, supporting the motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Item 2, Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 – Wading Pool Rationalization and Splash Pad Reinvestment Strategy

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

Councillor Rollins: Well, Madam Speaker, it's fitting that I sit beside Councillor Santos today because I really credit this motion and some…a lot of the work to her good work and advocacy on behalf of that is amenity that is a lot more time and, in many respects, safer to a lot more children of all ages. The spray pad – this is a great report with respect to…with respect to many things, in terms of laying out a decision making framework in its component and constituent parts which is found in Appendix A. And it's also a good report of describing some constraints of wading pools. And with that, I'll open, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I won't be supporting this report today. I appreciate the work that has gone into this report, but when we speak of wading pool rationalization and sprayed pad reinvestment and we look at this report, we see that it isn't a report really with a city-wide focus. It's very ward focused. There are 82 wading pools in the

city of Winnipeg. Some wards have no wading pools. The residents of Waverley West have no wading pools. 45,000 residents are serviced by one small spray pad. A report identifying a fair city-wide rationalization and reinvestment plan would look at ways that all wards would be able to partake in a rationalization and reinvestment strategy. We don't rationalize property taxes to specific wards. Maybe we should. A robust plan would look at how we could redistribute the potential of these 82 wading pools across the entire city and not solely in the wards that have wading pools. Therefore, I can't support the report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of the report as I voted on the Protection, Community Services and Parks. Madam Speaker, there needs to be an understanding of why this particular report is here. It's not actually ward-focused. It looks like it is, but the issue is, this is inherited from Unicity, Madam Speaker, the problem. And so, it goes way back when. When Waverley West was being developed, I don't know why, but it seems to me the Province said, and the City finally had to agree, that as they moved ahead there would be all these great plans for Waverley West and it would have all these great things for the people who bought into the area which eventually will be the size of Brandon. So…at least in population, Madam Speaker. So, this report here, it really arises from a discussion and that I think we all as Council members should understand is, Mayor Bowman will remember his first budget season along with his then budget boss, Councillor Morantz, the whole issue about shutting down pools…wading pools. Very hot topic. But the reality is, and what the City was saying, and the new Council in 2015 was looking at, was looking at how the wading pools are just not sustainable in the previous budget world policy. We have all these great policies about providing for neighbourhood communities all around the city and we have a Recreation and Parks Master Plans coming down the pipe which will actually be looking at the big picture beyond what was inherited through Unicity and what has become an unsustainable set of infrastructure that neighbourhoods appreciate. And so, when…you need to remember that. So really, the time to address spray pads and other recreational amenities around the city will be under the bigger master plan. When Mayor Katz was around he and Council moved a Spray Pad Investment Plan that looked at creating spray pads and they only had enough money to do the ones they did in the past but places like I think it's Southdale received a spray pad, although, the Province funded a good portion of it. But there were spray pads invested in, I'll call them newer communities because Southdale isn't exactly a new community. So, Madam Speaker, I think that we all should be actually supporting this because the work that went into this and the discussion with the stakeholders, looking at how to proceed, like you can't just take something away from a neighbourhood, you need to reinvest a little bit of money as well after you have decommissioned a wading pool, to provide those kind of amenities that neighbourhoods can appreciate that are actually more sustainable as well, Madam Speaker. And so, I support this plan. I don't like shutting down wading pools, but you know, the reality is, is it's not sustainable. And what will be coming soon as well, we're having…I don't know what's happening in the budget, but there are some of those bigger outdoor pools that we have, those aren't supposedly sustainable either, and so I don't want to pick on St. Boniface, but that's the legacy that we have, that we need to consider if we are taking away, what can we provide back to those neighbourhoods, those communities, so that they can appreciate the recreation and park type activities that everybody loves. So, thank you, Madam Speaker, that's all I have to say.

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

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to quickly thank the public administration for their hard work on creating this strategy. Fully support the report that is before us. Community spray pads are the corner stores…cornerstones of neighbourhoods in Winnipeg during the hot summer months. I think all councillors can agree that one of the critical aspects of this report is the information provided confirming the high needs in our under-served communities. This strategy reinforces our need to have a vision and an action plan for our public administration to better serve our communities in both the short term and the long term. Madam Speaker, I would like to address some of the concerns my fellow councillors had voiced during this process. Simply, this is a decision-making framework for our public administration that not only looks at rationalization of older wading pools being replaced with new spray pads, but it also looks at addressing potential gaps in service for other areas that do not have facilities. But it's also very important to not lose sight of is when and if wading pools are to be closed, that funding be identified within the project budget to reinvest and recast in those old wading pool spaces to provide year-round, or, enhanced recreational opportunities like community gardens, basketball courts or whatever the community would like. I have been assured by the public administration that in no way does this report recommend closing wading pools before we have the funding to invest in new spaces. The point here is to enhance these services, not start shutting them down. The reasons for the investments are access to recreational water facilities is critical to the health and well being for Winnipeg communities during the hot summer months. Public infrastructure provides a wide range of health benefits including exercise, community bonding and relief for families from the summer heat. Municipal recreational spaces encourages and support summer play for all demographics during the summer months. Many families in my ward don't have access to cottages, backyard pools or even a vehicle to drive to the beach for the day. So, these community spaces create opportunities for social bonding and supports the development of community relationships in both children and parents. Aquatic play parks bring communities together offering a fun, interactive and accessible recreational space. Splash pads offer opportunities for children's sensory and mental growth to

develop, for families to come together to socialize and for municipalities to lower costs. Splash pad installations are environmentally sustainable as they reduced water usage and lower maintenance costs than a wading pool. Splash pads also meets the accessibility guidelines ensuring nobody is left out. The zero-depth design is fully wheelchair accessible and no life guard is required. The city of Seattle actually promotes splash pads as a saving water concept. As an element of the city's water conservation effort, we are encouraging people to use public wading pools and spray parks rather than filling their own home kiddy pools or running their backyard sprinklers. In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I urge my fellow councillors to see this report as a very basic framework for our public administration to begin prioritizing high need and user served areas for our city for continued splash pad developments. This is not in any way a report that is seeking to shut down any wading pools. When we as a Council go to Community Services with funding in hand for new spray pads, we need a blueprint to identify our priorities, to address the needs of our under served areas and to reinvest in old infrastructure. A strong vote in favour of this plan from Council will show that investing in spray pads in under served communities is a unified priority of this Council. We, as a Council, need to unite to improve our communities, protect the environment and build a city for all of Winnipeg's communities, regardless of income levels, to have the same access to spray pads to enjoy our Winnipeg summers. Thank you.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise today, fairly briefly, just to speak in favour of the report before us here. First of all, spray pads are great. By not requiring an attendant or…it's actually not a lifeguard, it's a wading pool attendant, the season can be a lot longer. A lot of our wading pool attendants are school aged or university or high school aged kids and you are not able to open them, really, until quite late in the season. So, the season is limited. Wading pools, as a result, also…a lot of them aren't seven days a week. Their hours are quite limited. So, you know, even if you are…I mean, in some cases, trading in 3 for one or 2 for one old, decrepit wading pools for one new splash pad, you are actually offering a lot more hours of entertainment, potentially, through the entire summer even though you are, as the report calls it, rationalizing them. Reinvestment is important. We need to make sure that when we're going into these neighbourhoods and dealing with our decrepit rec infrastructure, our wading pools, that they are replaced. Wholesale close of wading pools, in my books, is not on. That's not what this is about. This is about providing better, modern recreational activities in our existing neighbourhoods. In terms of new neighbourhoods, I'm going to put this on the record here, you know, I have always said growth should pay for growth and one area of where we're perhaps not picking up with new development, these costs of growth, are in some of these recreational amenities. If we need to add an additional cost onto new homes in new neighbourhoods to add amenities like this that should be expected and people are expecting in these new neighbourhoods, that's where I believe that a growth fee of this sort is appropriate and, you know, would go towards the cost of these types of amenities in neighbourhoods. So again, I am supportive of the report before us here today and I would like to thank the Public Service and my colleagues because, again, even rationalizing and, you know, combining wading pools is contentious in neighbourhoods. In North Kildonan we closed two wading pools and consolidated it into one and some people who live right beside the wading pools, they were, you know, hesitant at first but over time, they've realized that these better amenities actually are better and, you know, over time they definitely…you know, people have actually said to me, hey, we've come around, that splash pad is amazing and it was a good thing to do and you know, we can live without the former wading pools. So again, thank you and those are my comments.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Going remote to Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to draw our attention to…of the five points to this motion, item 2…point 2. "That where a future spray pad addition is recommended in the ward where there are multiple wading pools within the Targeted Level of Service, that a minimum of 1 to a maximum of 5 wading pools be identified for closure in consultation with the area councillor based on usage, proximity", et cetera. So, I just draw attention to that just given the wording it says, "Where a future spray pad addition is recommended". I assume that…now, Councillor Santos clarified part of that by making the point that nothing would be closed until funding for the new spray pad is there. I'm assuming what that means is not just when the funding is there but when actually they are in the process of constructing it, so that no spray pads would even be considered to be closed until that season that they are building…no wading pools will be closed until that season that they are building the spray pad. And…otherwise, just because you make the recommendation, therefore you can't just, like, start closing down the spray pads because it is a contentious issue as Councillor Browaty says and some areas more than others. And it certainly can be in my ward of East Kildonan and Elmwood. So, I'm assuming that's what it means. And also, in consultation with the councillor because I can't…I feel I can't make any consultation on this with the administration without having my consultation with the community on this. I'm assuming my interpretation of this is what Council is interpreting as well and if I'm misinterpreting, I hope that can be clarified before the vote. And I just wanted to make that point given the wording of item…of point 2.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak about this because, you know, much like in the wake of the Portage and Main vote, the heat maps don't tell the quite…the complete picture. I look at this map and I see splash pads, which we've got a glorious one in Transcona, there's also one at north…in Kildonan Park. The one thing as we're talking about access to these, the one thing about those two in particular and I can't speak for other areas, is you have to pay to access them. They are not free services. You have to pay to enter the facility. So, we do have one at Park City West Community Centre, there is one that's over at Valley Guards that are free access. But that is not defined in this map, in the Appendix A and I think that's a very important factor because wading pools are free for use. Splash pads, not so much. So, I think we need some clarity on that matter, Madam Speaker. So, I don't know if this report is quite complete enough, but I hope that some answers towards that matter can come out at the end.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm rising today in terms of this rationalization plan to ensure that it addresses the inequities of water aquatics in the city. Currently the neighbourhood of Fort Richmond does not have a wading pool or a splash pad. This is an area of high needs as suggested in a variety of research reports concerning community needs, the Illicit Drug Task Report as one instance. This is also an area of high settlement of our newcomer community. Specifically, settlement of our refugee community who have adopted Manitoba and Winnipeg as their new home. And they have less means than others in our city. So, as they seek to integrate in their new neighbourhoods, what better way than a community gathering spot such as a wading pool or a splash pad. So, as this rationalization plan will address aging infrastructure, I also hope that will it will address the inequities of our neighbourhoods where these amenities do not currently exist but are so desperately required. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be brief. I want to commend our committee Chair and Councillor Santos' words, I thought, were outstanding. I think this is a report that is worthy of support. As has been noted, it does seek the approval of Council for a spray pad reinvestment and wading pool rationalization decision making framework. And so, there will be ample opportunities for a further scrutiny and deliberations by this and future councils at a later date, Madam Speaker. What I really appreciated, I just want to…I want to note, I'm sure others have picked up on this, the discussion through an equity lens. Something that my two colleagues that are previously seated behind me are often in front and leading on in terms of just better educating us and our residents about the need for us to look at decisions through that equity lens and through an inclusive lens of how do we build a city for a million people that doesn't just get bigger, but it gets better for our residents. And that's something that these decisions, while they may seem small in the grand context, they are cumulative and they add up to creating the conditions for that greater equity. I think when you look at the historical legacy of Unicity, when you take a look at where the locations of splash pads and spray pads are, of course, there is a lot of legacy there that the city inherited when it formed Unicity. I think it's incredibly important that we use this chamber to assist with that equity throughout our community. I don't believe, as was suggested this afternoon, that we should be rationalizing property taxes to specific wards. I think that that could have a very dangerous and a very…I think it could harm those that really rely upon the deliberations of a city hall that is a city hall for every ward, to not look through that equity lens, Madam Speaker. And so, I would just caution us from considering moving property taxes to specific wards or at least rationalize them as was suggested. Perhaps it was just in jest, but I would not support that. That's not how you build a city for a million people. That's not how you look at things through an equity lens. But I'm looking forward to voting for this in a few moments, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. What this report is, Madam Speaker, and what it isn't, it's not a report that puts a chicken in every pot or a spray pad in every ward. That's not what the disposition said, in fact. The disposition tied wading pool rationalization that has a particular history in the city of Winnipeg to spray pad and the investment strategy and I think that that's really key because how a disposition is written, how a motion is written, really does mean that a report turns out a certain way. You have to ask fundamentally different questions, I think, to get to some of the questions and concerns that have been raised here today, Madam Speaker. And I encourage councillors to ask those questions of the Standing Policy Committee of Protection Community Services and Parks for sure. I sat with Councillor Lukes, Madam Speaker, to look once again because Mr. Mayor, Madam Speaker, as you know, put in my mandate letter, the delivery of Waverley West Community Centre. And so, I have from time to time sat with my colleague, my acclaimed councillor colleague, Janice Lukes, Madam Speaker, and to talk about the ICIP and how it's going including the possibility, Madam Speaker, of late, of a spray pad for Waverley West. And I would be happy, Madam Speaker, this report, of course, was…the disposition was written in a certain way, it came out the way it did because it tied these two recreation amenities together. And one might find that problematic. I certainly did. But there is a lot of good here and I'll be supporting it, Madam Speaker, but I do encourage my Council colleagues to really bring some of those concerns forward because I do think that that's another disposition, another motion, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Yes, Councillor Allard and…is recorded in opposition and Councillor Lukes. Councillor Klein. There's three. Next is Item 3, Mr. Clerk.

Item 3 – Recreation and Library Facility Investment Strategy

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

Councillor Rollins: My pleasure, Madam Speaker. It is an under estimation, it's an understatement to say that this 50 million is really great stuff. Not only does it assist the City with the basic maintenance and critical infrastructure needs that would otherwise be unfunded, but it does so much more. Like moving 7 million right across the city in all 15 wards, providing opportunities to leverage funding through community, corporate and government partnerships, Madam Speaker. Like completing the Library Redevelopment Strategy, Madam Speaker, something I know is close to your heart in particular. Supporting the grassroots planning effort of the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres who will be celebrating 50 years, 50 years, Madam Speaker, in 2021. Improving facilities in areas in the city that are high…that have high need, social and high health equity needs. So, attached, Madam Speaker, are two documents approved by Executive Policy Committee last week and today we're looking at a recreation and library investment strategy, one that I think should be absolutely showcased in the preliminary budget. And I'll open that way, Madam Speaker, and look forward to a discussion today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Any further speakers? Councillor Gillingham, followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to rise to first of all begin by thanking Councillor Rollins for her work on this and to thank Mayor Bowman also. If you look at this report, you see in the financial impact statement the funding source proposed is the Province of Manitoba. And so, this is a result of several years of advocacy by Mayor Bowman to get some certainty from the Province of Manitoba on not only the City's operating funding, but specific on the City's capital funding. When we brought in…were developing the multi-year balanced budget, to their credit, the Province of Manitoba did give us certainty, funding certainty, on capital funding for the next several years and that is very helpful. And so, earlier in this meeting we acknowledged the funding from the Federal Government for the Rapid Housing Initiative here, I think it's appropriate that we acknowledge the funding commitment of the Province of Manitoba. And as Councillor Rollins stated in her opening comments, this is much needed funding for much needed work. And when you take a look at the proposed list that has been put forward, we see…in the rec and library facilities we see a number of them for which there is needed maintenance investment that can be accomplished through these projects and through this funding. And I think all of us, I'm assuming all of us, around this chamber over the last few weeks have been hearing from our residents. I know I have been speaking to some of the seniors in St. James who really rely upon the St. James Civic Centre or the St. James Assiniboia Centennial Pool because they are using the facilities to walk and swim and do weight programs and keep active and as they head into winter they want those facilities open. Of course, because we're under code red and in the case of the St. James Civic Centre because there's a reconstruction project going on right now, those facilities are not available. Our residents are missing them. So, if…I don't think any one of us around this chamber would ever think that these facilities are not important. Close a pool in the middle of a hot summer day and your phone will light up because our families use those pools, use those facilities. No matter what part of the city we are in, these recreation facilities and the recreation assets are very, very much valued by our residents. So, this is a good news story. This is a good report and there is a lot of potential for important investment. It is fun, sometimes, to…it's always fun to cut the ribbon on something new, but we have a lot of existing assets in the city of Winnipeg that still have a lot of life left in them if we can just make the investment and the maintenance of them. And so, that's what this report really proposes. One final thing I want to note, and that is when we developed the multi-year budget one of the most difficult things, I think, was the work that all of our departments had to do to balance, to bring forward a budget that balanced over four years. It was the right thing to do. It positioned us to absorb and to kind of work our way through the pandemic and there is a long way to go. But, our Community Services Department had a very difficult task because for years they've had a list of important projects that needed to be done and haven't had the funding to do all of them. This now provides the department with the opportunity to begin working on those projects and investing in the maintenance and the upgrade of the assets that our community Services Department and by extension, of course, our residents rely upon. And so, I'm very pleased to see this report before us and I trust it will receive unanimous support from Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Eadie, followed by Councillor Santos.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I, of course, will be supporting this report. And well, I would like to thank the parent government down on Broadway for seeing fit to provide the money for us to do all these much needed projects in our neighbourhoods across the city, in our wards, I don't know, anyway, you can call it wards, specific, whatever. You know, the thing is, is a facility like the old Ex Arena getting 5.9 million, it's going to serve people far beyond the neighbourhood in which it exists in. As a matter of fact, the community it serves is the North End and some of the sport

fields are actually where I think somebody changed it along the way but were regional facilities that were used from the Daniel McIntyre ward as well in terms of the football fields at old Ex and all those things. And as Councillor Chambers, having played football, enjoyed as well. But anyway, Madam Speaker, you know, these investments from the Province are interesting in that Councillor Nason brought up the issue of paying to utilize spray pads, splash pads. What was interesting, Madam Speaker, is the Province allowed the City to use some money that they put up for transit, rapid transit, way back quite some time ago, around 2008 or whatever, Madam Speaker. And what happened was, the wading…the free wading pool at West Kildonan Park or Kildonan Park, sorry not west, at Kildonan Park, it was closed down. And there were some life guards there, but when they opened up the spray pad within the big outdoor pool that we have always had to pay to use, ever since I was a little kid at Kildonan Park. The reality there is, I believe they reassigned life guards to there because they increased the capacity of the Kildonan Park outdoor pool, along with the spray pad and stuff. So, it wasn't…and it just…I don't know, it ended up that way. I always explained that there are a number of people who can't afford, just like in Fort Richmond and just like in the North End and whatever, Madam Speaker, there are people who can't afford to pay to go and enjoy the facilities all the time. Because there is also transport involved when you get to these regional facilities because Kildonan Park Pool is a regional facility. So anyway, I just thought I would explain that the Province in the past has put up money for recreation, outdoor pool experiences and so on, and it's ended up in a fee for service. But anyway, all the projects are great in this report, Madam Speaker. I'm glad that the Province has decided in a timely fashion to assist us with the situation at the old Ex Arena with the new station being built on a much smaller piece of the old Ex grounds and upgrading these facilities are very important. But, I'm not supporting it just because of that. I looked at the projects in here. We had a library, I'll call it a library sustainability plan or whatever, it was looking at what we had to do and, you know, as you know, Madam Speaker, West Kildonan, Old Kildonan, were looking at library situations and well, which is already covered under the capital budget, Madam Speaker, but I note that some projects that were scheduled for St. James, I'm glad and happy to see that that's happening and all the other projects I'm very happy to see are spread out. Thank you.

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

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again, I would like to quickly thank the public administration for their amazing and hard work in developing a strategy in a very short time. I would also like to thank the Province of Manitoba for supplying and supporting the $50 million in funding for these projects. Thank you, too, as well to Mayor Bowman for mandating myself as acting Deputy Mayor to work with the Chair of Protection, Community Services and Parks, Councillor Rollins. It is imperative that we all work together to build better communities with shared priorities and vision. Creating a vibrant and healthy Winnipeg for all to thrive depends on continued investments in infrastructure. Our public green spaces and supporting a sport and recreation system for people of all income levels to come together. As a city, we know the built environment correlates to the physical, social and economic health of a community. These investments will have profound short term and long-term benefits for our citizens. I am also pleased to see that there is an opportunity in every ward in Winnipeg to have a direct benefit from this funding. I would like to start by reminding Council that these recreational spaces that support our communities are multi faceted investments in our parks and recreation facilities, have consistently proven returns on investments. Recreation and library facilities close to properties increases that property value which in turn increases property tax collection. Recreation and library services have profound positive health impacts on our communities, reducing our emergency response services costs. Community centres bring people together through shared interests and are the simple building blocks of our community. Recreation programming supports our youth by providing structure, leadership opportunities, mentorship and a place for kids to develop self worth. Communities with engaged citizens are shown to be safer and reduce costs on policing. Community sports support inter city tourism which helps to fund our neighbourhood local businesses. Social capital, from all the people who have dedicated themselves to the service of our communities at these facilities and the community connections that are created in these spaces. Community services was identified as a number one priority from a recent budget public engagement survey. As leaders, our job is to listen to our constituents. We need to lead and fulfil the needs of our constituents, ensuring that these public community gathering spaces are our priority. And ensuring that we have consistent financial and administrative support for more than the basic infrastructure. But also, for the community leaders and groups who develop and program in these spaces as the crucial cornerstones of our communities. We have seen what happens in our communities when we look at closing these valuable recreational spaces. People will not let it happen and I stand with my constituents. Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my fellow councillors to invest in the value of these spaces of our city and to vote in support of this strategy and begin to get this money flowing into our wards. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak to this. $155,000 based on the amending motion over three years for the residents of Transcona to invest in recreation. That's a mere drop in the bucket. I know we have, in the state of infrastructure report, a plan that's listed slightly behind that of Councillor Lukes' ward. The East of the Red plex. Tomorrow we see the budget come down and we'll see what this Council, the members of the Budget Working Group which make up the majority of Council come down with. We see recreation being invested in some areas of the city

whereas other areas continue to be deleted. Not even a footnote in the budget book. It's a challenge. I see in this thing there is a blanket for City contribution to arena twinning requests for proposals. It doesn't state what rinks are being twinned. Do…is there a capacity need? Where are we twinning rinks? There's $8 million tied to that, I would be curious to know. Hopefully, maybe in the close, that can be noted as to where that is. Our infrastructure is not getting any younger. The area of Transcona and our community clubs, we do not have a full-sized gym. That is not something that we presently have. The East of the Red complex would realize a full-size gym. Last year when the Public Service presented their plan for recreation it was to close the Transcona indoor pool, the Kinsman Centennial Pool. I don't know where this Council is planning to renew that, I have made motions to try to address that with the East of the Red, it's been kicked around. We need private partnerships in this matter because it's obvious we do not have the funds needed to realize the amount of renewal that the city needs. The city is an old city. Our core is old. Our suburbs, as part of Unicity, are old but we can't forget about them. We need to renew as we grow. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker Well, the preceding two speakers had a pretty good juxtaposition you could see the glass is half full, the glass is half empty here. What troubled me with the original draft of this before the amendment at EPC was, there was a particular vision laid out by our staff. If you take a look at the St. Vital part of Councillor Chambers' ward and the St. Vital part of mine, it's about 10% of the city's population, very close. There's $400,000 here out of 43 million that was allocated, so less than 1%, and that was allocated into Councillor Chambers' ward, so there is a certain equity argument there. How is that equitable for the people who have been paying in for years, people who have community centres from the '40s, like Greendell in my ward or older facilities. So, I am pleased to see there are certain new things being funded. The $2 million, I think we're now calling it a community space in the Starlight building on Portage Place. It's gone through a couple of different names, but that's clearly a new initiative, not an old initiative. And the arenas, that is…I think we should take a little bit of pride in that. $8 million isn't going to build a new arena, but it's something. That's an area where we haven't built a new arena in the last six, seven years. Hopefully that will get us to a point where we can cost share and get a new sheet of ice somewhere. It's almost certainly not going to be in my ward but there are some places probably led by Councillor Orlikow's ward, but not necessarily where we do need to close down some of our aging arenas and get something new up. So, you can sort of see there are glass half full, half empty but this does put a fair bit of money into some older facilities, but, the $7 million is an important aspect and my thanks to some people on staff who don't want to be named but who put a lot of work in on this and to Councillor Gillingham who worked on this pretty hard as well. To say, okay, well every ward will now get some part of this. Every ward will get roughly 155,000 a year for each of three years. So, we're going to have to work that through in the budget because it's a three-year program and you just have a whack of numbers put in front of you here so some things could move around a little as we fit that in in the budget over the next couple much weeks but it's important to note that, that there will be flexibility to put the money towards projects that you want. I can't guarantee that all 32 provincial ridings that overlap the city of Winnipeg will get a project but it will be pretty close, I think. If you look at what's already here, I've certainly already had calls from Andrew Smith and from Audrey Gordon and from Rochelle Squires who are all MLAs. Audrey doesn't quite overlap me but almost. They are interested in this. They know what was passed last week with the $7 million. So, I think there's some provincial interest to work with us. It's a provincial grant we should note that, many already have. I think it's exciting to say, okay, this for the first time in several years we will now have some money where we can work with another level of government and do some projects, something exciting. You can maybe put two years worth together and do one big project. It'll be up, really, to the councillors and to the MLAs locally to try and come up with a plan and try and do something across your ward. It's more money that each Councillor will be able to use as they see fit. I think that's very important. As I've said many times, it doesn't matter that we have elections. It doesn't matter who wins elections, it shouldn't all simply be a staff report otherwise, frankly, you wouldn't need this chamber and the people in it. So, I find this quite exciting. Maybe people won't like how I choose to dole out the money from my ward with Minister Squires or Andrew Smith or Audrey Gordon, but at least it will be within the control, it will be an open and transparent process and we will be able to do some projects that I think are going to be exciting across the city in different provincial ridings and in each and every ward. So, my thanks to the Mayor and Councillor Gillingham for getting behind and Councillors Rollins and Santos for getting behind this idea of moving some of the funding so that each ward can look at this and say, hey…each Councillor can say, well good, I'm going to get something out of this. Where the arena money will land we don't know. But that's also an exciting part of this, I think, that we're starting for the first time in years to really think about and put some money aside for our arenas which pretty much all are built between about 1955 and 1970, I think. So, an exciting opportunity here to do some good projects at newer locations and at older locations. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First, I want to thank two of our Council colleagues, Councillor Rollins and Councillor Santos. It's been noted that in the mandate letters that were updated earlier this year, this placed…this was placed a very high priority. It's incredibly important to me. It's incredibly important, I know, to members of Council and to our residents. You know, when I look at recreation and library facilities you really can't…it's hard to think of other spaces

in our community that do just that; bring community together, bring our residents together. From a recreation standpoint, not only is recreation important in terms of a community space and all the physical and mental health benefits that come from recreation, there is also leaders that come out of these recreation facilities. Just looking around the Council chamber today, I look at a number of my Council colleagues, some of whom are professional athletes still to this day in arm wrestling, in martial arts, in cycling, speed skating, running, hockey, football, golf. I'm not sure who that is, but that's not me. Or the bravest of all sports for men which is putting a speedo on and racing in the water. Recreation is one of those areas that really does develop future leaders. When I look at our youth and I look at the skills that they develop in our recreation facilities, I know just in speaking for myself a lot of the skill set that I bring to this job and other jobs that I have had is largely shaped from competitive swimming. You know, and I know others bring different skill sets shaped by their experiences in sport. Libraries as well and their value is something that continues to grow in my own mind in terms of the value and in the importance. And I have really been pleased over the last number of years to attend re-opening and new library openings with many of my Council colleagues around the chamber today. And so, I know that when we broke ground at the future Bill and Helen Norrie Library, one of my prouder moments as Mayor was standing there with our Council colleague, Councillor Orlikow, and Helen Norrie and her family. And so, this is incredibly exciting. I would be remiss and I do want to properly acknowledge and give a most heartfelt appreciation to our provincial partners. I want to thank the premier, Premier Brian Pallister. I want to also thank Minister Rochelle Squires who has been key to making sure that we have these funds, that we can bank on them and they can be utilized for what I would describe as once in a generational investment in recreation and libraries. And so, I'm looking forward to voting for this. I want to thank my colleagues for all of their work. I commented recently on this floor as well that when you don't have dollars to allocate politically it's a lot easier. You throw $50 million at a group of elected politicians, all of whom are fighting and defending for the needs of the constituents that they serve, and we all serve in this chamber, it becomes more difficult and it really is a testament to the leadership skills of many members of this Council, including Councillor Rollins and Councillor Santos for getting this here today, because I know it wasn't easy and I'm really appreciative of both of their efforts and the efforts of Councillor Mayes in terms of the amendment that we have before us. So, I would urge you all to support this and I'm looking forward to doing so in a few moments. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Rollins: Yes, Madam Speaker. And I want to thank all councillors for their time devoted to this today. I really have enjoyed working with each and every one of you, in the past two years as Chair Protection, Community Services and Parks. And you know, Madam Speaker, getting to know what some of the ambitions are in each and every community. Meeting your residents around the community centre and library facilities, Madam Speaker, that's been the best part of this job. I had the opportunity to thank Minister Squires last week. It was a really heartfelt discussion and had the opportunity to share with her the meaning, the great meaning on this funding at a time when communities can't be higher. And I want to thank those of you in the chamber, and you know who you are, who have had to share some really difficult days with me and our community. This 50 million is a bright light in recreation and libraries. And I hope you see your thoughts and your ambitions and really, the work reflected here, like I do when I look at it. I see, Madam Speaker, Councillor Klein and Councillor Gillingham in the St. James and Westwood Library renewal lease. I really do. I see Councillor Orlikow, I see yourself, Madam Speaker, Councillor Gilroy and more on the pool tanks and pool repairs to keep people swimming at Seven Oaks to Cindy Klassen to Pan Am Pool and St. James. I see Councillor Mayes and Councillor Chambers in…right across the city as they are concerned with food security and Councillor Schreyer in the Magnus Eliason Recreation Centre and the Turtle Island kitchens. I see the advocacy and work of my colleague, Councillor Santos, who has assisted in capturing some of the interests of all councillors. I have had time to meet with executive directors like Trevor Laforte of the Winnipeg Aboriginal Sports Achievement Centre. The…I know Councillor Santos is mandated to work with me, but, Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to work with her here at the City, to hear and understand her City building concerns and really, to hear her beautiful prose today, quite simply saying that city community centres are building blocks of our community, a place for kids and social capital. It's prioritized high and the backdrop of this couldn't be more stark or plain at this time. And I know it weighs heavy on our hearts, especially now, when, since October 31st, we have suspended our recreation and leisure programs and services and our libraries have been closed. And in contrast what is open in terms of our community centres, are warming spaces. But our daycares, too. Our foodbanks in our community centres. They are open. While our library branch is closed on October 31st, we know that our online services saw a 30% increase and we know as Councillor Santos reiterated too, that Winnipeggers really prioritize these services. So that's why this $50 million and I couldn't be more grateful to the Provincial Government, something I shared with councillor sorry, Minister Squires, and I couldn't be more grateful to all of Council who a couple of weeks ago on Friday got together, all of us, to talk about Winnipeg wellness because I think that that's what is at the heart of this investment strategy, Madam Speaker. And so, it is my pleasure today to move it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. With that, I'll call the question on Item 3 and it's a call for a recorded vote. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The vote on Item 3 was unanimous. We'll now move on to question period under this committee. Are there any questions for Councillor Rollins? Asking once again, are there any questions under this committee? Seeing none, let's…Councillor Klein.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair, through you to… to Councillor Rollins as the Chair. As I understand the City of Winnipeg will now be taking on the cost of fees for the new Manitoba College of Paramedics. This is something that has been required, and I'm just wondering if the Councillor could find some time to send out what the financial impact will be on the City of Winnipeg for that cost?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins?

Councillor Rollins: Yes, Madam Speaker, I think it's profoundly bad timing, the transition to the College. But be happy to look at those costs. But want to underline, Madam Speaker, that it's profoundly bad timing. I've spoken before and would every single time about the over-reliance on the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service at this time, when most jurisdictions, provincial jurisdictions are hiring people in the thousands, thousands of people, to cover personal care home needs during the pandemic and that we know that there's a troublesome of reliance on the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service. It is a bad time to transition to the College and the College fees, so I thank Councillor Klein, through you, Madam Speaker, for the question. And delineating those costs are important. The… definitely this isn't the time. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Nason: Yeah, through you, Madam Speaker, I'm hopeful that the Chair can answer. With COVID-19 and the closure of community facilities, those that are homeless and in need of a place to go have limited options at this time. Many of our providers are… are full. I'm wondering what plans are in place to support those that are homeless to… to find a place of shelter, a place of warmth, since City facilities are closed?

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, I, Madam Speaker, I think it's important to note, some of the facilities that I mentioned that aren't indeed close and… and start there. There are many community centres that are, like the Magnus Eliason Centre, that are performing double duty, in terms of a warming centre at this time. Turtle Island, as I mentioned earlier, is still an important food back, in terms of handing out food. There are Siloam Mission, Main Street Project, Salvation Army, WE 24/7, Spence Neighbourhood, Broadway Neighbourhood, many of our neighbourhood centres are still providing, Resource Assistance for Youth are still providing shelter, warming, and social services at this time. So happy to really reiterate some of the… happy to share with all of Councillor… Council, if they are not aware, Madam Speaker, the emergency facilities that are available, whether it is a warm lunch, Madam Speaker, like we have at the Oak Table in Osborne Village, or the whether it is shelter space in for those need that at this time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Any further questions? Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you to the Chair. We talked about yesterday, at a Council briefing, with respect to the public and their exposure in terms of being on retention ponds. It had been relayed to us that there have been numerous calls this Fall already with respect to children crashing through the ice and of course, today, tomorrow, and Saturday, the temperature is to be above zero and further increasing risk of thin ice on the retention ponds. To the Chair, I ask the question, will there be efforts to enforce, increase enforcement of people on retention ponds, minimizing the risk of children crashing through the ice and succumbing to exposure?

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

Councillor Rollins: Well, thank you very much for the question, Councillor Chambers, through you, Madam Speaker. Really close to my heart, actually, in the face of not only the over-reliance on the Winnipeg Paramedic Service… Fire Paramedic Service, with respect to the pandemic and the unmet needs of the Provincial Government, with respect to personal care homes. He's absolutely right, Madam Speaker, and I… the danger of thin ice couldn't be more apparent. And the last thing I want is our First Responders to have to find people under the ice and they have had to do this over the years. There's been significant rescues already this year and so, it is a really important caution around our City waterways and retention ponds and drainage ditches, culverts, streams, and creeks and more, our rivers, to just stay away. It's a Canadian reality that it takes time to freeze and sometimes it never does, with the amount of salt content the City has. So really important to stay away, first and foremost, Madam Speaker. With respect to enforcement, the Chamber will recall that I stood up here at the beginning of Summer and Drowning Prevention Week, to create a caution, and I think the first piece of prevention and enforcement has to be that of all of Winnipeggers, all of Winnipeg families, to really keep children and the vulnerable away from water as it freezes, similar to what we say and the public education we give around drowning, Madam Speaker, we must give the same level of public education around these retention ponds and waterways, and I want to acknowledge my acclaimed colleague, Councillor Lukes, for her video that she has recently posted and she allows Councillors, Madam Speaker, as you know, to riff off her good work, like a beautiful jazz riff, to… to really do that work of public education. All Councillors, I would encourage not during the meeting, but later, to really post the pictures of dangerous thin ice that… that our staff have made, our administrative staff, and want to acknowledge the work of Assistant Chief Mark Reshaur, who, among all other duties, has had to really talk about the ice thickness, what it is and what it isn't, how unpredictable it is and to stay off it as it thaws. We are just in into November/December, and we have some mild temperatures, and there's a reality that with respect to enforcement, we know in the City of Winnipeg that we're doing a tremendous amount on enforcement, nine of our 18 Enforcement Officers, are dedicated right now to COVID. That's a lot, we don't have very many. So this is just a bit of a pile-on effect, Madam Speaker, so forgive me if I'm going a little long, because we really need a team effort. I want to thank Councillor Chambers, through you, for that team effort. But those same enforcement folks that are looking after COVID, they can't... they can't do it all. So we really need a team approach on this. So I encourage all Councillors to get out there, get out on social media, get to the media if they can, and… and, you know, really post the dangers of thin ice.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Seeing no further questions, let's move on. The next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Allard, on the report dated September 16th, 2020.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED SEPTEMBER 16, 2020

Councillor Allard: Yes, I would like to move the consent agenda.

Madam Speaker: Item 1, okay. Sure, it'll be stood down. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Amendment to the Winnipeg Transit Plus Policy – Trip Priority System

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

Councillor Allard: Yes. There has been a number of concerns about these...this proposed change. Currently we have a policy that prioritizes trips based on priority so healthcare first and other priorities after. I think the major concern from most colleagues is that some of those people who need their health appointments honoured may not have the trips available. The Public Service is confident that they will be able to accommodate within existing resources given some efficiencies that will now be realizable through their new trip management software. The recommendation coming down from EPC or coming up from EPC would be to accept the report and ask for a monthly verbal update as soon as the change is implemented. And so, that's…that's addressed the concerns at the EPC level to date. I remain somewhat skeptical, however, that's why we've asked for the monthly updates in terms of when we do change this policy. I do support the report. I think that people with mobility issues deserve to have mobility in the city. If you believe in more than equality, if you believe in equity, then these are the types of policies that we need to be promoting and if it does mean eventually increasing the resources to Transit Plus then I certainly would be leaning in that direction. I'll wait to hear from my other colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm not going to beg forgiveness but I should have…I…the opportunities I had to speak to this didn't really appear or wasn't really…I couldn't make presentations as it came on. Madam Speaker, I want to say that it's a very difficult time to be the Chairperson of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works when such a change is coming. And the change does have to be made because if the Province, you know, passes the standard and the regulations it becomes the law of the province and one must follow it. And the concept of getting rid of the trip priority is a laudable one however, Madam Speaker, as I have mentioned before, my first foray here in this chamber was in 1991 to speak to the addition of a few thousand…couple of thousand (inaudible) passengers who can move around like persons who are blind and others, which put a huge strain on the budgets allocated for, at the time, Handi-Transit. I don't want to go way back there. But, in reading the…like, people with disabilities want to take the bus just as often as people who use regular transit and don't need Transit Plus. The amount of trips and the higher cost in running per trip to run Transit Plus is huge, especially in the winter, because our low floor buses do accommodate some people at times but ultimately, there is a huge demand. And it's pent up because this priority thing is there. And it's not just about being able to get to your health trips, priority A includes health trips, work trips, school trips and so on. Now, this is being implemented during COVID times, there is no university to get to. There is a number of work places where people are laid off. But so, it may not be that bad. I noticed that you are requiring some reporting in May of 2021, I think that's good. But you are going to hear way before that, what the real problems are going to be in terms of when that demand comes in. So, what I don't see in here, which I think is very important to consider, it says first come first serve. So, whatever your trip is it's first come first serve and remember it's not just a one-way trip. When you're booking a trip, you are booking it both ways. So first in the queue books both ways. Under the priority and then there's…you know, if you are way down the list, if the resources become available or even if there are some, they'll give you a one-way trip. Well, they need the trip there but they also need the trip home. They've got no alternative. So, what you have is a ton of cancellations and then you'll have no shows. Some of those no shows are because people forgot or whatever. But the point is, is it's relying on reallocating no shows and trip cancellations. Well, once you get rid of that priority system, there isn't going to be that much. And when you are going to work and you have to get to work, you know, if a resource becomes available they say, well, we can get you to work. How are you getting home? How are you getting home? I hear there's other things in the queue coming under recommendations, under the new Master Transit Plan. You know, dialysis trips are medical, so are trips to go see your doctor about cancer. So, there are all kinds of medical trips that are required. If you don't have an alternative to get there it's not right. So, I hear there is this crazy idea that somehow it's a medical trip for dialysis so therefore the Province should pay for it through health care. Wow. That's interesting. Then maybe the Province should pay for the parking fees for somebody who goes to Cancer Care down at the Health Sciences Centre. What do you think? Good idea, colleagues? You know, I get really worried. There is a way to deal with this but you have to think out of the box. So, when the time comes I'm going to vote for this report because the majority of the community demanded the Province to set this into rolling on. But I'm going to explain something to you. There are people who don't necessarily need right door to door, and we had this other service in this city where we serve transit called Dart. We, the City, are in mass transportation business. That's what we're good at. This is like almost taxi door to door service. Now, door to door service, the trade off was trip priority. There were trade offs negotiated way back when, when all this stuff came into place. Now we should then say, well, for those passengers who don't need door to door, maybe they get dropped off about, you know, 25, 30 meters from their destination and get picked up there as well on the way back. I don't know. But I know that many of the people who qualify on Transit Plus are able to walk or go on their own for a certain distance to wherever they're going. And so, you can combine the Dart system with Transit Plus. You've got these bigger vehicles. The more people you have on these bigger accessible vehicles, the cheaper it is per trip, mass transportation. These are the kind of ideas. So, when a change is coming like it is, that changes the old, I think by the time we hit May, people will start wanting to listen to what I'm talking about because this magical software now that Transit Plus has, it seems to me it could utilize…like, why don't we utilize it, provide the Dart service to other areas? We're talking about cutting feeder routes, like the 88 Cathedral, to these neighbourhoods. So, you know, the idea is, you know, maybe...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard moves extension. Two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. So, innovation and change. I was sitting on the Innovation Committee when they were looking at, you know, the idea of the City running some of the transit services. But you know, let's get innovative, people. Let's get innovative. Let's do it. Let's do it right. Let's create a system of transit that works for everybody. Let's do it. I'll leave it at that. I'm voting for this report and I just want to thank Councillor Allard. This is...this is going to be a huge challenge on your portfolio, councillor, and I appreciate that you are up to the task for us to try to deal with it.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in somewhat hesitation to support this going forward because I am worried. I have heard from constituents that are worried about their medical appointments and the high cost of seniors seeking those appointments to get to them and back. I worry that they will be left at the curb. I worry about those that depend on it to get to work that now will have to probably go to work several hours in advance of their work just to get a ride and maybe get home. You know, the advocates aren't here today to speak to it so obviously they have got their time

and are comfortable or we're told that there is no room to move on this. I do hope that there is dialogue at the other levels of government with regards to capacity and that we are able to react if we find that when this change is implemented that the system is choking, that we're able to be nimble enough to be able to respond to the public for this matter, that lives aren't being put at risk or being forced to make decisions to not go to a medical appointments because they can't afford the taxi to get them there, or home. You know, we've…we're hearing about this routing system. We have seen how Peggo worked so great when it was implemented. I think they finally got the bugs worked out of it but it's taken considerable time. When the new software dispatch system was brought in for Transit Plus, it did not work smoothly at first. Hopefully we've got everything, contingency wise, worked out, and that our residents that depend on this service so critically, are well served by it. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. And I want to speak to this motion and acknowledge Councillor Allard for his efforts on this. And it certainly does concern me when Councillor Allard even shares his trepidation moving forward with a motion. But I'm going to go back to September 20th and I'm going to read the e-mail that we all received again, because it's very important that we hear this message. And it was an e-mail we all received on September 20th from John, I won't use his last name. John says, "I'm writing this memo to express my extreme concern over the proposal to end the Transit Plus priority system for dialysis patients. I live alone and am dependent on Transit Plus to transport me three times a week. I need the priority system to ensure I will have the necessary transportation. Life expectancy without dialysis is one to two weeks. And one to two days if other factors are present. We are advised not to miss one treatment. I contacted", John went on to say, "Brandon Transit and they advised that they have a phone-in system for all with the exception of dialysis patients who are a priority, using the subscription booking method." John asked, "How do they get around the so-called ruling of first come first serve? Did the report contact Brandon for comparative data? If they can do it, there should be no reason Winnipeg can't. Was there a public meeting to disclose or to discuss the level of need? The investigation into scheduling may be incomplete." John said, "Our health and lives are at stake. We need priority booking to ensure we have consistent access to dialysis. I understand this topic is coming up for a vote in the very near future, possibly within a week." He said this September 20th. "I urge you and other Council members to amend the proposal to continue a priority system for dialysis patients. If Brandon can do it so can we. Our health and potentially our lives are at stake. I have made points which reflect on your incomplete study and recommendations. I would like to receive a response to this before the issue comes for a vote." We spend millions of dollars on studies. Millions on consultants. Surely this group has the combined intelligence to reallocate a few million dollars to improve Transit Plus. And if we can't, we have some serious questions to start asking ourselves. We can certainly find it for other projects. It's been a hallmark day for other projects. People's lives are at stake and I will not support a motion that puts any taxpayer's life at risk. I would certainly offer to my colleague Councillor Allard an amending motion to this that patients with issues like dialysis do receive priority. And maybe there are is a few other medical treatments that must be treated in a different way. But I'm not going to support a motion that we appear to just agree to and hope that it will be attended to by the Public Service. I didn't come here to put people's lives at risk. I won't support it. I hope you don't support it. We are here to represent people. Please, listen to John, who counts on dialysis. What if he can't? What if he can't call in and can't go to dialysis? What if something happens? That's on us. Do we want that on us all because we have a report that says, you know what, we think we're going to be okay. I would like something more than a, "we think we're going to be okay."

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise I will be supporting this. I do appreciate what Councillor Allard has said. Councillor Klein talks about an amendment, but there's no…I don't have an amendment in front of me. We've had the report for…it's gone through the committee system for quite some time, so I think that there's…to be an amendment it's to be in writing and there has been lots of time for that. The assumption…I guess, the assertion by the councillor of Charleswood that somehow, we just wilfully, blindly follow the lead of the Public Service is somewhat offensive. I was in the position where I was going to reject this motion until I did my homework. Talked to Connie Newman and the Manitoba Association of Seniors Centres who has been an advocate for seniors, all things seniors, for over 15 years. You will not find anyone in the city of Winnipeg probably who works harder for seniors than Connie Newman and who is a stronger advocate. I encourage others to pick up the phone and call Connie and some of her allies. She assured us…she assured me that the right thing to do is to accept the Public Service's recommendation on this. Councillor Allard in his opening comments just indicated that the Public Service has indicated that they can still accommodate, that they are confident they can accommodate the needs of our seniors and those…not just seniors, but those who rely on this service to get to their medical appointments. As I said a moment ago, I was in the position first of all before doing some homework and making some calls, that I was not going to support this, to say that this is a bad thing. But, as we take a look at the draft report…or pardon me, the report that's before us, the Manitoba Ombudsman's report indicates that this is the change the City of Winnipeg should make. I think that my reaching out to people who are on the front lines of this work and the front lines of people who rely upon this service has been informative and has led me to make the decision to support the recommendation that the Public Service is bringing forward.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to thank my colleagues both on IRPW and EPC for the debates and discussions we've had on this up until now. I will be supporting it today, but I do have my scepticism and reservations. Beyond medical appointments there are, in my belief, different priorities of trips. I mean, getting a medical appointment, dialysis is, you know, at one extreme level. I mean, that you have to do. Other medical appointments with medical professionals, making sure you get there exactly on time is important, but so is a job. One of the best ways we can enable people with physical disabilities is being able to make sure that they can participate in the community as much as possible. If all of a sudden getting to work is the same priority as going to visit…well, outside of COVID, going to visit friends, going to the casino, going shopping for leisure, I don't think that's right or fair. Now, I do appreciate that the department is bringing forward innovation. They believe that this new scheduling software is going to enable us to not have these passes. There's going to be an ability to meet all of the trips. If that's the case, great. I'm very happy that we've added into the report and the motion here before us today, the (inaudible) reports back. I will not hesitate for one second to bring back the prioritization system if this doesn't work. I've had conversations with John Graham, the provincial head of their Abilities Committee under Minister Stefanson, and he claims that the City has at least two years before we're mandated to make changes like this. Yeah, I mean, we know that going for grocery shopping is essential right now. It's an essential trip. It's an essential…you need to eat. But if your appointment is…for a Transit Plus service is for 10:00 a.m., is it the end of the world if that trip happened to be at 10:30 or 11:00 a.m.? But if you've got a job and you've got to be there at 8:30 in the morning, you have to be there at 8:30. If you've got a medical appointment to get on to a piece of, you know, expensive diagnostic equipment, you need to be there when your slot is. So again, I have my concerns and my reservations. The department is quite adamant that this will work. We'll be watching very carefully. Thank you.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to point out the particular irony and that's that, speaking to the transit 50/50 funding program which was, as we know, arbitrarily cancelled by the current Provincial Government. The irony is that it was brought in by a former conservative government, I believe. Councillor Eadie, I believe you had instructed me in this. I thought it was brought in by Premier Filmon, 50/50 funding specifically for Transit Plus or then Handi-Transit and so, we now have a new government that arbitrarily is starving our transit system. And we go get an administrative report to estimate how much the transit system is starving because of our Provincial Government. And so, according to the IRPW June 9th report, "By 2020, the transit system has been short changed $8,571,629." That is a lot of money that could be spent on Handi-Transit or Transit in general. I want to point…I wanted to point that out because it is ironic that while the Provincial Government on one hand is starving us from resources, on the other hand is imposing new legislation through the AMA and through the Ombudsman's recommendations. So, they are taking it from one hand and they're taking from the other hand and that's a really tough place to be as a municipality. Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Klein, we have had months to address this report. If any councillor had an amendment to make, a better report, I understand grandstanding can be good if we want to post online videos, if we…I don't know, if we want to score some cheap political points. But if we really want to make a difference, we need to change policy and to change policy words are cheap. It's all about motions around here. Move your motion, let's have a debate. Let's make a better city. But please don't come at the last minute and say you might or you might not have a motion that would make this report better. I have been clear on my reservations, Councillor Browaty has too, but if you are going to sort of, like, play both sides and say you sort of support a report, but you don't, but you may or may not have amendments. You know, come talk to me. We have had months. We could have had a report we could have all supported together. So, I wanted to…I mean, it's a little frustrating to hear words like that at this point in the game. So please support this report. We have to do it whether we like it or not. There is the Ombudsman's recommendations, there's the AMA coming down and it's also the right thing to do. And if it turns out that we need to put more resources towards Handi-Transit so that citizens of Winnipeg have equitable access to society, then I think we should do that. So please support this report. And please, please, if you want to amend a report before we get to Council, a report that's been sitting there for months, please come talk to me. Let's have a debate. There has been plenty of opportunity. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Noted Councillor Klein. Thank you. Next is the same committee, Councillor Allard, the report dated November 10th, 2020.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED NOVEMBER 10, 2020

Councillor Allard: Yes, I would like to move consent agenda on this as well.

Madam Speaker: That's Item 1. All in favour? Councillor Nason, were you pulling? No. Okay, that's carried. Thank you. Next is Motion 6. Motion 6 was circulated today. It is moved by Mayor Bowman and seconded by Councillor Allard and it's regarding on-street parking. This is an automatic referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

Motion No. 6
Moved by His Worship Mayor Bowman,
Seconded by Councillor Allard,

WHEREAS on October 29, 2020, in recognition of COVID-19's continued negative impact on businesses, and that many residents of Winnipeg continue to work remotely from home. Council authorized one-hour complimentary parking at all on-street metered locations throughout Winnipeg until December 31, 2020, and directed the Winnipeg Parking Authority to not enforce parking time restrictions on residential streets until December 31, 2020 but to continue to enforce all other parking restrictions (such as obstructing fire hydrants, parking too close to intersections, etc.);

AND WHEREAS the impact of COVID-19 will continue well into 2021;

AND WHEREAS the measures passed by Council should be put in place on a longer-term basis;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That the October 29, 2020 Council decision with respect to Item 6 of the Executive Policy Committee report dated October 20, 2020, be amended as follows:*

    A. *That the date for one-hour complementary parking on all on-street metered locations throughout the City of Winnipeg, as outlined in Recommendation 1, be extended from December 31, 2020 to June 30, 2021.*

    B. *That the date in which to Public Service is directed to not enforce parking time restrictions on residential streets, as outlined in Recommendation 2, be extended from December 31, 2020 to June 30, 2021.*

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. We have no motions, no by-laws, we'll now move into question period for this committee. Any questions for Councillor Allard? Any questions under this committee? Seeing none, let's move on. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Finance and we can get right into question period. Any questions for Councillor Gillingham? No questions for Councillor Gillingham until tomorrow. Thank you, let's move on. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. Councillor Mayes, on the report dated November 9th.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
AND THE ENVIRONMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 9, 2020

Councillor Mayes: I will move…I will introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Item No. 1 and pulling Item No. 2.

Madam Speaker: Okay, both have been pulled. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, Item 1, please.

Item 1 – Winnipeg Sewage Treatment Program 2019 Annual Report Program Agreement Between the City of Winnipeg and VWNA Winnipeg Inc. (Veolia)

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

Councillor Mayes: I have been here nine years to the day. So, I just want to commend Councillor Vandal who brought in the first one of these saying, well, this is number 1 of 30. We are now up to number 9 of 30, I think. It's a long-term agreement signed with Veolia prior to almost all of us being elected. Some would say they have the best minds in the world on water matters. That was, I think, former Councillor Swandel said that once. I'm not sure of that, but it has been, I think, a reasonably successful now long-term relationship and looks like we're in for another 21 years or so of this relationship. So, I look forward to hearing what Councillor Eadie has to say.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thanks, Madam Speaker. I used to be on this committee and I always got excited when it came because I guess on Council, Councillors Browaty, Sharma, Eadie and Orlikow were around when this kind of blew up because there was a thought that we were privatizing sewage. And yeah, Swanny…Councillor Swandel, don't worry we're not privatizing your water. And Swandel, you can call him Mr. P3. Anyway, but I have to say, so this report from VNWA or Veolia, what's interesting, they have saved the City a lot of money. And you can see that reflection in the…their net balance. They have a balance of, I think I heard it's 57 million now or somewhere close to that. I'm not quite sure. They were quite instrumental in us getting a good bid on the current sewage plant work, I think it's the south plant that's been worked on or the west. I can't remember, anyway. One question that wasn't answered in there is, we the City actually pay for the wages for the Veolia people who do have a lot of expertise in the area. What's interesting is I would like to know what hourly rate do we pay them? Do we pay them more than our sewage engineers? How much are we paying them? Nobody questioned that because you know, that is a cost that the City bears under this contract. Now, I just want to get really quick to where I'm going here. The whole idea…this is a private/public partnership in terms of operations and contribution and it seems to be working well. But, under the contract, which none of us ever did get to see the actual contract, although you hear a lot about the elements are in this report that refer to it, but, one of the things which is interesting in here is that Veolia will have an ability to bid on a sewage project. Will have the ability. I don't know if Veolia has been lobbying the Provincial Government, who all of a sudden says they want to do a P3 on the bio solids unit, the digester, make it a private/public partnership. Now that involves the ownership by the private sector of that digester. Now, I know many of my colleagues understand when it comes…there is an element of risk with this digester that…which is the hugest portion cost of what our projections are for the whole North Winnipeg Sewage Plant upgrades which will last, you know, hopefully a couple of lifetimes. But ultimately, a P3. And Veolia gets to bid on it. That's interesting. And the Province all of a sudden now says we're going ahead and we're going to do a P3, which is going to cost the taxpayers more money. I prefer to see Veolia, they do have expertise, this is good. So, rather than this possibility now of a private/public partnership where the private sector actually owns the digester and then charges the City back for the cost because we're going to put up the money for it and everything, I get really worried. I get really worried because it's going to cost more. You can still do the kind of build that would happen under a P3, you can do that and just keep it all public. There are examples in Surrey, BC, and other places in this country where they didn't go ahead with a P3 on a road, like the east extension of the Chief Peguis Trail. But so, you know, people need to raise this in attention. So, under that contract not only do they now have 57 million, they'll…I don't know what role they are going to play in the design of the digester. Which, what is it, 800 million? I don't know. Whatever it's going to be. It's a P3, it will be more because the private sector always makes sure there is enough money to maintain something in a proper way. But when it comes time for the private sector to pay taxes so the City can take care of what we own and take care of, oh no, we can't do that. Oh, no. Anyway, I just thought I would flag that. So, Veolia will probably have a chance to make way more money than what sits in their reserve which they haven't pulled out yet, but they might want to pull some of that money out. I don't know what they're going to do, but I mean, if it's going to be a true private investment, they should use some of their profits and invest it in the 800 million or more digester. Anyway, I'll leave it at that. I am voting for this report, just receiving it as information, I believe. I'm glad that this partnership is working for the City of Winnipeg, but I would be interested to know, really, next time, please find out because maybe we could actually hire experts for a better price. I don't know. Just saying. Thank you, Madam Chair.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to make a couple of comments based on what Councillor Eadie was getting at. A couple of clarifications. One, when you take a look at sort of the financial schedule with (inaudible), bear in mind, what I had to ask about at the Water and Waste meeting is the terminology for our payments to Veolia, what is that their compensation, what's called compensation, is their…that's their salaries and wages. That's not called earnings. Earnings is something else. So, it's 2 million a year in salaries and wages, which is not considered their earnings. That's just considered their compensation. $2 million a year, that's for wages and salaries. Earnings are something else. Earnings are profits. So reviewing…bear in mind, we're paying 2 million a year to Veolia for their fees, their wages and salaries and that's not their profits. That's called compensation. And then later on, possibly millions, millions if not tens of millions of dollars in profits later on which is called earnings. This is the…the distinction to me is important just the terminology took me by surprise. I want to make another point. Councillor Eadie was talking about contracts, potential contracts with Veolia any other contract…potential contractors that, with the provincial funding for this that the Provincial Government…we were told at the last meeting, my understanding, my recollection, we were told at the last Water and Waste standing committee

meeting, that to go along with the provincial funding, we are to look at a P3, a public/private partnership. We are to look at that. So, that's not…my understanding is, it's not an obligation as the City to do so. And, bear in mind, it is not or my understanding that the Federal Government, with their contributing funds, they are not putting that obligation…I have not seen that obligation put on us by the Federal Government. And so, just bear that in mind as we move forward. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't know what the hourly rate is, I'll look into that for Councillor Eadie, I can get back to him. On the broader issue of Veolia; perhaps it's a reflective day for me and we seem to have named virtually every member of the 2010 Council during the course of debates here, having heard everyone from Grant Nordman to Justin Swandel and a few more. This was, I think, actually a Scott Fielding initiative at the time along…who is still around, some may remember, Scott Fielding…then Councillor Scott Fielding and some others moved forward on this deal with Veolia. I remember talking to former Councillor Gerbasi and Mike Davidson from CUPE during my campaign in 2011 and I had in my literature that I wouldn't favour privatization of water and I continue to stand by that. And I believe Councillor Eadie you and probably former Councillor Smith and others voted against that. I think you were right in that but we have this long-term arrangement with Veolia and we are nine years in. It is worth pausing for a moment, the south end plant was noted, we have been making great progress on that under Director Moira Geer, Jeff Batton, others in that that unit it's a huge project. Huger yet, is the North End plant and it behooves us to just stop for a moment. If you are being reflective, we didn't move that under the former mayor, Mayor Katz, we've moved a long way under the current mayor on that. We've had some support, I think, from Minister Squires. I think personally this was the leading achievement of our former CAO, Doug McNeil, with getting us going on the $406 million first stage, 50 million to that, of course, is the power plant, 356 is the Headworks, 256 million that's a huge project. That's almost as big as one of our BRT lines. Bigger yet…and if you look at the City website there are two potential proponents. There is a long process that's been gone through to try and get that work under way, to get the Headworks $400 million project under way. Obviously, we continue to have interesting back and forth with the Province and the Federal Government about who is going to fund these projects. But if Veolia ends up bidding on phase 2, my view is going to be, we are doing phase 2. It's an $800 million project. It's actually more than 800 million, it's…no, it's 589 combined with the other it's over 800. $589 million, it will be the biggest capital project in the history of the city of Winnipeg if you look at it because the BRT came in a little under budget. 589 million that we're trying to make happen with the Province and the Federal Government. So, if we can get…A) we're going. For the first time in years, or the first time in 20 years, we're going to do something at the North End plant under this Mayor's jurisdiction. B) wouldn't it be something if we could get the other building under way, the bio solids facility. And building understates it at over $500 million. Wouldn't that be great? I don't know who will bid on it, maybe Veolia will. The more the better in my view. But I think that the larger point here is not so much debating about whether they might bid or not, but to say, you know, if you take a look back about where we were nine years ago and where we are now, my goodness, we are moving forward on one of the biggest projects environmentally in our history with the Headworks. And Ms. Geer has been a pretty big champion for that. And what an opportunity is there if we can do the bio solids thing. What a legacy to leave behind. Standing further yet down the track is the nutrient removal building or buildings at 800 million, I believe. We haven't yet got to that, but if we can do one and we are, that's a great achievement I think. If we can do the bio solids and I know there is will from people like Terry Duguid and Rochelle Squires and the current mayor and our staff, if we can get that through and our acting CAO, Mike Ruta. Boy, if we can get that shovel in the ground or approval for that, wouldn't that be a great achievement, I have to say, environmentally. So, we are…we have made some real progress I think on these files over the years. Councillor Gilroy had a period during this committee, I'm back now, but it's an exciting opportunity that's in front of us. So yeah, this Veolia report, we're in for decades with them but if you take a step back and look at the larger stuff, where we are on the sewage treatment plants, man, this is a huge opportunity and would be a huge achievement for the City if we can make this work.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. With that, I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 2, Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 – Manitoba Conservation and Climate Grant Agreement for Residential Food Waste

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

Councillor Mayes: Tempted to give Councillor Browaty's speech, but instead, I will give my own. This is part…this is in support from our Provincial Government. We've you know, said some good things about the 50 million, we said some critical things about transit funding, back to the good things here. They are providing some money to help us with our composting program. Some good work by our staff, Ms. Geer and others, Mr. Gordichuk who's been a very good hire, in my view, to try and get us going on this. So, pulled it mostly just to commend the Province for, kind of out of nowhere, frankly, getting us $300,000 to help with our composting initiatives.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. When this came to committee it was my first meeting so my history on it is limited. I do know that the Mission Gardens area of Transcona was selected as one of the pilot sites for this program. When you look at how this has evolved, this found money from the Province, I equate it to something of you have a concept car and suddenly you are going to go into full production. The money from the Province is very prescriptive. It's not to offset the 1.8 million that's being done as part of the pilot but whereas it's driving us towards the finish line. It's having us come forward with a Class 3 estimate for setting up this in permanency. This is to check a box, perhaps at the Province, great that it's found money. To me, that 300,000 should have went towards the pilot to determine if it is the most appropriate and best fit for the city of Winnipeg. I appreciate that the Province wants to get involved in this, except we're not there yet. We're still exploring the hiccups, the checks, balances. If it works for us in Winnipeg. The biggest challenge I have is the fact that it's so prescriptive and the timeline is only a few months away. It's not that it's for when this pilot is over, no, it's like in March, the end of March, that the final report is due with a Class 3 estimate. When do we put a Class 3 estimate for something that's in a pilot? That wasn't part of our scope? So, this to me is major scope creep. I voted against it at standing committee and I'll be voting against it today. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I did vote for this at the standing committee meeting. It's an extra $300,000 from the Provincial Government. One should say, don't look a gift horse in the mouth. Of course, it's our obligation to these things. In this case, I guess it just offsets some costs, hopefully, for the City on this. I have to say though, that I did vote against the initial specifics of the pilot project given that I truly don't believe that a mature community in traditional old north Winnipeg, old Winnipeg, in the north part of Winnipeg, and any mature community in there, whether it be Elmwood or the North End or Point Douglas, that none of those chosen for the pilot project and I think that's unfortunate because we would have learned from that. It's an important study. It's a pilot project. We're supposed to learn the best that we can from it and I don't think we chose our communities…the best communities were chosen of the over half dozen. In this case, we've had this argument before, I'm just putting out there for the record. We have gone through this and I've explained it before. I'll be brief today. Nonetheless, it's an extra $300,000. Given the cost of this it could have been that it could have funded another community to be part of the pilot. Unfortunately, that's not where we're going with it…where we're going with this. It should have been but nonetheless, it's provincial funding that should offset the cost of something that's important, which is the pilot project. So, on that basis, I'm supporting.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I'll just quickly say that Councillor Schreyer successfully convinced me to vote against this particular item. And that is…you know, I appreciate all the work that solid waste and Water and Waste is doing in terms of the composting, the pilot and it's good that we…if there is some found money to improve that pilot that's fine. But you know, Madam Speaker, like, I don't know the specific houses that were selected in the various neighbourhoods, but what I do understand is these are neighbourhoods that it's going ahead and are not the neighbourhoods that struggle the most at just dealing with the existing system as it is. It should have been done because when you develop…this pilot will be developing the policy for how to move forward with curbside pickup compost. And I just…without understanding what's going to happen in neighbourhoods where they struggle using the system as it is right now, we are not going to form good policy, I can tell you that right now. Anyway, thanks.

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

Councillor Browaty: Not to disappoint my colleague from St. Vital. Again, clean air, clean water, this program is insanely expensive. We're doing more work now so we can spend even more money later. We have all sorts of opportunities. I mean, Brady Landfill, not too many years ago had 100 years of capacity left at it. And we…I believe our diversions increased so the capacity is probably even lengthened out from that point. The cost of this pilot project going from one…and just to clarify for Councillor Schreyer's benefit, this isn't the Provincial Government overtaking part of our expense, this is making the project broader and doing more things as Councillor Nason was alluding to. So, the project was 1.8 million, it's now $2.1 million and they are doing other works that basically are saying, we're doing this anyway whether or not this test is…this trial period is successful. So, I'm going to be voting against it. Again, I do believe, you know, in clean air and clean water and living sustainably, I just find this…the cost of this, the having additional vehicles going through every neighbourhood, depleting streets in a lot of residential neighbourhoods. By far the heaviest vehicles on the streets on a regular basis are garbage recycling trucks. I have been in Canadian cities, big and small, that have composting programs, the leach that comes out of these trucks stinks until the next time it rains. I'm just not at all in favour of this. And I hear from residents like people that have single family homes, I guess in particular, that already do compost in their backyard. They want credit for this. They don't want to be doing it. So, before, I believe the number was…I believe the cost of this trial was 450 over two years, so the equivalent of…sorry, two and a quarter per year, so increase that, you know, percentage wise and this program is just out of control. I'm going to be voting against.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Seeing no further speakers, Councillor Mayes to close.

Councillor Mayes: Good debate. I think it was Thomas Steen who once said, "The more you talk, the more likely I am to vote against you." And this may be an example of this, where I pulled this thing and seem to be losing votes, so I'll try to be brief. It's not really a debate about the whole pilot project it's…we have had that debate. We are doing the pilot project. In defence of the staff, they talked at length about why this...they said there was only five wards who were going to do the pilot and it turned out to be six because of the boundary shift in 2018 as between Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Lukes' wards so we're into parts of 6 different wards with the pilot project because you need to look at a variety of different neighbourhoods not just one kind of neighbourhood. So, that was a pretty statistically driven process as to which wards ended up with participation in the pilot project. You know, Councillor Browaty has made some of those comments before. It's a fair point by Councillor Nason, it doesn't go toward the base cost, it's broader than that. We should debate what comes forward in terms of a Class 3 estimate. There would be a large difference between an all-season facility or the thing I've talked about in the past, a Salt Lake City style facility where at least you can get going. It's an outdoor pad, you do it part of the year. That's what they do in Salt Lake City, they don't do it in winter. That would be cheaper, that would be quicker. Is that a bad idea? Maybe, but we'll have that debate. So, Class 3 estimate could be on a number of potential different models but at least we're getting money from the Provincial Government to help us with this. And it is worth noting that from 2012, I think the staff have said, you'll get your diversion rate up and then it will plateau if you don't start doing the composting of organics. That is exactly what's happened so we are, again, under this mayor, we're under way finally with this and I think my thinking on this has shifted over time from being pretty cautious to saying, you know, we've got to…we've really got to go ahead and do this. So, the pilot will happen, we'll get a report, we'll see what participation rates was, we'll see what we can do. There will be a cost. Councillor Eadie has spoken with great eloquence in the past about his concern that the 2012 garbage, 2011 garbage and recycle vote simply put a standard fee on each house, flat rate and it was $50 at the time. Councillor Eadie has said, I think quite eloquently, no, that should be on the property tax that way the home worth more is paying more than the house that's worth $150,000. That's also going to be part of the debate somewhere down the line is how much does this cost and how do we socialize that cost. It will be a good debate. For today though, we have money from the Province, we should accept I would argue and it will help us further the goals of the composting program. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. With that I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Okay, call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Nason.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 2 passes. We'll now have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Mayes? Seeing none, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Innovation and Economic Development. We'll get right into question period. Any questions for Councillor Browaty? Okay, seeing no questions, next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Gilroy, on the report dated June 16th.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, I would like to move consent of agenda Item No. 2.

Madam Speaker: Just give me a moment. Yes, Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Gilroy, on the report dated October 16th, 2020.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, Madam Speaker. I would like to move layover to the next committee on this issue. I know the Public Service is working on this and looking at different options with our stakeholders, so I'd like to move layover.

Madam Speaker: You mentioned layover to next committee, do you mean next meeting of Council?

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, please.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Gilroy has moved layover for Item 11 – The Broadway Neighbourhood Centre Insurance Cost to the next meeting of Council. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Gilroy, the next report dated November 16th, 2020, Report 'A'.

**REPORT 'A' OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT,
HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 16, 2020**

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, I would like to move consent of agenda Items 1 through 6, please.

Madam Speaker: 2 has been pulled. Okay, 1 through 6. I'll call the question on 1, 3 through 6. All in favour? Contrary? Carried: Mr. Clerk, Item 2.

Item 2 – Proposed Land Exchange between the City of Winnipeg and the St. James-Assiniboia School Division for Property Located at 1910 Portage Avenue and 100 Ferry Road

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

Councillor Gilroy: I'll wait to hear from my councillor colleague.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll see Councillor Mayes' 1975 future allocation languishing project and raise him one to a 1957 library that was built by the City of Winnipeg on school division land…St. James School Division land, which if you read the report, it's quite remarkable. It's quite the history section. 1957, they tried to do the land exchange. 1981, they started the process and never completed it. 1990s, they started the process and never completed it. So, finally we're coming to the point where the City of Winnipeg has a building on school division land and the school division has a running track on City of Winnipeg land. We have come to the mutual agreement that it's in our collective best interests to have an exchange of the properties. And so, this finally, after whatever 1957 to today is, I'm a little bit…thank you, 63, there you go. 63 years in the making, we finally come to this decision. Yeah, I'm the Finance Chair. It's a little concerning, isn't it? The budget numbers swirling in my head. After six decades we've finally come to the place where Council's going to make the determination to finally complete this transfer so I just wanted to highlight that. I think what would be a fairly kind of benign moment needs to be recognized because it's been a long, long time coming.

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

Councillor Mayes: I just wanted to say, I know Councillor Gillingham has worked on this one for years so kudos to Councillor Gillingham because it's kind of the un-glamourous work you sometimes have to do around here, but it's the right thing to do. And a word of praise of the St. James School Division who have been working with Councillor Klein and myself on a different running track project. One of the few school divisions that none of us sat on. We've got about four or five different school divisions that have produced trustees who have come to be councillors here. But, you know, we…I think we have had the benefit of dealing with a lot of our local school boards. We'll see what the Province does but St. James is not one I have had a lot to do with, but they have been great, I have to say, in recent months in dealing with us on a potential project. So, pleased to see. I'm sure Councillor Gillingham is very pleased to see this finally reaching its conclusion.

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

Councillor Gilroy: You can call the question, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question. All in favour on Item 2? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Gilroy, on the Report 'B' of this committee dated November 16th, 2020. We do have some amending motions, as you know.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah. So, I can speak to this and the amending motion at the same time?

Madam Speaker: First you'll move Item 3. There's amending motions for Item 1 and 2. Would you like to move Item 3?

Councillor Gilroy: Sorry, what are we on?

Madam Speaker: Report 'A', November 16th…Report 'B', pardon me.

Councillor Gilroy: Okay. And we want to move item number…the 3…subdivision, oh right, the…sorry, I just want to make sure I'm getting the right one, the old Southwood Golf Course?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, I'd like to move Item No. 3, please.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, we have amending Motion 8 going with one item and amending Motion 9 with the other.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy, to introduce the item followed by Mayor Bowman who will introduce amending motion 8.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. The item that probably doesn't need any kind of introduction because we have been dealing with it throughout our committee system here throughout the standing committee and onto EPC. I will be supporting the amending motion that is in front of us here today. And I would like to read a little bit about what we are here to do today. The purpose of the Secondary Plan is to provide detailed policy to direct development within a specific area of the city. Through a collaborative planning process, these plans can adapt and implement the objectives and policies of OurWinnipeg and the Complete Communities Directions Strategy to the local context and provide certainty regarding future development and aspirations for the area. So, looking at the amending motion that is here in front of us here today, we have had lots of discussion throughout our standing policy committee. I think it was really, really good, the discussion, that took place. Councillors learned a lot from the process and I think we all really felt that this could be a very, very good project for the City. And I think we just want to make sure that we're developing the way that we need to develop and that we are responsible for that. We're the keepers of that and I think that that's important. So, the…we also heard from the developer a willingness to do a lot of the things that they felt the administration was asking for. So, when we're looking at the amending motion here today, it talks about sidewalks and it talks about the developer agreeing that there should be sidewalks. So, let's make sure that we're doing what we need to do in our role as to ensure that there's sidewalks when…where there should be sidewalks. We are now in a process where we're putting sidewalks in where we didn't have them, and it's, you know, a cost to the City. So, let's make sure that in future developments that's our goal and our job to make sure that we have sidewalks. We have a developer that's willing to put the sidewalks in where they should be. So, I think that's a positive thing here. We also, Madam Speaker, I think this is in your ward. When my first…my first time on IRPW was the bus situation where a school bus couldn't turn down the streets. So, as a city, we had developed implements that were being built that didn't have the proper radius for a school bus to turn, right. That's on us. What this motion does is to ensure that in the Secondary Plan we would have to make sure that they are going to make sure the radius is proper for a school bus. Which again, the developer said he supported, so that's a good thing. We do have buildings from time to time being built where they shouldn't be built. And, you know, we sit here on the Appeals Committee and we have to listen to all those. Our responsibility is to make sure that we're having the development built to what we want it to be built

for. And so, that's what this motion does here today, it's making sure that the developer is adhering to some of those things. We also understand that the TOD wants to have more density. And I think that throughout the committee, what I heard from my councillor colleagues at EPC and at standing policy committee was, you know, maybe we're okay with the amount, but we want to make sure that there is a cap, that there is an amount in there, that it isn't that the developer can go and build more units than is allotted. And I think they want…the Public Service wanted that clarity in there and that's what this motion does. So what I think we have in front of us is something to try to bring the two parties together, that allows us to do our job and role as councillors to ensure that we're…making sure that we're trying to follow the policies that we have to adhere to, making sure that we're doing all the things that sometimes we see at Council, whether it's school bus radiuses, where it's having development where it shouldn't happen, where, you know, making sure that we have the units that are required in the area and that's important because all of us deal with traffic issues. And we know with this plan proposal it's not going to have a commercial district in it. It's going to rely on another commercial district that people are going to have to travel to because there is a railroad track there. So, it is a different issue than in just any other area where there isn't a railroad track. People can travel different routes to get where they are going. This is going to be limiting how they're going to travel through the area. We need to make sure that we have the amounts of people that our traffic can manage. So that's what this motion is doing. So, I think that this is a good meshing of getting this project up and running and making sure that we're supporting some of the concerns that the Public Service has raised. So, I'm hoping that, you know, that you will look at this and say, we need to make sure that we have some of these things in place moving forward. We need to make sure that we are looking at the units that are being…that can happen there. We have to make sure that we're making sure that this is a TOD and residential district with small commercial, that there is no industrial or anything that's going to be taking place there. This motion does that. So, I think that when we look at how we move this forward, it has to have some of the recommendations that have put forward through our Public Service but also recognizing that we want this development to happen. We are eager, all of us are eager and we have seen this…we have seen this dating back for a few years now. So, I'm hoping you will support this because I think that there was a willingness from everybody from the standing policy committee to EPC, to try to get something forward that everyone can support. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Mr. Mayor, your opportunity to speak to the item and the amending Motion No. 8.

Motion No. 8
Moved by His Worship Mayor Bowman,
Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,

WHEREAS on November 16, 2020 in their presentation at the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development the applicant stated "This site has sidewalks on every street; if a pedestrian is on a street he is able to find a sidewalk on that street to walk down.";

AND WHEREAS rail safety is critical to any development adjacent to rail corridors and both rail companies and FCM have provided leadership on rail safety best practices, and on November 16, 2020 in their presentation at the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development the applicant stated "There is a guideline that FCM put out … the Team's understanding is that we have followed the FCM guidelines.";

AND WHEREAS on November 16, 2020 in the applicant's submission to Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development the applicant clearly confirmed their density intent from previous communications as "The maximum residential density for the entire Planned Area of PDO-2 PARKER LANDS shall be 1,920 dwelling units", and subsequently reduced this density to "1,918 dwelling units"; and at 1,918 this plan falls within the bottom end of the applicant's desired Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Zone and just above the top end of the public service's desired TOD Zone. Furthermore on November 16, 2020 in their presentation at the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development the applicant stated "Our net [density] is something in the fifty (50) something it's not even sixty (60) units per acre";

AND WHEREAS according to the zoning application "The purpose of this [PDO-2 PARKER LANDS] overlay is to support the redevelopment of the planned area as a 'Major Redevelopment Site' in a manner consistent with Parker Lands Secondary Plan and Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Principles as an 'Urban Neighbourhood' with an underlying TOD Zone.";

AND WHEREAS the TOD Zone "Urban Neighbourhood" allows for the development of Residential, Retail and Class B Commercial use;

AND WHEREAS on November 18, 2020 in their presentation at Executive Policy Committee, when asked about having a street design that accommodated school bus turning radius the applicant stated "… we would be amendable to add that

as a policy, if that was the concern of the school board and the public service feels it's important to put it in we would certainly be amenable to that.";

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 1 of Report 'B' of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development report dated November 16, 2020, be amended by deleting Recommendations 1-4 and replacing with the following:

1. *That the Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site ('G') SP 1/2018, (attached hereto as Attachment A – Parker Lands Secondary Plan) be approved as a non-statutory secondary plan policy, subject to the following amendments:*

   A. *That all streets must be designed to ensure appropriate turning radius to accommodate Winnipeg School Division buses, as determined by and to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.*

   B. *That the final location of all sidewalks and multi-use pathways within the planned development be subject to the approval of the Director of Planning, Property and Development and the City Centre Community Committee and constructed to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.*

   C. *That prior to development, the applicant be required to submit a final rail mitigation plan protecting the proposed adjacent residential development in alignment with the FCM Guidelines or endorsed by CN, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Property and Development.*

   D. *That Policy 3.3.2(2) Density Policies which reads as follows:*

      3.3.2(2) Net housing densities for the Urban Neighbourhood Area TOD Zone shall be 99-247 units per net hectare (40-100 units per net acre) as per the TOD Handbook.

      be deleted and replaced with the following:

      3.3.2(2) Net housing density of the Urban Neighbourhood Policy Area shall be no greater than 60 units per net acre and the number of residential dwelling units in the Urban Neighbourhood Policy Area shall not be greater than 1,918.

   E. *That to ensure consistency with the plan and to ensure zoning rights are consistent with TOD:*

      i. *That Policy 5.5.2.4 be deleted, namely:*

         5.5.2.4 The Parker Lands Urban Design Guidelines shall not apply or affect the ability of land owners exercising their existing land-use rights for developing lands currently zoned for Industrial land-uses.

      ii. *That the following wording from section 5.4 Development Applications be deleted, namely:*

         Until such time as the zoning By-law regulations are changed in a under future development applications, nothing in this Plan shall preclude current uses in the Planned Area from continuing as they existed prior to the Plan, with all the zoning land-use rights inherent in the lands, and for as long as the land owner wishes.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank our committee Chair for all her work. This has been a very challenging file for some time including for the committee that's recently looked at this matter. I want to thank all the members of the committee who had extensive dialogue with the applicant over the course of this committee cycle. There are two motions…two amending motions for the purposes of Report 1 and 2. I'm going to speak to…they are complimentary motions and so I'm going to speak to the intent to both. I'll try not to speak when we get to the second matter, just in the interests of time. But, Madam Speaker, members of Council and also for the viewing public that's watching via the livestream, there have been a lot of reports, a lot of exchanges that have occurred on this file for many, many years. This has been a controversial development for some time, certainly predating my term in office and I would certainly chalk this file up to clean up. It's one of many cleanup matters from previous work that I think this Council has an opportunity to see through and to complete. I believe part of the challenge has been for all of the parties and for Council

today, Madam Speaker, is to navigate through all of the layers and all the reports and all the exchanges. There is a lot of information and so I'm going to go through this amending motion and I'll apologize to my colleagues. I'm going to go through it very slowly because many of you, or all of you, were receiving it here today and so, I want to go through and just discuss it in some detail and I'll try to do it within the next 8 minutes if I can. Participating in and watching other committees on this file I can say…and I also believe I can say very clearly, progress has been made because of the due diligence and the discussions that have happened and the analysis that has happened throughout the committee process. And while that progress came at a cost of time and added complexity, I also believe that we have now heard with the benefit of the public dialogue, some basic principles that we may be able to move forward with today. This will not be unlike some of the previous votes today on a $50 million rec and library strategy or a $12 million rapid housing initiative. I don't anticipate this will be unanimous and I want to say during my comments, I respect the views of my Council colleagues that will have very strong views on this development. First, in front of you is, as I have mentioned, two motions for both dispositions one and two in this matter. The motions…the amending motions embody really the challenge on this item and many files that Council has voted on. There is necessary complexity and I want to thank Clerks, and thank our Public Service for their assistance in guiding our deliberations and our due diligence. For Council, I'll highlight the principles in this amending motion that I hope will not only guide our vote today, but also allow for this development to proceed within parameters set out in the amending motion. And I'm going to highlight just some of the whereas', just to frame the therefore be it resolved, whereas on November 16th, in their presentation at the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development, the applicant stated, and I quote, "This site has sidewalks on every street. If a pedestrian was on the street, he is able to find a sidewalk on that street to walk down." That was good to hear and we heard it again today and I would like to just make sure that there is absolute clarity on that point and then that's why you will see point 1(a) in the therefore be it resolved, "That all streets must be designed to ensure appropriate", sorry, (b), "The final location on all sidewalks and multiuse pathways within the plan development be subject to the approval of the Director of Planning, Property and Development and City Centre Community Committee." And so, this is so that additional due diligence can occur. It can happen at the committee with the guidance, of course, and input of the Public Service, but it moves it forward so that we don't necessarily have to look at that granular level to date. Second whereas, is that rail safety, an incredibly important file which Councillor Allard knows very well and others have put a lot of time and attention to rail safety. This development is adjacent the main line of CN, and so, the whereas provides, "That rail safety is critical to any development adjacent to rail corridors and both rail companies and FCM have provided leadership on rail safety best practices." I note in the whereas that on November 16th in their presentation to Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development, the applicant stated, and I quote, "There is a guideline that FCM puts out. The team's understanding is that we have followed the FCM guidelines." That's great. I would like to just make sure that that certainly is a requirement. And so, you will see in the motion, in the therefore be it resolved, "That prior to development, the applicant be required to submit a final rail mitigation plan protecting the proposed adjacent residential development in alignment with the Federation of Canadian Municipality guidelines or endorsed by CN to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Property and Development." The 'or endorsed by CN', I think originally it was 'and'. My understanding is Councillor Lukes made that change, which I support. And I thank her for her input on that matter. Hopefully, I have articulated that accurately. The next whereas is November 16th, 2020 and the applicant's submission to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development, the applicant clearly confirmed their density intent from previous communication, as quote, "The maximum residential density for the entire planned area shall be 1,920 dwelling units", and subsequently reduced this density to 1,918 dwelling units. And this 1,918 or at that level, this plan falls within the bottom end of the applicant's desired transit-oriented development zone and just at the top end of the Public Service's desired TOD zone. Furthermore, on November 16th, in the presentation at the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development the applicant stated, and I quote, "Our net density is something in the 50 something, it's not even 60 units per acre." So, what I have done for clarity...and that was much of the debate we heard at Executive Policy Committee was the intensity of the density. And so, what this does is it clearly sets out the density...the density policies and establishes that the net housing density of the urban neighbourhood policy shall be no greater than 60 units per acre and it shall not be greater than 1,918. So, that's the maximum amount. And we heard the applicant provide that clarity as well. There is also in the whereas' the TOD zone for an urban neighbourhood, which is, as you know…members of Council will know, is a defined term, allows for the development of residential retail and Class B commercial use. And so, that is also stipulated in one of the therefore be it resolved as well is that…is that this would be the manner of the permitted development in this zone. Finally, Madam Speaker, with respect to school buses; on November 18th, in their presentation at Executive Policy Committee, when asked about having a street design that accommodated a school bus turning radius, the applicant stated, and I quote, "We would be amenable to add that as a policy if that was the concern of the school board and the Public Service feels it's important to put it in, we'd certainly be amenable to that." That was good to hear. I think that's incredibly important for a new and a growing neighbourhood is that school buses can navigate the streets that are being built. With the few principles in this motion, provided that the stipulations in the amending motion can be supported, I will support the project moving forward. To date, I have supported the administrative report's recommendation at the committee process, with these changes, if supported by Council, Madam Speaker, I can certainly work with the applicant, work with our Public Service and my Council colleagues to finally see this project proceed and to realize the investment of the transit-oriented development that started many, many years ago. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Lukes: Madam Speaker, I would just like clarity on Motion No. 9, Report B, Item 2. How would I seek clarity on one item?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, if you wish to speak to the item at this time you can certainly share your remarks. And perhaps in Councillor Gilroy's closing or Mr. Mayor, he can address your questions and points of clarification.

Councillor Lukes: Sure, I mean...

Madam Speaker: It's Item 1...Item 1.

Councillor Lukes: I'm speaking to Item 2. Mr. Mayor had put them both together. He spoke to both of them together. I can speak later if you want on Item 2. Or I can ask the question on Item 2.

Madam Speaker: If you would like to speak now, and I suppose weave in your comments at the same time, but it's Item 1 we're dealing with at this time.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, I'll wait till we deal with Item 2 and I'll ask the question on Item 2.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers at this time? Councillor Mayes. Councillor Orlikow? Councillor Mayes? Which one? Councillor Klein? Who? Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I'll go last. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes. I see that.

Councillor Mayes: I may speak to No. 2 at more length than No. 1. I'm glad we seem to be finding some consensus on this. The Mayor is right, it does predate him. It predates me. It's the original land swap, but I think Councillor Steeves was here for that. I'm not even sure of that because he left to run in a bi-election…to run in the general election. This is a long running file. I certainly remember debating where the…that certainly was in the 2010 term. I remember Councillor Havixbeck, Councillor Browaty, Councillor…there are three of us here, at least, who voted in favour of the current alignment who are still here today. And I think this is…this is the step that's needed. That alignment went in a dog leg to facilitate transit-oriented development. That was one of the main reasons to do it that way. It wasn't the only reason. Here finally we're getting to a point where we can approve a project that would put shovel to ground and get building this going. It is not perfect. It has been messy, it has been lengthy, it has been litigious. But I think with the amending motion we have resolved a lot of the concerns. And I should point out, the school bus turning radii issue is in my mind from Trustee Rollins berating…well, that's too strong…lecturing us about approving projects that didn't allow school buses in. I think that was one where we learned a lesson and I'm glad to see it being incorporated here all these years later. So, that actually is…it sounds minor, but it's actually, I think, fairly important from the way Councillor Rollins, then Trustee Rollins, talked about dealing with weeping parents who are so upset because the bus couldn't get into a neighborhood and that always stayed with me. So, I'm glad to see we're doing something about that. So, it's been a long difficult fight for a lot of the people around here. So, I may say more on Item No. 2, but I'll be supporting the amending motion.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As the Mayor indicated, we are only receiving this amendment today, but I see no need to play that card myself. The City has spent half a billion dollars on bus rapid transit. And I've always wondered why we haven't work diligently years ago as the Mayor said on this file to, you know, keep it going, to make it happen. Many, many years were spent and I'm happy to see that it's finally happening today. And I'm going to fully support the Mayor's motion because I think this has to happen. I think that this is a good development, period. I think that this is a good step into the future, period. I think that the presentation that Mr. Naughty gave during SPC because I had the privilege of sitting through nine hours of dialogue asking questions. We heard both sides. Mr. Naughty gave a very well-balanced presentation, a very thoughtful presentation based on many factors. I felt that he was very accurate in describing transit development and transit-orientated development, he was right. It's very new to Winnipeg. And we shouldn't be afraid, we should be embracing it. And this motion says yes, we're going to embrace this development and we're going to embrace this with a new way of thinking for transit-oriented…orientated development. So, hearing the Mayor now supporting this development with some conditions is something that I'm going to support fully because this development is a good idea for the city, it's good for our environment because it's supporting transit and I think it's good for our future.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. We have Councillor Chambers on the roster to speak. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank the Mayor and Councillor Gilroy for their leadership on this file. It has been a very contentious and laborious type of endeavor to getting this over the goal line. To use my previous analogy in sports. I want to make sure though that, again, in these whereas' that we're looking at rail safety as Councillor Allard had referred to earlier ensuring that whether it's the speed of trains that are passing through this area, whether it's the materials that they're carrying, whether it's individuals that are walking by closer to the tracks that this is fully addressed as this is going to be 1,918 units that will house families, will house small children. The potential for disaster to happen as we've seen in Quebec is quite concerning. So, we just want to make sure that that is nailed down and that is fully addressed. The issue with regards to the radius of the school bus, again, young families in the area, making sure that there is access, both entrance and egress of school buses is an important thing as well. I'm glad that we're addressing this in terms of the transit-oriented development with respect to the surrounding shops that are available on Taylor, you know, grocery stores, other types of retail that is in that area. Also, with proximity of the University of Manitoba, I think it will alleviate some of the pressures that the families in Richmond…the area of Fort Richmond and University Heights would be feeling with respect to the shortage of housing. And fully recognizing as well that the University of Manitoba has recently announced the future plans for development of the old Southwood Golf Course. So, all of these activities in terms of development in this area are great for the city of Winnipeg along this rapid transit corridor, but making sure that we address all of these fundamental issues first for development. So, I will be supporting this. Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Councillor Gilroy for your hard work on this file with these amendments.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Councillor Sharma. I just want to rise and thank the leader of Council and the leader of the standing policy committee responsible to actually see that this development goes forward. We all know that it's very important. It is the kind of growth that people like the former Councillor Gerbasi supported. And with today's development and as things move along there was some density built on the first phase of rapid transit and alls I could say is, with these amendments, it works for me. I will be able to support those amendments and move this development along. And I hope that the developer, the owner and his people are able to find the money and develop the property as planned. It is a difficult, large development, but I think it's very important as Councillor Chambers said to this part of the city and to the city as a whole. Anyway, thanks for your leadership Councillor Gilroy, Mayor Bowman.

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

Councillor Orlikow: My oh, my. We're finally here. This has been in my area and for…you know, I actually don't remember how long. It's been a pretty amazing journey. It has, I think, for many people involved in this file, damaged our souls a bit. It's been a very, very difficult journey for everybody involved. I just want to recognize that. We've had a number of back and forth. You know, we do…it's not the idea right now today that some people are saying it's a $500 million investment. This is the reason why it had to go…it is. But we also have done Fort Rouge yards. And in a much more difficult position, we've also done the Bishop Grandin crossings. That was actually very difficult proposal because it was brown field. So, it was quite a journey. So, I think the idea that the City of Winnipeg is or is not committed to TOD, we also have some incredible progress going on at the Osborne Station TOD there as well. So, again, we'll put that aside. We all agree TOD in getting this project moving is important, getting it…that area of that land. I actually did approve the dog leg under a little bit of distress to get a Secondary Plan Approval done in the process. Well, that actually didn't work out. But that is the way this project has worked out in general. So, we're here today. Now we're here today on the Secondary Plan. Again, this morning was quite eye opening to see the delegation come forward to talk about a Secondary Plan. But again, as the Clerks have informed me, the first time in my entire career that's happened. But the many, many first times in my entire career things have happened on this site, on this project itself. But again, water under the bridge. We're moving on. The developer has done what they are allowed to do, the City has done what they can do and we're here today. Where do I stand on it? Well, again, I represent, again, we all have our own, Beaumont neighbourhood. This is a very small neighbourhood. It's bungalows that are going to be right adjacent to this. The main entry point out of the neighbourhood is either you're going to go down Hurt into Waverley or you're going to go through Beaumont. So, again…which is one street, really, where you can get through to McGillivray or to Windemere and out. So, again, how impactful would this be upon that adjoining neighborhood. You know, I have to…I think we all do that when we all do our developments. We see, okay, we want to put an apartment block, well yes, all development is great. We always want infill. But maybe an apartment block (inaudible) street is not the best idea. So, that's where we come in, the City councillors, and we start looking at policies that we have. So, I'm going to just talk about the policy basis. So, the Secondary Plan, I do not support the Secondary Plan. And I'm having a little hard time in calling it a Secondary Plan because the…there's incredible…and this is all just taken from the report. The plan is missing important content and policies. Yes, it is. The plan identifies the forest. The forest is no longer there. But the plan identifies the forest. And this is what's being presented to us today. The graphics, even though they have the retention pond, it's still the same one from 2017. So, none of that new information has actually

been brought into the Secondary Plan. Does it matter? Well, not so much because much of the battle that's been going on is, should this be a statutory Secondary Plan, i.e. had some legal teeth to it? Or should it be a non-statutory one? Councillor Mayes has pointed out some of his frustrations for the non-statutory plan with The Forks. Again, this is similar…that will be similar to this one. Okay, so, we know that. So, that was really...we want to have to make sure we have, as they say in here, we want to have...we want to have some context in the Secondary Plan to be able to guide development going through. So, I do appreciate the…I do appreciate the amendments today. They are good in...good, but to me, they don't go far enough. That is a problem. There are too many other areas in the Secondary Plan alone. The idea of using, I guess, a linear retention pond as your green space, there's no green space on this thing. There's a little bit for parks, for play structures, a little bit of wandering, but there's no place to play soccer. You've got a Hydro corridor right beside you, you can't go on that. Beaumont doesn't really have anything. Actually, we just...our Victoria Community Centre, which will be their main community centre, is shut down because the building was an old trailer and a class. We're trying to rejig it now. Like, there isn't a lot of amenities for these people to be able to use. So, Councillor Lukes has talked about we can't keep developing neighbourhoods without the proper amenities. Well, this one doesn't have the proper amenities. The community…if you're going to use Beaumont's community centre, it's not even there. You want to use field space in Beaumont neighbourhood, there really isn't any. They're very small, it's a very small neighbourhood. So again, you know, we talk about this and that, I am happy about the cap. I was very concerned about the 6,000 that potentially could happen based upon the way that, you know, the Secondary Plan was kind of rolled out. So, I'm very happy to see that cap on it. But again, I still say, when we actually talk about the dog leg, as Councillor Mayes has pointed out, and it was actually quoted in that report that we would support medium density. (inaudible) that's what was said when the land was happening. Again, this was one of the land exchanges. So, this was back in the days of past I call them. But we're here today. So, after gruelling years of this, and I tell you, it's not just myself that is feeling beaten on. I'm sure many people have. It's been a very difficult file. Why so? Well, I believe the developer is really trying to get, which is his right, the most development breaks he can have. And that's fine. I don't know any developer who doesn't want that. Again, but we also have to do city planning. We have to ask ourselves, do we want streets with no sidewalks on them? Do we want driveways with just one long rows of concrete driveways are going in front? No place for a tree. It's just going to be concrete. I think that will look not too nice. Do we want to have a single-family house where you bought your home and all of a sudden you go, hey, why is this apartment block starting up next door to me? Or an industrial plant? Well, because that was allowed. In the way that they wanted to have that nimbleness to be able to redo assessments…zoning. Again, this amendment does help cap that idea. Again, it doesn't help with the fact that we have to do density around the station. This amendment doesn't address that, but okay. I believe the developer and the markets will drive that to make that happen. That people are going to want to have more density around the station. But again, we don't have any guarantees. Again, that's not it here. So again, I look at the PDO, and I know we're all tired. I am probably the most tired of this file. It has been many, many sleepless times trying to figure this out. The reports are massive. We've all…it's been years of this. So, as a City Councillor or human being, I should just say, I'm done. Close enough. We're out of here. Close enough. And I would love to say that, but I can't. I don't believe we're close enough. I believe the City by accepting this even with the amendments, we're taking on a large amount of risk going forward. Risk not only for the City and costs, also for those people who are going to buy those homes in those areas. A lot of risk for those people now. Unimproved gravel parking lots, they were still okay in here the last time I read it. Maybe it's been changed too. So, there's very significant issues that are still remaining in here even with the amendments. So therefore, I won't be supporting.

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

Councillor Orlikow: So, I'll have more to say…and again, this is so confusing, as we saw this morning where I was quite amazed. When you talk about a Secondary Plan are you actually talking about the Secondary Plan, or are you talking about the PDO, or the Subdivision? You know, we look at these amendments today, they are kind of similar for both. So, that was just the way it was. That's the way it is. I know our Development Procedural Guidelines in the future will make sure that, you know, as Councillor Wyatt and I used to chuckle a little bit about when we go through a process and we see the little changes that need to be done to improve the process. Well, this difficult process has allowed the City, through the development guidelines, to actually shore up some of those areas so in the future, we'll have more clarity for the developer and for council going forward. So, that is on the back side of this. But at the end of the day, do I believe that we should do TOD development on this site? Absolutely. Not even a question. Do I believe this proposal…Secondary Plan is ready to go? No, I do not. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close on the amending motion?

Mayor Bowman: No, I'm good. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy, your opportunity to close.

Councillor Gilroy: No, I think I'm good too, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question on amending Motion No. 8. All in favour? Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Orlikow, Rollins.

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

Madam Speaker: Amending Motion 8 passes. And now to the main item, Item 1, as amended. Did I hear something over here? Pardon me? We were just on No. 8. I'll call the question on Item 1, as amended. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Orlikow, Rollins.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk Item 1 passes. Onto Item 2, Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 – Subdivision and Rezoning – Parker Lands (Northeast corner of Hurst Way between Asquith Avenue and the CN Railway) – DASZ 12/2018

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

Councillor Gilroy: I'll wait to hear from my councillor colleagues. There's been lots of discussion on this already, so.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, amending Motion No. 9, corresponding with this item.

Motion No. 9
Moved by His Worship Mayor Bowman,
Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,

WHEREAS on November 16, 2020 in their presentation at the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development the applicant stated "This site has sidewalks on every street; if a pedestrian is on a street he is able to find a sidewalk on that street to walk down.";

AND WHEREAS rail safety is critical to any development adjacent to rail corridors and both rail companies and FCM have provided leadership on rail safety best practices, and on November 16, 2020 in their presentation at the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development the applicant stated "There is a guideline that FCM put out … the Team's understanding is that we have followed the FCM guidelines.";

AND WHEREAS on November 16, 2020 in the applicant's submission to Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development the applicant clearly confirmed their density intent from previous communications as "The maximum residential density for the entire Planned Area of PDO-2 PARKER LANDS shall be 1,920 dwelling units", and subsequently reduced this density to "1,918 dwelling units"; and at 1,918 this plan falls within the bottom end of the applicant's desired Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Zone and just above the top end of the

public service's desired TOD Zone. Furthermore on November 16, 2020 in their presentation at the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development the applicant stated "Our net [density] is something in the fifty (50) something it's not even sixty (60) units per acre";

AND WHEREAS according to the zoning application "The purpose of this [PDO-2 PARKER LANDS] overlay is to support the redevelopment of the planned area as a 'Major Redevelopment Site' in a manner consistent with Parker Lands Secondary Plan and Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Principles as an 'Urban Neighbourhood' with an underlying TOD Zone.";

AND WHEREAS the TOD Zone "Urban Neighbourhood" allows for the development of Residential, Retail and Class B Commercial use;

AND WHEREAS on November 18, 2020 in their presentation at Executive Policy Committee, when asked about having a street design that accommodated school bus turning radius the applicant stated "… we would be amendable to add that as a policy, if that was the concern of the school board and the public service feels it's important to put it in we would certainly be amenable to that.";

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 2 of Report 'B' of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development report dated November 16, 2020, be amended by deleting Recommendations 1 and 2 and replacing with the following:

1. *That the subdivision under Development Application No. DASZ 12/2018 be approved for preparation as a plan of subdivision (the "Plan") by a Manitoba Land Surveyor in accordance with the map dated November 16, 2020 and attached as Schedule "A" to the report of the Winnipeg Public Service dated November 2, 2020, with such minor changes as may be required, and registration in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office, subject to the following conditions:*

    A. *That the developer enter into a Development Agreement with the City pursuant to subsection 259(1) of The City of Winnipeg Charter in accordance with the report of the Administrative Coordinating Group dated October 28, 2020 and attached as Schedule "B" to this report, with the following amendments:*

        i. *Under Section C – Agreement Conditions, I – Servicing Conditions:*

            a. *Under Condition 6 "Pavement" add the following new condition:*

                "c) The Developer shall design all streets to ensure appropriate turning radius to accommodate Winnipeg School Division buses, as determined by and to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works."

            b. *Under Condition 8 a) "Multi-use Pathways/Sidewalks", add the words ", and subject to the approval and determination of location and requirements by the City Centre Community Committee" immediately after "as determined by and to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works".*

    B. *That the City enter into, execute and deliver with the Developer a Development Agreement in accordance with Recommendation 1; 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").*

    C. *That authority be delegated to the City's Director of Planning, Property and Development (the "Director") to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of the Development Agreement and any Ancillary Agreements in accordance with this report and such other terms and conditions determined necessary by the City Solicitor/Director of Legal Services to protect the interests of the City*

2. *That the Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 200/2006 be amended by rezoning the subject land to a "TOD PDO-2 Parker Lands" – Transit Oriented Development District, as shown on the map dated November 16, 2020 and attached as Schedule "A" to this report, subject to the following:*

    A. *That the developer enter into, a Zoning Agreement with the City of Winnipeg pursuant to Subsection 240(1) of The City of Winnipeg Charter in accordance with the following:*

i. That prior to development, the applicant be required to submit a final rail mitigation plan protecting the proposed adjacent residential development in alignment with the FCM Guidelines or endorsed by CN, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Property and Development.

ii. That the maximum density shall not exceed 1,918 dwelling units.

3. That this matter will be deemed to be concluded and all approvals in connection with this matter will expire if a by-law to implement this report (the "By-law") is not enacted within 2 years after the date on which this report is approved by Council unless the developer applies for an extension of time before the expiration of the 2 year period and Council approves the extension.

4. That upon instruction from the Director of Planning, Property and Development, the Director of Legal Services/City Solicitor prepare and bring it directly to Council for enactment the By-law in accordance with the above.

5. That the subdivision section of the By-law will come into force when the Development Agreement is fully executed and/or the Plan is registered in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office.

6. That the zoning section of the By-law will come into force when the Plan is registered in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office.

7. That the By-law will be repealed without coming into force 1 year after the date it is enacted if the Plan is not registered in accordance with recommendation 5 unless the developer applies for an extension of time before the expiration of the 1 year period and Council approves the extension.

8. That this matter will be deemed to be concluded and all approvals in connection with this matter will expire if the necessary Plan approval signatures on behalf of the City have not been secured within 1 year after the date on which the By-law is enacted unless the developer applies for an extension of time before the expiration of the 1 year period and Council approves the extension.

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

Mayor Bowman: I'll follow Councillor Gilroy's lead and I'll wait to hear from Council colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any speakers for this item? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. You know, I was one of the committee members that sat through nine hours of discussion on this file. Not anywhere near number of years Councillor Orlikow has. But I did have the opportunity to have nine hours worth of questioning with some of my colleagues. And, you know, sure, we could go on for days speaking on this. I, too, believe it's time to move forward. I appreciate the amendments that the Mayor has made. And I just want to seek clarity on something. It's great that we get these, you know, three page, four page, whatever motions the day of. But I do have a question, and I'm not clear on point one when it speaks to attached Schedule A. I do not see a Schedule A at all. And I just wanted clarity, the Subdivision under development application lists the number be approved for preparation as the plan of Subdivision by Manitoba Land Survey and is in accordance with the map dated November 16th and attached as Schedule A. I see no Schedule A. I just want clarity from the Mayor on what he's speaking on or from someone on what Schedule A is. What map specifically we're speaking to. I don't know if that's possible. I would hope so on one of the largest transit-oriented developments that we're doing and this amending motion the day of Council, I hope that we can get some clarity on that.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I've had the pleasure in my two years of really working through transportation-oriented development and the pain. I agree with most of the comments that Councillor Orlikow made about how important it is to get the details right especially with respect to transportation-oriented development. It was the women, actually, of Lord Roberts who had experienced really concerning sexual assaults and really concerning crime and safety opposite transportation-oriented development that brings me to the vote today, because you have to get those details right. In particular in transportation-oriented development where the…if you get it wrong, there's some well documented crime unfortunately that results. I don't…I understand the water under the bridge. I understand that there is some content and policies missing. I understand, in fact, that there needs to be political intervention as we see here. This is, in my

opinion, a very unusual motion. Quite detailed whereas' that are relying on quotations and unfortunately, I'm not comfortable with that. And I'm not comfortable because of the experience of Lord Roberts residents, the Fort Rouge and Osborne Village. So much so that I have asked and worked with Councillor Gilroy to bring in Jay Pitter from Toronto to support our City Planning staff on projects including transportation-oriented development issues that I've experienced because I haven't found the support within the department. There's a story here of a fairly unusual briefings. And that story perhaps is not for today, but it is a concerning one. And the ever changing public servants on this file before committees is of concern. Again, not for today. But it is those other projects, the transportation-oriented development projects, including the ones that I've supported and are really excited about. And this is not that, Madam Speaker. So, with that, I'll sit down but I won't be supporting it today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Any further speakers? Seeing none. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. And I apologize that it is...this idea, we usually do Secondary Plans and our PDOs and whatnot together and so it's easier to speak. So, this is trying to separate what a Secondary Plan's role is and the Subdivision is. So, again, I went through the documents to try to sidle them from each other, but it wasn't that easy. So, the reasons why, again, in the PDO which raises some concerns. And some of the concerns have been addressed. Specifically, the guidelines. The idea of having a ditch and a little fence as your safety barrier was absolutely a terrible idea. Again, so, these amendments, even though I'm not going to support them, again, because I think it has to be in a wholesome discussion, not just these one offs. For example, we know there is no connectivity. They talk about it, they try to pretend that Grant Park's Festivals is like right next door. Not pretend, but they showed error. But the fact of the matter is, CN is actually going to be building a third line in there. We had that issue when I was meeting quite extensively with an artist in regarding the Waverley underpass. They are going to be making it a little bit wider. But regardless, you're not allowed to cross there. You have to go around. And again, they have a beautiful bike lane that we paid for to do that. And it's very...it's wonderful. But it is not just next door…the retail. You have to go through Beaumont, all that neighbourhood. And yes, you go out to McGillivray and there's a Safeway there. So, that's…but again, why do I say that? Because that means this is not going to be a walkable place unless you want to get on the bus. But if you want to do anything else, because again, it says the services…there won't be enough density in the area to accommodate a whole new retail sector. It says that in the report. You're going to have to…you're going to have to drive. But not only that, we're going to reduce the parking to .75. We're going to have streets that are just one long driveway. Where are they going to park? So, there's going to be some parking issues. .75 is very low. Even in the Planner's report, they're not sure why that's even considered. We also have, again, the park space. There's no park space within this thing. There's a couple of little small parks which are nice. The connectivity, they try to do it. But again, they're...as the Planner's report says, we need a central place that's large enough for people to kick a ball around, throw a frisbee. And no, you can't do that in it the dog park and no, you can't do that in the rail line…the Hydro corridor. Is it connected to Beaumont as they try to say? No, it's influenced…Beaumont influences, but no, it isn't that easy to get to Beaumont either. So, again, you are land locked. Again, I go back, is this really TOD? Not if you're so land locked and you have to use your car to get out there. You know, maybe some people take the bus. Is it the, as the Urban Neighborhood Center says, it's the first ring from downtown? No, it's not. But again, that's what they wanted and I say, no, you should get the medium density as was told that land we would agree to way back in the day. So, you should get that. And again, there's also the issue about the use categories. When you have the larger one, you have much…the commercial usages goes way up. You can have office towers, a whole bunch of things that would be appropriate to something closer downtown. But again, because we're saying, oh, it's only about density, then that's all we really care about, but there's also the use of what they can actually put into these commercial…into the area. Is a huge entertainment complex that's land locked between Beaumont and a railway track an appropriate thing? No, it's not. But it could be allowed because we are allowing that through this process here. Let's hear a funnel of points I find in here. And the last one is, we don't really have an assurance that the highest density is going to be around the TOD station. We mentioned that before. I thought that was a very simple thing. Again, the Mayor has mentioned that they had said they are willing to do that. But again, they haven't put pen to paper. So, one person said the really one of the most apropos things I've ever heard about this whole thing is, the car looks great. It does, but you know what? Check under the hood. Check under the hood. Because you know what really matters in this whole game right now? It's not a game, it's a serious issue, is the PDO. Is the Subdivision. That's what really matters here. Because that's where the legal teeth are. Secondary Plan is not statutory. So, this one really is the document we're voting on today, in my opinion. Again, I will be very…regardless of the outcome today, which I think I pretty well got, I absolutely will try my best to work through with the developer and the neighbourhood to make sure that development goes forward as smoothly as possible. But I still have very strong concerns. I don't want to be coming back here, and I won't, because I never do that. We are Council, we make a decision and that's about it and we have to be supportive. But inside my heart, I hope I'm not saying I told you so. I really am. I hope we can…the history doesn't show it so far to me, but we can just sort of say, okay, we'll be okay, we'll trust you. It's not about trust. Again, it's not about individuals and personalities. So, to me, people always think it's something personal. It's not personal. My job here and our job here is to make sure the development is in keeping with the character of the adjoining neighborhood, it is not. To make sure that the built form is appropriate for where it is, this one is not. And it's to make sure that things such as, you can have secondary suites on multi-unit buildings. Our by-laws don't allow that, but in the proposal, it says we can do that. I've been told that that won't happen because our by-laws override, I'm not too

sure. Why is it even in there? So, the idea of having…and again, I'm going back to even have a dry ditch being clarified as green space, that's just ludicrous. So, will all retention ponds now be considered…we'll consider that green space? No, this is water storage. We built a big pond that they are able to use. But we're now going to take this dry ditch and call that green space. That's sad. That's why they're…hey kids, why don't you go out in the dry ditch and play for a while. You know, right by the train with that little low fence there. It will be fun. No, that's not how it works. So, this development that they've proposed, I understand the theory and the vision. Very lovely. But look under the hood. There's some real, real problems and the planners have tried their best to explain it to us. And yes, the developer may not agree with it. But again, I'm very proud of our planners who have stuck the course to the policies that we created. We created these TOD policies. And they are trying to make sure that those TOD policies are adhered to. And yes, we can change that. But again, they are doing their job. So again, they could have easily, easily just sort of said, I'm done. But these are professionals that are giving us their best opinion. And again, some of the concerns that they have raised are very alarming because the proposal is just not ready yet. So again, it's not about killing this one. I would love this to be gone and moving forward today, which it probably will be. However, I would prefer to do it right now than find out later on that we made a huge amount of mistakes, but by then, it's just too late. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a few words. First of all, I want to commend Councillors Rollins and Orlikow for standing their ground in the face of being…in the face of a large majority voting against them. In that respect, I don't feel alone today because I do that maybe more often than anybody else in the last six years. Now, it's not the easiest thing to vote on your own like that. But what's harder, is to be able to explain your position. Especially when it comes to something as important as this and heavy as this. And in particular, Councillor Orlikow, given how much…how long this one has been going on. And so, I do…although, I won't be voting with Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Rollins, (inaudible) negates sort of what I'm saying. It's just that the debate's really important and the explanation. So, I really respect the insights given here because Councillor Orlikow says, you know, we have to move on and he hopes he doesn't have to say he, you know, he told us so. Happens to be, you know, we might not be around city hall when we find that out. I hope one day Councillor Orlikow can phone me up or I'll phone him up one day in the future and he can let me know…he can let us know if he told us so. Because in the end we still have to learn from these histories. Hopefully there will still be something to learn from it. Why do I say that? Because it's impossible to deal with the fundamentals and what we deal with here at city hall in a merely a three or five year loop. Let's face it. And so, actually, we learn from longer term things here. We learn from our elders. We will learn from those who came before, and that's a fact. You just won't learn things from city hall if you think you're just going to do it in a three-year or five-year loop. You won't understand anything fundamentally at that rate. That is why I bring up when it comes to let's say, Portage Place, I bring up the eighties when it started, when they created Portage Place in the beginning. How they planned it out for the future. Then we understand. That's why I bring about…I brother to mention one of the fundamentals of how much money we're putting into affordable housing and how much we used to right here in the city. Because it gives us true perspective on what's happening today. If you're just comparing yourself in a three-year loop in terms of what we're doing for affordable housing, we won't understand anything about affordable housing. So, Councillor Orlikow, I do look forward one day to learn from this, I hope you're wrong. But you just might not be. And I hope we learn from this because that's how we learn. It is from…if you want to call it a historical perspective, I don't know. We learn from that which we did before. And if it takes a number of years to figure that out, that's the lessons learned. That's how we progress as a society. And so, I do actually look forward to that day, Councillor Orlikow, where we can have that discussion in the future and we will learn from this one way or the other. Thank you.

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

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Gilroy and the Mayor for trying to make an amendment to the Rezoning and...sorry, I'm not getting the right word here, but the Rezoning plan. I actually will not be supporting this amendment. Councillor Lukes and I, we've made some recommendations during the public hearing and some of them are not in this recommendation…are not in this amending motion. Some of them where we deleted some recommendations, we changed 8%, replaced with 10%. So, some of those comments that Councillor Lukes and I had worked through are not in this amending motion. So, I actually would not be supporting an amending motion at this time. I will encourage councillors to really revisit what the standing committee had recommended and go more on a side-by-side and kind of look at that (inaudible). And unfortunately, there's a lot of things missing from the recommendations that came from the hearing. And again, reiterating some of the FCM guidelines. We already support it in the Secondary Plan. So, I don't think it's necessary to reiterate it again in the Subdivision. So, I wish we had more time because I think some of the recommendations here are worthy. But, kind of, you know, we're working off the cuff right here. And just, unfortunately, I will not be supporting the amending motion and would like to support what the hearing…what we did at the hearing. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Santos. Any further speakers? Seeing none…Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I just have to rise and speak to this. I really would like this development to go ahead. We're currently debating the DASZ which is going to be in law. And the expected development standards are incorporated into this. I think that Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Santos raise some very important points. I would have preferred, myself, to have a Secondary Plan in by-law as well as we've done over in the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee area, Madam Chairperson. But it seems a judge doesn't seem to agree with that. So, whatever. It is good practice. But so, in terms of this by-law, and there are some good amendments here. But, you know, this land lock thing and it's interesting. You know, I understand the green space issue is not there. And I know that this developer in the past is not too open to a lot of green space in other developments that have happened over the years. The…so, for me, it's just difficult. I really do support the amendments. But if Councillor Santos believes there was essential amendments required, I don't know if it can be added to what was in amendment 9. We're only allowed two motions. Anyway, the whole Procedures By-law kind of throws us off now because of how the past practices caused a problem as Councillor Schreyer had raised in his first term in regards to the thing about amending…it was two amendments to an amendment if you read it properly. But apparently, it wasn't interpreted that way in the past. So, it is a problem. I think that Councillor Orlikow really does present a real serious issue in that in order to undertake and do one's job as a councillor representing not just this new TOD development, but having to represent the neighborhood of the Beaumont neighbourhood. Which, last time I took a tour through there, the roads are in awful shape. Hopefully we've been fixing those when we raise it. So, I would…anyway, I'm going to support the amendments to the by-law and I'll have to see if I want to support the whole report if it doesn't contain what I believe Councillor Santos believes is a very important point to be made in there. So, I'll leave it at that. Oh, and the secondary policy, like…anyway. That's why it should be in there to deal with…it should be part of a by-law that moves forward. And, you know what, if this zoning DASZ doesn't pass, you know, I don't believe there's any development because the Secondary Plan is just a policy. It's not a by-law. And, you know, people have to work at changing the policy. But as Councillor Mayes has definitely expressed and we've seen in The Forks with its Secondary Plan policy, it's pretty easy to change. The by-law, this DASZ is not going to be easy to change. And I'm really concerned about this land locked situation that can turn out happening. And I know that in presentations what the developer here, they want what they want. Once they get what they get, they are going to operate just on that. I am sure. So, anyway, that's all I have to say on the issue.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor close on the amending motion.

Mayor Bowman: Sure. Thanks, Madam Speaker. I want to thank my Council colleagues. Councillor Orlikow raised a number of good points and I know they're cautionary notes which, I too, share. And obviously what I'm trying to do with this amending motion, it was pretty clear to me in the lead up to this vote today that there were very strong, different views on the part of Council. I supported the administrative report's recommendations up to today. And what's happening today is, I think, is folks putting a little bit of water in their wine and making sure that there's certain parameters for this development to proceed that had it not been for this amendment, wouldn't…simply wouldn't be there. I appreciate and I respect the concerns that Councillor Orlikow and others have raised here today as well. And I certainly am hoping that these amendments supported by Councillor Gilroy, whose efforts I continue to appreciate, can help us move forward in a way that provides greater parameters for this development than would otherwise be there had it not been for this amendment. So, Councillor Lukes had questioned where this Schedule A is, it's referenced in the first 'therefore it be resolved'. That the Subdivision…and I'll just read the motion; It speaks to, "That the Subdivision under development application number DAZ 12/2018 be approved for preparation as a planned Subdivision by the Manitoba Land Surveyor in accordance with the map dated November 16th, 2020 and attached to as Schedule A." It is…my understanding is, it's page 39 of the report. A copy has been provided to Councillor Lukes and myself from our Clerks. I do appreciate that clarity. With that, I'm hoping Council can support the amendments and we can proceed with getting this development finally off and being built in support of our transit-oriented development. I know all members of Council want to support transit-oriented development notwithstanding the concerns that have been raised today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Gilroy, your opportunity to close.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I concur with Councillor Orlikow's concerns and I've raised them throughout the different committee processes both at standing policy committee and at EPC. But hearing my colleagues, I knew that the writing was on the wall. And I know that it's important that we have some information in the document outlining what we really want and that they aren't permitted to create more units than we want them to. Because I think that is a real concern that Councillor Orlikow's raising regarding the land lock. You know, there is only a few ways to get in an out of that community. And with people having to go to commercial shopping outside, they are going to have to go through the different communities and not shopping within that community. So, it is going to be different. And so, he raises really valid concerns. I'm hoping that what we're doing here today is mitigating some of that. I wish we weren't in this situation. And I know moving forward we have a, you know, more of a secure policy to ensure that when things come forward through our system we have a proper mechanism of dealing with them, but this is what's been done through the courts. So, we are managing with what's in front of us. And I will be...and I hope everyone supports this because I think it is trying to piece together what I think some of what the administration was missing. And trying to get this development to

happen which we all know is going to be…once it's done, add more density into our community, into our city. So, I hope you all support this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. With that, I'll call the question on amending Motion No. 9. It's a call for a recorded vote. All in favour of amending Motion 9, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Orlikow, Rollins and Santos.

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

Madam Speaker: Amending Motion 9 passes. And now, the main Item 2, as amended. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Councillor Rollins, Councillor Orlikow noted in opposition. And Councillor Santos. That is carried. We have no motions under this committee. No by-laws, or pardon me, there are by laws, yes. Councillor Gilroy.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, Madam Speaker, sorry. Move By-law 20/2020 be read as a second time.

Madam Speaker: Is that 109/2020?

Councillor Gilroy: Sorry, 109/2020.

Madam Speaker: And that's a first time. Pardon? Second time, sorry. Oh yes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 20/2020.

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move that By-law No. 20/2020 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Gilroy.

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

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law 109/2020, By-law 110/2020, and By-law No. 111/2020.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 109/2020, By-law No. 110/2020, and By-law No. 111/2020.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move that By-law No. 109/2020 to By-law No. 111/2020, both be inclusive, be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 109/2020 to 111/2020, both inclusive.

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 109/2020 to By-law No. 111/2020, both inclusive, 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. Are there any questions for Councillor Gilroy under this committee? Seeing none, next committee, Councillor Eadie, will you take the Chair?

Deputy Speaker: Yes, I will. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you, Mr. Deputy.

Deputy Speaker: Sorry, I just have to get down to it.

Councillor Sharma: It's the Governance Committee of Council.

Deputy Speaker: Yeah, Governance Committee of Council and we have Reports 1.

REPORT OF THE
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED SEPTEMBER 23, 2020

Councillor Sharma: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'd like to move adoption of the content agenda Item 1.

Deputy Speaker: Alright. Nobody wants to speak to it? So, I'll call to question. All those in favour? Is anybody…all those opposed? Nobody is opposed, that is carried.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you.

Deputy Speaker: Would you like to move adjournment?

Madam Speaker: I'll take the Chair back. Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: Would you? Oh, I thought maybe you wanted to move adjournment.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I'd like to move consent of adjournment and wish Councillor Nason a happy birthday.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty, for that. We certainly wish you a very happy birthday, Councillor Nason. Thank you. It's been a long day. Thank you for a great meeting. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, roll call.

Council adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

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.