COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, May 27, 2021

The Council met at 9:35 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Gilroy.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. We'll move on to morning announcements momentarily. To our Deputy Speaker, on behalf of Council, we wish you a happy birthday today, Councillor Eadie. Thank you. Mr. Mayor, on to you for your morning announcements. Thank you.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I echo happy birthday to Councillor Eadie on his 29th birthday. It's a pleasure to be here amongst colleagues to wish him a very happy birthday. Madam Speaker, I want to begin by offering condolences to the family and friends of Elder Theodore Fontaine. The former Chief of Sagkeeng First Nation and a survivor of Fort Alexander and Assiniboia Indian residential schools. Ted was brave. He also was...we have a family connection. He...I bumped into him a few years ago at a city hall event and he referred to my dad as big Al. He grew up with my dad who grew up in an adjacent community near Pine Falls. And Ted will be missed by many in our community, including members of this council. Madam Speaker, over the last month, since April 26th to today or yesterday I should say, May 26th, Winnipeg saw 8,371 new COVID cases. Sadly, in the last month, we have lost 31 of our residents and our test positivity has increased from 8.2 to 15 or over 15 over the last 30 days. I want to just take this opportunity to remind Winnipeggers, continue to follow the public health orders. Continue to do what you can to demonstrate the kindness and the compassion that our community is known for. And I want to also, of course, thank our health care heroes in our ICU units and throughout our health care system for their ongoing life saving work which we know they are under tremendous stress right now. I had the opportunity to speak with our Prime Minister recently about the dire situation in our province and in our city. I would like to thank him for his accessibility. Among other things, we discussed the availability of federal assistance to our province, should the Provincial Government request it, Madam Speaker. And I understand that request has recently been made, which I certainly appreciate it and I know our residents appreciate that collaboration and efforts between our Provincial and Federal Governments. It's Paramedic Services Week. I would like to make specific mention of the incredible work done by our paramedic service personnel. They do incredibly important work. Our province is experiencing a third wave of COVID-19 and it's fitting that in this month Winnipeggers recognize the incredible work of our essential workers with awareness days and weeks such as International Nurses Day, Indigenous Nurses Day, Emergency Preparedness Week, National Physicians Day, International Firefighters Day, National Police Week, Family Doctor's Day, National Hospice and Palliative Care Week, National Mental Health Week and International Day of the Midwife. Thank you not only for this month, but also, of course, throughout the year to all of these amazing individuals. This month we also raised awareness in acknowledging National Mental Health Week and Child and Youth Mental Health Day. Each of us have experienced or know someone who has experienced some form of mental illness and during the past 15 months, mental health awareness has increased even more as people in our community are navigating the effects of COVID-19. It's important that our residents remember it's okay not to be okay, and to please ask for help. This month in close, Madam Speaker, Winnipeggers also recognize the Day of Remembrance and Honour for Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls, Vesak: the Day of The Full Moon, World Red Cross Day, International Day Against Homophobia, Trans-Phobia and Bi-Phobia, National Missing Children's Day, Asian Heritage Month, Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month, National Celiac Month and Brain Tumour Awareness Month. And to close, I just want to offer heartfelt congratulations on behalf of all Jets fans for the series sweep to our Winnipeg Jets and thank everybody for watching and celebrating in a responsible way, of course, physically distanced, of course. This was redemption from the 1990s or 1980s and the last series, of course, in 1990, Madam Speaker. And I want to just offer congratulations and thanks to the players and the organization and looking forward to round 2 whether it's against the Habs or the Toronto Maple Leafs. Thank you, Madam Speaker

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise today to speak a little bit about hate and against hate. Unfortunately, members of our Jewish committee…community are seeing a rise in anti-Semitism yet again. And just a few weekends ago on the streets of Winnipeg, we saw tensions and frustrations between members of our community that led to hateful comments, and in some cases, violence from both parties. Like me, I know you do not want to see the same violence happening in other countries, brought to our streets or grow in Canada. I understand that heritage and religious beliefs are important to individuals, but we must remember that we are also Canadians. Canadians united as a respectful and peaceful nation. People who have freedoms that many countries will never experience, but those freedoms also come with responsibility; to treat each other as equals and to respect each other's beliefs no matter what they may be. We are the home of the world's...of the world's Human Rights Museum. Hate speech and violence have no place in our community. In Winnipeg, we celebrate being different from each other and I ask all residents and my colleagues to remember, Winnipeg is the strength of one with the power of many. Let's embrace our differences. Let's treat everyone equally. That's what makes this a great city and a great country. I also want to thank the over 60 percent of Manitobans and Winnipeggers who have taken the time to be vaccinated. This is a big step towards ending the pandemic and it's a doorway to normalcy. So, I would urge all Winnipeggers to get vaccinated as soon as they can and to make sure you sign up for your second vaccination. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Councillor Chambers

Councillor Chambers: Good morning, Madam Speaker, His Worship. Today I rise to thank all front-line and essential workers who have been working tirelessly through…to keep our community safe. Our grocers, our pharmacists, teachers, police officers, firefighters, emergency medical responders and all health care professionals, as always, thank you for your continued efforts. In acknowledging the efforts of our front-line workers, I would like to give special thanks to our early childhood educators. Of course, April 25th to May 1st was Early Childhood Educators Week and I would be remiss if I did not take the opportunity to thank all of our ECEs who have been providing some semblance of normalcy to our infants, our toddlers and preschoolers on a daily basis. Your commitment has allowed other essential workers with child care needs the ability to attend to their essential jobs with focus knowing that their precious little ones are receiving the very best care available. Through their collaborative approach with school divisions and other levels of government including provincial and federal, and as they continue to partner with early learning and child care educational stakeholder groups, along with parents, they provide appropriate programming and services that help to prepare children for successful school entry and learning in the early years of their lives. As we are in the third wave of this pandemic, early childhood educators have faced many challenges in providing this valued education during these unprecedented times. For their tremendous effort in making a difference in the lives of families and ensuring children are receiving an education and remaining safe and well cared for, I want to thank you for all of your efforts. On behalf of the City of Winnipeg and us here today in this council chamber, I'm wishing you the very best in your continued...as you continue to provide exemplary service to our children. Please be safe and take care. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Going remote, Councillor Santos, your morning announcement

Councillor Santos: Good morning. I would like to take this moment to acknowledge and thank all the incredible organizations in Winnipeg and Manitoba who have shone a light to celebrate Asian Heritage Month. During these difficult times, I am proud to have had this entire month to celebrate, learn and share more of our Asian stories. Now more than ever, it is important that we stand up and take this space for ourselves. We matter, our stories matter, especially our heritage. I hope that every Asian Canadian feels seen and valued, not only this month, but every day. Sharing our stories brings us together, fosters empathy and encourages more understanding in our society. I love who I am. I owe…my own lived experience inspires me to speak up and advocate for change to represent the needs of our diverse city. Earlier this month, I had an amazing opportunity to share my own personal story to a classroom full of young women at the St. Mary's Academy. St. Mary's Academy hosted a variety of events all month long covering all facets of Asian culture; historical stories, reading Asian literature and the exploration of Asian visual arts, music and dance. I was truly inspired. Asia is a large, rich continent. There was so much to explore. I was inspired by these connections with our young Asian community, their curiosity and pride to hold space and celebrate Asian culture was not my experience as a young person. I truly enjoy the opportunity to connect to my own culture and learn more about other Asian cultures. Our collective power begins with sharing our stories, lifting each other up and continuing to speak up and hold people accountable against racism. More specifically, the Stop Asian Hate Campaign. It pains me to continue to see COVID-19 be referred to as the Chinese virus. Xenophobia has no place in our society and continuing to see these statements shows that we still have a lot of work to do. However, I remain inspired by our young leaders of tomorrow where ideas, empathy and energy with a future continues to inspire me. Together, we have the power to create meaningful change. Asian Heritage Month has given us much to celebrate. We must continue to shine a light on our stories. To build a progressive and inclusive city for the future, it is critical that we listen and support the diverse perspectives and experiences of all our citizens to build an equitable city for all, to be safe and supported to thrive now and into the future. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Santos.

MINUTES

Councillor Gillingham moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on April 29, 2021, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We'll now move into delegations. All of our delegations will be joining us remotely via Zoom today. First up is Mr. David Grant. Is he with us, Mr. Clerk?

DELEGATIONS

Clerk: Yes, Madam Speaker, David Grant is just entering via Zoom.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Grant will be addressing Council in opposition to seven items on the agenda this morning. From the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated May 18th, 2021: Item 4 – The Lobbyist Registry. Item 5 – Proposed Property Tax Rebate – Home-Based Composting. Item 7 – Winnipeg Metropolitan Region Draft Plan 20-50. Item 8 – The Creation of a Full-Time Investigator Position. From the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks, the report dated May 10th, 2021: Item 1 – regarding the Appointment of Weed Inspectors under the Noxious Weeds Act. Also, from the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment, the report dated May 7th, 2021: Item 1 – regarding the Request for Budget Revision for the South End Sewage Treatment Plant, Nutrient Removal/Expansion Capital Project. Also, from the report of the Governance Committee dated April 23rd, 2021: The Annual Report of the Integrity Commissioner for the period of January 1st, 2020 to December 31st, 2020. Mr. Clerk, Mr. Grant is with us? Yes. Mr. Grant joining us via telephone. You can proceed with your presentation. Mr. Grant.

Clerk: Mr. Grant, if you could unmute yourself and proceed. I can see that you are waiting.

David Grant: Hello.

Clerk: Hello Mr. Grant, you can proceed.

David Grant: I'm on Zoom.

(Unknown Speaker): Mr. Grant is on Zoom.

Clerk: He is on Zoom with audio only.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Grant, we are ready for your presentation. You may proceed.

David Grant: (inaudible)

Madam Speaker: Mr. Grant, can…

(Unknown Speaker): Give him 10 seconds.

David Grant: I am on Zoom. Let me in.

Clerk: Mr. Grant, we can hear you. You are in the room on audio only.

David Grant: I'm on Zoom. Can you let me into the room?

Clerk: If you could turn your YouTube off or pause your YouTube if you are watching live and you can proceed.

Madam Speaker: We're going to move on to the next delegation and we'll get this sorted out and come back. Mr. Clerk, maybe we can call Mr. Grant in the meantime. Our next delegation is Vicki Poirier who is also in opposition to the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks, the report dated May 10th, 2021. It's regarding the Appointment of Weed Inspectors under the Noxious Weeds Act. Mr. Clerk, we have the delegation on line?

Clerk: Yes, we have Vicki Poirier.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Clerk: And she is entering the room.

Madam Speaker: I see Mr. Grant with Vicki's name on the bottom.

Clerk: Mr. Grant.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, do we have the correct delegation with us?

David Grant: Hello? Hello? Hello?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Grant, can you hear us?

David Grant: Yes, finally. I was waiting to be admitted on Zoom and now I am.

Madam Speaker: Just give us a moment. We'll proceed with Mr. Grant's delegation at this time. Mr. Clerk, does that work in terms of your queue? Mr. Grant, I have outlined the items you are in opposition to. Go ahead and we have ten minutes on the clock for you.

David Grant: Thank you. I truly want to thank you and your Clerk for enabling my speaking here today. This could be the most important part of your day. You will hear dissent but only from me and two other mere citizens. Without hearing dissent, elected officials are in danger of stepping into traps. I remind you that our Prime Minister spoke out strongly this week in favour of dissent. I know that some of you strongly support him and I'm glad that you still allow this form of polite, reasoned dissent. I do find his rhetoric to be highly ironic, considering that he has worked as hard to suppress dissent as the leaders of Belarus. Both tend to break the law in their zeal to harm reporters and dissenters. Moving on, once upon a time I completed my studies in chemical engineering. I was on my way to a very successful career as a professional engineer and researcher. I worked at the West Windsor Sewage Treatment Plant. I published my work in advancing the science of reducing nutrient loading on our lakes and rivers. Very similar situation to where Winnipeg is today, 50 years later. That plant used ferric chloride to flocculate and remove nutrients. The good scientists at the Lake Winnipeg Foundation asked you recently to use this simple means to protect their lake. This could have been done in under a year and for less than a million. Instead you will spend a thousand times as much over many, many years. Why? We know some will get rich, but how does the lake benefit from this costly delay? You may find it very odd, the list of today's topics to which I speak, they are related. There is a theme. Lobbying; you are asked today to add four more months delay in acting against unfettered secret lobbying. Any one of us could report on this in a week and you could actually take action. Don't worry, Winnipeggers deserve transparent city government. Some of you certainly said so before you were elected. I believe that all e-mails to those at city hall should be backed up to City accounts. The text of all that is said by every lobbyist in every call and meeting with City officials should be repeated in official messages saved on City servers. Only when all such messaging is documented and backed up properly will there ever be an incentive for everyone to, "Do the right thing." Other government and corporate entities already do this, so I am in favour of enhancing and improving the lobbying registry, but against the idea of delaying it. Large corporate interests indirectly tell Council what to do. What I say here is right, but maybe futile. I get ten minutes. Each of those interests has devoted hours to lobbying you and your staff. They usually get the results they want. Many of those are engineering companies regulated by EGM. They largely fund EGM. Is anyone surprised that after nearly a hundred years of existence EGM has suddenly deleted all the rules against issuing misleading engineering reports? Corporate lobbying at EGM is well hidden, but we can all see the results. Lobbying here at city hall is mostly undocumented, but seems to be very effective. Let's cut that 120-day delay for the registry improvements down to 20 days of intense study, then act in June to make public all lobbying and influencing. I have found that when an important report is received as information it pretty much means that no one will ever mention it again much less act on it. We see those words applied to Ms. Walsh's fine report and the report about support for home composting. These should both be talked about at Council and acted on right now, not shelved. The fraud investigator could already be helping your audit folks. Delaying and watering down the name and mandate of this important job is not helping. On a lighter note, I see that you are about to name your weed team. Recall that weed laws grew uncontrollably…joke, out of the distaste some feel for the property of others. Until now, if a person did not like the look of your lawn, they were free to complain to the City. We had no weed patrol cars cruising our residential streets. My lawn always complies with the rules but even those rules are wrong. In dry months, 7-inch grass is better for the environment than 2-inch grass with frequent watering and fertilizing. You want us to not waste your water on our lawns and you tell us not to poison our lawns. How many of you actually pluck those yellow flowers from your lawn every day? We do because we don't believe in poisoning. Anyway, if you have any questions I invite them now. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Grant. Are there any questions for our delegation? Seeing none, we'll move on with Vicki Poirier.

Vicki Poirier: Hi there.

Madam Speaker: Good morning.

Vicki Poirier: The camera is not covered. I'm not sure why you can't see me but I will just go on anyway. Hello and thank you for this opportunity. Hiring people to inspect lawns is against lawn diversity. Rock gardens, grass, shrubs, bushes, statues, whatever people want is fine with me. If someone doesn't like it they can complain, then go inspect. No need to snoop if there is no complaint. Your enforcement will simply encourage more harmful poisons being used. Dandelions are good for bees. Poison is bad for bees, cats, dogs, bunnies and the environment.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Vicki, does that conclude your presentation? Hello? Vicki? Vicki, can you hear us?

Vicki Poirier: Muted. Okay. I was not muted. Where was I? Do I have to start over?

Madam Speaker: No, you can continue on where you left off.

Vicki Poirier: Where did I leave off? Okay, there. It says Zoom is unavailable to detect camera. Okay. So, poisons on the lawn also cause birds to have thinner shells which crack easier and you will find more dead hatchlings on your driveway and lawns. It's also bad for the lakes, poisons and salts harm our lakes. Dandelions are edible, they can be put in salads or make tea out of them. Bunnies eat them. Owls eat the bunnies. We need to stop the madness, stop encouraging people to poison their lawns by saying there is lawn police out there. We need to save the bees and the bunnies and the owls. This is the prairies. Long prairie grass should be an option or perhaps at least a mowing exemption for First Nations people if they want it. Forcing us all to have short, mowed, watered, perfect lawns without a dandelion is culturally and environmentally insensitive. Don't let lawn enforcement kill bees, bunnies, mice, cats, owls and the environment by the encouragement of weed killers. Stop looking for cash grabs at the expense of our environment. I mean, dandelions are good for bees. Poison we know is bad for bees, cats, dogs, bunnies and the environment. I think we're…you are on the wrong path if you are going to send out snoops around the neighbourhood to look at people's lawns. You're going to freak them out, they're going to use poison. It's just wrong. It's just the wrong path to go. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Vicki. Are there any questions for our delegation today? Seeing none, thank you for your presentation. Next, we have Mr. Braydin Huynen. He is from Dwell Design Homes Limited. He is appearing in support of Item 2 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development, the report dated May 11th, 2021. It's regarding the Sale of City-owned Property at 409 Mulvey Avenue East. Braydin, welcome. We have 10 minutes on the clock for you.

Braydin Huynen: Good morning councillors. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. As mentioned, my name is Braydin Huynen from Albatross Developments and Dwell Design Homes. I'm just going to share my screen here with you today so you can see our presentation. Perfect. Again, my name is Braydin Huynen. Again, thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Huynen, I believe at Council there are verbal presentations either in person or remotely. There is no screen sharing at this committee.

Braydin Huynen: Oh, okay. I'll…this was e-mailed out anyway, so it was provided to the Clerk beforehand. There were some relevant slides on there to show the particular boundaries so is there any opportunity to present those today?

Madam Speaker: They could be e-mailed to the Clerk and they will be circulated.

Braydin Huynen: Okay.

Madam Speaker: They have been circulated actually. They have been already.

Braydin Huynen: Okay, so you have the slide presentation in front of you today. I'll pull it up on my own here just to go through it with you. So, to start the meeting, I'm not here really to speak to the details of our proposed development, that was well documented in our RFP response, the administrative report and the presentation I made during last week's EPC meeting. Today I am here to discuss the co-existence of infill development and park space at 409 Mulvey Avenue East. Examples of this development and co-existence can be seen throughout our country and our city. On slide 2 I have provided, you will see sort of a 3D view of the site. You can see the dotted black line represents the parcels as it sits today. The red portion you see is the proposed site that we are looking to acquire and to be subdivided by us from the existing site. We believe a more focused effort can be made between a collaborative process between developers like ourselves and the City of Winnipeg. As an infill developer, we do share some of the same goals of the city…as the City and Council. And we really want to stress the fact that we are not here to...we are not trying to take away parkland or green space from the city's public. Our vision is to enhance it. As mentioned previously, the site was acquired by the City in 2013, has never

acted as a park and is currently zoned M1. Additionally, similar developments throughout our country and city have a collaborative balance and co-existence of commercial mixed-use space and park space. On slide 3 you will see some examples throughout the country. Along Vancouver's sea wall, Olympic village, very well designed, mixed-use development of commercial, residential, park space. On this page as well on the left-hand side you will see a picture of a common area, a commercial patio and similar vision to what we have for the site of 409 Mulvey Avenue East. If you move on to slide 5, you'll Grey Stone Village in Ottawa. It's an infill development comprised of residential uses, steps from the river bank and the river bank pathway, again, very similar to what we see at 409 Mulvey. We do truly believe that green space and development can co-exist on this site. We are happy to accommodate certain development conditions to facilitate this co-existing. Under the proposed development subdivision, the City is to retain over two-thirds of the existing site including all river front land and an existing bicycle pathway. We also can't stress enough our willingness to contribute to the City-retained parcel by adding spaces such as off-leash dog parks and/or public gathering spaces. Furthermore, as mentioned, our proposal offers commercial component further activating and engaging the existing riverside bicycle pathway. And if I do backtrack quickly here to slide 3, again, more of an aerial view of the site. You will see the proposed development is within 300-meters, less than a 5-minute walk, to the Osborne station rapid transit. You have the existing bicycle path and the red is the parcel to be subdivided. I should also note that the size of this parcel was reduced after the Planning Department had conducted…contacted Public Works or the Parks Division, I should say. This was reduced in size to accommodate the retention of the existing bicycle path and to create a larger pathway between the subject development and the pathway. I'll now move on to slide 6. Again, a view that displays the proximity within the Osborne station. And on to slide 7. Rapid transit, again, we have recently approved a Transit Master Plan. Rapid transit has been a challenge in your city and when we're focusing on developing, however, this type of infill development has the opportunity to increase our ridership within the city's current rapid transit infrastructure and the return on the City's rapid transit investment. As illustrated below, the blue line offers a direct transit link to the University of Manitoba to allow for additional student housing opportunities. This is a 20-minute non-stop ride…or sorry, one bus ride and an additional connectivity to the city's downtown, again, to further enhance our public access. On page 8, we have illustrated some of the crime stat numbers and safety numbers related to this specific parcel. Information here was provided by crime maps on the Winnipeg website. As you can see in this specific parcel, total crimes in the area, 2019 versus 2020, rose 312 percent. If you look at that same map, the parcel immediately to the north and the parcel on the other side of Osborne to the west, have numbers even higher than the 312 percent. We believe by adding a mixed-use development in this space, we're adding residential units that act as eyes on the street. They enhance the safety and security of what currently is a hidden undeveloped parcel right now. There is a large commercial structure between Osborne and the site. There have been public comments made online, stressing issues with safety, providing...on the site itself, residents observing activities happening in the parking lot at night. And I've spoken with some of the commercial tenants in the adjacent properties and they have expressed concern leaving their place of work in the evening due to the lack of light and activity in the area. On to page 9, we have an illustration of the connectivity. So, this is, again, more of an aerial view. We see this site as a direct link to The Forks, a destination that currently doesn't exist by adding that commercial component we are connecting the site through to our Forks, a 9-minute bicycle ride, under 30 minutes walk. As mentioned, connectivity to the rapid transit, and really, we see this as a destination site. Somewhere where we can have a local brewery, a taproom that flanks our public pathway, encourages those people to use the path, bike between The Forks and this site and further activate our bicycle pathway. On to page 10, again, our RFP proposal was provided to PP&D. It was scored. In regards to our alignment with OurWinnipeg, we scored 19.98 points out of a possible 20, which I see as clear evidence that our development is in line with the City Council approved policies that guide our vision, including but not limited to OurWinnipeg, Complete Communities and our city's Climate Action Plan. Additionally, we plan to offer at a minimum 25 percent of the units to fall within the affordable housing definition as defined in Complete Communities all while also offering agent place options for local area residents and as mentioned, further student housing options. We believe that this site is an excellent opportunity for co-existence of park space and residential development. I encourage City Council to support our acquisition of this portion of 409 Mulvey Avenue East. Our vision for the location and mixed-use development was carefully thought out and numerous stakeholders were engaged throughout the process. We believe that this proposal does an amazing job balancing multifamily development, park space, all while maintaining the existing bicycle paths and creating more of a sense of community in our city. Again, I would like to thank you for your time and I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Huynen. Any questions of our delegation today? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Huynen, for your presentation. I want to note for the record that I am familiar with the work that you have done in the past and you do incredible work. And what's being proposed is incredible. I think, you know, commercial on the main level to activate and I guess you'd be working with CMHC to do the market affordable housing, you know, I think the concept is great. As you know, I am choked about the fact that it is on water front property. And I would like to ask you, have…when you were working with the department on your RFP, did the department speak to you about a greater plan for the water front, larger vision for the water front. We have a planning document, a Council approved document with concepts and ideas that you are familiar with to the water front. And I'm just wondering if the department spoke to you about that in your discussions.

Braydin Huynen: No. I sort of went…you know, our RFP response was specific to the RFP that was submitted. So, we responded directly to that. I believe...are you referring to there was a draft document regarding our water front space? Yeah, so I did read through that document. I was not aware of that, actually, until you had brought it forward. Amazing document, you know, sort of highlighting our opportunity to work within our amaze…existing water front that we have. Additionally, in there, there was mentioned...one of the pages had touched on looking at other opportunities to activate our water front space while also encouraging housing in the area based on examples that it has seen a positive change. So, in regards to the park space, no, I was not aware of that. That was brought to my attention during the SPC meeting for Property, Planning and Development. As mentioned, before you know, having this brought to our attention, we are willing to work with the City. You know, we want to develop this space. We do feel that a mixed-use project covering only really one-third...less than one-third of the property does allow for both. You can still have the park space and the development there. As it fits right now, there…as you are well aware, there is nothing on the site and since 2013 when the City acquired it, there has been no park on the site. But no, it was not brought to my attention until after submitting our RFP response.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, you know, personally I find it disappointing that the department wouldn't have written sort of that into the RFP and the importance and the vision of water front development, but that's another issue. I guess my second question is, you know, we have a downtown that we've got, I think, 20 percent of downtown property is empty parking lots, empty lots, you know, while this is in proximity to downtown, have you looked at any other locations for your proposed development in the downtown area?

Braydin Huynen: I am always looking. So, as you are aware, I strictly do infill development. It's you know, a little more challenging in our city than others, but it's where our passion lies. So, I am always looking, you know, frequently following the City websites for property being sold. So, this came up, I saw this, this was one of the opportunities, especially with the location to rapid transit, you know, and the connectivity to the U of M, I saw this as an ideal location. You know, should a property in the downtown area also pop up on the Merc system, hundred percent. You know, that is an infill opportunity that I would be equally excited about.

Councillor Lukes: And I guess my last question is, and I want to thank, actually, Councillor Rollins and Councillor Gilroy, we had some really good conversations on affordable housing, market affordability, subsidized, all of that. You know, building on the water front will provide an opportunity to create a spectacular building with a view...a million-dollar view. You have indicated 25 percent affordable. My understanding, market affordable in that area would be…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, the question?

Councillor Lukes: Yes. How much do you…how much do you perceive market affordability for a one-bedroom apartment?

Braydin Huynen: Well, as defined in Complete Communities you know, essentially, the total rent and expenses must fall within 30 percent of the gross household income. So, that's the target we are working within. CMHC Affordable has their own program, that is, essentially, irrelevant from what we're proposing. Ours is more specific to Complete Communities. The CMHC programs, both the standard and the affordable, offer longer amortization periods, larger fixed rate periods, so in turn, these rates that are available provided by CMHC today, we don't know for how long they will be available, they allow you to, again, lower your monthly expenses by these longer amortization periods and maintain consistency in your rate as you are seeing 10-year lock periods. So, we are not necessarily looking at the CMHC Affordable Housing Program option, we're staying 30 percent of gross annual household income is the amount that the rent and utilities must amount to.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, well, thank you very much and I really appreciate all your efforts on infill housing. It's a gruelling road as you and I have discussed many times.

Braydin Huynen: It is, yeah. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Seeing none, Mr. Huynen, thank you.

Councillor Allard: I've got one.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, okay.

Councillor Allard: Just to be clear, so right now, the land is zoned industrial. If this sale goes forward, the reason…just so I understand, is the rezoning of park conditional to the sale of this property or are you basically creating a park out of what is now a zoned industrial piece of land? Is that accurate?

Braydin Huynen: So, my understanding is we would be responsible for subdividing the portion that we would be acquiring, the .74-acres, and taking that through rezoning. So yes, it's zoned M1 now. Our proposal does have a conditional period of, I believe we put 120-days to ensure we can do the proper noise study, geo technical assessment and also complete a pre-application so we have the City's engagement throughout the process. So, there is a 120-day due diligence period should we enter a contract on this site.

Councillor Allard: Okay, so you are not…the sale is not subject to a rezoning to park land. So, it's subject to a subdivision where the other portion would remain in the property of the City? Is that (inaudible)

Braydin Huynen: Yeah, so the City would retain the 1.6-acres. We would subdivide off and acquire the parcel that would be used for the...essentially, we would be looking at residential mixed-use rezoning for that site. And then the other parcel would be retained by the City. And I can't speak to what would happen with the zoning of that. That would be a question better for PP&D.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard, final question.

Councillor Allard: Sounds like you would be…if this goes forward, you would be subdividing the land, rezoning for residential on your portion of the land and the other portion of the land would remain industrial land. That's my understanding from...is that your understanding?

Braydin Huynen: Yeah, I don't have a hundred percent clarity on what would happen with the City retained land or how that would be sold or what the zoning would be, but yes, we would…as per the RFP, we would be responsible for rezoning our parcel, the subdivided parcel, the .74-acres.

Councillor Allard: Okay. Thank you.

Braydin Huynen: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: At the risk of clarifying the clarification, on the zoning though…I mean, the report we have in front of us indicates, the subject City-owned property is zoned M1 but is under Park's jurisdiction. So, you are aware of that being part of our report here that it's...it…I mean, what we're being told is it's under Park's jurisdiction.

Braydin Huynen: Yeah, in my conversation with the administration, that is essentially for vacant land that becomes a default designation. So, if it's open land within the city, it falls under the Park's jurisdiction that doesn't affect the zoning. Parks...the Parks Department was involved, it's also noted in the report. They supported the sale of it after the revisions were made to decrease a portion of the property site on the south as you see it angles in near the bicycle path.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any other questions? Councillor Mayes, second question.

Councillor Mayes: It is an interesting legal point, but just as the golf courses in 2013 were deemed to require two-thirds simply to change the...to move to a longer-term lease, you are familiar with this two-thirds requirement that pertains not to land that's just zoned as park, but land that would also be considered as a de facto park or under Park's jurisdiction?

Braydin Huynen: Yes, I am aware of that. And when Mr. Kiernan had spoke you know, there was some grey area around this by the sounds of their presentation and they, of course, erred on the side of caution and proceeded with the Park's designation and the two-thirds vote. That's my understanding of the designation on the site.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions, Mr. Huynen, thank you for your delegation today.

Braydin Huynen: Thank you everybody.

Madam Speaker: Next we will hear from Ms. Shirley Forsyth who is appearing before Council in opposition to the same item we just heard from: 409 Mulvey Avenue. Mr. Clerk, is the delegation on the line? Ms. Forsyth, good morning. We've got ten minutes on the clock for you if you can unmute your mic and turn the YouTube off. Ms. Forsyth, can you hear me? If you can give a thumbs up if you can hear us. Great. Your mic was muted. Go ahead.

Shirley Forsyth: Good morning. I am just trying...we've got ten minutes on the clock, if you could unmute your mic. Oh, I thought I had, sorry.

Madam Speaker: Ms. Forsyth, if you could turn the YouTube off that's in the background.

Shirley Forsyth: Sorry, sorry.

Madam Speaker: No problem. Take a moment.

Shirley Forsyth: Is it gone? Is YouTube gone?

Madam Speaker: I believe so. Go ahead.

Shirley Forsyth: Good. Okay, good morning councillors, Mayor. I would like to speak...I mean, I have been talking about this parkland which apparently isn't considered parkland, although, I go walking around on it, I don't know what other kind of use you are supposed to be doing to parkland. So, I'm going to give my presentation even though you can't see it, you have received it. The Donald riverbank parkland is part of the visioning process as we've heard of the City's water front strategy in 2014. It is the largest parkland in Corydon-Osborne area and next door to the Osborne transit station. This is the only parkland in the corner of our city. Our community has a shortage of park space and is far below national standard for green space per person, the Donald riverbank parkland can never replaced once it is sold. Total is 5.1 hectares and we need this parkland because we don't have any other parkland. I provided an over…an aerial view of the area from 2016, prior to Winnipeg Transit coming and dumping all the gravel onto the property. As you can see we have a lot of hard surfaces and no other park and we really need this area. This is a City of Winnipeg parks and open spaces. That was the next slide. I live within 800-meters of the Osborne transit station. We've come up with a little piazza in little Italy which is .07 hectares in size and mostly hard spaces. I attended all the community meetings and focus groups on this property which was organized by The Forks and the City of Winnipeg as part of the community consultation process for the water front 20-year vision. It was lots of fun. We had BIZ groups. We had residents groups and we never discussed selling the property. Our councillor at the time said the water front strategy is the beginning of a rebirth for our water front. The strategy was passed by Council in 2014. It was referenced in the recent drafting of Winnipeg Parks Strategy. This planning document should not be ignored. There has been no meaningful discussion or consultation on the necessity of this property to Winnipeg's park system. OurWinnipeg 2045 stresses the importance of green spaces to our city's health. And the sale of this property goes against the spirit of that document. There is a rendering which hopefully you have all got to look at which shows a pie in the sky idea of what this property could look like with, you know, piazza...well, not piazza, but umbrellas and greenery and a bridge over to St. Boniface and it would be a wonderful thing if it ever happened in my life time. Next, so The Forks trail phase 2, it shows the envision...the bridge that was talked about by the City and The Forks over to St. Boniface connecting our areas and the Winnipeg transit and the walkways. In 2014, Corydon-Osborne Community Plan was passed, and we had a lot of recommendations; one…two of which pertain to this property. One was secure access to the Red River from the Osborne transit station area with any redevelopment east, enhanced connections within the area and river bank parkway system. The second was develop an open space acquisition strategy for the areas adjacent to the Osborne station. This is another aerial view and it's showing the transit station and the parkland in the back. It's the empty space where I usually wander around. When I was younger I walked on what Councillor Rollins referred to as the monkey trails, but now I have arthritis, I prefer the even, flat ground up top and it's actually really nice to wander around there and look at the river and I can't imagine what other use you would be doing with parkland. There is no mention of master plan for APRs, a biodiversity plan, dog group…dog parks, community or pollinator gardens or any dozen uses for parkland that have been discussed with the community. This is the only park space south of Corydon within 800-metres of the transit station and it needs to be protected. So, those two diagrams, one is 2014, after 10 years of community meetings, there was a Corydon plan…Corydon-Osborne plan was passed. We had a fair amount of green space in that plan. 2016, the City amended our plan, wiped out most of the park space. In it, it stated, "Parks areas between Pembina and the rapid transit corridor are now labelled as high-rise POD mixed-use policy, with a parks policy overlay." This addresses any misconception that development rights are being suppressed while still flagging the area for possible parks acquisition in the future. Again, there was no talk about sale. Certainly, there was no talk about meeting community needs. Parkland is at risk in the Corydon-Osborne area. Park 2A which is what we're talking about now, subdivision of this is a continuation of Winnipeg's move to reduce the amount of park space per person in the Corydon-Osborne area. Repeated requests for City land not to be sold, so that it can be used as park space have been denied. Recently, 145 Osborne Street was declared surplus despite community requests for more greenspace. Park 2B, (inaudible) park space owned by the City, was sold and is now going to be a parkade and not a transit park, which will increase traffic flow and contribute to urban sprawl. Then there is an aerial view, again, showing a lot of really hard spaces in the area. The Donald Riverside Park is the only greenspace. It is quiet. There is not a lot of people when you wander around there in the evening. It's the same thing do I in St. Vital Park or any other park space, I just walk around and look at things. And you can look out over the river. The Public Works Department preferred to retain the subject property as a greenspace, but confirmed probably after I don't know how much conversation, to support the sale if the redevelopment would not compromise Park's ability to maintain the riverbank plan or impede the use of the path. The needs of local residents were not taken into consideration when this decision was made by the Public Works Department and the residents of the area need to be considered. This is another aerial view. This is what the property looked like in 2016. In 2017, Winnipeg Transit received

permission to use the parkland as a temporary parking lot and gravel, huge amounts of gravel, were brought in and dumped all over. There is now lots of vegetation starting to stick through the gravel, but it should have been cleaned up. The community…Osborne community does meet the World Health Organization's guidelines for greenspace that meet the needs of its population. The sale of this parkland would rob the community of the opportunity to plan and change the riverside parkland to meet the community needs for greenspace. In OurWinnipeg...transport accounts for 27 percent of all energy used and Winnipeg has a shortage of active transportation routes. The OurWinnipeg 2045 development plan states that, "A goal of living in a sustainable city means supporting biodiversity and ecosystem health by enhancing connectivity of greenspaces and parks." Our city needs this parkland to provide a place to meet and play as well as to connect our communities and to decrease our environment footprint. And we also don't need another bar. Just received an advertisement from Lee Valley for a perennial pollinator garden and I looked at it and I just thought, that looks like the ground that we are now trying to sell. We're showing how to set up a community garden, which would be a much better use for this property. There are many uses for this property that involve the community and we are getting a lot of infill, almost every meeting they are talking about infill, but we're not talking about parks or greenspace and I really think it's time we started to do that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms. Forsyth. Any questions? Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Ms. Forsyth. And thank you very much for your enduring support for parkland and for Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry. My question is this, do you recall it ever being posted during the infamous land swap stage and can you take me back to that time? The Fairness Commissioner's report that is attached to this item on the agenda clearly doesn't indicate that anybody in the ward had an opportunity to even know what was going on through a posting. And do you recall it being posted?

Shirley Forsyth: I'm trying to think. That was 2013? I think 2013. I think I still would have been wandering through that area twice a day because I was walking my son back and forth to school. He went to Ecole Churchill. I don't recall any signs. I do know that my son at some point did a presentation for the school because we were going down and taking lots of pictures of the area, but I don't recall any posting. I don't think we knew that we could lose it.

Councillor Rollins: Second question: you know, currently it's a surface parking lot, it was graveled out, it provided additional support for Transit while it was undergoing...Transit was undergoing their repairs. It's been indicated to me, you know, it should have immediately return to parkland following this vote. You know, the question is this, you know, you recall that it was a surface parking lot, you recall when the gravel was put in, you mentioned it in your presentation. You know, the intervening time between, you know, it being a pollinator patch, for instance, and a surface parking lot, you know, is how long in your mind?

Shirley Forsyth: Well, it just happened in 2017, so that's just a couple of years ago. Up until then it was like you know, you had to go and pick out the burrs out of your clothes because there were all…like, lots of different vegetation there. I'm not a naturalist, I can't tell you how (inaudible), but it was vegetation and you definitely had to clean up when you got home because of the, you know, variety of stuff that was there. And like I said, I used to walk around it, I think that's a park use. I mean, that's all I do in St. Vital Park or other parks is I wander around. So, yes.

Councillor Rollins: I would ask a third question. Are you aware that being the councillor for Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry, you often times are home with burrs. And your children are picking…and your ward residents are picking burrs out. That's not my final question, my apologies, Madam Speaker. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Any further speakers? Okay, seeing none, we appreciate your presentation today. That concludes delegations, Mr. Clerk, correct? We'll now move into reports. First up, the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated May 18th, 2021, noting we have Motion No. 1. Motion No. 1 is an amending motion going with Item 1. And we also have amending Motion 2 before us. And that's it. Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED MAY 18, 2021

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 through 11.

Councillor Allard: I'd like to pull 2, please.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Two, yes, Councillor Allard, thank you. Councillor Eadie. Two is the Main Street project, yes, correct.

Councillor Allard: I'd like to pull that.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie? Five and seven. Any others?

Councillor Klein: Can I pull 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: Just a point of order. On…that's an extension of time, Report No. 2. Is that debatable at this point?

Madam Speaker: It is. Yes, it is. Thank you. So, I'll call the question on Item 6, just Item 6. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Item 1 has an amending motion going with it. Moved by Councillor Nason, seconded by Councillor Klein. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Accommodations at City Hall for flying the flags of Treaty One First Nations, Dakota Nations, and the Métis Nation

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, Item 1.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is following consultations with First Nations representatives, the Public Service. In addition to Métis and Inuit governments, the Public Service is recommending that three flag poles be installed in the courtyard at city hall adjacent to the existing flag. I want to thank Councillor Nason has also advocated for this, I want to acknowledge that and thank him as well as other members of Council who have been providing support for our efforts to really support our journey of reconciliation. A number of initiatives over many years in the community at the grassroots level where I think it really matters most but also here at city hall in recent years and I want to thank all members of Council and the Public Service for their efforts. I think it was important for the appropriate dialogue and due diligence to happen so that we could roll this initiative out in a positive way in partnership with respected Indigenous leaders and governments. And I'm hopeful that Council can support the report before us today and do it in a decisive way, I think, would send a very clear message. We see other levels of government, other legislative bodies, still not able to find a path to even providing the treaty acknowledgment or acknowledgment that we're in the heart of the Métis nation and we have been doing that since 2014 and it's now a formal process. It warms my heart every time Councillor Sharma, our Speaker, acknowledges at the beginning of our Council meetings and committee chairs make that acknowledgment for our other committee meetings. And this is just one additional thing that we can do to remind all of us that we are all treaty people that our journey of reconciliation is an ongoing effort that is going to take many, many years to reconcile a painful past and also to chart a future together that was initially envisioned in the treaties of peace and partnership and economic prosperity. And so, that work continues. The flags are one way in which we communicate to our residents in a very public way our respect for each other and our acknowledgment of the land that we all inhabit. Madam Speaker, should I speak now to the amending motion or will there be an opportunity at a later time?

Madam Speaker: You can speak to it now, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Sure. I'm just seeing that…this motion now for the first time, so I haven't had an opportunity to speak with my Council colleagues, but I see that...and it's unfortunate because this motion really is about our Indigenous people. And the amending motion would, if it were supported, not allow the raising of respective national flags unless there were a visiting dignitary on an official visit to city hall. Madam Speaker, I know in the coming month I'm anticipating we're going to be flying the flag of India. I know we fly respective flags of nations in which requests are made to city hall, and which we have as a nation or the Federal Government has diplomatic relations. And so, that's been happening for many years and it's one way in which we connect to the world and demonstrate to our residents that city hall is inclusive and is respectful of countries of origin for many of our residents or the birthplace of family members. I…for that reason, I won't be supporting the amending motion. I think it's one way in which we just provide that connectivity. And I think the main motion is still worthy of support and can help demonstrate that journey of reconciliation work is ongoing. And again, want to acknowledge and thank the efforts of many members of Council to move this matter forward. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Nason, your opportunity to speak to the item and amending Motion 1.

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

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 1 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated May 18, 2021 be amended by adding the following new Recommendation 2 and renumbering the remaining recommendation accordingly:

"2. That only the flags of The City of Winnipeg, The Province of Manitoba, Canada, Treaty One First Nations, Dakota Nations, Métis Nation and the flags of the countries of visiting dignitaries on official visits to City Hall shall be permitted to be flown at City Hall with the latter replacing the Flag of Manitoba for such events."

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am pleased that the main motion is here today and that EPC supported it at their most recent meeting. This has taken a long time to get here and I hope that it's supported unanimously. I want to thank the Indigenous leaders that worked with me in crafting the main motion. But the main motion was missing the original challenge of division that ceremonial flag raising can and has created at city hall. As Councillor Klein stated in his comments earlier today, anti-Semitism is on the rise. Flags were recently set on fire near the provincial legislature. Rocks hurled, hurtful language used. Councillor Santos also made mention of the rise of Asian hate magnified by COVID-19 pandemic. There are many flags of nations or marketing campaigns that can lead to protests or conflicts. The City of Winnipeg has within its option to perform ceremonial flag raising at Portage and Main, which they have on occasion designated only that location to do such a thing versus here at city hall. We eliminated ceremonial proclamations in Winnipeg and I still stand here today saying that it's time to eliminate ceremonial flag raising except for the criteria that was placed in the amending motion and was in the original motion as it came forward. And I hope that you'll…can join me today in supporting this amendment. Thank you.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much. I would like to congratulate Councillor Nason on the original motion. Councillor Nason has done some excellent work with respect to meeting and crafting a motion that will be an enduring...will be really an enduring motion for this term that upholds the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, that upholds the call to action on the truth and reconciliation calls to action. And finally, responds to the calls to justice, the framework including the TRC and (inaudible). So, I want to acknowledge that work today. I think it's really important to do so. I also want to acknowledge those special moments that we've had as a Council where we have come together, whether it was to celebrate the Bombers and raise the flag or whether it's to celebrate each and every Pride and raise the flag outside of city hall. Those have been special moments with community and I don't want to see them go. So, I won't be able to support the amendment, but I want to acknowledge what I think will be a unanimous vote for the raising of Treaty 1, the Métis nation and the unified Dakota flag that I look forward seeing. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Rollins. Any other speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Nason, do you wish to close? Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close on the item?

Mayor Bowman: Yeah. I mean, I'll just…again, just reiterate, I think the main motion is very positive. And as Councillor Rollins and Councillor Nason have articulated, I think a unanimous vote would send a very positive and a strong message to our broader community including our Indigenous leaders. Treaty 1 chiefs that I have spoken with I know have greatly appreciated the efforts we have made over a number of years including this initiative. And so, hopeful that we can support it. Again, I won't be supporting and would ask my council colleagues to consider not supporting the amending motion just by virtue of the fact that the flag raisings that occur are done in consultation with the Chief Protocol Officer, Lisa Blake who I want to acknowledge and thank her for her efforts. You know, again, when requests are made and where there are formal acknowledgements from our Federal Government in terms of recognition of various governments or states I should say, when a request is made, we have historically provided those opportunities to raise the flag. Right now, we don't get that opportunity as councillors with community members to gather as we have historically done. And as Councillor Rollins acknowledged, it is a really nice opportunity to come together as a community. You know, you don't always need a need a dignitary visiting to bring community members together. And you know, certainly, the manner in which the discretion has been exercised, it has always been done, at least on my part, in a way that is respectful of the requests and the community, as well as recognizing the status that our country has with respect to nations around the world. And so, it's something that I think is a positive and for that reason I won't be supporting the amending motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on the amending Motion 1. All in favour, please rise.

Clerk: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Sorry, which one is this for?

Madam Speaker: This is amending Motion 1.

Councillor Lukes: Oh, the amending motion, okay. I'm not standing for that. Sorry.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Klein and Nason

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 1 is lost. On to the main item. All in favour? All in favour, please rise. There's call for a recorded vote.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Item 1 passes. And I'll remind Council, if we have more than three members recorded in opposition, we will automatically be going to recorded votes today. Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 – Financial Support for the Main Street Project Van Patrol Outreach Program

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, and followed by Councillor Klein to speak to the amending motion. Mr. Mayor, the main item and the amending motion.

Mayor Bowman: Sure. I will be very quick on this, Madam Speaker. I want to thank...I want to thank the Main Street Project. I want to thank all of our partner agencies in our community who are doing invaluable and life saving work in our community. I want to thank members of Council including Councillor Rollins who has been a tireless advocate for Winnipeg's...some of our most vulnerable residents as well as support for a number of the agencies that we partner with. I am looking forward to receiving this report and considering it in due course hopefully very soon. So, I look forward to hearing from my council colleagues though.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein, the amending Motion 2 and the main item.

Councillor Klein: It's my opportunity to speak to it, right, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: That's right.

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

WHEREAS the services offered to the City of Winnipeg by the Main Street Project through the use of an outreach vehicle include the following:

A. Visiting those in crisis or who are on the streets and need support
B. Providing harm reduction supplies
C. Transport back to shelter
D. Volunteer transport for the Winnipeg Police Service and Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service
E. Encampment response, monitoring, and support
F. Protective care
G. Connection to other Main Street Project services (including Covid-19 isolation services);

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg relies on the Main Street Project to perform these services at no cost the City;

AND WHEREAS the Main Street Project has stated that a lack of such funding will result in a reduction of service from its outreach van program. Such a reduction of service will result in increased costs to the City through the usage of resources from the Winnipeg Police Service and the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service;

AND WHEREAS the Main Street Project has stated this program costs $800,000 per year to operate, equivalent to $91.32 per hour;

AND WHEREAS community donors and the Province of Manitoba are relied on for contributing the remaining $400,000 to the Main Street Project for running the outreach van;

AND WHEREAS the Main Street Project has requested $400,000, equivalent to $45.66 per hour, in funding from the City of Winnipeg for running an outreach van with two caseworkers or outreach workers in downtown Winnipeg on a 24 hour basis;

AND WHEREAS the services performed by the Main Street Project would otherwise have to be performed by the Winnipeg Police Service or Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service at a much greater cost to the City;

AND WHEREAS the cost to the City of Winnipeg for two constables and a cruiser car is at least $285.60 per hour, over six times the rate available from the Main Street Project;

AND WHEREAS the work performed by the Main Street Project is highly specialized and has demonstrated strong success within the local community;

AND WHEREAS through allowing the Main Street Project to dedicate its expertise and resources to serving the downtown with its outreach vehicle, frees up staff and equipment resources within the Winnipeg Police Service and Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service which can be redirected to other areas of importance;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg Charter states that the Purposes of the City 5(1)(d) includes "to promote and maintain the health, safety, and welfare of the inhabitants" and the efforts of the Main Street Project directly compliment this purpose;

AND WHEREAS the Main Street Project is a trusted Winnipeg based non-profit community led organization, operating in Winnipeg since 1972, 50 years.

AND WHEREAS on November 26, 2020 Council adopted the Recreation and Library Facility Investment Strategy which included allocating "$7 million to the Land Dedication Reserve Fund, distributed equally amongst each of the 15 electoral wards over three years;"

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

1. *That a grant in the amount of $400,050 be approved to the Main Street Project to assist with the cost of the operation of the outreach vehicle program in 2021.*

2. *That the grant be funded through the reallocation of $26,670 from each of the 15 electoral ward's portion of the $7.0 million in Land Dedication Reserve Funding approved by Council on November 26, 2020 as part of the Recreation and Library Facility Investment Strategy.*

3. *That the authority be delegated to the Chief Financial Officer to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of the grant agreement in accordance with this motion, and such other terms and conditions deemed necessary by the Director of Legal Services and City Solicitor to protect the interests of the City.*

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

Councillor Klein: I think we all know, but let's go over this list just in case what the Main Street Project outreach van does. It visits those in crisis who are on the streets and need support. It visits those in crisis that may have taken refuge in bus shelters that need support. It provides harm reduction supplies to residents who are experiencing difficulties at this time. It provides transportation back to shelter. It's a volunteer transport for the Winnipeg Police Service and the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service at no cost. Encampment response, monitoring and support when the City asks for it at no cost. Protective care, connection to other Main Street services, including COVID-19 isolation services and they do all this, Madam Speaker, for free. All of it is done for free. The Main Street has told us and did tell us, sorry, months ago, that a lack of such funding will result in a reduction of service from its outreach van program. And such a reduction of service will result in increased cost to the City of Winnipeg through the uses of resources from the Winnipeg Police Service and the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service. So, all of the advocates that we talk about internally and so on should know that this is costing us thousands and thousands of dollars. Yet how do we know that? Well, let's do a quick math session. The Main Street Project operates their van program 24-hours a day for $800,000 per year. That's equivalent to 81...$91.32 per hour. Main Street has requested $400,000. That's the equivalent of $45.66 an hour. $45.66 an hour. Please remember that number. And that would be in funding from the City of Winnipeg for running an outreach van with two case workers or outreach workers in downtown Winnipeg on a 24-hour basis. Okay, so that will cost us on average $45.66 an hour. Now, without the Main Street van in operation...I guess the Mayor has gone to get a calculator. Without the Main Street van in operation, the Winnipeg Police Service and Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service respond at a much greater cost to the City. Two constables in a cruiser car is at least $285.60 per hour. That is over 6 times the available rate from the Main Street Project. The work performed by Main Street is highly specialized and has demonstrated strong success within the local community. The City of Winnipeg Charter states that the purpose of the City, 51(d), includes to promote and maintain the health, safety and welfare of its inhabitants. And the efforts of the Main Street Project directly complement that purpose. On November 26th of 2020, Council adopted the recreation and library facility investment strategy which included allocating $7 million to each councillors' Land Dedication Reserve fund to be used at their discretion on projects. This was distributed equally to all 15 councillors for over three years. Therefore, I am asking that we stand united, we stand together as opposed to being one group against another group, and say, we can come up with $400,000. And I am asking you to join me today in approving that the grant be funded to the Main Street Project van for the...through a reallocation of $26,670 from each of the 15 electoral wards portions of the $7 million in Land Dedication Reserve funding that we all approved. We need to do this. It's costing us money. It's costing us resources. And it's not respectful to the residents that need help. Main Street knows how to deal with this. Gives people dignity. Respects individuals and is a more efficient and effective means and, of course, cost efficient than using Winnipeg Police Service or Winnipeg Fire Paramedics. You will make the decision. Hopefully you will make it based on your own thought and not on that of somebody else. Think about what this will do for the city. Think about the money it will save. I'm asking you for a unanimous vote on this because it's what our city needs right now.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm rising to speak to this report. I'm going to be doing a 'I told you so', Madam Speaker. Because you know, for quite some time, mid…like, mid-previous term and even before, Madam Speaker, trying to get us to acknowledge through our budget process that while we the City do not undertake certain activities to prevent people from coming into harm, prevent people...or to assist them in getting out of their social ills at the moment or at the time, and all kinds of other prevention things that many agencies in this city work at day in and day out but are never resourced properly in order to accomplish their work. For example, and I think the Mayor did get them a grant, but the gang action interagency network which I participated with ever since I have been elected and stayed on top, they are the ones doing the prevention. The police service are doing the other two aspects to dealing with gang activity, for example. And ultimately, you know, we should be supporting them in prevention because we do have a committee that talks about prevention and it only, at this point, deals with, like, policing and fire. But Community Services is also dealing with prevention. And my colleagues who were here the last term may recall that I was recommending that we raise property taxes by a half a percent to raise a couple of million dollars that we could direct to organizations doing excellent work related to prevention and holding and helping people from becoming harmed out there on the street. So, these are things that are important. And this service here is a great example of the need. While we as a city don't deliver those kind of services directly, we as a city and we as Winnipeggers, because that's who we are all here for, we are all here for Winnipeggers. And I know that all of my colleagues are really supportive of this 24/7 and other initiatives. But really, you gotta come to the plate because it's not that simple to demand from your CAO and others to come up with money when they are already stretched trying to achieve the work that they are doing in all of these different areas of the city. And this is why I moved that motion years ago now. There was some work moving towards trying to come up with that, and really, Community Services came to us with a four-year budget that basically said, well, we're cutting stuff. And some things were reduced. You know, that's what happened in our budget process. So, I just want to stand up here and just say…and I have heard the demands. I listened to EPC the other day on this issue, and I applaud my colleagues who want to speed this

up. But the reality is, is we as Council have not armed the Public Service to be able to deal with and do this. You can cry and say that somehow there's savings all over the place, but ultimately, all those paramedics still need to be out there. Ultimately, all those firefighters need to be out there. You need to be able to find the resources for those other people that are going to go out there, but we're…they are not our employees, so we need to find a way and it's really sad that we didn't deal with that, colleagues. So, you know, when we make demands we need to look at it and maybe there is somewhere, a little fund here or there that wasn't really meant for something like this. And maybe we can...and the administration can find some money. But I definitely know that Community Services, which ultimately, this would be a grant out of, they are struggling right now. Like, meeting their financial obligations under the budget, it's like…it's crazy. And you all know that. So, you know, we can bite the bullet and you know, why wait for the administration, you know, just take the grant or some money from somewhere, we'll report it as a deficit at the end of the year, whatever. We know that we're going to have a hard time making ends meet and balance everything by the end of the year. But you know, let's pray it doesn't snow a lot and so on and so forth. But ultimately, colleagues, let's get on with this. Like, we gotta do something and we should have been doing this a long time ago. So, let's get with it. Thank you.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, I want to thank Councillor Klein for the motion today and I want to thank Councillor Klein because I feel his frustration. I wrote a motion that should have been here by now and so I was not in favour with any layover. And I wasn't in favour with any layover because I just feel like there has been motion after motion that seems to have been eroded. And I think it's being eroded because there isn't a clearer message from Council that we're prioritizing homelessness, prioritizing those that are sleeping rough and prioritizing their needs. So, I think that it's sending mixed messages on what the City's priorities are with respect to homelessness and encampment, whether...though we have made really important shifts towards upholding human rights, really important shifts, that it is absolutely key that a mobile van is on city streets. And it was absolutely key when, on March 25th, I believe, we voted unanimously in support of the motion for Main Street Project, yes, for mobile resources including in St. Boniface street reach. And we said to the public…the civil service, please come back with some haste to Council because we know what the mobile service is doing. We know that the mobile service is going out to those that are sleeping rough on city streets. And this was still when we were experiencing minus 30 weather. So, that's really key. I sit before you today…Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry where weekly…weekly there is an occurrence that I find out that someone is either burned or dead. Following the EPC meeting where I said no, not an extension, thank you. I am not...where is this report? I spent the rest of that night flagging down and calling on the phone with 911 for someone who wasn't doing well on a bench on Stafford and Corydon. So, this is what the weekly experience is as Fort Rouge- East Fort Garry and that's why I have burrs on me, is that we're…as councillors…as inner-city councillors, which is why I won't be supporting Councillor Klein's motion. That $26,000 is actually a really different issue for Fort Rouge-East-Fort Garry and a Land Dedication Reserve where I only have $150,000 and I don't have the types of resources that some of my council colleagues have. But I do disproportionately fund, I would say, as a decision and I appreciate other councillors wouldn't make these decisions, I have to support just proportionately with my money that would be going to parks or would be going to swing sets, public washrooms, dignity washrooms, structural food distribution centres that provide 400 breakfast programs for school children. I fund Bear Clan, not with performative picks because I'm not really a good politician first term. I don't do that. Over $10,000 for PPE for West Broadway and just generally whenever Brian Sharpolo needs it. So, I can't...I have to look at it in the context, if that was eliminated from this motion I might be able to support it, but then perhaps the motion doesn't work and I haven't had…I just saw it, you know, five minutes ago. But I do want to say that the haste in which...and the spirit in which Councillor Klein is also saying I believe with this motion that we shouldn't lollygag. And to that I say, yes, you know, he is absolutely right. The frustration that I had when I saw that it was being asked for 60 days and then upon further questioning that it might not even get to Council in September means months and months and months without a mobile resource. The mobile resource is why Winnipeg doesn't have a response that is published and on our website. And I think that that's really critical to know and I think it's really critical to know further the context of that. The context with respect to almost every other jurisdiction in Canada big cities; Edmonton, Calgary, Toronto, Montreal, having identifiable plans for all of those partners, whether it is the Pollard family who has cleaned up around Main Street Project with groups and groups and cart loads of...car loads, sorry, of supplies in and around Main Street Project and Siloam Mission and more. Toronto, just like Winnipeg, behind closed doors and not publicly available information, prioritizes the safety of those living in encampment, they work with partners to provide essential support. They focus on health and well being. They build trusting relationships to support the transition in indoor...you know, from outdoor to indoor settings. They provide access to safer indoor spaces including shelter and housing and encampment are provided with the life safety supports, in terms of fire, public toileting and more. And so, Calgary…Calgary, too, has the clean up including those that are self led, right. Providing garbage services in encampments from public policy. Calgary has that helping focus of encampment occupants, connecting them with social services. This is work that our Public Service...I want to be clear, they are doing it, but they absolutely underline the critical element is that mobile piece. If we don't have it we're not sounding like other jurisdictions. Edmonton. Edmonton has an encampment response team. They address the low-lit risk encampments and the high-risk encampments. They have an administration that looks at the high-risk encampments. This is really key. Montreal, I could go on. California. I could go on. What is really critical though to know is that March 25th, we passed this motion. Many of

us knowing it was a critical piece. Where is the motion? And that is why I won't be supporting another 60 days. I can't support another 60 days. I really cannot. Can I support a motion that, you know, doesn't have the Public Service length potentially? I don't know if Councillor Klein consulted with the Public Service on the $400,000 plus $26,000 from each ward. I don't know. But what I do know is this: the mobile unit is really critical to our response. I am very concerned as we hit into plus 30 weather, and we will get there, that we will be missing a critical piece of our protection services and our extreme weather services for more months. So, I do not support the extension. I am very frustrated and…that there isn't a clear understanding.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins, are you wrapping up or looking for an extension?

Councillor Rollins: I'm either way.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer moves extension. All in favour? Two-minute extension. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried.

Councillor Rollins: We need to show better leadership than this. My fear is that if we don't send a clear message today, what happens is we send an unclear message and the Public Service will return where it will be clear that there will be another gap in service for a mobile resource. We needed to have a mobile resource in the last few months. I certainly felt the lack of most mobile resources and I know other councillors did, too. And any councillor that considered the people sleeping rough in city transit and in their riparian open space lands and on their riverbank, any councillor that's supported the community cleanups on the abandoned encampments, any councillor that voted in favour, which I believe was a unanimously held vote on March 25th, needed to send the message that we need that mobile resource. I would like that…to see that message again unanimously held today. I will thank Councillor Klein for his motion because I believe it underlines the expeditiousness and mysteriousness of the mobile resource and the need in Winnipeg, but I won't be supporting the amendment. And thank you to my colleagues for the extension.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, we are being reactive. It's…you know, this challenge has been ongoing on our streets for, well, I can't even tell how long. The challenge that we have is, you know...you know, I would have invited Mr. Ruta to join us to discuss this, but he doesn't appear to be present. You know, I listen to EPC.

Councillor Rollins: Point of order.

Madam Speaker: I just want to clarify…thank you, Mr. Mayor. Mr. Ruta, our CAO is joining us today. It is remotely.

Councillor Nason: Okay, well…

Madam Speaker: Just in case there...he's here to participate with us.

Councillor Nason: Can I ask questions of Mr. Ruta then?

Madam Speaker: If it's a time sensitive matter.

Councillor Nason: Well, obviously, by the dialogue that we are having, it is time sensitive.

Madam Speaker: We're going to…we can get Mr. Ruta online, but I'm going to go to another speaker so we have a chance to do that. Did you want to state your question in the meantime?

Councillor Nason: Well, my question for Mr. Ruta is, you know, listening to EPC, I wasn't given assurance based on what was being presented, that this 30-days that's before us at Council is realistic. They were pushing for 60 and even that didn't seem realistic. So, I truly want to know from the Public Service perspective is, what is a realistic time to have action on this file?

Madam Speaker: The item is before us, Councillor Nason, and Council will decide on the time frame. Do you have a specific question about this program or the budget?

Councillor Nason: I'll carry on with my comments if that appeases you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Nason: We're being reactive. You know, I have had many conversations with Marion Willis at St. Boniface Street Links. This motion...the amending motion doesn't speak to it, but I know the Councillor Klein is thinking about them as well, but this is a step forward. This is trying to provide positive action on the file. It's a file that, you know, residents of Transcona reach out to me regularly because they see the people congregating. I won't say rough sleeping, but they are congregating in transit stops in Transcona along Regent Avenue. Businesses are being negatively influenced by the situation as well. We are not serving those individuals that are congregating in the bus shelters because we are not reducing the harm that they are being exposed to by the products that they are consuming in these bus shelters. This amending motion provides an opportunity to at least move forward. We clouded the perspective of the original motion that was put forward back in March by that challenge of matching funds with the Province of Manitoba. The Province of Manitoba hasn't been funding St. Boniface Street Links, Main Street Project for the outreach, to my knowledge, at all. It's been the Federal Government, it's been private grants that have been funding these for a long time. So, there is a gap. And I know we have heard many times from members of this council, talking about the gaps that the Province of Manitoba are leaving for others to pick up. Pick up the pieces. It's not an urban, suburban fight that we have in front of us. It is a fight for all residents of Winnipeg. Because if we don't have support for those that are most troubled, it is going to be an all of Winnipeg challenge. If we don't have all of government...and not just the elected government of the federal, city and provincial, but our Indigenous leaders as well. We all need to be at the table discussing this, this crisis. You know, we hear many times of how close people are to be homeless. We hear that all the time. You know, I'm hearing from residents, talking about their most recent tax bill, you know, that have come out and the impacts of that. You know, people are struggling in our city and we need to find a way to help those that need help. And the work that Main Street does is invaluable. The work that St. Boniface Street Links does is invaluable. I, too, don't have a lot of Land Dedication Reserve money in spite of being in the suburban...the area of wealth that some people surmise that I have. I occasionally talk to the former councillor and jokingly talk about the land dedication reserve of days of old. That money isn't flowing to Transcona. I've tried to find ways to bring more opportunity for land dedication in Transcona, but it wasn't supported. This is a good use, I think, of some of the land dedication money, some of the found money from the recreation fund. I think it's an opportunity for us to show strong, decisive action on this file. You know, most recently we talk about growth in our city and growth paying for growth. Well, you know, the airport west project, you know, it was $60, $70 million, now it's $113 million. We're…you know, that seems to be no problem. You know, that's decades down the road of a problem. Well, we've got this front and centre today because we can go outside of these doors at city hall and go to the two adjoining bus stops, one is at city hall and the other one at the Concert Hall and we will likely find the very problem that we are discussing here today. So, I urge you to support the amending motion and that we send a strong message to the Public Service that we do demand that this comes back in 30 days, this report. And that anything less is just not acceptable. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I need to explain how I think on this as every one of us does when we bother to speak on these issues. What do I think of what's going on right now? Okay. We are being reactive, as Councillor Nason says, I believe we're being reactive as a Council. I think we are being reactive as a government. We are not being proactive on these issues. But we do...I'm not trying to judge anybody's motives on this, but we all act indignant about…I'm not saying we're…I'm not saying we're just acting, we talk an indignant line, all of us, in terms of what this issue is today. In terms of the need for financing Main Street Project services, Main Street Project type services to deal with the issues of homelessness, addiction, all these…all these layered aspects that create the disempowerment and dysfunction and the pain and suffering that we have in our city. And those at the highest rate of personal crisis, how can we help them? Madam Speaker, I really wish we as councillors, we as politicians, as public servants, would spend half as much time talking about why we have to spend our time today dealing with how we're going to squeeze out that little bit of money to provide these services. Madam Speaker, we don't talk about the causes that brought us to this point and division of debate or whether we can wait another 30 days or 60 days, well, where is the source of the funding we've got to come from? We don't talk about what's causing that. So, we will continue to be reactive. Because we're trying to just minimize as reactively as we can the amount of money we put into it because we have less and less. Oh no, our taxes are going up, the City's budget goes up every year, but this is the stuff, when it comes to the utmost in people suffering, that we're not…we're not ignoring it, we're just wondering, well, where are we going to get the money for this? Our taxes go up every single year, our budget goes up every single year, but this is where we're wondering, you know, geez, we're talking about weeks here, we're talking about, you know, thousands of dollars per ward. I don't blame Councillor Klein for the idea. Well, you'll explain…you will see the inherent systemic logic in this for trying to get the money from LDR. I don't blame him for that. Let's face it, during a time when Winnipeg's greatest virtue...we don't have the greatest weather, we don't have the greatest view of the sea or the mountains, but we do have one of the greatest tree canopies around and we're losing our trees fast. And in the era of the Million Tree Challenge work is where Worship Mayor Bowman said himself, trying to deal with this without putting as much burden on taxes. He said this in this council chamber. I think he was looking at me when he said, I understand sort of…because I was on the other side, because this is the challenge we have, to the extent that for me to deal with the loss of tree canopy in my ward, guess where I was trying to get the money from to dream…Million Tree Challenge, I was taking money to an…from an unprecedented level from my local LDR fund. So, there you see the pattern. And then what happened after that? I did $50,000, promising more over the next two years to

retain the amount of canopy in the most tree canopy of my ward, the oldest area, Glenelm near the Red River. Cindy Gilroy, Councillor Gilroy, in very recent weeks; $300,000 from her own ward fund to deal with the trees because we as a city are not. So, now where is the pattern? Now Councillor Klein says, well, why don't we all put money in from the LDR to deal with what is a big crisis. Well now you see where we're at because we don't have the central budget, we don't think that way. We're being reactive. So, we are sending…as Councillor Rollins says, we send mixed messages and are we prioritizing homeless? I know we want to. I know we say we do, but then why aren't we dealing with the causes putting us into this problem in the first place? Well, we don't want to talk about that. That, everyone, is being reactive. Or at least the causes, there is no other way. If you're not going to deal with the problem, you know, this financial problem, just sheerly acknowledging the financial problem that puts us into this debate we are having today, well, we will continue to be reactive, we will continue to sort of...not that we have the solutions, not that I'm blaming anybody, any individual, I sure don't have the solutions, but at least acknowledging like other cities to put the money into the resources we need for those that are at utmost crisis in our community, including mobile units and things like this. Now, for myself, you know, I live close to Main Street. I've literally have had to drive to drop...to meet up with the police at Main Street project just given my proximity to Main Street Project. It's not like that for everybody or everyone's ward, but to have the mobile units can be extremely helpful for everyone. And there is no doubt in my mind...I hope there is no doubt in anybody else's mind, that given…at the rate we're going in terms of how we're discussing this, how we're analysing this, that it's going to be worse next year and the year after that. Not because the...not merely because the crisis itself might be larger, but because we have less and less resources to deal with it. And that's not the only problem. I accept that challenge. But we don't even talk about why that's the case and that's our fault. That's our problem and that's our perpetuation of the problem. We at least have to put an effort...not just show we're trying, but to prove it, to actually try. We can't do that until we acknowledge the financial problems that are causing this unfortunate, truly unfortunate, conversation we are having today which I would like to think should be unnecessary. But nonetheless, here we are at. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. You know what, I am frustrated. I'm frustrated very much because this should be here and we should be dealing with this right now. So, I will not be supporting a layover. And I'm going to do that on principle because I have been calling on our CAO to make sure that he is making this a priority, to make sure that the City is coming up with a plan to deal with these issues that we are facing. Our...all of our offices are probably being well recorded with recordings of people calling and calling, wanting us to deal with this matter and yet, we haven't even sat down and met with different departments to talk about how we're managing this moving forward. This is a COVID need. We have people that will not take in their friends and families that used to because of the…you know, being scared and making sure that their own…their safety and their health is...so they are not taking in those friends and families that maybe they would have taken in. So, there is more people on the streets. We have a Provincial Government whose divesting of social housing for the most hard to house people and those are some of the people that we are seeing on the streets. This is a crisis. I am working with a national committee that's looking at the housing crisis and this isn't even just within the City of Winnipeg. They are feeling this in many, many cities, but the city needs to be at the forefront of coming up with a plan and saying that we're giving money to end homelessness to deal with this isn't the answer. We have to have a response and an answer for things that are happening in our parks. The garbage and debris, people that are now taking over houses that are boarded up in the inner-city and now taking them over and living in them. We have to make sure that we have a plan to deal with our bus shelters and our bus shacks, that people are making home. They are making home in those places. And we are being asked by our residents to make sure that that is a place where everyone can feel welcomed and safe and go into while they're waiting for a bus. And we also have to make sure that we have the dignity of the people that we are supporting, the most vulnerable people we are supporting. So, this should have happened a long time ago, it should happen now and it should come out of the City coffers like all the other very important things that we support. I don't support it coming out of Land Dedication. I appreciate Councillor Klein and I love the initiative and I…one thing I know about Councillor Klein, he is always looking for a way to make things work and I appreciate that. But I do use a lot of my money within my own ward to go to this stuff already. So, I would hate to lose some of that stuff that I am already supporting; food for all, you know, a lot of different safety walks, public washrooms so people can use the washrooms. Stuff in the heart of our inner city at Spence Neighbourhood Association, food and supplies, those are things that, you know, I am supplying that stuff already and I just think that this is a priority for the City and we need to be at the forefront and we need to make this work. And this is what the residents are asking of us. So, it's unfortunate I won't be supporting this because I really think we should be dealing with it now and that's more of a principle thing. And look forward to greater discussion and dialogue because I do know...and I want to recognize, I said harsh words regarding the CAO, but I do recognize and I know that they are working on a plan. I just...it needs to happen now. So, I just want to talk about the urgency of that. So, I do want to thank them because I know Mike Jack has been working with me on a few things and they have been responsive. But we need to be...we need to make this happen fast and this has to be a cross-departmental review. It can't be just one person dealing with this, this is happening in multiple departments from our parks, to our staff that are picking up garbage, to bulky waste pickup, to social workers that are dealing with some of the people that are in our parks, to Community Services who has lots of different things that they are working on in terms of poverty

reduction, harm reduction, and the work that they do every day to help prioritize people that are the most vulnerable people. So, thank you very much, Madam Speaker for listening to my comments today.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I want to acknowledge the thoughts, feelings, frustrations of probably every member of Council and we have been talking about this for several months, and certainly issues of homelessness, unsheltered individuals, addictions have only been exacerbated by the pandemic and we have all seen that and are bearing witness to that. And no doubt around Council, there's a bit of a philosophical divide on who should do what when it comes to responding to the issue of homelessness. I won't be supporting the amending motion. I will be supporting the extension of time for the report. I share the…some of the frustration, certainly, as far as timelines that Councillor Rollins, Councillor Gilroy and others have expressed, but I think what's clear for me is that, certainly, we do need a plan as a city but it's a plan...the plan we need is one that outlines the City's role in addressing these matters because I think the City's role, frankly is limited...should be limited to that which is under our purview in this...in these very important matters. Many of the matters that we are talking about and we're seeing consistently on our streets are matters of health and social services. And they are the responsibility primarily of other levels of government. My guess is that probably some of the struggle that some of our Public Service are having is we are asking the Public Service to look into areas that they are really not under our purview as a city. Yes, other cities and other jurisdictions across the nation maybe have expanded services that they are responsible for, the City of Winnipeg is somewhat different in that regard. And I can appreciate that some of my colleagues, in fairness, want us to take on more as a city, go deeper into some social service provision. We think about the van...and I appreciate that the van can certainly save...the Main Street Project van, I should be clear, can help reduce perhaps some calls to service that our police or paramedics would respond to. But when we think about it, what those police and paramedic calls for service are responding to, are…less frequently are they crime and justice calls for police, they are responding to social services calls. When the director of Main Street Project was here initially, maybe before Executive Policy Committee, asking for funds for the outreach van, my question to him was something along the lines of, have you spoken to the Province of Manitoba because a lot of the work that you are doing is really trying to assist the Province with their work, their health issues, addictions issues, housing issues, social services issues. And so, I do believe that we as a city need a plan, but we need to know our role in partnership with other agencies and other levels of government. Councillor Gilroy pointed out...I think Councillor Nason as well, pointed out that many of these matters are matters that are primarily the responsibility of the Province of Manitoba, whether it's the Health Department, Justice Department, Family Services Department. And so, yes, let's get a plan, let's have our staff put together a plan, but the City cannot be and should not be all things to all people. We should not take on to ourselves that which is the responsibility of other levels of government. We just can't afford to do it. Now, do we provide temporary assistance? Yes. I will be fine...I'll most likely be supporting in the future some mechanism by which we can temporarily assist Main Street Project with their van patrol. But their van patrol is a stopgap measure. It's a temporary measure, critical, important, they do great work. I have seen them...I've personally witnessed them, I think I shared this before, in the middle of winter when the Main Street Project van showed up to talk to someone who was living in a transit shelter in St. James, I was there at the same time. I witnessed the good work that they do. But let's really be clear, the City has a role, but it's not the...I don't believe it's the primary role to take all of this social service responsibility on. And so, I think collectively, I hope that the Provincial Governments...the Provincial Government is listening and attentive. We need you at the table. We need you to take the primary role as a province to deal with the social services matters that are the matters that individuals in our community need assistance with. So, I look forward to the report when it does come back from our Public Service but the Main Street Project van is just one small, important, but small component of an overall comprehensive plan that necessitates each respective partner, each level of government play their role and not advocate their responsibilities to...forcing another level of government or another agency to pick up that which really should be done by them.

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

Councillor Santos: Thanks. I just want to put a couple of things on the record here. I appreciate the concerns brought forward from my council colleagues that I want to let people know that Main Street Project's outreach van is not ending. They do have some funding to assist with their program for the next 6 months for the evening shift. So, I was able to locate the original request from Main Street Project and I want to read that...the Main Street Project grant was able to locate it from reaching home for the overnight-shift only, from April 1st, 2021 to March 31, 2022. So, they are able to still continue on with the program. The requests that Councillor Rollins has brought forward in her motion was to seek 24-hour service. So, now we're looking for funding just for during the day. In essence, you know, I don't support a 30-day layover. And I appreciate some of the comments that were made for it, but I wanted to note that this program is not ending. I think 30 days is a reasonable ask. I want to urge the public administration who are listening right now, to please find the funding within your own budget and come forward with the report. I look forward to seeing that hopefully at our committee next month if possible. You know, I completely agree with everybody around the table that we need to support the Main Street Project and their outreach as well as the other one at St. Boniface. So, I just want to put a couple of those points. It seemed like there was a lot of conversation that this program is ending and it's not. They did send an e-mail earlier to all of Council,

you just have to take a look in your inbox and it's there and they are just saying that they are just re-jigging their hours. Evening is I think the most top priority for everybody because that's kind of a different situation than during the day, so I want to thank Main Street Project for being able to locate funding to continue on with the program. It's just, again, we're just looking for 24/7. We do need that support during the day and I hope that the public administration can come back with a report sooner rather than later to see if they can find some funding to make it 24/7. Thank you.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today after listening to a lot of the debate that has taken place with respect to these Main Street Project van and St. Boniface Street Links as Councillor Nason had spoken about as well. Recognizing the value…valuable service and critical service that they bring to the citizens of Winnipeg that are in their most dire need. We have seen over the last…this last winter, of course, in dealing with our pandemic, just how further marginalized those that are vulnerable in our community are. As indicated by our bus shelters, the occupancy in our bus shelters, the amount of tent cities that have popped up during the milder part of our winter and now into our spring. You know, I continue to receive e-mails from citizens and residents in our city, mindful of, you know, Kamta Roy Singh who has his business on Maryland and is continually impacted by individuals who are taking up residence in his parking lot. And while he wants to do more for them, he is also in, you know, running a business and trying to provide services to customers that you know, purchase his product and services as well as provide good paying jobs to those that work for him. I recognize, again, that there is a report that is due, that will be coming to Parks, Community Services and Protection. You know…and I'm hopeful that, you know, the department who are working cross collaboratively with other departments can find resources that will allow Main Street Project and community…and organizations such as St. Boniface Street Links, the Bear Clan, Ka Ni Kanichihk, all of these other great community resources to provide…to continue to provide those services to our most vulnerable. It speaks to who we are as a city that we acknowledged that these issues exist and that we're working collaboratively to provide, you know, the dignity that individuals need and get them back on a path to becoming contributing members to our society. It does take all levels of government and I note that the Federal Government has also introduced their rapid housing program and has made commitments to the City of Winnipeg along this regard. The Provincial Government has made commitments towards recovery efforts by the creation of a new department, Mental Health Wellness and Recovery. Recognizing that the Bruce Oak Recovery Centre has just opened its doors and welcomed its first individuals who are committed towards their goal of recovery as well. So, it is a matter of getting all the oars in the water and paddling in the right direction to ensure that we can have an impact on those that are marginalized social economically in our city, and again, helping to restore them back to a path of recovery, of being contributing members to our communities, and reducing the stigma around homelessness and poverty. And I, you know, welcome the debate that's taken place this morning, but I do believe that we need to get this under way, recognizing that, you know, our land...our LDR funds are in place for the community projects that I know all of us as councillors work with our communities, work with our other stakeholders in getting these projects off the ground where we can provide those resources right within our communities as well, to bring communities together, and after this pandemic, to heal, which is going to be a huge part. We talk about economic recovery. We also need social recovery and making sure that our communities can heal. It's going to take a yeoman's effort to heal after this pandemic, and I believe our LDF and those other resources that we have as councillors will be fully subscribed and utilized towards that social healing. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Allard: I'll speak in French, please. The interpreter is on notice. I can give my colleagues a second to…

Councillor Lukes: Excuse me...excuse me. How do we do that remotely?

Councillor Allard: There is a little button that says English and French interpretation available. I've never used it, but I presume it works.

Councillor Lukes: Thanks.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: So, I want to recognize the questions of Executive Policy Committee. I voted against the extension of time because I thought that we should act as quickly as possible. Since then, I have had conversations and communications with my colleagues and the Public Service, I am convinced that we should proceed as quickly as possible with the report. So, I was satisfied with my conversations with my colleagues and the Public Service that we are advancing on this file and that we will be receiving the report as soon as possible. So, with these clarifications, I am…I would like to see what is contained in the report. And for that reason, at this moment, I won't support the amendment from Councillor Klein that proposes we use funding resources that we can only use one-time, capital funding. And what's necessary is

operational funding so that we can continue to support the Main Street Project and other projects like St. Boniface Street Links who does excellent work in St. Boniface. So, I want to emphasize that we are in a drug dependency crisis, in particular, fentanyl and also (inaudible). And so, it will take a permanent solution to address these issues. And so, approving the amendment of Councillor Klein, we are not solving the problem long-term, it would only give them a cost-break one time. What we need is a permanent solution. So, for those reasons, I won't be supporting Councillor Klein's amendment. And I impatiently wait the administrative report. And so, with these conversations, I will be voting against Councillor Klein's amendment and I will also vote for the extension of time. I believe that it is the only way to be consistent in the two votes, so I will change my Executive Policy Committee vote because I was convinced that the Public Service are doing everything they can to create this report and so, we need a permanent solution for this issue. So, that will be my position today. Thanks to my colleagues for their communications, the (inaudible) and also, to Councillor Klein for the proposition, but I don't believe that it is the solution for these problems.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Klein, back to you for close if you wish. And then on to the Mayor.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And I thank all my colleagues for the comments. I want to go over some of them. A special thank you to Councillor Rollins and Gilroy for their kind words, but it's not necessary. I see this as my job that is to provide solutions and alternative solutions. I want to recognize also that both Councillor Rollins and Gilroy do provide a lot of funding to groups within their wards. But I also want to acknowledge that the residents of Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood, because it's not my money, have provided funding to the Bear Clan, to Ka Ni Kanichihk and also to the Tuxedo Family Resource Centre. We have provided thousands of dollars to an Indigenous men's circle that takes place in the North End that helps men find their way. Helps them overcome stress and anger and anxiety. And recently provided over $50,000 to the Oak Park High School students who banded together last year to take their funding that they raised for their grad, to build a healing circle classroom outside in Charleswood. This is their initiative. I think it's the first one of its kind. And the group of students doing this come from all walks of life. So, the residents of Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood, like all residents in the city, are concerned with what is happening in our city. Councillor Rollins talked about other cities and what they are doing and rightfully so, a lot of them are doing great things. What is the difference between them and us? Well, they take action. They get things done. And Councillor Gillingham had mentioned that, you know, he would certainly support the next motion that comes or the report when it comes if it's temporary assistance. That's what this is, temporary assistance. It's just asking for it one time. And it's about 15 percent of what you are going to get. And I'm sure if you are going to vote no to this, like I heard many of you say, that of course you will not be hypocritical and you will vote no to the other motions that are coming before us that are requesting LDR funding that are outside the rules. Because surely you can't vote for one and not the other because that would be odd. Councillor Gillingham mentioned we need a plan. We do. I agree. And many councillors have been on Council now, this is their second, some third term, so where is the plan? What's been happening? We talked about the fact that the…you know, I heard people talk about the fact that yes, this needs to be addressed. Yes, we have to help this group. But we need to get it into the budget and...well, everyone that I heard from is on the Budget Working Group. Why didn't you do it? You've been on the Budget Working Group for more than two years. Why didn't you do it then? Listen, if the Main Street continues with their project, again, here is simple math: 2,000 hours of responses will cost $92,000. If the police or fire paramedics do, it will cost $520,000. There is a calculator on your phones. It's not that hard to figure out. Other cities take action and we're not. Just weeks ago, PP&D approved more funding for a City-built project, for a project that we're building which 80 percent of that more funding of almost $200,000 is going to be given back to the City of Winnipeg to cover overhead, administrative fees, permits because we have to build something. Well, we've got to get permits, lord knows how long that might take to get them. But is that the right use of money? Is that what you are going to stand for today and say no to helping individuals in our community because we have a Bloomberg initiative? Well the Bloomberg initiative would almost talk to this as well as Councillor Gillingham saying social services have to respond. The Main Street van is the right group to respond. They are trained professionals. And Councillor Santos is right. They are doing overnight, but they are not doing daytime and evenings. So, stop calling them. So, when the City of Winnipeg picks up the phone and calls Main Street to help out because of some situations going on, stop because you are not helping them. You are not paying them. Police give them a little bit of money for the…the…you know, the services that they provide to inebriated individuals. Doesn't cover their cost. Go to my website, folks, I interviewed the director of Main Street. He put it all out there, not me. Tomorrow, we are going to be talking about adding what could be $120 million or more for sewer and water charges in the airport vicinity, just like that. Out of the blue kind of. All of a sudden, we've got more money to put there. Although our debt has doubled, almost tripled, and we can't help them. We can't take this one step and take 15 percent of that money and help, do the right thing? I mean, this is your moment. This is your moment because we often will play the caring card at this council. Actions speak louder than words. Reports are not going to help anybody on the street. Reports are not going to ensure that we are treating people with dignity because we know how afraid they are when a police car pulls up. Many of you could have come outside this morning when I was out there trying to help an individual who was frightened because they had to call police and I sat there with them to make sure he wasn't afraid. Can't call Main Street to help the gentleman because they won't come because they don't have the funding. Right now, they get their funding from…some funding from government, they get a lot of funding from private individuals in this city. My residents, the residents of Charleswood-

Tuxedo-Westwood have told me this is the best use of money in their opinion. They want to see people get help now, not when a report comes. So, again, I urge you to support this. It's a one-time thing. And I will note because the Clerks had mentioned that when we put the motion together we had neglected to include a point there where this motion would replace the one that is before you, a technical item, and we should mention that in there. That is the intent of this motion. But it is one time. One time. This is your chance. Because if you vote no because it's LDR funding, everyone will be watching to see what's next because we heard many platforms practised here today. What will you do? What will you do? I'm hoping you will support the residents that need our help.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, will you move a motion to go past 12 noon just to finish this item?

Councillor Eadie: I shall move a motion to go past 12 noon to finish this report Item 2.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor, over to you for the close on this item.

Mayor Bowman: Sure. Thank you…thank you, Madam Speaker. So, I think it's important to keep in mind what the...what the…what we're voting on here today and what we're not voting on here today. This is a request from the Public Service for a 30-day extension to complete and provide for Council's consideration, a report that was requested by members of Council and I want to support those efforts. The amending motion, I won't be supporting for a couple of reasons. The main reason is, and I do appreciate the intent, but at the same time, the funding source appears to be one-time funding from the Province of Manitoba for ongoing operations for a third-party. I think it misses the mark. That being said, I'm hopeful when we see the report we can find a path to supporting it and supporting the Main Street Project for the van. The one thing I will keep in mind and I appreciated there was reference to the Province, the direction that we have previously provided to our Public Service is a report back on the potential funding support for the initiative as well as the St. Boniface Street Links mobile community support unit which Councillor Allard spoke to a few moments ago, including specific sources of City funds and a requirement that any City funding be matched by the Province of Manitoba. I think it is important to Councillor Gillingham's point to acknowledge that the Province is ultimately…you know, within their jurisdiction, is social services, housing, health care as a primary level of government responsible for those. That being said, we still have an incredibly important role to play and it's why, you know, when we talk about actions, I know some members of Council are speaking about actions, that's why I supported funding in previous budgets. I think all of the budgets since I have been elected for End Homelessness Winnipeg who continues to do I think very important work for our community as well as recently funds for 24/7 safe space dollars. These and many other initiatives like the Illicit Drug Strategy and other initiatives are all intended to try to help our most vulnerable residents and I know that our work is ongoing and will continue. I'm optimistic that when we receive the report in the next 30 days that we will have an opportunity as a Council to support the funding, going for an important need in our community. Appreciated Councillor Santos mentioning the funding, it is currently there for the van in the evenings but the need is still there during the daytime and I think we have to acknowledge that and why the 30-day extension was preferred not the 60 or a further delay as was discussed at committee. And so, for those reasons, I will be supporting the main extension. I also…I do appreciate the frustration that members of Council have. I think...you know, I would like to hear from our province what they're doing. I have facilitated dialogue with relevant ministers both provincially and federally on some of the acute housing needs in our community. That advocacy is going to continue regardless of this, but we do have an opportunity as we have demonstrated with votes and action in the past that even where matters don't strictly, I would argue, fall within our jurisdiction we still have a role to play. These are our residents. And based on the dialogue today I'm optimistic Council will find a path to supporting the funding for these initiatives. The reason I...I'm not going to vote against the extension simply because I don't want...I don't want to kill the opportunity for a report to come forward. I want to provide that extension so we can get that report. We can look at it, having the diligence and the input from our Public Service and then we can vote on it with due consideration in the coming weeks. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on amending Motion 2. 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 Klein, Nason and Schreyer

Nays

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

Madam Speaker: Did you record Councillor Allard's vote? Councillor Allard? Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: I would like to vote no.

Madam Speaker: That would be...okay. Yes.

Clerk: And Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma and Councillor Allard.

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

Madam Speaker: Amending Motion 2 is lost. On to the main item. All in favour? Contrary? One in opposition. Councillor Klein and Councillor Nason. Councillor Rollins. Okay. Item…Item 2 passes and three councillors have been noted in opposition. Yes. Councillor Mayes are you…

Councillor Nason: Three in opposition to record a vote.

Madam Speaker: I was just asking who the fourth...I just had three names. Okay, so Councillor Rollins, councillor…

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, can we just have a recorded vote, please?

Madam Speaker: No. Councillor Allard, are you in opposition? You were not noted in opposition, correct? Okay, Councillor Rollins, Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein are in opposition and the motion passes. You have to speak up if anyone wants to be recorded. I have asked a few times. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I was in opposition.

Madam Speaker: Okay, then we will have a recorded…

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, is it out of order to ask for a recorded vote?

Madam Speaker: We are doing that now, thank you. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Rollins, Gilroy, Klein and Nason

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 2 passes. We'll now have a recess and reconvene at 1:15. Is that acceptable? Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
May 27, 2021, at 1:21 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of May 27th, 2021. We are on the Executive Policy Committee dated May 18th, 2021. And it's Item 3, Mr. Clerk.

Item 3 – Citizen Member Appointments – Board of Revision

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to introduce Item 3.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. I want to thank all those that continue to serve on boards and commissions. This is important work for city building and I look forward to hearing from my council colleagues. I'm not sure…I can't recall who pulled this matter, but I'll look forward to hearing from my council colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The first speaker, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Just briefly, the reason I wanted to stand this down is so that I could mention why I'm opposed to it. I'm not opposed because of any of the people provided, but I believe it's important that when we're asked to make a decision of any magnitude, especially on behalf of residents that we serve and that pay us, that we have the information. And I noticed that going through this that we have the information of names, but we don't know who selected them, why they were selected, what their credentials are, what their affiliations are and none of that is made privy to us before we get here and are asked to support this motion. So, for that reason alone, I would like to be able to support my colleagues, however, with limited information, I find that an unreasonable request.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you very much. I would have welcomed an opportunity to speak with my council colleague if he had questions in advance. I'm sure the Clerk's Office was available as well if there were specific questions. And if there are opportunities for improvements to the process with regards to appointments from any member of Council or from the public, I would certainly welcome them so that we can make sure we are more fully apprised on…and can try to address the concern that's been raised today. That being said, I want to support these individuals for appointment to the Board of Revision and want to, again, just thank them for the work that they are doing on behalf of our community.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on Item 3. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Klein, you're noted in opposition. And that is carried. Next item, Item 4, Mr. Clerk.

Item 4 – Lobbyist Registry

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

Mayor Bowman: I'll wait to hear from my council colleagues first.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker. Councillor…was it yourself, Councillor Klein?

Councillor Klein: This is Item 4, which I believe talks about the motion that Councillor Nason had put forward. Again, I'm not…I'm going to stand opposed to this one. I have a lot of respect for my colleague, Councillor Nason, and I hate to be opposed to him on anything because we are a small group that have to stick together. We don't have the strength in numbers, but I think we have important things to deal with right now, as thankfully, I have a partner in crime now preaching the same thing; our debt is getting out of control under this current regime and crime, transit safety, permit delays I get calls three, four times a day. So, I would like to…think we could focus on that type of work at this particular point in time, although, I respect his motion and appreciate what he has brought forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thanks, Madam Speaker. Our voluntary lobbyist registry is interesting. And when we first started it up, Madam Speaker, you know, it was very difficult for me to convince people who would be considered lobbyists, to register. For one thing, they don't have a lot of time and my colleague on Council here has referred to a number of issues that we deal with every day. And technically, when you have an employee of an agency or a community group or whatever, who is representing and trying to resolve the social ills that we do have in this city, and actually, I believe all of our major cities in Canada are experiencing levels of problems, Madam Speaker. But what I found very frustrating is I used to be able to go walk and go to the North End Community Renewal Corp and go talk to the director, who is now considered to be a lobbyist. And you know, if somebody wants to write me up right now, I guess I've been violating our existing lobbyist registry. So, like I understand, like, when we're hearing from private interests, for example, trying to gain some hold regarding the public domain, but really, like, I don't understand why an NGO with a not-for-profit motive would be considered to be somehow a sinister lobbyist or whatever alls they are trying to do as the Main Street Project for example is trying to do, is…and technically, I don't know if Jamal is now registered as a lobbyist in our volunteer lobbyist registry, but technically, we should have been reporting that. And, frankly…so, like, I understand the concerns about having a lobbyist registry and having the Province back it up and say that it needs to happen. I think that's great, but I just don't understand how you can include people trying to achieve the public good in that manner. And I find it very frustrating. So, I'm not actually going to be supporting this report today because I just...like, until something better comes along, I don't...like, I just...Madam Speaker, I don't see how I can support it. And it is important and if anybody wants to ask me,

yeah, I met with Chris Lorenc last year, yeah. He is technically a lobbyist for private industry association, you know. Anybody wants to ask me, whatever, like...anyway, thanks, Madam Speaker. I...as I said, I'll be...I won't be supporting this move to more...actually, red tape, Madam Speaker. Thanks.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. When there was a report that was…that helped establish the lobbyist registry in April of 2017, at that time a cross jurisdictional scan was already done and outlines the charter changes that were necessary. There is an attachment for those that are following these proceedings or even for my council colleagues, they may want to reference it if they haven't already done so, but there are…there is a document that is attached to that report. It's from the 2015 audit report that does discuss the needed changes for our voluntary lobbyist registry to be mandatory. And, of course, the needed changes that would have to occur at the province level. That being said, if…you know, if Councillor Nason at this time wants to have another cross jurisdictional scan undertaken or just another look at this to see how it can be strengthened, I'm happy to support that and see what we can do. So, the recommendation coming out of committee was to have it go to Governance. And I am pleased to support his efforts to have that review conducted to see what we might be able to do to strengthen it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on Item 4. All in favour? Contrary? That was Councillor Eadie. Put your hands up please. Councillor Gilroy, Councillor Klein in opposition. That is noted. And the item is carried. Item 5, Mr. Clerk.

Item 5 – Proposed Property Tax Rebate – Home-Based Composting

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, just a quick point…couple of quick points on solid waste. Solid waste collection expenses according to our budget books are roughly $25 million per year. Excuse me while I read them and make sure I have these correct. Solid waste disposal expenses are pegged in around $15 million a year. Long-term landfill expenses are not included or spoken to within any of our budget material or information that's provided to Council. Total expenses collection and disposal roughly as it reaches $40 million per year. Total garbage in 2020 was 1,900...or 195,000 metric tonnes. Forty four percent of that garbage is compostable organics. Forty four percent of that. Now, we have been informed that implementing collection of organics would be costly to taxpayers and they are already paying more than enough for water and waste collection today. The gap between what our water and waste costs are and property taxes is quickly closing. And maybe, unfortunately, one day we'll see water and waste is more expensive, more costly than property taxes. Winnipeg has a very ambitious green objective, but I don't see that we are doing much. I know we have a pilot project in place. We've talked about this for years and we still only have a pilot project in place. The funding as outlined in the motion with a number of whereas' could be used from the green initiative reserve account to support implementation and staffing. The concept is not new. In fact, we can use funding as a…from that source to do other green initiative projects. This project, this discount, this incentive would help cut our cost in the long term. I don't think I have to explain that. It's very simple. It's right before our eyes. It's simple. And we get more with sugar than we do with pepper, right or honey or however you would like to say it. We're enticing people to participate in this and it ultimately saving us money and helping save the environment while promoting the composting. I've received e-mails from residents in support of this concept from all across the city. Some that have been composting for 30 years and one lady...a couple, actually, that I spoke to that has been composting for over 25 years said since they have been composting, their garbage has gone down to the equivalent of one Safeway bag per week. I don't suggest you use those if you are at the landfill, however, that was the comment that was made. What I am suggesting here was…or what I was trying to suggest is let's do things differently. Let's reward people for reducing their waste not just tax them more. I believe that we can find new alternative solutions, creative solutions that will help benefit us all today, tomorrow and well into the future. I will note that this is the second time I put this on and both times I never received one question from any member of the Executive Policy Committee or any member on Council. I never had one phone call, one e-mail, nothing. I am here every day. I return my calls. Not one. Now, I know some of my colleagues will say, well, you had the opportunity to present at EPC. Correct. Absolutely correct and I have done that on a number of occasions and I'm happy to share that video back to you whenever we say, is there any questions and there's crickets. So, I don't know how you vote on something when you're not asking any questions, when you didn't ask for any data to back it up. One could only assume it's personal. That's okay. We can get beyond that. This is a really good thing for the City of Winnipeg. People are saying this is a really good thing. Residents are saying this is a good thing. And they can work in tandem. You could have the organic waste pilot project go on today. Not a problem. And you can do this with it. Why would we not want to do everything we can to be more environmentally

friendly? Well, I'm sure we're going to hear lots of political reasons why we can't, but I just can't see it. There is no good reasoning why we couldn't do something like this that will obviously save us money. There is no question about it. Anybody who has done high school home economics and learned a household budget would see that this could save money and it saves the environment. I know you accepted it as information yet again but I thought it was important to get on the record in this very collaborative setting that not one phone call, not one e-mail. Not even a letter, like a mailed letter, nothing. Note on the car windshield. Not a thing. But we decided not to run with it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Councillor Gilroy, Councillor Mayes and then Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. For your note on your car window, Councillor Klein, through you Madam Speaker, the reason why I am not in support of this is I know the intent of it, but I'm not in support of this because when I was working as the…on the Climate Change Action Committee and we looked at Brady Landfill, what we need to do to actually target our greenhouse gases is not necessarily the organics that we are putting in our backyard, it's the meat, the dairy, all the things that we can't put in our backyard compost. And that's why we need a comprehensive composting program, which we see in other major cities. We're the only city in Canada and the only city in Manitoba, big city, Brandon actually has an organics program. So, what we really need to do is to make sure that we are composting things like...it could be dog waste, cat waste, diapers, meat and dairy, all the things that you can't put into your backyard compost. So, I don't want to lose that...lose sight of the fact that we need this comprehensive programming by giving people the feeling that what they are doing in their backyard compost is enough. And if we're going to put money into something, it needs to be at the bigger picture on the things that we really need to do to target our greenhouse gases. And it is something that we're going to eventually have to do because the Province is also going to be mandated to do it because this is where a lot of their greenhouse gases are coming from and this is where the target's going to be. So, I really feel I'm somebody who composts in my backyard, probably not very well. We have no way to go and make sure people are composting properly and making sure that they are doing it. So, I really believe that if there is any money that's involved in this, it needs to be done to make sure that there is a city-wide program and we are getting the benefits of our…getting the benefits of making sure that we're reducing the overall greenhouse gases that we are seeing and what we need to do as a city and as a province and as a country. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I don't want to leave a note on the car windshield because the lights blink at me every time I walk by your car. It's slightly frightening. So, I…god knows what would happen if I put a note on the windshield. On a more serious tone though, this is an important issue. This is one we have wrestled with really, I think, since I was first elected is what...at least since 2012, what to do with composting. And another critique that could have been made today was, hey, we have a new report out today that shows our diversion rate has actually gone down slightly. We basked in the glow of it going up from 2012 to 2015 and then stabilize and now a slight decline with COVID. So, how do we address that? Almost certainly, we'll have to do some form of composting. I did say at EPC I would reach out and wanted to talk to Councillor Klein about this, so I haven't yet done that, to my discredit, so I will do that, depending on what happens here today. It's a…I mean, it's a debate we have had many times around here. I could probably give Councillor Browaty's speech. He could probably give mine. But it does look like with the information we have at hand, if we're going to get that diversion rate up, we're going to have to do some form of composting. Is there a cost? Yes. So, it isn't actually as simple as some might suggest. There is a cost. We could just say, well…well, we're going to increase your garbage, but we're not charging you for compost. Well, that doesn't seem particularly forthright. We do have a mayor who ran on a particular property tax pledge that he has kept, too. Whether you agree with it or not, you have to admire the consistency of we have kept to that pledge. So, faced with this cost, we are going to have to wrestle with how to do that. When is that debate going to happen? Might not be for a few years given that we we're underway with the pilot project, but maybe there are some things we can do in the interim that don't conflict with the pilot program. Maybe we can do something like this. Maybe we can do something more on the corporate side because if go to St. Vital Centre, I went there for a meeting a few years ago and there were four bins and the fourth bin was compost. And I mentioned this and it was…the fellow who was in charge of that had been waiting for someone to mention it. You're coming with me to the freezer room. We were all over the mall looking at all the compost stuff they were doing all on their own effort. And then Green Action Centre now picks up the compost from there. So, there are some initiatives being done through Green Action Centre, the Compost Winnipeg folks, maybe we can do something more at the schools, that's I think worth looking at as an interim measure because we do need to start getting some of this diverted otherwise we're going to keep going backwards in terms of the Brady Landfill. And Browaty will say the Brady Landfill has got a hundred years left in it, and that is true, but Gilroy has already correctly pointed out, Brady's the second biggest greenhouse gas emitter in the whole province. So, the less we put in, the better we do on our climate change goal. So, it unfortunately isn't a terribly simple debate, I wish it were. But we do need to start doing more and I'll certainly reach out to Councillor Klein, perhaps not near that car, but somewhere we'll...electric car, to his credit, but we'll hopefully have a chance to sit down and talk and maybe there is something we can do that doesn't call into question the whole pilot project that finally, under this Mayor, that we are finally doing.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Before I proceed to speak to this report specifically, I just want to remind people through the whole composting debate that goes back to Mayor Bowman's first year or so, a couple of years in office, in terms of the waste master plan that we have or whatever, Madam Speaker, since then that debate and so on, it has been discovered, Madam Speaker, that commercial-industrial production of compostable material vastly outsizes the private residence production put out of compostable material. So, we'll just leave that there. But that's something...you know, I don't see the City pushing ahead because you've got private citizens on one hand and then you've got private commercial industrial operations on the on the other hand; they are both private, Madam Speaker. And I don't see us moving forward, pushing a composting program from those commercial outlets and that's probably ending up in the Rosser dump. I don't know what's going on with that compostable material, but it's my understanding that most of the commercial goes to Rosser versus Brady. I don't know. I haven't seen a study on that. But in terms of the idea, I think this was a great idea pitched by Councillor Klein, I believe it started out. It's a great idea, but we're not ready to look at how to deal with what will become a sub system of our solid waste operations. But I just want to point out, there is...like, there is no monetary savings, Madam Speaker, if you know…if a…let's say 10,000 people started composting and were given tax rebates, it will still cost $23 to $25 million per year on the property taxes bill to remove garbage. The other components of solid waste are actually on the water bill, as we all know, and the idea or concept is, and we'll see what happens, whether or not when we go to curbside composting, how we propose to deal with that. And you know, if it's going to be a fee on the water bill, again, I hope it's on a progressive basis as my colleagues have heard me state many, many times. A flat fee is not a fair tax. So, anyway, I digress. But...so, this idea of a rebate is good in a way in that it may compel people to do more composting. But it doesn't save any money because that same company that collects our garbage is still going by every household to collect that bin. So, it's still going to be the $23 to $25 million, I think it is. Anyway, so you know, we have that component, Madam Speaker. When the new system comes up and this pilot is over and right now I appreciate the work that Green Action does, and I hear...so, now I'm hearing some commercial attempts at putting forth composting, I think that's great. But whatever the system comes up, we know that in various neighbourhoods that a one size fits all composting program is not going to work. Not going to work. Like, it just...our garbage system right now doesn't work, for example, in William Whyte. It doesn't work. I tried to get them to acknowledge that it doesn't work; one system fits all, it doesn't work. Tried to get them to understand that you know, the 4R depots, the idea was, I was told, that they were going to take renovation materials so that people didn't have to drive all the way down to Brady. Well, what's happening now? I just heard the other day, the lot that the Winnipeg Housing Rehab's going to buy in Transcona, it's full of waste…dumped waste. Lots of it is renovation material from properties around Transcona. The Molson Brewery lot, it's piled on all kinds of stuff, right. We need our 4R depots, for example, to start taking that in. Yeah, you know...anyway, there has got to be ways of designing the system so it works better. And every neighbourhood is not going to work properly, so you know, maybe this incentive idea might work in an area like William Whyte where you're going to charge people fees who can't afford to pay them. Lots of those people are already composting. So, anyway, it's an interesting idea, but there is no saving of money on the collection system because you still got to collect that same cart. It might be less weight, Madam Speaker, but it will still be just as expensive. Thank you.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much. I...many of the comments that I would have made were made by Councillor Gilroy, so I...as of the rationale of not supporting the motion. But I do want to reflect briefly on a climate caucus call I had last week, the week after and one of the...and you are all invited to the climate caucus call. I will make sure to send you details of when it happens because it is important to note that my colleague, you know, invoked climate change, climate justice and that's the spirit in which likely he wrote the motion. But I won't be supporting because of the reasons Councillor Gilroy already went into. But one of the first questions that the climate caucus asked this week was, what is your council doing this month for climate…in the interest of climate justice? And I want to acknowledge the unanimous vote we did have on what I said was our number one thing that we are doing this month and that is a motion from Councillor Nason, with respect to flying of the flags at city hall. And I think it's important that we're not only taking action and appropriate action on climate change but that we're taking action on climate justice. And part of that piece is environmental protection more broadly, including affirming Indigenous people's rights to protection on the environment, in particular, the conservation and protection of environment and the productive capacity of their lands or territories and resources. And in part, we did a really...this agenda is filled with successes we can underline with respect to climate justice, climate change. With respect to the motion, like I said, I won't be supporting it for reasons that I believe in a curbside composting plan, I believe in the pilot that we are doing as an incremental step to get to that plan. It is slower than I would have liked, but it is the focus. And I have said that before on the floor. I think what we say on the floor is better than any note on a car that, you know, well, we all know about Councillor Klein's car and mazel tov for that. But you know, I think that that's important too, time that we spend with each other right here. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would hope all the vehicles of City councillors are as energy efficient as Councillor Klein's. I hope mine is as energy efficient as Councillor Klein's. I know his is a little more economical than most. It used to be years ago…it was put in the paper decades ago, the majority of City councillors got SUVs. And so, if we're going to talk about energy efficiency of vehicles…I'm into the conversation, and it's...can be important in terms of how councils provide leadership on these types of choices. But I'm not going to initiate that conversation, but if we wish to have it, that…I'm fine to be part of that. I have to admit, when Councillor Klein asked me to second this motion, I laughed because I was wondering, can he read my mind? Because it fit in so well with a few factors that I had to try and bring together and make sense of. And I'm going to bring three factors together: one, the annual increase in the cost of curbside pickup in the City of Winnipeg alone. Other jurisdictions, most probably. But as Councillor Mayes had made the point when it came to recycling, the cost for the recycling contract, when we had a new contractor for about five or six years, the contract went up by 30 percent. So, I have got to deal with...I have got to justify to the taxpayers that I represent, how it is that curbside pickup is going up by 30 percent every contract term. Larger than the increase in the income and salaries of the taxpayers that pay for that curbside pickup, and this has been going on for a long time. So, how do I make sense of this? And if we're going to…if that is the case for recycling and garbage, well, I can only assume it would be the same for composting. We've never really gotten a report from the administration in terms of how we head off the fact that these contract increases are increasing at a rate much higher than the salaries and wages of the vast majority of taxpayers that pay for it. So, what am I supposed to do, ignore this? Well, I'm not going to. So also, years ago, in my first term when we were dealing…first dealing with the issue of curbside compost pickup, I was talking about the...with the administration, it's all on record on one of our meetings, standing meetings, that I had my concerns over sort of the feasibility of it and the economics of it. There was a response by the administration on record in response to my comments and my concerns, that nonetheless, people want to participate in composting. And because of that, that the weight of cost increases, notably above and beyond the increase of the wages and salaries of the taxpayers that pay for it, shouldn't be weighted as highly. So, I have to deal with the issue that even the administration said, on record, people want to participate in composting. Okay, but how do I justify this with the fact that it's costing people more and more every year, money they are not making. They are not getting that same increase as the contracts…as the cost of the contracts. What do we do about this? What do I say to them? Then bear in mind as well, Madam Speaker, that we are looking at harnessing the biomass methane from the Brady Landfill. We're looking at harnessing that energy. And you know, you have to take a hard-nosed approach to environmentalism and energy resources. And sometimes you end up...I've realized that in recent years, you end up coming to a conclusion that might not be the one that is sort of easy to put out in a PR piece. But the reality is, Madam Speaker, when we're talking about energy conservation, it is best when we're not using it, when we don't need it to keep our natural resources where they are, that's the cheapest place to keep it. It's not worthwhile to produce more oil than we need and refine it and then have a glut above ground. The best place to keep our natural resources, our natural energy resources, primarily like our fossil fuels, our oil and our natural gas, if it's in the ground, leave it there. I'm not talking about biomass methane from landfills, I'm talking about the natural gas and our oil supplies underneath Canadian ground. Best to leave it there. If we are using natural gas for whatever purposes, ideally, we have a place like the Brady Landfill where if we're going to harness that, take advantage of that. I'm not saying go towards using the use of natural gas, far from it. As we know, I seconded Councillor Mayes' motion to look at conversion from natural gas to hydro for buildings in Winnipeg. But when we are not doing that, where should we get our natural gas? From fossil fuels under the ground or if we're already doing live biomass harnessing, isn't that the best thing we can do? And we are doing that. So, I can't deny that. When it comes to the Climate Action Plan and you know, we are being asked the question: what are we doing? Bear in mind, as Councillor Eadie has been pointing out for years, that the industrial sector of compost…of compost waste, we have not looked at it seriously as a city. So, we know that's a huge factor. Not only is it a huge factor in compostable materials that this…an opportunity loss here because we are not dealing with it. It's not part of the plan. It's not part of the Climate Action Plan. So, why isn't it a part of the Climate Action Plan? Not only is it a huge factor, might be the majority of what could be doing…done easily in the short-term, but it can be done very efficiently because we're talking about industrial con…industrial sector, where they're already organized for such a thing. We're talking about shopping centres, malls, supermarkets, restaurants, hospitals, they are not part of the Climate Action Plan, so they are not part of the composting plan. What I'm looking for is a report from the administration to take all these factors into consideration and make some maybe counterintuitive to some people, but kind of make the best decisions we can, based on the increasing costs of curbside pickup, rising at a rate much higher than the salaries and wages of the taxpayers that pay for it, so how is it sustainable? How is it…how is this supposed to be...to do with environmental sustainability, how is it economically sustainable? How can we have brought in industry…the industries that are high in composted materials, how come they are not part of this program? However, we can, at the same time, limit the amount of people and to do that, limit the amount of compost into the Brady Landfill. And at the same time, offer people the opportunity to compost with an incentive. So, the issue is, well, how does this incentive, this financial incentive, compare to the cost of compost or curbside pickup?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you. So, I'm thinking that the annual increase in this incentive of a hundred dollars, I'm thinking, chances are, the annual increase in this incentive will be less than the annual increase of the curbside pickup. So, in that respect, this might be the best way to go in terms of those that really wish to participate. As well, I never said

that I was fully in favour of the composting program. I mean, I went for the pilot project and I'm always looking at, we have to try these things, we have to, you know, try pilots, we have to try reports. In this case, it astounds me that we're not willing to look at a report from the administration, and that's too bad because given the issues that I just raised, the administration would be able to take a look at these factors, you know, and create a report and take a look at the feasibilities and to see one: what comes out more economically sustainable because our tax increases aren't sustainable in terms of what our increasing costs are, compared to the income of the people that pay for it. It's not sustainable. And two: to really take a good look at in terms of what is environmental sustainability, given the fact that we're already looking at harnessing the methane from the land…from the Brady Landfill and the fact that we don't even include industrial compost in our plans for composting as we try to deal with our obligations towards the Climate Action Plan. Having said that, Madam Speaker, if we're really serious with the Climate Action Plan, there is more we can do regarding hydro in this province. The fact that a representative of Manitoba Hydro says we do not have the capacity to increase isn't true. I'll leave it at that for now. I'll tell you later.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to thank Councillor Klein for bringing this innovative green idea to the Council floor here today. Curbside organics are extremely expensive. The pilot project that we're conducting at the moment is over $200 a year per door. An ongoing program thanks to construction inflation and regular inflation is probably going to be over a hundred dollars per year. Everyone likes the idea of, you know, doing the right thing for the environment, composting, but nobody wants to pay at the end of the day. If you ask Winnipeggers, do you want an extra hundred dollars on your water bill every year to go towards paying for this? The answer is a resounding no. Some will say yes, but the overall majority will say no. My colleagues talk about wanting to have affordable housing, you know what makes housing less affordable? New fees like this. This takes away, you know, from kids being able to participate in sports, for example. This takes away trips to the beach, music lessons, perhaps a movie, maybe a couple of meals out. These are choices. We all have to make these things. The whole point of municipal solid waste is public health not virtue signalling. Having rubbish in your yard, people get sick. In California back in the 1940s when they didn't have garbage pickup, people burned their garbage in their backyards. It was one of the earlier classes of smog. Yes, of course, in the last year during the pandemic there has been more...there's been…our diversion rates have gone down. A lot more meals are being consumed in the home not out in commercial establishments where the numbers don't count towards the residential numbers that the City posts. This seems like a reasonable alternative to encourage people to do the right thing. The people who don't want to participate are the ones who are effectively paying for the hundred-dollar subsidy. Again, this program would have no real cost to taxpayers if the fines for not…you know, for being caught not participating paid for that type…paid for the enforcement. So, we fine people for being caught for not actually composting but that pays for the enforcement, perfect. This is not a big fancy expensive operation like the tens of millions of dollars we would spend putting more diesel burning trucks on the roads going around all our streets every week and also building, you know, a hundred thousand square foot plus massive composting facilities. We're saving the environment by not doing curbside organics and adopting a program like this. So, today I'm going to be voting against receiving this as information. I think this is an idea worth pursuing. Thank you.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am not going to be supporting this motion today. You know, for families who have been composting over these last many years or few years or many years, however long they have been doing it are quite visionary and have been doing it because they are good stewards of our environment and don't need financial incentives to help encourage practices that they have been doing for many years already. We are undertaking a pilot project with curbside organic composting and you know, the studies that come out of that will lead us in a direction on what the City of Winnipeg is to do. I'm quite disturbed by hearing that our diversion rates have decreased, but seemingly over this last year, as Councillor Browaty has alluded to, more people are eating at home. There is less eating at commercial establishments, less people going to work and making more waste at home, solid waste at home. If you have ever ordered anything from one of the...from amazon, even something as small as our cell phones, comes in a big package. All of that goes into our landfills or is recycled at some point. So, hopefully after...or we get through this pandemic and are on our way towards recovery, we will see those diversion rates going back up as there is more commercial enterprises happening and people are away from home. And you know, we have talked about, in my ward, adding more garbage collection. We recognized that people are walking up and down AT pathways, sidewalks and what not, and are carrying…you know, whether it's pet waste bags or water bottles or what have you. You know, shortly, I want to introduce a motion that talks about the concept of you know, garbage out, garbage in and not leaving a trace. This is a concept that is being widely used across Canada where people are responsible for their garbage. I mentioned at our public waste standing policy committee meeting that I had the opportunity...my wife and I had the opportunity to spend some time in Tokyo, Japan. Tokyo is a very, very clean city. One of the cleanest cities I have ever seen, ever been in. And they have that concept of not leaving a trace. They don't have garbage cans or waste receptacles along their streets in public. They take their waste with them, bring it home and throw it out. And by virtue of that, their cities are very, very clean. Like I said,

some of the cleanest I have ever been in. We want to spread that philosophy here in our city and not have so much of a focus on City providing that service on our public…on our public streets. Having the opportunity to reduce or take responsibility for our own garbage and getting it off our streets, getting it off our public spaces, I think is something that we should be moving towards. So, again, if we are to be good stewards of our environment and good stewards of our land, we have to take that responsibility, Madam Speaker, in reducing our dependency on you know, government to provide subsidies or provide incentives for us to do the right thing. Thank you.

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

Councillor Lukes: I'll just very briefly speak to this. There is nothing more that I would like to see done than Brady mountain, mount Brady reducing in size and it will happen when we start the organics program. I really want to see the organics study be comprehensive and at that point when it's finished, that we look at many different options. I really appreciate Councillor Klein's motion but I really think we need to do the study, see what the costs are, and yes, to Councillor Browaty's point, they're not going to be cheap, but also to Councillor Gilroy's point, we're the last city in Canada to do this. So, I'm not going to be supporting Councillor Klein's motion. It's creative. It's innovative and I think those are the kind of motions that we need to see when the final report on costs comes forward. So, thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Sure. I appreciate the comments around the Council table including the virtual table. I agree with many of the comments that were made today, including Councillor Lukes, I think articulated reasons for her vote which I'm in…I'm voting for similar reasons and consistently with my vote at committee. So, look forward to voting on this and moving forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on Item 5. Call for recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Allard: Please record me in support.

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise.

Clerk: Just for the record, Councillor Allard was in support as well.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, were you on the screen for the vote or are you just coming back?

Councillor Allard: I was on screen. I asked to be recorded in support.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Just put your hand up when that time comes because I did…we did…it did pass already, but we have got you. Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Klein, Nason and Schreyer

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 5 passes. Mr. Clerk, next item.

Item 7 – Winnipeg Metropolitan Region Draft Plan 20-50

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, over to you for the opening.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I'll be brief. The Winnipeg Metropolitan Region Draft Plan 20-50 is as a result of the work of a lot of folks. I want to thank the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region Board and staff as well as the members who have been part of this work including our Deputy Mayor, Councillor Orlikow who is on the board representing City of Winnipeg Council and of, course, Councillor Gillingham, our Finance Chair, is serving in a leadership capacity. The...I'll be supporting this primarily because what's being asked of Council is to get the commentaries contained in the report, provide that feedback to the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region and that feedback will be provided to the Provincial Government in due course. What I want to just ensure is on the record, however, is that certainly my vote for this is to ensure that that information is provided to the Provincial Government. It is not an endorsement of a final plan which we are not...we do not have here before us today. And I would once again call on the Provincial Government to ensure the capital region partners and their respective councils, all of which who are, you know, local democratically elected representatives, have the opportunity to vote in chambers like this on the final plan before the Provincial Government finalizes it and turns some of the work into legislation and active policy. Of course, this is consistent with the approach that we have taken with respect to Bill 37. That being said, I do appreciate the opportunity to receive this information, to consider it, to have it debated on the floor of this council, which is obviously in an open and transparent way, but I want to just caution those that are following these proceedings that a vote in favour of this is certainly not a vote of a final plan which we don't have before us today. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thanks, Madam Speaker. I'm actually rising to support the actual motion in this report which is we are not deciding on the plan, but...and I, too, wanted to express in reading over our Public Service's analysis of the 20-50 Plan as it compares to the new OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities especially in terms of mapping and all the various minutiae that falls under plans. And really, Madam Speaker, you know, essentially what you get from our Public Service is that there needs to be substantial co-ordination and alignment between Winnipeg's plan and the 20-50 metro Winnipeg plan. Excuse me. And it's interesting in that some of the components that start talking about infrastructure required for growth of the built environment, the…you know, I have...that's where I have the greatest concern in terms of being treated consistently by the Province and this new body, unelected body, that will be put in place to oversee how these plans move towards fruition. And our density goals I think are pretty decent and they pointed out...so, I just wanted to just say, like, it's a big plan and aligning that stuff, you know, that was a lot of work and I really appreciate, again, our Public Service. I wasn't able to actually listen to the presentation at EPC the other day, although I listen to most…lots of that meeting, Madam Speaker. Anyway, I have confidence in what our Public Service is saying and hopefully...because after metro Winnipeg group, they submit that 20-50 plan, the Province, of course, probably will...one would hope, consider aligning things to make sure that we as a metro region can work together in seeing growth for our whole region and hopefully the Public Service with the Province will respect what our Public Service will have to say for a better alignment which they pointed out issues that should be dealt with. I mean, I really...when it talks about development, you know, Bill 37 itself, this plan, you know...and I appreciate the work the metro region did, they put a lot of work into putting together this plan. There are some things they weren't able to accomplish with a bigger view plan, Madam Speaker. But, you know, the way things are going to go down as growth happens and development and permits are pulled, you know, the real problem is the meat of how the process is going to work. And for example, you know, they are talking about changing development parameters and those kind of things at the permit level supposedly in the guise of being consistent. Well, the problem is, Madam Speaker, you know, when we look at how neighbourhoods were developed in the past, there have been inconsistencies between different cities at the time and how neighbourhoods were allowed to proceed in terms of the built environment, development, we are actually considering a subdivision, I think today, really, we need to stay on top of what our neighbourhoods...what complete communities...what the needs are what the needs are in West St. Paul, what the needs are in East St. Paul when it comes to constructing things in an appropriate fashion that…so we don't get into the Glenwood neighbourhood issues, you know, in 2050, down the road. Because then there will be a whole bunch of complaints because we're going to shift direction, for example. Maybe…there is supposedly a density infill, all these things, Madam Speaker. You know, they are going to have to be a very consistent growth and when they are building employment neighbourhoods, when they are building residential neighbourhoods, mixed-use neighbourhoods, and so on, you know, we have to make sure that the requirements for life to be sustainable in the metro region are consistent and work together so we can all as a region work together. So, you know, that's my speech to it and of course I will be supporting this report which means we're asking our Public Service to do ongoing work as it proceeds through the Province and as things become law and start to operate differently. I still think we're maybe a couple of years from full bore movement. I don't know, we'll find out. But anyway, that's all I have to say today. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise to support this report. I want to thank the Public Service for their work not only in putting this report together but there has been ongoing dialogue and work between the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region and the consultants that were hired to draft Plan 20-50 and our Public Service. There has been a lot of e-mail exchanges, phone calls, meetings whether virtual or when you could meet in-person. Seems like a

lifetime ago, but there was a time when we could meet in-person and I know our Public Service met with Winnipeg Metropolitan Region consultants and staff on the development of this plan. I also want to thank the Mayor for his advocacy on behalf of the City on Bill 37. Also want to express appreciation to AMM and Councillor Browaty, our representative on AMM, who also worked to advocate for the City's position and concerns that municipalities had related to Bill 37 and, of course, Plan 20-50 falls out of or comes out of Bill 37, which as I understand, I think last Thursday was passed I think at the legislature. I also want to express a sincere appreciation to Councillor Orlikow who's my colleague on the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region. He put a lot of time into this. And before him, Councillor Lukes spent several years involved with the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region contributing on behalf of the City. Plan 20-50 is a very important plan. It's a regional plan that focuses on how the City of Winnipeg and the 17 municipalities in the capital region are going to develop land, use land, focus on economic growth and planning in collaboration. I think Councillor Eadie used the words a few times and I…a few times, and I would echo them about working together. Is this plan perfect? By no means. Is it finalized? No, it's not finalized yet. It's a draft plan. And I know that the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region has solicited from every municipality involved in the capital region input and responses to the draft plan. Those will be forwarded together with the draft plan to Minister Johnson, the Minister of Municipal Relations at the Province of Manitoba in the coming week or weeks. The plan, as I said, has many months, years ultimately, before it's finalized and it will be the future capital region planning board that will be established ultimately in due course that will ultimately adopt the final plan. There is a lot of work to do. There's a lot of hurdles to overcome. I don't think there is any one municipality in the capital region that is 100 percent...you know, I'll use the word 'pleased' with everything within this plan. It's going to necessitate a lot of dialogue, a lot of work, changes within municipalities. I appreciate what our report says here from our Public Service and it notes some of the highlights of the draft plan. And it notes, for example, on Item No. 4, the draft plan implementation will require significant City resources. Heading into this plan, I know I and others have said this...noted this several times is that the extent of this plan, the establishment of the capital region, the participation of the City of Winnipeg as a capital region member will by necessity require resources. There will a financial cost, there'll be a person hour cost to the work of this plan. I think what's really important to remember though ultimately, this is...this is a…this is the good direction in my view. This is the right direction to be going. We need to be thinking, working, planning, developing together as a capital region. And the more we do that as a capital region the more we can effectively, as a region, be competing against other capital regions throughout Canada and throughout North America. Our...one of the good challenges that we face with the City of Winnipeg is that we have a growing population. There is a demand right now in housing. There is a demand right now for employment lands and for growth and so this plan will allow us to work in partnership with our adjacent municipalities, our neighbours, our municipal neighbours to work together, to collaborate and to find a way to grow our communities respectively. And to attract investment to our region. We know this, that Winnipeg and the capital region is...you know, produces the lion's share of economic growth and development for the Province of Manitoba. And so, our mutual and shared success is really critical to the success of the Province of Manitoba and the future. So, I'm pleased to support this report from our Public Service and once again acknowledge that they have done a lot of work and they've got a lot of work left to do and we, too as council, this council and future councils of Winnipeg will have a lot of work to do to work in partnership with the other members of the capital region, to grow our economy, to grow our community and to make sure that we're making the most of the resources that we have.

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

Councillor Lukes: That's great. Councillor Gillingham, that's exactly what I was going to say. So, I am going to speak to the report but I'm also going to speak to my support of a regional plan and regional planning. I have a rural background and I grew up in a municipality just north of Winnipeg. And I have had the opportunity to sit on the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region Board for four years and to really dive in to the benefits of regional planning and to understand the many benefits that it brings as Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Gillingham have had over these past few years. The regional plan looks at long-term strategic investments. It looks at planned infrastructure and services that support our growing communities, businesses, industry and protects our environment. Over the years, there has been missed opportunities related to coordinated transportation routes. There has been infrastructure investments where services overlap. There are multiple environmental plans throughout the region, all with great intent, but with overlap and that could have a much more strategic focus. The benefits of regional planning include co-ordination of many things: transportation, housing, other public services such as police, fire departments, hospitals and schools. Many cities have regional plans. Regional plans strengthen and they integrate development. A regional plan will enable Winnipeg and regions to compete on a national and international level like we have never been able to before. The plan will support the growing needs of our city as well as the requirements and future demands of the surrounding area and will help with a more balanced approach for the whole region. I think one of the benefits…the key benefits of a regional plan is that it focuses on the fact that there is only one taxpayer and the focus is optimizing that dollar and optimizing those resources. Does Plan 20-50 accomplish all of that and more? It's a step in the right direction. And like Councillor Gillingham said, there is much refinement that needs to come, but we have never gotten this far before and this is very positive. I am supportive of the comments that are being proposed for the Provincial Government to consider, and I want to thank the staff for the work that they have done and put into this process because I'm sure it was a very interesting process for them. And for meeting with councillors to discuss the concerns being put forward. And I want to thank Colleen Sklar and the team of the Winnipeg Met Region. Years and years and years of

work have come together for this document. It's not been an easy process and there is still much work to be done, but the payoff is going to benefit every single Winnipegger and Manitoban. A regional plan is a move in the right direction. And you know, I will say, I don't think that a regional plan would ever get passed if every Council had to vote on it, the pros and cons and whatever. I think ultimately, you know, the Province will make the final decision. And it won't be perfect right off the bat and it will probably still require refinements, but for sure it's going to put Manitoba in a position better than it's ever been before from an economic development and planning perspective. So, I'm supporting the report today. I'm a big proponent of regional planning and look forward...I actually look forward on what's to come. You know, it will be challenging, but it's moving everyone in a direction and I think that's a positive thing. Thank you.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be brief. I want to thank Councillor Gillingham and Councillor Orlikow for their work on the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region. You know, as the city of Winnipeg is growing steadily towards a million people, you know, we're seeking a comprehensive and diversified economy that provides, you know, sustainable employment to support our growing region. We also must be mindful to leverage our competitive advantage with an eye towards an interconnected and circular economy. Winnipeg and its surrounding area are made up of vibrant collection of different communities that are thriving and that provide a wide variety of housing choices, amenities and recreation to support a high quality of life that we all enjoy. We are working steadily to increase diversity and inclusion in these communities. Visionary long-term strategic planning of our infrastructure and services will support our growing and expanding communities, our businesses and industries, and protect our environment. Development of our communities and the impact of our environment should be the focus of all to ensure that there is a balance that allows for sustainability and shared commitment towards our climate action goals. Manitoba, of course, has long been known as a keystone province and Winnipeg is the gateway to transporting of goods to market whether east and west or north and south. And infrastructure planning that supports transportation routes that safely connect our communities to and from and within the region, moving people to jobs and goods to market will be a critical factor, Madam Speaker, in our continued growth and our economic success. I support inclusion and strong collaborative relationships between all levels of government, business and industry, and our Indigenous communities and the public. And Plan 20-50 provides opportunities for all to have a seat at the table and contribute to a shared vision of success and sustainability. In my last article I contributed to the community newspaper, I wrote about the importance of greenspace and biodiversity. Winnipeg must conservatively strive towards a robust and healthy ecosystem supported by a network of natural assets that allows us to protect our communities while strengthening and enhancing resiliency to minimize the impacts of a changing climate. I want to thank former Mayor Susan Thompson who through her vision was one of the first leaders to see the value that collaborative work, through a body like the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region and Indigenous leaders could have such a positive and sustainable impact on this region. We must share the same vision to plan for the next 30 years for this region and work collaboratively to implement the policies and ideas that will shape us for our future success while increasing capacity for a resilient environment. And I urge my council colleagues to support this plan. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Mayor Bowman: Just call the vote. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on this item, Item 7. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Item 8, Mr. Clerk.

Item 8 – Creation of Full-Time Investigator Position

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. This stood…Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think we might want to make sure everything is recording because it might be the one time that His Worship and I agreed if I read the comments correctly. So, this is a historical moment for all of us. It's…this position is making us reduce the position of the Fairness Commissioner role. And in today's environment and especially with some of the sales happening at the City of Winnipeg and we're talking about one today that has some concerns with it and is it parkland, is it not parkland and so on, I don't think this is the right time to be reducing or eliminating third-party oversight to add this position which will look at those that are treating the city or, you know, in essence, doing wrong to the city and maybe taking water that they are not supposed to and so on. And at the same time, we're not adding a position that will help residents that are having issues with water and waste. They are not doing anything to really support those except other than pay your bill and we'll work on it after that. So, I think that we have just kind of looked at one spot

here. We need this because this is a revenue generator. And the position may be a revenue generator for all the wrong reasons. But the oversight on how we are selling our assets on a regular basis now, and the questions that come, the old St. Vital...St. Boniface, sorry, my apologies Councillor Allard, St. Boniface city hall. Lots of questions surrounding that. Ultimately, it worked out the way they wanted it to work out because parties outside of government decided to be reasonable with each other and make a deal. I think that the Independent Fairness Commissioner is necessary right now. And I know that it is something that was brought in under this leadership. And I think that it's not the right time to have it reduced to bring on this role, not that this role may not be important. Again, it's a revenue generation role and it may be. But we also have to improve our services to residents and make sure that we are looking and reviewing...looking at and reviewing every sale in detail and in more detail.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor, back to you. I'll call the question. Item 8. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Klein…Lukes in opposition. Councillor Klein. And that's it?

Councillor Lukes: I am not in opposition. I'm supportive.

Madam Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Lukes: Sorry.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein, you're in opposition? Okay, Councillor Klein is noted in opposition, otherwise the item carries. Item 9.

Item 9 – Summary Report – Implementation of Audit Recommendations – 2021 Quarter 1

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I can't recall who pulled this matter, but I'll wait for my council colleagues to speak. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Pretty safe to assume it was me at this point. I, again, pulled this just because unfortunately, I would have liked to have had more time to review it. I know it just comes out and despite the fact that we do have the...we're told we have the opportunity to speak, the fact is, is that when we send an e-mail it goes to an anonymous address, a title if you will, and it can take up to 14...anywhere to 30 days to get a reply on some questions. I don't want to say whether the report is right or wrong. I just don't have the information necessary to make an intelligent choice on whether to support or oppose it. So, for those reasons, unfortunately, I have to oppose it.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor back to you.

Mayor Bowman: I'll just call the question, please. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. All in favour of item 9? Contrary? Councillor Klein, you are noted in opposition. The item carries. Item 10.

Item 10 – New Fire Paramedic Stations Construction Project – Implementation of Audit Recommendations Report – 2021 Quarter 1

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Again, I can't recall who pulled this earlier today, but I'll wait to hear from my council colleagues, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Klein: Again, safe to assume it's me. All the same reasons that I put forward before. We certainly do get, I think, very generic reports. In my experience in the reports that I have seen in the past from different industry or such, these are very generic. And again, to get questions answered, there is a process that we have to follow. I'm not seeing what I think is one of the most important things, which I think is something that we have to look into when it comes to the police headquarters, too, is how many change orders and so on are we going to allow, are we allowing change orders and

so on. So unfortunately, I would like to support my colleagues, but with limited information and very limited access to information, I will have to vote opposed in all good conscience.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I note these auditor reports are as a result of our experiences and our first term, Madam Speaker. And we had a number of auditors look at all these things and pointed out problems and I believe there are some very detailed reports that originated. And as our City Auditor's responsible for overseeing the implementation of all...like, there was tons of recommendations, Madam Speaker, you might recall, for example, under the new...we're still calling it the new firehall. Those fire halls aren't that new anymore. But the...so, this is a general report, talks about some of the progress. But like, I don't know how much effort we would expect our small auditor office to continue to compile and provide previous information, but Madam Speaker, I do believe if...actually, if...I do believe I still have...I still have those reports, I believe, if the...my honourable colleague around the table can come and ask me, I can electronically give him if he wants the gory details, I believe I still have them. And anyway, I'll of course be supporting the auditor's report. I'm not sure at what point you know, I haven't checked the timetable on this but at some point, it should be complete and I think we're already beyond where we should have been in order to accomplish implementing a number of recommendations that came from various auditors and that we engaged and paid money to investigate all these things. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have had an opportunity to review the report. I trust most members of Council have done their homework, have reviewed the report and have asked questions where they felt appropriate. I will be…look forward to supporting this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Call the vote on Item 10. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Councillor Klein noted in opposition. Item 11.

Item 11 – Winnipeg Police Service Headquarters Construction – Implementation of Audit Recommendations Report – 2021 Quarter 1

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Sure. I'll wait to hear from my council colleagues. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: I don't think there's any reason to delay the meeting. Same reasons as I have for others. And I, you know, will be looking further into the whole idea of some of these recommendations and why we're not talking about change orders and how they get approved and what the processes for that. So, unfortunately, I will be opposed to this one.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, I'll call the question on Item 11. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Two are noted in opposition: Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein. Okay, moving on, we have Motion 3 that's been circulated. It's moved by Councillor Eadie and seconded by Councillor Gilroy. It's in regards to public property insurance. It will be an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. Next, by-laws, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,

WHEREAS the original intentions for Manitoba Public Insurance included providing affordable public property insurance;

AND WHEREAS properties in many areas of Winnipeg and more than likely other Manitoba cities are finding it very difficult to find underwriters who underwrite property insurance, and upon finding an underwriter, the prices are very high from spreading their total operational losses to maintain their profit margin;

AND WHEREAS Manitoba Housing is a big stakeholder in providing affordable housing to Manitobans which becomes very difficult in the face of rising uncontrollable costs;

AND WHEREAS on top of escalating renovation and construction costs, many of the affordable housing entities the City of Winnipeg is trying to support are paying over 30% insurance increases to maintain underwriters' profits;

AND WHEREAS private affordable housing providers in some areas of the city are paying double and triple property insurance increases, resulting in an inability to keep rents down while making a living;

AND WHEREAS group policies can reduce insurance fees and do provide discounts in areas around the cities, but the underwriters still make substantial profits while reducing their risk by having the group delist certain properties from the group depending on where the properties exist;

AND WHEREAS many micro and small businesses are having difficulty obtaining property insurance in struggling areas of the city, and when insurance underwriters can be found, the businesses are paying substantially more than their property taxes, causing decisions to move out of these areas of the city;

AND WHEREAS the city commissioned 2018 Fire Underwriters Survey report only dealt with city wide responses to risks with no reference to dealing with other risk factors that exist in postal code areas like R2W, R2X and other postal codes in the inner city.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that City Council request of the Province Of Manitoba to have Manitoba Public Insurance establish public property insurance for areas of Winnipeg and other Manitoba cities to maintain the public interest in viable businesses and properly insured residential properties.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law 40/2021 and By-law 41/2021.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 40/2021 and By-law No. 41/2021.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that the By-laws No. 40/2021 and 41/2021 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 40/2021 and 41/2021.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 40/2021 and 41/2021 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We'll now have question period. Thirty minutes on the clock, please. Councillor Nason.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Nason: Just give me one second. Actually, I have a question to an appointee of the Mayor, Councillor Chambers. Madam Speaker, crime is running rampant in many neighbourhoods. Residents in Transcona are bearing

witness to it. Many times videos are being shared on social media about night-time creeping, but more recently broad daylight thefts of catalytic converters. Out in the open, in shopping centres…

Councillor Allard: Point of order, Madam Speaker. Is this…is this in order? Question period for the Mayor and asking questions to not the Mayor? I'm legitimately curious.

Madam Speaker: Yeah…yeah, thank you, Councillor Allard. It is in order, in fact, to ask questions of Boards and Commissions et cetera. I'll have the Clerk pull up the wording; I'm doing the same. Mr. Clerk, I see you got a hard copy in front of you there. It is in order and could you just, we'll just take a moment. It is in order, Mr. Clerk, correct?

City Clerk: Yes, Madam Speaker, it is in order. Section 14(1), Procedure By-law allows that questions may be directed to the Mayor, Deputy Mayor, Standing Committee Chairs, and to Councillors on the various Boards and Commission and Subcommittees related to the Standing Committees. I'm not sure what the question is, if it's a police services matter, it would be more appropriate to ask that under the Standing Policy Committee of Protection, Community Services as opposed to EPC, but maybe an EPC question.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, thank you. Councillor Nason, who are you directing your question to? Which committee or…?

Councillor Nason: It's the Winnipeg Police Board.

Madam Speaker: Then maybe we will pause it now, and…and ask the question under Protection. That would be the more appreciate place, but it is in order. We'll move it to that committee though. I think that would be more appropriate, Mr. Clerk or…?

City Clerk: Under the City Organization By-law, one of the jurisdictional responsibilities of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks is Police Services, so…(inaudible).

Madam Speaker: …Yeah, okay. So that would be the appropriate place. If you can hold your question until that time. I'm asking…

Councillor Nason: …So is it…so is it a matter that I ask the Chair of that Standing Committee at this time, under that or… by-law? Or do I wait until (inaudible)?

Madam Speaker: Question period for that particular committee will be later in the agenda, yes. Okay. We'll come back to you though, certainly. Any other questions for the Mayor? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I asked this last month, and didn't receive an answer. I had asked the Mayor, if he had funded any of the voting button…voting button project from his budget and if so, what amount and I received no response, so I'm asking again.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I did response last month in question period, which I did undertake to endeavour to provide a response to Councillor Lukes as well as Members of Council. Those efforts are still under way. My initial review has…has been that the dollar amount is approximately $26,000. It was provided to assist with the electronic voting. The reason for the delay is, I'm trying to get a little bit more of a breakdown because while the electronic voting and the use of the screens is being utilized, and continues to be utilized for Executive Policy Committee meetings; some of the back end technology is being utilized to properly compile the outcomes from Council meetings. And I'm trying to get that breakdown, and…and do intend as I undertook last month to provide that information to…to the Councillor. And I will continue to do that and expect to be following up with her very soon.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Anything further during this question period? Seeing none, we'll move on. Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks, the report dated May 10th. Councillor Rollins.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED MAY 10, 2021**

Councillor Rollins: Yes, I would like to move Item 1, pull 2 as per one of my council colleagues and 3...sorry, move 1 through 3, but pull out 2...4, sorry. Pull out No. 3. I apologize. We're pulling out No. 3. Moving 1, 2 and 4 unless there are folks that want to…

Madam Speaker: My paper is messed up now. Thank you, we're pulling 3. Okay.

Councillor Rollins: Yeah.

Madam Speaker: Pulling 3. We'll call the question on 1, 2 and 4. All in favour? Contrary? It's carried. Item 3, Mr. Clerk.

Item 3 – Community Incentive Grant – St. Vital Mustangs

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

Councillor Rollins: This item was passed unanimously at Protection, Community Services and Parks and I'll turn it over to my colleague, Councillor Chambers who was the mover.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am requesting that Council support this request under the Community Incentive Grant Program. The St. Vital Mustangs Football organization has been providing programming in our community since 1947 and continue to do so right up until COVID. And during this last year they have not had the opportunity to provide programming, the vital programming that they do in our community for kids as early as age 5 all the way up to adults. As a result, they have not been able to generate revenue and address the mounting bills that they continue to receive which include insurance on their building and equipment as well as their director's liability insurance as well. So, I'm requesting that Council support this request as it started at our Riel Community Committee, was voted through PCSP, then went on to EPC and is now here before Council. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be supporting this as well. As of yesterday, I put forward a very similar request for the Buhler Park is the better known name. They, too, have been greatly affected by COVID-19. We have many in our community that have been affected by COVID-19. I've got Transcona Nationals at…you know, at some point they will likely be coming as well. Our grants funding isn't sufficient to cover all the need. We had a community centre...community centre, the West Broadway organization who recently through Council was provided coverage under the City policy, under the blanket policy for their insurance. I think we need to go back and look at that because the report that came forward said that this really was the only one that needed that coverage. I think there is a much broader need and to have the understanding of the financial impacts, is there opportunity to support St. Vital mustangs, the Transcona Nationals and all the other...pardon me, clubs that would fall into this sort of situation, the COVID-19, where they have been shut down. We need to do a better job for them. I will support the motion today. And I hope that reciprocal support and/or amendments to perhaps look at this more wholly for other groups that are impacted by this is looked at very carefully, hopefully next month when it comes around again. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The St. Vital Mustang's home is ironically enough located outside of the St. Vital Ward, but my thanks to Councillor Chambers who is stepping up and putting some of his ward funding in to help out. This is a long-standing organization in St. Vital, a lot of history, former Councillor Steeves was a player, remains a coach. I have seen him out there coaching when I have been out there; luckily for all concerned, not coaching. I think I was doing the coin flip and left the football side to former Councillor Steeves. Although, Councillor Chambers could have been out there coaching, he had played against the Mustangs in his prime. He has talked about that. So, it's a good community group. It's a good community initiative. Glad to see it. I'm sure, as Councillor Nason said, all sorts of different groups will have requests and we will be hard pressed probably to find ward funds to satisfy everybody, but in this case, commend Councillor Chambers for stepping up here and helping out what's really been a very good group to work with over the years. We have certainly put some City money into that park and into that field and the Province has both under the current government and under the Selinger government put a fair bit of money in. So, a good group to be supporting and hopefully we'll get the two-thirds required.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor. We can call the question. It's Item 3.

Councillor Rollins: I can close.

Madam Speaker: Oh yes, Protection Committee, Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: It's been a long meeting. Thank you for all the words. I hope it's unanimous again today and thank you to PCSP and Councillor Chambers.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We'll now have question period under this committee. There was a request for a short recess at three o'clock. Let's continue maybe with question period right now. See how far we get. Time is on the clock, Councillor Nason.

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

Councillor Nason: Let's try this again, Madam Speaker. Crime is running rampant in many neighbourhoods. Residents in Transcona are baring witness to it. Many times, we're seeing videos shared on social media about night-time creeping and crawling in the backyards. But more recently, recent broad…board dFinanaylight thefts of catalytic converters are occurring in the open. They are happening in shopping centres, parking lots and beside takeout restaurants. These brazen thefts are causing residents significant dollars, dollars they can't afford to lose. So my question for Councillor Rollins now is what is possible to do?

Madam Speaker: Your question can be asked of the Police Board Chair under this committee.

Councillor Nason: Oh, okay, pardon me.

Madam Speaker: So, would you want to…would you like to address it to the Police Board Chair?

Councillor Nason: Sure, I'll address it to there.

Madam Speaker: And if you could just restate your question.

Councillor Nason: Yeah, so my question for Councillor Chambers is what is it that the Winnipeg Police Board can do to get the message back that residents want this activity stopped, and feel that their property is safe?

Madam Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Orlikow: Madam Speaker, may I call a point of order?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Orlikow: I get this is the first time I've heard this process where we're asking the Police Board Chair at this committee to speak on a matter of the Police Board. Can I just ensure that this is proper? I don't believe this ever happened in the past, and so I want confirmation from the Clerk's there, that Councillor Chambers' role here, this is… this is not Police Board. You know, it's not the Police Board we're having here, it's Protection Standing Policy Committee.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. You're right, it doesn't happen often, but it is in order and it is in the Procedure By-law, and so the question is in order. Check the document. Councillor Nason, the question you posed was for Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you Madam Speaker, and I thank Councillor Nason for his question. Yes, the issue of crime in our city has been something that has been raised. Last year, in our 2020 Strategic Plan, this was something that was addressed or raised as part of the Downtown Safety Strategy and the Winnipeg Police Service through their Business Plan, did come back with a plan to address downtown safety in the downtown context. This year is an update to our Strategy Plan. We did add the element of Neighbourhood Safety Strategy to our Strategic Plan, and asked the Winnipeg Police Service to come up with a plan through their business…through their Business Plan on how they are going to address Neighbourhood Safety. I know that for me, personally, as a ward councillor, I've been working a lot with my

community residents in developing Community Neighbourhood Watches that work towards providing a visual presence in their neighbourhoods, supporting things like reflective vests, flashlights, whistles, so that they can be mobilized, getting tips from our Community Services through the Winnipeg Police Service as well as other groups such as the Bear Clan that have experience in community mobilization. And having residents be part of the solution towards reimagining community safety and well-being. But I do thank you for the question, and like I said, we are waiting for our Business Plan or our updated Business Plan from the Winnipeg Police Service which now includes Neighbourhood Safety. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers, Chair of the Police Board. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: So for my second question for Councillor Chambers, what is the Winnipeg Police Board's approach to drive attention in areas of pawn shops and scrap dealers in regards to the items being traded through crime?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: So, in terms of the actions that will take place of the Winnipeg Police Service, that is really up to them in terms of how their operations will deal with you know, pawn shops, items getting fenced…stolen and fenced in pawn shops, and that type of activity where items are sold for the purposes of, you know, getting money to further their habit. Again, that is…that is an operational question, and something that the Winnipeg Police Service would be responding to.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, for my third and final question for Councillor Chambers. Winnipeg has unfortunately has reached double-digit murders tragically in this past week. What actions will Winnipeg Police Board be undertaking to turn the corner on what we've seen over the last several years of 40 plus murders in our community?

Councillor Chambers: Thank you again for that question, Councillor Nason. This is on the minds of every Winnipegger, dealing with safety. We've seen over the last couple of years that there has been a dramatic increase in the amount of homicides in our City. The reports that I received back from the Winnipeg Police Service with respect to the clearance rate of homicides is in the 90 percentile range, which means the majority of these cases are cleared. There is also an active strategy dealing with guns and gangs, and working towards gang suppression, and getting rid of gangs out of our city, which a lot of these murders are attributed to. So that is one of the active strategies that is being worked on by the Winnipeg Police Service. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Chair of this committee? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: This is to be directed to Councillor Rollins, correct?

Madam Speaker: That's right.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, so our parks are really being embraced with COVID restrictions and just people getting out and enjoying the beautiful weather. I know lots has been occurring in regards to working with the Public Service and Take Pride Winnipeg to have our parks kept clean, have the garbage dumped, pathways cleared from tree branches. Could you just give us an update on, I guess, specifically, the garbage scenario, Councillor Rollins, what's happening?

Councillor Rollins: Thank you for the question. Well all of Council certainly did hear through the most recent announcement with Mr. Shaw and Mr. Mayor, the additional resources that will be in city parks this summer with respect to Community Services and…and moving to support Public Works, Parks, and including Summer Students, just similar to what I have in terms of support for Green Teams, Mr. Mayor had also included some supports to…to augment the increased use of Parks, and of course, Councillor Lukes, you know that coming to PCSP will…will be your motion with respect to the same interest in augmenting service. It was passed unanimously, I believe all three motions with…with maybe some tweaks that…that you…you had at PCSP this month because Winnipeggers need to know that this council is prioritizing the space that they can occupy during Code Red and that includes our parks where they can safely distance with their families, and we're seeing augmented use meaning, you know, more garbage, and so, you know, PCSP was…was grateful to you for the discussion that you prompted with the motions, all three of them, that you did this month at PCSP. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Madam Speaker, to…to the Chair, I would like to know through you, Madam Speaker to the Chair, about what we're doing on crime prevention from the Chair. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much, Councillor Gilroy. I was listening with interest in aware of our Governance By-law and also, really importantly, the work that we're doing on catalytic converters at PCSP in particular. Catalytic converters is not a new thing to be stolen in Winnipeg, it is something that I think that Council has a partitive plan, but moreover before I got here, Councillor Eadie was all over it in terms of disrupting and wanting to disrupt bike theft and interrupt the metal trade that we know has been going on for years in Winnipeg and has only increased. So at Protection, Community Services and Parks, we've had several motions that have been passed and program that you can find on the City's website to support and disrupt the metal trade in the City that is being done illegally including tackling the important issues of catalytic converters. And I would like to thank for their efforts, Community By-law Enforcement and in particular, Mr. Winston Yee who's just a rockstar and has been on it, including in consultation with the Winnipeg Police Service. So that has been important work at Protection, Community Services and Parks, and how the Community Safety and Crime Prevention Program that many organizations have been benefiting from across the City there and doing really important work on community safety and crime prevention. We also have invested in $1 million in 24/7 Safe Spaces which is really, really important to ensure that our communities are a lot safer. And finally, we have invested in community services like libraries, community centres, and have…that we hopefully will approve when we get report a Homelessness Partnership Partnering Strategy. So taken in tandem, these are some of the things we have done including the Bicycle Registry, an important investment including the Community Safety and Crime Prevention Program, and I thank my colleague for the question.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Recently Canada Post Corporation took the media circuit in regards to animal bites that their letter carriers are experiencing in the City of Winnipeg from dogs. Could the Chair articulate what breeds have been involved in these attacks? What's the number involved and what actions are being undertaken in this matter?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. Your question was breeds involved and actions being taken. Was there another question that I'm missing there?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Just numbers.

Madam Speaker: Would you like to restate the question?

Councillor Rollins: Just the numbers, all right.

Madam Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Nason: What breeds are involved, the numbers involved and what actions are being undertaken.

Councillor Rollins: The last time I looked at that data was in consultation with the Winnipeg Humane Society on collaborative work that in fact, just at the Protection, Community Services and Parks last month, we directed the public service to go forth (inaudible) and do relative to the Responsible Pet Ownership By-law. I met a couple of years ago with the Winnipeg Humane Society and at that time, the data with respect to breeds, no coincidence, really reflected the breeds that were most popular in Winnipeg, Labradors, for instance, and you know, German Sheppard mixes from what I recall. I will get that information from the source, the Winnipeg Humane Society to the Councillor. In terms of actions being taken, we have the Responsible Pet Ownership By-law. There, we just voted on a bit of an augmentation with respect to the RPO today, and we've directed…we've directed in a variety, more areas in order to make sure that we were emphasizing responsible pet ownership in the city.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further? Seeing no further questions that ends question period under this committee. There was a request for a short recess. Ten, 15 minutes? What's the feeling? Ten minutes. We'll reconvene at 20 after. Thank you. Ten minute recess.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
Maye 27, 2021, at 3:22 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of May 27th, 2021. We are on the committee…Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Allard, the report dated May 12th, 2021.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED MAY 12, 2021

Councillor Allard: I would like to move consent agenda.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That's one item. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We have a motion that's been circulated. It's Motion No. 4, moved by Councillor Orlikow and seconded by Councillor Rollins. It is in regards to Sunday holiday bike routes. It's an automatic referral to this committee. We have no motions, no by-laws. We'll now have question period for this committee. Councillor Nason, your first question for Councillor Allard.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS the Sunday / Holiday Bicycle Routes are outlined as part of By-law No. 1573/77 of the Highway Traffic Act;

WHEREAS By-law No. 1573/77 does not provide amendments to the routes by the Director on a as needed basis except for issues related to safety;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the following be submitted to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works:

1. *That the Traffic By-law No. 1573/77 be amended to delegate the authority to the Director of Public Works to:*

    A. *Set and amend the dates and times for streets designated as Sunday / Holiday Bicycle Routes, in consultation with the relevant area Councillor*

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker it's been awhile since I stood and asked the Chair questions so, I see a lot of comments about safety concerns for our transit drivers and I'm wondering what...what the chair can share with us as far as any reports or items of interest that can reassure the drivers that safety is being taken under advisement and that it's going to be addressed.

Councillor Allard: Thank you for the question. Safety concerns are referred to generally the Transit Advisory Committee which is a multi-stakeholder committee and safety issues are discussed there. The committee reports periodically. I am the chair. If there is anything specific I would love to hear what the issue is and can bring it to the Transit Advisory Committee either directly or by motion from Council to the Transit Advisory Committee, which has been our practice.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Nason: Has there been in recent months an uptick shall...a I hazard to use that word on violence on transit drivers?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I have to check with the Public Service. The Councillor would have to define what he means by uptick. Violence against transit drivers has been an issue and one that is discussed quite often at the Transit Advisory Committee. There has been various safety measures implemented like new shields for buses, and a number, almost countless initiatives in terms of increasing transit safety. I'd be happy to dig up the reports that demonstrate all of the actions that have been taken since the Transit Advisory Committee was put into place.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question.

Councillor Nason: Could the Chair advise us on what percentage of transit workers have been immunized to this point? Or vaccinated, sorry.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I presume the councillor is talking about COVID-19 vaccinations. I would defer that question to public health. I am not aware of what percentage or contingent has been vaccinated.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Actually, I had a vaccination appointment last Friday and I found myself in a situation where I decided to take public transit for the first time since April 2020, and while riding on the bus, I had a short conversation with the drive, who seemed to me, things were going okay. But I'm wondering if the Chairperson of IRPW could bring back to Council, because I know you probably won't have the answer at this point. But like what's the status of trying to keep people socially separated on the buses? As my experience while users are respectful, the reality is the bus design and stuff is difficult. And I…it would be to hear back if there have been some attempts to figure out how to keep people socially distanced on the bus. I know, maybe we only have another four months or so, but ultimately, there's a fair number of people rising the buses. So I'm wondering if he can come back with a little more information on that for us, just to find out. Because it was the understanding of the driver that the Committee or whoever was still trying to figure out various means of social distancing on buses.

Councillor Allard: Thank you for the question, Councillor Eadie. I'll be e-mailing the CAO's Office, probably the Director, himself immediately, I'll be asking for that update on that information.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any other questions for our chair? Okay, seeing none, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. Councillor Gillingham, on the report dated May 14th.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE DATED MAY 14, 2021

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to introduce the report. Can I comment on it at this time? Or…so I'll stand it down then.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – COVID-19 Economic Support Grant Program Round Two

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think everyone certainly around the chamber…this chamber, understands that the most recent health orders continue to affect or further affect many businesses, especially small businesses and not-for-profits, who we know have been struggling and continue to struggle under the health restrictions. Most businesses, it seems that almost all businesses and non-profits are doing their part to comply with the public health

orders. They are co-operating in an effort...part of the collective effort to defeat COVID-19 so that we all one day can get back to some sense of normal or new normal and open…open our economy, open our recreation centres, it's everything that all of us long for. And so, the most recent health orders, as I said a moment ago, are having an impact; once again, a detrimental impact on the financial situation that businesses find themselves in. And the first round of the economic support grant program was, of course, $3 million included in the 2021 budget. And it is almost fully subscribed. There was 2,000 grants available of $1,500 each. Last reportedly were up over 2,500 applications have come in. 1,900...just over 1,950 of them have been processed and just the last few to be processed. And so, it looks very much like that first round of grants will be fully subscribed. It was really good to hear at the Finance Committee when our Chief Financial Officer shared some letters or a couple of e-mails that were received by our department from not-for-profit organizations just really expressing an appreciation for the first $1,500 grant. I spoke to one restaurant owner over the phone, he said, you know, it may not seem like a lot, and I'm paraphrasing his words, but this is what it was, he said, it may not seem like $1,500 is a lot but it will help me get through one more month. And so, I think if, you know, if that's what we can do here by offering a second round of the grant, $3 million…another $3 million, made available to businesses and not-for-profits, if we can assist, you know, a business, if we can assist a non-profit get through a few more weeks or another month, then perhaps they have a better chance of surviving the COVID-19 and their business pulling through. And so, I'm really looking forward, I trust, to full support, a unanimous support of this second round of the grant program. It will be an additional $3 million set up very much like the first round was; $1,500 grants available, 2,000 of them available, and applicants can apply online. And so, once again, I think it's fairly straightforward and I ask for everyone's support on this matter.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, followed by Councillor Nason and then Councillor Eadie.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Gillingham for his leadership on this as well as members of Council who I know who have also been advocating for greater supports for local businesses and not-for-profits who have been directly affected by the Provincial Government's public health orders. I think the public health orders have been introduced to help protect Winnipeggers, their families and our economy. I have and I will continue to advocate on behalf of Winnipeggers that those measures should be stronger and more proactive so that the pain that our businesses are feeling as well as not-for-profits, in addition to, of course, the health effects are mitigated to the greatest extent. But this is something that we can do, doubling down on the COVID-19 Economic Support Grant Program, is one additional measure that we can take to provide some support to businesses and not-for-profits that need the support right now. I also want to acknowledge and I want to thank both Federal and Provincial Governments for the supports that they, too, have provided. I think we should acknowledge that of course I know many were hoping that with some of the modest measures that were introduced today by the Provincial Government that there would be economic supports granted, but this is something that we can do within our means and within our jurisdiction, and I'm looking forward to supporting this and would hope that my council colleagues, too, would provide support for this motion. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise and I will be supporting this. I didn't support the budget along with, I believe, it was six other members of Council that voted against the budget that had this in it the first go round. I happened to be at the same location at lunch time with Councillor Gillingham and I said…you know, at that time I said, you know, why wasn't this part of a…you know, having it in the back pocket in case we needed more for the budget. And you know, more needs to be done because we are not out of this yet. I know many of us probably have been getting contacted about tax bills, business tax bills that came out in May that, you know, they are having to pay a hundred percent. So, yes, this will help. You know, I have got a motion that's going to be making its way through with regards to food trucks. Nominal amount. It's a very small amount that I worked with the Public Service. So, again it's one of those things. Last year our budget 2021 was supported with I believe it was $75 million in federal tax relief. I don't know if that will come around again this time. There is provincial money in there as well. But you know, we have got some dark clouds ahead of us with regards to our finances and you know, this $3 million is one thing, but we voted down a motion earlier to support some of the most vulnerable, to support Main Street Project, right. That number was less than this, but it's important as well. We will have a report come back, but yet, it's further delays. We're able to bring this one forward rather quickly and I hope that when this report from the CAO comes or whoever is going to bring it forward on supporting the other motion, I hope that we don't drag the puck and we get supports where it's needed most for the most vulnerable. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll rise just to speak quickly. I, of course, will support this initiative. You know, there is more I wish we could do and we are in a different situation than other levels of government. But I just wanted to say, Madam Speaker, this second round, yeah, it's $1,500, people say, well you know, that's not much, but I just wanted to reflect a call I received from...even though I didn't vote for the operating budget last time, but I do support initiatives that try to help businesses and not-for-profits through this time. But our...or social enterprises or what have you, Madam Speaker. But everybody's friend Tracy from Luda's, a family run restaurant, was so happy to receive the $1,500 that...it's

a small restaurant that people...North Enders current and North Enders formerly all congregate. It is a great restaurant. Luda stands for people in Ukrainian. And anyway, Tracy will be happy to hear because she hasn't been able to open at all, it's too small, no way to social distance, and…but this extra $1,500, it's helping her pay those fixed cost bills that she is not earning any money to deal with. And again, it's her and her daughter who run that restaurant and they make a living on it. And I know that they will be thankful that Council is moving this forward, Councillor Gillingham and all of us, actually. I don't see how you would be opposed to this. So, thanks, Madam Speaker. I just thought I would put a face...I know there is probably lots of people who know Tracy and so let's just hope she can reopen when the time comes and that she hasn't gone under because it is a great place.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Filter, prioritize, analyze and synthesize data or information to support or refute a decision. Extract and categorize best practice insights and wisdom in an easily accessible, knowledge repository. Communicate critical information and knowledge to the appropriate decision makers. That's how a decision is made, a well-informed decision. And that doesn't happen here. A year ago, I asked the City for the emergency plan. It was never shared. One would have to feel that there was a reason why it wasn't shared. Over a year ago, along with Councillor Nason, we had put in a request to address what will be the economic fallout of COVID-19 and it was ignored and not supported by many on this council. Now, I know we can ask for more information, a lot of it is vague on this particular motion. But it is impossible to ask anything of administration unless, of course, you sit on a committee. In fact, on several occasions I have been denied discussing directly with administration outside of committee meetings, and again, directed to an inquiries line, an e-mail, an anonymous process. States of money is coming from general revenues and if necessary, we'll dip into the reserve fund for $3 million, which is great. Our businesses need the help. Will it be enough? I don't know. Is there something more we could do? I'm sure there is, but we haven't had that discussion. This wasn't sent to all councillors and it wasn't discussed in a collaborative team effort. It was moved forward. We have no traceability of details of what goes into and out of the general revenue fund. And I'll note that my colleague, Councillor Gillingham, voted no to my previous three, no, four motions that I've provided...presented at Council to provide assistance to businesses and hotels. I'm tracking how many businesses have in fact closed since the start or the first vote that we had on those motions. Those numbers are very interesting and we'll see what happens in the weeks to come. Entrepreneurialism and resiliency of our small businesses will be the key to Winnipeg's success. The $1,500 motion is great and it will make a wonderful social media post, but are we doing enough? Is this the best use of that money right now? I agree. Some have found it very helpful. Some have just taken it and used it to keep alive during this time. But will it be enough, is it enough? Is it the best that we can do? And I know that there is another report coming, but I would think when it's a decision that impacts our city such as this, a decision that is really important, and impacts every one of our wards, that we would have done this collaboratively. That we would have taken this as a team and talked about what is possible. Obviously, some did but didn't include everybody. The motion is fine. Another $1,500 from the reserve fund is fine. $400,000 to help homeless people apparently is not. I'm going to support the motion because I support small businesses and I support the entrepreneurial spirit and I believe that it now...it now outnumbers the amount that it would have cost to give a 10 percent reduction in business tax which was asked for a year ago. I guess what I'm saying today is that politics aside, wouldn't we be better off doing this together and truly showing a united front for our business people and residents in the city when it's needed most? The inflation rate is growing. We have all seen the impact it's had in the last few months and it's growing again. This will be step one of many steps that we're going to have to take to address economic issues. So, I will support it but I do hope in the future we could have more collaborative conversations together.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I'm looking forward, hopefully, everyone supporting the motion. As to comments by Councillor Klein, I certainly welcome collaboration. I note that the motions he brought forward, there was…previously, there was, if I recall, no collaboration on and not sufficient funding sources for some of them for sure. And this is not the only thing we have done. I just noted that, of course, in the budget there was not only the first $3 million and this is…the Mayor says doubles it to $6 million for the Economic Support Grant Program, but in the budget, we also extended property business tax deadlines once again and we raised the business tax threshold allowing another thousand businesses to not pay business taxes in 2021. Councillor Klein voted against those initiatives. I'm glad to see now, though, he is supporting local business with voting for this motion. So, thank you, Madam Speaker. I look forward to be calling the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question on this item. All in favour? Contrary? And that's carried unanimously. On to the by-laws under Finance, Councillor Gillingham.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 49/2021 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 49/2021.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. I move that By-law 49/2021 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 49/2021.

Councillor Gillingham: And I move that the rule be suspended and that By-law 49/2021 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We'll now have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Gillingham? Councillor Klein.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This just kind of came to me with Councillor Gillingham's comments, the other motions, I think were also coming from general revenues, he wasn't sure where that was coming from, and he did mention that I voted against the motion to provide the $3 million the first time…

Madam Speaker: Your question.

Councillor Klein: …I'm wondering if the Councillor can answer the question for me that, are we…was the opportunity to vote on every budget item, one by one, provided to us as Council so we could tell or support the motions that we felt were good and not support those that we felt were bad or if we only had the option of yes or no?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think that all councillors should know by now that there is no budget where every councillor or any councillor probably likes 100% of the budget. There's never been a budget we passed, my time on Council where 100% of the budget I agreed with. And so, we vote on budgets, capital budgets, and we vote on an operating budget, we vote also on the Police budget as a separate motion, but I think councillors have to understand that it takes a lot of effort, a lot of collaboration, and so if a councillor is waiting to, you know, get 100% of what they want in a budget or pick a budget apart and go line by line, that's not going to happen.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you I thank the Councillor for the response. Maybe the Councillor could then tell me or answer if it is true that some…I guess offers were made to certain councillors for their support, if they would have supported the budget because I never had that offer. So, I do know from two councillors that they were given the option A, if you support the budget, we will give you this. Is that accurate?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: I think the councillor would know, Councillor Klein would know because I met with him at least once, and extended an offer to him to meet the second time perhaps, we did meet a second time. But I meet with every councillor in my role as Chair of Finance to try to see what priorities are needed, requested, desired by councillors. And within, you know, we work hard to accommodate the needs and priorities that the councillors have. It's not possible to…to

always accommodate everybody, but I think what we have to understand is we try to work together. I made an effort over the years to make sure that the Council process includes dialogue with every member of Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Klein: Sorry Madam Speaker, that doesn't answer my question. It's pretty simple. It's a yes or no answer.

Madam Speaker: Third question. Is that your third question, Councillor Klein?

Councillor Klein: Can we have a ruling on that? Because I would like to have an answer. I'm going to ask a question, shouldn't I get an answer on it and not ([inaudible]…

Madam Speaker: …Questions can be answered how the individual sees fit.

Councillor Klein: So we can ask questions, but we don't have to answer.

Madam Speaker: Your third question.

Councillor Klein: I'm just going to ask the same question. Did he or did he not make offers to certain councillors if they supported the budget?

Councillor Gillingham: I can tell the Council that I ask for every councillor's support on the budget, every one of them. And…and I will be looking forward to every councillor's support and requesting now, every councillor's support on the upcoming budget as well; to continue to work hard and to meet with every councillor to see what councillors have for priorities, and where possible, to accommodate those.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to rise and I'm wondering if it's, anyway, just to preface it, I spent my time dialoguing with Councillor Gillingham and right from the get go, I understand that we're not going to agree on budgets and budget directions, but Madam Speaker, what I wanted to say is, I'm wondering if Councillor Gillingham understood that when I voted for the capital budget that I didn't vote on it because there was some help there for the Old Ex grounds for example, I voted for the capital budget and wouldn't never vote for the operating because it…the four-year budget has no… Anyway, so my question really is, I don't know if Councillor Gillingham knows that I appreciated him accepting some big ideas that I thought would apply for everybody, and I'm wondering if he understands that I didn't…I wasn't making a deal, I was just throwing things at him to consider in the upcoming budget. I'm wondering if he knows that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: I am aware. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason, over to you.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm challenged to rise and ask this question following on Councillor Klein's line of questioning. But I feel compelled to get up and ask the question. During budget deliberations, and I guess the strong negotiation, can the Chair articulate what his position was on a matter of great importance to me, if there was an offer made, if I supported both budget items, if that matter would be successful?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, I have asked for and will continue to ask for as Chair of Finance, every member of Council's vote for the budget, for both operating and capital budgets. That will be my consistent position. As part of my role, I work hard to meet with every councillor to see if their requests can be accommodated within the budget. There is so…only so many funds available. Council is a matter of give and take. Everybody who has been around this chamber for any length of time understands that. There's compromise. As I said a moment ago, there are things in the budget that I voted…there are things in the budget that I voted for, a budget I voted for, that would not be my preference. I will continue to work hard to meet with every member of Council to try to see their priorities reflected within our budgets.

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

Councillor Nason: Yes, we did have meetings. I believe it was a total of three hours perhaps, Madam Speaker. How many hours was…did the Budget Working Group actually meet?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: The budget…I don't know the number of hours the Budget Working Group met, but the budget work begins months in advance of the budget adoption day.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Yeah, I'm only rising because I just want some clarity because I know that Councillor Gillingham, he's asked for the support of the budget from every councillor. I don't remember being asked. Can he tell me exactly when he asked me in my office for my support of both the operating budget and the capital budget?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: I don't have the date on me. I do know the Councillor, for whatever reason, had to cancel one or two of the meetings we were supposed to meet.

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

Mayor Bowman: I'll just ask an are you aware, Councillor that you asked for all members of Council's support in this form when we were voting and deliberating in a public, open, transparent way, the budget?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Mayor for that reminder, and yes, thank you. I did, and so I will say it now, if I'm still the Chair of Finance in the coming months, I'm asking now for every Council's members' vote on both the operating, capital budgets for the 2022 budget.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move forward to the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. Councillor Mayes, the report dated May 7.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT DATED MAY 7, 2021

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll move Item No. 2 on this May 7th agenda and pull Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Item 2, we have...just a moment here. Go ahead, Mr. Clerk.

Clerk: Item No. 1?

Madam Speaker: Item No. 1, yes.

Item 1 – Request for Budget Revision for the South End Sewage Treatment Plant (SEWPCC) Nutrient Removal/Expansion Capital Project

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I thought it was worth pulling this. This is a fairly major initiative that the City of Winnipeg is doing. We had a session one time at Water and Waste where I think it was Lake Winnipeg Foundation came in and said, this is great, the interim solution that's coming in would be the first time you are taking any phosphorous or nitrogen out and Moira Geer turned to me and said, we're spending $400 million at south end. That's helping as well. We are doing some work already. It tends to be forgotten, given the long and at times agonizing progress on the North End plant, that we have put money in, we the City, on west end, that was before my time and on south end during this Mayor's term of office, we have been spending, frankly, hundreds of millions of dollars on an important environmental initiative. This plant, formerly in my ward, is now moved into Councillor Chambers' ward after the boundaries changed, so it's in Councillor Chambers' ward, south

end plant, this is a major initiative that…you will remember, this work sort of phased out in about four different contracts. This was the big one. It has gone over budget. It has not gone wildly over budget. It has gone over budget. There are some troubling comments if you look down around pages 5 and 6 about concerns with the work of the contractor. But the work by our staff continues. This is a request for $16.5 million to do...to finish off this particular contract. It's coming out of the environmental projects reserve so this is not a matter of debt financing. I suspect we'll come to that debate in about five minutes or so when we talk about North End. I suspect that because I will be raising it, but…and probably some others as well. This is money that would come out of the environmental projects reserve. You will remember that had at year end about $160-ish million in it, so this certainly does not drain that reserve, but this is part of a sort of larger narrative of our work on the sewage treatment plant. It certainly goes unnoticed. No one stops by and says, I saw that. It's a great project you're doing there. Ironically, you know, you get compliments on the basketball court or the play structure or the splash pad or something, but here we are spending tens of millions, hundreds of millions on the south end plant without anybody really noticing it. So, there have been some issues. There have been some issues flagged by the building trades about the labour supply there. That will feed into our debate about North End that we're coming to in a few minutes, but this one is relatively straightforward. It is a cost overrun. $16 million is a lot of money. We could probably build a new arena for $16 million, but this is money that's been accumulated under the environmental projects reserve they're going to need to use to get this very major initiative to the finish line. It tends to be overlooked. It tends to be forgotten and I just want to flag some good work done by Moira Geer and her staff in moving along with this south end project. So, more to discuss, I think, on the North End, which is coming in a few minutes, but the south end...I mean, in a way, it's a good news story. We're nearing the end of the work on the south end. In a way, it's a bad news story. It's gone over budget and there are certainly issues that are highlighted in the report. But it is a major environmental initiative that's been undertaken last term and this term. Proud of that work that's being done and we're near the conclusion. So, $16 million, yes, is a large amount of money, not nearly the amount we will be talking about in a few minutes under North End, but it's not all bad news. We should take some pride in doing this. This will help the lake, this will help with our emissions. So here we are, nearing the end on south end, nearing the start on North End which we will come to in a moment, but I would ask for support on this item. It is a cost overrun but it is…there is room enough in the environmental projects reserve. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thanks to the Chairperson for introducing and putting some levity on the south Winnipeg plant. Madam Speaker, I recall...I wasn't on Council, but I recall the overbudget, the controversy around the west Winnipeg sewage plant and the upgrades there and the cost overruns. And it seems when we get into these highly environmentally sensitive projects which require really a complex level of construction. It seems we have some issues. I am voting to…for this report, it goes $16 million over. But I just wanted to reflect on the design-bid-build process that went ahead with this particular project in that we actually had our contractor, Veolia who provides advice, put together a very detailed spec in order for the…design spec...in order to get a bid from a company who would then build. And at the time, Veolia, I can't remember what the net amount was, but they benefitted and it went into their helpful account as a positive in terms of their role and work that they did on it. And what I find interesting, though, is that, so the bid comes in, and we applaud Veolia because, you know, they are the ones who helped us get the price down, and they get a reward. But then we have a contractor who bids, and you know, more than likely underbid inappropriately, and that's the controversy around this in terms of labour and skill and ability to undertake the work. However, Madam Speaker…and you know, $16 million on a project like this it really…like, that's not too bad, but ultimately, what these...at $16 million, I'm wondering, Madam Speaker...and I'm sorry, I didn't listen to the discussion at the Finance Committee or Water and Waste in this regard. I'd like to know if we rewarded Veolia based on a bid, not on the actual cost to build. I'm wondering if we get to take back some of that positive that Veolia received. This is where I find a problem with this contract with the private firm, providing their advice, and they do provide good advice. There's no doubt about that, Madam Speaker. But ultimately, you know, the idea of that contract is we reward them for their great assistance, and we penalize them if it ends up not that helpful. And under our next discussion we're going to have, it looks like Veolia has nothing to do with it. But in terms of this one, I just want to know that, you know, I thought they were, as part of this deal, this very long-term contract that they have, I thought that it was part of the deal if we experience, you know, a risk thing that costs us more money, they are supposed to share in that. And I'm not sure if we ended Veolia's participation in this when they finished the design spec that was quite detailed so that we could get it a bid that was closer to budget. And this is actually pretty close when it comes to...$16 million, you know, it's a big project. It's lots of millions of dollars. So, you know, and we should be worried about, you know, enough money to build a two-sheet arena for $16 million, I believe, not a single-sheet arena. So, anyway, I'll leave it at that. I'm going to be voting in support of this report. But you know, I didn't…and I haven't heard…I don't know if there's a specific analysis of this, but I think that if we, the City, the taxpayers…well actually, in this rate…in this case, it's the water bill payers, the rate payers, who are actually paying for this increase. It's not coming out of the property tax budget. It's coming out of the rate payers' reserve that was set aside for this project. And ultimately, you know, I'd like to see if this private contractor with us is experiencing part of the risk, the bad part of the risk on this. And thanks.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In the words of Whitesnake, 'Here we go again'. We need more money, millions. The report is here, it's ready to go, it's on time, but help for the homeless? No, we can't do that. There's nothing to gain from that. Look, here we are again spending money because we have it, it seems. I've heard that a couple of times. I've heard that in the presentation of the motion. Well, we have the funds available, so let's spend them. That type of thinking is traditional government thinking and thinking that I think we need to move away from. That's that status quo thinking that we need to move away from. You know, why are we really here? And I think it's because we continue to follow an antiquated bid system that has been proven by other jurisdictions and many post-secondary institutions across North America to be the worst. We follow the design-bid-build. There are other ways. There's new ways. There's creative ways. There's ways that are working. They could be better ways. We just haven't looked at them. We continue to do the things the same way and end up with the same results many times. Other practices include the design-build RFPs or best value models where you're actually looking at the credentials of those involved to make sure you're going to get the best for your money. There's also one called the integrated project delivery model where it's a true team effort of everybody involved including the taxpayers because everyone wins when the project is on time and under budget. I can send these to everybody. They're from various different post-secondary institutions and other jurisdictions. Happy to provide. Those aside, I'm concerned that this council, administration and…is not necessarily providing us all the details on this. I'm going to go back to the police headquarters again. How many change orders have been requested with the south plant? Do we know? How much have they cost? Do we know? Who approved them? Do we know? Were they necessary? Do we know? Those are the questions that I am looking for answers on. Those are the questions that I would like to see detail on. I often hear and see numbers that I think we're paying $3 for something that for more people would cost $1. That has to stop. We're not in that process anymore. We can't do that. And I think that it behooves us to ignore the facts. Change orders cost us money, so how much of the budget is the biggest question that I need answered before I would support anything, is being reallocated to other City departments in the form of overhead charges, administration fees, permits, et cetera? Once I have those details and once I can talk to a resident and say, well, the City, you know, follows that old adage; pay yourself first. Then I can support or oppose. I'm not going to support this motion. I want us to start seeing the detail, and I think all of my colleagues, if they really took time to think about it, want to see the detail and the deeper detail. You need to drill down to find out really why we're over budget. Not three or four statements, why are we over budget?

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wasn't going to speak on this, but I spoke on this one at the Standing Committee for Water and Waste. I did say that I would hold my nose and vote for this. It's highly distasteful, but I would do it just given the circumstances and I am supporting this. However, having said that, I wasn't going to speak, but I am speaking because I am inspired by, heartened to hear the speech by Councillor Kevin Klein because that's exactly the kind of questions we have to ask. I completely identify with his frustration. I completely…well, I can't say completely. I'm not standing in his shoes. What I'm saying is, as he speaks, I identify with his words. His words of frustration make sense. His…as he did here generally, making the point that we have to change the system by which we do these contracts. It has to change. Yes, we can't continue this way. In what way is the way in which we do this sustainable? Because I'm going to tell you something; I've told you before, and I'll say it again, the only thing that's making our City budget unsustainable are the private contracts. Nothing else. None of our collective agreements. If you check out the way we're raising our taxes, the level of our budget every year, what is causing us to go into debt? None of the collective agreements. Check it out. What's tipping us over budget-wise, fiscally-wise are the private contracts. So, Kevin Klein is saying, well, we can't continue this way. That's true, I don't know how we can continue this way. So, he's actually mentioning certain ways in which there's other jurisdictions. They do things differently. They're trying to do things differently. They're looking at different…at alternatives to awarding these contracts. Well, what am I supposed to say? That's not true, we shouldn't look at other alternatives? The way we're doing, the status quo is okay? The status quo is unsustainable. And that's why I'm voting…I'm voting for it in this case because I don't know…if we didn't pass this at this time. The fact is that, yeah, I mean, if I voted with Kevin Klein on this one, it would be a vote of principle. Because what he's saying is, we have to look at it this way. I'm voting for it because we're…what are we…what am I supposed to do right now? We have to finish this up, but let this be a warning because we can't continue this way any longer. So, he's mentioning the fact that…he's admitting the fact that we can't, and he's saying that there are alternatives, and we as a city have no choice but to look at alternatives as to how we award these prior contracts because it is the only thing that is making our City budget unsustainable. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Good debate. Good comments made. Not always dead accurate in my view, but good debate. If you look at the report from October of 2017, which is on DMIS, October of 2017 at the Water Committee; just should state some praise for the Mayor for creating the Water Committee because we…this used to be at the tail end of Public Works agendas, and you'd be there for like nine hours when I sat on there with you several years ago, Madam Speaker. So, these are like the main things at the Water Committee meetings. It's good. It's a good question asking process. Anyway, Veolia, not mentioned once in this report in 2017, so I don't think Veolia really had any role in this. And Ms. Geer who is

notionally on vacation this week has texted me saying, there was no money flowing to Veolia for anything to do with this project. So, thanks to Ms. Geer for interrupting her vacation to follow up on that. Because nothing says vacation like watching a nine-hour City Council meeting, I'm sure. But the…on this matter: 2017, report came forward. This is the last at the four at south end. The first three were smaller, including heavy involvement from the private sector consultants doing the design, getting together. If you look at the 2017 report, this bid comes in, actually, 12%...12.2% below the pre-bid estimates. So, actually, the bids that we got came in a little lower than what we thought on this phase four. There was some debate about what would that mean in terms of the relationship with organized labour, and I think some of those concerns, frankly, were correct and we heard about that at committee as well. But really what we're looking at here is an overrun. That is accurate. It doesn't have anything to do with Veolia. Some of it is…there was a small contingency. This is within a sort of normal contingency at $16 million. This is a massive project. We are nearing the completion of it, but again, I would refer people back to the October 2nd, 2017 Water Committee agenda. There's a whole report attached that talks about the work done by CH2M Hill Consultants to come up with this whole plan of how we proceeded. So, this wasn't simply people in our Water and Waste utility doing this off the side of their desks or something. There was a lot of work that went into this, four separate contracts, this is the last one. So, I encourage everyone to vote in favour. It's not a good news story in that it has gone over budget. On the other hand, the total project nears its completion, and that I think is something we should be proud of given the environmental impact this project is going to have. And frankly, we are complying with the requirements of our regulator, the Province, on waste water treatment. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein are noted in opposition. The item carries. Okay, we have a second report of this committee. Councillor Mayes.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT DATED MAY 17, 2021

Councillor Mayes: Shall I just speak to this and the amendment then?

Madam Speaker: Yes, the main Item 1, we have an amending motion, Motion 5. That was moved by yourself and Councillor Gillingham. It's an amendment to this item, to Item 1. So, we'll ask the Clerk to introduce it if you could just give us a moment. Mr. Clerk, Item 1.

Item 1 – Recommendation for the Preferred Proponent for Design Build of the North End Sewage Treatment Plant (NEWPCC) Upgrade: Headworks Facilities Project Request for Proposal No. 659-2018B and Increase in the Capital Budget

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And Councillor Mayes, introducing the item and you can speak to your motion as well at this time.

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

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment dated May 17, 2021 be amended as follows:

1. *In Recommendation 2, delete "June 1, 2021" and replace with "June 12, 2021"*

2. *Add the following new Recommendation 7 and renumber the remaining recommendation accordingly:*

   "7. That the proponent be required to provide a report on efforts to engage with local labour organizations as well as local vendors and suppliers to build relationships for a successful project and that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back to the Standing Committee in September 2021 with an update on the matter."

Councillor Mayes: All right, a big ticket item here and potentially historic if we try and move forward on the North End. My thanks to the Mayor and former CAO Doug McNeil, but I think under this mayor, we've really made some progress on this North End plant or potentially we have because here we are near the starting line on phase one which is the Headworks project. So, or clarity, I spent a lot of time at EPC last week debating phase two which is the biosolids building.

That is not the business at hand here today. We're on phase one which is, frankly, a massive project in its own right, hundreds of millions of dollars. Here we are at the end of a two-year-long procurement process. I have been frustrated with it. Others have been frustrated with it. We did have two bidders, ultimately, and here we have the report recommending a choice of the one bidder. It is certainly well over the estimated price. It's over the usual contingency that you would have, a 30% contingency for a Class 3 estimate. That is public. That is open here. To some extent, it's the complexity of the project to some extent. It's supply and demand in a COVID era. These bids came in over the $200 million that we wanted. So, that's really the core of the debate here. A couple of things that are worth pointing out: some of the funding would come…some of the required additional funding would come from the environmental projects reserve, some of it will be debt. I've been pointing out recently in the paper that our debt has tripled in the past ten years. Councillor Nason, quite rightly, pointed out I've been on EPC for most of that period, and that's I think a fair comment and probably something we need to start paying more attention to as our debt continues to rise toward the debt ceiling, where are our priorities? What are we to do with that debt? So, it's a fair comment, the…which he probably would have made, so I thought I'd make it on myself. The debt, there's some tricky wording here that says, well, after we take out this debt, we'll be at $131 million left in utilities borrowing room. Remember, transit's a utility for the purposes of debt. So, it's in here with water and waste utility. The sharp eyed among you might say, well, wait a minute, when we passed that transit motion at the last meeting, it said there would be $131 left, how can this add up? Some good work by Catherine Kloepfer, our new CFO, saying it does hang together because the ceiling continues to increase each year, so even though this represents more debt, we'll still have $131 million left. Now that's nearly enough left to fund what we want to do on transit, on CSO work, on the North End, but it's at least worth clarifying, we do have $130 of debt room left for the utilities. What are the amendments about? Okay, the amendments are important in two respects; the amendments are: Ms. Geer has deftly pointed out that the original draft of this said, we expect the federal and provincial ICIP funding to be approved by June 1st. Well, we're getting very close to that date now as we meet here now. So, we are recommending a…an amendment that would move that to June 12th. Why…why only to June 12th? Because these bids, the two bids you…that are talked about in this document, expire June 12th. So, we really can't go any later than that or we'll be confirming a bid that might not…might no longer be in front of us. So, amendment number one: move the June 1st date to June 12th. Nothing lost there. It gives the Feds and the Province another 11 days, hopefully, to confirm our ask on...for federal/provincial funding. The second amendment is in response to concerns I had, I think Councillor Schreyer had at committee, I think others had about what does this mean for local labour, local suppliers. There were concerns at south end that we had brought in a contractor who would not be as focused on local workers, as local businesses, as we would have liked. We added a provision in at committee that talked about a labour force estimate coming back. A proposal from Councillor Gillingham and myself is to add another provision that would require a report back by September, require the winning bidder to meet with local labour organizations, to meet with local businesses, to give us a report on what they're going to try to do to employ local workers and to work with local businesses. We are...we can't simply say it's only local. That would violate trade agreements, but I think we're doing everything we can here to try and emphasize to the potential winning bidder here that they should be looking at local labour organizations to work with and we had three different presentations, I believe, from the Building Trades Council and Mr. Sandhu talking about the importance of a reliable labour source. So, hopefully, that relationship can be hammered out between the build and trades and the winning bidder here which is a consortium. So, there you have it. We stand…I have…I'm not delighted with it, but it's really a yes-no decision here to get going on a historic moment to get going on a major environmental project, to get going with what our regulator says we have to do at the North End. This is phase one of three. We may not be here long enough to see phase three. I sure hope we're here to see phase two because if we're not, then we've got some real issues about our ability to grow as a city because phase two is the biosolids. It's the issue where we have to keep building in more capacity or we're just going to run out of sewer space potentially in the next seven years. That's phase two. This is phase one that you've got in front of you. This is the moment to vote on whether we go or don't go on phase one, which is the Headworks. We've talked about this a lot. You've heard Ms. Geer get up and say, if Walt Disney came down and cleaned up Lake Winnipeg tomorrow, we'd still have to do all this hundreds of millions of work at the North End because it's just an aging plant. So, this is...the Headworks is an important part of this phase. Biosolids will be important. It will be hundreds of millions of dollars as well, but the Headworks is a necessary first step. We've started going on the electrical work, so the numbers start getting a little confusing. It is well beyond what we budgeted, that is true. It will add to our debt, that is true. It would be wonderful to have $30 million to do arenas, to do the east of the Red complex. Of course, this is…this is money that's collected in the utility, right? This can't be used for an arena. It's been collected from the water rates, we've got to use it towards water-related project. So, imperfect, yes, but a huge, potentially historic step to get going with the North End. Yes, I would encourage people to vote for it. I'd encourage you to vote for the amendments as well. I should emphasize that. It's a chance to do something I think hugely important for the environment to get going on a plant that we have been talking about here since I think Terry Duguid's 2003 study as the Chair of the Clean Environment Commission. Here it is in front of us now in 2021. Let's get rolling. Let's get building. I'll save further comments on…depending on what people have to say.

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

Councillor Nason: You know, Councillor Klein inspired me on the previous one with his talk about different types of things…ways that projects can be done, Madam Speaker. It brought a quote that a lot of times Albert Einstein is tagged

with, but “The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result”. At committee, we talked about this expenditure of taxpayer dollars. There was talk about, you know, 30% was okay for a Class 3 estimate, this was 35%, but it’s still okay. Still gets the rubber stamp. This is ratepayer dollars and it’s challenging that before shovels get in the ground, we're over by this. This was a $200 million bid opportunity that only two groups were prequalified to bid on. It's now closing in on a $300 million phase project. Shovels still haven't hit the ground. There's a lot of concerns about COVID-19. There's concerns about, you know, Kijiji ads for resources and being able to fill the market…the demand of the market. We couldn’t really figure out what was COVID-19 impacts and what wasn’t. There was talk about having to go in-camera because of sensitivities around it. We didn't go into…into camera at that time. You know, Councillor Schreyer, perhaps he’ll get up and talk about the impacts of construction inflation on this project. And you know, the longer it takes, the more it's going to cost. I think COVID-19 is going to have exponential costs on materials. I’m not quite sure if the bulk of this is labour, how it's gone up so exponentially. I don’t know if there’s that much work going on in the province of Manitoba right now on works of this nature. It is specialized. I believe there was a lot of electricians that were going to be required for this work. I had the opportunity to go to the Winnipeg Building Trades Centre, a very impressive location. Lots of people getting ready to do electrical work. I know Red River College is training lots of people further on their tickets as well. I voted against this at standing committee mostly over the fact of the escalating costs. I don't feel ratepayers are being well served by how we’re dealing with these. Again and again it's escalating costs, and we have to do better by this. So, I know there's probably enough votes around this table to pass this, but I won't be supporting it at this time, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yeah, these are frustrating times for us, and we have to make some decisions right now despite the fact that I might…may very well, for various reasons, agree with some of the remarks made by people that I won’t be voting with on this item. Having said that, a few things should be said. You know, we had a, what I thought was a pretty special meeting of the Standing Committee of Water and Waste and the Environment a few weeks ago. We actually had Sudhir Sandhu, the Chief Executive Officer of Manitoba Building Trades, representing a lot of skilled workers, the very people that we need to do these very…these very…this very type of project. We had Peter Wightman, Executive Director of Construction and Labour Relations Association, who matches up labour with the company so that these types of important projects get matched up with the right type of skilled workers. And it was a special meeting because it lets you know there’s some sort of writing on the wall from…these people showed up that day to give us a message that we can't continue to do things the way we do, and we have to heed that. We have to take this into account. We can’t continue doing things the way we have been for the last number of years, maybe for the last number of decades. It's gotten worse, I’d say, in the last 20 years, and it cannot sustain itself. It has to change. Bear in mind, as councillor…Councillor Mayes made the point, there are trade agreements that we have to abide by in terms of labour. Nonetheless…in terms of rights of labour coming in from other jurisdictions. And those are part of the trade agreements, there's a fairness to that. It applies to Manitoba workers, too, if they are to work elsewhere. And so, bear that in mind. Having said that, it is a question of I think what we hopefully, what we will be starting now is a greater level of communication among serious people trying to do a serious job on serious projects to a level that we haven't yet before because we've got into these financial quagmires, and we can afford it less and less. And on that basis, I’d like to think that right now, just lately, we're coming to some form of consensus realization that we've got to change the way we do these large-scale projects. I’m not pretending to have all the answers, but I’m not going to pretend that I haven't raised some of the important questions that we have to answer if we're going to solve a trend in our fiscal challenges that we haven't really been acknowledging yet. Okay, so, we've got Councillor Mayes, paraphrasing Councillor Nason that our debt has tripled in ten years. Okay, well, is that changing? If you took COVID away, there's a trend. You can see the graph…there’s a graph there. It's still the same trend. COVID or not, can we sustain this? No, we can't. So, we're going to dry…draw an arbitrary line in a certain year? This is the point. Well, none of us have the crystal ball. What we do know, at a certain point, it just cannot sustain itself. And I’ll say this again, Councillor Nason says maybe I’ll start talking about construction inflation and the fact that if we don’t do things now, it'll get more expensive later. I want to mention part of the dilemma of this because sometimes people don't really want to acknowledge the problem construction inflation is causing us. Not just Winnipeg, our society. So, well, if we don't get this project now…done now, it'll cost more later, and that's the justification for getting more done now. The problem with that...I’m not saying that there's not a justification for that or if that there’s not a logic, but bear in mind, that when you try to get more done at one point, and you run your construction industry hot, it perpetuates that inflation because the more you’re trying to get done now in the name of fending off construction inflation costs down the road, it creates a higher rate of construction inflation at that moment, that year, and the year after that. So, bear that in mind. So, that unto itself isn't a solution, it's another expression of what the problem is. So, we can't ignore these things. And if we can, someone tell me and everyone else, how it is that we can continue living this way. I understand there's new monetary policy, and the idea that as long as we can, you know, get the money from, you know, the national bank or the federal reserve or whatever national jurisdiction you're in, as long as you can pay it back with low interest for the sake of infrastructure, you can sustain for a longer period…indefinitely...I don't know how long, this sort of economy of bizarrely high construction costs. The problem with that, bear in mind, is when you're perpetuating that, when you're feeding the dragon, just going into debt just so you can now sustain some level of regular

construction in your society, bear in mind, the problem with construction inflation is taxpayers' paying for it, and the taxpayers' wages and salaries aren't going up at the same rate, they never were. So, you can go back years, you can go back decades, you can go back generations and you see the growing disparity between the people that pay for the construction and the cost of the construction. It's not a flat line. It goes up on a curve. And yes, these graphs, these equations can be misleading depending on how you (inaudible), but it's still…it's not sensational to show the fact that even with new monetary policy, you still have to deal with the fact that you're abetting feeding the dragon of disparity because who's going to pay for that debt? The majority of taxpayers. Are their wages and salaries going up at the same rate? They never were, so where does it end? So, it's not just an issue of whether we can sort of scrape by, abetting with our…going into debt and raising our taxes of paying for construction, at least we got that construction project, at least we got that construction project done. But the reality is when it…that unto itself is abetting the disparity growth between the people that pay for it and the cost of these things. Well, you tell me. That's the question. Let's all tell each other. Let's tell the public, let's tell each other what the results of that are, and how long this can go on.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wanted to say that I'll be supporting the amending motion unless it's been...I don't think it was withdrawn, but I...I actually am not going to vote for the main report. And Madam Speaker, it's…I have concerns related to...so, we have design build, and we've done design build, financing, own-operate with some road project in the past...road projects in the past. Those are pretty simple projects. And you know, while it may not have been debated in the council chamber or at a standing committee, but you know, ultimately, the private sector like to say, look how good we are. The blueline came in under budget. And then, we had a non-P3. We had the Waverley underpass, and it was budgeted for and…you know, it came under budget as well, Madam Speaker. But for the most part, we're looking at the proponent here for the Headworks, and who may even bid on the biosolids, don't know at this point, but it's all design-build-finance so far, at least the Headworks is. And you know, actually, we could do a design bid without going to private financing. I mean, ultimately, it's debt. It's ultimately debt. Just like the debt we're paying on that phase two rapid transit, the .33 per years. It's paying to maintain and the financing portion of it, but it's still recorded on our books as debt. So, it's interesting in that, what are the higher...you know, I just don't understand how we aren't paying a higher interest rate when it's coming from the private sector unless they've got some kind of a deal with the bank saying oh, no, this is really the City of Winnipeg, it's government, so you have to give us that rate, but we're going to mark it up .25% just to pocket in our own private pockets from the public ratepayers in this case. So, I mean, we could do a design build and it's a good idea. When you have a complex project like these sewage plants, sometimes it's good to do a design build because and…because you don't really absolutely know what you're going to find when you get down there. And I heard those big pipes are like 60 feet underneath the plant. Like, you know, anyway, who knows? Like, and they did a lot of testing, and that's good, and the prices are higher. But if I was the...if I'm the one, the proponent on here, when I came up with what I want as a budget, I'm going to come way over budget. So, hopefully...you know, I'm not going to vote to go ahead on it necessarily, but you know, hopefully they've overbudgeted, and at the end, they'll be able to brag and say, see, we came in on budget. Only the private sector knows how to do it right which, the private sector builds it anyway, that's what's happening at the south Winnipeg plant. It's the private sector. It was the private sector who did the west end plant, that went way out of whack on budget. So, anyway, let's hope with these complex things that we won't actually see another budget increase because that north Winnipeg plant, it's quite old, and things are quite old down there. Who knows what they're going to find when they actually really get down there. So, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to end with this: so, you know, the whole biosolids thing, there's this need for 368-point-whatever $3 million or something, I believe that was for the biosolids and we're all worried about the Province, Madam Speaker. And we're looking at doing, you know, the private financer…financing rather than the City actually buying…issuing some debentures, 30 or whatever year debentures on this thing. Ultimately, it is the ratepayers that are paying for everything. And $368.3 million that the Province said they won't give us, well, you just tell the Province, you know, that supposed money you put on people's kitchen tables, which being taken away by inflation anyway, Madam Speaker, I did a calculation based on the 2018 water consumption. Very hard to get the numbers from the department that are more current, and I find that interesting in that all this stuff is stored in a database, the consumption. Like, if I go on that electronic website, I can find out how many cubic metres I purchased. But $368.3 million on the ratepayers would be 6…at the volume of 2018, would be $6.003 something per cubic metre of consumption. So, if you're using...I can't remember what the average cubic metres are, if there's a 1,000 litres in a cubic metre. So, you know, I don't know. I didn't finish the calculations because I was working on something else, Madam Speaker. But you know…so that's a one-time hit though, $6. So, for one year, your consumption, you pay $6. And there's a lot of people who can't afford that, I understand that. But they're still going to be paying for it over time in the operating rates for waste, and they're also going to be paying for it in the reserve because part of this is going to be a rate increase to those billpayers and we all want to get that sewage plant working properly. There's no doubt about it. We haven't even got to phase three which is actually the phosphate removal. Thank goodness the short-term methodology is moving ahead, and the Province hasn't threatened to take that money away and we're moving…and we've got money inside for that. So, that's good. But Madam Speaker, so you could even spread...if you're financing it, you don't have to charge the $6 full rate for the full year on each cubic metre, you know, you could spread that out over the years to make payments. So, like anyway, I think people need to understand in context what we're dealing with. And you know, all the power…make the

private enterprises…I mean, they do do…we want them to do good work. We've got the Manitoba Builders Association, they're working hard and they're going to make sure that Manitoba workers who are skilled and you know, making sure that when the work is getting done, it's done by skilled labour and it's supporting our communities because I mean, these are huge amounts of money. This is an increase. And I'm only voting against it because this is this design-build-finance thing. You know, we could hire a company. We'll just monitor them to do design build and we'll borrow the money ourselves. Like, I don't know why we have to pay extra on top. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First and foremost, I'll talk about the inclusion of the labour and the change of date, which I think is a good first step, I'm just wondering if it goes far enough, is it enough. I'll note that the company doing the work out of Texas, which is a multi-million-dollar organization, in a letter they provided to all councillors, said that according to reports for Manitoba, projects…construction…projects, sorry; construction employment to drop by 4% up to 2024 as work concludes on several major projects towards the end of 2020 and into 2021. The report, among others, noted that Manitoba is coming off a…the peak of an extended construction expansion. And they say they will, you know, try to work with as many local resources and organizations as possible, but how many? We are the customer. We get to negotiate the terms, not the person we're buying a service from, Madam Speaker. We need to negotiate on behalf of the citizens of Winnipeg, the people that we represent, the companies that work here, and pay our taxes. And I think that, maybe, it's far too late for this, and my apologies, but this just came on our plate today, so I didn't have the time to review it or talk to my colleagues, but I would hope that it would be a little more aggressive in the sense that we want more than a report. We want a requirement. We want to make sure that Winnipeg money is being spent on Winnipeggers. And I'm also very happy to hear my colleague be talking about debt because now I'm not the only one saying it. Our debt has in fact doubled, maybe more. And with one person coming on board at a time, well that's fine. Little baby steps. We'll be that little ant that could. We still haven't fixed the plant yet, we're just starting to work. We've spent less than 30 minutes talking about another project where we just approved, you know, millions of dollars, just like that. Item 3 in this recommendation states 35% more in debt financing. Now, when taking on City debt such as this, there's no disclosure of the financial details. Now, when I talk about that, let me be clear; now the financial details that I'm talking about is the interest rates, the net present value of interest to be paid and so on. These are the factors that are very important, not the glossed over facts. So many financial impacts one must consider when making a well-informed decision. That's what we're here for. It's not our parents' credit card that we're spending on, it's the residents of Winnipeg. We do not, in my opinion, have the required information to make multimillion-dollar spending decisions with other peoples' moneys. Again, how much is being spent on admin fees? How much is being spent on permits to ourselves? How much is for…are we charging for overhead, from other departments within the city? Are we impacted by the US dollar because this is a US company? My assumption is we're not, but this is a company out of Texas. I don't know. Are we limiting change orders in this project? So, can they come back for more? Will they come back for more? These are all the questions that I would hope that we would have answered, and these are…this is the type of information that is shared when you are asked to make a decision especially of this magnitude. So, I find it…I certainly appreciate the amendments that are put forward about hiring local. That's great. It's a report. I would ask for more than a report. I can't because again, it came late today. But I would support that, but I can't support just adding 35% more to our debt financing when we're not going to have a more in-depth conversation.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank our committee chair and members of the committee for their diligence. They, I understand, canvassed this matter at the committee and expect that they had a fulsome opportunity to ask questions as we did at Executive Policy Committee last week. This is an incredibly important project for all of those that want to see us continue to lead and provide support to help clean up Lake Winnipeg and our rivers to do our part. As our city continues to grow, it's incredibly important that we continue to invest in the upgrades of the North End Sewage Treatment Plant as well as the connected plants throughout the system, of course. We just dealt with the South End Treatment Plant. And so, I'll be supporting the main administrative report. I'll also be supporting the amendments. I think they're reasonable amendments. The one just deals with the date. The other though does provide a requirement for the proponent to provide a report on efforts to engage with local labour organizations as well as local vendors and suppliers to build relationships for a successful project. And so, I think this is a reasonable request. I think it'll allow for the proper scrutiny at the committee, and appreciate your efforts. I understand Councillor Sharma has been advocating on this issue as have other members of Council, which I appreciate. So, I want to support not only the amendment but the main report. And as I've mentioned, I'm doing it for two reasons, two primary reasons: one, I think it's incredibly important that we do all we can to continue positive momentum in making needed upgrades for the benefit of the health of our environment, but I also think it's incredibly important with limited capacity that we not delay or stop a project that is going to help address the real issue about the capacity issues that we have regarding growth and development in Winnipeg and the capital region in the future. These are incredibly important causes as is our licensing requirement, of course, from the Provincial Government to make needed upgrades. So, I would strongly urge members of Council to support not only the amending motion, but the main motion. It really is a vote for the upgrades at the plant or not. It is that simple, and I think it's needed

and it's important for our environment. It is also important for growth and jobs and our economy going forward. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. That was a good debate. Better a debate than to simply push this through with no debate or to not care, so I think it's a good day for Council that we are having a debate on these issues. I hope to have a very similar debate or perhaps a somewhat similar debate when phase two comes. I hope that's before the end of this term of office, I really do. I'd be very proud if we could come to some sort of agreement, whatever it looks like on phase two. But for clarity, what we're dealing with here today…there are reasons to vote no on this. I've been tempted myself. The Mayor has talked me off the ledge a few times on this one, I have to say to his credit. So, my thanks to the Mayor and some of his staff. There are reasons to vote no if you want to, but let's be clear about what's at stake. This is getting going on the North End Plant we've been talking about literally for decades. This is what we have. It's been two years of working with the bidders. Some fell away during the process. This is what we have: these two bids. The staff have recommended one of them. Long process to get there. Is it over the estimate? Yes, it is, but we don't have…we don't have better options than that presented by the staff. So, if you vote no, there's the risk of we're in breach of the license. If you vote no, there's the risk that the bids could come back in even higher and these are only time limited to June 12th. Please don't vote no, though, because you'd think somehow the Province is putting in some sort of P3 requirement. That's last week's debate. That's the second phase. That was just at EPC, talking about just a study on phase two. That doesn't creep into this. That shouldn't creep into your decision here. Similarly, this is a design build. There's no finance aspect to it. There's a finance aspect in that we are borrowing $32 million. I think Councillor Klein was saying 35%, I think he's saying $35/32 million. That is accurate. We are…we are going to need to borrow 30 some-odd million dollars to get this rolling. That's in front of you, that's the debate, but this isn't a finance through the private sector somehow. This isn't the P3 debate. That was last week, that's phase two. I hope we come back to that at some point. I hope the Province changes some of their requirements, we'll see. That's a separate debate though, what you've got in front of you is phase one. So, it's the Headworks project. It's hundreds of millions of dollars. It's a huge plan. You could vote no, saying, no, I wanted a local company to do it. Or you could vote no saying, it's just too damn expensive. I shouldn't be swearing, should I, Madam…sorry, Madam Speaker, given recent history, I'll try and clean that up. In any event, you can vote no for that reason. Please don't vote no though because you think there's some sort of finance part of this. It says right in here, it's a design build, and we can't start building until we have the design build agreement. We are…we are sort of been hedging on this, waiting for the ICIP money, and that deadline's fast coming. It may all yet fall apart because we don't get provincial and federal go ahead. I hope not, but let's not make it easy for them by voting no here. Let's call the question. Let's approve what's in front of us. I'm glad to hear Councillor Eadie say he'd vote for the amendment. When walking the dog earlier today I was thinking, well, I'm almost tempted to vote for the amendment and then vote no because then…but I'm going to vote yes. I do think the amendment makes it stronger. It does require the proponent to meet with local labour organizations and local suppliers. So, if you still want to vote no, that's fine, but the stakes are pretty high here. But if you vote no, please don't do it because you think there's some sort of finance aspect to this or there's some sort of debate about P3s. That really was last week's debate at EPC on phase two, okay. So, this is just phase one; this is just the Headworks that's going ahead. I want to thank Ms. Geer. This has been long running. This I think is probably former CAO, Doug McNeil's, finest hour because he, I think, took leadership to say, we're going to split this into phases because otherwise it's just going to keep getting more expensive due to construction inflation and we're never going to get going. So, we're going to get going if we vote yes and if we get the federal and provincial money, and that is historic. That is to the credit of everyone around here. Credit to the Mayor for agreeing that, yeah, let's get going on this, let's not just keep pushing it down to future councils, future generations. So, here's our chance to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on an environmental project. We do have…we do have money set aside, debt room set aside to do this. Not all of it though, that's why this request is in front of you. You've got to bite the bullet here and say, yeah, we're going to need $32 million more out of reserves, $32 million more in debt. That's the cost of getting this done, but let's not shoot it down over some misunderstanding. We are I think getting as much local wording in as we can with the amendments and my thanks to Councillor Gillingham for backing the amendment. So, I would say, let's go forward and we'll put the question to the Province and the Federal Government. Hopefully they will do the right thing and approve our ICIP request. And this is going to employ a lot of people and be good for the environment and is the necessary precondition to the bigger question yet, which the Mayor has identified, which is we've got to do the biosolids building, both for environmental reasons and because we're just going to run out of sewage room here in the City of Winnipeg over the course of this next decade if we don't do it. So, we've got…let's get going on this phase first. And thank you for the support on the amendment, and hopefully we can move forward on the…on what's going to be a historic project.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I will call the question. First on the amending Motion No. 5. All in favour of the amending motion? There's a call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The amending motion passes unanimously. Onto the main item; Item 1 as amended. All in favour? Contrary? Contrary is Councillor Klein and Councillor Nason are recorded in opposition. Otherwise, Item 1 as amended passes. Thank you. Okay. No by-laws today. We're now onto question period under this committee. Councillor Eadie.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. In the debate on the salt plant, I distinctly remember hearing it in a seminar or somewhere that Veolia did earn something for their little kitty there on the positive that they could withdraw later. Did the…I'm wondering when the Chairperson, Madam Speaker, what did he listen or just read reports regarding meetings around either the salt plant and the winning bidder, a meeting where the winning bidder was picked or had he listened to the Veolia annual report of their activities?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I would like to dispel the rumor that Councillor Eadie voted for the capital budget because we agreed to change the name of the North End Plant, so we'll just...we will get to that eventually, I think he's got a good point. We should rename the North End Plant. But…

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, just so you know, for him to know, I was offended to say there was a disingenuous debate on that issue. I'd like to know how it was disingenuous.

Councillor Mayes: I don't think I used the term. In fact, I'm 100% sure I didn't. I didn't use the term, disingenuous. I do think Councillor Eadie's right about renaming the North End Plant. I do think that's right. To answer the question though, yeah, Veolia's got that kitty that you referred to, they…money adds in, they've been around for nine years now, I think it was…was just before I was elected, that that was voted in. But my answer was that, they're not mentioned in that October 2017 report on choosing a winning bid for the South End Plant. Are they involved? Yeah, there's an annual report on Veolia that comes out every year. So, I'm not sure what exactly is being asked, but I'm not saying Veolia has no role in our operations. Why would we keep them around if they weren't doing something? But there is an annual report on what they've been paid and what they are owed.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Chairperson, I'm wondering if the Chairperson knows who did the class one detail design spec that got ready for the bid.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, I think it was…since I mentioned it, in that report, it talks about work done by C…I may have the acronym wrong, C2MH Hill, did the…did the design work on that South End Plant, so…I mean, that…that's what's in the report… that's the answer I can give today. I can get back. I can ask the Director if…what role if any Veolia had in terms of the construction. It's a $400 million project down there at South End, but they…there's no mention of Veolia in that document from October of 2017.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: (Inaudible) part of the debate, but my final did you know question is I voted for the last report because I did get confused about the debate, and it is only a design build which is good, and so therefore, I voted to actually increase the budget so that we can get…get this thing started. So, thanks. I'll give you that, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor. Thank you. Mr. Mayor, over to you.

Mayor Bowman: Sure. I have a question for Councillor Nason as a committee member of the Water and Waste Committee. So we heard from Councillor…

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, I don't believe that is in order.

Mayor Bowman: I believe I checked with the Clerk's office beforehand. I understand it is on order.

Madam Speaker: Okay. I'd like to read the section on that.

Mayor Bowman: Section 14(1) I believe. It was cited earlier by Councillor Nason.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

City Clerk: Madam Speaker, Section 14(1) of the Procedure By-law reads: under Rules 11(h) and (j) questions may be directed to the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor, Standing Committee Chairpersons and to Councillors on the various boards and commissions and sub-committees related to the Standing Committees.

Madam Speaker: Okay. That is not how I read that. The end of the sentence, Marc?

City Clerk: It reads Councillors on the various boards and commissions and sub-committees related to the Standing Committees.

Madam Speaker: I don't believe this is related to any of those.

Mayor Bowman: It's a question regarding Water and Waste.

Madam Speaker: Are you reading that differently? It's a standing committee. It's not a sub-committee.

City Clerk: (Inaudible), yes I agree, Madam Speaker. It's councillors on the various boards and commissions and sub-committees related to the Standing Committees.

Madam Speaker: And it could be, but today, we're not going to proceed with this.

Mayor Bowman: I'm sorry. Madam Speaker, this is the same section that was cited earlier in asking a question to Councillor Chambers and we have…

Madam Speaker: And that's fair, Mr. Mayor. I think I'd like to take…

Mayor Bowman: I would like to…

Madam Speaker: …personally take it under advisement and look at it, but the way I am listening to the section, that's not how I'm interpreting it. Yes.

Councillor Eadie: I just...Councillor Chambers is the Chairperson of the Winnipeg Police Board happens to be on Protection and Community Services. I don't...Madam Speaker, I, like you, believe that Councillor Nason is not chairing any sub-committee of Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment, similar to Protection and Community Services has a sub-committee to deal with the recreation master plan.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, thank you. Seeing the hour, I'd like to move on.

Mayor Bowman: I'm sorry. I have to challenge…I mean…I'm…

Madam Speaker: Yeah, I was just going to say, challenge the Chair if you like. My ruling at this time, I'll take a look at it later, tomorrow on words but today...

Mayor Bowman: Could…could we hear from…

Madam Speaker: I just heard Mr. Mayor, the statement read out loud more than once I believe, and that's not how I'm interpreting what's written in the Procedure By-law.

Mayor Bowman: I didn't hear clearly whether it was permissible or not. I did check with the Clerk's office during break whether or not it was permissible. I was advised that a question to a member of the committee was permissible under Rule 14(1) of our procedure so I'd like to hear that again from our Clerk's, please.

Madam Speaker: As I said, I'd like to continue with the meeting. If you'd like to challenge the Chair, we'll go for that vote and I'd appreciate being informed as well if we're looking at this at break being the speaker. So challenge the Chair or we can move on with the meeting?

Mayor Bowman: I'd like to challenge the Chair, please.

Madam Speaker: So let's challenge the Chair. All in favour of talking about this ruling some more, please rise.

Councillor Allard: I think we're ruling on challenging the Chair, right?

Mayor Bowman: Yeah, it's not just debate it. I'd like to just have the…I'd like to hear from the Clerk…

Madam Speaker: That is the challenge of the chair, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I'd just like to hear from the Clerk's, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Lukes: Can you clarify that…what we're voting on?

Councillor Rollins: Yes. I'm not understanding.

Councillor Eadie: The Mayor has challenged the Chairperson, so the Chairperson was calling the vote. Are you in favour of beating the speaker's decision, are you against?

Councillor Orlikow: What…no…

Councillor Lukes: Say that again.

Mayor Bowman: I'd like to hear from the Clerk's.

Madam Speaker: Five remote participation today, this is fun. Mr. Clerk, I'll give you one more opportunity. We need to move on with the meeting, but how are you interpreting that, and could you read it out loud once more?

City Clerk: I can. Section 14(1) of the Procedure By-law allows for questions to be asked to councillors on the various boards and commissions and sub-committees related to standing committees. Mayor did ask me about this on the…at the break. I may have misinterpreted his questions, and when I read it here, it does not state that you can ask questions of councillors sitting on the standing committees, but rather, councillors on the variance boards and commissions and sub-committees related to standing committees as mentioned earlier. It's not a very common occurrence. I may have misinterpreted that and I apologize I provided the Mayor with incorrect information, but I do agree that it's related councillors on the variance boards such as Police Commission, Heritage Winnipeg and other boards and commissions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Thanks, Marc. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, just a question, know yourself or Clerk can help me. it's not discrete to mine but when do we or where do we have sub-committees of standing committees?

Madam Speaker: Transit, Access Advisory Committee was a…structurally a sub-committee.

Councillor Eadie: (Inaudible) although we haven't met for quite some time, Protection, Community Services has a sub…ad hoc sub-committee dealing with the parks and recreation master plans, but the chairperson of that is the chairperson of the standing committee though.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Councillor Gillingham. This is question period now for procedure.

Councillor Gillingham: Yeah, it's question period for anybody.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: (Inaudible) happy to look into it further.

Councillor Rollins: Will you turn the Mayor's mic on for those of us that can't hear him?

Madam Speaker: We can hear him just fine. Mr. Mayor, I appreciate the question…

Councillor Rollins: we cannot hear. So, if it's a procedural matter, we cannot hear, so we need his mic on. Could you recognize him, Madam Speaker because I cannot hear him if you don't.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, can you hear?

Mayor Bowman: Can you hear me now? Can you hear me now? Okay. My understanding from the Clerk's is different from what we're hearing now. So I'll save the question. I was looking forward to asking a couple of questions of Councillor Nason. I believe he welcomes it, but if that's not something you're willing to allow at this point, I'll follow up with the Clerk's in due course.

Madam Speaker: Appreciate that. Thank you Mr. Mayor, and that's fair on everyone's part. Thank you very much.

Mayor Bowman: Let's move on.

Madam Speaker: Where were we? Next speaker for questions. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Well, I know the Mayor has chairs that he deflects to, so you know I'm sure that he can direct his questions to the chair of the committee and the chair can consult with me if he needs to and not able to answer the questions that the Mayor has. But my question for the astute and wonderful chair that we have for the committee...there we go. We just talk about some rapidly increasing projects to support water and waste. I'm wondering if there's corresponding increases that would be coming to those outside the City of Winnipeg that benefit and utilize the service as well.

Councillor Mayes: It's a great question in a way. I mean it goes to where are we going to go on rates. And you know, we've had a couple of people here today to speak to the…it's an angle sting, right? If you keep going at 2.3 percent on property tax and the rates increase at a sharper amount, eventually those two lines are going to intersect. Where that is, we don't know yet. That debate is coming. If you want to pick up the pace on things like CSO as I do, that comes at a cost. If you want to do these massive infrastructure projects which is regulated demands, that comes at a cost. Hopefully, we can get some aid from the province and the feds on that. In terms of what can we charge the other municipalities, I know we have directed and Ms. Geer and staff's going to talk to St. Andrews, Rosser, I think West St. Paul about the agreements that were made, and not with West St. Paul. That's a different matter, but with sorry...not with St. Andrews. I think that's an even more complicated history. Yeah, when we stood here in December 2011, we were never told oh, there might be ten years from now, there might not be enough room in the pipe. That was not part of the briefing. I remember that clearly as does Councillor Eadie and others who were here. So, are we going to be able to increase costs to the other municipalities, the rural municipalities? At this stage, we probably don't have that mechanism under the agreements that were made, but we've directed our staff to go and engage in these talks with the RMs because it doesn't do them any good if we run out of room and there's some mad scramble in about 2025 to build as quickly as possible to get the room. So, it's a fair question. It's a sort of big debate we're going to have to have about rates and about how we're going to deal with some agreements that were made when it looked like we had a lot of room in the pipe and now there isn't so much room in the pipe, and that's a reality we're going to have to face as…over the next few years, and who's ever standing around this table is going to have to face over the next decade.

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

Councillor Nason: Yes, thank you. What sort of protection, Madam Speaker, will be afforded City of Winnipeg and as we move forward on the OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities to ensure that we can realize the growth potential in the City of Winnipeg as far as sewer and water capacity?

Councillor Mayes: Yes, certainly the developing community has said pretty loud and clear, we need an infrastructure study, we need that. I know Councillor Gillingham has said that. I think Councillor Rollins has said that. I think a number of people have said, look, this has got to be a high priority to get some sort of infrastructure study done because you don't want to buy the property and then find out, you know, the guy across the street took the last bit of room in the pipe, you can build a pipe all the way down to Bishop Grandin. That's our solution for you. We don't have that study yet. We are going to have to get that done. That will be part of…as the Mayor said, stand by for a long meeting next month because we've got infill guidelines, OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities in addition to the regular agenda so yeah, I think that

will be a big part of that debate as how do we prioritize that. How do we…if that's in the budget, hopefully we will all vote for that to get some sort of a study finally done so we can say to people with some confidence, this is where there's room left. This is the infrastructure that lies under the street.

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

Councillor Nason: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Just on greywater capture and recycling. I'm wondering if the Chair has any idea if we'll ever get to a point where we can be innovative and use that type of technology in the City of Winnipeg.

Councillor Mayes: People did know I was joking about that business of Eadie in the naming of the plant, right? It's late of the meeting and I thought I hope no one has the (inaudible) he should have never made that a condition. He's right in making that request. He should rename the plant. In any event…in any event, that…yeah, the greywater thing is actually mentioned at some length in the little noticed and largely forgotten water and waste master plan of 2011. It's something we're going to have to come back to and talk about. Certainly, the green infrastructure projects that we've committed to $104 million worth of green infrastructure over 20 years, and we're at $0 in the first two years. I want that in the budget. I'd like to see that in next year's budget some pilot projects on the green infrastructure under the combined sewer. I wish I had a fast answer saying, yeah, we're going to go a…x million on the greywater. It's a good…good to have you on the committee, Councillor Nason. You care about this stuff and there's Councillor Schreyer and Councillor Orlikow. It's been…that's been a very good committee I find for raising some of these issues. Yeah, I think we do need to have that debate as part of our debate about combined sewer and where we're going. This...I mean I've been here for years when somebody said, well you know, it…there's like a water and waste plant that's like the trans…you know like the transit master plan. Nobody ever talked about it. Nobody ever dealt with it. So, I think we can do better going forward with this council and trying to come up with the plan, the infrastructure plan you're talking about and some way of saying yeah, how can we…how can we approve some of these greywater thing because we…we've had both like that one on Arden Avenue where the developer got shot down trying to make it work, trying to be innovative. So, do we have any money set aside for it? Not yet. Stand by for the budget and I think stand by for the OurWinnipeg debate, see what we can do there.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Any further questions for our chair? Okay. Seeing none, let's…let's move on. I've lost my place, Mr. Clerk. Innovation, yes. Thank you. Mr. Chair, Councillor Browaty.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DATED APRIL 26, 2021

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to introduce the report of April 26th and move Item 1 as consent.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We'll now have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Browaty? No questions for our Dean, Councillor Browaty? Let's move onto the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Gilroy, the report dated April 19th.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED APRIL 19, 2021

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, I'd like to move adoption and consent of agenda Items 8 and 11.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Both items have been stood down. Mr. Clerk.

Item 8 – Zoning Agreement Amendment – 153 Brittany Drive – ZAA 4/2020

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I first want to start by thanking Councillor Gilroy for standing this down at our last City Council meeting. I appreciate that. That was to allow for time to have some discussions. Nothing has changed, unfortunately. I spoke opposed to this at the Assiniboia Community Committee. I spoke opposed to it at Property, Planning and Development because it is in my ward. The residents of my ward spoke loudly and clearly that this is something that they did not support. In fact, if you go back in time, the very popular and well-respected Bill Clement said no, and made sure there was a caveat put on that. But for some reason, we don't respect what was done in the past, and we overturned that, although I hear that we often support councillors when it comes to their own ward. All the residents here were opposed to this. They had reasons. They presented their reasons, and many of them spoke to it. My job is not to represent…my job is to represent my ward, not to impose the will of others on them. There is no way possible to do that when others will make the decision on your behalf in your ward. I did speak to the Public Service, they, you know…quickly, the individuals that we work with in the department got back, and they provided me the answer that they felt that it's a good idea; that they support it. Well, we'll respectfully disagree, and that's not the answer I'm looking for. And you'll excuse me if I want more. I work for the residents in that area who spoke loud and clear about the fact they were concerned. They shared their fears, their concerns. They shared history of the property, they talked about concerns. They had neighbours from adjoining streets talk about impacts on them. We all talked about the fact that Bill Clement, when this was done years ago, knew this was going to be a problem, and had the forthright thinking to say no and put that on the property. This cannot be developed until the section beside it comes up for development. I've tried to have some of those caveats changed in my ward to address safety concerns that one, if not the most dangerous intersection we have now in Winnipeg. We're told, oh, you can't do that. You can't change that. But here we are, everyone agreeing, except the area councillor that this is okay and me having to answer to residents, yeah, sorry, we don't have a say in this. I would ask that you consider the residents. They are not, and they said countless times, not opposed to the development. They want the development that is supposed to go there, that is planned, not ad hoc development. That development could be coming soon, but if we do this, that's going to challenge what can be done on that vacant land. We talk about wanting to do infill. We talk about hey, we've got to build up, we can't build out, we have to build up. Well, this would be infill. But we are probably going to stop some of it because we're answering to one person who doesn't live there who wants to do something with a piece of land that will impact development of a larger piece of property. And will impact all the residents that live there, that came and spoke, that wanted to be heard at City Hall and were not heard. Thanks for coming. We got this. I'm asking my colleagues today, let's send a message to residents that we are listening. This doesn't have to be approved. There's no, you know, federal rules hanging over our head here, there's no provincial rules, there's no deadline, there's no debt require, there's nothing. Nothing. It's a piece of land. The residents are asking for us to support them, and I think it's the least that we could do in this situation and allow that other development to come back in a bigger, better way. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Any further speakers on this? Seeing none, Councillor Gilroy for the close.

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah. This is a...and I understand the frustration that Councillor Klein feels as we all do because a lot of us get these issues within our wards and wish we were the final decision makers. But I think, you know, it's important that…to know that things do go through Council, and there's a reason we're not the financial decision makers. We have to kind of look at our planning from a city perspective, and sometimes they don't always agree with that area councillor, and that's why we have, you know, these opportunities to go through different committees and up through Council. So, this is…you know, this property was...the…sorry, the public administration has said that they feel that this is appropriate, and they approve the proposed amendment will not limit or create additional changes on the (inaudible) future development on properties to the north. The property is to consolidate the subject property with an adjacent property to the north and is likely to occur in the near future. The subject property is considered generally consistent with nearby properties on Brittany Drive containing a single-family dwelling, and the Public Works Department does not have any concerns with the addition of a new single-family dwelling on this dead-end street. So, I am supporting the public administration's recommendations and understand the frustrations of the area councillors. I have been in these issues myself, and I know many councillors around the room have, but this is my feeling on improving density and making changes within different areas within our cities. Thank you.

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

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

Nays

Councillor Orlikow, Klein, Mayes, Nason and Schreyer

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next item, Mr. Clerk.

Item 11 – Construction of Improvements in Mission Street west of Bournais Avenue

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

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

Madam Speaker: This was stood down by? Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Yes. This part of Mission that has never had a physical street is actually in Transcona, and that's part of the challenge. This has been vacant land adjacent to CN Rail crossing or railroad, opposite to a school. And the Real Estate Division doesn't report to community committee, so it didn't come to community committee. It goes to standing committee and then up to EPC, and there's some changes that ended up I missed this on the first time around. Did I come speak to it at EPC? No, because, well, we don't get to ask questions of the Public Service there. The challenge I have is that as local ward councillor, we don't get the opportunity to direct the development. We don't get the opportunity to talk about some of the area concerns. You know, I was on Appeals Committee with Councillor Mayes. Thankfully, we don't have to do this for another year, but there was an issue in his ward that was on the agenda, and it was the ward councillor knows his community. The ward councillor knows his community. The ward councillor knows his community. I know that investment in our community's great. I applaud that. This company is part of the submission before us today is out of Niverville. They talk about shops being there. We don't know what kind of manufacturing or types of businesses that may be offered in there, 1,000 to 2,000 square feet directly across the train tracks from a school, a school that has seen a couple collisions lately with students transiting to school, to a school that kids like to bike to. There are speed humps that have been installed there. It's a 30 kilometre an hour zone. This is new construction adjacent to a school. Ideally, people transiting through that area may have liked to have an AT path to come and go to work. I know I've been asked for that, mostly for the still named, St. Boniface Industrial Park. The challenge I have is that at community committee, we didn't have the opportunity to have that discussion to see if there was those opportunities for investment. It goes forward. It's here today. I'm not supportive of it as it stands today. I'd like to have the investment in the community. I think, you know, there would be more opportunities. It almost sounds like downsizing. I don't like the idea of downsizing. That was mentioned in the submission from the applicant. That means that somewhere else, jobs are being lost, opportunities being lost or gained, I guess, in Transcona. Employment lands, yes, it's more opportunity for employment lands. Again, these have been sitting vacant for many years. I note that the majority of the approvals for this are of the Director of Public Works, the Director of Water and Waste. I think the Director of Planning's in there, but there's nothing for what goes in there to come to community committee. I guess I could have amended this motion today, but I'm hoping that my council colleagues will see, from a perspective of the ward councillor, I'm not supportive of this item. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Gilroy, back to you.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. All this is doing is...

Madam Speaker: Oh, just one second. We're seeing a hand. Councillor Rollins, go ahead.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be supporting the local councillor today. This isn't the only agenda item we have where I have concerns on the lack of attention with respect to administrative reports in and around schools. So, I'll be supporting Councillor Nason, if only to drive home a point where councillors have been driving home, I think all term, that we really need to add complexity to our reports with respect to school and our time and attention on safety when it comes to roads. So, I'm supporting Councillor Nason.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a point of order. Would it be allowed for me to move this matter to the community committee for consideration?

Madam Speaker: You can refer it to a standing committee. Not…correct, Mr. Clerk? Not the community committee? Pardon me? Yeah, refer to the Public Service for more information, refer to the standing committee, but not to community committee.

Councillor Klein: So, I can refer it to the Public Service for more information or inclusion.

Madam Speaker: No, with instructions, as I said, for a report for information of some sort.

Councillor Klein: So, it has to be for information? I'm sorry, I'm just asking.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, I'll let the Clerks answer you.

Councillor Klein: I was wondering could I move it…could I move it to the Public Service, asking for a report back on conversations with the area councillor?

Clerk: The Procedure By-law allows you to refer it either to a standing committee or EPC or to the Public Service. You cannot include instructions, but the idea would be that it goes back to the Public Service for a report back.

Councillor Klein: I'm okay with that. Thank you. I mean, I would move…

Madam Speaker: So, you want to refer it to the standing committee?

Councillor Klein: Yes. Yeah, to the standing policy committee.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Klein has moved referral of Item 11 to the standing policy committee for further review. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Eadie, did you ask for a recorded vote? Okay. I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Any opposed, please rise.

Clerk: Councillor Allard, do you wish to be recorded in opposition?

Councillor Allard: I think I'd like to be recorded in favour, but this is the second time I waited for the vote. I wasn't sure how I wanted to vote on this. I'd like to be recorded in favour.

City Clerk: So, the vote, Madam Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 0, with Councillor Gillingham absent.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I just want to remind everyone attending virtually participating that we do count the virtual votes first. Okay, we'll proceed, thank you. Moving on, that item was referred successfully to the committee. Carried. Next is question period. Or no, the May 11th report. Councillor Gilroy, May 11th.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED MAY 11, 2021

Councillor Gilroy: Madam Speaker, I'd like to move adoption of consent agenda Items 1, 3, 6 to 13.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Start again. Which ones do we want to pull?

Councillor Gilroy: Okay, I'll just pull…let me tell you, I need to pull 2 and 7.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Any others? Okay, we'll call the question on 1.

Councillor Orlikow: No, I have one. Where is it? There it is. No. 9, please.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Eadie, did you ask for a number? Okay. We'll call the question on Item 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, and that's it. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Item 1.

Item 1 – Sale of 138 Argyle Street North and 129 Sutherland Avenue

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. Item 1, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a motion that we as Council agreed to try to move ahead. Our Public Service is following the rules that they have and made recommendations, but I'd like to thank the standing committee for moving this forward, changing some of the dates because I know our City Legal is running behind on things, so we want to make sure that this transaction, title transfer...offer to purchase and eventual title transfer happens. And what's really cool coming out of this report, it's not essentially that this is the Manitoba Indigenous Education Cultural Centre that will be...and they're paying market value for the land. And you know, to some degree, there was one that had to be declared, the Argyle property, I think it is, had to be declared surplus in terms of it was land set aside a long, long time ago for who knows what purpose. But the ultimate purpose of this land here is for Indigenous education and culture. It will be, for those in the public who have been quite concerned about Council and their decisions about green space and just open space, what really is essentially happening here is we're selling the land back to the Indigenous people from whence, really, the land came originally. And so, it's good to see...you wouldn't want to have a lease agreement on a property like this for 99 years because that would just be the colonizers telling Indigenous people, once again, you know, we know what's best, and we can't let you have…care for your land, so this is great. And what comes out of this report, and it is coming with new rules that are being developed under OurWinnipeg or Complete Communities, but what's really important about this report is you'll note at the end, when we're talking to Indigenous peoples about truth and reconciliation and amending and finding paths forward, Madam Speaker, what's interesting to note, and this has a lot of influence, I believe, from our current Mayor as well, in that when we're looking at land sales or transfers to Indigenous peoples, we're going to be looking at it in the future. And I think this is important, that's not what we're voting on today. But this is what's arising in that we will talk to First Nations government to government. Similar to it was government to government basically on the old Vimy Arena, it was government to government. It was a different perspective, a different look, and so I think that's really essential, cool idea, and it looks like those are some of the recommendations that we might be seeing from Real Estate and from Property and Development into the future. So, thanks again, colleagues. We are...we are moving ahead on an important journey for the Manitoba Indigenous Education and Cultural Centre, and so thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Any further speakers on Item 1? Seeing none, Councillor Gilroy to close.

Councillor Gilroy: Call the question.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Okay. That's carried. Councillor Klein is absent. Item 2.

Item 2 – Sale of City-owned Property – 409 Mulvey Avenue East

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to move this item, and…but I don't want to support the EPC recommendations. I will be moving it forward, but I will not be supporting the EPC recommendation today. And I…this is a really interesting debate, this one, and this one is one that was really, really hard for me because it's a really good development. And at standing policy committee, we had a very, very, very good debate on this. And this is a funny one because it's considered parkland, so it needs two-thirds of the Council vote. And I did say at standing policy committee I'd be thinking this through till I got to Council to see how I was going to vote on this because this is a hard one because I've been somebody who's been very supportive of finding more greenspace within our city, especially within inner-city urban areas. So, this is an opportunity because...an interesting opportunity because it is considered park space and needs two-thirds of a vote or else it wouldn't even be here. So, I'm going to stand on my principle. And I know that this is a really good development, and I want to thank the developer because if this was in a totally different place, I would be supporting it. I just think this is an opportunity for us to add some greenspace. When we look at our sustainability goals and we look at our Climate Change Action Plan, we're going to need to have more greenspace, and also as we densify. We are looking at densifying, and that area, in particular, sees a lot of densification already, and you know, it is going to require the space for people to gather, the space for people to play, the space for people to go out and be in nature. And you know what,

that is so important right now. I think all of us understand how vital being out in nature is right now when so many of us are stuck at home for long lengths of time and can't go do the many activities that we normally enjoy. So, these are one of the things where, you know, I'm switching my vote at the end, at Council, and, you know, we don't always keep the same vote that we had at the standing policy committee, and this is one of them. But I am moving this item forward, but I will not be supporting the EPC recommendations, and I look forward to hearing my colleagues on this interesting vote here today.

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

Councillor Lukes: I'll unmute myself now. Thank you. So, yes, I just want to speak to this. 409 Mulvey has an illustrious past; being part of land exchanges, being declared surplus, potentially being used to support other land deals, the list goes on. According to Director Kiernan, it was in the mid-1990s that this property was acquired by the City through a land exchange. The acquisition was responding to a policy directive to acquire lands for public purposes as part of the riverbank parkway network, and it was then that the property was placed under the jurisdiction of Parks and Open Spaces. So, while it was rezoned at some time over the years, the point we must be acutely aware of today is that this property is under the jurisdiction of Parks and Open Spaces, and it requires a two-thirds vote of Council. And that councillors, this is a rare opportunity and a very unique opportunity that we have to gain waterfront and to protect waterfront space. You heard from the developer that in the RFP process, there was no mention of a Council endorsed Go to the Waterfront Planning Strategy, a document that, in principle, is to be used to…as a guide for riverbank initiatives and partnerships. This was a City of Winnipeg-led initiative that looked and envisioned how our waterfronts could be developed. And I, like Shirley, participated in this waterfront process. I find it incredibly...I find it incredible and frustrating that this Council-endorsed planning strategy was not even mentioned in the RFP for the City and for the developer and the fact that to sell this land would require two-third vote of Council and that it wasn't included in the RFP. You know, I can appreciate the developer's frustration on this. Winnipeg has over 240 kilometres of waterfront, but not even half that is publicly owned. We have the opportunity to add to a larger amount of waterfront to that inventory of publicly owned lands. For sure, currently, this piece of property is a slab of gravel, and not a park at all, but recall what The Forks looked like 30 years ago; 1990 didn't seem like that long ago when I presented earlier and I said it was 20 years ago, but it was 30 years ago, an industrial rail yard. Recall what FortWhyte Alive looked like 20, 25 years ago. It was a concrete gravel pit. Both of these examples involve long-term plans. Madam Speaker, I reflect on what has occurred on the waterfront in Councillor Allard's ward, some incredible work, but that was because of long-term planning, and that beautiful walkway that's there now that so many of us supported highlights the beauty of the waterfront. Our waterfront deserves a higher level of planning and partnerships. What the developer is proposing is exciting, but it is directly in front of two old warehouses and another…alongside another large storage shed and on the edge of a massive failing riverbank. Areas like the waterfront deserve a more comprehensive level of planning, and this sometimes means waiting for opportunities to involve and partnerships to be made. It requires long-term forward thinking that may not be embraced by the moment of the day. You know, we could reflect back on the council of the day's reflection to protect Assiniboine Park forest and Assiniboine Park…or to develop it. I think they all weren't re-elected. I reflect back on the Duff Roblin vision of the floodway, thank goodness. Waterfront lands demand visionary planning. It doesn't mean selling off a small chunk. It doesn't mean jamming in yet another building in front of two old warehouses. If we approve the land…if we approve the sale, we give up finite waterfront space. And any feeling of public space will be gone as the proposed apartment block will be located virtually feet away from the active transportation pathway, and that's not my idea of keeping the waterfront accessible to the public. The pathway, for sure, but if we've got this opportunity for greenspace to make it accessible to the public. I reflect back on a recent report at the Property and Development, Heritage Downtown Committee. There was a request for a variance to construct a tall apartment block in the heart of the Exchange District, a national heritage site. I, Councillor Santos and Councillor Gilroy supported the almost 25-year history of keeping the built form of Exchange and preserving the human scale and pedestrian friendly nature of this historic area. We voted against allowing an extremely tall apartment block which I'm…I know caused every one of us pain because we want people in the Exchange. But we have to…we are here…we are elected to be responsible and to have vision for the future. Like we've done to protect the integrity of the Exchange District, we should be protecting the waterfront greenspace and working towards a longer-term vision and not selling off a section without it being part of a larger plan. We have…we can have development and greenspace, but we have to do it in a meaningful, thoughtful way. I won't be voting to sell the waterfront property, and I hope you, too, will support a longer-term vision by keeping this waterfront land and eventually seeing something much greater come from it. Thank you.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I took a course, and it's a course that I've been reflecting on as I read the report and I see the layers of understanding on this land. And it was a course by, before he was senator, Murray Sinclair and Marilou McPhedran before she was senator, they taught me and others, of course, on Treaty Land entitlement. Explaining that things on land be understood as layered. It was not black and white. It was not one or the other, it was Treaty Territory, Crown Land, provincial land, city land, residential parkland. So, these layers

fall apart sometimes. Our understanding can be fractured, it can be made incomplete, given history, time, and of course, genocide, genocidal tendencies. But this report, I think, requires piecing together and I think back to that course, and I will say on behalf of the residents, residents of Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry that they are indeed caught in the middle of all this. So, facts as Councillor Lukes already mentioned, that this property…this property is part of a larger holding that includes riverside by pathway along beautiful river...riverside. And yeah, there's a little police patrol tucked in. And we acquired it in the '90s, and the acquisition was, as Councillor Lukes already stated, response to a policy directed to acquire land for public purposes, specifically the major cycle, vehicle access node that (inaudible) the riverbank parkway. And a fact that this report makes clear in a few different ways this property is under the jurisdiction of Parks and Open Space. Now, the admin report goes on to say that Council declared the subject property surplus to the city's needs back in 2013. It says that on February 18th, 2014, that the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development approved the Public Service's recommendations to sell 409 Mulvey Avenue for $1 million. And that February 26th, 2014, Council directed that net sales proceeds of the property be transferred from the land operating reserve to the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service in 2013. But it's really important to go back, I think, to what we know about the architecture of this deal. That this land was put up in a now infamous land swap deal; a deal where the City would trade two vacant (inaudible) and a City-owned parcel of land, this property, 409 Mulvey Avenue for 1780 Taylor Avenue where a new fire station would be built. And as the story goes, and some of you may have been here at the time, that by the time Council said no to that deal, the fire hall was almost complete. Now a fire hall sits on a land owned by the developer, and the City must pay for the price of the land. An audit into that whole deal, the fire hall land swap deal, found that the developer got special treatment. A deal that former City councillor, Jenny Gerbasi said came out of thin air. But important to where we're at now is that this deal gave rise to our fulsome regime of the Independent Fairness Commissioner. Relevant to where we are, on behalf of my residents of Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry is that beyond the fact that the audit found the developer had information not available to other proponents, but pertinent really here is the significant issues existing which bring into question the openness and fairness of the processes used at the time that was characterized by many. A number of examples where Council was not properly informed. And I'm going to tell you as the local area councillor, if Council was not informed, residents were not informed. So, fast forward from the days of 2013 to 2014. On the Friday this report was posted, this 409 Mulvey property was posted, I had to call and ask for the Independent Fairness Commissioner report. Now, it was soon after posted, but I will say, it was very difficult for me to say, out of all...of all the gin joints, of all the properties, why was this report late to being posted? So, please note in the documentation provided by the Independent Fairness Commissioner and for the department, that the file documentation back from 2013 does not include evidence with respect to when the subject property was posted on the City of Winnipeg website following the declaration of surplus in February of 2013. Now I want you to note, another matter that management agrees, the department fills it out and says, look, with the findings of the Independent Fairness Commissioner, we agree. But we note that it wasn't a requirement to post surplus properties on the City's website in…back in 2013. What I want you to understand from this is this: when many of the residents I represent here have come forward to committees or through letters to all of Council have said is that they want to keep the park line…parkland that they feel was unfairly traded at the time. They had the parkland. That is clear from this report, and it slipped through their fingers in the infamous land swap deal in the manner in which I just described above, and despite it never being posted in 2013, and I don't think there has been any effort to date to post in the intervening years. So, it's clear that this, this is the moment, Madam Speaker, this is the moment, not the intervening years since 2013, that will make a difference in upholding the basic of what is now what we understand now to be our fairness regime. It's as evidence as a two-third vote on parkland, a two-third vote that is invoked by our Charter and implied by recommendation number one. So, for some of you, for instance, some of my colleagues who came forward in opposition to the administrative report at Property and Development when I appeared there, it wasn't a unanimous vote. And it was not…it might not be unanimous here either, although, of course, that's what I'd like. It wasn't…it certainly wasn't at EPC. But if that isn't sufficient, what I want to say to those…and I expect to hear arguments that invoke infill for maybe the sake of infill or investments in transportation or into development as a justification or its proximity to bus rapid transit or it's…that it…or perhaps even a desire to see this exact development built because you feel it's beautiful or a position I have some sympathy for because historically, there was a brewery, and poetically, this developer, Mr. Huynin, wants to see beer brewed and served on the banks again. But for those that are inclined to consider those aspects, I want you to listen and consider the overwhelming message of what was missing in OurWinnipeg Complete Communities, the greenspace that countless people came forward to discuss with us. And finally, I want you to consider some recent data that I crunched. Actually, I didn't crunch it, my harm reduction intern, Gwendolyn Black, a phenom in her own right, crunched for me…as a matter of fact, I will give it all to you and I think you will find it assuring. So, first, the factual information, and it pertains to our…I hope what is our mutual love of growing the city up and not out. And I want to provide some details on the number of units I, as well as other councillors...

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you, to the colleagues for an extension. So, as the acclaimed council colleague made really good arguments with respect to preserving riverbank, in particular, parkland generally and this specifically, I want you to note that she leads the whole city in units built in the last term with 2,732. And in a recent conversation, Madam Speaker, with Councillor Lukes, I asked, how many of that do you think is infill because

we know through some of her impressive towers that she posts on social media that she likes her residential multi-family large. So, 2,732, roughly half or maybe a little over is infill development. St. Vital, my brother across the river, Councillor Mayes, 2,016 units. Transcona, 1,798 units this term. Also, not exclusively infill, I'll point out. Old Kildonan, 1,586, and right next to Old Kildonan, rounding out the top five is Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry Ward at this term, 1,550. For those of you I haven't mentioned, with few exceptions like Councillor Santos, with over 1,300 units this term, you have a little bit lighter of units. Some of you finished the term…likely will finish the term with what I do in one year or maybe even less, so depending on the year. So, why am I saying this? Because for those of you who might just want infill, I want you to know, for me, this isn't about blocking infill or dislike the transportation-oriented development, clearly given the number...and mine are exclusively infill, I do have…I do what I say. I want to grow this…I want to grow this city up and not out. And I need to challenge those that think that that to consider your relative approval or units in this term, and then consider the parkland that you have.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins, your time is up. If you could wrap up.

Councillor Rollins: I'll be wrapping up. And then consider, you know, that this is parkland.

Madam Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Rollins: And that the approval of two-thirds of all of Council members is pursuant to our charter. And I want you to consider the world of that…

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Rollins: The World Health Organization that Ms. Forsyth…

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Introduced.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Rollins: And not support the report.

Madam Speaker: Moving onto Councillor Mayes. Thank you. Councillor Mayes. Just prior to that…just one moment.

Councillor Nason: Continue past 6 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Yes, Councillor Nason moves a motion to continue our proceedings past 6:00 p.m. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Please get Councillor Chambers some sunglasses, yes.

Mayor Bowman: If Councillor Rollins was finished or not, if she isn't, I'd like to move extension so that she could conclude her remarks.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins, another extension?

Councillor Rollins: Oh, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Do you require another extension?

Councillor Rollins: Yes, I did, Madam Speaker.

Mayor Bowman: I'll move extension again.

Madam Speaker: Okay, and we'll require two-thirds vote for the second extension. All in favour? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Rollins, that's passed. Two minutes on the clock.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And to my colleagues, one more time, really quick. So, it is unfair. It's not transparent. It doesn't adhere to our policies and unfairly charges, I believe, the residents of Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry, that are pulling more than, they would argue, their fair share on infill. And I don't believe that that should be invoked. And I believe that it was a deal built on a house of cards. And that, you know, this should be a vote for greenspace with the full comfort that infill, transportation-oriented development is alive and well in Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry. I've given

the numbers to…and even celebrated them. But what I'd like to…for this council to do is to preserve this property by giving the Complete Community tools back to the residents of Fort Garry-East Fort Garry, indeed, the City, protect the integrity of the vision, the longer-term vision of the city and our views of the riverbank, what they…the views of the riverbank that all Winnipeggers deserve to be held publicly and preserve that with your vote today. And I thank you, colleagues for the additional time.

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

Councillor Mayes: Given the hour, I'll try and be brief. Thanks, Madam Speaker. I'll be supporting Councillor Rollins' position on this. It does merit some discussion, though, where is this two-thirds requirement coming from, and it's section 205(2) of the City of Winnipeg Charter: Restriction on Disposable Parkland. Despite Clause 1(d), no land owned by the City and used for park or cemetery purposes, on the day this act came into force, or acquired after that date by the City for park or cemetery purposes, may be disposed of without approval by a vote of two-thirds of all members of council. So, A) it's the hard 11 requirement. It's not…if there's 15 of us here, you only need 10, no, you've got to have two-thirds of all members, so if you're not here, that counts as a no vote. Second thing is land acquired by the City for park or cemetery purposes. So, one's instinctive look is to say, well, it's not zoned as a park, it doesn't look like a park how can this attract the two-third's requirement? And it was pretty clearly acquired by the City for park purposes. We've heard about that from various speakers, EPC and here. I don't think there's too much debate about that. This actually came up in my ward, a piece of land called the Beliveau Forest which was zoned for housing, which was residentially zoned. When I asked the staff about it, they said, well actually, you'd need two-thirds if you ever wanted to sell because we view it as a de facto park even though it's zoned residential. They then said, but if you sell it, we'd keep the money because it's not a de jure park, it's not technically a park. Luckily, we didn't have to get into that debate because I think if you're going to treat it as a park and it's sold, you should get the money. That would be consistent with our policy, but we don't really need to get into that today. And at Beliveau, we didn't either, because we changed the zoning around and turned it into a park. So, we didn't try and sell it. I didn't get any money because we didn't try and sell it. But here I think we've run into two problems; it clearly is a two-third's requirement because it was land acquired for the purposes of a park. And then, to me, rather oddly, there's never been any mention here of, well, if we do sell it, our policy normally is that the ward councillor gets the proceeds of sale. If it's park, interestingly, similar provisions if you sell off community centre property as Councillor Steeves had lined up before I took over at an old piece of land, Glenlee Community Centre and that money…that sale went back into my ward in terms of some community centre projects. So, I'm going to support Councillor Rollins for two reasons. It does need the two-thirds requirement. It was clearly acquired for park purposes, albeit, the zoning doesn't reflect that, but it was required, therefore it attracts the two-thirds. And B) the money…if this were to sell, I don't think the money should be going anywhere other than the ward councillor, that's been our policy on other sales of land zoned for park. And frankly, I think it would set a bad precedent in terms of our upcoming discussions about greenspaces and golf courses if we were to somehow say, well, this doesn't need two-thirds or we're going to change the rules around right now and try to put the money somewhere other than in the ward. So, I'll be supporting Councillor Rollins' position. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yeah, I already indicated. I'm going to rise, and I'm voting against this report. It is quite convoluted, but you know, I want to just clarify from what I…my perspective on this whole matter. So, go to the river or whatever they called it, was never adopted by Council as policy related to anything along the Red River and Assiniboine Rivers, which it was projecting a lot of different ideas and concepts, including between the Louise Bridge and the north side of the CP Rail main line, there's a private lot and a publicly owned boat launch area, which they had planned to actually not create greenspace in a harbour. They were talking about building some density right there and making their own little harbour gated community. That was in that plan. This was a plan that was initiated by...I can't remember the architect's name who was involved with The Forks, and I mean, there were great ideas there, and I had met with them just before they were starting. Council actually adopted it...received it as information. We didn't receive it as policy or anything of that nature, like some of the other things like we accepted a secondary plan for The Forks area or those things. They were concepts and ideas that were great. Actually, some of them were great, some of the ideas I thought they didn't go far enough north on the Red River, actually, for some of the elements that they were talking about. And I think to some degree, there might have been a little discrimination against the area up towards the North End and West Kildonan, anyway, I digress. So, while they had great concepts, that's a good thing. Now, the whole fiasco with the fire halls and the back and forth with this particular property, you know, we did take it in with intentions of parks. I understand that. And it does require two-thirds vote because it was the intention and the Parks Department...Parks and Open Spaces, Public Works is actually the…determined to be the City internal owner of that property. So, okay, fine. Now, what I also heard in a presentation from the potential purchaser of this particular lot, he never knew any of this stuff. He wasn't told in the RFP, there was no consideration. And I heard him maybe only picking up a smaller piece of this lot to build on and leaving more for a park. Like, there's a…this thing's a fiasco. We need to defeat it. And upon defeating it, hopefully the administration can go back and either re-issue an RFP or whatever, but you know, let's be clear to anybody who buys this, like, the intention is to have some element of park. And for me, the beauty would be, if we only sold one-third of that lot to the purchaser, and

the rest of the land came to us and then whatever the sale price is, that money should go directly into making it a park, which is what it's supposed to be, right? It's supposed to be a park. So, that's where the money…the net proceeds should go. You know, that mess over there on Taylor, that was the current Mayor and some people's bad decisions. Actually, we were just looking at the Auditor's report on the fire hall. Oh, sorry. Sorry. Sorry. I'm sorry, Mayor Bowman. No, really. A former mayor, my first…during my first. And some other of my colleagues letting a rogue CAO go along. Anyway, I don't want to go down there. We are still dealing with the outcome of that in that we had an auditor's report today we voted on, it's still dealing with that whole fiasco. But you know, I don't think that the Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry Ward should be punished by not seeing the proceeds go towards park and open spaces that everybody wants to have down there close to Churchill Drive and that whole area. And you know what, if you want to talk about drinking beers down there again, there's nothing like a good Oktoberfest in a park, so I'll leave it at that. I'll be voting in opposition to this. Just be...like, really, somebody should have sent this back already. I'm not the one to do it. So, I'll just be voting against this. It's the simplest thing to do.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's interesting because we're take…a lot of, kind of, opinions have changed on this. And I guess I have some concerns that in our…the OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities, I don't remember or recall seeing any discussion on protecting riverbanks or parks, and that obviously is something we have to take note of. I'm a little bit concerned that we're assuming…we're talking as if it's the whole area. When I looked at the drawings, I'm seeing that it's not the entire area, and I'm hearing that there...you know, there's opportunities to work together with the proposed…or the buyer, in all essence, at possibly saying what goes there or what doesn't go there or having them actually build the park because I don't know if we have the funds to do that and do the riverbank stabilization. And also, do we want a park that's hidden away and how we secure that and such. I think we have to protect parks and we have to protect riverbanks. That was one of the concepts that I put forward with the OurWinnipeg, and I know we have to do it a different way now. I'm also kind of concerned that, you know, in one area, we're asked, you know, to think about the residents in one area, but in another area, just moments ago, we said no; that we have to make what is the best decision for the area councillor because they're not, you know, not capable of possibly doing that. And with this one, I know it's become very political, it's become really good for social media, but I'm concerned that maybe we're opening ourselves up to another lawsuit. I think we've had enough. I really...I'm conflicted with this one because there's valid points on both sides, there really is. I don't hold any grudges on how people vote at all. There is valid points on both sides because I do think that we have to look at the costs, when are we going to make it a park, how is that going to happen, can we control it, can we, you know, make it safe? Have we talked to the developer or the buyer that we've already put the RFP out. I hear often when we're in meetings that when we put an RFP out, we start to play with that, we're open…we're subject to lawsuits, all of us. We're subject to those lawsuits. And that concerns me as well because that just means more money, more resources from taxpayers to fight something that you know maybe…maybe…maybe we could…we could, you know, have solved had we taken the time. I had…at the standing policy committee meeting, I requested a delay, just to lay it over to allow the parties to talk. You know, maybe we could just talk. And you know, I did that because Councillor Rollins was at that time supportive of it but not happy that she wasn't getting the funding, which I agree with, you know. And that's…that I understand. So, I...I had moved for the delay to have those discussions, and it wasn't supported. Unfortunately, it was a tie, I think. Councillor Lukes and I had supported it, and the other two members did not. So, this is a really difficult one, and I actually appreciate all the comments that I'm hearing because this is a decision that I think we have to look at when we make and say okay, how is this going to impact everything else and other decisions that come forward here shortly on different pieces of land and parcels of land because this really isn't about just one piece of land. It's about the decision making process. It's about how…and it's about the information we receive as councillors which is kind of the point I was trying to make today. It's limited. It's 30,000 feet, Madam Speaker. And sometimes that's not enough to make a well-informed decision. Thank you.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'm…I found a report from the September 10th, 2002 Property and Development Committee. There's a…it's a…a lot of the report has to do about a historic building listing of this property, but in the memo here that's attached at the end of the document, the City acquired the 50,000 square feet building located at 409 Mulvey Avenue in 1995 from the Phillips Temro Company. The acquisition by means of a land exchange for a City-owned property located in St. Boniface Industrial Park. The Phillips Temro Company subsequently leased the building for two years ending in the spring 1997. Anyways, it talks about the purpose of acquiring this property was specifically to gain access to the river property. It even goes on to say that the acquisition was...they contemplated either potentially doing a fire paramedic station on that property at that time when they acquired it from Phillips Temro or selling off the remaining land. It was contemplated when the City did that, ironically, another swap with Phillips Temro for that land in St. Boniface Industrial Park. To me, this was always the plan. This is consistent with what…why the City acquired it in the first place. I question as to why this remaining residual piece of the Phillips Temro, formerly the brewery property, would be this considered park. This is a good development. It's transit adjacent. The key piece that parkway is

going to be part of the City's inventory and will allow access. Unfortunately, I will not…again, I don't take varying from the area councillor lightly, but in this case, I think it is the right thing to do.

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

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It was very enlightening to listen to everybody speak on the floor of Council and getting different perspectives. And taking a look at this project, again, having a very long debate over at PP&D. I'm really challenged with this report. You know, as someone who does not have a lot of residential infill and has a lot of parking lots, it's very challenging. And I want to…you know, inside of me, support and stand to what I had said on PP&D. I think one thing I am disappointed in is the recommendation number four where the disposition of the net proceeds are still going to the Land Operating Reserve. I tried moving a motion to amend it. It was defeated where the land…the net proceeds would go to Land Dedication, which would help, you know, support greenspaces within the City of Winnipeg and possibly revitalization of the waterfront. With that being said, I mean, if I were to not support the development, and this gravel surface parking lot that's owned by Parks or managed by Parks, where are we going to find the moneys to redevelop it into park space, into active transportation, into bike? As we know, we go every year and year, we cut back on community services and parks and recreation funding. So, this is a huge challenge. Like, you know, I moved forward a motion to make a compromise and, unfortunately, you know, we're at a standstill on a very, very challenging report. I want to support the development, Albatross Development in purchasing this land, but if we were to leave it as a surface parking lot, and we're saying we need to revitalize our waterfront, we need to be cognizant, where is the money going to come from? We don't have the budget for it. So, those councillors who have said that they want to keep it as greenspace and wants to keep it as a waterfront, I hope you advocate for more funding for parks and recreation because I know I have been every year, you know, and it's challenging. And I don't usually change my votes when I'm on a committee, but you know, I'm going to stick to my ground and I will support Councillor Rollins and Councillor Lukes. And I think you've made some very compelling arguments, and I do feel bad for Albatross. You know they had a great presentation. I think it was a great idea. It's just…we're there yet, and I think we need more money for parks and recreation. I can't say that over and over again. So, this is going to be that nail in that coffin to prove my point. So, I will not be supporting Executive Policy's committee recommendation for a number of reasons.

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

Councillor Nason: Yes, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move referral back to the standing policy committee for this…for additional consideration.

Madam Speaker: To the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development?

Councillor Nason: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason has moved referral. All in favour? Nay is…

Councillor Nason: Recorded vote.

Councillor Rollins: Nay. Nay. Recorded vote.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all those in favour of the referral back to the standing committee, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Referral motion is lost. Councillor Nason, do you wish to speak to this item?

Councillor Nason: It was interesting hearing Councillor Santos talking about cuts to…or lack of funds for parks because in just 2024, there will be $0 allocated to our wards, and I believe she's on the Budget Working Group, and the chair and

the ward councillor on this matter is responsible for that area. So, you know, hearing that there's a deficiency in that area, you know, I think it corrected on the record, telling me I was wrong, but $300,000 between 15 wards in 2024 is not much investment in maintaining our park space. Transcona known as the park city is a challenge. So, surface parking lots and finding the funds to repair waterfront and erosion of our waterfront, I guess, you know, erosion on…or restoration of waterfront falls to Water and Waste and there's not much money in that especially when it comes to private holdings. This developer is trying to renew a property and I'm hearing positive things from several members of the Council here with regards to this project. I felt that there's…seems that there is additional conversations needed. I know I've received several e-mails from, I believe it's from ward residents saying that, you know, keep it as greenspace, there's not enough…you're not asking enough money for the land, those types of challenges. So, that's why I had wanted to move it back. And unfortunately, that wasn't the mood of the Council, 8-8, I guess we almost had enough. But you know, I would like to see this be received positively. I don't know if we're going to get to the two-thirds, but we'll find out shortly. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know what, I think that this…you know, this is an opportunity for us to look at increasing some of the park space, especially along the riverbank, which is really vital to many different people in the city and also, too, that community that has really seen a lot of density. I think it will require us to be very creative in terms of how we're going to fund this, and we'll have to look at that for sure. I know that just for an example, Friends of Lower Fort Garry had the parking lot right adjacent to Fort Garry Place, and they've been using some of that money to reinvest back in the park, and that might be an option that we can look at, considering it's a parking lot if we were to look at reinvestment to the park. But anyways, that will…you know, there'll have to be creative ways. And I just want to really thank all of my councillor colleagues. I really think this was a really great debate that we have had here today, and I think this is a tough one because I think it is a really good development close to a transit line but also, too, it could be a really great park close to a transit line…the rapid transit line that people could access and get to. So, this is a…this will be an interesting debate, but that's why we're here and we're in charge of making these decisions. So, I'm glad we're having this debate today. I don't think taking it back to committee would have changed anyone's minds. I think we've talked about it enough and now the time is to make the decision. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. With that, I'll call the question and it will be a recorded vote.

Councillor Rollins: Call for a recorded vote, please.

Madam Speaker: Yes, thank you. All in favour of Item 2, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard and Browaty

Nays

Councillors Rollins, Orlikow, Lukes, Santos, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Mayes, Nason and Schreyer

Madam Speaker: I already voted previously.

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

Madam Speaker: Item 2 is lost. Correct?

City Clerk: Item 3 is lost. Yes, sorry, Madam Speaker. You were…

Madam Speaker: Item 2.

City Clerk: You were in favour.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

City Clerk: Sorry, the vote is 3 to 13.

Madam Speaker: Item 2 is lost.

City Clerk: Correct.

Madam Speaker: Moving on, Mr. Clerk, Item 7.

Item 7 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 45/55/100 Daman Farm Road & 2974 St. Mary's Road – DASZ 29/2020

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is another difficult one that came to committee. A very complex situation that we don't normally see. This is very close to the perimeter. And what the developer is looking at doing is he wants to build…he wants to have two acre lots instead of five acre lots. And it wasn't…this started…originated at community committee, the Riel Community Committee. The City recommends that we reject this option. They don't feel that a two-acre lots…they have too many wells because there's not…it's not service land. So, they'd have too many wells and the potential...there would be potential impacts to our groundwater. And the five-acre lots, which they would be allowed, would be a more acceptable numbers of wells, so it wouldn't impact the aquifer, which is the drinking water, and that's what a lot of there residents were very concerned is that these wells could impact the drinking water. And how many wells that they have…if we have two-acre lots, there's going to be a lot more properties with a lot more wells. So, it is a huge concern. We don't regulate wells; the Provincial Government does, so Riel…it came up through Riel Committee. At standing policy committee, it was a tie vote, so it came up to EPC, and EPC is concurring with the Riel Committee with the Public Service's recommendation, so I'm hoping that my councillor colleagues will also concur with recommendation of the Public Service because this is an area that is un-serviced. We have to make sure that we have…we have to protect the portable groundwater and I think that that's critical. So, hope that…looking forward to hearing the dialogue here. Thanks.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My colleague, Councillor Gilroy provided a very good summation of the circumstances here. This is an un-serviced area and in specifically speaking, the area between St. Mary's Road and the Red River south of the perimeter. It's a protected area, Madam Speaker, in terms of the groundwater and ensuring that residents there have potable water. The impact to the aquifer by drilling additional wells has an impact on the groundwater and potentially will reduce the quality of drinking water for the residents that are already there. The developer has indicated that they would like to subdivide and rezone the five-acre properties. It's 55-acre property altogether, but instead of going to five-acre properties, they would like to go to two-acre properties and put a caveat on the title that says that the City of Winnipeg would prohibit any well drilling to go forward. It has been determined that the City of Winnipeg doesn't permit well drilling. This is a provincial responsibility, and as such, the way the act reads is that if you have title to the property, and you have equipment, you are eligible to drill a well for the purpose of domestic use. If you have a five-acre property, you can drill a well for agricultural purposes. So, you know, having the City indicate that they are putting a caveat on the title would not be sufficient enough to stop well drilling, you know, if you own that property. So, that's why we're here today. The matter did go to P&D. P&D did go in camera for a legal opinion. I can't comment as to what that was. I have no idea, but essentially, we're asking for the support of Council to concur in the recommendation of the Public Service so that the well water for those that are currently living there is protected and that, you know, based on the recommendations of the planners that, you know, they're indicating a way of managing the aquifers is to limit to five-acre properties. So, with that, again, I thank Councillor Gilroy for her summation of this issue, very contentious issue. We do want to protect the potable water for those residents south of the perimeter. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Well, for all those who think the City of Winnipeg is bounded by the perimeter, and this is the revenge of the people who live south of the perimeter. And of course, south of the perimeter on the St. Norbert side, you've got transit, you've got water, you've got sewer, you've got Handi-Transit prior to this year. On the St. Vital side, you've got no transit, you've got no water, you've got not sewer, up until this year, you couldn't even get Handi-Transit, but luckily we've solved that. So, very different and a sort of quasi rural area. You will all remember my speech at the May 28th, 2015 Appeals Committee hearing, where we last had an issue with well water in this same neighbourhood when I still represented this part of the city. It's the same issue again, it's the tragedy of the commons. If you allow one too many people to partake in the common good of the aquifer, it potentially risks wrecking the whole aquifer and you get the Walter…water with too high a salt content. It's a…it's not unique to this part of the city, but it's a pretty rare issue that comes up, but it's part of the city. They pay their taxes and we have these idiosyncratic issues that come up down there; nuisance beaver shooting permits, all sorts of stuff you just don't get elsewhere in the city. So, I think Councillor Chambers has handled this well. I think he's handled it correctly. Some good heroic efforts, really, by Donovan Toews on behalf of

the developer here, but at the end of the day, it's really…comes down to the well water issue and whether you want to gamble and the people in the neighbourhood don't. The City staff say no, don't. The area councillor says yeah, I'm comfortable with that position, so I think we should back Councillor Chambers here. I mean it's an odd issue, but at the end of the day, there isn't city water, there isn't city sewer. It's a small development, really too small to justify bringing a whole pipe down at the expense of the developer. This issue will go away someday, I suspect. Within 20, 30 years, there'll be pipe coming down St. Anne's and St. Mary's, and the city will spread out a little further, but for the time being, I think the people who showed up who said, you know, we rely on well water don't…you know, that there's a reason behind this policy. I took that position on…in 2015, I'm going to stay with it. I think the area councillor has done his job and has done it right on this one. So, I will be…I mean, the developer really did make efforts here, I think. But at the end of the day, I think we've got to go with the position of the administration.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers, unless there's any other speakers? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: I'll speak to this briefly, thank you. This is a complicated issue because there is a lack of clarity on enforcement and who's responsible. Protecting the aqueduct would by having no wells allowed and that was what was being proposed. And protecting the aqueduct by having no wells allowed would mean putting a caveat on it. The challenge is, who's going to police it? The challenge is, the same people probably that police, you know, when you build a deck without a permit. When you, you know, build an encroaching driveway without a permit. We have City staff to police these infractions. This is where it all fell apart. I do think that, ultimately, this will continue on and go to a higher level of decision making than what is occurring here because there's a lot of...there is a lot of grey area in this, and what's the point of a caveat if it's not going to be adhered to? And we have caveats on many things. So, at the time, I did vote for…in support of no wells, but at this point, I think I'm going to leave it to the litigation and legal aspect of what will probably come from this. So, I just wanted to put that on the record.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wasn't going to speak, but when I hear about legal issues and challenges, Madam Speaker, I get a little concerned because essentially, when I was looking at this decision, and I think our planners made the right decision because, you know, ultimately, you know, you go two acres for this particular person who owns this property, who says oh, no, we won't do wells, but whoever ends up buying the two acres, it doesn't matter if you put a caveat on there. Like, really, who's the caveat against? The City of Winnipeg doesn't own anything to do with wells, although we have had our Water and Waste look at running that cross-country oil line across and what it would do to damage the aquifers east of the city is interesting. But ultimately, you know, this is going to be a part of the city eventually as Councillor Mayes has mentioned, like it will be. And then, what is the legacy there? So, we have wells. So then, we get into the debate, you know, about bringing in water and sewer lines and all that kind of stuff that happened in West St. Paul when they joined in at least on our waste disposal system. There was a lot of people who really didn't want to because they couldn't afford to pay out of their pocket to have the connections to their…I think it's two-acre…one…some place is two-acres…one acre lots. But ultimately, you know, if you want to say you're using cisterns, I don't think this person whoever the developer is looked at putting in a plan. But I stayed in Cabo San Lucas, a friend of mine bought a house in Cabo San Lucas. And he lives in a neighborhood where it's a cistern system and the water truck comes up and there's a pipe at the beginning of the neighbourhood and that one pipe feeds like probably about 100 residential units, somewhere around there, I can't remember. But ultimately, you open up your valve when you're ready to receive more water and it's measured, but there's a pipe system put in. It's not delivering a truck full of water from door to door. It's going to one entrance point where you let the water in once it's used up in your house. And so, like, so I heard that they're proposing that you use water cisterns in this circumstance, but again, you know, if you have the kind of system in Cabo San Lucas that they have, you could eventually connect the watermain to there and then you're feeding the house water that way. Like, you know, but there's no structure being put in place here. And you know, ultimately…in the end, long time from now, there'll be complaints like we received in Glenelm, like, oh, they didn't pave the back lane. Oh, they didn't do this. There was no improvement here. There's…so, our planners made a good decision. Not only did they make a decision to protect the water for the people who are already there, but they made a decision to ensure that this area...and, you know, somebody could call it a neighborhood. It's south of the…actually, it's south of the floodway, too, right? I think…anyway, so, you know, you have to be concerned about this stuff. So, I mean, I'm voting with the planner's recommendation, but I just thought I'd bring this to attention. Like, a long time from now, the decisions we make will have some effect in the future, and this is the right decision for that particular area of the city. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers, to close.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In listening…oh, sorry.

Madam Speaker: Yes, you're correct. Councillor Chambers, you were the first one that spoke. My apologies. Back to the Chair for close, unless there's anyone else that would like to address this item. No? Councillor Gilroy for the close.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Okay. Call for recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 7 passes. Just before we move on, I just want to go back to the Mulvey vote for a moment and just make sure, Mr. Clerk, that my vote was captured correctly as the no. There was some confusion I think at the end there with the pause. So, it was 2…2 to 14 was the result, correct?

City Clerk: Correct, Madam Speaker. With you as no, the vote is 2 to 14.

Madam Speaker: 2 to 14, yes, thank you. Moving on, next, Mr. Clerk.

Item 9 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 1465 Corydon Avenue and 492 Queenston Street – DASZ 7/2021

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy to introduce the item.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. This was stood down by? Councillor Orlikow, go ahead.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I've saved all of my beautiful words for this moment. It's been a long day, and so I'll just get right to it. I think we've seen some pretty interesting things today especially between the councillors where we're looking at votes have changed from day…from community committees to standing policy committees to Council, which I think is healthy. That's a point of democracy. We do sometimes get accused of being narrow-minded, and once a vote is done, it's set in stone, and it moves on and it's some type of...you know, sometimes we talk…people think is that the area councillor always wins the day, well, it doesn't happen. I can say Parker and a number of other ones where the area councillor doesn't win the day. But again, the democracy requires some movement and people being willing to actually move as they learn more information and talk to their colleagues. So, I do really appreciate that. I don't appreciate this move, though. So, I'll put it out there right now. This decision here was unanimously supported to reject the application by the community committee after enormous number of residents came forward in opposition. One resident did come in support with a caveat that he did not like the idea of having the easement go across the sidewalk onto the street to have…allow access to the parking lot in the back. My personal opinion is that I don't really like the subdivision. I mean, to combine two corner lots, I'm very concerned. Still am, about the fact that we don't have any...we worry about infill guidelines and all of this, but the major issue I still see is the amalgamation of lots and moving down lots with no protection, and that's encroachment, I call it. It's happening throughout the neighborhood, and we don't have a corridor plan. That, I believe, should have been done prior to an infill guideline, but we are here today. So, we are here today without the guideline on what to of corridoes. So, the issue with corridors is generally what is here today. The idea of commercial nodes is here today. That's another one they want to put forward. So, really, at the end of the day, the issue that's germane to me and the neighborhood specifically, is the fact that this is really close to a very busy school, Brock Corydon School. It's on a very…it's on a residential street that is already having traffic problems by cars coming off Corydon and flying down Queenston. They are a block off of that back lane, off the commercial node, and they don't want it to be expanded farther down than what it is today. We have a nice little building there that was done by the previous develop…owner who did a business under the caveat, another caveat idea, that the building would remain looking like a…looking like a residential building, and it does. However, now this proposal is a larger proposal to add in more commercial units, take away the house…the residential house that is needed behind it, which developers and people are arguing they're buying up adjacent properties and letting them sit, and then say, hey, the building's not really that good anymore, so we're going to amalgamate the two lots, kind of a self-fulfilling prophecy model. But the really…the core problem here really is that easement in the parking in the rear. I believe we could have settled this if the developer and the Planning Department came forward, and as I mentioned before, without having parking off the rear. I think that would have settled a lot of the concerns that people have. So, why am I so concerned about having easement go across the...and my council colleagues who are on the committee with me, and as per the decision (inaudible) here at P&D. I don't really know what happened at EPC, but we are here today. So, why did…why is that a concern? Well, A) having an easement

there where it has…you're going to have the first easement on that block, could that justify more? Well, it does. People will say, well, there is an example right there on the block. That's a problem. I'm not a big fan of easements going along some residential streets. It creates a hazard for people walking, and who's walking? Well, the kids are. This is very close to Brock Corydon School. A lot of children go down this street to get to Brock Corydon School. So, it is a safety issue for the children. It also puts more traffic that are going to go down from Corydon. They can't maybe get back on easily, so they're going to go down into the neighbourhood and we're going to increase the problem that we're existing in River Heights right now which is traffic flying down our streets. Because we have long, linear streets, it's hard to deal with that. So, the best idea there would be have…if we're going to do this, make sure that parking is off the back lane. However, that wasn't proposed. It was proposed to come across the sidewalk, quite a large entranceway, and to amalgamate two lots. Now…and also, to expand the commercial footprint because now what you're going to have is those houses are facing the other side of the street are going to have cars coming in and out of there at all times shining their lights in their house and bringing commercialization down their block, which they never expected in this very nice, quaint area. So again, the community committee, the neighbourhood, part of the P&D committee, and I hope today, will realize that we have to respect, A) the fact of safety. We have to recognize that the area councillor does know significant problems in this area. 7-Eleven is just right across the way. There's a large garden centre that's already causing some quite significant pressures in that area. So again, I would definitely say that if a developer came by with a better plan that didn't have that easement and that parking as such and more landscaping and buffering to protect the neighbourhoods from this commercial encroachment down the block, it may be more acceptable. But what I was presented was it was a commercial encroachment down the block with a driveway that's going to be a precedence setting, dangerous, increase traffic down the street and is not at all, even the one person that came in support of this application said, I'm in support, but I really don't like the driveway going out onto the street. So, I consider that no one really in support of it. So, that's what I heard at the meeting. We all at this community committee accepted that. We were all very concerned about the impact on safety for the kids and increasing traffic loads on that street and speeding, and there was a better design and opportunity to go forward. So, that's...not saying no, just saying this was not it. Go back to the drawing board, come back at a later time. So, I ask for your support today. We've heard today already, we've seen today already, councillors changing their vote the other way, so maybe my words of wisdom or hope, helped out someone. And I've also heard today from many councillors of respecting the area councillor. I agree, there is some…the times when you don't go with the area councillor, myself, is when they're preposterous, when everything they're saying is clearly…I just can't accept it. But I think I've outlined a number of issues with this proposal that doesn't make it that I'm just trying to stop development completely or the community committee is. Councillor Rollins quite clearly pointed out that she's very supportive of infill. Councillor Gilroy is very supportive of infill, and so am I, but we have to make sure that it's in context with the neighbourhood. So, this development is just not appropriate, especially with that driveway going across the sidewalk. It's not safe. It provides very little benefit for the neighborhood except for having more cars race up and down their street and shining lights in all to their houses, cutting down a few trees, all for the purpose of build…to amalgamate two lots, so they can do a parking lot in the back, and build a bigger plex even though years ago, the caveat…

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. That even though the caveat before it was quite clear and it's going to…you know, well, it was good then, but not now, it's still the same, that if they want to develop that single property and have the parking off the rear, absolutely no problem. We could even get off the caveat about having to make it look like a house. That's fine. However, two properties, that's a little hard to swallow for me at this time, but again, the community committee could look at that. But again, the one with the no starter is going off to the…off to the sidewalk. So, I ask for your support today. I hope the developer will come back with another proposal that takes these comments into consideration and supports the community committee's initial recommendation. And I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And Madam Speaker, I'd like to thank my colleague from River Heights for speaking to this issue. This is the first time I get to…I've heard and get to vote on this particular development idea. And I just want to actually stand, Madam Speaker, in solidarity with Councillor Orlikow in that I spent a good portion of my life working around this neighborhood as well as walking and visiting friends. I've worked at Brock Corydon School. I've also worked at William Osler School just, you know, further south on Grant where, again, we have motor vehicle issues around those schools that, you know, they do pose a problem. It's not…you know, this isn't like it's right by Queenston School, over at Kingsway, you know, where the…there isn't that…the traffic, as far as I remember, isn't all that bad or whatever, but around this particular area, I'm going to be supporting Councillor Orlikow and voting in opposition to this plan. He's right, if they're going to develop it, they should do it properly. But you know, I've walked down Corydon Avenue, and it can be fairly loud, and when motor vehicles are coming, I'm going to…I'm supporting from a person who's blind perspective, and having that driveway come there and people coming in and off of that road. You know, it gets pretty noisy on Corydon now compared to when I used to walk around there a lot. And I've almost been hit by cars coming out of back lanes further east of Queenston, and you know, it's…Madam Speaker, it's dangerous. And for kids, you know, sometimes they're not

trying to...I'm always trying to pay attention to what's going on, but you know, you don't always hear hybrid cars or electric cars, who knows what's coming out of there, I think is a problem. So, anyway, I've talked too much already. I'll be supporting standing with Councillor Orlikow on this one. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I've travelled on the Indianapolis 500...sorry, I meant Corydon Avenue, many times over the years. My son attends school, when school is in session in the area. I used to live on Campbell. So, I know this area very well and I've gone to that 7-Eleven. I think…I can't remember what it was before, little ice cream shop to the west of the…of 7-Eleven, but it is a very nice looking building that's there. And then the subject property that we're dealing with. You know, hearing about the challenges of speed in that area, it is definitely a speedway, only made worse by the significant investment in new concrete in the area. The lighting at the Corydon Brock School, it was a crosswalk as opposed to a half light, which I'm surprised about it. If there's such a challenge with safety, that I would have thought a controlled intersection would have been an improvement that likely would have been sought. I...you know, consolidating the lots, yeah, there's a driveway there. It does make more sense to not have that opportunity there. So, I will be supporting the councillor today...or this rejection and encourage others to do as well. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: I'm just...process wise, I'd like to refer back to the committee so that more dialogue and work could happen here.

Madam Speaker: The standing committee…the Mayor has referred the matter back to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development for more consideration. All in favour? I heard one nay. Okay. There's a few. Okay. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Santos, Lukes, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy and Schreyer.

Nays

Councillors Rollins, Orlikow, Browaty, Chambers, Klein, Mayes, Nason and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

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

Madam Speaker: The referral's lost. Next speaker to this item? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I can speak. I was planning on supporting the position at the EPC. I want to thank Councillor Orlikow for his comments. It was actually moving that forward because I thought that was the direction he wanted to go, but in hindsight, now seeing his vote, I'm glad it was defeated. I will be supporting the position that he's articulating. I really appreciate the input today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any further speakers? Councillor Schreyer, followed…Councillor Rollins, he's changed his mind. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Yes, I wasn't going to speak to it because I had been I think clear at community committee and Councillor Orlikow said everything that I would have said. But the…I think it is important when there are some major design pieces that need to be…that I don't like designing on the fly at community committee. So, I do think…you know, I want to say, you know, retroactively, I didn't support referral because I think it is really important to hit pause and that isn't for councillors to do. And so, it's just a principle. If I see, you know, one, two, three design elements that I am unable to support, I just don't support it because, you know, it requires, you know, going back to. I also want to say that, you know, this will stand out to me as an important moment for an assertion of area councillors and really why there are sometimes a really needed eyes, ears, nose on the ground. Brock Corydon School raised me up as a city councillor because I was their school trustee. And so, the issues that councillors have brought up almost to theme at Council today with respect to what I will call Complete Communities and the care and attention that they need, including when it is a school zone, and the subject property is two-minutes walking distance. If you put it into Google Maps, it could be faster, depending on your pace, from Brock Corydon School. So, just wanted to put those words on the record. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. When this came to committee, you know, I looked at it. I did not sit and listen to the whole public hearing. As you know, many of us don't have the time to listen to the whole public hearings that come forward because we'd never get anything else done. It's unfortunate that we don't have enough staff to help us with that. That's a whole other topic. I'm very supportive of corridor development. I think that this is where we should have our development, should be along corridors where transit is, the snow clearing, where sidewalks are in place versus in the residential neighbourhoods. There's a lot of lots and pieces of land. We saw one earlier today in Charleswood, where we've got big pieces of land around houses, I don't think that's where intensification or commercial or towers or such should go. On Pembina Highway, I've been very supportive of seeing density along Pembina Highway because it's a corridor and all our services are along Pembina Highway. I do have a hang up on schools, right? We've got challenges in schools. I've been very involved and active in safe routes to schools for almost two decades now. And I think we could do a lot more around our schools, but of course, you know, it's all about priorities and budgets. And you know, we do have a lot of schools in the inner-city that are on very busy streets that there's a lot of traffic, but you know, I've heard more today, I've listened to Councillor Rollins. I've listened to Councillor Orlikow on this. And again, I want to say, I'm very supportive of corridor development and I'm not crazy about not seeing densification, corridor development, but if the developer can come up with a better plan that allows better transportation, I'd support that. I know there's a challenge with supporting infill in some of these neighbourhoods. Councillor Orlikow, your neighbourhood being one of them. So, I'm…and I get a little choked on that, too, but you know, I will support you on this in hopes that the developer comes back with a better plan a whole densification along the corridor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Any further speakers? If not, back to you, Councillor Gilroy for the close.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would have liked to have seen this go back to the committee so maybe we could have made some of those changes and this development could occur. But however, I…because I agree exactly with Councillor Lukes, this is a major corridor and we should have this kind of development. I think the issue is around the safety with the school, which I think we could have minimized if this report would have went back. However, we are here and this is why we have healthy debate. And I think what we're hearing today is really, really good. I think…I, myself will be supporting Councillor Orlikow's decision on this. He raised a lot of really good points. So, I think that this is…this is important for us…a day for us because we are having healthy debate today and we are hearing people change their minds from previous decisions. And it's important to note that sometimes as the debate goes forward to Council, a lot of new information comes to light for some of us and I think that that's a good thing and a healthy thing. And I want to thank all my councillor colleagues who are participating in a healthy debate. So, I rise and I will be supporting councillors…Councillor Orlikow, so I will not be concurring with the EPC recommendation.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question on Item 9. All in favour? Contrary? The nays have it. The nays have it. Agreed? Carried. Thank you. Next is by-laws. Just one moment. By-laws, Councillor Gilroy.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Okay. I'd like to move that the following by-laws be read the first time: By-law No. 46/2021, By-law No. 47/2021, By-law No. 48/2021.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 46/2021, By-law No. 47/2021, By-law No. 48/2021.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Not yet. Councillor Gilroy, go ahead.

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move that By-law No. 46/2021 to 48/2021, both inclusive, be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 46/2021 to 48/2021, both inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: And I'd like to move that By-law No. 46/2021 to 48/2021, both inclusive, be read a third time and that fine be…sorry, and…third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Gilroy? Seeing none, let's move on. Councillor Eadie, if you could take the Chair, I'll move the next committee.

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL DATED APRIL 23, 2021

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer…or Sharma. Councillor. I am…anyway, sorry. Am I displaying my age? Pardon me. I'm in the Chair now.

Councillor Sharma: Councillor Eadie.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, Councillor Sharma, to introduce the Governance report of…

Councillor Sharma: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'll move the Governance report dated April 23rd, 2021. One item; the Annual Report of the Integrity Commissioner.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, thank you. Would you like to speak to that report or are you just introducing it?

Councillor Sharma: I think you can call the question. It has not been stood down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Nobody wants to stand it down? Okay. Great. All those in favour then of the Governance report, report from the Integrity Commissioner? Anybody opposed? No, that is carried. Thank you. Yes, I…if Councillor Sharma's okay with it, I'll ask Councillor Chambers to move adjournment. All right. All those in favour? Nobody's opposed? Thank you.

Councillor Sharma: One more item of business, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Oh, roll call. Yes, sorry.

Councillor Sharma: Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 7:05 p.m.