COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, September 29, 2021

The Council met at 9:40 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Mayes.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now move on to you, Mr. Mayor, for your morning announcement.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I will listen to that song, Councillor Mayes. I walked down the aisle to Van Halen's 'When it's Love'. I would also encourage you to listen to Van Halen. Good morning to all my colleagues, those that are joining us in-person and joining us remotely. We are still very much in the battle against COVID, Madam Speaker. The Winnipeg numbers to date; we've had 34,752 cases to date. Sadly, we've lost 815 of our residents. We currently have 82 in the hospital, 19 in ICU. None of those patients, as far as we understand from provincial health officials, are fully vaccinated. And so, I would just once again encourage all Winnipeggers to please go get your vaccines. The test positivity rate in Winnipeg is currently 1.2. It's more than double in the rest of Manitoba with a test positivity rate of 2.8. Obviously, we're all Manitobans, and we want what's best for all of us as our residents throughout our province and want to wish our…wish all the very best to municipal leaders in other jurisdictions in our province. I want to congratulate Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and all members of parliament that were recently elected or re-elected, including many friends to this council. We have, of course, a renewal of terms for many members of parliament from Winnipeg and I want to wish all of those that were re-elected to represent Winnipeg ridings heartfelt congratulations on all of our behalf. Sadly, Madam Speaker, we lost two individuals in the last month that I want to just pay tribute to George Peterson. Along with my wife, Tracey, I was honoured to attend the celebration of life ceremony for Winnipeg Grenadier and Prisoner of War veteran, George Peterson. Really grateful for the opportunity over the years to speak with him. I want to offer, on behalf of all of Council, our deepest condolences to the Peterson family. We also lost this past month a community champion, Anne Oak. Along with her husband Scott and Darcy, the last years of her life were spent working hard on an effort to save the lives of so many others in our community. And we're so grateful for her efforts. She leaves behind a legacy of healing that will be felt for generations to come. And, again, my deepest condolences go out to Scott and Darcy and their family and friends. Madam Speaker, I just want to finish on some of our reconciliation matters. We had 39 new partners to Winnipeg's Indigenous Accord in the ceremony that we had recently in the courtyard. We've recently, with the support of Council, had the Indigenous flag raising ceremony for three new flags. And I want to thank my council colleagues and the Public Service and the community for all of their efforts to ensure that what was missing for so long is not missing outside of city hall. Tomorrow is the first ever National Day for Truth and Reconciliation. Our civic offices will be closed. Employees will be encouraged and are being encouraged to wear orange for those that are working today, as well as tomorrow for those that are working tomorrow. Flags will be at half-mast. The Winnipeg sign will be lit orange. Winnipeg Transit will be changing their digital signs to mark the day. We're encouraging all of our employees to participate in a variety of community-led educational opportunities to learn the true impact of residential schools. I would encourage all Winnipeggers to do the same as well. The Winnipeg public library has put together a comprehensive info guide with links to a variety of resources to learn about the legacy that we still are dealing with in our community of residential schools. And just final…just conclude by encouraging all Winnipeggers to think, to reflect on what they can do to contribute to our reconciliation efforts. One of the ways in which Winnipeggers can join us on our journey of reconciliation is to become a partner to Winnipeg's Indigenous Accord. Madam Speaker, and I would just encourage all those Winnipeggers that are watching these proceedings, if you're not yet a partner to the accord, to consider signing tomorrow. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

MINUTES

Councillor Lukes moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on July 22nd, 2021, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We'll now move in to delegations. We have present in the chamber with us, Will Goodon. If you could please come forward. He's the Minister of Housing and Property Management with the Manitoba Métis Federation along with Carrie Scott. Both are in support of Item 2 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 21st, 2021. And it's regarding the City of Winnipeg Rapid Housing Initiative Round 2 Federal Funding Update. Welcome to both of you.

DELEGATIONS

Will Goodon: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And thank you to Council…Councillor Mayes for the opening prayer. Very much appreciate it in the Métis tradition. That's very important that we do at almost every single meeting that we're at. And it's also, I think...I want to say, thank you to Mr. Mayor and all of Council for the opportunity to be here. We have been working with the City and your team to come up with a really...I think a good solution for Métis citizens who are experiencing homelessness. And I wanted to talk about that a little bit. But before I did, I wanted to just also say thank you to the Speaker for the acknowledgment of the homeland of Métis nation. I think today it's even more important that we recognize that considering, I'm not sure if everybody keeps up with some of the political issues that are happening across the Métis nation, but today is…it's an auspicious day. I think there's an ending, but also a new beginning. And the Métis nation, as I have always said, will endure, and that's what…and I think as the government of the Métis citizens here in Manitoba, the Manitoba Métis Federation has been doing an extremely good job. I don't want to pat myself on the back, but from where we were when I started in 1996 to where we are today, it's quite the difference. And I want to say a big shout out to my president for that. I'm here to talk today about the…our homeless initiative. We have…you know, there…this is struggle. You know, obviously, in the last couple of years with COVID, some of the press that we have received is not always positive, but behind the scenes, we were always working. We…if I can remember correctly, 25,000 or so sandwiches that went out, water, all kinds of supports for the homeless population, but at the same time, you know, when we were, sort of...how do I say it? Our office was kind of surrounded, and there was some safety issues, and we appreciate the supports from the City to help us out with that. That being said, there's many of our citizens who are experiencing these homelessness...I like the clock here. That helps me out a lot. So, we came up with this idea, and we had applied through the Federal Government through the Rapid Housing Initiative. And at that time, we didn't quite make the cut, but when we…we actually found a different building and were able to work with the City. And I want to say a special thanks to my team; Carrie Scott, in particular, but our whole housing team at the Manitoba Métis Federation who did a fantastic job putting together the proposal and working with your staff to come up with a solution. And my understanding is, there is great support around Council table, but I did want to come here today because I think it's important to have these relations continue to build up so that we can have those discussions when they need to be brought to the table. So, we're looking at a building just down the street at 670 Main. We have purchased the building and we have the costs that are projected to be necessary to make this into a...honestly, I think it will be a model for others to follow. So, I just want to talk about the concept before we go too much further into the funding side of things. So, the objective is obviously to reduce and prevent homelessness. It's guided by a housing first philosophy. It seeks to get vulnerable Métis citizens housed first and then offer support services. Sober living is not required, but there will be wraparound support services in place to address mental health and addiction issues. You may or may not know that the Manitoba Métis Federation has various services from our Justice Department to our Child and Family to our Health Department. We all work together very collaboratively, and I think this is going to be one of those projects where we're going to see several departments within the MMF come forward to assist here. So, just a couple of examples of some of the wraparound services that will be available here. Obviously, there will be intake and assessment, there will be a drop-in safe place, there will be one-on-one support, in-house programming, workshops, culturally sensitive. And you know, with that being said, I want to point to the Louis Riel Institute which is our cultural and education arm at the MMF will be able to assist us as well. Advocacy; you know, people who are living without homes have lots of needs, and that's part of what we're going to be doing. Housing support is definitely going to be part of this. Mental health, addiction supports, access to computers. We're going to have a Métis elder that's going to be in-house so that that person will be someone that the residents can lean on, can learn from and reconnect to the Métis culture. Resumé building, job readiness, there will be laundry, showers, a clothing bank, meal program, so we're looking at target groups of the following: young adults, and when we…when I mention that, we are also in the process of getting an approvals done for a transitional housing for Métis children who are aging out of care. And that will be another partnership that we'll be able to have with this…with this project. Women fleeing violence will be allotted 25% of the new units. Two-spirit LGBTQ folks. Veterans in the 2018 Winnipeg street census, 1,519 homeless Winnipeggers were counted. Of these, 66% were identified as Indigenous, 15.4% of these were identified as Métis, 234 self-identified as Métis. More than half of the homeless Indigenous peoples had spent time in Child and Family Services, and 15% of those who identified as Métis had spent time in CFS. We are going to be looking at...let's go back

to my first page here. So, we're looking at a total estimated project cost of about $3.4 million. The building was purchased at 1.4. We have engaged architects and engineers to design the interior because it's the…I think the ground floor has…and the second floor has some infrastructure in it, but a couple of the floors up above have none so that we can go in and do exactly what we want to do with these micro apartments that they will…that the people, the residents will be staying in. We're looking at about 16 to 24 units. A one-bedroom, self-contained microunits and possibly one or two two-bedroom units because there's…when there are people fleeing domestic violence, there's oftentimes children who are coming along with the family, with the victims, and we want to make sure that there's a safe place for families at that place as well. The units would be rented at current EIA rates as well as rent subsidies will be provided through the MMF, through our Housing Department for a minimum of 20 years. Some of…again, going back to some of our internal partnerships, we have our Education and Training Department, Health and Wellness, Justice Institute. We also have…and those of you who haven't been to Elsie Bear's Kitchen, the restaurant that we have in the basement, obviously, in these days with COVID, there's some restrictions, but you're going to find some of the best bannock anywhere down there. So, I would encourage you to come down and check that out. But at the same time, that will be a part of our services that we bring to this project. So, I maybe...I've got 1:08 left, so I think I did okay. I just wanted to underline the fact that this is so much needed. Oftentimes when there are programs that are aimed towards Indigenous people, the Métis nation, Métis citizens get left to the side. That happens all the time. And we even had to explain that to Prime Minister Trudeau at one point. But, you know, people are beginning to understand that Métis citizens have similar effects to First Nations and Inuit citizens in the way that they receive or don't receive. I've got 30 seconds left. So, anyways, I just wanted (inaudible) to say thank you very much for your time. Wanted to impress upon you the importance of this project. We are really, really excited about it. I think it's going to be a little bit of a landmark for us as the Métis government, and we look forward to working with you in the funding and the partnership as we move forward. Thanks. Two seconds.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Goodon. We do have questions if you would stay with us for a few minutes.

Will Goodon: No problem.

Madam Speaker: Mayor Bowman.

Mayor Bowman: Process wise, we need to ask the question, so I'm going to preamble with just thanking you and…for being here and also for your work on this project as well as everything else you're doing to help Winnipeggers, Métis weather the COVID storm. So, thank you. You are aware, and this is my question that I need to ask, that the best bannock is actually made by Hayden and Austin Bowman? But I'm looking forward to coming and trying the bannock.

Will Goodon: Sorry, can you repeat that? I missed that.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you.

Will Goodon: Absolutely.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Minister Goodon, I would be remiss if I didn't recognize you in this chamber for…if you have never been recognized in this chamber for all the work you've done to advance Métis rights. My family has their harvester cards thanks to you. And I'm a bit awestruck, actually, to be in this chamber with you today and get the opportunity to thank you for your ground-breaking Section 35 establishing rights. So, thank you very much. I'll stop that now and move on to my questions. Again, you were appointed recently to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporations new ten-member Indigenous Advisory Council.

Will Goodon: Yes.

Councillor Rollins: And as the City of Winnipeg, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, perhaps all councillors in this chamber and, certainly, Mayor Bowman and his colleagues, Big City Mayors and more, advocated for the city stream, that makes that $3 million available and prioritizes within it, Indigenous lead women's centre; Gender Diverse. And I'm very excited about the MMS Program, but I'd be remiss if I…and availability. I'd be remiss if I didn't, you know, really ask two questions: we've drawn down over 25 million as a city now, we need more. Your sobering statistics that you shared are the reason why we need more. And so, what is the context of the rest of the housing program? I believe we need a territorial approach here for the urban Indigenous community and I think this project and this city's stream is part and parcel of that and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Committee is part of that. And so, we've drawn down that money, the money was possible for city stream. Could you share with us some of the Métis nation's plans for housing and how we could collaborate more going forward?

Will Goodon: Yeah, no, that's…I really appreciate that question. And the Indigenous Advisory Committee that I'm on for CMHC is, you know, I guess I was appointed almost six months ago, but we're really just getting started on how we fit into CMHC. Anyone who's done work with them knows that it's a bureaucracy and there's red tape and it's one of things where you're driving a great, big tanker ship and it takes a long time to turn properly. I know that there is a little bit of worry amongst my colleagues on the committee what we need…what our role is, quite frankly. And we're trying to assert ourselves to push the envelope as much as possible. That being said, I also want to say thanks to the…to Mayor and Council for the work you did in pushing forward this city stream of the Rapid Housing Initiative because we…that's how we're able to do this. As we very much appreciate it. We we…as I said, we had made an application through the regular stream, and it hadn't quite made the cut. When we were given the opportunity a few months later to come here, and the excellent cooperation and partnership values that we've seen here, it's been fantastic. As you know, as far as other housing goes in Winnipeg, we're building a six-plex in St. Boniface. That's going to be done…I'm…they keep telling me it's going to be done soon. You know, contractors, right? But it'll be done, hopefully, in November. And I would extend an invitation to everyone in this room to come out and see that. It's affordable housing for families. We are also looking at other opportunities here. As I said, we're looking at the transitional housing for kids aging out of care. We're also looking at a housing...this is through an innovation program with the Federal Government. We are looking at...the best way I can describe it, I guess, is a Ronald McDonald House for Métis families. We have purchased property on Notre Dame and we're looking forward to moving on that as soon as possible as well. And you know, I just...as the Minister of Housing at the MMF, I get calls and texts, e-mails from all across Manitoba, everybody wants something in their community, so I have to try to be a little circumspect in how we arrange that. We do have a substantial amount of funding to build, but it doesn't seem to be…it's never enough as you just said. I think going back to what I want to reflect on a couple things you said is the idea of collaboration with the City. And I think that would be an excellent opportunity for us to talk if there…you know, if there's properties that could be available. If there is other funding opportunities, if there is development ideas that are being talked about, you know, in the offices here, we would definitely love to be a part of that. And I would make myself available to meet with each of you, all of you or whoever it is, you'd be the right person to talk to. I think that would be an excellent suggestion.

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

Councillor Rollins: Yeah. I absolutely will be in touch along with my colleague, Councillor Gilroy, Minister Goodon who is Chair of Housing for the City of Winnipeg and Chair of Property and Development Downtown. And I occupy the Chair of Protection. In terms of follow up, at that meeting, I can share, and I'll state it as an, 'are you aware' question. We do have substantive data, a great study led last term by Councillor Gilroy in partnership with University of Winnipeg on housing similar to the data that you shared, it doesn't change very much in terms of the pie. And you know, at that meeting, happy to share that, but are you aware we have that? And that can be the question.

Will Goodon: Yeah, no, looking forward to learning as much as possible. Like, we...I think that's...whenever we build in communities, you know, St. Eustache and Dauphin and St. Ambrose, The Pas as examples, the…when we…Portage is another really good example. When we have support from the elected officials, things happen much easier with us. Not that we're, you know, skipping stages, but the fact that we are all working and pulling together, I think that's really important, and I think that would be a wonderful idea and a wonderful thing for us to do here together at the MMF and Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein, your opportunity for questions.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And Mr. Minister, thank you very much, megwich, for your…for your presentation today and what you're doing in your community. As a son of a mother who was murdered by her spouse, domestic violence has a deep-rooted passion in my life. I note that you said 25% of the living space, let's call it, would be dedicated to victims of domestic violence. My question…which is great, thank you. My question would be, is there going to be a time limit on the length of their stay?

Will Goodon: Yeah, I do believe so. This is not going to be long-term, you know, several years for folks. It's to get people safe. I can't...off the top of my head, I'm going to take a quick peek here, but off the top of my head, I'm going to…I don't have that in front of me, but what my understanding is, is that it's getting people off the street, getting them safe, getting them help for the…any issues that they may have that put them on the street. They're…you know, we're going to make sure that there is safety involved. My understanding...and this is just in the concept stage at this moment, but we are also talking with the Infinity Women's Secretary, which is the women's representative body at the MMF. And there has been some really good discussions about a stand-alone domestic violence shelter, and that is something that we will obviously, once we get this done, and then start working on the next project, then we can have these partnerships that bring people into safety but then help them become, you know, become more involved in society and becoming...not worrying about being a victim but becoming a contributing member of society as well.

Councillor Klein: Bless you. Megwich.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you very much for your presentation this morning. Just to follow, I guess along the same vein as Councillor Klein, could you just expand a little bit on the programming that will be provided, especially with the kids that are aging out. They seem to fall between the cracks from time to time. So, I'm interested in hearing about the programming that you have available to help them transition back into society and perhaps contributing members of society as well.

Will Goodon: Exactly. So, this'll be a part of that solution. You know, one of the things my president told me is to...when I was looking at a project like this, is to make sure that we don't...we can't be everything for everybody; that we need to be able to be successful in a few areas, and those are the ones that I had talked about, the young adults. That reflects to the other project that I talked about. We do have some properties. We are looking at applying for permits from the City. And it's going to be...it's just off Henderson Highway if my understanding is correct. And so, that will be a transitional housing, and that will be up to two years from my understanding of people living in that who come out of...it's...from my understanding, if I can get the ages right, it's 18 to 24. So, these people, these young adults who are no longer under care by CFS, they will have a safe place to go. Again, all of the wraparound services, the resumes, employment and training. Our Métis Employment and Training Department at the MMF is one of the best in the country, bar none. Like, Indigenous and non-Indigenous, we are one of the best and that's one of the services that we'll be bringing. The Health Department at the MMF has recently launched a mental health strategy and mental health program, and that will definitely be a part of it as well. You know, we, one of the things that...again, going back to the idea of safety, it's just getting people off the street. Now, this one in particular at 670 Main will be having...one of the focuses is on young adults, but it is our hope that when we have these other projects out there, whether it's a new shelter for victims of domestic violence, whether it's for transitional kids aging out of care, whether it's strictly homelessness issues that are being faced, they're all going to be working together. A lot of times, governments...and you probably know this, you are a government, and you deal with governments, they're silos, and that's one of the things that we actively fight against at the MMF, is that their collaboration is extremely important, not just amongst the politicians, the elected leadership, but also amongst our staff. So, they're forced to work to get...not forced, but they…we…there is a strategy to help people work together. And I apologize, I'm going to have to get going here. I'm actually doing a presentation to some students on the Métis nation homeland and identity in about 15 minutes. So, I apologize for that, but thank you so much for your time, but I'll take a couple more questions as well.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Chambers, Councillor Allard, and Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Chambers: Yes, and thank you for that response. And you know, later on we're going to be discussing the status of our social purpose enterprise. I'm hoping that you'll be able to tap into that as well because it will be a great opportunity in terms of the City's leadership on social purpose enterprises and agencies like yours tapping into to get the training and develop the skill and confidence that individuals need to re-enter the workforce.

Will Goodon: Thank you very much. I've got my couple of staff here who are hopefully taking notes, and that we can follow up on all of these ideas.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard, followed by Councillor Chambers. Councillor Schreyer, pardon me.

Councillor Allard: Yes. Thank you very much for the presentation. Thanks for the work you do. Thanks for the site you're building in St. Boniface. It was my honour to participate in the opening there.

Will Goodon: Yeah, and you'll be invited to the ribbon cutting, too.

Councillor Allard: Excellent, thank you. I wanted to ask you an actual 'are you aware' question. There's two reports on the agenda today; one, thanks to committee members at the Planning, Property and Development Committee as well as Executive Policy Committee, we've amended our real estate planning policy framework to…for properties that are taken in tax sale for the City of Winnipeg. First, give the opportunity to organizations that are building affordable housing first for the first 90-days.

Will Goodon: Excellent.

Councillor Allard: And in St. Boniface, I'd invite you to, if this motion passes today, there are two properties in St. Boniface that I would love to see affordable housing built in on the agenda today. So, I hope that my colleagues will support and I hope that you will bid. You mentioned people want to live in the neighborhood that they're living in. The changes that we're making today will make some of those changes occur city-wide, not just in the six targeted housing areas. So, thanks.

Will Goodon: Excellent, yeah. Absolutely, we'll follow up on that. That sounds like a great opportunity.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you. Pleasure to see Mr. Goodon here. I've known Elsie Bear since I was a child. Shared meals together and in fact, I was eating her bannock when I was five years old because of, well, Selkirk. I don't want to give the…it's an opportunity to make a point, we don't live today in society…progressive society and era progress in terms of affordable housing relative to what we used to do. At the time when I was sharing meals with Elsie Bear here in Winnipeg, through primarily the Provincial Government, we were creating 10 to 20 times more affordable housing per year. Maybe 30 times on affordable housing units per year than we are today. Having said that, what we're doing today is important, but we need to remember that it's deceptive and it's not helpful not to remember these…not to know this, where we stand. Having said that, it takes more than merely affordable housing to provide…you know, to uplift our communities, and that's a fact. What I'm fascinated by today, what I'm so heartened by is using traditional methods and modern methods together because we're dealing with traditional problems we have in society and modern problems we have in society. And the myriad of services that you're combining to do this. This is fantastic. This is exactly what we need. Affordable housing onto itself isn't the solution. This is what it takes.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, your question, please.

Councillor Schreyer: Yeah, the question is, have we done this before? Where are we seeing this? How are we combining this to create this kind of ideal attempt to help people?

Will Goodon: Yeah, so my understanding, and I'm going to look up at my staff here, is that this idea originated from San Francisco.

(Unknown Speaker): Housing First.

Will Goodon: Yeah, Housing First. Yeah, so it's a housing first wraparound services. So, that's right across the country, and in fact, I'm sure the city has its own housing first programs. But we worked, and our researchers went through all kinds of ideas that are global in perspective and then pulled out these ideas and we are making it Métis specific, which is I think is always important when we're talking about our citizens, is although there are services they can get to through the different levels of government, when you're talking about Métis specific ideas, we know our people, they know us better than anybody, and that's why I think the success you see at the MMF on all levels, on all different departments and ideas is…it shines through because of the…just that simple concept of we know our people the best. So, thank you all again very much. I did take up a little more time than I thought, but it was an honour to be here, and I would love to come back at some point and come here or come and meet with any or all of you at some point in the future to talk about incredibly important housing issues that we are all facing and that we can do better at working together. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Goodon, thank you for your presentation. We wish you a good day.

Will Goodon: Thank you so much. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Moving on to our next delegation, is Ray Yuen. He is in support of Item 3 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 21st, 2021 regarding the Welcoming Winnipeg Renaming Papoose Park. Madam Clerk, do we have the delegation online?

Clerk: Yes, Ray is in the room.

Madam Speaker: Ray Yuen, welcome. We have ten minutes.

Ray Yuen: Yes, good morning.

Madam Speaker: Ten minutes on the clock for you.

Ray Yuen: Great, thank you. Good morning, Council. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak. I am a resident of Niakwa Park, and that's the neighborhood in question for Item No. 3 regarding the renaming of the area park. I understand EPC supported recommendations number 1, 3, and 4, of the administrative report, and I thank them for that consideration. I'm disappointed, however, that EPC rejected recommendation number 2, and that is that the present name of the park be removed. I think that that name, and a part of it is that the reasoning was that the park would be nameless, and that I think that that is a mistake. As EPC has established, the current name of the park is offensive and it is an insult not only to the Indigenous people of Winnipeg but an insult to all citizens of the city. Because of this affront, the name

needs to be removed as quick as possible. The process to establish a new name, it may take months or it may take longer, and every minute that this name stands, the park insults the citizenship. I walk by this park on a regular basis. I see people playing in the park, and I hear parents talking to their children. They cite the name of the park as though the word is used in every day in play conversation. And every time that happens, it's a reinforcement that this word is publicly acceptable. It's not. It's offensive. And every time the word is used, it's another affront, it's another offense. Let's take a second to imagine that the park is not named Papoose Park. Let's imagine that it's named Nazi park or the other n-word. Think about it. If it was named any of those things, would we not take every available opportunity to remove the name reference as quickly as we can? And of course, the answer is yes. It would be a severe black eye to the city, and it is. It is right now. So, why are we hesitating to remove this name? Is it because it's another affirmation of the flawed Canadian history that Indigenous people are not as important as Jewish people or as important as black people? It's an insult. It needs to go. During EPC, Councillor Gillingham moved against recommendation number 2, citing that a nameless park would set a bad precedence, and I don't see how that's bad. It's a temporary measure until a new name is established. Having a park with no name offends nobody. Having a park with an offensive name aggrieves everyone. New parks have no names until they establish a name, so what's a difference here? Simply being nameless is not a reason to not remove an offensive title. We need to act right now. We can't wait on this because every minute that name is up, it's an insult to our Indigenous people and it's an insult to all of us. So, I strongly urge the members of EPC who struck down recommendation number 2 to reconsider their positions, and I urge the remaining members of Council to right this wrong as quickly as possible. It's the right thing to do, and it's imperative that we do it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now take any questions. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Ray for being here today. And thank you. I mean, I do…I don't think anyone suggests that Papoose Park is going to be a proper name that it, you know, is not offensive at all. Again, and having a park nameless for a period of time, you're right, probably is not the end of the world, but as we go through the whole Welcoming Winnipeg process as part of our journey of reconciliation, we're going to be finding there's other things that we potentially want to rename; schools, streets, perhaps entire communities within Winnipeg. You know, talked about Wolseley or St. Vital or who knows. The question is like, when it comes to, you know, emergency services and, you know, just even ways to identify a neighbourhood, if it's completely nameless, do you not see there being potentially a challenge for, like, emergency services or even way finding? You know, if there perhaps, you know, a way, you know, that we could go and, you know, put in temporary names? You know, that are, you know, that need…that can be put in. I'm just looking for suggestions. I agree, a nameless park is not the end of the world, but in terms of, you know, precedent and that as we go through other processes going forward, there could be challenges.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Ray Yuen: Yes, councillor. I understand, but I'm sure the City has provisions on what they do in these cases. The address is 100 Comanche. It could very well be 100 Comanche until a new name is established. If the City has naming protocols that involve numbers before they actually have names, I'm sure the City will have some kind of application to use rather than just call it a nameless park. I really have no problem with whatever it's called, so long as it's not an offensive term.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. It's a new...it isn't…there's no established protocol yet, so we do need to figure this outgoing forward. Thanks, Ray.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you for the presentation. I voted with Councillor Browaty and others at EPC to rename the park. I agree, it should be renamed. I think you overlooked, though, the rationale that was provided at EPC, though, it wasn't because we think that Jewish issues are more important than other issues or anything like that that you've mentioned. The issue was safety. The issue was making sure if someone has an accident at the park, they can find a sign and indicate to 311, to 911 where the emergency is. Why is there a sign in Norfolk Park now when there hasn't been there since the '60s? There is a sign in Norfolk Park because I was contacted by staff saying we're trying to get up signs in all these parks. Do I think it's an offensive name? Yes. Do I think it would be offensive if somebody can't get emergency services because we took down a name that, hopefully, will be removed in a couple of months? Yeah, I think that would be a poor choice. So, I certainly voted to remove the name. I agree with that choice, but I do want to make sure we're aware that there is a safety issue to this, and that's why there was a vote to keep the name on a temporary basis for safety considerations. We are going to have confusion, and in fact, we had it at the last meeting. Schools are not under the jurisdiction of Welcoming Winnipeg. Street names are not under the jurisdiction of Welcoming Winnipeg. Park names are under the jurisdiction of Welcoming Winnipeg. You could have Churchill High School, Churchill Drive Park, and Churchill Drive all treated very differently. That's the period we're entering into. So, there will be mistakes made, there will be review, there will be the need to consult with the public, I think, which was not done in this, but we'll come to that later. But I just wanted you to be clear, you didn't mention the safety issues that were raised at EPC, and I'm not sure if you were unaware of those or not,

but certainly, no one thought the name was less important or other issues. The concern was, if you have a nameless park, there could be an issue with anyone having an accident at or near the park and the need to alert emergency services as quickly as possible.

Ray Yuen: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. If the accident occurred in front of my house, the 911 call would be, there is somebody hurt at X Cherokee Bay. And they would be in front of the house at X Cherokee Bay. This park has a street address and it's 100 Comanche. And emergency services I don't think would have any problem going to Comanche and finding 100 Comanche without a designated name to the park. And my point originally when I stated on other ethnic groups is that if those other offensive words were used, in your mind, would you still vote to keep the name until we could go through the process to find a new name?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Just…

Councillor Mayes: I really…I really have to respond to that. I fear we're going to start heading down a road where people say, so you're soft on Nazism, and no one is saying that here. So, let's not make that analogy about Nazism when we're talking about a park in a neighbourhood called Papoose Park. Completely different issue. We've had a tribute earlier today to a gentleman who passed away in my ward and I want to the memorialize to the Mayor who, you know, lost years of his life fighting Nazism. So, nobody's soft on Nazism here, so let's just maybe leave that aside. Leave that analogy aside and we can debate Papoose Park, which I agree, should be renamed, but I'm not going to get into a debate about, so what you're saying is, Nazism is okay. I'm not getting into that debate with you or anyone else now or ever. We're not soft of Nazism because we want to delay a park name for safety. So, I want to make that clear. I voted to change the name of the park. I agree we should change the name of the park. We'll change the name of the park. I don't know what it will be, but it will be changed for something. I think there is a safety issue here.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll move onto the next speaker. Just before we do that, Mr. Yuen, I'd like to remind you and everyone in the chamber that all remarks will come through the Chair, through myself. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you and good morning. Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Yuen. I do want to switch gears a little bit here and just talk about process. And while I am in favour of changing the name of the park, it is, for me, about the process and ensuring that there is true dialogue among all stakeholder groups ensuring that there is transparency in the process for selecting a new name. And additionally, that we're not here, you know, 50, 75 or 100 years from now debating on changing the name again. So, it is about that dialogue that exists in the capacity of consultation and ensuring that all members of our community can be part of that discussion and part of the solution in terms of looking at what a new name will be and what it does represent. So, as long as there's that dialogue, as long as there's that consultation and engagement of all the stakeholders moving towards a direction of reconciliation, that's the course that I would prefer to see take place. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Moving on, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Mr. Yuen, for coming and speaking today. This is a 'did you know' and then I'll make some…a couple of comments. I represent the ward of Waverley West. We have 20, 25 new parks in the Waverley West Ward that have no names on them. The Public Service has never come to me and said look, we need to name these parks and put an address on them for safety reasons. I do have a park that the Public Service felt motivated to dream up a name and put on without even consulting with me, and the sign they used, like most park signs, is the name of the park and another sign underneath with the address and calling 311. I think you're absolutely right in asking that the name be removed. I have specific examples that are just the address and call 311, so I don't know what the big deal is here and the whole safety aspect because like I said, I have many parks with high density population that do not have an address on, do not have a name and no one has ever come to me saying, you need to come up with a name and an address. And other examples with just the address and 311. So, I don't know what I can do before we vote on this motion, but I thoroughly think someone should come along, just remove the name, leave the address and calling 311 and be done with it. Sometimes at city hall things get churning in the bureaucratic process when the simple solution is take the screwdrivers, remove the name, you've got the address and 311, and then figure out what the next name is. So, I don't know if I can inspire Council to move to do that or we just go do it one evening. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. Through you, Madam Speaker, I just want to thank Mr. Yuen. Are you aware, you've convinced me. I'll be changing my vote today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any other speakers today? Seeing none, Mr. Yuen, thank you for your time.

Ray Yuen: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next, we have David Grant. Madam Clerk, is he with us online?

Clerk: Yes, he is.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Grant.

David Grant: Yes.

Madam Speaker: He is…

David Grant: Yes, I'm here.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. He is appearing before Council on Item 14 and 20 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 21st, 2021. Items 1, 5 and 6 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment dated September 13th, 2021. And Item 2 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated September 15th, 2021. Mr. Grant, welcome.

David Grant: Hi. So, I want to begin by thanking Council and its clerks for helping us all to speak today. They've always been so friendly. I speak via Zoom. This uses much less fossil fuel than a live appearance and does not spread germs. I want to expect my…express my respect for Your Worship and Council. A day this warm and wonderful at the end of September is a rare thing. While you toil away all day, I will be thinking of you on today's long bike ride across the south of the city. I will not be afraid of the cars on Kilkenny now that it is indeed open to traffic. Moving on; irony. The city hall…city hall hires engineers to convert an old building into a shiny new police station. I toured it before the work began. This was a huge job. The engineers went way over budget. City hall then decided to spend a lot of money on lawyers to punish those who overspent on the building. Now those lawyers are coming to Council because they are also going way overbudget. The supreme irony has brought me to speak to you today. If this hadn't struck me, I might not have bothered. Many famous fables have been built on this sort of escalation. The tar baby and the old woman who swallowed a fly come to mind. Some engineers are inclined to increase the scope of work and overspend. That pales when compared to the rules under which lawyers happily and profitably work. I sat through enough legal proceedings to know that they cannot even budget the length of the case, much less the dollars they'll spend on it. Has a team of lawyers ever worked within a budget on a big job like the rest of the world is forced to do, including you folks, every day? Under the AVL system, vehicle locating, it says that it'll be received as information. Can anyone explain how this does not just mean ignore? Keeping track of City vehicles has very high dollar implications, and a lot of money has been spent on the AVL. The AVL system has failed. Why no action by Council right now? Moving on; combined sewers also says received as information. This topic is too important to be ignored like this. We are on…aren't…we are on target to make a difference, but it will take 90 years or so. Has no one done the math? It reminded me...if reminded, I am sure no one in Winnipeg would say this is acceptable. The first engineering job I had was 50 years ago on reducing the BOD load from Winnipeg from Windsor's combined sewers. It was also the first time I was published nationally on engineering research. This is...this topic was a huge deal in the '70s. Well, here we are, nearly five decades later, and we're doing next to nothing. City hall has a lot of spending priorities, but keeping raw poop out of the rivers is clearly not one of them. The city has a good treatment system, even before it throws billions more tax dollars at it. Combined sewers routinely dump untreated sewer…sewage into the river. This should be a much higher priority for Council in my opinion. The steps which are recommended in 1972 did not cost much and could help our rivers in 2022 if we care to do so. Next one; greenhouse gases happen. Hiring a contractor to help you pretend that they do not is a waste of money, but it does signal virtue to those who do not think deeply. Composting. My parents used a composter when I was very young. I keep that tradition going. It benefits our gardens and saves the City money. It is the right thing to do. This report says that helping home composters is important, but the report then ignores them utterly. Instead, the report says that tax dollars should go to contractors who will waste fossil fuel collecting household waste and processing it at a central depot. This is a waste of time and tax dollars, but signals virtue nicely while ignoring those who do the right thing. It is really unfortunate that a compromise couldn't be used to encourage home composting. It hasn't been that many decades since the City gave out composting devices, plastic boxes to put the stuff in, and encouraged in a material way those who want to do this at home. Those who have been doing it their whole lives will keep going with or without a subsidy, but what we need is to triple the number of people who do that. And giving them a free composter seemed like a good idea many years ago, but giving a subsidy to people who hire a garbage collecting system seems like a counter…counter indicated and is not doing the right thing. Moving on; By-law 86/2021. I agree that heavy trucks on Jubilee might add to the congestion. Of course, it's a disaster right now while the sewer work goes on, but this by-law ignores the harm done to all the other narrow, old streets in the area. By-law says nothing about the parade of huge 18-wheel dump trucks going past the elementary school. It says nothing about the damage to the streets in this easily forgotten alcove. Have any of you actually used the lumpy, broken streets? Why does the by-law ignore every important aspect of traffic in this area? Residents have tried to raise these issues for many years but still

seem to be utterly ignored by city hall. So, I will leave that with you. And thank you, again, for allowing me the time. Okay. Councillor Sharma?

Madam Speaker: Yes, thank you, Mr. Grant. Any questions for our delegation? Are there any questions? Okay. Seeing none, Mr. Grant, thank you for your presentation today.

David Grant: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next is Rosa Walker, President and CEO Indigenous Leadership Development Institute, in support of Item 2 of the report of the Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development Committee dated September 14th, 2021. It's regarding Proposed Acquisition of Land located on Academy Road north of Centennial Street. Madam Clerk, the delegation's with us?

Clerk: Yes, she is.

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

Rosa Walker: Thank you very much. I'm happy to be here. Your Worship, Mayor Bowman and councillors, thank you for the opportunity to present to you today. I represent the Assiniboine Residential School Legacy Group. We are a group that formed to commemorate the legacy of the Assiniboine residential school survivors. We incorporated in 2019, and many of our members are former students of the Assiniboine residential school. We have been working as volunteers to create a monument to honour residential school survivors and secondly, to establish a place for survivors, their families, Winnipeg citizens, Manitobans, and in fact, all Canadians a place where they can gather and reflect. Our intention is to create a place of healing. We understand the transfer of land from the RCMP to the City of Winnipeg is under consideration today, and we are requesting our project be supported. We appreciate the support the City has provided us thus far and look forward to continuing working together. A couple of items to mention while you deliberate; on September 13th, former students of the Assiniboine residential school attended the site and concluded there were no remains of former students buried on the proposed land. And at the same time, they conducted a healing ceremony. Secondly, we approached Welcome Winnipeg and applied for a name change to honour one of our former residential school survivors, Theodore Fontaine, in acknowledgement for his contribution. We have not heard yet from the...from Welcome Winnipeg on the results. And I just want to take a few minutes to acknowledge the people who are part of our committee in addition to residential school survivors. We have the Canadian Centre for Child Protection. They provide us with meeting space and assisted with our reunions. City of Winnipeg, several departments, we are…received advice, and they've also assisted with our meetings. Dr. Andrew Woolford, the professor of sociology and criminology at the University of Winnipeg. We've had representation from the RCMP. They provided us with advice as well on achieving our objectives from the community. The Westworth United Church has also been a part of our committee. And an architect and former Dean of the University of Manitoba, Herbert Enns, has volunteered his time as well. So, we are a committee that is reflective not only of residential school survivors, but as the community. And so, on behalf of them as the ex-official members and ourselves as the legacy group, we would like to ask you for your consideration of this request and thank you, again, for all your support.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions for our delegation? Okay. Seeing none at this time, Ms. Walker, thank you for your presentation today.

Rosa Walker: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: We'll now move into reports. The report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 21st, 2021. We do have Motion 1 before us that corresponds with Item 10. It's an amending motion. That's Item 10. Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED SEPTEMBER 21, 2021

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 through 25.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Fourteen.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Welcoming Winnipeg, 3, 14. Okay. Councillor Lukes? Just one moment. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Councillor Nason. I was going to pull No. 4.

Madam Speaker: Four as well. Councillor Nason, you were saying?

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, Item 19 also has an amending motion.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Seventeen. Any others?

Councillor Santos: Did we get Item 19?

Madam Speaker: Item 19, yes. Councillor Gillingham?

Councillor Gillingham: Would you please just once we're done, repeat which ones have been pulled, please? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Yes, okay. I think that's it. We're going to pull Item 3, 4, 10, 14, 17, 19. Okay. And now I'll call the vote on Items 1, 2, 5 through 9, 11 through 13, 15 and 16, 18, 20 through 25. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Madam…Madam Clerk, Item 3.

Item 3 – Welcoming Winnipeg – Renaming Papoose Park

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item, and there's an amending motion with this item being circulated right now.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, how far the City of Winnipeg has come in recent years on our journey of reconciliation, that we now have a unique process that didn't exist to facilitate, in fact, encourage discussions and debates that we're having today on the floor of Council regarding place names, the absence of Indigenous acknowledgement history and in our place names and our community. And I want to thank all of the volunteer members of Welcoming Winnipeg for agreeing to, of course, provide their efforts to facilitate the guidance that's provided to members of Council. I want to thank all those that participated in the establishment of Welcoming Winnipeg and my council colleagues, of course, who have demonstrated an openness and a willingness to continue to lead on that journey of reconciliation. When we began the Welcoming Winnipeg process, as far as we knew, and still to date, as far as we know, we are the only jurisdiction or certainly the first jurisdiction in Canada to create such an initiative. So, rather than simply wait for the polarizing debates that often come with respect to monuments and place names that we're seeing elsewhere, this process is to facilitate. That doesn't mean that we're not going to have difficult and at times polarizing debates on some of these things that we're talking about an absence of Indigenous history and absence of Indigenous place names that is one of the ongoing legacies of colonization in our community. And so, I just want to…before we get into the merits of this renaming of Papoose Park, which I'll wait to hear from my council colleagues on the proposed amendment as well as just overall discussion, I just want to take a moment to recognize that the fact…the very virtue that we're having this discussion and debate is something that has been needed for a long time. Wish it would have started sooner, but I'm glad we're here today to have discussions like this. So, look forward to the discussion and the debate from my council colleagues. I want to thank the delegations who came forward to voice their thoughts. Historically, this would be…there would be just that kind of direct line to Council, which there still remains, but we've now got the additional input of the Welcoming Winnipeg community leaders. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Lukes, your opportunity to speak to the item and amending Motion 14.

Motion No. 14
Moved by Councillor Lukes,
Seconded by Councillor Gillingham,

*BE IT RESOLVED Item 3 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 21, 2021 be amended by adding the following new Recommendation 2 and renumbering the remaining recommendations accordingly**:***

"2. That until a new name is approved, the park should remain nameless and the Public Service remove reference to "papoose" in existing park signage and include signage to indicate the address of the park as an identifier for emergency services."

Councillor Lukes: Sure, thank you. Yes, I want to thank all of Council for supporting the Welcoming Winnipeg initiative for the renaming of parks and many different assets in the City of Winnipeg. I, too, think it's long overdue and is a more formal process. And I know in my ward right now we've got some exciting initiatives underway with the Southeast Collegiate, one of our stellar, stellar Indigenous high schools. So, I look forward to seeing what they bring forward on some of these nameless parks in the ward. My motion today, basically, is to have the sign removed. Just the sign removed saying the name of the park and to include the address of the park for emergency services. As I noted before, this is completely possible. It's done all over, at least in Waverley West Ward and I'm sure in other areas, yours Madam Speaker, being one ward that's probably got many parks with no names also. So, this is just…it's very simple. It's a couple of screws to remove it. And I completely agree with Mr. Yuen's statements that he had made earlier. So, that's my motion bringing forward and thanking Councillor Gillingham for seconding it.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, I'll be…I wanted to thank Councillor Lukes for this amending motion. Glad to second it. Certainly, the name, Papoose Park is an offensive name and it should be changed. I think we're all in agreement of that. My concern at EPC was that if we start un-naming City assets, you know, how many will be unnamed? And I was concerned related to the precedent. But you know, that's…this is the…the great thing about democracy is you can hear the arguments and discussions of others. The delegate today convinced me that it's more important today to remove the name and to, you know, refer to the park by the address in the interim, and we'll make sure that as per Councillor Lukes' motion, amending motion that the name is clearly articulated there. I do want to say and acknowledge Councillor Allard, I think this was the case he was trying to make back at EPC and…you know, I didn't hear it at the time, but my mind has shifted, and again, I appreciate the opportunity to hear from delegations and to hear the concerns of the community. Glad there's a process underway and I'm glad to support the amending motion today. Thank you.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of the motion that's before us today and the amending motion…the thoughtful amending motion by Councillor Lukes and supported by Councillor Gillingham. As I mentioned earlier, Madam Speaker, this is also about the process that is undertaken to come to, you know, the decision to change the name. We all recognize in this chamber that the naming of that park, whenever that occurred, was done in a period of time where things were, to some degree, less political in nature. There is an education process that has taken place and has edified those that are around this chamber, as well as those that are in our community. But that needs to continue through engagement, from consultation, through feedback, and ensuring that members of our community, members, residents in our neighborhoods, and those other stakeholders have a voice in this process so that years from now they can see through transparency how we came to a decision to rename this park. And that information will be part of the public record. So, it is, for me, about that process and allowing our residents, allowing our stakeholders to be part of that communication loop and feedback loop to ensure that we're not here 25 years, 50 years, 100 years from now, debating the same issue. We can see on the public record how we came to this point. So, again, I want to reiterate and emphasize that point, that we do need to have that consultation and level of engagement in undertaking, you know, these types of renaming or naming of new parks as we go forward. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Councillor Mayes, followed by Councillor Allard.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I'll support, as I did at EPC, the main motion. I'll support the amendment. With…we get these briefings, we get briefings from staff about, you know, emergency issues. I guess in this case we can put up the address. Bishop Grandin's name will continue to be out there for possibly months or years to come, so our policy on un-naming is going to have to be thought through as well, I suspect. Also, I have to say, there's some irony in you'll identify it by using Comanche, which as far as I know, has literally no connection whatsoever to this whole area, but that's how you'll identify it. Some might argue that's a bit offensive itself, but I guess we'll come to that debate. Excellent comments by Councillor Chambers. Councillor Gillingham, I'll support the amendment. If there's some way of doing this without having the name up there and it's still retaining safety then it wasn't the briefing I certainly got, but I'll go along with that change, that's fine. But I want to emphasize what Councillor Chambers said because I think it was very important and I think it was very good. The Niakwa Residents Association are actually an active group. They were not consulted on this. We have to do a better job of how we publicize these sorts of things. The Welcoming Winnipeg briefing note in here says, well, we followed the procedure, which is, we sent out an e-mail and we did…put it on the City's website in someplace. I think we need to do a better job in consulting, otherwise we are going to end up with polarization, otherwise we are going to end up with acrimony. Maybe we will have some level of that, but it could be a lot better if we do what Councillor Chambers is saying and trying to have some more dialogue with people. Murray Sinclair, former senator, former justice, you know, talked about reconciliation is simple; I want to be your friend and you want to be my friend. That's a laudable approach that I think we should strive for and I think what Councillor Chambers says goes partway towards that. It's saying, look,

this one's fairly easy, frankly. This is…surely, we'll have ones that are harder than this. This…we can change this name, we should change this name. It is an offensive name, but I think when people come down here from the neighborhoods, we should deal with them with respect. I know the people who came here felt a little grilled afterwards, and they talked to me. I think we need to do a little more of what Councillor Chambers is saying and try and have a little more consultation, a little more empathy for all sides here. This is an easy one to me. And some in the neighborhood might say, no, we want to keep the name. Well, I disagree with them on that. But I think we need to talk to people from the neighborhoods, from the affected communities. We also need to listen to the people on our Welcoming Winnipeg Committee how we're going to deal with un-naming of things, and leaving things unnamed is going to be an issue as Councillor Gillingham pointed out. But for today, yeah, I'm fine with the compromise or the idea that Councillor Lukes has put forward about using the address as the identifier. That may not be possible on all things. That may not be possible if we start taking street names down. Then again, Welcoming Winnipeg doesn't pertain to street names. Then again, we said at Council, Welcoming Winnipeg should weigh in on Bishop Grandin. And I will vote to change that name as well. So, we're going to make some mistakes. We're going to have some curves in the road as we go forward here. For this one, though, for today, yeah, I think we should rename. Fine with having the address up in lieu of a sign. It does appear to contradict a number of briefings I've had over the year, but that's okay, we can deal with that at some other forum. But I do think as we go forward, a little more of what Councillor Chambers is saying, a little more effort, and it might cost us a month here or there, but a little more effort to consult with people and say, this is why we're doing this. We are going to have incongruities. We are going to have schools and street names and parks all being treated differently, that's okay. At least, as the Mayor said, and I've said this on the floor. I said in my last speech on the last budget, I think the Mayor has changed some thinking around here on the issue of reconciliation. And then the challenge, how do you go about reconciliation? That's going to take probably decades and be seen by different people in different way, but at least we're having the debate and we're starting to take some measures. Is this largely symbolic? Yeah, and symbolism is important. Surely this isn't all we are going to do. If this is all we're going to do, that's pretty hollow. We do need to take some more concrete steps on reconciliation, but for today, this is what's before us, and I'll certainly support it.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you. I'll be making some comments in French.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Welcoming Winnipeg Committee for the recommendation. I would also like to thank the resident that presented for offering their suggestion on changing the name. I think that…I think that if there's something that should be done it would be to better communicate with the residents if they have a recommendation to do from the Welcoming Winnipeg Committee. I think it's very important to recognize the recommendations from the Welcoming Winnipeg Committee. Even at the process level, I think that we need to pay attention to not inform the process of Welcoming Winnipeg. I think we need to recognize their traditions and their world view. And I think that when we start to integrate the ways they do their recommendations that we have possibly began to pre-judge or influence things in a way that's not appropriate, but I think in this instance, the communication with the residents could have been done better. And I think that at the City of Winnipeg level, there is no problem with consultation, but I think that we should leave the Welcoming Winnipeg Committee their independence.

Councillor Allard: So, in French, I said…I mean, essentially, thank you to Welcoming Winnipeg for their recommendation. Thanks to the residents who came out. We had residents coming out, I mean, for information, residents who came out, saying please support the recommendation. That's what we're going with today. I knew from the beginning, I wanted to support the Welcoming Winnipeg recommendation, and I think there's work to be done in terms of communication from the City of Winnipeg in terms of the City of Winnipeg process side, but I do want us to be careful of suggesting process changes in terms of how Welcoming Winnipeg does its business. I think even process has a lens. Even process is different depending on the community that you belong to and the voices that you represent. So, I wanted to be very careful about what we tell the Welcoming Winnipeg Committee in terms of how they do their business. I've heard from the Indigenous community that I think originally there was an idea that we might have a list of names that we could pull from if one name became problematic. And hearing from members of the Indigenous community that it's not that simple, you need to take the time, you need to heal the space in order to come up with a name that's proper to Indigenous people. So, I want to be careful about starting to talk about processes. And in terms of the welcoming committee, I really do think that we need to have them be independent and we can change our processes here at city hall. That's great, but I don't think we should be…I think we should respect the welcoming committee in its recommendations. So, I plan to support this amending motion. Thank you to Councillor Gillingham. And I want to share a story that I heard from one of the elders at the renaming ceremony for Bishop Grandin. And it struck me particularly hard because the elder was talking about how when she was a little girl, she was taken from her parents at the age of six. My son is six-year-old, and to think that my son would be forcefully taken away from me, and that I wouldn't see my son again till my son was 17 years old, and my son having been told his whole life that the way of my people was wrong and dirty and that it needed to change in order for my son to be

successful in society, I can't imagine what that would do to me, but I know that it would make me…it would be devastating. It would destroy my spirit. And so, when the...I heard some of the debate about…like the delegation this morning said, if this were another name, if this was the n-word, for example, there would be no question, we would take down the name. And I think that's because there's a majority understanding that that is a bad word, but one of the other things that the elder said, that same elder that said she was taken away from her family when she was six years old, didn't see her parents until she was 17 because she ran away, she said her father was dying of a broken heart. I lost my train of thought. I hope that I get it back. The other point...you know, I wish I could make it. I'll have to get back to...I guess this is my opportunity. There's no coming back.

Madam Speaker: I can come back to you, Councillor Allard. It was the name you were talking about.

Councillor Allard: Can I come…can I come back?

Madam Speaker: I'm going to come back to you in a moment.

Councillor Allard: Okay. I can get some time back?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Allard: Okay, thanks.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And just in terms of just that personal expression of how it would feel makes you realize how important it was when we…when we ended residential schools primarily in this province with the Federal Government 40, 50 years ago. And...but the effect is so strong and echoes so strongly, we're still dealing with this to date. One thing that I find truly sad is that overtime, things get so bad, instead of reclaiming that which is one's culture, we feel obliged now to walk away from it. In the sense that…although, it's different in Manitoba, you see Papoose as a real word. And for me, it's really sad. I mean, I learned the word when I was living in Ottawa and Quebec. And so, the Algonquins there, that is their word. That is the word. As it moved over here, it's not really the word you would use in the Cree or Ojibway, Anishinaabe in Manitoba. And therefore, you know why it came here, it came here through the European culture, and in that sense, the concern is that it became pejorative. It never occurred to me when I was living in Quebec or Ottawa, among the…within the language map of the Algonquin people that it was a pejorative word. And it's a shame that it evolves into one because it shouldn't be that way. And I want to know how they feel about this in Quebec and those parts of Ontario. Do they have to walk away from this word rather than reclaim it because there is essentially nothing pejorative about this word of endearment within the language itself. And so, it's sad when this happens in our history, in our culture that we have to do this. But…so, I will support...because we're not there yet. We're not there. We have to walk away from these words at this time. And this isn't like other words that are specifically meant to be pejorative. This is evolved that way in a terribly unfortunate way depending on where you are. So, I would support the amendment. I was looking at a sub-amendment because it says, "should remain nameless", which implies that it is nameless, and it's not. So, the word 'remain', to me, should…to…maybe should be 'to be', but I think it is understood, should become and remain nameless. So, I won't bother with a sub-amendment. Although, people must understand when it says remain, it doesn't mean that it is not nameless. It should become nameless and stay that way until such time that then. I truly appreciate Councillor Mayes' remarks as he's looking at other people's speeches. I do see his concern because it is one about safety and the sheer logistics for our police and firefighters, paramedics, et cetera, which is why we need these place…these name holders and addresses. I understand in this case, we can deal with this. It does have an address. And I think this will be dealt with practically by City services for this temporary case in this one case. I am concerned that we are setting precedence because what do we do? As Councillor Mayes makes the point, what do we do about Bishop Grandin in the meantime? Things like this until we sort these things out. Having said that, in this case, I do believe it's feasible. It's temporary and we learn from this. So, we go forward from this. And I believe Councillor Mayes had made the point that we deal with the administration, and the administration learns in terms of how we'll deal with these place names as we move forward. It's truly unfortunate that a word like this becomes pejorative because it wasn't always pejorative, and I certainly didn't learn it as a pejorative term where I learned it, but this is, I guess, a lesson in terms of evolution, culture, this spirit…how we deal with this in the spirit of what's derogatory and what's not. I do look forward to the day when people…when rather than a culture walking away from their words, that they can reclaim them and are part of that process of reconciliation. Unfortunately, a moment like this proves we're not at a moment where that culture can reclaim that word, and that's sad, but we're going to do the best we can today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Allard, if you could finish your thought, and then we'll go onto Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you. So, yeah, so I'm reminded of my point. The…so, the elder, the one that I had referenced who was taken when she was at the age of six, she said it's not about how you and I see the name, it's about how members of your community feel where…when they see these pejorative words being used in places of honour, and that that is hurtful to...that was hurtful to the person the elder was talking about. So, I think we need to understand that many of us have a majority view, and that we may not understand the view of the welcoming committee and what some of these words mean to the Indigenous peoples. So, I wanted to make that point, that we may not see the word as pejorative, but to Councillor Schreyer's thoughtful comments, it would be…it would be great to live in a world where these words mean nothing anymore because we have achieved reconciliation, but we're not there yet. And for now, these words are hurtful to people. And that's the point that I wanted to make, that I was trying to remember. Thank you for the indulgence, Madam Speaker, and splitting my comments in two.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Something that Councillor Allard touched on, Madam Speaker, is what prompted me to rise today is he contemplated, you know, majority viewpoints and what the good work of the Welcoming Winnipeg Committee allows us to see. And when I think of the intersects that we represent, the Indigenous Jews like my friend and member of Parliament, Leah Gazan that just got re-elected, when I think of the intersects in my own family, the Métis, Wyandot, Jewish, Ethiopian family that I have, I think of how sophisticated, Madam Speaker, your eyes are on symbols that other folks might not see. Symbols like confederate statues still everywhere in North America. Slave auction structures still everywhere in North America. Names that we can't really understand in a neighbourhood named long before with beautiful architecture in Niakwa, but as Councillor Mayes aptly points out, Comanche, that's a Great Plains US Oklahoma, Kansas nation. Pawnee…Pawnee Bay. That's a central plains Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma nation and more. Mohawk, well, we're in Haudenosaunee territory, New York State and more. Iroquois, a great confederacy. When we represent all Indigenous people on this territory, the Dakota nations, the Métis nation, we take great pains in really ensuring that we're representing and seeing the diversity of the experience of the communities. And that's a process of learning. It's a process of learning. And it might go without saying that we're not seeking perfection here. And more than one speaker in the delegation this morning used, you know, sort of that tone, police language, but it is entirely appropriate to revisit our past decisions like naming of a park, and feel a bit uncomfortable and probe that as a city. That's the work, and working together to bring about a future where parks and public lands are fully inclusive. And we don't have that now. And…but we can work towards it. I like the amending motion that...of my colleagues, that indicates that time is of the essence by Councillor Lukes and Councillor Gillingham. And I appreciate the comments today. I do think that we have an opportunity to…with this vote, to really demonstrate work in this debate today, but also, to really focus on the policies and culture that govern our city, that have governed us and really commit to that hard work. It's hard. It's uncomfortable, but that's a good thing.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Seeing no further speakers, Councillor Lukes, do you wish to close on your amending motion? Thank you. Mr. Mayor, back to you on the main item for closing.

Mayor Bowman: I look forward to the vote. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. We'll now have the vote on amending Motion 14, moved by Councillor Lukes. All in favour? Contrary? And that's carried. Now the vote on the main item as amended. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Madam Clerk, Item 4.

Item 4 – Results of the May 27th, 2021 Advertisement of the Proposed Asphaltic Concrete Lane Pavement Local Improvement Project (City Centre Community)

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I look forward to hearing from my council colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes, I believe you stood this down.

Councillor Mayes: Very briefly; I just wanted to thank Councillor Rollins. There have been…there have been relatively few of these. I think only four of them over history in that ward. I think this is the first one with Councillor Rollins as councillor. I'm not 100% sure of that. I want to thank Tim Austin who is the tireless Assessment staffer who deals with these. We are up over 60 now city-wide. Some in City Centre, some in I think Councillor Browaty's ward and that community committee. Certainly, many in Riel. Over 50, in fact, I think in Riel or close to it. I think maybe one out…I know Councillor Gillingham has tried out there in the Assiniboia Community Committee. Some of this is just the product of where the lanes are located. We will soon be nearing the end of the long extension to this program. It has been, frankly, a great success through work by people like, well, Councillor Wyatt who was part of bringing it in, former Councillor Wyatt to

former Councillor Vandal. So just, we are nearing the end of this round of funding. I think we should keep an eye on this though for future budgets. We don't have to deal with it this year, but good work by Councillor Rollins. I know these…not everyone on the street generally loves these. There's always a petition that tends to be 60/40 or 70/30 sometimes, but these have been a great success for the City of Winnipeg. I know Councillor Allard took the lead at some point on this and has some more than my ward does, but really, it has been a way of people paying directly for infrastructure upgrades, and the lanes have been really a great success in dealing with this problem. So, just wanted to flag this because it's relatively rare. The Clerks even said, are you sure that's the one you want to flag because that's not the one in your ward, but no, I did want to flag the one in Councillor Rollins' ward, just to commend her for her putting this forward and getting this through. It's a city-wide program and it hasn't affected all parts of the city equally, but good to see one coming out of City Centre. I approve that. A great many coming out of Riel. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? I'll call the question. All in favour of Item 4? Contrary? That's carried. Madam Clerk, Item 10.

Item 10 – Subdivision and Rezoning – Land located on the North and South Side of Commercial Avenue, West of Hazelton Drive – DASZ 15/2021

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Again, I'll just await hearing from my council colleagues who pulled this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie to speak to the item and amending Motion 1.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Sharma,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 10 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 21, 2021 be amended as follows:

- *Add the following new Recommendation:*

  "13. That, in lieu of the dedication of land, the developer shall provide a cash payment in an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the appraised value of Development Application No. DASZ 15/2021, as determined by the City's Director of Planning, Property and Development."

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. The amending motion is really just an omission that didn't show up at Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee when we considered this very excellent project as we had spoken out at our community committee, Madam Speaker. And it was just missing the fact that this is a major subdivision and there was no land actually provided for park and open space. The 10% cash in lieu of land dedication needs to be a part of this particular application…subdivision. And Madam Speaker, I just...it's an opportunity...this is actually a great example. It's out near...the neighborhood's named Castlebury Meadows and near Waterford Green but on the other side of King Edward Street. You'd note that it says that it's the north…north industrial…North Inkster Industrial. But basically, along King Edward, we are seeing on the west side and towards that way, Madam Speaker, we're seeing some multi-family residential developments coming and being put in place. And so, greenfield development, Madam Speaker, can and develop those…developers are creating multi-family spaces for people living up in our area of the city. And that's basically it. So, it's just an administrative thing that was omitted.

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

Councillor Eadie: No.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor? I'll call the vote. All in favour of amending Motion 1? Contrary? That's carried. And all in favour of the main Item 10 as amended? All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Madam Clerk, Item 14.

Item 14 – Over-Expenditure Authorization for Legal Services Department 2021 Operating Budget and Contract Over-Expenditures – Winnipeg Police Service Headquarters Fraud Matter

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Out of all of the files that previous and this council have dealt with, this is a pretty important one in terms of ensuring that we are holding people accountable and protecting taxpayers' interest. In the administrative report, in the executive summary, Winnipeggers and those following these proceedings can see that the City has commenced litigation in the Court of Queens Bench involving the construction of the Winnipeg Police Service headquarters. This litigation commenced in January of 2020 against a number of parties, including Caspian, AAR and others. The City is seeking damages for allegations of fraud, conversion, fraudulent and or negligent misrepresentation, deceit, conspiracy, unjust enrichment, negligence and breach of contract with a variety of parties involved in the project. Furthermore, the administrative report sets out that the legal and forensic work completed to date has identified a serious pattern of potential misconduct consisting…consistent with the allegations that are made in the City's statement of claim. Madam Speaker, the...this matter matters to Winnipeggers that want to ensure that we are holding people account where we are alleging as a municipal government that wrongdoing has occurred. Members of Council and certainly media will recall that there was a previous audit. There was a request from Council for a public inquiry into this matter. That was...that has not been something to date that has been accepted by the Provincial Government. Had there been a public inquiry, it may have mitigated the need to pursue legal action in court. But this is…essentially, this is our last available recourse to hold folks accountable, to attempt to recoup the dollars that we are alleging in court documents that was inappropriately taken from taxpayers. And I think it's important that we see the court process through to the next level to review the documents that are…that we understand, based on the administrative report, quite voluminous. And of course, as we heard at Executive Policy Committee in an open and transparent way from our Director of Legal Services, the allegations and the strength of the case has been growing as a result of the due diligence and the review as part of the process to date. I want to thank our Legal Department. I want to thank our external lawyers who are also providing assistance. And I'll be supporting…I'll be supporting this as I did at Executive Policy Committee because I for one want to make sure we're doing everything we can to hold people accountable and to protect taxpayers' interest. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I agree with His Worship, it's unfortunate. Once again, we have to make a decision, that's unfortunate. We need to account for what happened here. In this case, we have to do so through legal proceedings. Those things are expensive. That's just the way it is in North America in our…in the culture we've built in terms of the cost of legal fees in this continent as well as, you know, many other countries. It's not like this in all countries, but let's face it, you take away your legal accountability in your society, and what do you get? Wait a generation. Wait a couple of generations. What do you get? So, this is…this is what we have to do right now, and it's truly unfortunate how expensive it is. I wince at this, I really do because it is about holding people accountable. It is about protecting the taxpayer. The reality is if we're talking about protecting the taxpayer, I've got to say something because it's the same thing. Here, we've got to pay this extra money to protect the taxpayer. There's going to cost us this. And we're talking about construction here. But I want to make the point because it's really important, if we're doing this to protect the taxpayer, we've got to talk about where the costs are. This isn't the greatest cost in terms of where the taxpayer is not given an accounting, it's systemically the problem of construction of inflation itself, not one case where we think we have…where there's a legal case here going on in terms of...it's not…we're not talking about inflation here, we're talking about cost overruns and all this in a specific case that, well, let's face it. We need to...to continue in terms of legal proceedings to find out what happened. That's the only fair way to do this for everybody. But in terms of spending the money to protect the taxpayer, to show due diligence, to show accountability, my concern is that we do this when we have a situation in which we have a legal concerns over a specific contract. Meanwhile, Madam Speaker, the reality is that we're not accounting to the taxpayer in terms of why we have construction cost inflation on a systemic level year after year, decade after decade, yay over a generation of this. And we have known…shown no account…accounting to the taxpayer. And what we're dealing with today, unfortunately, it's important what we have to do, the cost overrun for the legal fees. Has nothing…it has…it isn't…it is a fraction so small in compared to what we have potentially overpaid, the taxpayers overpaid over the years and decades for which we do not offer them an accounting. And Madam Speaker, that's wrong. That's what get is…what get is…what is getting us into trouble in terms of our annual budgeting. Madam Speaker, what am I supposed to say, that's my opinion? All right, well I've offered facts and figures. I've offered the facts and figures from the administration itself, put them together in a new way that they're not denying is true. They just don't give an explanation. And that, Madam Speaker, when it comes to accounting to the taxpayer, cannot continue. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And I want to stand and certainly get it on the record that I completely support the concept of holding people accountable for their actions both internally and externally. I think that we're in a case or a situation right now where unfortunately, we have to move ahead with spending more money. We're trapped. We have to. But as I said previously, when money was being requested, I'm concerned that we didn't approach this on contingency. We heard His Worship, Madam Speaker, say that the strength of the case, it's strong. We have a win here. We've heard from the Public Service, Madam Speaker, that we have a binder that clearly says fake invoices. We haven't seen it, but we've heard about it. So one would think, with that much material, with those words coming from our

legal representatives, that they would be happy to do it on contingency because then, there's no risk to the taxpayer, and they can make even more money. We're not out anything, we just gain. And I know we're not in a position to do that anymore, unfortunately, but I would hope that we would consider it in the future, but I have to go back to the advice that we've had from legal counsel before. I understand that there was advice that said we were certainly within our powers to change the police pension. Lost. The impact fees. Lost. Those two alone cost us millions of dollars. We have the Parker Lands case that is ongoing. It's costing us hundreds of thousands, maybe millions of dollars. If we're worried about the cost overrun and with holding people accountable, great, but shouldn't we be doing the same for Deacon? Or maybe the South Treatment Plant. What about the trees on Roblin that were cut down that we've heard the City's going to go after the people responsible? Nobody will answer the question. So these are all different items that I bring up because we're talking about one item. It's like a political agenda item in the sense that this is a talking point. We've got to use this to say it was former people that didn't hold others accountable. I want to hold people accountable. I want us to do that. I'm going to support this motion because now we're in. It's like a card game. We've already made the bets. You're being told once again, like we were with police pension and impact fees and others, that we are going to win, that we're in the right. But I would really ask my colleagues that make up the Executive Policy Committee that get to make these decisions earlier than us, that they start looking at the potential and the ability to do these...do these actions on a contingency. Get the law firms that are telling us it's a win-win situation, we can't lose, to take on the risk and not the taxpayers like we did with the police pension, like we did with the impact fees and others. So, yes, we have to support it today because the case has started. We're going to give money to Deloitte, we're going to give money to the law firm to keep going to go through millions of documents. We've been told there's a binder, so I guess we have to keep going. We haven't seen it. But I will support it, but there's a part of me that just wishes we would manage this better by looking at alternatives such as contingency.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. It is relatively rare to say here, but everyone who has spoken before me has a point and has made a good point. But they're slightly different points and I have something to add as well. The history on this goes back a long way, well past even the Council that was elected in 2010, Councillor Eadie and yourself, Madam Speaker and others. There was a vote actually before 2010 on the police headquarters. There's a long history here. One of the key votes, in fact, was July of 2011, before I was here, and that was a vote late in the day in Council in a summer meeting to increase the budget by tens of millions of dollars. Wasn't pulled from the agenda. Voice vote on that. When the matter began to increase, and increase in costs beyond that, eventually, there was an inquiry called for as well as a quantity survey. I wish to commend Dave Sawyer for tuning me up on an original vote on that, and I think Councillor Browaty and I changed our minds about a day later and thanks to Dave Sawyer on that one. But in any event, we voted the right way eventually on that, and both of those studies were done. And the quantity survey in essence said, well, the problem here isn't so much that it cost 175, the build…buildings like this cost about $175 million, the problem is, you as councillors were told originally it was going to cost 105. Council should have been given more information. So, it somewhat…there's some irony to be here ten years later and I think this briefing, though well intentioned, there should be more information provided to Council to make a more informed decision. At three different points this document says hey, and in fraud cases, if you win, you can get the other side, you can apply to have the other side pay all your legal costs and that is true. In fact, if you look up fraud cases with costs, a case I argued and won at the Manitoba Court of Appeal is the fifth reference there. So, I think I have some knowledge here. In any event, you can apply to get your costs. Nowhere does the document say the reverse, and when I was asked about this, I was told, well, that was an editorial choice. Fine, and I'm going to exercise my choice to speak about that. If we lose, the other side can apply to get their legal costs covered by the City. There are 43 different defendants when this thing started. I think we're down to 37 now. We've settled with six. We didn't pay any of their costs. They didn't pay any of our costs, six are out. Now, in fact, there are two trials going on; the Sheegl defendants and the other defendants. The Sheegl defendants were only seeking something like $700,000 plus possibly punitive damages, so most of what we hope to recover is over in that other group, the…with Caspian and others, literally dozens of others. So, there is a risk here, we should be apprised of that. The risk is, well, if proceed and don't succeed, we'll be paying legal fees for the other side. That should have been disclosed in this document. Also, there is, as Councillor Klein indicates, quite a rosy picture painted of our prospects. The Mayor didn't say we're going to win. I don't think that's fair to attribute that to the Mayor. On the other hand, what I said at EPC, is look in the decision I found another quote, saying, of course, the defendants will all vigorously defend against these allegations. And they will. And they are. So, there is not a slam dunk here guarantee. Do we have a chance at victory? Certainly. We had it in other litigations. Some we win, some we lose, but I think that should have been made clearer. Perhaps, most importantly, look near the end of the document. This amount of money is not to get us through trial. This amount of money is to get us through what's called the discovery phase. There are literally tens of thousands of documents is my understanding here. So, this is going to be a long, complicated process, many lawyers making money because there are tons of lawyers involved with the different defendants. So, this would get us not to the finish line but to the next phase, which is the end of discoveries. I will vote for this today. I do think we should be aware of what the risks are. That's what Council wasn't told in 2011, now we should be clear on what the risks are. I reserve the right to say, perhaps if I'm here in a few years, you know what, we got through discoveries, we didn't discover what we wanted to, we're not going to win this at trial, let's go, let's settle. Our legal counsel

is saying, well, if you cave in now, we're going to be paying a bunch of people for their cost to date. That is true. It's also true there's an axiom in business. I owned my own business, the axiom was, your first loss is your best loss. Well, we're at beyond that now, we're underway and we've spent seven figures already, so it does make sense to keep playing this out through the next phase I think. But at some point, we're going to have to sit down with our Council and say, did you discover? What did you discover? Because the prospects of paying millions more for two separate…and it's two, right? On that we didn't win, there are two different groups of defendants, two eight-week trials, that could be millions more. So, there's a tension here and Councillor Schreyer got this right, I think, which is, we should try to hold people accountable. We should. I understand that that's part of the story. We should also, though, be responsible to the taxpayers. And if you're suing someone who is worth nil for $10 million, I don't know that it's responsible to spend $1 million in legal fees to get judgment against somebody who's already bankrupt. Maybe we'll win against this bizarre company that's named in here that has no assets, no employees, never did any work, maybe we'll win against them and we'll recover nothing I would suspect or maybe we'll recover millions of dollars, I don't know. That should be made clearer, though, some of the defendants may not have any resources. We don't know. So, a more...a broader picture I think should have been painted here of what the risks of proceeding are. Someone said, well, why are you asking questions? I'm asking questions because they didn't ask questions in 2011, and I think it's responsible to ask questions and say, what are the risks of proceeding and what's the downside of not proceeding? Doug Brown, good lawyer, good lawyer, said, well, partly you've got to proceed just to protect the City's interests and to send a message; you don't mess with us, you can't defraud us and then walk away. And none of that…none of that's been proven that there's any fraud here. That is an allegation. I get that from Mr. Brown, but also, I think we should be given a clearer picture of, well, you might win and it might be empiric victory because you've got judgment for $20 million against people who aren't worth 20 cents. I think we need…we need a better briefing on that. So, it's been a mess. It's been…it's been very costly to the taxpayer. This will also cost to pursue it. I think we should be clearer, though, on at some point we may determine that it isn't worth proceeding against 24 of the remaining 37 defendants, something like that. As a lawyer myself, I understand. I'm not trying to second guess our legal counsel, but I'm saying, look, we need to be clearer with the members of Council and the public that this isn't a victory tour we're embarking on here, this is going to take years. It's going to be two trials, quite possibly. It's going to cost millions and millions more in legal fees. Does this mean I'm soft on corruption or soft on what happened at the police headquarters? No, it means I'm going to vote for it, but we have to be more open. We have to say look, there are some risks here, and there's also the chance of us winning and recovering nothing. We haven't knocked it out of the park in legal matters of late, that is a fair comment by Councillor Klein. Other projects have also run over budget, and we haven't initiated litigation, also a fair comment by Councillor Klein. The South End Sewage Plant comes immediately to mind. We'll talk about that later today. But it is…I understand…I understand the Mayor's point as well to end with that, which is look, we've got to defend the City's reputation here. We've got to take some action. This looks egregious. There's clearly some wrongdoing in the City's view. Okay, well then let's pursue that, but let's at least be open, which I think has been a failure in the past. Let's be open about…

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

Councillor Mayes: Let's be open. I'm not trying to pull the punches. I'm not…I wasn't here in July of 2011, of course, and I'm not casting judgment on those who were. They got a briefing from the staff. We've revisited some of this many times. But I'm pleased to have voted with Browaty and others back in the day for where the inquiry that took place. This is going to play out for a while longer, but I do think we need to be clearer that there is risk involved in this. This is not going to get us to the finish line. This is going to get us through discoveries, then somebody around this table is going to be sitting here in a few years faced with a prospect of spending millions more. Well, I'd want to be pretty sure there's a good chance of recovery if we're going to keep spending millions and millions of dollars on lawyers. So, I will be supporting what was…what was supported at EPC, but I do think we need to be much clearer with the public about the risks and the possible upside. And I do…I do want to thank Mr. Brown and Mike Jack, actually, who pretty…pretty open in talking with me and talking about the reputational risk of not proceeding. Hard to put a dollar figure on that, that's fair. So, I do think we need to proceed, but we also need to be what the Mayor ran on in '14: more open and transparent. I think we need to be more open and transparent about the risks and the potential rewards.

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

Councillor Nason: Yeah, thank you for that close by Councillor Mayes. Mayor Bowman ran on a lot of things in 2014, some that never did get realized. My analogy will be about fishing, and it's from a perspective of you've got a really expensive bait, and you cast out, and it gets snagged as you're fishing. And you've got to figure out, you know, am I going to…what am I going to do here? I really like this bait that I've used. Am I going to continue to try to get it out or am I going to cut my line so I can continue fishing? Well, I look at this legal quagmire, this fishing expedition, with a whole bunch of unnamed individuals as nothing more than that. You know, we're going down a rabbit hole with no clear positive outcome. I think a lot of our energy should be focused on, you know, stronger policy. We've had issues since the police headquarters, I believe, you know? Timing…my timing and memories might be off, but the water plant. We had tens of millions of dollars of potential legal recuperation that we could have got from that, that someone in our Legal Department failed to file

paperwork in time. Yet we continued to use that same contractor as I understand. We haven't excluded that contractor that cost taxpayers lots and lots of money. So, you know, from a perspective of possible positive outcomes from this, might we get a judgment? You know, impact fees, you know, some on Council declare that as a win. We were affirmed that we can have impact fees, but yet, the monies that we collected, we're paying back. So, did we win? I'm…you know, legal…legal language and reports, you know, there was…I remember a report that was a 100-page report, but it was like one paragraph at the end that basically found the persons that were being accused of something innocent of that. So, we can put all the legal mumbo jumbo, spend all kinds of millions of dollars or we around this chamber, some in this chamber that may have been, you know, behind closed doors, behind the curtains in the conversations about the police headquarters, we can work together and get stronger policy so that we don't have Deacon Road, so that we don't have police pension, so that we don't have all of these other legal issues that we waste so much time and money on that we can focus on doing the best that we can. I think of the money that we're spending on this legal adventure, of what we could be spending that we're not going to be spending on our parks starting in 2024. Right? Where can we go from here? I won't be supporting this today. I…I'm…I think there's other things that we can spend taxpayer dollars on that might have better outcomes. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Last week, I had a conversation with a gentleman I've known for year. His name is Ian. And he said, I'm Ian, and I'm the average Winnipegger, is what he told me. And he raised with me, I didn't raise it, he raised this file with me. And he said, you know, it's been alleged that taxpayers were taken advantage of in Winnipeg. He said, Scott, I'm the average Winnipegger. You need as Council to fight on my behalf. He said, in fact…he said, I kid you not, we'll start a GoFundMe page if you won't do this, which as Chair of Finance, I almost took him up on on the spot. But the point of the matter that he made and went on to make is that, you know, if there's something alleged there, please…he said to me, please, on my behalf, on our behalf as Winnipeggers, do your job for the people of Winnipeg and continue to pursue this because from all that he has seen and observed, he believes that the City has a case. And so, I'm…his words are kind of ringing in my ear today because we are elected by the people for the people, and so I really appreciate the comments that my learned colleagues have made, those that have a law background or business background did…do identify, yes, there's risk involved. Yes, there's not certainty involved in pursuing legal matters. We know that. But I really think that today is about making a decision on behalf of the people of Winnipeg. And if it's alleged that something was taken from them, then I think it's incumbent upon us who have been elected to pursue to…with the aim to get back for them that which is alleged to have been taken from them. So, I'll be supporting this request today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Just looking at my list, it's Councillor Chambers then Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank, actually, Councillor Mayes for his comments in defining what this is and what this isn't. The request for additional dollars from our Legal Department is for discovery, and for our Legal Division to determine how they're going to proceed in going forward in these allegations. I, too, am focused on accountability for the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg, but I also want to put the challenge out there if we are moving forward with this, that at the end of this, it informs us as Council to improve the processes that are in place in developments going forward that involve the public dollars so that we can't go down this rabbit hole once again. So that our processes are tight because I think that accountability starts with us here at city hall. And ensuring that, you know, we are doing our due diligence and ensuring that as we sign contracts with third parties that are out there doing work on behalf of the taxpayers of Winnipeg, that you know the processes are in place, they're tight, and that they're transparent so that we can go back and ensure that it's met to the letter of the law of that contract. So, again, if we are pursuing this avenue, that it does, at the end of the day, inform us to improve our policies and ensure that we will never go down this rabbit hole again. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: We are the second largest city in Winnipeg, and I do expect that we are going to have legal disagreements from time to time over our policies and procedures that we regularly put through Council. I also understand that when we are doing major contracts and…with doing major construction projects, we are going to have disagreements with many different groups that we work with, and those will have to go through the legal process. What isn't…what isn't normal and isn't a matter of our day-to-day activities is that a member of our administration are a public official...elected public official be questioned in regards of mismanagement of City funds. And I think that that is something that we should all take seriously. This is very different than the normal cast of the normal legal agreements and procedures that we do here at the City of Winnipeg. And this is our only recourse, we heard that at EPC through our public administration. This is the only recourse. We wanted the Provincial Government to act and do a proper inquiry. That didn't happen. We were hoping that through the RCMP there would be a willingness for legal matters to proceed. That didn't happen. This is the only recourse we have as a city to ensure to our public that we are going to take matters seriously when it comes to elected

officials or our members of the Public Service, that their job, role and responsibility here is to act appropriately when it comes to public funds. And I think I take that very seriously, and I think we should be pursuing this, and we should make sure that we have the legal means to pursue this until our legal team deems necessary to not proceed. And I feel strongly about this. I think that every single member of our citizen body here in Winnipeg should have faith in their elected officials and faith in their administration. And if we don't pursue this, I think that we are...we are also tainting our reputations as well as the reputations of our public officials that do really great work every single day to make sure that we're acting in the fairness and a responsible manner in terms of public funds. So, that's what I have to say, Madam Speaker. And I encourage all my councillor colleagues to support this.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm supporting this report, request for over-expenditure, Madam Speaker. I wasn't really going to speak to it, but, you know, having lived through this my first term, Madam Speaker, as you did, I just want to remind people that when this thing started to go sideways all those years ago, there was a number of interesting things at play. I don't want to get into any real specific details, but ultimately, Madam Speaker, the Charter provides the Auditor to the ability to have the powers under an inquiry which is what people were calling the Province to do, Madam Speaker, in regards to this police station headquarters, major construction project. Yeah, every contractual agreement that the City has with the builder, the businesses that will be undertaking the work on these major projects, Madam Speaker, because we don't have...it's the private sector, Madam Speaker, of course, that does all major construction. The City doesn't have the staffing and workers to be able to do the work ourselves to make sure that it's all done properly because that's another issue. We spent all that money, and there's issues of things not even being done properly in that building. So...and, you know, the original idea came from former CAO just before we...about a year before we were elected, Madam Speaker, so it does go back before everybody except for I think one councillor on Council right now…a member of Council. But in the Charter, the Auditor, and I called on the Auditor to exercise the power under our City of Winnipeg Charter which is provincial legislation, and you know, despite what's in a contract, when things are going sideways if, you know, under a contract it says, well, we can look at your records anytime. Well, like, whatever. I mean, ultimately, you know, we heard issues about...I'm not saying anybody's guilty of anything, but we heard issues about the Steering Committee related to this major project. So, the only reason I could figure that the Auditor wouldn't exercise the power because you know, they keep coming back to me and saying, oh no, we don't…we don't have that power. Yeah, we do. We do. And actually, our new Auditor exercised it in a miniscule way a couple of years ago because we had that power under the inquiry. I'm not saying he put on a public inquiry, it's the powers to grab records, which is what the Province ordered the RCMP to do in the end. So, the only reason I could figure that EPC and the Auditor wouldn't go for it was going to be the cost, Madam Speaker, in going and obtaining out of all their offices, all the records pertaining. And I'm sure, over time, records did disappear. I don't know. I don't know, but I heard about the project over by the airport related to the same business. So, now, what we're voting on people here is we're having to spend the money. We should have just moved forward in the first place because we would have had the records early enough if you just would have followed it. So, like, I just…you know, so sometimes, we get advice from Legal. Legal said, oh no, we can't do that. Oh, no. Yeah, we could. And it has been done and it could have been done then. So, we called on the Province to do the work, and they would spend the money because really, how much money did it cost the RCMP to actually go through all those records, which we now have to go through ourselves now in order to go into a case? They were looking for criminal offenses. We're looking to get our money back for our taxpayers who got ripped off. So, Madam Speaker, you know, it's either spend the money now…then or spend the money now. I still say it would have been better off doing it back then. we probably would have had better records and they all would have had to be looked over, those records, and so on. Yeah, and there would have been a cost to look into it, absolutely, but ultimately, now we're doing it. And I just want to finish by, whether you hire a lawyer outside or you use your Legal Department inside, I'm not a lawyer, but what I do know is, lawyers are only giving you opinions. It is actually the judge and the court who will tell you, tell us; guilty, not guilty, fraudulent, not fraudulent. That's where the judgment comes in. So, yes, there's always a risk with any legal opinion, any of it, Madam Speaker, any of it. Now, it looks like, and I've heard in the news, there's some interesting evidentiary things available that when we do go in court to submit our perspective to a judge, it'll be there. But I just wanted to remind people, and I...you know what? The last thing I want to conclude on; they talk about changing policy and not spending money, Madam Speaker. If you look at, I believe, it's report number 24, we all voted in favour of. It's the last implementation of audit recommendations related to the police headquarters. It's the final report. That report over the years...and Councillor Orlikow, when our new mayor came on, was the one who was sort of making sure that all of those audit recommendations were followed through and completed. And so, finally, they are. That is where...and those audit recommendations were the ones that were put in place. They've all been put in place now, that would supposedly protect the City from potential corruption and various fraudulent activities or whatever you want to call it, Madam Speaker. Supposedly after implementing those, that's going to protect us. So, this talk about changing things, they've been changed. We've paid lots of money for those auditors, Madam Speaker, as you may recall as well, and even on the firehall thing, too. So, anyway, I'd urge you all to vote for this. I mean, everything's a risk. It's only an opinion until the judge tells you what it really is.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate Councillor Mayes clarifying. I certainly haven't said we have or we guarantee a win. It's unfortunate one of our council colleagues has inferred that on public record, hopefully we'll clarify in due course. What we have is a Public Service administrative report that, if folks take the time to read, will see make significant and pretty serious allegations. Let's also be very clear. This is one of the biggest scandals to ever rock Winnipeg's City Council in history of our city. There have been others over the years, but this one is a doozy. And this one, to Councillor Gillingham's point, is one that our electric…the residents that we serve, the taxpayers who foot the bill think very strongly of the need to hold people accountable. Now, the Public Service's report talks about the…the City has faced significant opposition to advancing the court matters. I will add that, in those cases, numerous attempts have been initiated in respect to this court matter to have the matter stopped. The City has won repeatedly over and over and over again with respect to this matter. What we're being asked to do today is to provide the dollars necessary to see this current discovery, this current due diligence phase completed. To hear a member of Council say that they're not going to support it, to me, says we don't…we've heard enough, we don't want to learn anymore. We don't want some of these matters in a public courtroom. I think that is irresponsible at this stage. There will obviously be attempts going forward or decisions to be made going forward based on all of the available information, much of which is coming out through this court process. Thanks to the resolve of this council, we are learning more. Now, in terms of the references to our policies and procedures, fortunately, when I was elected, we inherited some audits that did provide some guidance. And as been rightfully noted, the audit recommendations have been implemented. And I think that's incredibly important for the checks and balances that we need to have within the City of Winnipeg, but let's also be very clear, we are talking about, in this case, allegations where third parties, despite policies and processes and procedures, are alleged to have committed a fraud, a fraud. And so, let's keep that in mind and let's not try to daze and confuse what the issue is here. If you don't want to learn more…you don't want to hold people accountable, fair enough. People will make up their own minds around the floor of Council on this one. But to suggest that there's nothing...there's no benefit to seeing through at this stage, I think is…I don't obviously agree with that. There are named parties in this legal action. The policies and procedures have been implemented. I heard reference to contingency. Contingency funds, for those…I know there's a few lawyers around the chamber, and I know there are members of Council who have purportedly had lots of dealings with lawyers over the years. A contingency on something like this would be highly unusual. I will add, my exposure to contingencies, not directly, are typical with personal injury lawsuits, not lawsuits involving tens of millions of dollars. I'd love to hear a law firm, a credible law firm that would be willing to take something like this on contingency, and then I'd love to know what cut they would take if they were successful. I don't think that would likely be in the best interests of taxpayers. We have a Legal Department that has retained legal counsel that has demonstrated in this matter that they're up to the job and that they're doing their best after win after win after win. Procedural, and that's the ability and that's the right of parties in a legal action, they have the ability to throw procedural…what I would call procedural road blocks or attempts to have the matter thrown out, they've lost those matters. And so, I think it's incumbent upon us to see the matter through at this stage. I think, you know, when we look at the Public Service's report, the initial forensic review raised concerns with invoicing and claims related to the project that totalled over $20 million. This is not an insignificant matter. And when we are learning more as a direct result of the investments that we've made, the matters that are now before the court, it is, as far as I'm concerned, this one is something that is deserving of members of Council to have the backs of taxpayers, to have the backs of the people that we serve. To Councillor Gillingham's point, our Finance Chair, we have to remember who we owe the duty to. I owe the duty and members of Council owe a duty to taxpayers, and for that, I'm urging members of Council to vote in favour of this. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on this Item 14. All in favour? There's a call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillor Nason

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

Madam Speaker: Item 14 carries. Seeing the hour, we'll now recess and reconvene at...what is the will of Council? Okay. We're going to do 1:15. I think 1:00 is a little short. Okay. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
September 29, 2021, at 1:25 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of September 29th, 2021. We are on the Executive Policy Committee dated September 21st, 2021. Item 17 – Formal Recognition - National Day for Truth and Reconciliation. Mayor Bowman to introduce the item.

Item 17 – Formal Recognition – National Day for Truth and Reconciliation

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Winnipeg is home to the largest population of Indigenous peoples in Canada. It is a source of strength, resilience and pride. We also are a community that continues to deal with the legacy, both in the past and present of colonization and, of course, residential schools, Madam Speaker. And so, I want to thank the Federal Government for marking the first ever National Day for Truth and Reconciliation. I want to thank all of those third-parties in the community who have been at the grassroots level, in the corporate boardrooms, colleges, universities and schools and every place in between that are marking the day tomorrow and are taking tangible steps on our journey of reconciliation. The City of Winnipeg tomorrow, we will be closing our offices. The Winnipeg sign will be lit orange. Flags throughout City buildings will be…will be at half mast tomorrow. There is…we are encouraging our staff to wear orange tomorrow for those that are working and for those that are not working tomorrow to wear it today. Members of Council, I want to thank for marking the day by wearing the ribbons, Madam Speaker. I know our Clerks are as well today. There is educational materials that are being made available through the National Center for Truth and Reconciliation as well as through our Winnipeg public libraries. And they've put together an info guide. And so, there is a lot of recognition going on to mark the day. This report is just ensuring that those that are going to be working tomorrow that will require some overtime are being treated in an equitable way with other bargaining units. And so, obviously, I'll be supporting that. And I hope tomorrow will be a day of reflection. I'll be taking time with my kids and my wife Tracey to just reflect on what we can learn. We will be visiting a few sites as a family and just reflecting on what we can do as individuals on this…on this…on the important work of reconciliation. And I know members of Council share that support and I want to thank them for all of the work that we are doing as Council. I am really proud of that work. I know there is a motion which I won't get into in any detail right now that our Deputy Mayor is introducing. I want to thank him for that. I know we will have some more dialogue on that topic in due course. Thanks.

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

Councillor Mayes: Very briefly, I hadn't intended to speak to this, but at lunch hour I walked over to Sport for Life Centre (inaudible) Browaty's hangout at the coffee place. Always cheers me up to go see the Sport for Life Centre. You go by the bus mall, though, the Pacific Street bus mall, there's a fellow outside wearing an orange shirt. I said, are you a Transit driver? He said, yeah, and I said, good, you know, you've got the orange shirt. I said, yeah, it's the least we can do. Proud to wear. Feels good. So, I just wanted to…I have been critical of Mr. Ewankiw and Transit on a number of occasions on this floor and I think I should give credit where credit's due that Transit has, obviously, given approval to go with the orange shirts. I know ATU wanted that. So, to the driver who I talked to, to Mr. Ewankiw who is the head of Transit, it is good we are taking some measures here. And as the Mayor says, tomorrow as well, we will be encouraging those employees who are working to be wearing orange as well, which I think is the progressive things to do. So, it was a little moment, but I think a little microcosm of what…what we've been trying to do here. So, pleased to support the motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And Deputy Speaker. Yeah, I rise in support of this motion as well. It is interesting in the sense that I just posted this morning on my social media with respect to, you know, acknowledging and recognizing what tomorrow means for Canadians and for our Indigenous population. And was asked, you know, if I feel it necessary to, you know, add the costs for our unionized employees here at the City of Winnipeg. And my response to that individual was, yes, I feel it is justified much like in United States when Martin Luther King Day was recognized across the US in recognition of the struggles of the black community in the United States throughout its history and the recognition of what needs to happen in terms of inclusion going forward. So, that is my lived experience in the sense of I, you know, being a person of colour and recognizing that the Indigenous community here have struggled in the past and how we can make our city, province and country more inclusive and recognize, you know, the 215 which is now up to 5,280 if not more children whose lives were taken from their parents and buried in cemeteries, unmarked cemeteries across this nation. So, yes, we do need to acknowledge and recognize the harms of the past and have a commitment towards moving forward in a meaningful way. And if the least we can do is wear an orange t-shirt or an orange ribbon, I am certain that many more of us will do much…what it takes to move our city, province and country forward in the spirit of reconciliation. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor, back to you for close. I'll call the question on Item 17, then. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Madam Clerk, Item 19.

Item 19 – Vaccine Requirement for Council and Political Staff

Madam Speaker: Okay, Item 19. Mr. Mayor to introduce the item and then we do have two amending motions following.

Mayor Bowman: Sure, thanks, Madam Speaker. I have supported this at Executive Policy Committee, will be supporting it as well. I understand there's two motions. The first motion that was raised today by Councillor Nason and Klein, if it is still on the table, I'm not planning to support. The recommendation 1 that we voted on talks about all elected officials including myself. And so, my understanding is it does apply to all members of Council, but Councillor Rollins and I have seconded her motion, just making sure that that language is clear in some of the other recommendations; recommendations 2 and 3, that it does apply to all members of Council. I am double vaccinated. I've already indicated to my staff the expectation that they will comply with this direction regardless of the outcome of this vote today. But I will be supporting it. And I want to do what we can to ensure that we are leading by example, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Amending Motion 2; moved by Councillor Nason and seconded by Councillor Klein. Councillor Nason, your opportunity to speak to the main item and your amending motion.

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

WHEREAS Item 19 of the September 21, 2022 report of the Executive Policy Committee proposes to enact a vaccine requirement for City Councillors and political staff to City Councillors;

AND WHEREAS the recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee does not include the Mayor or Mayor's Office staff;

AND WHEREAS any such requirement should include all Members of Council and their political staff, not just City Councillors.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 19 of the September 21, 2022 report of the Executive Policy Committee be referred to the Governance Committee of Council for further review and discussion, to ensure all Members of Council and political staff are included in the vaccine requirement.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The challenge is not so much the motion, but the matter in which it was brought forward. It was brought forward without any dialogue with Council. It was a walk on motion at EPC. Wasn't on the agenda, as I understand. It wasn't an opportunity for public input on it. So, having it go to Governance because it affects all of Council. The language of the original motion does not stipulate the Mayor and the Mayor's staff like city councillors. So, yes, you had to quickly come up with an amending motion to clarify the language. But again, it is a matter of opportunity for this to be as part of Governance which I believe is where it should be going because it affects governance of this Council. As elected representatives, Governance should have an opportunity to review it and see if there's adjustments made, not just by EPC. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Amending Motion 13; moved by Councillor Rollins and seconded by the Mayor. Councillor Rollins, your opportunity to speak.

Motion No. 13
Moved by Councillor Rollins,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Bowman,

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 19 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 21, 2021 be amended as follows:

- *In Recommendation 2 delete "City Councillors" and replace with "all members of Council"*
- *In Recommendation 3, delete "City Councillor" and replace with "member of Council"*

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, proud to say I'm double vaccinated. And all of my staff are double vaccinated. And important to say that because as a councillor, your staff work for you, the councillor of Fort Rouge-

East Fort Garry or councillor of Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood. They report to me, me alone. As does the Mayor's Office staff report to him as elected officials. And this amendment does, and I want to thank my colleagues for pointing out that there was a plain language problem here. We are elected officials. We are members of Council and as members of Council, that absolutely includes the Mayor and the Mayor's Office. And so, important to learn from each other. That is what we do sometimes in here. We do friendly amendments. And I do see in part this amendment, Madam Speaker, is friendly in so far as it clarifies some language so that we didn't exclude. Make unclear, sorry, that was my mic…make unclear that the intent wasn't to include the Mayor's Office because surely it was. He is an elected official. He's a member of Council, but time is of the essence. That is also the point of this motion. Time is of the essence to consider specifically that the leadership involved in demonstrating that despite the fact that we have a separate Public Service, that we are indeed in step with the Public Service when it comes to vaccination mandates. And that we aren't going to do anything that our departments, in fact, our first responders have to do. So, I think this is an important motion to…and I will be calling for a recorded vote, to not only recognize great work of the vaccination team in Manitoba like Joss Reimer, in particular, I want to point out, who have really worked overtime for years and years to really make sure that this province, this city is as healthy as possible. And so, supporting the small amendment really deleting the word 'city councillors' and replacing it with 'member of Council'. And I hope everyone supports this motion today. In terms of the timeline and the concerns about no public input, I do believe science has spoken in this regard and that other corporations and other boards all across this country and in particular in this city are doing exactly this with actually very similar timing. And in terms of the dialogue with Council, at the end of the day, like I said, it is my thoughts that as councillor offices we are the ultimate boss in that office. And we do from time to time talk about matters of governance, but we can sign onto this today because ultimately, we are the leaders in that office with our staff and collectively while there is lots of room for discussion, as a matter of fact, I think that there's other policy work to do with respect to public health. Councillor Chambers and I have another notice of motion on public health work. It is important to discuss and my door is open.

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

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. With many Manitobans receiving, you know, the two doses of the COVID-19, SARS CoV-2 vaccines, decline in a number of hospitalizations and fewer deaths, life is trying to feel a bit normal than it has been in a while. However, acknowledging a potential fourth wave upon us, the unknown is a very scary thought. The narrative surrounding my vaccine status has been a very difficult conversation within my home, between family and friends and now today. It is going to be a difficult conversation with my council colleagues with this motion before us. Recognizing the social isolation during this pandemic has created such a negative impact on society that the divisiveness on social media is very disappointing to see. However, I remain positive since the removal of the Acting Deputy Mayor appointment, I have been overwhelmed with messages of support from residents', community leaders and mostly from front-line workers. I want to thank each of you for your willingness to be open and honest with me by telling me your personal stories of how the pandemic has affected your daily lives. I have learned that by asking others to respond to the questions relating to their vaccine status, we are then ultimately asking them to disclose personal health information. As its name makes abundantly clear, it is personal, meaning that it does not need to be disclosed to others. The decision not to disclose personal health information, however, leads to a host of inaccurate assumptions about one's health, health status and personal values. Each of these assumptions are leading to harmful consequences and discussions within our communities. Privacy is a human value that many may want to maintain. Learning a person is not inoculated seems to influence the idea that the person is unconcerned about others health or that the person is ideologically opposed to vaccines. However, it may be the case that an unvaccinated person has a medical condition preventing vaccination. Alternatively, perhaps this person identifies as part of a community that previously experienced abuse at the hands of the health care and government systems and is hesitant about the vaccine or has experienced unjust discrimination or medical harm, a stigma which continues to be overlooked during this pandemic. In short, the justification to disclose or not disclose information about one's vaccine status and to receive or not receive a vaccine is deeply personal. I want to make it abundantly clear, I am not anti-vax. I absolutely support citizens who have chosen to vaccinated themselves, and I also understand those who are not fully vaccinated. I believe both parties are doing everything possible to mitigate and adhere to the public health measures that help reduce the spread of this terrible virus. I absolutely love my job and I love representing my community. I truly enjoy working with council members on many different issues, but today with this motion, you have opened up a part of me where I need to tell my truth because I know at the end of the day, no one can take that away from me. As someone who has experienced and survived many different types of trauma growing up from sexual abuse at a very young age to mental and physical abuse and almost recently, a medical trauma where I suffered an anaphylactic seizure, it is a constant struggle to continue to move forward from these traumatic experiences and I am always working to heal myself. I want to give you a different perspective of how I became sovereign over my body. Body sovereignty is a permission to choose, to protect, to feel, to experience, to play, to refuse to take up space, to be different, to be the same, to make noise, and to perform for no one. Body sovereignty is the liberty…is the…sorry, body sovereignty and liberty is the clear inhabitant of your choices and it is the protection and respect of the boundaries of your body. I have always supported the emergence of a world where we have sovereignty over our body and live in a country where we have the freedom and liberty to choose what we put inside our body. This is why I will always respect the autonomy and sovereignty of your individual body and choices. So, today it is very difficult for me personally to coerce anyone to take

the vaccine. I want to make it abundantly clear again, I support citizens who choose to vaccinate and I also understand those who are not. I believe most Canadians are pro-science and, yes, we are pro-vaccine. It is these mandates that do not sit well with us and it shouldn't sit well with any Canadian. I understand this may not be a reality under our province's state of emergency, and at the very least we need to be asking difficult questions. Are we prepared to layoff or reallocate public servants, paramedics, fire fighters, bus drivers, police officers because they are not vaccinated? How do we break down the systematic barriers for the underrepresented population so that they can continue to access public facilities or City services? How do we accommodate citizens who are fully vaccinated but don't have the QR codes? How do we accommodate our employees or citizens who are not yet fully vaccinated? Can we offer and accept rapid testing results? Can we invest in upgrading our air quality systems in our public facilities? I want to express that there are potential legal consequences associated with governments asking people to disclose their vaccine status and mandating vaccines. It is a very real issue. One of the many benefits of being an experienced legal assistant, I've had many mentors, and one of them was Mayor Brian Bowman, himself who practiced privacy law while I was his assistant. The Canadian privacy laws make it very clear that your medical information is private. This information must be given voluntarily. I respect Councillor Rollins' motion and understand that she and the Mayor want to protect the public and council colleagues. So do I. I recognize that I am privileged and I'm so very thankful that the City Clerks and Madam Speaker who worked tirelessly during this pandemic in order for Council members and delegations to Zoom into Council meetings from home. This has been an excellent plan to keep everybody safe. It is a known fact and be we can't dispute this argument, while the vaccine does reduce the symptoms and possible hospitalization, the vaccine does not prevent transmission. Therefore, I am glad to see that there is a recommendation that suggests we continue to work remotely because I would not want to catch COVID from the Mayor, Council members or vice versa. Regarding Councillor Nason's amendment, I would have been supportive of the amendment to suggesting a referral to Governance.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Chambers moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Councillor Santos: However, the second portion it still states a vaccine requirement. In conclusion, it is possible to honour two perspectives; by one, not asking others to disclose their vaccination statuses. And two, adhering to the public health measures that help reduce transmission. These types of mandate policies divide us against one another. During these difficult days ahead, communities should be coming together and making plans to help one another, all of which are required for our society to thrive. I want to quickly acknowledge that I condemn any acts of violence or social media posts that portray acts of violence or death from COVID. That is not how we incite compassionate dialogue and understanding. We must rise above it all. A positive approach that would likely allow each of us to live more comfortably and safely together is to provide people with the opportunity to discuss the pros and cons of the vaccine with their family doctors. Trust people to be able to make their own personal decisions about their health and the vaccine. And all the while, keep their personal health information private. As always, I seek positive, empathetic and compassionate solutions that benefit all Winnipeggers regardless of your gender, political views or class. I believe it is possible to respect personal health information and stay safe. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I truly appreciate the speeches made by everyone so far on this very important issue. Yeah, I am double vaxxed. My staff is double vaxxed. It's nice to see that we have a…trying to deal with this as a council. So, that was overlooked, apparently, in the first motion that was passed by EPC, so we're trying to resolve that today. So, now we've got two possible motions. So, basically, I am in favour of both. Both solve it, except that one is a little more robust and has the potential for more insight because it will go to Governance because I had a couple of concerns. Because when I take a look at this, in its simplicity, it is good. It is the right thing. However, does it address a few things that along the way you realize here at city hall get misplaced? It falls through the cracks. It is not dealt with properly. And I've got a couple of issues for which I feel that the Motion No. 2 would be a little better. And that is, when it comes to people that might be contracted but they are not actually staff, but they might be contracted. They might be on some form of separate contract by which they are not…they may or may not be part of this motion as I read it. So, who's going to determine this? Wouldn't it be nice if it went through Governance and we could deal with that issue? Also, what about people that's…be accepted or might be willing…yeah, they are on contract, but…yeah, but they're doing all their work from home. In any professional capacity in which they interact on behalf of any member of Council, they have no physically…no physical social interaction because they do it all from home. Okay, but you see, the way the motion is, it doesn't explain this stuff. I'd like to know. Don't we as a Council want to know? So, I am in favour of both motions. It is just that in terms of addressing my concerns and addressing potentially some of those concerns as presented by Councillor Santos would be best represented by supporting Motion No. 2. By supporting the motion of Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein because it allows for that greater insight so that we've got greater clarity in the end and a more robust motion, which I believe is the intent of what we are trying to do here. Because of the issues that I just represented, am I comfortable with the motion as it is with the…with the motion…amendment Motion No. 13? No, I am not. It seems okay, but we have seen before how things fall through the cracks. What are the exceptions? What are the things that are being missed by the administration as we try to implement this? What are the questions that we have that aren't being

addressed? That can be addressed through Governance with Motion No. 2? And all respect to Motion No. 13 by His Worship and Councillor Rollins, I've got no problem with it, it's just that it doesn't address these concerns that can be by going to Governance. And on that basis, I recommend if you have any concerns over the fallout, what might happen in terms of any imperfections with this that we don't need that we may very well be in a position to solve before we go out and say, we have got…we've got this great motion on behalf of councillors and their staff. To be certain of that, support Motion No. 2 so that it can go to Governance and we can hash this out and be certain about what we are doing.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you I want to thank Councillor Santos for her passion and her comments this morning recognizing that, you know, health information is private…private information and that she does support those that are getting vaccinated, but it is the mandate that she has questions about. Back in, I believe it was 1976, the Province of Manitoba introduced legislation that required the use of seatbelts in vehicles. It was met with a lot of opposition, but the intent of the seatbelt legislation, the mandatory wearing a seatbelt was to protect Manitobans as they drive around our city and around our province and throughout our country. It doesn't necessarily mean you are not going to get in an accident, but it does help protect you and reduce the risk of injury associated with high-speed collisions. That is the intent of this mandate. It is not going to prevent you from getting COVID, but it is going to help to reduce the viral load in your system and help to reduce our hospitals being overwhelmed with people in a COVID state. We are seeing now in the southern health region that the majority of cases that are entering the hospitals are unvaccinated. And it is overwhelming our healthcare system in that region. For that reason, we're asking our staff, those members of Council here and our staff. And I am first to stand...not first, but one of those that stand in this chamber and say, yes, I am double vaccinated. My wife and my children are double vaccinated. We do that because we have elderly parents that we want to protect and ensure that we are not, you know, overwhelming the healthcare system, not necessarily for COVID, but for the other illnesses that are still out there that have been out there even in the midst of COVID. So, I know that with my appointment as the Acting Deputy Mayor, it was on the basis…and again, I want to thank Councillor Santos for, you know, the role that she played as Acting Deputy Mayor. And she well knows that you are often asked to represent the City at different events. And as we roll out in going back to in-live and in-person events, they are all requesting that you are double vaccinated and you show proof of your vaccination card as well as other ID. And that is what we want to do to support all of these great organizations and all of these great businesses that are asking to see us in public. It is that requirement of being double vaccinated and showing proof of your vaccine card. So, I am happy to represent the City of Winnipeg, represent the residents of my ward, whether it is at in-person events or in live meetings where we can have discussion and network and have side discussions that are not necessarily as available in a Zoom context. So, for me, this works. Being double vaccinated, showing proof of my ID card and being invited to, again, participate in live public events, which is the direction that we want to move to. And so, I am happy to accept the role as Acting Deputy Mayor for that reason. And hopefully, we can move more of our residents towards getting double vaccinated and hold off or push back. Manitoba was brought into this confederacy based on the resistance that happened at La Barriere. Let's resist that way for by getting vaccinated and keep our numbers low and move back towards full implementation of our economy, supporting our businesses, supporting our community, events that happen. It is so great after 18 long months to be back out in public and connecting with people once again in the way that we did before this pandemic hit, not only our community but the entire world. So, for that reason, I'm supporting the motion that was drafted by Councillor Rollins and the amendments that have been made to clarify who it is that is to be vaccinated as part of our team here. And I am supportive of the efforts and the comments that are…have been made around this council chamber here this afternoon. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thanks, Madam Speaker. We were elected to a public office, Madam Speaker. And unfortunately, even your most privatist moments, Madam Speaker, that you wouldn't want anybody to know can come at you and go public. And then you fall under people's judgment, Madam Speaker. It has happened to me. I had to get through that and it was very difficult. This motion here isn't asking us to publicly state whether or not we have been double vaccinated. It is stating that we as leaders, public leaders should present and be double vaccinated if possible because there are individuals who have had allergic reactions to the vaccine itself which may not be the same as a reaction to other things. There is a lot of people who are…is very toxic; peanuts, for example or my son, it's shrimp. And that kind of a reaction is one thing. And speaking of my son, I shouldn't really publicly say, but you know, the first vaccine he went for and we found out when he was in junior high school and went through a vaccination, he actually passed out. Turns out, though, it is not an allergic reaction. It's…it is very stressful if you're…I hate needles, Madam…I really hate needles. Probably because of my first vaccination right here on my shoulder that everybody does and had experienced in the early '60s when the technology to give vaccines was awful and it left scars. And any of you who are around my age, Councillor Mayes probably got one of those scars right there. I don't know if he was in Manitoba when that happened, but yeah. And my mum today, because of the experience that she's seen her kids when she took me to the Children's Hospital and my brother and seen, she today still will not vaccinate. I can't convince her. Can't convince her. But you know, she doesn't…at her age now,

she's not really going anywhere or anything, but you know, she does need to protect herself. She is still fairly healthy. But I digress. It's a personal thing. And it's…we are in public office. But so, I just…when I think about this, and I've received calls from people…I mean, I'm not provincial MLA, but I get calls lately about healthcare from people from all our wards. I have been getting calls. I don't know why they are calling me because I can't change the healthcare system. But they are concerned because their significant others are not able to get really important surgery because our hospitals are full of people who need care, and they have the right and they do deserve care. Vaccinated or not, they do have a right. But what comes to my mind is, it used to be on my Facebook page. I don't know if it is still there. And I can't remember the exact wording. But there is an economist…there's a whole documentary by CBC about Mr. Polanyi. And one of the things he said, and this was about economic freedom, so he was saying that his perspective was, and he was a very intelligent man, that every individual's economic freedom comes at the cost to another individual's economic freedom or limitations because it limitates. So, when we take…it…there is always offsetting area. And I remember the battles and I still fight the battles of my rights and freedoms under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. And you know, I spoke about this when I worked for the Independent Living Resource Center and the right for us to make our own decisions to have our autonomy, that right for persons with disabilities instead of other people deciding what I can and cannot do, which is…was for years and years was put on people with disabilities. But I must say, you have to remember this; for every right you have, there is a responsibility. It is not just you have rights. For each right you have, you have a responsibility. For example, I have the right to take Transit Plus, but I also have a responsibility. I am quite capable to use the regular transit system. So, I take the responsibility of not using up resources that somebody else has the right to use but has no choice. They are limited to only that. So, when we think about what we are trying to do for our society, I have studied and I understand how, you know, the communists in Russia and how…what affects that had on thousands and thousands and thousands of people. Totally get that. But what we have to do is, we have to remember that we have a responsibility to try to ensure that those people who need surgery, you might not think it is really important. Yeah, somebody just had a heart attack is going to be in there, intensive care and emergency room or whatever. But ultimately, though, everybody's health is important. And so, I am voting yea to the amending motion, making it member of Council. And I am not reporting to you or anybody if it's…I think it would be upon the Clerk, but if somebody wants to see my proof of vaccination, I will show it privately in my office, Madam Speaker. Okay? That is up to you. I…you know, I get…I don't want my personal life out in the public and my decisions. But I will be voting for the amendment because all members of Council, as leaders in this city and this province, we should take on this responsibility. It is unfortunate that it all has to become public. But…and I think I'll just leave it at that. I will be voting for the amendment. I won't be…I don't know that we need to have more dialogue at Governance on this. So, and then once it's amended, I will be supporting the motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Madam Speaker. Thank you everybody for their comments today. Just very quickly, I'll just get back to the motion though. There's comments being made that are very personal in nature, which I understand. But just getting to the motion we are talking about today. This is to mirror the City staff vaccine requirements. Now, this is our expert staff who have…are doing a much grander scale throughout the City of Winnipeg by the experts. Unfortunately, we aren't experts. To ask City Council to be experts in vaccinations is very troublesome. We shouldn't be doing that. So, we are going to follow the lead of the experts who's our…who are…who's our EMO staff, who designed something for the City, all our employees. So, that's what we're doing today. So, again, I prefer it if this could be rolled in with the City program in general. But again, that idea was not…that idea just didn't work in our framework. We heard one comment today about, you know, does this include subcontractors, maybe contract workers or part-time? It's staff. It's staff. Contract workers or not, we don't have to send this back for that. It's a fair question, but it's staff. And have the honour to say, contract worker, part-time worker or whatever, if they work for you, they are staff, period. Contractor or employee. So, I think that is pretty well answered there and we have responsibility to do that. The idea of amending motion to send this back to Governance which would mean it would come back, hopefully, not just amended and amended and laid over and laid over again. This is time sensitive. You know, this is…we did…did not want to do a walk on today. When Councillor Rollins and I were talking about this, we did try to get it to Governance before, but then it would have missed…it would have missed EPC because that was happening at the same time. So, this is, unfortunately, with the processes that we have, this is what we got, but we have to be able to be shown as leaders. And when there is time sensitive, I think we all understand that COVID is happening to us and next…the fourth wave; I think it's here. I have been told it is here. It is here. So, delaying this for another month, we know what happens when we delay health orders for a month. It is too late. So, let's get ahead of this. Let's show our staff some respect as well that we are going to follow them. We're not telling councillors to get vaccinated. Some people called me already demanding we should do that. Again, we're not saying that you have to show your card everywhere. What we're saying is, if you choose or you can't get vaccinated, we're going to accommodate you and you can work remotely. So, again, it is not anything more than that. And I hope that anybody here who feels sick or maybe have the sniffles or has a little bit of illness, they work remotely as well even if they are double vaxxed. Let's start protecting each other as well. Nothing wrong with that. Now, we hear the thing today, again, the semantics are there, fair enough, that it should include the Mayor. To me, the first was there, for elected officials, including their staff. And should have been more clear down the line. We got the amendment today. Fair enough. If we want to go into that kind of detail. But a real big detail we have today is we have to lead. We have to show the public, we have to show our employees that we

understand the fourth wave is here. We understand that some people are very concerned about being around people who are not vaccinated and vice versa. I don't know about the other one, but vice versa. But so, we have a…we are not saying that you cannot work. We are not saying you can't be a councillor. We're not saying that you have to fire your staff. Absolutely not. We just want to do what is safe for everybody, so until we get this sorted out better, please work from home or remotely, including the staff. So, again, I support this. I do believe it's time sensitive, so that's why I won't be supporting No. 2, I think it was. Yeah, No. 2. I will support the amending No. 13. It seemed to be a concern that was listed out on No. 2, which I think that's addressed at. And if there are some things that we need to tweak as we go along, that can still happen. The City of Winnipeg is looking at the rapid testing model still, how they are going to do that. We will look at that and it will still evolve. But today…we are here today, not to delay, we are here today to lead. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: In my new Gillingham-like graceful persona, I will try to be generous. A) that really was…seemingly graceful persona of Councillor Gillingham. Yes, thank you. Yeah, I'll be…that really was very good from Councillor Orlikow. And very good from Councillor Eadie talking about rights and responsibilities. I agreed, I think, with virtually everything they both said. I would thank Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein for Motion 2. That is an issue that we, obviously, missed the Mayor's Office and that motion at EPC. I'm not going to be critical. I'm going to thank him for raising it. That said, I'm going to support Councillor Rollins' motion. She is right. Time is of the essence. That's right. So, to me, fairly straightforward. So, apologies in some ways for not supporting 2, but I want to keep this moving. And so, I will be supporting Councillor Rollins' amendment. A lot's been said already about leadership, about responsibility. There's this great expression of solidarity in an Eric Church song about everybody's got their arms around everybody else's shoulders. And it's this great communal vision and low and behold, Eric Church is coming on October 2nd for a concert and it's at the True North Centre. And you have got to be double vaccinated to go. So, that's really where we are as a society right now is we need to show some solidarity with one another and I think doing that is saying, yes, we have a responsibility to one another and that responsibility is to get vaccinated. So, will be supporting the motion and supporting Councillor Rollins' amendment.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, we will have Councillor Rollins close.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. That Eric Church, Madam Speaker, reference really does apply here because, in part, I did really believe that Councillor Nason's motion was putting arms around shoulders. It is a friendly amendment in part. And I welcomed it and really got to work when I saw it. Madam Speaker, reasonable accommodation applies to all organizations. And I think it applies to ours in particular because we run a city. We're politicians, we're essential service workers and with the help of our administrators. There has been a lot said here that I absolutely agree with. Councillor Eadie, Councillor Orlikow, Madam Speaker. What I hope is this; I hope that, you know, today we are very, very clear as a Council that we are advancing like other organizations are right now as we speak. Maybe have done a little bit before us because we didn't sit this summer. That we as an organization absolutely are balancing the rights of people who have not been vaccinated on specifically protected grounds, but that we are ensuring individual and collective rights to health and safety. So, I want to be definitive on that today. And I think that that is what this vote is about. We always want to uphold individual rights while really trying to collectively protect including the public servants, Madam Speaker, that are in this chamber. So, we know that this has been the challenge in public health moves in the pandemic. Some people are not able to receive the COVID-19 vaccine for medical or disability related reasons, but as an organization, we know we have a duty to accommodate them in the city. Unless, of course, it significantly interferes with people's health and safety. And I think given the public nature of our job, that is an important consideration as we go to events, as we manage or go to seniors homes or we're around seniors that we serve or school-based events or, indeed, events with elders. So, consistent with this duty is this proof of vaccine regime and I don't dole out, Madam Speaker, praise to this Provincial Government very often, but the vaccine regime, the QR codes that have literally opened our economy are the envy of provinces and territories in Canada. You know, some councillors and I went to lunch today and that downloaded responsibility to each and every restaurant has, you know, I watch with interest as I enter. Because Manitobans, Winnipeggers are taking this really seriously, whether they are a waiter at Kum Koon Garden or, you know, they are the highest level public health official. So, I assert we should stand shoulder to shoulder with our staff. And I think this motion hugs and mirrors the Public Service motion really well. Let us match the most current pandemic conditions and we look to Saskatchewan and Alberta and I, like you, probably have family there and feel feelings associated with their fourth wave. And let's reflect up-to-date evidence and public health guidance that vaccines prevent needless hospitalization. Madam Speaker, I do take seriously that barriers persist to vaccines. That is why I also want to thank the Public Service and, again, praise the Manitoba Government for their mobile vans. Three times this week including today out front or outback, depending on where we are situated, the mobile vaccine clinics were out to staff in Transit at Osborne this week and more. So, I want to thank the Public Service for arranging that for even, you know, any of us could have availed ourselves for that today. And I would like to, you know, particularly praise Manitoba Government for that. Like I said, I don't…I don't give compliments lightly, but you know, that is one instance that where we should. The discussion amongst each other as colleagues and with our staff, if there is hesitancy, I think my colleague Councillor Santos did illustrate this very well in

terms of those who have experienced medical related trauma, that's absolutely real. And individuals and groups who have faced discrimination or traumatic experiences while receiving healthcare, they may not trust vaccines in testing. And I want to also show with our votes today, Madam Speaker, that we are respecting those very difficult employer-employee conversations that have been taking place maybe inside this building, maybe across the street in every department, in every office, in organizations that need to get back into business and more. That…those hesitancy and those conversations are really important. We understand something through them. The language barriers, the lack of access to phone and internet, you know, have been barriers for vaccination testing and more. Older people, people living with disabilities, low-wage workers with multiple jobs, caregiving responsibilities, lack of time, resources and more, all have faced barriers during this pandemic and those are really real and absolutely need to be discussed. But, you know, both things can be true, Madam Speaker. The Governance Committee can discuss them. We have…we can pass this motion and then move a discussion. And I would welcome…I would welcome that. As I said, time is of the essence. We can mandate and require the proof of vaccination to protect people at work when receiving services within our council offices. I think that that should be easy given how tiny. We have a handful of contracted staffs. And as I said, boards and companies across the city have been doing this with hundreds of staff in the same timelines as we have. Time is of the essence. Over the last few months, like I said, many other organizations have begun to mandate vaccines for employees and service users. Madam Speaker, I know we can do this, but the implicit question is, why can't we?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. On to Councillor Nason for your close.

Councillor Nason: You know, the more I read into this motion, the more challenges I have because you've got in here, must receive their first vaccine no later than X. Second dose no later than Y. What if someone took Johnson & Johnson, that's a single dose? Are they fully vaccinated? We now have calls for a third vaccination for the MR…MNRA. Sorry. I am Astra…I'm AstraZeneca. So, where does that leave me? Am I no longer going to be considered fully vaccinated? There is no legal opinion attached to this motion, so I don't know, do our contracted staff need to have all their contracts rewrote to include full vaccination as terms and conditions of employment? I don't know. I haven't had the opportunity to ask the Public Service on that. We have some legal minds that are at the Council table that crafted and debated this at their Executive Policy Committee. You know, time. You know, if this was a well thought out motion, we had time. We had months leading up to this. I am hearing the room, I'm fairly confident my motion will not succeed. But I don't know, Madam Speaker, you can tell me if it is in order or not, but I will rescind my motion because it seems worthless at this point.

Madam Speaker: Certainly, can rescind your motion with the permission of your seconder.

Councillor Klein: Yeah, absolutely.

Madam Speaker: So, pardon me? And with the permission of Council…the consent of Council, Motion 2 to be rescinded. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We'll now move on to yourself, Mr. Mayor, to close.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I want to thank my colleagues for the, really, the respectful discussion on a…I know, a very difficult topic. Before adding my comments on the matters of public policy that are embedded in this…in this motion that Councillor Rollins, I believe, introduced at the Executive Policy Committee, I want to just acknowledge deeply personal comments that were made by our council colleague, Councillor Santos moments ago. And I want to, on behalf of everybody here, offer support for the strength that it took to share some deeply personal things on the floor of Council today. With respect to the motion at hand, you know, this motion that was supported at committee and we are now voting on with the amendment that Councillor Rollins has introduced and I seconded, does seek to promote vaccines here in the Council chamber and with our staff, as was rightfully noted. Ultimately, the decision whether any member of Council or their staff choose to receive the vaccine or not is ultimately their personal choice. If…and I, of course, unless obviously in consultation with one's family doctor, you know, if they recommend that you not receive it, obviously, I would defer to medical experts, but otherwise, what we are hearing is that it is one of the best ways for all of us to keep ourselves, our families and our community safe and for us to get through to the other side of the pandemic. And so, I have and I will continue to work hard to promote vaccines while, of course, respecting the personal choice that people ultimately have about what…whether or not they agree with the science and agree with what we are hearing from medical experts or not. What I do recognize in this motion is that for those that are unable or unwilling to receive the vaccine as prescribed here and which parallels that which our Public Service is asking of the majority of members of our Public Service is that accommodations for city councillors and their staff be made if that choice is exercised in a way that doesn't result in the vaccine or can't be taken for medical reasons. Of course, we are expecting the testing…testing framework to be rolled out within the Public Service. And this would ensure that the manner in which this is administered for members of Council and their staff mirrors that of our Public Service. And so, there will ultimately be choices, but of course, what I would say is, you know, we are…right now there are very divisive debates happening in our community. Again, I want to thank my council colleagues for respectful discussion and debate on this, especially something that applies to members of Council. You know, in our broader community, there are some pretty divisive debates happening right now on vaccines. And that division is regrettable when the science is crystal clear, when healthcare experts have been

unwavering in their support for the benefits of vaccines and the science behind them. And I am not going to contribute to undermining the public's confidence in the experts' opinions, the experts' advice that we are receiving through Manitoba Health as well as the Canadian Health Agency. What I find really sad, unfortunately, is what we're seeing right now in our ICUs. We're seeing…we're not…the last update that we received as Manitobans yesterday from Manitoba Health officials disclosed that there aren't any current patients in our ICUs that have been double vaccinated. And this is generally consistent with what we've been seeing in recent weeks. As Councillor Rollins articulated very well, time is of the essence. The Province has rolled out that there are similar requirements for their employees, for certain employees that work with vulnerable peoples. I understand, as well, the legislative assembly will be requiring a similar framework as well. And this is paralleling the work that's happening both at the legislature and provincial Public Service and, of course, in our Public Service. What we see, however, is sadly far too many people that we have lost in our community that we understand from health officials may not have happened had they opted to receive the vaccine. There is nothing more divisive than having to part ways with a loved one and have to bury somebody. And that is something we don't want to see for anyone in our community. We want to ensure that all members of Council and their staff and people that we work with are as safe as possible. And I know that that is something that we can all agree to. I know we all want what is best for all of us and for our families and for our staff and for our staff's families. We want them to be safe and we want them to be able to see the other side of this pandemic. And so I am hoping that members of Council can support this. I do think it's important for us to lead. And again, I note the accommodation that's imbedded in this motion as well as the expected testing requirements that would be there. Of course, this was not an administrative report. I understand one member of Council was questioning the manner in which it was introduced. Public Service, as I'm sure members of Council can appreciate and fully know, don't have the ability to regulate members of Council and their staff in this way. That is something that is the responsibility of this chamber and members of Council. And that is what we are doing here today. And so, I would urge members of Council to support this. I would also urge all Winnipeggers, if you haven't yet received the vaccine to go out and get the vaccine and encourage people in our community to get the vaccine. It's the responsible thing today to do. It's also a way that we demonstrate respect and compassion for everybody in our community because that is how we show it. We roll up our sleeve and we get the vaccine. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I will call the vote on amending Motion 13. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Now the question on the main item. There has been a request to vote on each clause separately and that is in order. We have four clauses. So, I will call the question on clause one. All in favour? Call for a recorded vote. Clause one, all in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillor Santos

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

Madam Speaker: Clause one passes. On to clause two. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillor Santos

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

Madam Speaker: Clause two passes. Clause three; all in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: Clause three passes. All in favour of clause four, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: Clause four passes, so Item 19 passes as amended. That completes the report section. We'll now move onto Motion 3, correct, Mr. Clerk? Motion 3 is moved by Councillor Orlikow and seconded by Mayor Bowman, and it's regarding the symbolic items in the Council Chamber. This is an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. We have Motion 4, moved by Councillor Nason and seconded by Councillor Mayes. It's regarding 311. This is an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Clerk. So, going back to Motion 3, that was moved by Councillor Orlikow and Mayor Bowman regarding symbolic items in the Council Chamber, this is actually a notice of motion. It'll appear on the October Council agenda. Okay. We'll now move into by-laws, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Sorry, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Is there a question?

Mayor Bowman: Yes, sorry, my understanding it was auto referral to EPC, but.

Madam Speaker: The way it's written, it's a notice of motion.

Mayor Bowman: Okay. Okay. So, move...go into by-laws?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Orlikow,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Bowman,

WHEREAS in a historic ceremony on September 15, 2021 the flags of Treaty 1 First Nations, the Dakota Nations and the Metis Nation were raised outside Winnipeg's City Hall;

AND WHEREAS initiatives such as the Winnipeg Indigenous Accord and the Welcoming Winnipeg Policy demonstrate progress the City of Winnipeg has made on its Journey of Reconciliation;

AND WHEREAS progress has been made but it should be recognized that there is more to do;

AND WHEREAS there is an absence of symbols honouring Indigenous peoples within the Council Chamber;

AND WHERAS in recognition of the need to rectify that, a permanent and tangible symbol or item recognizing Indigenous peoples and their history, in all its rich diversity, within Council Chambers could be added;

AND WHEREAS consultation with Indigenous governments and stakeholders should be undertaken to determine how best to honour and recognize the history of the land on which the City of Winnipeg Council Chamber resides.
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That the Winnipeg Public Service, led by the Indigenous Relations Division, be directed to:*

    A. *Engage with Indigenous governments and stakeholders on how best to reflect Indigenous history and culture through the permanent addition of a symbolic item or items displayed in Council Chamber to honour the land on which the City of Winnipeg is situated; and*

    B. *Consult the Planning, Property and Development Department to ensure any recommendations align with the historical designation of the Council Building and the City Clerk's Department on protocol related matters.*

    C. *Report back within 90 days.*

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

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

WHEREAS 311 is the main point of contact for citizens to get information about city services and programs or to make a request for service;

AND WHEREAS although 311 Customer Service Representatives are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, response times can vary significantly depending on numerous factors;

AND WHEREAS the Public Service has advised that wait times to answer 311 calls have increased due to COVID-19;

AND WHEREAS according to the 2021 budget documents, full-time equivalent staff levels at 311 have decreased by more than 25 percent over the past two years;

AND WHEREAS budgetary changes have not only resulted in increased response times but also increase resolution times;

AND WHEREAS residents often resort to contacting their ward councillor when faced with lengthy wait times at 311 for basic inquiries.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back within 90 days on the following:*

    A, *A cross-jurisdictional scan reviewing best practices and standards for contact centre operations in the public sector, including but not limited to acceptable wait time and issue resolution times.*

    B. *Options on how the City can improve wait time and resolution time for matters directed to 311.*

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

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: Okay, sorry, Madam Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law 71/2021, By-law 72/2021, By-law 73/2021, By-law 74/2021, By-law 75/2021 and By-law 91/2021.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 71/2021, 72/2021, 73/2021, 74/2021, 75/2021 and 91/2021.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Oh, wrong…Mr. Mayor, on to you I believe.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. Yeah, I move that the By-laws No. 71/2021 to 75/2021, both inclusive, and By-law 91/2021 be read a second time, Madam Speaker.

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

Clerk: By-law Nos. 71/2021 to 75/2021, both inclusive, and By-law No. 91/2021.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, I believe one more.

Mayor Bowman: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 71/2021 to 75/2021, both inclusive, and By-law No. 91/2021 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. Any questions for the Mayor? Any questions for Mayor Bowman? Okay, let's now move on to the next section. It's the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT
DATED SEPTEMBER 13, 2021

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I will pull No. 1 and I'll move…it's unclear to me if people want to pull any other ones. So, I will move 2 through 8 inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Okay, I'll…5, 6. Okay. So, 1, 5 and 6 have been pulled. I'll call the question on 2, 3, 4, 7 and 8. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Annual Report on the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Master Plan

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

Councillor Mayes: Sadly, there are no great rock and roll songs about CSO overflows. And so, I must speak for myself. Luckily, I'm qualified to do that after ten years here talking about this. Years ago, somebody got up and said, well, we all know the Seine River is the second longest river within the City of Winnipeg, and I said…felt like saying, yeah, you know that because I just repeated that so many times that actually it's true. So at some risk of this, I'm going to keep talking about CSO plans and just keep raising some of the issues that are found. This actually…I mean I was a bit critical of a report earlier today, this is actually a very good report. I want to thank Moira Geer and company for putting forward this report. I think I said at EPC, we're in the golden age of sewage treatment here in the City of Winnipeg. We really have an excellent group. We have Moira Geer, Cynthia Wiebe, Jeff Patton are doing infrastructure work, so I think the hour is now to try and do some more work on our sewer problems. We obviously have taken progress under this mayor in doing the North End. That's something to be proud of; the North End Plant phase one. Hopefully…hopefully within the next year, we'll get going on phase two, but that's a different issue than what we've got here; the CSO system. And that's just worth dwelling on for a minute I think. The report outlines what it is we have been doing and the challenge in front of us. It's a

provincial requirement that we have to hit a certain target by 2042. That was a decision made, and I think the correct decision made by then Minister Rochelle Squires. As Councillor Rollins says, it's not always in the fashion here to praise the Provincial Government, but on this one, I think they made the right call a few years back. So, there, we have a plan. 1300-page report that's not appended, mercifully, that outline how we're going to go after that target that's been set by the Province. So, a couple of clarificatory remarks that I'll use the introduction to do; there is an issue here about combined sewer and how we treat removal in the combined sewer district. I know Councillor Nason has a question about that, so I'll come back to that later. The issue being, how do we…how do we measure that? How do we view infill developments and their impact on the sewer system? So, it's an interesting question. We talked about that at committee. I think we got a pretty good answer from Ms. Wiebe about some of the challenges there. In short, we do give approval to individual houses, lot splits with secondary suites, however…however, we have a sewer by-law that mandates discharge control if you're building a triplex or bigger. So, the Province did not say green light everything. The Province's position is somewhat more nuanced than that, and so was…and so, we had to respond to that. So, that's the issue number one. What about the issue of infill in the CSO areas? Issue number two is a mathematical one. Rare to get…you get to use the words numerator and denominator in these discussions, but we did that at the committee and we talked about this. So, we are aiming to get to 85% capture. So, people say, so you're trying to get all of these spills eliminated, right? No, actually, we're just trying to get to 85% and even that's a $1 billion challenge. 85% of what? You'll notice the report at one point talks about how we have 94% capture, but that's capture if you include the whole city, areas like Waverley West, Sage Creek, River Park South, that aren't on CSO, right? 94%, but if you look at the CSO area, roughly, the pre-1965 area of the city, the ring around the centre, we're at 75% capture now. So, this is...this is…gets a bit technical, but I think…doesn't matter of the annual rainfall. This is the 1992 representative year, the typical year for rainfall applied against our current infrastructure. We have poured tens of millions of dollars into projects in Cockburn and Calrossie, into Councillor Eadie's ward at Jefferson, into Councillor Gillingham's ward, Ferry Road. We have done some good work on this that's increasing our capture rate a bit, but it's not so much annual rainfall that matters, it's…you take the average year of rainfall, '92, and you keep trying to striving toward 85. It's telling that we've spent tens of millions of dollars to get from 74 to 75%, long way to go yet to get to that 85% target, but I'll come back to that as well, which is, we are putting in 30 million a year. I think I mis-answered a question from Councillor Schreyer at committee because I said, well, I think in 2015 we were only doing about 16 million a year. If you look a little more closely, in that year we were going wildly up and down, like 16, 44, 11, all over the map. We've been pretty constant at 30 million a year for the last few years, which is good except we're going to get to our target by 2095 at that pace. We're going to be 50 years behind schedule. The Mayor said on our running track announcement last week, well, we're 50 years ahead of schedule because they used to build the running track in this town every 50 years and we've done two in three years. Great, we're 50 years ahead on that, we don't want to be 50 years behind on the sewer removal. So, I think we've got to start picking up the pace. We need to ask the Province and Federal Government for their share of the funding. We do have a model that says, if we start putting in 30 and each of the other levels puts in 30, away we go, and we'll get to the target roughly by the prescribed date in 2040. Somebody said to me, that's crazy. You know, good for you for trying to accelerate. You know, 2045, that's way too far out there. Good for you for trying to accelerate, to which I said, no, that's the accelerated position. That's what I'm trying to get to. The unaccelerated is 2095. So, but there's a ray of good news in there, which is…and here Councillor Schreyer will be interested, I think the…we need 90 million a year if we go at the 2 billion estimate for total cost. And that's built in 100% contingency, right? Really, the cost we're looking at is 1.3 billion. So, if these projects come in roughly on pace, we could get done by about 2045, if we're…but we're going to have to pick up the pace and we're going to have to ask the Province and the Federal Government for some help. Really good debate at committee. And Councillor Orlikow asked a very good question to Moira Geer, which was, yes, but dollars aren't infinite. There's a challenge here. Where should we put our emphasis? Is it on CSO or North End? And Moira had a very emphatic answer, which was North End. You'll get more bang for your buck that way. If there's a certain limited amount of funding, that's where we should go first. Fair enough. That said, nothing prohibits us from going after it trying to get additional funds from the Province or the Feds to say, let's speed this up. Hopefully, we'll be done by 2045, the accelerated position. Maybe we can even be done sooner if we get more money flowing and avoid the scourge of construction inflation as Councillor Schreyer would put it. So, the sooner we get going on this, the better. We are doing some good work. We are putting in 30 million a year, that's to the credit of this council I think. But to meet the target, we're going to have to pick up the pace either with our own dollars, which is something I have proposed, we'll come to that in budget or with money from the other levels of government. So, I'll have some more comments when I conclude, but very good debate actually I thought at committee and at EPC. This is a big ticket item and, you know, councillor…I think Councillor Nason has a question coming about, can we not do some of the community benefit stuff that we're talking about at North End with CSO, and I'll deal with that question when it comes. But this is…you know, even if we do 30 million a year over 10-years, it's a $300 million project. As Councillor Klein pointed out at committee, 30 million a year, that's a quarter of our roads budget and we give about 1/100 of the attention to this. So, fair point. So, it's…it's an item that as Councillor Rollins said, we should be debating this. Hopefully, we can accelerate the funding, but very good report. Some interesting mathematical issues here, but ultimately, this is a big challenge for us and we do need, I think, to give this a little more attention over the next few years because I really don't want to leave this to when my sons are in their 90s for a completion date. And that's what we're currently on the arc to meet. So, thanks. I'll introduce it and I'll speak at conclusion.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you to Councillor Mayes as the Chair of the committee, a stickler for data when the chips are down as it is today. And I will continue to challenge him on that because it is worthwhile. He actually provides, for the most part, and as he did in his speech. We talked about the difference…as he did today, we talked about this at the standing committee meeting, in terms of the fact that we've been doing this for almost a decade, but how much we've been doing lately and how much we've been doing, you know, almost a decade ago. Not only that, we've been increasing. Now, maybe it was a little more sporadic, as Councillor Mayes made the point, but we're getting more consistent as we're getting more into a plan. The question, of course, is not just how much are we getting done, but how much is it costing? Now, I'm going to make the point that the increases in the last decade for this project has…is approaching doubling already. So, when we look at the stuff, when we're talking about when are we going to get it done, it's going to be a question of budgeting and budgeting priorities. So, that will also be a factor in when this is going to get done. Councillor Mayes made the point, you know, is his son going to be paying for this? Is my son going to be paying for this? And of course, that's going to be the case of…a function of the cost of it. So, when we plan for this, when we project, we've got to ask the question, let's be fiscally responsible, let's be fiscally conservative, let's be accountable. What is the rate of construction inflation when we're looking over the decades on this? And of course, is there a way of avoiding that question? So, you can tell me one way or the other, how there's a way of avoiding that question when it comes to an important project such as this, given all the other construction projects that are taking place that we're obliged to. And besides all of those construction projects, all of the rest of our over billion-dollar obligations to running the city on an annual basis. Councillor Mayes says there are no songs with the word overflow in it, but incredibly, I found one by, incredibly, by the name of a fellow called with Jay Broady. Yeah, Jay…there it is. Well, it's Jay Brody depending on…B-R-O-A-D-Y. Depending on how you pronounce it. And he talks about overflow. When it comes to his grace, I've got overflow, when it comes to his love, I've got overflow. Those I think are consistent sometimes with the words of our Jay Brow. And there you go. And it happens to be that when I think of the cost of this, when we look at forecasting this, whether we're going to have a budgetary overflow, an inflationary overflow. Well, we already do and it's been happening for years, unfortunately. But I've got to say this because it's really important, because it makes you realize where our priorities should be when it comes to looking at our budgetary concerns. And I'm going to make this point; if the inflation rate for these construction projects were to be at the same rate as the construction workers, we'll be under budget, but that's not where the costs are going. it's not going to the construction workers. Their rate of inflation for their wages is not what's causing the burden on our budgets, what's causing our tax increases, our going into debt on every level of government and of reducing services and for the City asking more and more funding from other levels of government to get our…to get our work done. If the rate of inflation was at the same rate of inflation…it was at the same efficiency over the last decade, over the last generation of all our CUPE workers and the services that they've been providing over the last decade, over the last generation, if the rate of construction inflation were at their efficiency of providing those services, we would be the envy of the world because that's the efficiency of our CUPE workers. Now, you might…some people might not like what I just said, but it's a fact. It's a statistical fact, and I'm glad some people love it because it's the truth. And bear that in mind when it comes to looking at where we have to make our cuts, who's causing us problems. People actually have the impression in our city that our CUPE workers, of all people in this city, are causing the budgetary pressures on us. That's the reason our taxes are going up, that's the reason our services are going down, that's the reason why we're selling more debentures. That's not the truth at all. As a matter of fact, if the whole city could be as efficient as our CUPE workers, we wouldn't be having these problems at all. Thank you.

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

Councillor Rollins: Oh, Madam Speaker, all that is underground, that…those were beautiful words by my colleagues, Madam Speaker, making what is invisible visible. I was in a neighbourhood where we had recently put 2.5 million in the last two fiscal years underground, underneath their streets that they were lobbying to get repaved. And unfortunately, the work wasn't done, and so I gently and, hopefully, winningly told them that I was in their neighborhood to give them rather bad news, that I wasn't supporting the repaving because I really wanted to see that 2.5 million finished. First comes the water and sewer, then comes the re-road construction. And so, what Councillor Mayes put into words more eloquently than I could, maybe not in song, but more than I could, is that we have invested over 140 million in infrastructure and system upgrades or more, 30 million per year and to just be in compliance. And there's many of us that don't think that that is enough, it's true. But how do you make that tangible? How do you make that real? How do you make what's invisible visible? Fort Garry is on a flood plain. Fort Garry, I share that with Councillor Orlikow, and I watch, Madam Speaker, many of my colleagues take photos near outputs and outflows and thought about that. Not a photo I had ever thought of myself, but really thought about that and studied it because as Shoal Lake 40 knows that community waste water management, adequate sewer systems, sanitation, the disease prevention that comes with water, waste water, you know, it's important. So, I took up the challenge of Councillor Mayes to really celebrate this aspect of our budget and City work, and I hope others do today, too. It's the Cockburn Calrossie that Councillor Orlikow visited recently, the design contracts, the sewer separation works, they…the real time control and the green infrastructure pieces to reduce volumes that I think were really cooking with fire, which is a really bad analogy for water, really flowing fast. I'll stop now, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be…try to be short. Excellent report. I'm remiss, Madam Speaker, that I wasn't able to make this meeting or even listen to it to hear about all the nuances of this CSO program, Madam Speaker. But I wanted to just mention that I would have wanted to ask if somehow the new tunneling technology that was used on Semple, if that kind of technology would see in the...I mean, it cost a fair amount of money, but the work got done pretty quickly. And the technology seemed to work good, although, there was an error that I think will never happen again. But unfortunately, Semple east of Main had a major incident with their sewers and their private sewers to their homes and stuff. But it is a really interesting technology that I hope will make things work easier without as much destruction of the top of our streets because lots of sewer separation. There's…CSO mitigation can be done a number of ways, but when you're…when you're separating combined sewer and having two sewers, it does cause a lot of problems on top of the surface, Madam Speaker. So, hopefully, that technology will make it less offensive to the neighbourhoods in which it happened…which it needs to…sewer separation needs to happen. You know, I just wanted…we're talking about the funding reach and the CSO, and you know, boy, now that I know what I am…when I'm older, Madam Speaker. You know, in the early '70s, my friends and I living around the Red River used to swim in it all the time. Anyway, and I distinctly remember my dad's first house that he actually bought on Inkster. The first year we were in there, the sewer backed up because there was a big rain, a big melt event or something. And then, the City of Winnipeg at the time, Madam Speaker, had to implement a storm sewer program because many basements all over the North End flooded. And it just so happens that at Inkster, there's a…there's a CSO right at the end of it. And Madam Speaker, the way it was paid for was interesting. And I know we should be looking to other levels of government to speed this up because we really don't want to cause and pollute the river which pollutes the lake and we really don't want that. So, but the way the storm sewer was paid for back then in the early '70s, so there was a bunch of money borrowed, and my dad's property tax bill had a local improvement bill on…attached to it as well, Madam Speaker. So, that's kind of how they paid for that major construction initiative that happened throughout some of the neighborhoods in the North End, Madam Speaker. So, in terms of funding, I think it's very important, and CSO is important to resolve. So, anyway, I'll just leave it at that, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to mention those couple of things about that program. And I'll be voting, of course, for the report.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thanks to everyone for their comments, and look forward to further debate on this, hopefully in the budget. Couple of concluding remarks; I was talking to Cynthia Wiebe who replaced Jeff Patton as sort of the lead person on this within the department. And I was saying, you know, there's a certain beauty to it in that, there's no councillor who says, well, I want that work done in my ward, because that would mean you'd have the problem. And in certain wards, like Councillor Chambers, there are no combined sewer districts. So, she said, yes, it's ward agnostic in that sense. We made a list of where we thought we'd get the best bang for the buck by putting the money first. That's where we're going. So, Armstrong; I didn't know where this was. I'm learning a lot about the city geography through this. I had to go over to Councillor Eadie's office and look at the map in there to figure out where the Armstrong combined sewer district is, but that would be next up. Not in my ward, but you know, that's next up on the priority list. So, hopefully we can accelerate the work and get to that. Now, just to say, you know, I was at a tree planting in a new part of my ward, well, new to Royalwood which is newly into my ward in 2018. Right by some work that Councillor Klein, Councillor Nason and Councillor Chambers had all contributed towards different projects that were there. So, my thanks to that. But after we did this tree planting, a guy came up to me and said, oh, I know you, you're the sewage guy. And I said, yes, I am. So, if that's…if that's how I'm remembered here, that's okay because this is important work, and I look forward to debating it more and hopefully accelerating this program. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. With that, I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Item 5, Madam Clerk.

Item 5 – Grants or Partnerships for the Study and Establishment of Greenhouse Gas Offset Operations

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

Councillor Mayes: I'll wait to hear from those who pulled the item and then I'll probably have some concluding remarks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. This item…Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thanks, Madam Speaker. Just quickly; again, was unfortunate that I wasn't able to make it to the meeting to speak to the motion that I moved. So, I'll just begin by thanking the committee for having our environmental people spend 90 days to see if there are any possibilities or partnerships and grants to establish solar energy generation. I think there's probably two places that are promising, Madam Speaker, related to our old dumps that are sizeable and have been looked at for various kinds of development and that sort of stuff in the past. And those would be...I can't

remember the name of the former dump, but it's near Mission, somewhere around Panet, Mission, somewhere around in there, Madam Speaker. It was an area that Transit was looking at maybe utilizing for a north transit garage, but it was determined building on it, that sort of infrastructure, was probably not an appropriate place to do it. And the other one is, I came up with the idea when we passed the CentrePort South motion, and I know Optimist Park uses at least part of the former dump out there, but I think there's a lot of that dump that still is underutilized. So, there could be some potentials. And you know, what's happened since was very interesting in the news the other day, Madam Speaker, for my colleagues and for looking at this environmentally and climate change. So, we're here, we're talking about carbon offset, which you know is not necessarily the best thing but really, the circumstances drive it. But because of climate change, although we have had droughts in the past, Madam Speaker, but the droughts seem to get worse, and this year was a drought. And we heard that Manitoba Hydro can't generate enough electricity to sell under our contracts to places outside of Manitoba, which causes them a huge problem. Well, here we go. If we had these solar plants...because people say, well, why go with solar when we have this wonderful hydro? And so on, and you know. But really, if we can generate electricity within the city, and we can contribute some electricity to the grid, then, you know, that provides extra electricity when Manitoba needs it and it could feed into it. And there's various ways that it can work. And I know there are expert private companies out there that we can partner with, and hopefully other levels of government could see fit to doing grants. I noticed we're…Province of Manitoba just announced a bunch of grants they're giving for composting to keep our dumps from producing as much methane gas as they do. So, there's great possibilities. And so, I'll just conclude, I wanted to thank the committee rather than just receiving it as information, actually having us a take a real open-minded look at how we can take some responsibility for that gas that still leaks. I mean, we inherited them when the city…Unicity came into being, Madam Speaker. But ultimately, you know, anything we can do with big ideas, new ideas and I'm seeing other ideas that seem to me are new, and that Council is actually considering them is very important. Very important, indeed, Madam Speaker. So, thanks to the committee for having that, and let's see if any of these ideas can work out. Thanks.

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

Councillor Mayes: Yes, I should have thanked Councillor Eadie and Councillor Lukes for moving this. It's a good motion and as Councillor Eadie is saying, Summit Landfill which is I think in Councillor Gillingham's ward now. It's certainly out in the West End. That remains one of the top 10 or at least it did in the last charte as one of the top 10 greenhouse gas emitting sites in the province. Brady, obviously, number two. The plant in Brandon's number one. But Summit, though closed, is still on there. Maybe we can do something. It's certainly worth looking into. It's a good motion. Thanks for bringing it up. We have been doing flaring at Brady for at least eight years, seven years, I know that. So, maybe there's something we can do at Summit or that we have…it's very Winnipeg-like, we have 33 at least. They're strewn about the city irrationally because we used to have all these different municipalities. Some of them are more than 100-years old. Some of them date to the '60s. But it's a good motion, so certainly somewhat…is somewhere where we should be seeing if we can do some of this work for the environment. So, I'll be supportive.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of Item 5? Contrary? That's carried. Madam Clerk, Item 6.

Item 6 – Financial Incentives for Composting

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

Councillor Mayes: Yes, thanks. This…I should thank Councillor Klein. This is his third run at a version of this, and this is hopefully going to pass today. I was pleased to second this. This is a look at...staff will be asked to look at financial incentives for composting. And that could include…what's different about this motion is the idea of Green Action Centre or other providers offer compost services. Is there some way of subsidizing that service or those who use it to try and promote compost in the interim…in the interim until we have the debate about a city-wide program. I know we should be providing a city-wide program. I've come around on that and I believe we should be doing the city-wide program. I know Councillor Gilroy expressed some frustration about these interim measures and that's fair enough. But we don't have a…we don't have a plan right now to do it city-wide, we're waiting for the pilot project. So, this is I think a good faith effort by Councillor Klein to try and look at an interim measure to see if we can get people. It does help us all if there's less compost going into the Brady Landfill. So, that's the outline of why this is a little different than some of the motions that have come forward before.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. And through you to Councillor Mayes, he exactly provided or he provided us an exact review or overview of what this motion is for, and to keep on Councillor Mayes' theme of rock music, I'll quote the Stray Cats, "Three times a charm", in their song, 'Three Time's a Charm'. "I kissed her once, kissed her twice, three time's". There we go. So, this is the third one, but I think it's important to note that this is about taking action today. And

not just lending words to something that we need to take action on. This is to implement or get a report to see if we can entice more people to composting starting today. And that would be a win as Councillor Mayes alluded to, Madam Speaker, because it would reduce the waste going to Brady. It would be a financial gain for the City. And more importantly, it would be a gain for the future residents in the City of Winnipeg. So, I'm pleased that Councillor Mayes seconded this third-time motion, and I'm hopeful that it will be a unanimous vote in support today.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Yeah, I'm in support of this, but I just need to make the point because it's part of the ambiguity of what we're dealing with because we're putting resources into things, studying things that could be considered contradictory, but we're…we need to look at all these things and consider one thing that...remember, what we're looking at. We're looking at harnessing the methane emission from the Brady Landfill, harnessing that so that we can use it, optimize that...that methane release from the garbage dump, from Brady Landfill so that, you know, it can possibly be used at the U of M, possibly be hooked up to our grid. Now remember how important it is to be able to do this, if we can do this feasibly, because if we don't do that, if we don't harness and make use of the methane from the Brady Landfill, that means we're going to take our natural gas from underground, which is taking…taking millions of years to be created. Meanwhile, we count the methane released from the Brady Landfill, which we can harness, which we're looking at doing, we're talking about months, something like that, right? So, there's a huge difference because one is essentially non-renewable. It's a fossil fuel. So, when we…if we're going to be using natural gas, and although Councillor Mayes and I did put forward that motion here, which was passed by Council, to make sure that part of our plan, our greenhouse emission plan was to include looking seriously at using hydro instead of natural gas. The reason we have to do that is because we do use natural gas. Natural gas that takes millions of years to be created and then it's gone. So, when we can harness live methane creation through our landfills, that's a form of efficiency that, you know, can't be really compared to. People can say yeah, but you shouldn't be using the fossil fuels. I'm thinking, okay, but we are using the fossil fuels. But the worst way to do it is to be taking it from the ground. I understand that we don't want to use fossil fuels because of the effect of greenhouse emissions, but we're not solving that, exactly. We actually had to add to our greenhouse emission plan looking at conversion for future plants to use hydro instead of natural gas. That's not where we're at. So, bear that in mind. But the best place to store fossil fuels are in the ground. There's no better place to store your oil. There's no better place to store your natural gas. There just never will be a better place to store your nat…your fossil fuels. Yes, we're talking about the reasons for composting. Now, bear in mind, I'll just give a little background here, one of the reasons we compost is to reduce greenhouse emissions, and that's one of the reasons…the motivations for composting. Bear in mind, what I said at the very beginning of my speech was, we're also dealing with sort of what can be considered contradictory factors here because at the very same time, we're also talking about harnessing the methane gas release from the Brady Landfill. So, we're dealing with two of these things at the same time. And I'm saying, bear that in mind. And that's what I'm talking about, the Brady Landfill. That's why I'm talking about greenhouse methane emissions, and that's why I'm talking about greenhouse gases, and that's why I'm talking about the…how Councillor Mayes has changed our greenhouse emission plan by including hydro conversion and planning for hydro. So, I'm just showing you how it's all related. And there's no other way to look at it. You've got to look at it that way. You've got to look at it holistically. You've got to look at it contextually. If you don't, well, you can't make the right decisions because look, let's face it, I'm not making this up. This is literally what we're doing here at city hall. So, I'm saying, because we're doing this, take a whole look and see how we can optimize this because it can look like some things are…can be considered contradictory, and maybe…maybe in a way they are. But bear in mind, our greenhouse plan for the city doesn't include not using natural gas. Not at all. It doesn't say that at all. And that's why what I'm talking about is all the more relevant. It's not my opinion. It's not my decisions. This is where we're at as a city. I'm not complaining, I'm just saying, bear that in mind as we move forward regarding composting, and regarding the use of natural gas and whether you…rather we'd use natural gas from your…from your garbage dump or not, or just let it go into the air while you're taking fossil fuels out of the ground, which is a terrible thing to do. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Seeing no further speakers, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Just a question for the Chair, are we not already…we already are flaring our methane.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, question period will come shortly.

Councillor Allard: Right, but before voting on this report as part of my comments, I wonder as a city councillor if we are already not burning...flaring our methane. Is this not just a way to capture it? For clarification.

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

Councillor Mayes: Yeah. Good comments, and deserving of an answer on each of those two previous speakers. Councillor Schreyer makes a point which is if you're going to go all in on capturing methane, I'll paraphrase here, and

we're looking at the piping options and these other options, it might seem contradictory to then say, also, we can't keep putting the fuel. We've got to slash the amount of compostable…compostable materials going into the dump. It's a fair...it may seem contradictory. To me, it's sort of like, let's do it all. Let's try and do all of these things. Councillor Allard's right. We are already flaring. Have been I think since '13 or '14 at Brady, and there's some statistic as to how many cars this equals, how much we flare, and we're trying to ramp it up now with this study of possible, you know, should we be marketing it? There was quite a good report done by Ms. Geer and company about a year…in the past year. And U of M was one of the options and we're still talking to U of M. But so, both speakers make a good point. We are doing this already with the flaring, so that shouldn't take away from what we want to do to ramp up on composting. I think Councillor Schreyer makes a good point, though, that we should remember, okay, but if we're…if we have…if we're making massive investments about capturing the methane, can we afford to? Do we want to also take the steps to reduce the material that's going into the dump? I would say, yeah, but that's a fair question. And hopefully, in a year or two, we'll have the big debate, and the pilot project will have played out. And I'll give Councillor Browaty's speech and he can give mine because we've heard each other on this enough times, but it'll be a serious issue. Councillor…both councillors raise good points, so for today, though, I would like to try and do this. It's what Councillor Klein says. It's an attempt to try and increase the number of people keeping their compostable waste out of the landfill for the next couple of years until we get…till we get that pilot project done and get moving on the big plan.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. With that, call the question on Item 6. All in favour? Contrary? Noted. Councillor Browaty in opposition. And that is carried. Okay. We'll move on to question period under this committee. Any questions for our chair, for Councillor Mayes? Councillor Chambers.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you to the Chair. A while back a motion was passed through Council to go to the Water and Waste Committee with respect to the social procurement and social enterprise aspects of the City of Winnipeg, and including more community benefits and the contracts that are tendered out to the…to our third parties. I'm wondering what the status of that working group is, and whether the Chair can expect a report back on that information and where that's going to be sitting. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, that…thank you to Councillor Chambers for advance notice of the question. That group met I think in the past few days, continues to meet, it's a…it's an initiative that both Councillor Chambers and Councillor Nason have pushed for some version of community benefits. We are starting in now on to very big projects, indeed like North End Phase 1. We have missed that window. I have no intent on missing the window on the biosolids building with this. I think we have to get this in place. Building Trades have raised this, (inaudible) groups, other recycling, all sorts of groups are saying, "You got to do something on a community benefits." Agreement, it isn't just the sewer works, but my God, these are huge projects that we're queuing up and hopefully moving forward with. So, I know Building Trades have raised this, as have other groups. I think we got to get a report in the very near future from our staff cause it does, it will affect tendering in the City, I think in a good way though, so it's a very good question. I'd like to get this report from our staff. I'll try and have that for the next…it doesn't have to be at the Water and Waste Committee, but we've got some big-ticket items coming and I'd like to see us get going on these community benefit initiatives. There are various groups that do this as consultants, so we don't have to reinvent the wheel here, we can use that expertise, and hopefully, by the time we get around, hopefully we'll get the biosolids building approved while we still have our current Mayor. I think that would be appropriate. I know he's pushed pretty hard for it. I would love to see that happen in the next year, and I'd love to see this be part of that tendering process, and I very much think we should make sure it's a part of that tendering process.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, and as a follow up to the comments made by the Chair, I'm just…are you aware that again, the City of Calgary in development of the motion that I've put forward, and again thank you to Councillor Nason for working or his vision in this as well, but in putting this together, has recognized that the City of Calgary also put forth a social procurement policy and in developing their programs around social purpose enterprises, they use a consulting firm called BuySocial.com, and I'm wondering if the Chair is aware of this consulting agency? Again, don't have to reinvent the wheel by utilizing some of the good work that has been done by other jurisdictions that could potentially be implemented here.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I have in recent weeks become aware of that group. And I know the work in our staff are working on this with people from social enterprise groups, from Building Trades and other groups. Yeah, I don't know who exactly might be used, but yeah, there's some expertise out there. We've got some big projects coming. We can't wait a year, and as Councillor Gillingham has pointed out, if it's going to take a…if we've got seven years left in the pipe, and it take seven years to build a biosolids building, it doesn't take a mathematical whiz to figure out we've got to get going on this. So, let's…I hope we can with the other levels of government, but this community benefits part should certainly be part of that tender.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you, I got a question for the Chair. A letter from Deputy Minister Jan Forster submit to the Former Interim CAO dated July 23rd indicated that the City needs to interpret Clause 8 in a broader overall sewer shed manner, rather than the present narrow lens that has unfairly impacting infill projects. And we know through some recent media articles, it is impacting and we know at our committee as well, we've had multiple CSO issues. It's costing small infill developers thousands, probably in the tens or hundreds of thousands of unnecessary dollars. Uncertainty is these items are rarely disclosed until permit-issuance time. And I'm hoping that the Chair can provide clarity for those investing in infill developments and CSO areas, if there will be an immediate change in how the Public Service provides development approvals pertaining to CSO capacity?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you to Councillor Nason for the question and advance warning thereof, and know he and I have also talked about community benefits on CSO projects, where we're spending hundreds of millions, so hopefully in some of that tendering, we can also do community benefits. But to the business at hand, that the Provincial position and here, I think…where we talked about this at our last committee and we'll have to talk about it again, my understanding of the Provincial position and our approach is this: Glenwood Neighbourhood Association some months ago said we think the City is breaching it's licence because the licence says in essence, you can't make it worse, you can't increase the flow in the CSO area. The City took the position of well, with modern building techniques, and then a long bit about weeping tiles, I won't get into, with modern building techniques if you take out a house and put two houses in with secondary suites, we're not sure that actually is making it any worse for the combined sewer system, but if you're up over three units in a tripods, yeah, then we force you to start taking measures to control your flow. The Province's letter (inaudible) but, I mean and the City's position was no, we…it doesn't mean you can't approve any lot split, that isn't what the Province wants in it's licencing. The Province says well, because you're doing some other works elsewhere in the City, there is, you're not making it worse in the pipe. And then the tricky math, and as we talk a fair bit about net benefits to the system, so to simplify this, if you just approve every infill development and claim that's what the Province wanted in CSO areas, all of the tens of millions we're pouring into Colbourne, Calrossie and Jefferson and Ferry to rachet that capture rate up toward 85%, which the Province said is the target. Here we are, we're spending tens of millions, and we're clawing our way there getting a percent at a time, all of that starts going backwards if you just let more pour into the CSO areas. It's just the math of it. So, we can't just say, well the Province said greenlight everything it's okay in CSO areas. That isn't what's being said. We aren't going to blow tens of millions of dollars on CSO separation work based on some letter. So, we need to keep re-visiting that. I would be frustrated if I were the Developer and the Planner said, "You can have six," and then Water and Waste said, "No, you can only have three units". I get that, but there's issue with capacity and there's issue…there are issues with what we can do in the overall CSO area. There's a separate issue, my frenemy, Jon Blumberg, the Realtor talked to me about this that he's facing issues getting permits in areas that don't have CSO. Down in Councillor Chambers area, River Park South, seems remarkable, forty-year-old neighbourhood and we're at the edge of capacity, and that's not a CSO issue. That's just a capacity issue in that particular area. So, I know Water and Waste, if they were here, Ms. Geer would say, you know ten years ago we never had to think about these things and development, now we do, we got more staff looking at this, can we approve certain things. So, we're going to have this debate a lot over the next few years. It's going to get easier though if we can get going on the biosolids building. But I don't think the Province's letter says greenlight everything in the CSO district. That is not how I read it. That's, I think, not how our staff read it, but we can ask at the next Water meeting. You'll be there. For further clarity on this, it's a valid concern especially given the media coverage about developers saying, "Hey Planning said six, and Water said three, I'm out a lot of money". So yeah, I think that's worth getting further clarified.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move onto the next committee: Standing Policy Committee on Innovation and Economic Development. We'll get right into question period. Any questions for our chair, Councillor Browaty? Any questions for Councillor Browaty? Not today, let's move on: Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development, the report dated September 14th.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED SEPTEMBER 14, 2021**

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, Madam Speaker. I'd like to pull Item No. 12 and move 1 through 11 and 13 through 16.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so we're going to pull 12. Yes?

Councillor Eadie: I just need a question answered by the Clerk. Report Item 13, does it need two-thirds vote to rescind? Something that probably took two-thirds vote.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Rescinding, that's a good question. Never encountered that. We'll check on that. Councillor…Mr. Clerk, are you aware?

City Clerk: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, the…it does require two-thirds to declare something surplus, but it does not require two-thirds to rescind that decision.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Thank you for the question, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Now, we did pull Item 12. Is Item 5 to be pulled as well, Mr. Clerk? Just looking here. We don't have an amending motion with 5. No? Okay. Perfect. Eleven? One second. 11, 1, and 9. Okay. Nothing more? Okay, good. I'll call the question, then. Yes? Yes. We've pulled 1, 9, 11, 12, and that's it.

Councillor Klein: Sorry, Madam Speaker, can I pull 3? It's going to be a (inaudible).

Madam Speaker: Absolutely. Item 3 as well. Okay. So, let's move forward. I'll call the question on Item 2, 4, 5, 6 through 8. Item 2, 4, 5, 6 through 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16. I'll call the question on those items. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Bird-Friendly Urban Design Guidelines

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Madam Chair, to introduce the item.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll wait to hear from my councillor colleagues on this matter. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. In 2018, I had made a motion to have the City develop bird safe building guidelines. And I'd like to thank Councillor Klein for moving it along recently at our committee and so that it's here on the agenda today. Manitoba's recognized as the North American birding mecca. Being located within three migration corridors where over 390 species of birds have been recorded and 287 known to nest. Environment Canada ranked window collisions as the second highest direct human cause of bird deaths in Canada, estimating that 16 million to 42 million birds die from window collisions annually in Canada. The highest actually is from cats, so just so you know. I know. I know. As we work to grow our city up with many taller buildings, having a bird safety building guideline in place is important. Every developer who's been building a taller building in the Waverley West Ward has complied when asked to incorporate bird friendly window treatments. And now, this will be part of the review process for development going forward. I want this on the record that this motion initially when I brought it forward was inspired and is in memory of one of Manitoba's most renowned ornithologists, Mr. Daniel Weedon.

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

Councillor Allard: I'd like to recognize everybody who brought this forward. Being the son of an environmental ecologist, one of the things that my mother laments is the…the very high percentage of the extinction of songbirds. And, so this is a good motion. And I presume we…the next…the next challenge is to get those cats under control, Councillor Lukes. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I think this is a very worthy effort report, given councillor…Councillor Lukes' perspective. And I just thought, it seems to me there was a book by Councillor Allard's mum with birds, in that book, I think. If I recall, Madam Speaker. Got to love those songbirds.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And with that, we'll go back to our chair, Councillor Gilroy, to close.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I do want to thank my councillor colleagues, both Councillor Lukes and Councillor Klein who's championed this. And, of course, the many other members of Council who just…who got up and spoke today. I think it's important as we move forward as a city, as we grow up, we also look at how we can be more bird friendly and think this…these design guidelines will help us do that. Thank you. I hope I…everyone supports it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Madam Clerk, Item 3.

Item 3 – Real Estate Policy Framework

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

Councillor Gilroy: I will wait to hear from council colleagues. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any speakers on this item? Okay, seeing none, I think it was stood down for someone may want to be recorded in opposition. Councillor Gilroy, go ahead. To close.

Councillor Gilroy: That's fine, you can call the question.

Madam Speaker: Oh, I have one speaker. Mr. Mayor. Yes.

Mayor Bowman: Yeah, I'll make it quick. I just want to thank the Public Service. The real estate framework is essentially the completion of a lot of work that flowed out of the of the real estate audits that many of us inherited. I know Public Service has worked very hard with the direction and support of Council. And I want to thank them. I want to thank our chair as well for her ongoing leadership and efforts to ensure that real estate transactions are done appropriately here at city hall. So, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, Councillor Gilroy. I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? We have three members recorded in opposition: Councillor Gillingham, Councillor Klein and Councillor Nason. And that is noted. Moving on to Item 9, Madam Clerk.

Item 9 – Subdivision and Rezoning – Gull Lake Road and Markham Road – DASZ 21/2021

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. I wanted to speak to this item for many reasons, but I'll start with speaking about rapid transit corridors. Rapid transit corridors are built by cities to move people in an efficient and sustainable manner to relieve stress on the environment by reducing the number of vehicles on our roads, and to alleviate congestion on our roads, and to also encourage development along the corridor. Development of apartments, as apartment are a form of affordable housing for so many who cannot purchase single family homes and they encourage development of businesses and services, restaurants, medical clinics and many others. And this development, of course, in turn, help pay for the corridor and keep all of Winnipeg residents' taxes down. Specifically, Winnipeg's first leg of an actual rapid transit corridor has been 40 years in the making. It was identified that the corridor would connect downtown to the University of Manitoba campus, which other than downtown, is the second most commuted to destination in the City of Winnipeg. For many years, there was much debate and many, many public open houses that residents could and did attend related to the routes of where exactly the final route would be. And at these open houses, much discussion focused around why the City was moving forward to build the rapid transit corridor, again, to move people, to protect the environment and encourage development along the corridor. The first leg of the route received funding approval in 2008 and was completed at the end of 2011. The 2010-2014 City Council finalized the second portion of the route, the so-called dogleg route. So, it was clear for everyone where the route would be. And the Council of 2014 to 2018 initiated funding of the route which now sees every citizen in Winnipeg paying for this route. And construction started on the second leg. Much communication to residents who resided along the route and the route was completed in 2020. So, the blue line is a 600 million plus investment for the city of…for the citizens of Winnipeg. Transit corridors all over the world are proven effective means of shifting driving behavior. And I know that may be challenging for many to believe especially in a winter city like Winnipeg. Change does not happen overnight. It takes time, but it absolutely does happen. And we see this as we reflect on what is

happening around the world with established rapid transit corridors. The corridors are a catalyst that creates significant change in a neighborhood…in a city and a neighborhood. They do change the neighborhoods alongside the corridor. They fundamentally change neighborhoods alongside the corridor. The project on Gull and Markham before us is an infill project on a field that's been empty for years, decades. This project is also located directly across the street from a transit station which means people can access buses that run every three to four minutes. I want to thank the residents who came out to speak at the public hearing and they made excellent, valid points. And at the close of the public hearing, the Assiniboia Community Committee did reduce the height of the building from 10 to 8 stories. The committee requested additional traffic studies to provide a baseline for future traffic calming or parking requirements if needed. And the committee also improved the design of one of the portions of the lower buildings. From the record, I want to state that currently there is no mandatory rule, by-law process that states developers have to consult with the area residents. But in Waverley West Ward, I ask every developer to do consultations on any significant development that is occurring and virtually all do. Actually, all of them do. And this also happened for this site. And I also want to state that the Public Service followed every step laid out in the real estate process and in the Winnipeg Charter in listing the land as surplus and in the sale process and notifying residents for the public hearing. Everything was followed to a T. I want to thank the committees that this passed through: the standing policy committee and the Executive Policy Committee who respected the motion that was brought forward by the Assiniboia Community Committee level to reduce the building to 8 stories and not revert back to 10, which every policy that we have did support the building to be 10 stories high. I recognize fully this is not what the residents want to see happen on his site. And that, yes, it will fundamentally change the neighborhood. The route of the $600 million cord is not…corridor is not changing. And more and more change is and will be occurring along the transit corridor. And residents will always be able to come forward to present compromising options. This has been…this project has been and will continue to be a challenge for the neighborhood. Residents do have the opportunity for appealing and I encourage them to do so. I will be supporting the report today. I just wanted to put that on the record, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, very brief. That was a very thorough summary by Councillor Lukes. In my memory, 600 million is often used to describe that transit way. And I voted for it, and I am proud of it. But I mean, it came in at less than that. It came in at 493, 497 I believe because we…you've got to separate out the drainage works and the underpass. Phase…oh, you're adding one and two. Fair enough, then. If we add one and two together, that is probably right. One being the bid that got down to Jubilee. Okay, fair enough. No, I misunderstood. Phase two was sometimes inflated by its critics by including the drainage works and the underpass. But if you put one and two together, that is fair enough.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none. Back to you, Madam Chair.

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

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on Item 9. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Nason recorded in opposition. And it is carried. Item 11.

Item 11 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 1922-1924 St. Mary's Road – DASZ 19/2021

Madam Speaker: Okay, Madam Chair.

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

Madam Speaker: This was stood down…Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a new subdivision and rezoning that is occurring in the ward of St. Norbert…the great ward of St. Norbert-Seine River. I have had the opportunity to work with area residents who are addressing concerns with respect not only to the development that is occurring on the site but also the traffic situation on a stretch of roadway, a corridor, that has seen expansive densification over the last 10 to 15 years. Along that same stretch of road or corridor between Britannica and Warde or Ben Hull Way, we have seen multiple, multiple, multiple apartment and condominiums developed on the west side of St. Mary's Avenue. So, when this plan came to Riel Community Committee, between Councillor Mayes and Councillor Allard, we worked with the delegates that were representing the interest of the community that day and spoke about the traffic concerns which include any resident that is exiting the property on the west side of St. Mary's Road has to travel south, do a U-turn at a median cut to travel northbound. The residents that live on the west side, and I hold myself in that demographic as well, being 55 plus in age, and some are significantly older. So, as they exit their property and want to drive north for appointments or shopping or anything that takes them into the city area, again, they have to drive south, do a U-turn to travel north. We are seeing more and more and more traffic on that stretch of roadway. So, this is one of the major concerns that they had with respect to this development adding more traffic to that area through a 69-unit that would be approximately eight stories high. Sorry, six

stories high. So, we at Riel Community Committee worked with the area residents and made recommendations that went up to the Standing Policy Committee of Property Development and…Property, Planning and Development. It was at the standing policy committee where a lot, if not all of the recommendations that were made by the Riel Community Committee and, of course, the area councillor who has been in consultation with the developer, with the area residents, all of those recommendations seem to have been lost by the wayside, and none of them now address the safety, traffic safety concerns that were brought up by the residents. And that I fundamentally believe are valid concerns that are raised by that community. There is also a walkway that was discussed that we would have the developer put towards adding a lighted pedestrian crossway, recognizing that there is a valuable park amenity that is Henteleff Park that is in the area as well as long as the riverbank that is going to be development through all of this development that is going on along the west side of St. Mary's Road. So, again, I share the concerns of the residents in the area. I share the concerns of the residents on the east side of St. Mary's Road that want to connect and have a safe passage across St. Mary's Road to attend at Henteleff Park. We also have to recognize that later on this month or early into the month of October, St. Mary's Road will be part of the construction site for the interchange at the south end of St. Mary's Road and the south perimeter highway. There is going to be a lot of construction vehicles that will increase the traffic in that area as well. So, with all of the changes that were recommended by the Riel Community Committee that went to the standing policy committee, then to EPC that are now sitting here before us, I am voting not to support the recommendations that were put forward by the standing policy committee and EPC. I want to be recognized in opposition to that because I think we did some great work at the Riel Community Committee to address the concerns of the area residents. The fact that there has to be a crosswalk, a lighted pedestrian crosswalk to allow pedestrians to cross safely from east to west and west to east as well as perhaps looking at speed zone there and perhaps reducing the speed limits that reflects a safer speed limit for the residents and the densification that has occurred on the west side of St. Mary's Road. And then, perhaps looking at the medians that are there and removing them totally so that cars can access a left hand turn safely without having to do a U-turn. So, again, I will be voting in opposition to the recommendations that are here before Council today as in this report. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. There was lots of different discussion at the Planning and Property Development Committee on this property. And when we looked at what we just passed in terms of infill development and where we want to actually see infill projects, this exact property is where we would want to see it. So, the committee felt that, you know, we are pushing for more infill, we are pushing for development along our major corridors and these are the exact sites. If this isn't it, where else would we want to develop something like this? This is on St. Mary's. It's on the river. This is an exact site where we want to see higher density. And that is really how the committee felt we should proceed with this, the majority of the committee members. We are keeping the recommendations of the park that is in there. But it's really the concerning aspect of it was, this is where we want to see density, this is where we want to see higher…higher levels of apartment buildings. And it is on a major corridor along the river and this is what we want to see in our policies where we want to see this happen. And if we aren't going to put it here, where are we going to put it? So, that was the committee's recommendation as we move forward. I am hoping that Council will support that. This is something that we want to push, is to have along our major corridors, high density and this is what this project would deliver. So, we…there was a lot of discussion on this at the Property and Planning level. We worked with the administration on this and really supported the administration's recommendations moving forward. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy, our chair. And with that, I'll call the question on Item 11. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Chambers and Councillor Mayes in opposition. And that is noted, and the item carries. Item 12, Madam Chair…Madam Clerk.

Item 12 - Tax Sale Properties to be Marketed to Affordable Housing Providers – 88/90 Weatherstone Place and 663 Elizabeth Road

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This one here…this is in…within Councillor Allard's ward. And what it is, is just reverting back…there is a motion, I think here, Motion No. 5, Madam Speaker. I don't know if we do that first.

Madam Speaker: We…I don't believe there is an amending…oh, there is…amending Motion 5. Yeah, so following your opening, we will certainly…you can do it at the same time because you're the mover of the amending motion,as well.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Gilroy,
Seconded by Councillor Allard,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 12 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated September 14, 2021 be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendation 1 and replace with the following new recommendations:*

  "1. That the Offers to Purchase City-owned Property Policy, adopted by Council on December 6, 2006, be waived and the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to market 88/90 Weatherstone Place and 663 Elizabeth Road exclusively to affordable housing providers for a minimum of 90 days, and report back to Standing Committee on offers received during the marketing period.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Okay, perfect. Perfect. So, this amending motion, what this is, is this is just reverting back to the same decision that the community committee made and the same decision as Property and Planning and Development. So, it is just reverting back to those same decisions. What had happened at EPC, Councillor Allard moved that we receive information and he didn't coincide with the original agreements…original decisions of the community committee and the…and the decision of the standing policy committee. So, this is reverting back to the same decisions as both those committees. So, hoping that you support the amending motion. I am in support of it. And thank you, Councillor Allard for your work on this. I know that you are trying to make sure that we have affordable housing options in all…in all parts of our city. And I think your amending motion will help us do that today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Madam Chair. Any other speakers on this item? Seeing none, do you wish to close? Or I can call the vote?

Councillor Gilroy: You can call the vote.

Madam Speaker: So, I'll call the question on amending Motion 5. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. And now, Item 12 as amended. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. That concludes this section. Yes, we will move now into by-laws. By-laws…yes?

Councillor Orlikow: Wasn't 13 called down because we had to do a two-thirds vote?

Councillor Nason: No, we decided it didn't.

Madam Speaker: No.

Councillor Orlikow: Right, didn't decide. So, we're good? Sorry, thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: That's right, we're good. Thank you, though. Now we're on to by-laws. Councillor Gilroy.

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

Councillor Gilroy: I would like to move the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 67/2021, By-law No. 68/2021, By-law No. 69/2021, By-law No. 70/2021, By-law No. 77/2021, By-law No. 78/2021, By-law No. 87/2021, By-law No. 88/2021, By-law No. 89/2021 and By-law No. 90/2021.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 67/2021, By-law No. 68/2021, By-law No. 69/2021, By-law No. 70/2021, By-law No. 77/2021, By-law No. 78/2021, By-law No. 87/2021, By-law No. 88/2021, By-law No. 89/2021 and By-law No. 90/2021.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: And I'd like to move that By-law No. 67/2021 to 70/2021, both inclusive, and By-law No. 77/2021, 78/2021 and 87/2021 to 90/2021, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 67/2021 to 70/2021, both inclusive, By-laws No. 77/2021, 78/2021 and 87/2021 to 90/2021, both inclusive.

Councillor Gilroy: And I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 67/2021 to 70/2021, both inclusive, and By-law No. 77/2021, 78/2021 and 87/2021 to 90/2021, both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We will now have question period under this committee. Any questions for our chair, for Councillor Gilroy? Any questions under this committee for Councillor Gilroy? Seeing none, let's move on; the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. There's no report today, but we do have a notice of motion, and is moved by Councillor Rollins and seconded by Councillor Chambers. It's regarding safe zones in front of the health…in front of healthcare facilities.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has seen an influx in protests in front of healthcare facilities in violation of Manitoba's public health orders amid the fourth wave of COVID-19;

AND WHEREAS intimidation, harassment and coercion of patients, family members, healthcare workers and anyone attempting to access these services is an invasion of privacy and distressing;

AND WHEREAS protests outside hospitals cause traffic congestion, block emergency vehicles, and results in the cancellation of appointments, overall putting further strain on the healthcare system;

AND WHEREAS protests outside hospitals are a profound disrespect to healthcare workers who have worked tirelessly over the past 18 months and the family members of over 1000 Manitobans who have died from COVID-19;

AND WHEREAS anti-choice protests outside facilities that offer abortion services have been ongoing prior to COVID-19 and are equally distressing for patients and healthcare workers in these facilities as they are harassed and subject to graphic false anti-abortion imagery;

AND WHEREAS individuals should be able to access healthcare services, whether it be abortion, urgent care, or health screening, free from protesters;

AND WHEREAS City Councillors as municipal leaders have an obligation to protect the health, privacy and safety of all residents they serve and should do all things possible to prevent the intimidation and harassment of healthcare workers, and those attending healthcare facilities;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Executive Policy Committee recommendation to Council:

1. *That City Council enact safe access zones around any clinic, hospital or healthcare facility that prohibits protestors from coming within 150 metres;*

2. *That City Council enact safe access zones around public schools that prevents anti-choice protestors from intimidating and harassing young students with graphic imagery and misinformation;*

3. *That City Council establish safe access zone fines in the 2022 budget for those in violation and ensure enforcement of safe access zones to protect the safety of patients and healthcare workers;*

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

Councillor Rollins: That was a referral to next month's Council.

Madam Speaker: Yes, notice of motion?

Councillor Rollins: Yeah, notice of motion.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Rollins: Yeah.

Madam Speaker: Yes, notice of motion and it will appear on the October Council agenda. Nothing further under this committee. We will move in to question period. Any questions for our chair, for Councillor Rollins? Any questions? Okay, moving on; Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works the report September 15th, 2021.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED SEPTEMBER 15, 2021

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

Madam Speaker: That would be Items 1 through 6. Four has been pulled. I will call the question on 1 through 3, 5 and 6. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 4 – Cost Sharing Agreement with the City of Winnipeg and Red River Cooperative Ltd. for Improvements to the Intersection of Lagimodiere Boulevard and Cottonwood Road

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard to introduce Item 4.

Councillor Allard: Yes, so there is a new Red River Coop being built. It's happening, it's getting built. This is a recommendation from our Public Service to build a lighted intersection along with other improvements to facilitate the traffic flow at that location. The report says that this…this controlled intersection will make the area safer. It is also in line with our Climate Action Plan if you check that part of the report. I would encourage all my colleagues to vote for this. We've already laid it over once. And maybe ask you to visualize what would happen if you had a high traffic, uncontrolled intersection on a high-speed road of 80-kilometers per hour. That is what we are considering today. The other novelty about this traffic control device is that 70% of the cost will be born by the Red River Coop. And only 30% of the cost will be born by the City of Winnipeg. So, that doesn't always happen. In this case it is happening. So, the Red River Coop is paying for most of this upgrade. So, on the climate alignment, which I like to look at, it is a strategic…it's advancing strategic opportunity number three; advancing sustainable transportation, increase active transportation rates. Strategic opportunity number three; advancing sustainable transportation. And 3.5; reduce traffic congestion. So, I wanted to flag all of those things. I think I will perhaps address comments that may come from my colleagues. This is a high traffic road. It is a high-speed road. So, for many, it is commuting corridor for them and having another lighted intersection will result in delays for some. I think in this case given the fact that this Red River Cooperative is going forward, I think the responsible thing to do is to…is to prove the lighted intersection. And in particular, the contribution from the Red River Cooperative towards a majority of its construction costs, I think, should be welcome. And perhaps that is something we might encourage other…other private sector developers to do. This is a good deal for the city. And if we don't approve it, I expect we will have some very, very dangerous situations. So, please…please support this report.

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

Councillor Nason: So, I don't know if anyone's picking up the fact that we're building a gas station, but it aligns with our climate policy. I don't know. The big challenge I have, Madam Speaker, is the process that this was undertaken. It's a broken process. So, they approved the gas station through back channels. That was through the Public Service. It didn't come to community committee, which it's in the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee. It was not approved through there. It was approved through administration. Okay? Then they come forward with this cost sharing agreement. It is a challenge. I understand that there is a safety challenge in that corridor. There's no sidewalks along there, where we're building a set of lights so that people from the neighborhood Windsor Park can get across the street to fill up their cars and get on to Lagimodiere. Great. I understand that there could be some safety concerns. But just south of there, there's another set of lights that's on a bend in an 80-kilometer an hour zone. So, if we are talking about safety, where are we going here? We've got a whole bunch of lights within a very short parameter. We've got the lights at Fermor. We've got the lights that support the entrance into Springs Church. And now we're going to have the entrance into the north part of Springs Church and for the gas station and for the residents of Windsor Park. My opinion, the one in the middle needs to go, but my council colleagues are on IRPW. I apologize, I wasn't able to attend the last meeting because I was dealing with some personal business. I put an offer out after the meeting earlier in the summer and offered to meet with members

of the committee more so an offer to meet with the Public Service to discuss a matter that impacts my ward, that impacts the residents not only in the Transcona Ward, but possibly in the St. Vital Ward as well, coming from Sage Creek North. Councillor Mayes can speak for himself. The challenge I have; moving of goods in that corridor. Where now, again, 80-kilometer an hour route. I've travelled that route. Those lights aren't in sync. You get hit at Fermor, you get to the next set of light, you sit almost every time. So, the process is broken of how these get approved. Great that they want to put 70% towards this. Great. The challenge is that it is a broken process. And we are not looking at the big picture. We are looking at, great, that we're going to be able to enable this gas station to open. That gas station wasn't there. This road has sat there for many decades without a set of lights. I don't know prior to this if the ward councillor for St. Boniface has brought forward motions to put a set of lights in there. I don't know. Maybe he can address that. Oh, well, it is his committee. So, he gets to close. But yeah, safety is a challenge, but I don't think we're improving safety. The fact that it's got…that it aligns with climate, I think it's just…it's smoke and mirrors here. Gas smoke and mirrors. But if we can't lay it over, which doesn't seem that committee members didn't respond to my e-mail, either one, the one I sent earlier today. But I'm going to vote against it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am rising. I have a number of questions about…about this thing. But in speaking to it, I am glad I waited till after hearing Councillor Nason because he raised some of the issues that I was thinking about, Madam Speaker. So, Cottonwood and Lag; sidewalks are an interesting concept all over Windsor Park, in that, you know, really it's not climate friendly because it is not that easily walkable for people so they don't have to pull up their cars and get gas at the Red River Coop. I have nothing against Red River Coop gas station. But Madam Speaker, a 70/30 split in the cost for light standards that apparently our traffic people say are needed in order to make things safe at Lag and Cottonwood. What I…you know, I am aware of other private developments that happened along Kenaston and different places around the city where the actual private company who was establishing a place that required because of traffic flow and issues like that, that required traffic signals as well as accessible traffic signals and accessibility of that intersection, Madam Speaker. Those private companies paid 100%, 100% of the cost for signalizing the intersection. So, I don't know that 70/30 sounds like all that good of a deal in this circumstance. I know they are only going to be located at one quarter…corner. But…and then I have to also ask myself the question; in my ward, I have some private businesses. Actually, they sell motor vehicles. And they are not necessarily climate friendly until they start selling all electron…electric vehicles, Madam Speaker. But my colleagues are aware of the car dealership at Templeton and Main. And Templeton and Main requires…needs now, has needed for many, many years, traffic signals. And their rationalization…and even Winnipeg Transit wanted traffic signals at Templeton and Main Street. Why? Because their buses can't turn there in a…they have to sit there and wait forever. It throws the schedule off and all that kind of stuff and it is dangerous. The rationale from our experts about that is, Madam Speaker, is that it's too close to put in signals…traffic signals because of the traffic signals at the Kildonan Park which is, I don't know, about a…it's a fair distance, I'd imagine. So, now I'm hearing that there are a set of traffic lights to get into the Springs Church out there. How far is that I would ask? You know what, I am not going to vote for this report because what is the distance from Cottonwood to that entrance? I don't know. But it seems to me, it's probably not that far or probably the same as Templeton. So, why are you putting in traffic signals? Like, apparently, that is a problem. You don't want to locate traffic signals too close together at intersections. So, anyway, I don't see how I can support this report. So, I will be voting against it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on this item? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be very brief. This is just an indication of where it's very possible for there to be disagreement amongst Council, including with the good works that the administration does. This happens…I will be voting for this in this case. But just bear in mind, this is just an expression of the ambiguity that can be created when administration makes a decision and councillors don't necessarily agree. I completely understand where the councillors that are in opposition are coming from. And you know, had this worked out a different way through the mechanism, through the administration's recommendation to a standing committee, maybe things would have been different. But in the end, somehow, I think that this traffic light was inevitable, maybe it's just happening a little earlier than one would have thought.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will note the irony that we are talking about enhanced climate in the context of a traffic signal which was prompted by the creation of a gas station. So, there is an irony there. However, we are not considering the construction of a gas station today, we are considering the construction of traffic signals and other improvements. So, if you look at the big picture, I would agree with Councillor Nason. Perhaps not if you looked at the entire area and what was going on there, perhaps not the right direction in terms of climate when you're talking about gas stations. However, that is not what we are debating today. We are debating the installation or not of a traffic signal. And so, I would ask my colleagues to…well, to think of…to think of the potential of collisions, death and…and hurt that could

arise out of not approving this controlled intersection. It is…it's been analyzed by our Public Service. It's been analyzed by a third-party consultant. If you read the report, it is clear that this is going to be a net benefit for traffic safety. And if you vote against the report, then you are endorsing a direction which will make our streets less safe on a high-speed road. So, thank you for your consideration.

Madam Speaker: Just want be to remind everyone, we did talk about impugning motive just recently at…in this council Chamber. So, let's keep that in mind when we put remarks on the record. With that, councillor…sure.

Councillor Allard: Thank you very much. I had the opportunity to read the section around impugning motive in terms of our Council By-law. And I don't believe that any of my comments impugned anyone's motive. I am contrasting two positions. I am not…I am not guessing about why people are voting the way that they are. I am setting out two scenarios. You can pick one or you can pick the other. I am in no way impugning the motives of anyone or am I judging the characters of the people who are voting one way or the other. I am speaking explicitly to the issue. And I know, ultimately, it is a…it's a decision of Council to decide if I am impugning people's motives or not, but I think from a letter of the by-law perspective, I have not impugned anyone's motives, so.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. I think you have had conversations with our Clerk and myself. And we can continue those conversations offline. With that, I'm going to call the question on this item. All in favour? Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

Clerk: Councillors Santos, Allard, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes…oh, I'm sorry, did I say Eadie? Oh, I'm so sorry. Okay, not Councillor Eadie. Do you want me to just restart?

Madam Speaker: Let's restart, Madam Clerk. Go ahead.

Clerk: I'm sorry.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Klein, and Nason

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

Madam Speaker: And Item 4 passes. We'll now move on to motions. We have Motion 6; moved by Councillor Allard. We'll do by-laws after this, yes. Okay, so on to the motions. If I could get everyone's attention, please. Motion No. 6; moved by Councillor Allard and seconded by Councillor Gillingham, it's regarding the zipper merge. This is an automatic referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. We have Motion 7; moved by Councillor Mayes and seconded by Councillor Nason regarding Transit Plus. This is a notice of motion and it will appear on our October Council agenda. We have three motions: Motion 9, 10 and 11. Yes?

Councillor Nason: Motion 11 does not appear to be in order as it's not type set as the…to the seconder.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, okay. We're going to deal with Motion 9 and 10 first. Motion 9 and 10 is moved by Councillor Allard and seconded by Councillor Gilroy, regarding climate action plans, 9 and 10 are both automatic referrals to the standing policy committee. Motion 11, Mr. Clerk, we have not noted in type set the name of the seconder, never encountered this before.

City Clerk: I can…I can confirm that is an error on behalf of the Clerks and confirm that it is Councillor Gilroy's signature on the motion.

Madam Speaker: Yeah.

City Clerk: And it identifies Councillor Gilroy as the seconder.

Madam Speaker: It is her signature on the motion. I think I would let it stand. Okay, I would let it stand. So, Motion 11 is moved by Councillor Allard, seconded by Councillor Gilroy and it's an automatic referral to the standing policy committee. And the topic is climate plans. Next is Motion 12; moved by Councillor Santos and seconded by Councillor Eadie regarding low-income bus passes. And it is an automatic referral to the standing committee. Motion 15 is moved by Councillor Browaty and seconded by Councillor Rollins and it's regarding signs for bridges and…bridges and rivers I believe. And it is an automatic referral to the standing committee. That concludes our…our motions. Now on to by-laws, Councillor Allard.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS MOTIONS

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Allard,
Seconded by Councillor Gillingham,

WHEREAS many Canadian cities observe the zipper merge which reduces traffic lineups and improves vehicular movement where there is high traffic volumes and low speeds due to congestion;

AND WHEREAS the zipper merge manoeuvre is not observed by most Winnipeggers;

AND WHEREAS if there were more participation by motorists, vehicular movement during construction would improve at little cost to the city, if zipper merge signage was placed at the lane closure;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to update the Manual of Temporary Traffic Control on City Streets for 2022, to include zipper merge signage encouraging motorists to merge at the point where a lane closes due to construction.*

2. *That if the zipper merge signage requires approval by the Province of Manitoba, the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to undertake the following in time for the 2022 construction season, and report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works in March, 2022:*

    A. *Submit a request for approval to the Province to accommodate the usage of zipper merge signage;*

    B. *Submit a request to the Province for the authorization to conduct a pilot project for the usage of zipper merge signage, if it is evident the signage will not be approved in time for the 2022 construction season.*

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

WHEREAS the cost per ride for Winnipeg Transit Plus service has increased by 22% in the period from 2015 to 2019 (City of Winnipeg Budget Volume 1);

AND WHEREAS City Councillors have received numerous complaints about the level of service offered by current Transit Plus providers;

AND WHEREAS 100% of Transit Plus services are contracted out but the City had a period of transition between 1996 to 1997 in which the service was provided by public/private service providers for Transit Plus (with public providers covering 30% of total annual service hours);

AND WHEREAS the Winnipeg Public Service has indicated that a two-year preparation period is needed in order to bring a portion of the Transit Plus services in house;

AND WHEREAS service contracts for Transit Plus are awarded in periods usually covering 7 to 8% of total annual service hours at a time;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to implement a service model in which 22 to 30% of all Winnipeg Transit Plus total annual service hours are provided by in-house service providers as of January 1, 2024.

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

WHEREAS winning the fight against climate change is vital to the survival of future generations, and the City has committed to a Winnipeg Climate Action Plan;

AND WHEREAS the climate action committee had previously recommended to the Mayor that the Office of Sustainability report through the Chief Administrative Office because of the importance of the role, and the cross departmental aspect of community greenhouse and corporate gas emissions;

AND WHEREAS mode shift is a major component of the climate action plan, which aims to shift the mode of transportation within the City to 50% by 2030;

AND WHEREAS despite being the policy of Council to build active transportation during road renewals in a line with the City's pedestrian and cycling strategies using road renewal dollars, there have been many cases in which this policy has not been achieved;

AND WHEREAS the outcome of this practice is that road renewals dollars that would normally have been assigned to active transportation are not spent on active transportation and less active transportation facilities are built than could have been with road renewal dollars;

AND WHEREAS greenhouse gases from private vehicle travel currently accounts for approximately 50% of community emissions;

AND WHEREAS the construction of active transportation amenities is one of the best ways to encourage mode shift in citizens and reduce the dependence on the automobiles, which in turn contributes to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in line with the Climate Action Plan which aims to achieve mode shift of 50% by 2030;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that new active transportation funding equal to 10% of the projected total road construction budget be referred to the 2022 Budget Review Process and the six-year capital forecast.

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

WHEREAS winning the fight against climate change is vital to the survival of future generations, and the City has committed to a Winnipeg Climate Action Plan;

AND WHEREAS the climate action committee had previously recommended to the Mayor that the Office of Sustainability report through the Chief Administrative Office because of the importance of the role, and the cross departmental aspect of community greenhouse and corporate gas emissions;

AND WHEREAS mode shift is a major component of the climate action plan, which aims to shift the mode of transportation within the City to 50% by 2030;

AND WHEREAS despite being the policy of Council to build active transportation during road renewals in a line with the City's pedestrian and cycling strategies using road renewal dollars, there have been many cases in which this policy has not been achieved;

AND WHEREAS the outcome of this practice is that road renewals dollars that would normally have been assigned to active transportation are not spent on active transportation and less active transportation facilities are built than could have been with road renewal dollars;

AND WHEREAS green house gases from private vehicle travel currently accounts for approximately 50% of community emissions;

AND WHEREAS the construction of active transportation amenities is one of the best ways to encourage mode shift in citizens and reduce the dependence on the automobiles, which in turn contributes to the reduction of green house gas emissions in line with the Climate Action Plan which aims to achieve mode shift of 50% by 2030;

THERFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT criteria be added to the road renewal budget to include active transportation projects as part of road renewals in order to provide a new funding source, where appropriate.

Motion No. 11
Moved by Councillor Allard,
Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,

WHEREAS winning the fight against climate change is vital to the survival of future generations, and the City has committed to a Winnipeg Climate Action Plan;

AND WHEREAS the climate action committee had previously recommended to the Mayor that the Office of Sustainability report through the Chief Administrative Office because of the importance of the role, and the cross departmental aspect of community greenhouse and corporate gas emissions;

AND WHEREAS mode shift is a major component of the climate action plan, which aims to shift the mode of transportation within the City to 50% by 2030;

AND WHEREAS despite being the policy of Council to build active transportation during road renewals in a line with the City's pedestrian and cycling strategies using road renewal dollars, there have been many cases in which this policy has not been achieved;

AND WHEREAS the outcome of this practice is that road renewals dollars that would normally have been assigned to active transportation are not spent on active transportation and less active transportation facilities are built than could have been with road renewal dollars;

AND WHEREAS green house gases from private vehicle travel currently accounts for approximately 50% of community emissions;

AND WHEREAS the construction of active transportation amenities is one of the best ways to encourage mode shift in citizens and reduce the dependence on the automobiles, which in turn contributes to the reduction of green house gas emissions in line with the Climate Action Plan which aims to achieve mode shift of 50% by 2030;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Transportation Master Plan be updated to include a plan to achieve 50% mode shift by 2030 as approved in the Winnipeg Climate Action Plan, and include a comparison between the climate impact of induced demand for transit and active transportation relative to community and corporate greenhouse gas emissions.

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

WHEREAS Winnipeg Transit's low income bus pass policy qualifies new immigrants for a pass by utilizing an agency/organization who work with immigrants trying to get established in Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS many people living in poverty do not necessarily file income taxes especially when they are young adults or older teenagers;

AND WHEREAS people without homes often couch surf and use relatives' addresses to establish themselves in Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the policy idea that someone living in poverty outside of Winnipeg would want to fake an address in the city to allow themselves to buy a low income bus pass they can barely afford is ridiculous;

AND WHEREAS there are many not for profit organizations working with people living in poverty trying to assist those who are trying to get established and become employed to alleviate the poverty such as the North End Community Renewal Corporation, St. Boniface Street Links, women centres, and Main Street Project;

AND WHEREAS many First Nations entities assist persons who are indigenous get established in Winnipeg's urban environment so they can avoid living in poverty and live in safe homes;

AND WHEREAS all these reliable agencies/organizations can lift the administrative burden off of Winnipeg Transit by vouching that the persons they are working with are living in poverty;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Winnipeg Transit change the low income bus pass policy to allow not for profit agencies/organizations to qualify people living in poverty for a low income bus pass purchase in the same fashion as agencies working with immigrants.

Motion No. 15
Moved by Councillor Browaty,
Seconded by Councillor Rollins,

WHEREAS the original establishment of the City of Winnipeg is closely connected to its location at the confluence of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers;

AND WHEREAS our rivers continue to be an important place for recreation and leisure of both citizens and visitors;

AND WHEREAS bridge crossings are one of the few key locations for orientation to our street network, neighbourhoods and landmarks;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works consider the addition of signage on bridges with bridge names visible from the two main rivers in our city.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 83/2021, By-law 84/2021, By-law 85/2021 and By-law 86/2021. Or do I need that…do I need to read the entire text? It was good?

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Nason recorded in opposition to 85, correct?

Councillor Nason: Correct.

Madam Speaker: Okay, and the rest carries.

Clerk: By-laws No. 83/2021, 84/2021, 85/2021 and 86/2021

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I move that By-laws No. 83/2021 to 86/2021, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 83/2021 to 86/2021, both inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I move that the rules be suspended…sorry, I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 83/2021 to 86/2021, both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Nason's noted in opposition to 85. And that's noted. Carried. We'll now have question period under this committee. Question for Councillor Allard. Councillor Chambers.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair, through you to the… Sorry, thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you to the Chair of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. This year, 2021, the summer of 2021, throughout the City of Winnipeg there's been quite a lot of construction projects that are underway. There's a significant amount in my ward, which I've noted, and area residents have contacted me with respect to the duration of some of these projects. Of course, I do receive notification in advance of when these construction projects are going to commence with a duration date that will affect traffic into the area. I note that at one point there was a working group that was put together to look at construction projects within the City of Winnipeg, road construction projects within the City of Winnipeg. I'm wondering if the Chair can report on that working group, and the recommendations that were made to address the duration of some of our construction projects, and whether there are any efficiencies that could be utilized to shorten the duration of some of these projects and getting our city moving in a more efficient matter during the Summer months.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, thanks for the question, and thanks for the advance notice for the question. So, the Mayor had appointed me and several others to the Road Construction Working Group, had several recommendations. We approved the recommendations of the Road Construction Working Group as a Council. They are recommendations that are implemented or they are underway. In one of the recommendations was the creation of a…basically a follow-up task force, which would be a… if we were to follow the same model, it would be a consideration for the Mayor. But the work of the task force is done and is now with the Public Service, in terms of implementation. So, thanks for the question, and I hope that answers what you're…what you are looking for.

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

Councillor Chambers: Yeah, follow up question, and you know, you can report on this later on, and gather the information, but this came to mind. Can you provide a response in terms of the construction projects that are currently underway at what percentage completion they're at, and whether they're expected to be completed before the end of the construction season, assumably within a month, a month and a half from now?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, thanks for the…thanks for the question. I do not have that information at my fingertips. I'll follow up with the Public Service and I'll ask for that information. I will say, however, that I think this year we spent a record number, more than any other time, in the history of this council on road renewal, and I think I felt for the first time, well for the first time, I think I felt in a bigger way, feedback from the public about how much traffic or how much the construction impacted their daily commute, and I think our Public Service did a good job in staging the construction. But, as we…as we fix more roads, it means more construction projects, and even if they're stage 100% well, I don't know if I should keep going, there's still going to be impacts on road construction. And on that, thanks to Councillor Scott Gillingham for supporting the motion on the zipper merge. I think if we do adopt that policy will alleviate some of that…some of that congestion that's due to construction. So, thanks for the question, I'll get…I'll ask the Public Service to follow up on what the status is, but if you're looking for a general idea of how many roads we are fixing, it's lots more than ever and this council is hitting records on that. So, thanks for the question.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We know schools have gone back…some schools have gone back to in-person classes. I'm wondering if the Chair might be able to inform Council as to how many U-Passes have been sold since universities and post-secondary return.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, I'm reminded that question period here appears to be like a literal question period. I'm happy to follow up with the Public Service. I do not have that data at my disposal. I would consider that question to be more of an administrative nature, but I'm happy to follow up on Councillor Nason's behalf.

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

Councillor Nason: Yeah, Madam Speaker, that I know the Mayor has indicated that the Chair of IRPW's the know all, that the go-to for all these questions. So, the next question is, on the same vein, I'm wondering if he would happen to know, and I know this is personal to him, and a very important matter, but the number of low-income passes sold.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you for that. I did have an update when the question was last asked, and I'm happy to follow up on my colleague's behalf to the CAO line, with a cc to the Director's Office, and I'm sure we'll be able to get that information.

Madam Speaker: That concludes our question period under this committee. Seeing no other questions, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance dated September 17th, 2021. There's one item. Councillor Gillingham, our chair.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
DATED SEPTEMBER 17, 2021

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and, actually, pull the item to make a couple comments on it, please.

Madam Speaker: Okay, great. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Financial Status and Forecast Report to June 30, 2021

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be brief on this. Everyone, I think, has had a chance to review and see this second quarter financial status and forecast report that is before us projecting a total year end deficit of $14.3 million for the tax supported budget. And a further $12.4 million deficit for Transit. I think by now, everybody understands the primary reasons why and it's the…really, it's the impact that COVID-19 continues to have on us. I also wanted to note that it is not a regular occurrence that the quarterly reports come to Council. But annually, we do have the second quarter report come to Council because of recommendation number two that just says that in the event that general revenue fund reports a deficit at year end, the financial stabilization reserve transfer to the general revenue fund, the amount required to avoid a deficit in the general revenue fund because, of course, we need to start and end the year in balance as per provincial requirements. I do want to just take a moment too, to highlight that our city economists are working right now to update their economic projections which, obviously, have an impact on our city's finances. And some of you may have seen that just today, Stats Canada just released the Canada's population estimates and age and sex, July 1st, 2021. I want to highlight one thing because it does impact future reports. And it certainly will be incorporated, I believe, in our economists upcoming report which will come…become public, I think. It's just being finalized now and will be reported on in October. But just…I just want be to read a line from this Stats Canada report that came out today. "Canada's population growth has slowed following border restrictions to curb the spread of COVID-19. The pace of growth from June 20th to July 21st was the slowest population growth since 1915, 1916." So, that is the impact that it's…the pandemic is having on our nation. Of course, all of us around this chamber know that immigration is key to Winnipeg's growth and Manitoba's growth. And so, I know our economists are taking this reality into account. It will impact future budget preparations as well. And so, just to kind of signal that, that that…we should be mindful that that information will be coming forward and impact our future projections as well. And so, I will leave it at that. And just call for the question unless someone has questions or comments.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Any further speakers? Seeing none, I can call the question. All in favour of Item 1? Contrary? That is carried. Any questions for our chair, for Councillor Gillingham? Any questions for Councillor Gillingham? Seeing none, would our very graceful Councillor Gillingham move adjournment?

Councillor Gillingham: So moved.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Very graceful. Roll call, Madam Clerk.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 4:23 p.m.