COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, October 28, 2021

The Council met at 9:42 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 Nason.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, over to you for morning announcements.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And good morning to my colleagues and all those in the gallery and following online. I'll be…I'll be relatively brief. I want to just continue to commend Winnipeggers for doing their part to combat COVID-19. We are not through this pandemic yet as we've seen over the last month a number of our residents in hospital and in our ICUs. Again, our appreciation and thanks to those working in our ICUs continue. One of the ways in which we can support their efforts is to go get vaccinated, Madam Speaker. And I want to thank all of those Winnipeggers. From provincial reports, we understand that Winnipeg's vaccination rates are at 89%. And I want to thank all those Winnipeggers for doing their part to support the health of our community and local businesses, and of course, our healthcare heroes. Manitoba's test positivity rate as of yesterday was 4.2%. We're a little bit lower in the City of Winnipeg at 1.7%. But the risk is still there and we still need to continue to be vigilant. And so, I would just ask all of us, let's continue to be vigilant. Let's continue to support our healthcare heroes, those that are battling COVID right now and, of course, those that haven't yet had the ability to go get vaccinated. And I am speaking of many of our children, some of us are parents with kids under the age 12 and the eligibility right now. Let's do what we can to help ensure that they're as safe as possible. Madam Speaker, over the last month, I had the opportunity with our Deputy Mayor to take part in the Royal Canadian Navy's Canadian Leaders at Sea Program. This was…this was conducted out in Vancouver and Victoria. I want to thank all those members of the Royal Canadian Navy for their ongoing efforts and appreciate their invitation to join them on the HMCS Harry DeWolf. I also want to just recognize over the last month, October 6th, we marked the 50th Anniversary of the election of the First Council of Unicity. And this was a…it's quite a historic moment to kind of take pause and appreciate the city that has come together and all that we've been able to do over the last 50 years. The future is bright for our city. And just wanted to mark that occasion. I had the opportunity to travel to Ottawa. First meeting of the Big City Mayor's Caucus in about two years. And it was good to meet with the Prime Minister, Minister LeBlanc and my colleagues, some of whom are…have since concluded their roles as mayors. And I am speaking specifically in western Canada, at least, Mayor Nenshi and Mayor Iveson being Calgary and Edmonton, respectfully. I want to thank them for all of their work, their friendship and their collaboration. They've been strong leaders for their community and I know they'll go on to do great things for Canada in the future. And I want to welcome Mayor Gondek and Mayor Sohi to the roles. I'm looking forward to working with them in their new capacities as the mayors of Calgary and Edmonton. The Jets home opener was on October 14th. It was great to be in…I was fortunate enough to be there. I think Councillor Browaty was as well. And obviously, want to wish them all the very best this season. And I want to recognize our Blue Bombers punched their ticket to the playoffs. The next day, clinched the first in the west a week later. It's the first time Winnipeg will be the site of a western division final since 1972. And an east final was held in 2011, but this is really amazing. So, congratulations to our Blue Bombers. I also want to just mention the passing of a community leader, Kai Madsen. He was a remarkable Winnipegger who cared deeply for our community, was really the heart and soul of the Christmas Cheer Board. His…you know, after decades of work…tireless work that he undertook in our community, I just want to say, his legacy of cheer will live on in our community. And I would encourage all Winnipeggers to continue to support the Cheer Board…the Cheer Board and all the families that benefit from Winnipeggers' generosity. And last but not least, I just want to remind everybody, we've got Halloween on Sunday. I want to just urge Winnipeggers to be mindful of the ghosts and goblins that will be going out trick-or-treating. And also, just ask everybody to be vigilant in terms of COVID in your Halloween celebrations. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, I want to thank Councillor Nason, through you, for his opening reflections on Flanders Field. It's a good segue for my comments today. And Madam Speaker, the men and women of the Canadian Armed Forces, both regular force or reservists, have a long history of defending the values of democracy, maintaining peace and helping others around the world. And every year, the week of November the 5th to the 11th, the week leading up to Remembrance Day is Veterans Week. Each year, Veterans Affairs Canada releases a carefully designed poster to mark Veterans Week. This year's poster has been put on display in the Council Building and in the Susan A. Thompson Building as well. The theme for 2021 Veterans Week is service, courage and sacrifice at home, around the world and across a generation…the generations, pardon me. The poster this year reflects several milestones that illustrate this proud legacy of service for the men and women of our Canadian Armed Forces. There is a picture of a Canadian solider during a recognizance patrol in Afghanistan Kandahar province. A picture of a peacekeeper on patrol in Egypt's Sinai Peninsula. A Canadian soldier carrying a sandbag to help rise…fight rising floodwaters and we have experienced the Canadian Armed Forces assistance here in our own province and city, certainly, in 1997 and the flood of 2011 as well. There's an image of a princess…Patricia's Canadian light infantry soldier helping a wounded comrade get into aid station near Kapyong Valley. This year marks the 70th anniversary of the Korean War battle of Kapyong in 1951. For those that have not had yet taken the opportunity to visit the Kapyong Park on Ness in St. James to learn more about the heroic sacrifice of our soldiers, I encourage you to do so. There is an image of a Canadian aviator at an airbase in Qatar during the Gulf War. And of a Canadian signaler using a spotting scope in the hills of Hong Kong in World War II. And finally, there's a pair of Canadian soldiers training near the Somme Valley in France during the First World War. As they were last year, Remembrance Day services may be scaled back this year to meet provincial health restriction rules. But I encourage all of us and all Winnipeggers to please find the time to mark in a meaningful way Veterans Week and also Remembrance Day as well. As Councillor Nason already indicated, we will remember them. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Chambers, your morning announcement, please.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. October is Breast Cancer Awareness Month. It's an annual campaign to raise awareness about the impact of breast cancer. The reason why I rise today is to heighten the awareness as a result of a personal loss recently experienced. My wife and I suffered the loss of her lifelong best friend of 50 years on September 25th. Michelle was a tender heart. Was a compassionate Winnipegger. Stopping her car to help those she saw on the street in distress. While I don't stand today to eulogize her this morning, I will say, she fought very courageously till the very end. It is noted that one in eight women will expect to be diagnosed with breast cancer in her lifetime. The number may be startling, but the good news is that more and more Canadians are being diagnosed with breast cancer are receiving a better prognosis. In Canada, breast cancer death rates peaked in 1986 and have since dropped by an estimated 48%. This is through increased awareness surrounding the importance of testing and better screening practices. More Canadians with breast cancer are being diagnosed earlier and often before any symptoms develop. This means the chances of successful treatment are better. Progress in cancer research has also helped to improve treatment and management options for those individuals suffering with breast cancer. Throughout this pandemic, we must remember the many illnesses that still exist outside of COVID. We help others who are ill by getting vaccinated and lessening the impact to front line healthcare. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. And our final announcement, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just, the Mayor talked about the 1972 western final. I remember listening to that game on the radio with my dad. And Councillor Gillingham's wife would want us to point out, the Rough Riders actually won that game on the last play of the day with four kicks in and out of the endzone. So, hopefully history will not repeat itself in this final. I will keep my tone a bit light in that I don't want to become emotional. But I wanted to talk about former Councillor Doreen Demaré who I always referred to as Mrs. Demaré. So, I'm just going to keep doing that today. Who…Mrs. Demaré passed away earlier this month. Was a great St. Vitaler. Was…served two terms in Council and interestingly, changed wards and still got acclaimed. And that is not easy. Councillor Lukes is the only one in recent memory who's been acclaimed around here and to change wards and do it, not easy. And so, yes, Mrs…I'm coming to that, but Mrs. Demaré would have liked that. I don't have a recitation of what she accomplished because it never occurred to me, this is someone who was so full of life, I would have thought, well, I'll be long out of this job before we have to worry about that. But I do know, if you go in to the Louis Riel Library, there is a great plaque there that lists the councillors of the day in the late 1980s. It was a period of great growth in St. Vital and she was part of that with a strong group of other councillors. I had the…I had the privilege of naming a park for Doreen Demaré and Doreen Dodick won the first NDP MLA out of the St. Vital area. Won the city councillor, Doreen Demaré. And we were…we had the sitting premier, we had Greg Selinger come to that, partly I think, for Doreen Dodick, but also because he had a very good run on Winnipeg's City Council with Mrs. Demaré and she always spoke well of him. She was certainly a partisan conservative. I have a story about what happened when I asked her to take a yard sign that I won't repeat here. I repeated it to the Mayor yesterday, but if you are interested, someone come talk to me about that. But Premier Selinger, sitting NDP premier, came to that and spoke very well and talked about how they had sat on the community committee with some big personalities like Al Golden and Peter Kaufmann. And you know, there obviously have been some tumultuous times. And I think there was a

lot of respect there between the premier and Mrs. Demaré. She then spoke, I then get up to spoke. And she spoke so well, I did…I said…I opened with, you can confirm you're retired, right? Because it was this great speech that she gave about the City of Winnipeg and politics. So, she was a very strong character. She surrounded herself with…her life had other strong women; her daughters and Ramona and Renee, her daughter-in-law, Allison Hawkins who's a pretty strong individual herself. She surrounded herself with strong women. She also did not put her children off political life, which is quite a skill in itself. I had the great pleasure of serving on Brandon's school board with Ramona Coey who is daughter of Mrs. Demaré. And I got to know several of her grandchildren because they were wonderful kids. Four of them ended up babysitting my sons over time from three different branches, a lot of different cousins. So, I certainly had connections, as did my wife with the Demaré family. So, she was really a fine St. Vitaler. The last time I remember seeing here, she was out square dancing at one of these events one goes to as a politician and you know you're going to have to do the square dancing even though you don't know what you are doing. But she was helping me out and she was clearly having a great time. Age 80 at the time. So, a life very well lived. And I will miss her and I think St. Vitalers will miss her. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. And to that end, we do have a condolence motion for former Councillor Doreen Demaré. And it's moved by Councillor Allard…Councillor Mayes, pardon me, and seconded by Councillor Allard. Mr. Clerk, would you read that into the record, please?

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Allard,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of former Councillor Doreen Demaré, which occurred on October 12, 2021.

Ms. Demaré served as Councillor, Seine Valley Ward from 1986 to 1989 and Riel House Ward from 1989 to 1992.

This Council extends to her family, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Madam Speaker: Please rise for a moment of silence.

MINUTES

Councillor Mayes moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on September 29th, 2021, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: We'll now move in to delegations. First up is David Grant who is joining us virtually. He is in support…he's speaking on many items. In support of Item 1 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 20th, 2021 regarding Council Policy on Conducting Plebiscites. He is in support of Item 3 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 20th, 2021 regarding Welcoming Winnipeg – Creating a New Historical Marker: Lawson Ogg in the St. Vital Ward. In opposition to Item 5 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 20th, 2021 regarding River Trail 2021 Grant, Alternative Proposal. He is in opposition to Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks dated October 6th, 2021 and it's regarding the Winnipeg Police Service – 2020 Statement of Revenues and Expenses. He is in opposition to Item 9 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated October 12th, 2021. It's regarding Updating the Transportation Master Plan to Achieve 50% Mode Shift. Mr. Grant, welcome. We have the time on the clock for you.

David Grant: Thank you. Thank you very much. I guess I'll start right in. On the matter of plebiscites; I am in favour of the Council policy on plebiscites. On the other hand, I believe you should go further, but this is a start. Even though we voters are just lowly plebs, which is the root word of plebiscite, asking for our approval is part of good governing. To not ask is to risk blunders, which anger voters, no one wants that. Ironic that people think Canada is a democracy. It was until last year a constitutional monarchy. Periodically voting for those who will rule over us is just a quaint artifact from our history a

thousand years ago. In the republic south of us, public funding of major expenditures tends to require the approval of voter…votes by the people. As you know, politicians here often spend tax dollars on things which benefit only a few persons and tend to do so without asking voters. On EPC No. 3 – the historical marker for our local hero. Nobody should be proud of a council which names streets and so on after its own members. The phrase self-serving comes to mind. On the other hand, naming after local heroes and I guess we could throw corporate interests in there, too, because most of the public and semipublic buildings in the city are named after a corporate interest. But naming after local heroes is something, I think, everyone should support. And certainly, the story of Lawson Ogg and the flood of 1950, that's something that we should not be forgetting. And on the topic of the river trail, which listed as EPC No. 5; more than 60 years ago I built my first kayak. At the end of my block was a great launch point. That's part of the reason I built it was because I could just carry it down and plunk it in the river. I still have canoes which I love to use. In Winnipeg, I would suggest there are not enough places to launch such small watercraft. The City Parks folks should make sure there are places across the city where folks can carry their small boats, launch them or park and launch. These decisions should be part of a proper plan. I don't believe in the, we have money left over, where can we spend it, idea. I've never been a fan of the waste that sometimes happens with this rapid spending. Diversion of funding like this is a symptom of procedural dysfunction at city hall, but I do welcome an extra place to launch even though it's not close to my home. I think that's something we should support. That is to say, it should be part of a parks plan. On Protection Committee Item No. 1 – the police statement of income, et cetera. I was not the first person to complain that the City Council has been forcing our fine police service to operate under a massive conflict of interest. Recall that the WPS officers involved, it was a force then, not a service, were against photo enforcement in the years preceding your first PE contract. Around the world, police services have moved to more honest operations. Those services have been able to see the basic flaw in the business model being forced on Winnipeg by the for-profit PE companies. The public can see how wrong it is for the guy deciding to ticket or not ticket to know that his pay depends on that ticket income. It is time for Council to be fair to the WPS, fund police operations from tax revenue. Any PE income should go into City coffers. Not bringing in enough PE revenue is a constant worry for those running the service.

Madam Speaker: If we could just pause for a moment, Mr. Grant. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: I would stand on this, Madam Speaker, for any organization that was being accused of a conflict of interest. It is fundamentally different to accuse one of a conflict of interest or an organization and their members of a conflict of interest, Madam Speaker, in my opinion, than it is to state a political opinion of economics. And so, I am just standing in defense of Winnipeg Police Service members who individually and collectively, I don't believe in this chamber, should be accused of conflict of interest when this chamber, councillors like me, vote on police budgets and should have been made to defend them. Madam Speaker, that's my thoughts.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Mr. Grant, you have a few minutes left on the clock. If you could wrap up your presentation, please.

David Grant: How many?

Madam Speaker: Five, six minutes.

David Grant: Thank you. I don't want to waste my time discussing when you make someone's paycheck depend on them taking action. There are a lot of people who would say that if that was anyone else in the city, they would call that a conflict. And there are certainly people who work diligently for the service who feel that way, too. And that is why I am asking the City to…the City Council to no longer set things up that way. Anyway, so that was a bit disrupting, Sherri. Anyway, services elsewhere...

Madam Speaker: Mr. Grant, your comments shall be directed through the Chair and not to any…directly to any member of Council. I think you know our procedures here. You have presented many times in the past. So, please bring your comments through the Chair. That would be myself.

David Grant: Devi, were the comments by Sherri, did they follow the procedure that she asked for…

Madam Speaker: Mr. Grant, if you could continue with your presentation. We can have those discussions offline. We have a long agenda here. Please wrap up your presentation.

David Grant: Anyway, I believe it is time for Council to be fair to the WPS, fund police operations entirely from tax revenue as was done for many decades before. Any PE income should go into City coffers. Not bringing in enough photo enforcement revenue is a constant worry for those running the service. Sometimes people who are new to the Police Board worry about this. Certainly, the service employees do. Please remove this worry from those good people by removing this conflict of interest. And I will stand by those terms. IRPW No. 9 – the 50% shift away from cars towards

bicycles, et cetera. This is silly. Setting this as a goal is to deny reality. Winnipeggers like their cars. I have been riding longer than just about everyone in Winnipeg. I have commuted on my bicycle across cities across Canada and the US. Winnipeg is unique in throwing too much money at bike routes as they call them. If there is a secondary street that will get you there, no bike needs its own lane on an arterial street. Bikes need accommodation on our bridges, but not our major roads. I rode down Second or Third in Kitsilano because Fourth was far too busy and dangerous. In Toronto and other Ontario cities, I use these quieter streets. Until you protect bikes from cars with steel or concrete, as is done in a number of California cities that I've ridden in, you should not put them at risk like you do on Pembina. Don't waste your time and our money on more bike lanes in the gutter where nails and broken glass accumulate. There are more…these are more dangerous than simply riding on a less busy side street. Henderson, which may be getting the gutter bike lanes, and many other busy streets are parallel, safer routes for bicycles. Until you can assure me that my bike can be carried on my bike…on my bus, do not expect to get the 50% bike-bus level. Most riders do not want a 10-mile ride to work. Shorter trips are fine, but mixed mode is popular outside of Manitoba. I believe you should spend your money on making sure we all have bike racks on our buses. Note that the racks on Edmonton buses fold down so they are always there if they're needed. Winnipeg, the only real way to get on the bus that has a rack and that really stands strongly in the way of anybody riding to their bus and expecting to ride on after they get off the bus. That is something you are missing the boat on and yet, still, you are blocking off lanes for bicycle exclusive use. Anyway, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, David Grant. Seeing no questions, we will move on to the next presentation which is Kelly Ryback. I believe he is here in person. If you could please come down. Mr. Ryback is appearing on many items: Item 12; he's in support of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 20th, 2021 regarding 311 Call Centre Wait Times. He's in opposition to Item 7 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, the report dated October 12th, 2021. It's regarding Budget Referral for Active Transportation Funding. He's in support of Item 8 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated October 12th, 2021. It's regarding Including Active Transportation Criteria in the Road Renewal Budget. And lastly, he is in opposition to Item 9 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated October 12th, 2021 regarding Updating the Transportation Master Plan to Achieve 50% Mode Shift.

Kelly Ryback: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Speaker: Welcome.

Kelly Ryback: Thank you, Madam Chair, councillors, Clerks, audience, media. Thank you. My presentation has been provided with copies that you should be at your desk from the Clerk. But who am I? I'm lifelong Winnipeg resident recently retired. My last 28 years of my career, I supported and led call centres, one of the biggest in the city. I participated and led teams through process and productivity improvements, new systems, performance management, tradition from…transition from call-in to online customer self-serve and culture and business shifts. I developed and implemented agent and leader smart goals and score cards. My phone-in experience with 311, I have had many. Hit and miss; some few, they go smooth, but too often, I am placed on hold. I don't have the confidence that the rep knows what they are doing or that it's been properly submitted. But that leads to long calls. In the springtime, wait times 20 to 30 minutes. Recently, August, 45 minutes with the calls getting dropped. I then resorted to submitting an issue by City of Winnipeg Facebook messenger and that experience was actually satisfactory. I got the page where I have downloaded some of the 311 centre performance in September; of the calls, information requests were 44%. That needs to decline. That tells you that readily information is difficult to find on the website, apps or social media. Service requests were 55%. E-mail was 25% of requests. Voice was 66%. There should be a goal to reduce voice to 15% and move to an online structure on various ways. We did it where I worked. What else? Call average time, as known as HT, needs to decrease. Rate of service needs to improve. Call abandon rates need to drop. That's not captured in any of your performance results. That's huge. If you think you are getting 60,000 calls, how many thousands are just hung up on? First call resolution needs to improve. Work flow times and hand-offs need to be reduced. Agent productivity needs to increase. There's more, but I am on the outside and I'm right now not able to look in. What are some quick hits you could do? On Facebook, it says, you need to first promote online and the e-mail. Be bold with promoting 311@Winnipeg.ca. It should be offered in the on hold message and on social media. Your website…or, excuse me, on Facebook, it says send message, but it doesn't correspond to actually, that is how you contact 311. In the future, add live chat. A chat operator can handle three chats at one time. And the person at the other end, they're multi-tasking too. If there aren't a lot of chats that person can help with e-mails or actually be a leader…a lead hand or provide support to other reps. Provide a call back option with an expected return time. This gets the person off hold and on with their day. None of that is available through the City of Winnipeg 311. Send out customer satisfaction surveys and please learn from them. Doesn't exist. Wait, there's more. It is a science. But how do you know what is fixed if you don't know what's broken? The frontline reps and management teams must be involved. There's brown paper exercises for that. What are the…what's your performance and KPI results? How are you affected by attendance, vacation, sick time, the collective bargaining agreements? What is in the management toolbox, how is it used? What is expected from the agents and management? What are the goals and the results? Who is good and who is not and how do you improve those who aren't? Now, here is my offer; I am just not blabbing away. I have

wealth of experience on this. I was on some fantastic teams. We changed how we worked; 700-person call centre. In addition to what you're asking of the Public Service for a report, which I endorse, I am offering to help during those 90 days. Help you with the report, help you achieve some immediate improvements and results. At least set a ground work on how you can go forward. It doesn't happen overnight. It is hard. It is painful. Some people are not going to like it. Some people are going to leave if you truly want to get serious about providing good service to 311. I am willing to do that, devote my time to you for free with no expectation of a contract after the fact. I wouldn't even bid on one as a consultant. For free, my 20 years of experience is available to you. Maybe somebody could put a motion to add at a future time. Items 7, 8, and 9: I support and need…the need to reduce carbon dioxide and methane emissions, increase the absorption of carbon dioxide and support innovation to combat climate change. I support practical bike lanes. I broached bike lane opportunities back in 2005 with Councillor Nordman when I returned from San Jose and every curb lane is 4 feet wider than the rest of them as to allow for the bikes. Cheap, easy to maintain. Item 8: include active transportation criteria in the road renewal budget. I support that with simple solutions. It is very frustrating seeing Main Street, Portage Avenue and Roblin torn up and nothing done for bike lanes or…but we have two-foot-wide curbs, one on each side. Go to standard, there's your bike lane. Cheap. That's all you need to do. You want to see an example of a nice, wide curb that wasn't even intended as a bike lane, St. Mary's Road in front of Nelson McIntyre Collegiate. Perfect. Item 7 and Item 9: there's a recently released bike lane traffic report that was daily traffic on 10 bike lanes doubled in 2021 from 2020 (inaudible). That data collection dates in 2020 were freezing. The data collection dates in 2021, the daily high temperatures range from 8 Celsius to 15 Celsius plus, over weekends too. What did you expect? But break that down per bike lane per hour of daylight, it went from one cyclist per hour to two. That is brutal for the investment made, that is what it is. Most of these bike lanes are rarely used, they don't go where people need to go and they are causing emissions by congestion and having cars not turn right on red. I conducted my own bike lane study. I spent 20 hours in the Exchange. 16 cyclists per hour during the commute. It drops off dramatically other times. But in that same time, 40 vehicles idling per hour for a combined time of 20 minutes waiting for the light to turn green because you no longer allow right turns on red. This week and last week I did it again because the temperatures dropped. That hourly average of bike…of cyclists dropped to seven. It will be down to two in December, but we still have 40 vehicles idling, no right turn on red. In 90 minutes, six cars turned illegally. You could put Traffic Division there and meet their quota. Over 100 Exchange businesses want the bike lanes removed. There is a petition ready to come forward supported by thousands of their customers and their delivery companies and their service providers. Cars are driving around, couriers are driving around trying to find a place to stop. There's two art galleries right on McDermot. They have courier drivers walking blocks in icy conditions delivering thousands of dollars worth of art. Senior citizens are not going to these places. You can't get through the snowbank to get to the meter, but there is a priority on clearing a bike lane that's not being used. Volumes are similar pre-COVID, don't give me the COVID excuse. I drop my wife and pick her up everyday, 2018, 2019; sat waiting for the light to turn green, not a bike in sight. Driving. This is my fourth time in chambers. Every time I drove here down Portage Avenue with diamond lanes, one bike or two at best. The requirement and the demand isn't there. Emissions could be eliminated today and temperatures and oceans will still rise. Studies show there's a 100,000-year cycle of glaciers growing 20,000-year cycle of glaciers melting. The sea levels fluctuate 120-metres. There's more of that, I'm not going into it, you have my report. We do need to reduce emissions, increase absorption, adapt and (inaudible). The greatest contribution out of Winnipeg to make…to combat…would be to combat world climate change is to create an innovation that can be implemented widely in China, India and Africa. Winnipeg accounts for 1^{10000} of the earth's population. That is one one hundredth of one percent. What accomplish here, wonderful, it means a hill of beans 500, 2,000-years from now. There is still so much to learn, only low risk change to be explored. These aren't my views. Steven E. Koonin, Undersecretary of the Science US Department of Energy under the Obama administration endorsed by a U of M professor saying it's the only book you really need to read for climate change. We need to slow down, there's so many priorities. The City spends 78…the City buys 70.8 million liters of gas. How's that get down? Anyways, please oppose 7 and 9.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Ryback, thank you. I'll just ask you to stand down. We are going to go to another speaker and then come back to you for questions if there are any. I would like to call forward…or we'll go virtually in just a moment. Next delegation is in support of Item 12 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 20th, 2021. It's regarding 311 Call Centre Wait Times. We have the delegation Norm Norris on the telephone. Mr. Clerk, is that correct?

Norm Norris: Yes, good morning, Mr. Mayor, Madam Speaker and councillors. Thank you for the opportunity to address the important use of 311 response time. I am in support of the resolutions before you and would like to emphasize how important it is that citizen concerns are dealt with in a timely manner. It is essential that all citizens concerns are fielded and handled expeditiously. We want to encourage cities to…citizens to contact 311 with their concerns as this often helps the City address unknown problems in an efficient manner before it becomes serious. I ask that you support this proposal to improve the wait times in 311 because the system is broken, undermanned and under funded. 45-minute wait times are totally unacceptable. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Norm. We'll now have any questions for either delegation. Councillor Schreyer, I believe I saw your hand up. Mr. Ryback, if you could please come back to the podium.

Kelly Ryback: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I was actually going to ask for an extension for those speeches. But nonetheless, I do have a question. And I would like to know if Mr. Ryback is saying that whether 311 service has changed in the last decade or last number of years. Can he tell us what he thinks of the 311 service over the last number of years?

Kelly Ryback: Well, I don't think…

Councillor Schreyer: What has the change been?

Kelly Ryback: I don't think the barometer has moved. I feel, based on my experience and what you have seen media councillor comments, that 311 is in the position where my company was 15 years ago. I can't speak a lot of what we did, how we did, what the results were because of confidentiality and I'm still bound by that even though I'm retired. But if you would entertain a closed-door meeting with appropriate personnel I could share stories on what was done and what we went through. But when I identified a list of things to reduce calls and provide more information that have not happened, that tells me, yeah, little apps, there's little things we've done on social media, it's not where it needs to be. Not in this day and age, not with what your citizen expectations are. And I appreciate this opportunity of calling me back, Madam Speaker. Might have…I have one sentence to complete. May I do that?

Madam Speaker: If it's in relation to the question that was asked, certainly.

Kelly Ryback: It's in…back to No. 7 and 9, not to the question asked.

Madam Speaker: Okay, not at this time. There is another question. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I, too, share a background in service desk and help desk management internationally and would very much appreciate a sit down to talk the talk. My question, my first question, I do have two; relates to, if this was a private entity and 311 as the first point of contact for a business, do you think that business would still be in operation if it was operating in the manner of which it is today from a satisfaction perspective?

Kelly Ryback: I would say that they would be falling behind. It would be unfair for me to speculate on how they would do, but it would not be customer satisfactory. So, take that for what it is. But I can tell you that what we incurred, it went…there is opposition to improve, but it changed how we served our customers. And when I say what I…what the groups I…we were…that was to internal customers, but it doesn't matter.

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

Councillor Nason: Did you have an opportunity to look at the citizen satisfaction survey and the results that were presented with regards to what seems to be more satisfied results of the experience on 311?

Kelly Ryback: I did not see a survey. I'm talking about my own personal experiences. And with my background how frustrating it is on a call being placed on hold when it wasn't necessary when for the exact same matter, I had a different rep and it went extremely smooth. That tells me there was two out of the spectrum of skillsets for understanding of what needs…on what their jobs are. And this is more than just putting in tools in place. This is lead management. This has to have buy-in from the very top and has to buy-in from the very bottom.

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

Councillor Nason: Yeah, in your presentation, you talked about diamond lanes and lack of visibility of cyclists. And you know, on that journey, and I did have a prior motion at one time that looked to encourage carpooling, that would leverage diamond lanes for carpooling. Because if you drive around the City of Winnipeg, there's lots of single vehicle cars that are commuting or single passenger. Is that something that you think would help with regards to some mode shift, is incur…more encouragement of carpooling?

Kelly Ryback: It works in other jurisdictions. I referenced San Jose earlier. Carpooling in San Jose, the whole Bay Area of Sao Paulo, San Francisco, Oakland, but they're on…they are doing that on freeways. Five, six lanes wide. People are driving two hours to get to work. If you are carpooling, you get in the fast lane. If you are not carpooling, your commute is double the time. It's not going to work in Winnipeg. We don't have enough lanes, especially if you want to take lanes away to add on for more bike lanes, but if you're going to take lanes away for Master Transit Plan.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Just two questions to our speaker, Madam Chair…Madam Speaker. Thank you very much, Mr. Ryback for your presentation. What company was it that you worked for?

Kelly Ryback: Bell MTS.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie. Let's have some decorum in the chamber, please.

Councillor Klein: So did I.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein, next question.

Kelly Ryback: Let me get…I want to follow up with that because…

Madam Speaker: You are still answering the question?

Kelly Ryback: Yes. I want to talk about…you know, I will talk about just…shoot another target because we experienced it. And maybe because of the department that I worked in versus maybe the department that a councillor would not have been involved in the department I worked in. However, if you can reduce average handle time by 30%, which is achievable, you…a person goes from answering 30 calls a day to 43. That's actually like a 43% increase because you reduce call time by 30%. That's like going from 10 minutes to seven. In a seven hour day, that person can take a lot more calls. Multiply that by the number of employees you have taking calls and you have a much higher satisfaction of your citizens.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein, second question.

Councillor Klein: Yes, thank you very much. Thank you for that. And as you know, I was there for a while as well. So, could you tell me, I am intrigued to know what the other sentence was that you had on the Item 7.

Kelly Ryback: Okay. This is with respect to the 10% request on road budget to go towards active transportation. I am not the only one. On a CTV News poll on October 12th, out of 1,534, 1,670…1,067 agreed, 70% of respondents agreed; do not do the 10%. My problem I think the City has, citizens have become too complacent and have accepted mediocrity.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions, Councillor Klein?

Councillor Klein: No, that is all.

Madam Speaker: Next speaker, Councillor Eadie, followed by Councillor Chambers. Two and a half minutes on the clock. Councillor Eadie, you had your hand up, I believe.

Councillor Eadie: Yeah, I'm going to refrain. My question was actually answered.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Mr. Ryback for your presentation. I am just asking or responding to your comments with respect to bike lanes. You are talking about the impact is somewhat minimal in terms of if we're moving towards more bikes and getting…reducing greenhouse gas emissions through less vehicles on the road. You stated points on that, but you're also aware that there are other outcomes to riding bike…riding bicycles which include improved health outcomes as well. That's something that should also be considered?

Kelly Ryback: Yes, absolutely there's to that. I also know that climate change is used to sell a lot of ideas here, but the solutions are not about active transportation. Active transportation is going from your mode to a destination, not cycling around for exercise.

Councillor Chambers: Well, you know, climate change is just one of the…one of the lenses that is being applied in terms of active transportation trailways. It does improve health outcomes which lessens the impact on our healthcare system. That, you know, helps us all as Winnipeggers and Manitobans.

Kelly Ryback: Right, and I agree that it's actually helped, but there are things that the City is not doing that has a greater effect on reducing emissions. If you improve fuel economy by 15% because you eliminated intersections, you'd added underpasses, overpasses, you moved the traffic, that is equivalent to taking 15% of the vehicles off the road. If you add

more routes, it is less wear and tear on the streets, which means less money. Having to spend on…by reducing starting and stopping. We can drive Toronto, Edmonton, Calgary for 30-minutes without stopping. You can't drive two kilometres in Winnipeg without the requirement to stop unless you hit the lights properly. The other day I am driving Route 90 at 40-kilometres an hour.

Madam Speaker: Okay. I see that…

Kelly Ryback: McGillivray Boulevard at Ken…at Waverley, there is room in the left turn lane for 8 vehicles, but there's 30 that need to turn. So, we are blocking the through street and it takes three light cycles today in COVID to get through the intersection of McGillivray and Waverley. Scurfield and Kenaston is the same problem. There's a wonderful turn lane, Grant and Roblin.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes our question period. Kelly Ryback, thank you. Norm Norris, we appreciate you both appearing on these topics. Next, I'd like to call forward Laurie Monk who's here with us in person. She appearing in support of Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. It's the report dated October 13th, 2021 regarding Cannabis Cultivation in Residential Areas. Following that, we will go virtually to hear from Eddie Calisto-Tavares. Welcome, Laurie Monk.

Laurie Monk: Good morning. As you've heard, my name is Laurie Monk and I am a member of CARGO: Citizens Against Residential Cannabis Grow-Ops. We are a small, but dedicated group of non-partisan citizens with a common goal: to move large scale cannabis grow operations out of residential neighborhoods and into the manufacturing areas of Winnipeg where they are most suited. I want to acknowledge and give thanks to Speaker Sharma, Councillors Lukes and Eadie for your hard work and leadership on this issue. I also want to thank CEO, Michael Jack, and the public administrators at the City of Winnipeg. You have done your homework and this report certainly shows that. CARGO is not opposed to cannabis use; whether it be for medical, recreational or all points in between. What we are opposed to is houses in communities being purchased for the primary purpose of cannabis production which prevents families from buying homes in our neighborhoods. Homes are for people, not factories. This is my third time in 12 months presenting on this issue before the City of Winnipeg and I believe we have made progress every time. By way of background, on October 17th, 2018, cannabis became legal in all provinces and territories in Canada for adults 18 and over making Canada just the second country in the world to legalize recreational use of this drug. The current regulations allow Health Canada licensed cannabis growers to…sorry, to operate without occupying a home. This has resulted in homes being purchased for the primary purpose of cannabis production. The federal legislation has a large loophole that was quickly exploited by what we suspect are organized crime groups. Although I believe the intent of legalization was to ensure all Canadians could safely access medical cannabis unencumbered, the irony is that Health Canada's regulation loophole has caused mental health concerns, anxiety and stress to those living in the vicinity…in the vicinity of rows. The steep rise of Health Canada licensed grow-ops in residential communities prompted my fellow CARGO member, Ed Kolodziej to start a petition in our neighborhood last year. This resulted in a town hall meeting with three levels of government who heard a very clear message from the citizens in attendance: get these large scale grow-ops out of our neighborhoods. As CARGO began to collaborate we soon learned this was a problem across Winnipeg, not just in certain areas of the city. We have provided a map of suspected grow-ops across the city and I believe the City Clerk may have included it in your package. What we know is that the preferred grow sites are large bungalows with attached garages. Very desirable family homes. Winnipeg has been experiencing a very tight housing market with a short supply of available stock. This has been driving up prices with some homes being sold well above asking price. Given the deep pockets of organized crime, it may mean legitimate buyers and homeowners are being priced out of the housing market. The production of medical cannabis is a relatively new industry. Lack of oversight and regulation has created the problem we are all here to fix. The only way to grow cannabis legally in Manitoba is with a Health Canada medical cannabis license. You can either grow it yourself or have someone designated to grow for you. In addition, medical and recreational cannabis products are readily available across the city at a wide range of retailers. As CARGO continued on our journey we were shocked to learn the following facts. The first fact: the average prescription in Canada for medical cannabis is two grams a day. The average license to grow is for 22.4 grams a day, approximately 112 plants. Large scale growers can grow up to four licenses or hold up to four licenses at one address which translates to roughly 450 plants at a time. A second fact: a grow is 24 times more likely to have a fire than a non-grow. Last year, three significant events occurred: a residence in my Garden City neighborhood had the power transformer behind it explode and catch fire. Also in Garden City, there was a home invasion of a Health Canada licensed grow-op. The third incident was in Elmwood where an electrical plant…panel blew, a fire started and the owner tried to hide the fire. The City of Winnipeg did not create this problem, but today, by approving the report before you, Winnipeg can be a part of the solution. And with the lack of examples from other jurisdictions, Winnipeg can be a leader in addressing this issue. We like quite a few things about this report. We really like the distinction made between self-growers and those who grow for others. We like that it is a fully cost recovered licensing regime. That large scale operators must move to manufacturing zoned areas of the city. That no grandfathering of existing ops will be allowed. Inspectors will have power to fine or shut down ops as necessary. And very importantly, the requirement for a criminal record check for operators. Legalization is still in its relative infancy in Canada. The report may not be perfect, but we feel

it is very good. We do have a few friendly amendments to suggest. One, that limits should be in place for self-grows. Health Canada needs to establish a reasonable limit of plants that can be grown per license. Two, we would like to ensure operators have liability insurance in place. Three, we are concerned that there will not be enough inspectors. So, would like to raise that as a point for Council to consider. And four, we believe there is a need for a database of existing and future licensed grow-ops. Thank you again for your time this morning. I truly feel that we are being listened to and I do hope the report's recommendations will be adopted unanimously by Council. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Laurie. If you could just stay with us, we will have questions momentarily. But first, we'll go virtually to Eddie Calisto-Tavares who is with us today in support of the same item. Welcome, Eddie. Mr. Clerk, I see our delegation on the line, but she could be following on YouTube. There's a bit of a lag then. That's probably the case.

Clerk: Good morning, Ms. Calisto-Tavares. If you can pause your YouTube feed if you are listening on YouTube. This is your time to present if you can hear me.

Madam Speaker: Eddie, can you hear us?

Clerk: I believe the delegation may have some technical issues on her end. We were unable to test prior to the meeting as well from the area that she's remoting in from.

Madam Speaker: Looks like she's listening to the meeting, but there could be…could be a lag. Perhaps we can e-mail her and come back to her presentation. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Madam Speaker, I would like to seek Council's approval to add another speaker, Carmen Nedohin.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll deal with that momentarily. Eddie, can you hear us? Okay. All right. We will now take questions then on this…on this presentation. But let's deal with the vote. Councillor Lukes, you are moving suspension of the rules to add an additional delegation and the name is?

Councillor Lukes: Carmen Nedohin.

Madam Speaker: On this topic?

Councillor Lukes: On this topic.

Madam Speaker: Okay, in support…in support on this topic. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We'll add one additional delegation. And that's usually five minutes, no questions, right? Okay. Questions for Laurie Monk? Councillor Lukes, I saw your hand up.

Councillor Lukes: No, I have no questions.

Madam Speaker: No? That was for additional delegations. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you. Laurie Monk mentioned that she did not…I'm speaking through the…speaking through the Speaker, did not want to have grandfathering. It was notable to me and others since the last time that Laurie Monk spoke here in the Council Chamber that it seems like the growth…grow-op purchase of the housing…purchases for grow-ops continued like the day after, the week after.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer. Yes.

Councillor Gillingham: If we have another speaker on the same topic, should we hear the other speaker first and then questions to all or no (inaudible)?

Madam Speaker: No, we need to proceed with this first.

Councillor Gillingham: Okay, I thank you very much for clarity. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: But thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: The concern has been, by me and others, that it looked as if people were…despite what Council's been going through in the recent months including since Laurie Monk last spoke here, that it hadn't hindered the purchase of residential homes for what looks like the purpose of marijuana grow-ops. Laurie Monk talked about making sure it's not

grandfathered…there's no grandfathering involved. So, I just want to know specifically, is Laurie Monk comfortable with the by-law as it pertains to grandfathering of locations?

Laurie Monk: Am I comfortable?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Laurie Monk: What I would say is that we would like very strong language to ensure that grandfathering of existing grow-ops is no longer allowed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer, no further questions? Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you to the presenter, Ms. Monk, thank you for your presentation today. This is a topic that has gone through standing policy communities, community committees with respect to what it represents and potentially the decline of our neighborhoods through these types of activities. And I know that you are in support of the by-laws or, sorry, the recommendation to move towards larger scale operations being in more industrial areas of our city. But I am wondering to the extent that you feel the Federal Government has fallen short in terms of some of the regulations as they rolled out this cannabis legislation?

Laurie Monk: Yeah, that's a really good question. And I do feel that the Federal Government left the legislation somewhat vague, relying on the province and municipalities to strengthen it at the by-law level and at the provincial legislation level. So, my understanding, and again, I am not a federal politician; but my understanding is that the intent of the federal legislation was to ensure that there could be enough flexibility at the municipal and provincial level so that they could address the issues as they presented within those communities.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Chambers: Yes, thank you. And would you and your group also consider petitioning your local MPs towards strengthening some of these regulations through the legislation that the Government of Canada has enacted?

Laurie Monk: That's another great question. We have met with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, federally. She has heard our concerns. We've also been working federally with members of Parliament, both with the liberal party and with the conservative party. So, and have also sent petitions to all Manitoba representation at the federal level. So, I think they are aware of our concerns and certainly, I think they understand that there is a need to collaborate at all three levels which is really what we would like to see what happen.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question.

Councillor Chambers: Final question. Thank you again for that response. Again, has your group reached out cross-jurisdictionally in other Canadian cities to find out if this is a problem in other Canadian cities as well? And do you…are you working in collaboration with those other cities to bring this issue forward on that national plateau?

Laurie Monk: We are. We are aware that this is a significant issue in a number of other jurisdictions. We've made some connections with folks in Ontario who are also pushing really hard to get this on to their local and provincial radars. They haven't gotten a whole lot of traction. We seem to have been able to collaborate in a way that enables us to push the issue forward in a good way. What we are hoping is that this will create a precedent that other jurisdictions will be able to refer to.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham, did you have a question? I don't think so. Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I would just like to start off by thanking basically residents who have formed together to try to put a stop to what is a problem across the country. We know it is, Madam Speaker. And the…what I am very interested in and this is where I believe our citizens including Ms. Tavares and Monk and Carmen and a whole bunch of other folks that we haven't heard publicly from, who you, Madam Speaker, and Councillor Lukes as well have dealt with an ongoing basis now for quite some time. My question is, really, Ms. Monk expressed the…what I would say were incidents that happened because of violations of building code. How, Madam Speaker, did Ms. Monk and the group compile the information about electrical going out and problems with fire and so on? How was that compiled?

Laurie Monk: As I said, CARGO is a collaborative effort comprised of folks with expertise and specialty in various areas. So, we do have folks who are able to source out the type of information that you are asking for. I am hesitant to name

names at this stage because some folks do like to operate anonymously. So, I want to respect that. Should you like to have evidence, I think that we could probably compile any evidence you'd like.

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I would just suggest because of my presentations on the issue, because, Madam Speaker, the motion that we are moving I think will go a long way to resolving a number of issues. But there is the problem of an individual with a large certification will still grow lots. So, Madam Speaker, if the residents who have formed in a group have information, would they be willing to supply it privately to our City's administration who are going to be the ones who have to enforce whatever by-law changes we implement?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Would you like to respond?

Laurie Monk: I can't speak for other folks. What I can do is bring your suggestion back and see how the rest of CARGO feels. I feel strongly that we would like to provide whatever information, evidence and support we can to ensure that these recommendations are adopted. So, I will say, yes, but tentatively because I don't feel I have full authority to speak on other's behalf.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next, Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank the work of your organization and many others that are dealing with this challenge of the hostile environment that growing in residential areas present. In your responses, you indicated that you spoke with liberal MPs, conservative MPs but I noticed a very noticeable absence and we have NDP MPs in Winnipeg, specifically. I'm wondering, is there a reason that you're aware of that you haven't been able to converse with them on these matters? I know my colleague opposite, Councillor Schreyer, I am sure we share the same concern as to the absence of the NDP being mentioned.

Laurie Monk: We also share that concern. And we did reach out to all Manitoba representatives at the federal level. We had crafted a petition which we sent out and followed up with several other messages in hopes that we might be able to meet with them. So far, we haven't heard anything back.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you. Would you entertain us working with you as a…you know, in my area I am represented by an NDP MP. Would you entertain working with us to try to bridge that gap?

Laurie Monk: We would very much welcome that opportunity.

Councillor Nason: Okay, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes our question period. I do want to ask if Eddie Calisto-Tavares is on the line?

Clerk: Eddie Calisto-Tavares has left the meeting.

Madam Speaker: Has left the meeting. I did see her on the screen there momentarily. So, we will now go to our next speaker. So, we'll try…if she does appear, let us know. Thank you, Laurie Monk. We'll now call forward Steven Stairs who is appearing in opposition to Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. It's the report dated October 13th, 2021 regarding Cannabis Cultivation in Residential Areas. Our delegation, is he here in person? Yes. Welcome.

Steven Stairs: Welcome. Thank you. I would like to thank you all for having me today. I really appreciate it. This topic is very near and dear to my heart and I think we can bridge some gaps between information and solutions with what I am about to tell you, hopefully. Just to start off, I'd really like to point out that I don't have a presentation for you folks. I was thinking about this for a very long time, but I thought, I would rather have you listen to me for 10 minutes rather than flip through a page of already available facts or information regarding this topic. I think that's kind of a moot point. I think you will serve the constituents of this whole city best buy having the knowledge that I am about to share with you to do the best results you want in the end to get the desired results we all want. I'd like to start off by saying I am actually in favour of what CARGO is attempting to do. I think it's a very noble and wise decision for residents to be getting involved with cannabis gardens and the abundance of crime that goes on in our city's residential areas. Now, for a little bit of background, I am a cannabis advocate, this is why I am here. I am a medical cannabis grower. I've been doing this for 11 years. Some of you might know that, I have probably argued with you via e-mail or you've seen me on TV and that is fair. I think we all

like to know who we are dealing with when we talk about specific sensitive subjects. And for you to make determinations on how it will affect sick Canadians who need access to medicine, I think you should hear from one of them. Because so far, I have heard a lot of talk about different departments, different organizations, different political representatives regarding this topic, but I haven't heard one opinion from the people that this will directly affect. That's sick Canadians who have a doctor's note to consume or produce medicine for their own consumption. Now, I am not arguing about criminal activity plaguing that system, I am talking about the sick Canadians that this will affect by putting an over…over-burdened system in place of regulations and licensing that will cost them more money when these people are low income and fixed income for the most part. It will put more onus on them to find trusted individuals who could do this for them who now have to possibly follow a bunch of regulations that they've never had to follow before. It also really limits reasonable access. And that is the thing here. Medical cannabis has been around since 2001. The Parker decision in supreme court enacted the ability for the Federal Government to bring in a cannabis regulation system. In 2014…sorry, correct me, 2015, the supreme court in BC ruled that medical cannabis can be produced not only for the consumption of dried flower, but for oils and topicals and tinctures and all those kinds of varieties outside of normal consumption. In 2016, the Federal Government ruled that the attempt of the Harper government at the time to eliminate patients' rights to grow cannabis was unconstitutional because it put un…an overburdenous requirement on the patient's access and it limited their ability to consume their cannabis. There's three examples right there of supreme court challenges that have said, this system has to exist. Now, we are here because of smell and odour and crime and activity. Well, this report, as comprehensive as it is, touches base on those things. It notes that an odour is not a health concern. There's been no proven facts that a smell can affect someone's health. It can be annoying, that is fair. Trust me, there's some lilac bushes at some public City of Winnipeg bus stops, very smelly, very annoying. But I am not trying to ban them. Now, also, plant limits. Plant limits are an absurd notion to think you can limit them. It came up in all these court cases I've just referenced. Because let's say if you put 50 plant limits as a base, I have a plant limit for 50 plants and I grow in an apartment with proper electricity, proper ventilation, proper water, all that stuff, and I do it safely. And let's say, maybe you think 50 plants is a too large amount. It is where we bridge that gap between commercial and residential personal production. Well, you are just going to have people grow 49 massive plants or if you say they can't go in residential areas based on designated growers, which again, is federally protected whether or not it's personal production or designated growers, they both have the same constitutional charter protections. So, why you think you could somehow penalize designated growers when the majority of them are growing for sick family members, friends, loved ones who maybe have mobility issues or cognitive or physical issues that maybe limit them from doing cannabis growing themselves. I feel like I could rant about this all day. The real problem here, and I have been fighting this for 11 years; it is why I am so passionate about this subject because I am...some of you might be able to tell, Ross, you already know, I am a visually impaired person. I'm legally blind. Cannabis has saved…sorry.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Stairs, if you could address the councillors through the Speaker's Chair. Thank you.

Steven Stairs: Sorry, right. Sorry. Okay, sorry. As the Chair knows or may be aware, I am visually impaired as well as some of you may not know or may know. I grow cannabis for my own personal production because it limits the degradation of my vision loss. It has stopped my blindness from progressing. Now. that may not be the case for every person who's growing cannabis, but if you bring in a regulatory system that burdens the people who legitimately need cannabis, it is going to affect people like myself. People with cancer, veterans, people like that who need cannabis and maybe can't produce themselves, will need a designated grower to do it for them. Now, again, I could rant about this all day, but I think the real issue here is the criminal aspect of people abusing a medical cannabis system for their own personal profits. That puts legitimate cannabis patients like myself in a position where I have to be arguing in front of City Council about something that's been already ruled in supreme courts. We are kind of back at a situation where we're at square one again. So, I think what we maybe need to do is ask why the police aren't enforcing the laws? The Cannabis Act specifically…in 2018, gives police the power to enforce both recreational cannabis laws as well as the medical cannabis system. So, why is the Winnipeg Police Department who takes nearly a third of our budget and asking for more money now failing to enforce the law? That is my question. And the City of Winnipeg, as I have heard discussions about history, making change that will lead as a beacon of some sort of legislative hope for other follow…jurisdictions to follow. The reason why no other city has taken on this jurisdictional issue is because it is not your issue. It is a federal issue. It is a police issue. Yes, there are certain things you could do. You want me to…require me to have a ventilation system? Great, no problem. What are you going to do about the licensing fee system? Is there a compassionate pricing program you will have for the sick and limited income people who can't afford a regulatory hurdle put in place for them? Because I tell you, if there is not reasonable access given, there are more than one. I spoke to one this morning. The lead Council in the R. v. Allard decision in 2016 that guaranteed our access to medical cannabis plants for gardens has literally already told me this morning, he will challenge this. So, does the City of Winnipeg want to go through a challenge of being known as the city who tried to limit it out of all other Canadian cities rather than taking a comprehensive approach as to why the police aren't enforcing laws already in place? Because I've got to tell you, if I lose access, I will be the first person to challenge this law. That's it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now have the opportunity to take questions. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. As…as…as you know, Madam Speaker, we spent a lot of time communicating with other cities. And in our research before moving motions, Councillor Lukes and yourself and I, we found out that there is a city that is doing something through zoning type by-laws. It is a smaller city, mind you, Madam Speaker, but…and there is an assumption, Madam Speaker, we know that many cities have been trying to deal with this and in terms of dealing with it and the certification. So, Madam Speaker, and we also know that the police service, really, if you want to talk about enforcement, we know that if somebody presents their certification, that is what the proof. If they can't produce certification, as far as they know, there's no laws broken. And Madam Speaker, the Winnipeg Police Service doesn't have enough people to follow around anybody producing. And that might raise issues as well, Madam Speaker. But ultimately, Madam Speaker, in the federal regulations for medical cannabis production, they set up to a limit of four certified grows, doesn't matter who it's done by. Four…well, it does, but up to four at one resident…or one address. They don't say residential, they don't say commercial, they say at one address. So, Madam Speaker, I'm going to…I would like to ask our presenter if he knows why they established only four medical certifications being produced at one address?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Steven Stairs: Originally it had to do with access. Reasonable access. Patients who don't be have the ability to grow cannabis but were able to get doctor's authorizations for the program sometimes took advantage of the fact that some of their friends or patients or colleagues in that community that already supported them were already growing for themselves. So, Health Canada put a limit on it because originally, they didn't have limits. Limits, I believe, came in in 2012 when the MMPR program was being initiated and then challenged and then successfully defeated. So, again, I don't...you could have four licenses at a residence and if each of them are only growing 10 plants, that is still 40 plants, that's less than I am growing as a single person. So, the numbers really don't…don't fit. And just to touch on that last part is, the police, if they don't have the ability to stop crime, that's a big problem. And maybe we need to be looking at how they're spending their money and not asking for more if they don't have the ability to already enforce laws on the books. The Cannabis Act. Just because you have a medical cannabis license doesn't allow you to do criminal activity. And the police are great at investigations, you know, surveillance, all that stuff, if these people are really as detrimental as to the community as they say they are, it should be a priority list.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I am wondering how Health Canada determines that the regulation is being followed that states if you have over production, the licensed grower must destroy any excess. Do you know how that is enforced?

Steven Stairs: That honestly has been a joke amongst Canada's growers for the longest time because it's a misnomer of a notion. No one…if I grow too many potatoes in my garden, I don't throw them out, I store them. Same thing with cannabis, if I've grown a copious amount of it, it's put in a safe for later. It's cost effective...it's just…I don't…there has never been...originally, the government told you to mix your dried cannabis with kitty litter. I don't know if that's an insult to cats or not, but it doesn't…it made no sense. No individual is going to take their dried cannabis and just like, oh, I've got too much, and just shove it in the garbage. It makes no sense. So, the majority of them, and I think what you're getting at it, the people who are doing this for crime activity take their overage and sell it. For sure. 100%. And that is the problem.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much for presenting, Mr. Stairs. I was actually wondering why we never had anyone come down in all of this as a cannabis user to speak to this. I have received e-mails from individuals. So, I, too, am questioning the aspect of putting regulatory costs on to it for people that cannot grow. And I, too, feel that might be a weak point in all of this that may be challenged. Which sounds like a perspective you hold, also. So, I guess it's not really a question, it's more a statement. Did you know that I wondered why no one came down? I appreciate your presentation.

Steven Stairs: I appreciate your comments as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you, Mr. Stairs for your presentation this morning. I'm not going to debate, you know, the fact that you have extensive experience in growing and the use of medical…medicinal marijuana for your purposes. You have presented very well here this morning and I commend you on that. You know, I did ask Ms. Monk earlier today of, you know, her perception on the Federal Government's implementation or the legislation that brought medical marijuana into usage and recreational marijuana into usage here across Canada. You know, and you are debating from your perspective and side on this issue, which I do support. But I am wondering, again, with somebody like your extensive knowledge and experience in this, you recognize what we are also trying to do here because there…it does seem a little bit fractured in terms how this was rolled out and the impacts to neighbours that are living next

to these homes in the community. And I am wondering if your level of expertise can also be considered and put into this process so that it has a positive outcome for as many as possible that, you know, we recognize the need for medical marijuana and medicinal marijuana in our community, but also recognizing the sensitivities of those that are living nearby these homes as well. And I am wondering if you would be willing to put your number of years of experience and knowledge into creating something that is amenable for as many citizens as possible?

Steven Stairs: Thank you very much. Yes, I very much am willing to be giving my information and my knowledge to this process. I think the more information that you have when you're creating constructive policies like this that affect the general public, you have to have information from the stakeholders. And that means concerned citizen groups like CARGO. Again, I am…I commend them for their work. I just wish maybe we had been consulted as patients as well. And I think if we have the input that brings both of those concerns into fold…into the fold and we create legislation around that, then we can do those things that Winnipeg wants to do here. We want to be seen as a leader. You know, I've always been proud…when I am on the national news and I am talking about cannabis, they say, Steven Stairs from Winnipeg. And that may not mean a lot to you folks, maybe it does, I hope it does, but that means a hell of a lot to me because when it…the cannabis community in Canada has been Montreal, Quebec, Ontario and BC. Manitoba is not…we're not heard of. So, it was impressive and…getting a little emotional here…it was always very humbling for me to bring this city into the fold of those experienced jurisdictions regarding cannabis. And I want this city to be a leader. I don't want to have to challenge the city I love regarding limiting my access to medicine that saves my vision. That is just counter intuitive towards what I think this city needs.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you very much, Mr. Stairs. Your advocacy on this, your passion, your knowledge is very much accepted as we move forward in creating something here that, again, moves us forward. And you know, your presentation on a national level does put Winnipeg on the map, so thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Are we saying that lack of enforcement of existing laws and by-laws has skewed our perspective and thus it's…we do not have a proper perspective by which we're creating new by-laws? Is that it?

Steven Stairs: Yes, I would agree with that notion. There's a lot more information out there to create a comprehensive policy or legislature regarding this topic.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes our question period. Steven Stairs, thank you for your presentation. Appreciate it. Next, we have Mr. Al Dueck. He is here in person in the gallery. He is on behalf of Duxton Windows. He's the President. He is appearing in president…yes?

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, is…I keep forgetting her…

Madam Speaker: Carmen?

Councillor Eadie: Yeah.

Madam Speaker: We will come back to ones that we suspended the rules for after those that were registered.

Councillor Eadie: Oh, okay.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, but good question. Mr. Al Dueck; he's appearing in support of Item 4 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. It's the report dated October 13th, 2021 regarding the Sale of City Owned Property – 49 Higgins Avenue. Welcome.

Al Dueck: I will not take a lot of your time. You have a lot of important things to discuss and deal with. So, I simply want to make a case that I think most or all of you are aware of. We have two family businesses that have been operating on Higgins for, one 50 years and one approaching 25 years. We are very cramped for space. There's a very urgent need through us to be able to use the space between us, which we have agreed to jointly purchase at market rates from the City. So, we simply want to give the City money for this and spend several million dollars developing it further. We are not asking for any financial assistance in that regard. So, all we hope for that way is for there to be practical and reasonable use to allow us to continue to create hundreds of more jobs in a core area of the city where I believe we desperately need people to spend time and money and help keep our city on a healthy trend. That is very simple. As somebody said, brevity is the source of wit. So, I hope that that's helpful.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Dueck. Any questions? Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Good morning, Madam Chair, and through you to Mr. Dueck. The property that is in question here, your intent is, if this motion does pass, is to purchase, subdivide and expand your business in Border Glass. What does that represent in terms of economic development here into…not only here in the city, but in the core area which is in critical need of jobs and opportunities for people in lower income brackets?

Al Dueck: Thank you, Madam Chair and councillor. I would make a simple case of…from the bigger picture, Border Glass is right now having trouble to be able to expand their business and not only that, they have, with that, an opportunity to bring more of the artistic community into a building which is not right now under occupied. And quite frankly, again, brings not only an opportunity for them to grow their business, but to even provide further assistance and opportunities for more people to remain in the core area. We have, from a Duxton point of view, an architect and a builder already working on a building which will be roughly a $2 million further investment which obviously increases the financial benefit to the City directly in terms of cash flow, never mind additional people who live in the core area, cycle to work. And I truly believe have very positive benefit. As I've said before, the majority of our work products go out of the province. So, we are generating net positive jobs in the city as well as further investments from rooted families in the city, not that are here temporarily. I think both Border Glass and Duxton represent a really positive element of our city.

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

Councillor Chambers: Yes, thank you. In terms of this opportunity to purchase at fair market value and expand your business, what would be the alternative if this were to not go through? What would that represent to Duxton Windows and potentially Border Glass with respect to trying to maintain your operations at status quo?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Al Dueck: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think I can, as we have tried to make very blatantly clear, and I think is obvious, we are just flat out of space in the area and we have no further opportunity to grow there. I believe our only option would be to look for a space somewhere outside the core area more likely, and too, because this is pretty urgent from our point of view. We are beginning to lose business and have an inability to further increase the jobs that people that do actually live in the core area. The same thing applies in various ways to Border Glass. They, as people probably know, do some of the larger buildings in Winnipeg. The only firm that's really qualified for that. And their intent is to bring more people into the core area and at that location would be stymied if that lot either remains vacant as a number of properties in the area are, that is our greatest concern, that if this doesn't happen to all both of these businesses to expand and create more jobs in the core area, we would both, certainly in our case, would have to move elsewhere.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, thank you, Mr. Dueck for your presentation today. Your mask, sir. Thank you. Moving on, we have Romeo Ignacio, President, Business Agent, Amalgamated Transit Union in support of the notice of motion moved by Councillor Mayes and seconded by Councillor Nason regarding the Partial In-House Service for Winnipeg Transit Plus. Mr. Ignacio is participating via Zoom. Is he with us, Mr. Clerk?

Clerk: Yes. Mr. Ignacio, if you can hear us, you can turn your camera on, unmute yourself and begin your presentation.

Romeo Ignacio: Yes, I can hear you. And thank you. However, it's preventing me from turning on my video. It says, "You cannot start your video because the host has stopped it."

Madam Speaker: We will try to turn it on on our end. If not, we can certainly hear you. We have 10 minutes on the clock for you.

Romeo Ignacio: All right, there we go. Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker. And good morning, everyone. Good morning councillors, Mayor Bowman, other delegates. Thank you for having me. I would also…before I even start my presentation I would also like to thank Councillor Mayes and Councillor Nason for bringing…moving the motion to have the partial in-house service delivery for Winnipeg Transit Plus. And I am going to be speaking in support of the motion. Also, I would like to thank Councillors Allard, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Lukes, Mayes…well, Mayes and Nason, Orlikow, Rollins and Santos and Sharma, Madam Speaker for giving us the time to actually have a meeting offline before this meeting…before this Council so we can discuss more…in more details the…our perspective of the 30% in-house. Also, I missed Mayor Bowman; appreciate that he also met with us last week. And my apologies to Councillors Browaty, Gilroy, Klein and Schreyer for not being able to work out a mutually workable time to discuss our, you know, report prior to today. But…and so, I would like to start by saying that I would like to…I don't want to bore you with all of the numbers that I…that

is included in my presentation. I did provide a three-page illustration. I call it illustration because I am not claiming expertise on the budget, although a lot of this information is already publicly available through the…I believe I mentioned that there's the calculation that was provided with regards to this partial delivery as well as a comparison of the other budgets with regards to the conventional service and the plan to expand the on-request service to the Castleberry area, you know, northwest of the city somewhere around Jefferson. And this illustrates, basically, how things could be a lot better if we consider everything in one silo as opposed to different silos. I would like to point out, though, that this is not an attack on the Public Service. I appreciate that they have given us the opportunity to have the discussion. However, we agree to disagree because we don't see eye to eye as far as the calculation is concerned. I am not saying that it is not accurate. I am only saying that there are things that are not considered in this calculation in their presentation. And obviously, if you see 2.3 or 2.5 million difference in the cost, additional cost for the City, that is probably not good. You know, if we are talking about just the money. However, as I have mentioned, the three-page presentation would show that if we think outside of the three silos we can actually benefit from the shared resources. The cost savings from the shared resources because, as we have mentioned in our discussion with other councillors, there are things that could be…the additional cost could be mitigated by the sharing of the resources. Like, for example, what is not included, and I indicated that in the report, what is not included is how much it will save the City if we have the spare operators provide some of the service between the two…or between the three, you know, types of modes of transportation. The on-request would definitely be needing spare operators. The way…for those that don't know, the way things work for transit, publicly at least, we have to make sure that it is reliable. And by reliability, we need to have people that's available anytime there is an emergency, be it an accident, injury, assault, you know, health issues. We need to have the people, and they are called spare operators. That's stated in the report. From my understanding, we need 64 people to provide this service alone. However, 20% of that is actually spare operators. Of course, if we take that away, it will reduce the cost. Additionally, and it is shown in the report as well…in my presentation. Additionally, the 20-foot…27-foot buses that is required, the estimate provides for a spare bus. That could be sitting idling if it is not needed, but in our view, it could be utilized. And if you are paying the loan for that vehicle, you might as well make good use of that, you know, investment. And so, instead of putting it away for a spare, we could utilize that for service like the on-request service. I would like to see the on-request service expand in areas that don't have or have very limited service because that will actually gain…or we can expect to gain more ridership when we provide the service that's not existing right now. Additionally, there are other cost savings...well, costs that could be mitigated by incorporating that into the Transit Master Plan. Like, the storage, there is a need for storage in a separate lift for buses, for these 27-foot buses. There is a lift, a portable lift, that is sitting idly at our Fort Rouge garage that could be used right now. And that takes away 700,000 right there. I would also like to point out that my presentation doesn't even account for the $1 million cost savings that we could put…we could appreciate if and when we could sit down with Transit management with regards to our proposal to expand the Sunday…Sunday cruise. That we have, as I've mentioned to some of our councillors, we have a proposal to save the City $1 million a year. We have also have a proposal…we can…I think we can also find cost savings of about $750,000 a year if we are going to be providing…if we can improve the working conditions of our members because I have mentioned in several meetings that our members are leaving because of the cruel working conditions, the safety concerns. And if we can improve that, if we can divert the $750,000 that we need for extra people that we hire every year. If we can keep the members that we have right now by providing a safe workplace and improve the working conditions, that savings…it's not included in this one, but we can appreciate a lot more savings if we can put together the estimates, seeing it from one silo or one…one department rather than smaller departments and…or smaller projects. And so, I am asking…and also, it doesn't include the possible cost savings if we could actually integrate the software that is used, the route match software that is used for Transit Plus and the Via app that's being tested for these on-request service. I mean, there is a lot of other items that we could save on if we can only see them from one perspective, from one silo. And I think, you know, by definition I think it is...we can Google what silo means, and it's always negative when you talk about business because there are things that one department could be doing that's also being done or is complimentary to one…to another department, but if they don't talk to each other, then they don't appreciate the cost savings that would be…

Madam Speaker: Romeo, the clock has gone off. Do you require more time or have you wrapped up?

Romeo Ignacio: Well, I would just like to end by asking for the councillors to support the motion and that we set the foundation for 2024 when…you know, with this motion, that we would like to have even the pilot trial of the partial in-house delivery with regards to Transit Plus.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Romeo. Thank you. We are going to go to the next delegation, just stay on the line with us as we're going to take questions momentarily. Welcome to James Van Gerwen. He's also in support of the same item. He is appearing via Zoom. And we've got five minutes on the clock for you.

James Van Gerwen: Thank you for letting me talk. Thank you, Mayes and Nason for presenting this motion. I will just be reading my report. And I guess you guys all received it. Now, I guess, first off, I want to say, you know what, we all know over the last year on the struggles for a lot of the drivers, the current Handi-Transit drivers and you know what, the system struggles it's had over the last few years up to, you know, I'm having buses having ropes to tie the doors shut. That is a

pure safety issue and something that would stop if it becomes in-house because we have much higher standards, in my opinion, for the vehicles. But in my report I sent out, I basically stated; Handi-Transit…Handi-Transit, Transit Plus, was started to fill the needs with disabilities at the time when all transit buses were high floor. They were nonwheelchair accessible. Now the entire fleet has the ability and this is the time to unify the system. Quoting from the report from the standing…from Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure and Renewal on June 10th, "The current trend and industry direction as well as the recommended…recommendation in the Winnipeg Transit Master Plan is to move forward towards an integration of the conventional and paratransit service which refers to the family of services. The integration of the two service has the potential of achieving efficiency, promote independence, inclusion and flexibility for customers." That statement is fundamental for the reason of this report. I fully believe returning Transit Plus back in-house with conventional service is the only way we can truly fulfill Winnipeg's obligation of the Manitoba Disabilities Act and give persons with disabilities the same level of service as every other citizen of Winnipeg. And I believe the framework has already begun with the approval as part of the Transit Master Plan, it calls for wheelchair securement retrofit, basically meaning that every one of our conventional service will have updated wheelchair securement. So, they would be able to take them on conventional services. Earlier this year all Transit operators were given mobile device security training which includes the standard training of all new operators, which is standard in all training of new operators, which can reduce the 3.5 day training course that's stated in the report by at least a day, a day and a half. And then, July of 2021, the Council supported the recommendation of transit priority seating which develops priority seating area and policy statements for passengers who are experiencing safety mobility challenges. So, and as I say, I fully believe it's starting to come in-house already. I believe we can even take it one step further by integrating the on-request service into this report. The pilot project for in-request service started this year and all the reports from our drivers indicates it is a success. The motion has been put out to expand the service into the north part of the city. I think most of you, and most of you councillors, can probably think of an area in your city that, you know, needs better transit service and I think that the…that on-demand service…on-request service can help. Both Transit Plus and on-request services will use the same 27-foot crestline buses. History shows most of the transit service is used weekdays to attend medical appointments, while the on-request service is usually at nights and the weekends when the conventional fixed service is not required, reducing the number of buses required to supply both of those services already there. And I just want to state, too, the standard…the buses we have there right now, the 30-foot…excuse me, the 30-foot buses that are in service now, some of them are reaching their end of service. They have millions of kilometers on them and are over 20 years old. They have been there before I even started. So, those buses are going to be needed to be replaced already. In additional, the cost report says it would cost $2.52 million. I disagree with that. We need to think of Transit Plus as a family of services like in the beginning. And when we bring it in-house, we'd be able to share all the resources…resources and pools from the spare drivers to the mixed uses of the buses. This would greatly reduce the cost to run the service as a separate entity. As stated in this report, neither model proposed additional service hours or service enhancements beyond what is currently in place. And such needed…and such neither of models would mitigate or solve...

Madam Speaker: James? James, if you could just pause, the clock has run out. We do have a long day before us. Did you want to just take a few seconds to wrap up?

James Van Gerwen: Sure. I just want to finish this one statement. Neither model proposes the additional service hours and service enhancements beyond what currently in place and neither of the models would mitigate or resolve any of the existing service challenges. Instead, costing us (inaudible) to provide an apples to apples comparison between the contractor services and in-house delivery. Further to my report, you can see the numbers that I thought that…I feel the numbers wouldn't be 2.5, but more closer to maybe 500,000, but it would increase the service greatly in underdeveloped areas.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, James. We're ready to take questions now. Councillor Schreyer, question for James Van Gerwen or Romeo Ignacio.

Councillor Schreyer: Right, and thank you, Madam Speaker. I am not sure to whom to address my question, but either one could answer. I mean, I am hearing concerns about costs and disagreements with costs. Therefore, can we at least say that by bringing in at least 30% in-house, that we are in the position to actually make this cost share…

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Did you hear the question?

James Van Gerwen: I am sorry. Can you repeat that?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. So, I heard during the presentations that there's concerns about whether the statistics are right in terms of what the costs are. Therefore, could we agree at least, by bringing in 30% in-house, that we are in a position to make these cost comparisons and find out what the efficiencies are?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Romeo Ignacio: Yeah, I think that is the only way we could truly find out whether, you know, this…the cost is reflective of what is going to happen in the real world. You know, again, it's not an attack on the Public Service, but from our perspective, if we could find...if we can integrate the services. We call it family of services under the Transit Master Plan, let's make it a family of services and find ways to actually utilize the family of services to provide better service and make it run more efficiently. I don't want to see one bus going one direction and then another bus going the other direction when we can use one bus to provide the service to everyone. And I would like to see those improvements done in areas that are not serviced right now. We can't continue to do what we are doing now because it is unsustainable. And we just have to try something new. And I truly believe that this is going to not only improve the service, but help the City save some money. We are willing to work with the City in finding more ways to save the city taxpayer dollars as well as improve the service if we can only give…be given that opportunity. We just need to lay the foundation now and get it done in two years time. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. James, do you wish to respond? I saw you gesturing.

James Van Gerwen: You know, historically, you know what, Transit management has been able to find surpluses of upwards of $180 million over the last 10 years, pre-COVID. So, I fully…and I trust the system and I believe that they will find efficiencies. Again, bringing it in-house with the other services. Watching one bus sit idle in the tracks when it could be used for secondary service is a waste of the service or the buses there. And you know what, having the ability with the on-demand service to gear up and gear down the service as required. So, the ability to put a bus in service or take it out of service, it'll have the ability to save. And we have our spare operators that would be there to take on the overcrowding. And honestly, during…with the Handi service, I believe there is probably peaks and lulls in the service. Like, a lot of it is for dialysis, as I say. So, during the day when that's all operational. When it is closed, those buses can be used in conventional service, not only for the on-demand, like, honestly, they could be used in emergency services to help with fire calls or any other service that's out there that having an operator and a spare vehicle could be put in use, let's say, if one is overcrowded. We can have it pulled out of the garage or have it on standby and used as conventional service; on-demand service or Handi-Transit as required. And that's the joy…and that's the benefit of having a service that's all combined and not having them separate where if you don't have that bus because it is in Handi-Transit or Transit Plus, right, we can't call on it to do any other service because it's sitting in a silo by itself. But when you integrate it into the system, it is a resource there when its needed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you. Twenty years ago, the City sold off its own gravel quarries because we were told…Winnipeggers were told it was going to be cheaper, more efficient. We never found out ever whether Winnipeggers saved money from doing the same…from doing so, from selling off our quarries, from no longer doing that in-house. Do our representatives from the Amalgamated Transit Union realize the pressure that's on them to…if they are going to be part of this 30% in-house, to be part of this comparison to see what efficiencies we can gather here? Because we don't want to make this mistake again by not finding out whether it is efficient when we sold off our quarries. That's ridiculous. That's irresponsible. Do we see the pressure that's on us here to work together to find out if and how we either are more efficient or more effective in our services?

Romeo Ignacio: Yeah, I would like to answer that. Thank you for the question, Councillor Schreyer. Actually, right now, we are working with the City…with the Public Service, Transit management to come up with the $1 million a year of savings. And that is only for the conventional service that we have right now. We have that proposal. I have shown that to some members of the IRPW. And we are just waiting to have that conversation. We also have the $750,000 annually that we could save. That is outside of all of this. So, we are…we are more than willing to sit down and find efficiencies. We know there will be efficiencies. And the more we take on publicly, the service from Winnipeg Transit Plus, the more we could save because we...let's just…I would use the analogy of a smartphone. You know, those…when…in the '70s, the '80s, you know, you don't carry a phone, but now you can pretty much carry everything in your smartphone. You have your e-wallet, you have your smart key for your smart lock, you have your camera, text messaging and also, the phone, and a small computer. But before, you have to buy a pager. Some of you, you don't know what a pager is, right. But a pager, a regular flip phone, maybe you need a camera, a small camera. That is all now in one…one smartphone. And it may cost a lot, but in the end, you are actually saving from buying all those smaller gadgets. And of course, you only have to carry one smartphone in your left pocket rather than carry a bunch of them or a bag. But anyway, I hope you see the analogy there, that if we combine all the services into one, integrate them, they will be more efficient. That is where the cost savings will be, by efficiency and sharing of the resources. Sharing of the people power. Sharing of the equipment. One other example that I would use is that all the six contracts…five or six contracts that we…that Winnipeg Transit Plus has right now, they all require for every five buses or five cars, they require one spare vehicle. That could be sitting idle right now. Five of them times one for every contract, so 25 of them could be sitting right now, idly. That will be a cost

savings for the City if we don't require that in their RFP any more. That would be a taxpayer savings. I hope that answers your question. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Final question and then we have others waiting.

Councillor Schreyer: Councillor Eadie has brought to me the concern that the in-house might be getting the less efficient routes and services. Are you aware of this? Do you have anything…comments to say before this happens in terms of who gets the most efficient services before we start making the cost comparisons?

James Van Gerwen: I think…you know what? Bringing it in-house, the 30%, I…yes, it will be done in a certain area because to be efficient you need to be able to supply as much as possible. Who is going to…what area is going to get it? I am not quite sure. But I think after you see…you know what, this is…I think the motion is to have it start 2024. So, you know, if this is going to be a slow intake and it's going to be two years before we actually see it come in. But I think after you see one year, you're going to see that the efficiencies are going to be held. And you know what, I think we'll be brought back to Council to see how we can start integrating it fully. You know, the service…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason moves extension. All in favour? Two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

James Van Gerwen: You know, and the reason why we started at 30% is that's the reason why…how it left. It left with the 30% right, to show. They took away majority and then they slowly brought it out. So, we want to slowly bring it back in. And I think, yes, picking the area will be something, you know what, maybe with you guys or maybe we would work in conjunction with Transit management to see which would be the best area and the best way to implement it. And I am fully looking forward to working with management and Teresa to bring it in-house the most efficient way we have. I hope that answers that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Mayes, your question, please.

Councillor Mayes: Thanks. I'll try and be brief. James, here we are. After almost 10 years, here we are for a vote today. There's a discussion in the report that came through in July, a second report that came through at Infrastructure, that talked about the requirement to purchase 27-foot vehicles is how the comparison was made. It is worth noting that the last five contracts approved by Council or by committee didn't involve 27-foot buses. In fact, the most recent one that will not expire until 2026, was a contract for cars. That was back in July of 2019 at Council. So, it wasn't 27-foot buses, it was cars. Can you talk a bit about the current fleet; cars, vans, buses, there's a mix of them. Obviously, it's not going to be all 27-foot buses until at least 2026 because we have at least five contracts covering 44% of the fleet that don't currently require 27-foot buses. That is the comparison that was made by the staff, a rather expensive model, I would submit. Can you talk to us about what's out there now? Cars, vans, buses?

James Van Gerwen: Romeo did you want to…like, the current fleet, I guess, for Handi-Transit out there is basically cars and buses. The cars can only take, and especially now, they can only take one person. And having one person take, you know, from one quarter of the city to the other quarter of the city.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer moves two-minute extension. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

James Van Gerwen: It is not an efficient system. Having the buses, having being able to bring them…bring them to a central location or even taking a standard van that we can bring them to the blue line. Like, let's say we have the open blue line, we could take a bus, pick up the member…the clients, bring them on to the blue line, have that Handi-Transit driver put them on the blue line, bring them downtown where the Master Plan is going to have an actual section downtown for designated vehicles and have that member bring them down, bring them into another van and bring them to wherever they're gone with their appointments. Yes, the inefficiency on the private sector is mind boggling. Having…you know what, different contractors have, you know, 18 contracts or something like that, five providers on all subcontractors and stuff like that, it's so convoluted. It's…it's hard. Like, Romeo, did you want to state something on this or…?

Romeo Ignacio: Just wanted to say that the…I think we can all agree that having one car or one bus could replace maybe five to eight cars, you know, for this particular situation. Obviously, if we have the 40-foot bus, more cars will be taken off the road. And there is going to be more people that will be serviced within the same amount of time. So, from that perspective, I think, you know, I can't speak on why it happens that the contracts that are existing right now still have the cars but I think the future should look like all the buses providing the service and integrating them into the conventional service. So, it will provide more flexibility and more options for people with mobility issues. You know, I don't have a problem taking any bus, but you have to understand that there are people with mobility issues that would also like to be around...

Madam Speaker: Romeo, thank you. Thank you. That…we have discussed this topic. Thank you. That concludes our questions. We appreciate, gentlemen, your time today.

Romeo Ignacio: Thank you.

James Van Gerwen: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: We are now going to go back to a delegation that we were having difficulty getting on the line, Eddie Calisto-Tavares. Can you hear us, Eddie?

Eddie Calisto-Tavares: I can.

Madam Speaker: I'd like to just announce the topic. She is in support of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. It's the report dated October 13th, 2021. It's regarding Cannabis Cultivation in Residential Areas. We'll have five minutes on the clock. Thank you, Eddie for your patience. I'm not sure what the technical difficulties were; your end, our end. We're glad that you're here with us now. And I understand you are out of province, out of country?

Eddie Calisto-Tavares: Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor and councillor. I am actually in Portugal honouring my father. As you know, he passed away November the 11th, 2020 as a result of (inaudible). So, this is where I am and I am very sorry for the technical and so grateful that Carlos and I persisted and I am here today. I have been listening to YouTube and listening to Laurie Monk who I thank her so much for being so detailed and so focused on the things that generally are very important to our group. This group of six residents from across the city, we have worked tirelessly in collaboration with city hall, which really brings us some hope. This was never about people that grow a few plants because they need medicine. They need medical cannabis. This is about, for me, a resident of Amber Trails of 31 years, who has seen a vibrant community grow and change. And in the last two years, a lot of seniors have downsized and a lot of people purchased homes from $400 to $600,000. They never moved in. They don't live in those homes. They have turned them into factories. Under legal marijuana growing and we know this for a fact from working with many stakeholders including Safer Communities that some of these homes are growing up to 900 plants. This isn't about smell. This is about hazardous fumes that are coming from these grow-ops because they use pesticides and all kinds of chemicals to maximize their growth. This is not about growing 10 to 12 plants because I needed or a family member needs it that cannot afford to grow it. They are growing these plants, they are selling them. There is criminal activity going on. We know this. As a business owner, there is no way I would invest in a $400-$600,000 home, invest an additional $15 to $50,000 on the equipment that I need to grow this to not get a return on my investment. As a business owner, I pay taxes. I abide by labour laws. I would have not only city and provincial regulations on my profession. So, the reason that we, six citizens have worked with Peter Squires and the retail…the Real Estate Association of Manitoba. Credit unions who happen to be the biggest target of these mortgages. I have had meetings with Doctors Manitoba and so have my colleagues. We have met with several credit unions and banks and every one agrees that these folks that own these homes are selling cannabis in the black market. They are not growing this because they need it for their own personal use. And so, I urge Council and Mayor today to really stay focused on what we need to do to ensure that we have a licensing process, that we have oversights, that we give some power to the police department because right now, they have zero. We have a small unit in the Provincial Government that does have some power, but very little. And trust me, the city is only the first place. We are not going to stop until there is more regulation and until these homes return to what they were meant to be, houses where people live. Children can breathe and not have our neighborhoods where we can't walk safely. We have seniors that cry out to me because, of course, I'm in the news fighting for other seniors' issues with long term care and they think I can also help them not be prisoners in their own homes as they put it. Because they are afraid of these nefarious people, criminals are coming into their streets. I am passionate about this because I know that what they are doing is wrong. And so, I plead with you, bring us some hope. Pass this motion forward and let's bring about some positive results so that Amber Trails, my community, can go back to being the vibrant and safe community that I know it can be. Thank you for your time today. I especially want to thank Councillor Sharma, Councillor Lukes and Councillor Eadie and all the six champions that we have not stopped and learned and fought for what is right. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Eddie Calisto-Tavares. Are there any questions for this delegation? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you. Happened to be that Steven Stairs was saying that lack of enforcement of existing laws and by-laws were skewing a perspective on this issue and thus, could be affecting the by-laws and laws as we move forward. What does Eddie Calisto-Tavares have to say about that? And also, to the specific concerns that someone like him individually or someone with cancer and how we…how this…how she feels this is being addressed with this motion.

Eddie Calisto-Tavares: So, what I would ask him is, has he invested $400,000 and has he invested $50,000 to grow 900 plants? This was never about the 10, 12 plants that people are growing. This is about the quantities that are going in these

homes that are currently if you…and I can show you these homes. They are oozing mold right now because of the enormity of the growth that's going on. Is he using hazardous chemicals so that he can maximize on the 10 plants that he's growing? Is he selling them in the black market? These would be the questions that I would ask him. This is not about infringing on his rights to grow his own medicine, this is about the neighbour…the houses in my neighborhood, in Sage Creek and others that are fully loaded with plants and no one is living in them. From what I heard from him saying, he lives in an apartment where he grows his own marijuana. This is not about him.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, Eddie Calisto-Tavares, thank you for your presentation today.

Eddie Calisto-Tavares: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will now call forward Carmen. Yes. We'll call forward Carmen Nedohin who is in support of this very same topic. We had suspended the rules to hear this delegation. Welcome, and we'll have five minutes on the clock.

Carmen Nedohin: Good morning and thank you so very much for allowing me the opportunity to present to you today. My name is Carmen and I live in Sage Creek. And I truly appreciate this opportunity. I want to begin by saying that none of us in CARGO or any of them spoken to you in favour of the changes, is against...

Madam Speaker: Pause for a moment, Carmen. Excuse me, procedurally, Councillor Eadie moves a motion that we proceed past 12:00 noon. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Go ahead, sorry.

Carmen Nedohin: Okay. None of us is against growing for medicinal cannabis for personal use in reasonable amounts. Some of us are consumers ourselves. What we are concerned about is licenses that are being given out by physicians for non-medical use. Some of these individuals have never even seen a physician that has given them the license, they're not their primary caregivers. But individuals do need some of this medical marijuana, and for that, we certainly are understanding of their dilemma. Eight years ago this week, we moved into our dream home, but learned quickly that the house next door was empty. It was empty because the owner had been charged with having three illegal grow operations in the south end…southeast end of the city, including the house next door. Fast forward two years, and the owner moved back in. All was quiet for about a year until the signs were all there that he was back in business. Security cameras, hydro meters spinning like a top, and shortly there after, the smell. A smell so thick that it literally blanketed the entire schoolyard and park immediately behind us. And we are not dealing with an inconvenient smell, we're dealing with known carcinogenic toxic fumes because of the insecticides that they use in these large grow operations. These insecticides were being ingested by our children playing in the yard every single day. The home next door was now a designated grow-op as a…on a multitude of Health Canada licenses. They were being tended to by the owner. Hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of plants, over 600 was the estimated count. And how he was able to secure a legal license with his record is beyond me, but that's a question for Health Canada. When I presented to Council in the past, I have expanded how this has affected our family. We couldn't have our grandchildren over to play, they couldn't go to the park, they couldn't go into the playground. We couldn't sit on our own backyard, we couldn't sit in our deck. And when I say we, I am not just talking about my husband and myself, I'm talking about the people on our street that are all very concerned about this as well. In our own home we couldn't turn on the HVAC to get fresh air and we couldn't use the overhead fan of the stove for fresh air. We couldn't open up our windows for fresh air because the smell was so intense that it was actually nauseating. My husband has a lung condition and it was affecting his health as well. I don't have time to detail everything we did to get this shut down, but suffice it to say, it was two months of dogged determination working with neighbors, calls, letters, petitions, et cetera. We met via Zoom or spoke to or e-mailed or called MPs, MLAs, Real Estate Board. We had a meeting with Wab Kinew and Matt Wiebe from the NDP. Sadly, we had no response from the Attorney General or his department when we sent information asking…or telling him about the concern and asking for some direction. And Eddie has mentioned how we spoke to credit unions, banks and Doctors Manitoba. And if not for the determination of Safer Communities Manitoba and the Winnipeg Fire Service, we never would have been able to get this "legal grow operation" shut down next door. An operation which saw a residential home being used as greenhouse to grow on four individual licenses. And Winnipeg Police Service can only deal with grow-ops that do not have a Health Canada license at this point. When I first presented to you folks, I had a glimmer of hope that amid all of the many issues you have to deal with, you would hear what I and others had to say about this as a health and safety issue, and you've listened. That glimmer turned into spark when you directed staff to come back with a report on how widespread the issue was and what the City might be able to do to address the problem, and you listened. That spark turned into the beginning of a little brush fire when the report came back and it was clear that this was a major problem for many citizens and for the City and Province as a whole, and you listened. That little brush fire has turned into so much more when at the last committee meeting, it was clear that there was a path forward to ensure that no community within the City of Winnipeg would be subjected to these huge, residential grow ops. And you listened and you led and you voted to move forward. And today, I'm filled with hope that you folks have listened and you do care and you are willing to take national leadership on this. I imagine other cities

will look on your work here and use it to address the issue in their own communities. I am filled with hope that these policy changes will give protection to our children, to our neighbors, to the value of our homes, to our ability to enjoy the very homes we have worked so hard to achieve.

Madam Speaker: Carmen, if I could just ask you…the clock went off here if you could just take a few seconds and wrap up, please. There's no extension for additional delegations.

Carmen Nedohin: Okay. And I have hope that this will give the Winnipeg Police Service and City inspectors the teeth they need to do their job. My only caution is that the maximum number of plants allowed in one house will be without a realistic ceiling on plant count. There's nothing stopping these players from simply buying up smaller homes and growing 150 plants per location.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Carmen Nedohin: I want to thank you all very much for your continued time and support and understanding of our concerns. And we are always welcome…you're always welcome to ask us any questions at anytime. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Carmen for presenting. You are our final delegation of today's Council meeting. Have a great day. Council, with that, it is time to recess. And we can reconvene at 1:30 if that's acceptable. It is 10 after 1:00 now. I know there is also issues with Outlook and we have all been very patient. That's why we see people using iPads and phones. I think some councillors wanted to print off some documents that they need. So, the motion was…1:15 p.m. Councillor Mayes? Councillor Mayes just said 1:15. Thank you. 1:15.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
October 28, 2021, at 1:28 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I'd like to reconvene our Council meeting of October 28th, 2021. We're on the reports of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 20th, 2021. But before we get into that, Mr. Mayor, if you'd take a moment to make a special announcement.

Mayor Bowman: Yeah, thanks very much, Madam Speaker. I'll be very brief. As members of Council will know, every year the Intelligent Community Forums…Forum, I should say, looks at cities from around the world to assess how those cities are impacting the economic, social and cultural development in their own community cities in the digital age. We were absolutely thrilled to be nominated in the top seven along with other phenomenal cities and communities in Vietnam, Brazil, Russia, Australia and our fellow Canadian cities of Langley township and Mississauga, Ontario. Moments before entering the floor, Madam Speaker, I was thrilled to learn that Winnipeg has been named, for the first time in our city's history, as the world's most intelligent community. And I want to thank everybody at…in our city, the Public Service, Council, Economic Development Winnipeg and our partners in business, industry, education and all levels of government for this incredible recognition. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and congratulations everybody.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor for sharing that exciting news. Onto the reports of EPC dated October 20th.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 20, 2021

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thanks everyone for that indulgence, but it's great news. I want to introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 through 16, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, stand down No. 12.

Madam Speaker: No. 12 – 311 Call Centre. Councillor Gillingham? Fifteen. Any others? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: One through 15. Why don't I have this?

Madam Speaker: It's 16.

Councillor Lukes: One through 16.

Madam Speaker: This is the report dated October 20th. Fifteen has been pulled. Okay. That's it? I'll call the question on 1 through 10, 1 through 11, pardon me, 13, 14, and 16. All in favour? Contrary. That's carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 12 – 311 Call Centre Wait Times

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Who stood this down? Item 12. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak on this, I am actually supporting the recommendation from EPC and our City administration, Madam Speaker. But while I rise to speak to this, I would just like to apologize for my outburst to the presenter, Mr. Ryback. That was inappropriate for me to laugh out loud and it's not his situation. He's not that corporation and it was an unfair outburst and I just wanted to acknowledge that. But given the presentations we heard in regards to 311, and we understand that there is a lot of struggles and many issues occurring right now from the top-down, but there was some supposition I think in some of the presentations that...presentation we heard and the idea that what we need to realize, Madam Speaker, is that this report is calling for us to measure ourselves other 311 services in the country. Government organizations. Government corporations. And Madam Speaker, unlike some of the call centres which are very specialized in computer technology, in those areas, Madam Speaker, they are, first of all, they only have a couple of services that they are handling, whereas on the City side, I think...you know, who knows? There is 100-something specific services from department right down to our branches like Forestry, for example. And so, there is a great difficulty and our 311 system is an interaction, an intake mechanism. Many of the private sector call centres, they are actually doing the work to resolve a complaint or an issue that a customer has to deal with. Whereas, at the City level, we have the department divisions and branches working on the issues that come through 311 to them and they are the ones who are resolving the problems or not depending on policy and so on. And so, we need to realize that it is an unfair comparison to say the private sector does it better. I sort of, Madam Speaker, felt a little bit insulted about management. I know that our 311 intake managers are doing the best they can and they are very knowledgeable, Madam Speaker. Very knowledgeable. And so, one last aspect I would like to point out, which the private sector doesn't, and part of the reason I was laughing, because I've utilized many business services as well as, you know, just regular customer services from that corporation, Madam Speaker. And managing change is very difficult. But our managers actually understand that we're doing intake and we have to work with the various...our internal customers, Madam Speaker, to try to make their systems work better in meeting our Winnipeggers' expectations. But as the second presenter on the item said, residents need at the front end a quicker way to get it in so that our branches divisions, departments can get a resolution to what our citizens are looking to see. So, I'm totally in support that we're going to look at comparing this to other cities and hopefully they are looking at sort of how they operate. I don't think that any 311 service for a city is actually…their individuals are actually resolving the actual problems. So, anyway, thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, I did move this motion and thanks to my colleague, Councillor Mayes for seconding it. The 311 services, the first point of contact for residents. I'm assuming maybe my colleagues have had that phone call from residents in where they state, it's the first time I've ever called my councillor. Well, when we're hearing from residents, it unfortunately seems to be a lot of, I'm sick and tired of waiting on hold for 311 or I phoned 311, stayed on hold for 20 minutes, 30 minutes and got disconnected. I'm calling you. I want you to fix my problem. Then they get frustrated at our staff because our staff aren't equipped to get that quick answer for them to resolve their issue. No, we're faced with a lot of times of directing them and supporting them to get back to the 311 system. It…satisfaction-wise, it doesn't look good on the City on either front. I'm hoping that through this and, you know, when they...when the Public Service goes and looks at this, I know we've had many reports that have come before us on Council at our various committees that we're not limited to Canada. We looked cross-jurisdictional and the sense of going into the United States or other places. I've had the opportunity of looking at some of the ways in the US where they've leveraged artificial intelligence. We've all gone to websites. I guarantee almost all of us have gone to websites where artificial intelligence is there. Where we…it's so seamless now and integrated into society, we don't even know that we're not talking to a real person on the other side. Is it scripted? A lot of times. But it's intelligent enough to pick up on the issues that are being presented and getting at law so that it can get to that human on the other end of it that's actually going to fix the problem if it's something like filling up a pothole, getting their garbage picked up. There should be no reason why anybody has to be on hold for an hour to log those types of concerns. And we've heard in the past that, you know, redirecting by e-mail is a challenge. It's creating a backlog on that system, a drain on resources because they don't have the resources to shift over to these. You know, people…and we see it in social media, people do not want to interact one-to-one a lot of times.

They want to be able to do their thing and get on with life. And I think, you know, we can find a way to be helpful on that with this report going forward. I hope it is unanimous. The one last point that I'll mention, and I think we've heard this through the COVID times, is that there's been an increased demand, a surge. The problem is when we have resources working remote part time, either conflicting priorities like family, child care, school, sickness, we don't have the ability to quickly add more staff to support what I view as the most critical, nonemergent interface that the City of Winnipeg has. And we need to have that ability to be able to be flexible, to be able to surge volume. If that's internal or through technology to support what, again, what I view as a very important piece on the image and respectfully what the view of the performance of the City of Winnipeg is gauged by. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Mayor Bowman: Oh, no, it's okay. If you want to speak, I can close.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to add some quick comments. To recognize that back in the early 1980s when Margaret Thatcher was elected to office as Prime Minister for Great Britain, one of the first things that she did was engage with private business owners and stakeholders in terms of how their efforts could be…could support increasing functionality of the British administration or their government. She spoke with business owners from Marks & Spencer's and different companies in Great Britain that were known for their business acumen. I'm hoping that the City of Winnipeg can also take the lead and reach out to stakeholders that are engaged in this type of work in customer service relationships where...whether it is inbound call service or outbound call service, to tap into that business acumen and expertise to help improve the services that we deliver through 311. So, that is the only addition that I wanted to add in terms of this conversation. How we might engage, as I've mentioned, other stakeholders, other businesses that do this on a daily basis to improve the services that we're offering to the citizens of Winnipeg. Thank you.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. I want to thank Councillor Nason for bringing this motion forward. I don't know if he's familiar, but in the past, I've brought three or four motions forward on 311. And, you know, they've all gone to the Executive Policy Committee and basically the bottom line is more funding and it ended there. So, perhaps with the...maybe call it a silver lining of COVID, we will see some changes to our frontline services. Again, Winnipeg is growing through immigration and I know for a fact that many people call 311 to seek out services and it can be very, very frustrating to have to deal with the situation as it is. The 311 people that I work with are outstanding, so it's not the people, it's the system. But you know, in my almost two terms here, I've been trying to correct the 311 system and no one's felt it important enough to address. So, hopefully, Councillor Nason, you'll be successful in this. I encourage you on.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to make the point that as we analyzed 311, as we try to evolve it, bear in mind, 311 is the frontend for services from various departments. So, if we're effective in evolving 311, it will end up affecting those various departments. So, I just want to state that for the record. We have to bear this in mind. When you're dealing with 311, you're not just dealing with 311, you're dealing with a variety of City services. So, we have got to keep that into account. It's not just about analyzing 311 services, that will be in conjunction…it's going to be effective. It's going to evolve the various departments for which 311 is the front end for communication. And also, it's really important that we do this. We don't want a city in which people feel there is no point in contacting their City for services. That's just terrible for our morale and over years, that affects all sorts of things. We need to have a city in which people have the confidence in which they can contact their city hall the best way they can, as they're told to do and get their needs addressed for those in which they can be dealt with individually and immediately, and that's what 311 is about. And so, let's hope this is part of that positivity. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. And back to you, Mr. Mayor, to close.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And yeah, I've supported this through the committee process and I want to thank my council colleagues for their efforts. I do want to just say how much I, and I know others around this council chamber appreciate the work of our call center staff. I've had the opportunity over the years to visit 311 call centre. They've got an amazing team and I think our communications team does a great job. And if there are things that we can do to improve the process at 311, obviously, that's something that we want to support. As has been mentioned by my colleagues, quite often, while 311 call centre staff may be on the frontline, it's, obviously, the…you know, the specific matter at hand may relate to the provision of services to our residents by respective departments. And so, obviously it's not just kind of that front facing interface that people have, but more so kind of the processes and responses of respective departments if we're looking at it in a…through a customer service lens, that we should be open to seeing if there is ways that, as a

municipal government, we can continue to improve. But hopefully with the support of Council, we can look to strengthen the 311 service and, of course, the information that comes from the various departments. And looking forward to supporting this and hopeful that Council will as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the vote on Item 12. Recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Santos, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, 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: Thank you. Item 12 carries unanimously. On to Item 15, Mr. Clerk.

Item 15 – Negotiations – City of Winnipeg and the United Fire Fighters of Winnipeg, Union Local 867 of the International Association of Fire Fighters

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

Mayor Bowman: Sure. I'll be brief, Madam Speaker. I want to first start by thanking the members of UFFW for their life-saving efforts that they undertake on a day-to-day basis. I think all members of Council are, obviously, deeply appreciative of the work that they do in our community and I know our residents are as well. And so, I also want to thank the negotiators at the table on both sides of the table. This was not like all collective bargaining processes. It was a lengthy process and I'm sure it was very difficult negotiations at the table, but arriving at a negotiated collective agreement is always preferable. And is something that when we have a process that has been set out by our provincial governments to allow for binding arbitration, it's obviously desirable when you can seek a negotiated settlement. As we often kind of opine at the table, at this council table, you know, one party may think it's too rich, the other party may think it's not rich enough, that is the nature of negotiations. I think this is a sustainable agreement and one that I'm certainly appreciative that the parties were able to come together and I'm hopeful that we'll be able to support it as a Council this afternoon. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any other speakers on this item? Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, I pulled this down really actually just to kind of really state pretty much what the Mayor has stated. Just appreciation, first of all, for the men and women that are members of UFFW. We know they do excellent work for the citizens of Winnipeg, for our community. You know, we know that the last week or two especially it seems that there's been a lot of fires. They have been very, very busy and very, very active and so, we do appreciate them for their ongoing work. I want to commend today the members of the City's labour team, negotiating team as well as the executive of the UFFW, Mr. Alex Forrest and Mr. Rob Labossiere are here in the chamber with us. I just want to acknowledge that it is...it seems that it is always better for the taxpayer in the long run if arbitration can be avoided. And here we have what is representative of negotiated settlement for us to vote on. And I think, you know, some of the key points of what's before us I think is we do see that the general wage increases proposed are very much in line and they have been over the last…the last contract, the four-year contract, and very much in line with projected consumer price index numbers as well. So, there is a matter of I think sustainability there and consistency that is good for all. Also, you know, one of the things that I did want to highlight is, you know, that for…for all of our emergency service workers in the City of Winnipeg, the pandemic, you know, has put undue pressure on them. And so, to see some mental health supports within this contract is something I...I'm pleased to see. I know many of my councillor colleagues are pleased to see as well. So, I'll be supporting this contract that is before us or this motion that is before us. And I again want to just acknowledge the good work of all parties to get to this agreement.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As I always have, I will again be voting with what I believe is going to be the majority of Council on this agreement with…with the firefighters of Winnipeg. I learned when I was elected, I was misled before I was elected. And I thought the firefighters' agreements, that inflation rate was the main reason for the budgetary pressures on city hall and it's not. Never was. And certainly, is not with this agreement. And it's not just that I felt that the firefighters were being treated unfairly by our lack of clarity from the City of Winnipeg. Leaving people with the impression that it was the firefighters that were causing the inflationary pressures. They were the major factor. And they weren't. They're not. And by this agreement, you can see that they will not be for the time being of this agreement. And

it's not just unfair to firefighters, Madam Speaker, it's unfair to Winnipeggers. It's unfair to taxpayers. We all ought to know why our budget is changing, why our taxes are going up. Why our services are going down. Why we're going further into debt or if you don't want to say we're going into debt, you know, why we are selling debentures in a longer term. It might change from year to year, but that is the great…the grand movement of things. As the historical record will show for this last decade and for all indications, the 2020s as well so far. And so, I need to stand corrected. I need to make the point that I've been corrected by doing my own research and realising that it never was the firefighters. There's room for negotiation. There was negotiation here. I feel the negotiation was fair. I actually think that they came once again to a realistic agreement. And, therefore, I'll be agreeing with this collective agreement today because I feel it is within the realm of sustainability. I don't feel that all of the agreements that the City makes are within the realm of sustainability. This one is. Thank you.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The salary increases that are in line with frontline workers, the uniforms, the mental health and addictions and the steps to retain staff, these are the three reasons why I think both teams, the formidable UFFW and the City negotiating team should be proud of this agreement. This historic agreement during a pandemic, yes. But the work of these formidable public servants on the one hand and UFFW needs to be acknowledged and I want to do that today, Madam Speaker. And, of course, as the Chair of Protection, support the motion as it goes forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor, to close or I can call the question? Calling the question on Item 15. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Next is the notice of motion that was brought forward last month. It now appears on today's Council agenda; moved by Councillor Orlikow, seconded by Mayor Bowman – Indigenous Symbolic Items in the Council Chamber. Councillor Orlikow.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTION

Item 1 - Indigenous Symbolic Items in the Council Chamber

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.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam.

Madam Speaker: I just want to clarify, I'm just looking at the mover here, and this is under Executive Policy Committee. Mr. Mayor…Mr. Clerk, the Mayor could open and maybe share his time or speak second? Okay.

City Clerk: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Because it is a motion moved by Councillor Orlikow, it falls to Councillor Orlikow to open. He can certainly defer.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you for clarifying. Councillor Orlikow, to proceed and introduce the motion.

Councillor Orlikow: My pleasure. It's a very simple motion with some very important ramifications and another big positive step to flow from the flag raising we did and the amazing work I think…I know we're doing as part of our reconciliation in the City of Winnipeg. So, it's asking for a report to go out and consult with the aboriginal leaders in Winnipeg to look for a symbol or symbols that could be added into the chamber to represent the history and the culture of the aboriginal peoples in Winnipeg and to pay respect to that culture as well. So, that is what it's asking for, come back with a report. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Firstly, I want to thank our Deputy Mayor for moving this matter. I'm really proud to second it. I want to just acknowledge and applaud all of those efforts in our community at the grassroots level, in institutions and in our municipal government to support the journey of reconciliation that we're all on as Canadians. This is going to be a long and difficult journey in which we have to confront a lot of truths and we have to act to reconcile a painful history and present day for many in our community. And so, there's a lot at work that is ongoing. The Indigenous Accord, among many other things that the City has been doing, obviously the permanent raising of the three flags; the Treaty One First Nations flag, the Dakota First Nations flag as well as the Métis Nation flags. I think are permanent and positive additions at our city hall. Also, the inclusion of the treaty…the land acknowledgment that our Speaker and committee chairs do at the beginning of all of our formal meetings. These things do matter. They're not the only thing to help with our reconciliation efforts, but they communicate our commitment to working with Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canadians, to respond to the Truth and Reconciliation Calls to Action as well as the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women Calls to Justice. That work continues. But when you look around this council chamber, there is something missing. I love seeing the flags that we have here. I love seeing the symbols that we have. But there is something missing. Winnipeg is home to the largest Indigenous community in Canada. It's growing. We should celebrate it. We should be proud of it and we should communicate that all Winnipeggers, including Indigenous Winnipeggers, have a place in this council chamber and in our community. And so, this motion does ask our Public Service to engage with Indigenous governments on a government-to-government basis to have that dialogue as well as to recognize that this is a…this is a historical…this building has historical designation and that needs to be respected and then to come back to Council for consideration. And so, I'm hopeful that we'll be able to support this, hopefully unanimously. I know there has been good work by members of Council around this chamber over recent years and hopefully this can be a really positive addition for all of us as a municipal government and a positive and powerful symbol going forward for our reconciliation work. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, Councillor Orlikow, do you wish to close or shall I call the question? Any other speakers? Okay. Call the question on this notice of motion. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We'll now move into by-laws of the...or pardon me. There is one...there is one motion. I don't have mine numbered, Mr. Clerk. Is it Motion No. 1? Okay. Motion No. 1, moved by Councillor Mayes and seconded by Mayor Bowman. It's regarding the 2031 Pan Am Games. It's an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. If we could just read out, Mr. Clerk, be it resolved.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Bowman,

WHEREAS the COVID-19 pandemic has negatively impacted the economy of the City of Winnipeg, in particular its service, hospitality and tourism sectors;

AND WHEREAS strategic government investment would help to stimulate local spending and financial growth;

AND WHEREAS the Pan American Games are one of the world's largest multi-sport events and bring together more than 6000 elite athletes from North America, South America, Central America and the Caribbean;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg is one of only two Canadian cities to have successfully hosted the Pan American Games, in 1967 and again in 1999, including its estimated 100,000 associated visitors;

AND WHEREAS thirty-two years passed between the hosting of the 1967 and 1999 Pan American Games and in 2031 another thirty-two years will have passed since the City of Winnipeg hosted the event;

AND WHEREAS its widely-acknowledged success as Pan American Games host spurred the City on to host other large events, a development that continues to positively contribute to Winnipeg's service and tourism industries;

AND WHEREAS the Pan American Games of 1967 and 1999 left behind sporting and recreational infrastructure that provides lasting value to City residents, including amenities such as the Pan Am Pool, Pan American Track and Field Stadium and the Investors Group Athletic Centre;

AND WHEREAS large sporting bids require considerable time to organize prior to submission;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Public Service, in conjunction with external stakeholders, work with Economic Development Winnipeg and Tourism Winnipeg to explore a potential Winnipeg bid to host the 2031 Pan American Games and that discussions regarding a possible bid be initiated with the federal and provincial governments.

Clerk: Therefore be it resolved that the Public Service, in conjunction with external stakeholders, work with Economic Development Winnipeg and Tourism Winnipeg to explore a potential Winnipeg bid to host the 2031 Pan American Games and that discussions regarding a possible bid be initiated with the federal and provincial governments.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That is an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. We'll now move into by-laws, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law 96/2021, By-law 97/2021, By-law 98/2021 and By-law 99/2021.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 96/2021, By-law No. 97/2021, By-law No. 98/2021 and By-law No. 99/2021.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the By-laws No. 96/2021 to 99/2021, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 96/2021 to 99/2021, both inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 96/2021 to 99/2021, 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? That's carried. We'll now have question period under the Executive Policy Committee. Any questions for Mayor Bowman? Any questions? Okay. Seeing none, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. We have no report today. No by-laws. No motions. So, we'll get right into question period. Any questions for our chair, for Councillor Gillingham?

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE DATED OCTOBER 15, 2021

Councillor Gillingham: I there think there are two items, Madam Speaker. So, I would introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 and 2.

Madam Speaker: Oh, I'm sorry. Just one moment. I'm sorry. I'm just…I was looking at the wrong page, pardon me. Councillor Gillingham has moved consent of the two items. All in favour?

Councillor Eadie: Stand down 2, please. Sorry.

Madam Speaker: Two has been stood down. I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Councillor Nason has been noted in opposition to Item No. 1.

Item 2 – Strategic Priorities Action Plan

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. Yes, this really is a motion that calls for an alignment of the future strategic priorities action plan that will be at some point in the future developed by Council as per the plans of OurWinnipeg 2045. This motion is about aligning that strategic priorities action plan, when it is put in place, with the next term of the multi-year budget just so that they overlap the same four-year cycle. Really ideally, a plan should come first and a budget should fund a plan. And so, to have a strategic plan for the City of Winnipeg, we talked about the need for this for many, many years. OurWinnipeg 2045 calls for that plan to be developed by…by a future Council. When that plan is developed, it should align with the four-year…the next four-year budget.

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

Councillor Lukes: Councillor Eadie first.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Okay. Councillor Eadie, followed by Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm actually going to support this motion. But I needed to establish some concerns I've had with our current first four-year balanced budget, Madam Speaker. And aligning our strategic priority action plan coming from Council is very important to align with that. But I really still have concerns and, you know, we're not complete this 2022 budget cycle yet, but Madam Speaker, you know, we're just saying to align the dates. I know that. But let's not misinterpret that, you know, when you have extraordinary events, Madam Speaker, there are some actual extraordinary things we should be doing as Council to ensure that that budget is able to alleviate situations. We do have this plan coming, our economic plan, Madam Speaker, coming on November 1st to our community committee and, you know, that's great, but I'm looking at what's being propose to do and I just...when we established what a serious change could be to that four-year...whatever year it might be, it might be the first year or...well, usually not. But you know, second, third or fourth year, you know, ultimately why are we going with what we set up? Because you know what, what we're going to try to do, and you know, we're doing our best and I appreciate the work that our administration's look into it, Madam Speaker. But ultimately, when an extraordinary event comes up, strategy is strategy. But now we have to do something that is actually going to contribute something directly to people's lives at the City level. And we are unable to do that because we do balance budgets. However, there are some drastic changes we could go away from that were incorporated into the four-year budget. But Madam Speaker, it's not happening. So, I just want to point out that, you know, alignment with a strategic actions that would come from the new Council because we have an election in '22, that's fine.

‘23, we're kind of having to live with that because a strategic action, you know, that contributes to 2045 and that's also going to look at fitting in with the metro Winnipeg 2050, I think it is 2050. Anyway. And by the way, they just proclaimed the amendment to the municipal planning and City of Winnipeg Charter so it's being proclaimed in action as of October 29th, 2021. So, which will play a big role in, you know, strategy with OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities, Madam Speaker. So, you know, anyway...I just wanted to get that on the record that I appreciate that we say we're going to do the alignment. We as Council are doing this on behalf of the next council. Because that cycle, right, will be the new council cycle, not this council cycle. It will be the new council cycle. So, important to note. That's all I wanted to say. It doesn't mean that the strategic action plan has to align with our current council 's perspective on what a four-year balanced budget looks like. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I’m rising to speak to Councillor Gillingham's motion. Strategic plans for the city are in addition to various specific strategies; the transportation strategy, parks and rec. Most strategic plans are developed by the city’s…City Council or a standing policy committee. Strategic plans are also critical to helping the CAO guide and direct the thousands of public servants. Strategic plans help to guide the Public Service’s decision-making process. Over my terms here, many Public Service members have come to me looking to have a strategic plan to help them guide their departments. Strategic plans for the city are in addition to various strategies as I’ve mentioned. All of…all of Canada's major cities published a form of a strategic plan: Vancouver, Edmonton, Calgary…just hold on here, my mouse died, Regina, London, Hamilton, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal and Halifax. All of these cities have had strategic plans for years. And noted, all the cities of the Big City Mayors, except Winnipeg, published a strategic plan. Vancouver and Edmonton also have a further corporate plan. The City of Calgary and London have aligned the term lengths of the strategic plan at the municipal budget. Now, this one’s very interesting; the City of Ottawa utilizes a term of council priorities document that provides a score card to measure the performance of council to achieve the goals established within the strategic plan. And I think therein lies a key significance of the strategic plan. It's a score card to measure the performance of council, to measure accountability and actions. Over the last seven years, we've had motions for a strategic plan come forward. Councillor Wyatt brought forward a motion that was shut down by the Executive Policy Committee. Over the term, many councillors spoke in need for a strategic plan and when the pressure increased on leadership, an off-site meeting was held under the facade of a strategic planning session. Following the 2018 election, I again wanted to see a strategic plan in place but it was clear that under the current leadership at that time and now that wasn't going to occur. Today we're seeing strong leadership from Councillor Gillingham. And equally as important as leadership, through this motion, he brings forward the wisdom and insight into why a strategic plan is important for Council, for the Public Service and for the residents of Winnipeg. So, I encourage you to support the report to develop a strategic priorities action plan that will align with the budgets. And in my humble opinion, this is the kind of leadership we want to see from a mayor. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In terms of logistical alignment, time-wise, this is the right thing to do. I’ve got no problem with that. The issue is what we mean by a strategic priorities action plan. Because I’ve been saying for years our budget is unsustainable. So, what will the action plan include? Will the action plan include providing for councillors in the future? Why it's unsustainable and what we're going to do to try to make it sustainable. And if we can’t, what we’re going to tell the taxpayers of Winnipeg. If we can’t create a sustainable budget. I’ll give you just one example today. There's lots of talk, but I’ve talked about this before. But I’m going to give a specific question that everybody is in a position to try to find an answer to. And you don’t have to take my word for it. You can talk to other people. There’s lots of information out there. I’ve provided it over the years. But here’s one: in the last 30 years, and that’s how you have to think about budgets...remember, this budget is…this budget plan is for 2045, so we're talking about a 25-year budget plan. So, realistically, you have to think in terms of a generation. You have to think in terms of a few decades, which is essentially within the adult life time of the majority of people in this room. This is realistic planning for a council or any level of government. So, in the last 30 years, since I’ve been…well within the time that I’ve been an adult, the cost of construction contracts has gone up about 15 times higher than the wages of construction workers. So, therefore, we all have to ask the obvious question; how long can that go on? And I use construction workers as an example because people might get the impressions if construction contracts…the cost of construction contracts has gone up by 17 times, let's say, or 15 times or whatever, 17 times, 18 times depending on how you look at these things in 30 years, maybe the construction workers wages have gone up 17 times. They haven't. They’ve gone up about 85%. So, they haven't even gone up 100%. Hasn't even doubled. So, if something has gone up...construction has gone up 15 times, but the construction workers' wages have only...haven't even doubled, how long can that go on? Now, some people would say that is a math question you’d be asked in high school. Oh, how long…what is going to happen in another 10 years? How do you extrapolate? What is the calculus? Whatever. Well, obviously, that is our job to answer the question. Because unless you can stand up and say no, it's sustainable and this is why, and these are the projections in 10-years from now or in 25 years from now in 2045, this is how it's sustainable because these will be the construction costs and these will be the wages and this will be our tax base and this will be our debt and this is how we're going to abet this or whatever by how we're going deal with

the rest of the services the City provides. Well, come on. Let's just…let's just accept the fact that we're not on a sustainable course. Unless you can prove otherwise, but I've been wait…you know, I've been…I've been here seven years. No one is showing how it is sustainable. Good. Because you can't. So, at least we're in agreement on that so far. At least from what I've been seeing actively. No one's actively said my stats are wrong. So, when it comes to creating a strategic priorities action plan regarding the budget, how it amalgamates with the budget, coincides with budget timing, through the Finance Committee, I don't understand how we're...how it will have any great relevance other than timing coincidence, coinciding with the budget because we have to ask these questions. I've been asking these questions for years. I've been told, oh, well, it's coming around. The administration is going to offer…offer a report. Or it's going to be part of something. It's going to be in the budget. It never is. Maybe it will be in a…the strategic priorities action plan. We are talking about how we curb the costs for firefighters, how their contracts have reduced. Or police or how we're cutting the services here. But that doesn't mean our taxes are going down. That doesn't mean we're maintaining the same level of services in other departments. That doesn't mean we're not asking for more and more money in construction projects from other levels of government. We are. So, what's our 25-year plan at this rate? Where does it go? That's a good...that's…obviously, it's not as a good question, it's a necessary question. I can't imagine not asking that question or going back to my constituents next election and say, well, I don't know. I don't know. But I didn't ask, either. I'm asking and I'm providing information for people to work with, for the administration to answer to. So, it's all a very nice day, that today we're going to vote on coinciding timewise the ability of having a strategic priorities action plan from the Finance Committee to coincide with the budget folks. That's nice. But remember, it's…we're talking about a 2045 action plan. So, it's not about just timing things for voting, for coinciding things throughout the year. It's about saying where we're going to be in 25 years at the rate we're going. So, let's answer that question. Where are we going to be in 25 years at the rate we're going? That is the question everybody, all the taxpayers of Winnipeg deserve an answer. And if we find out that the answer to that isn't sustainable, what is our plan? That is our job.

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

Councillor Gillingham: You can call the question, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Okay. Any questions? We're now at question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Gillingham? Seeing none, let's move on; Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. Councillor Mayes.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT DATED OCTOBER 8, 2021

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll move consent agenda Items 1 and 3 and hold No. 2.

Madam Speaker: There is an amending motion for 1. Okay. Which other one did you want to pull? One will be pulled. There is an amending motion. You'll call the question on 2 and 3?

Councillor Mayes: Two is pulled, 3 to…3 is moved.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Two is pulled. Was there another hand up here? No? Okay. I'll call the question on Item 3. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 1.

Item 1 – Ten-Year Financial Plan for the Solid Waste Utility

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. There is an amending motion to go with this. Mr. Clerk, what is the number of the motion? The number of the motion? Mine isn't numbered. Okay. Motion No. 2 is an amending motion moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Orlikow. This is Councillor Mayes, your opportunity to introduce the item, and of course, speak to the amending motion.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

WHEREAS on October 8, 2021, the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment recommended to Council that a proposed mandatory Multi-Family Waste Diversion fee to fund diversion programs, be referred to the 2022 Budget Review Process instead of being recommended for implementation on January 1, 2023;

AND WHEREAS in response to the recommendation of the Standing Committee, Legal Services has submitted a Communication to Council indicating that as the Multi Family Waste Diversion fee was the only reason for the amendment of the By-law, the by-law amendment cannot proceed at this time and should be withdrawn;

AND WHEREAS Recommendation 4 of Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment dated October 8, 2021 reads:

"4. That the Solid Waste By-law 110/2012 be replaced with a new Solid Waste By-law as per attached to align with this report's recommendations.";

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment dated October 8, 2021 be amended by deleting Recommendation 4 in its entirety and renumbering the remaining accordingly.

Councillor Mayes: It's my long-time goal to have my name on every single motion and the meeting has been shattered by number five, I see, courtesy of Councillor Chambers. Yes, this is a...Item 1…two different 10-year plans here. So, a little tricky. No. 1 is the 10-year plan for the solid waste utility. Good debate at committee. Item 2 was approved to move forward. That is a 4R depot fee for small commercial. Much more debate about No. 1, so that was referred to the budget. I believe that's the potential for a new fee for multi-family. As you'll remember, back...well, back in October, 10 years actually, October of 2011, Council voted to proceed with an expansive new solid waste pickup regime, recycle garbage fee was introduced for family homes, not for multi-family. Given that the by-law change only was needed if that fee changed, staff have very alertly spotted that the by-law doesn't need to proceed. So, thanks to Councillor Orlikow for seconding the motion. It's entirely housekeeping. So, the by-law need not proceed if the fee is not proceeding at this time. Hopefully that clears matters up on Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. And could we have that resolve read out? Thank you.

Clerk: That Item 1 of the report on the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment dated October 8th, 2021, be amended by deleting Recommendation 4 in its entirety and renumbering the remaining accordingly.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yeah, I'm going to speak to the report, the amendment…and the amendment. Madam Speaker, thanks for...now I understand what the amendment is about. So, because I did read the communications from Legal in regards to 82. But this makes it...I thank the Chairperson for making it clear to me what's happening here. So, I'm rising to speak to it and I'll be supporting the amending motion as well as, I will support the multi-family initiative that fell under this plan that is actually a recommendation that Water and Waste who run solid waste, is really implementing recommendations from a consultant report, Madam Speaker, that isn't open transparent. I'm not going to get into accountability at this point. But it is not open and transparent, Madam Speaker, as to what that consultant has recommended as best practice and issues to deal with, Madam Speaker. And actually, even on this point and the amendment, while they describe to a certain extent the issues related to the various fees, Madam Speaker, the...their…the financial rationale needed to be more detailed and it was to some degree explained. But Madam Speaker, I'd like to know…we RFP'd, we got this consultant's report. I understand it's really large, Madam Speaker. And rather than saying that there would be a battle or anything, we know that what we've been told for solid waste is best practice is not necessarily best practice when you look around the country. Which the Chairperson has rightly stated months ago already, I think it was. But I heard him publicly talk about what is best practice, Madam Speaker. So, I have great concerns, though, because I envisioned not one system for every individual in Winnipeg. So, in this case, we're talking about this is how the fee schedule is going to be set up and dealt with for multiple...multi-family properties, which is different than the bin collection we have in most areas of our residential...most residential areas, Madam Speaker. So, but for example, I want to understand when they talk about...you know, they are saying markets and I'd like to understand a little more and read the report that would have it explained how they think the market will be affected in terms of competition, in terms of tipping fees, all that kind of stuff. So, Madam

Speaker, because I think there is some things that will happen to a certain circumstances. I don't know. But ultimately, though, they're pulling this out of a recommendation from a consultant's report that should be open and transparent and made public to everybody so that when I, from the Council level and the Governance level, Madam Speaker, I should be able to know what Water and Waste is basically taking everything out of this report and implementing it. That's what's happening here. That's what I see. Well, that's what I hear. I don't necessarily see it. But you know, let's get that report. I don't even know, does it take a motion from Council? Like, that's a consultant's report, you know, it should be made public. If Water and Waste is going to be following it, I want to know what's in it because I think it's going to go against the best interests of the residents of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker. I don't know. Because I don't know what they're pulling this out of. I know what practices don't work in Mynarski and in Point Douglas and in Daniel McIntyre, Madam Speaker. So, you know, solid waste, it's not just about…the finances are related to how the system works, Madam Speaker. And I'm telling you right now, the one system for all ain't working. Isn't working at all in certain areas of this city. So, I'll leave it at that. I'll be voting in favour of the amendment and I will support the Chairperson is recommending the amendments…the recommendations one, two, three and then the fifth one, I think. So, I'll be in support. Thanks.

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

Councillor Nason: Sorry, Mr. Chair. Madam Speaker, the Chair tried to jump up and I usurped him on that. I spoke a lot or a fair bit about this and voted against the main motion at the standing committee. Subsequent to that, I've had some exchanges with some representatives of the condo association in Winnipeg. And their big concerns, nobody talked to them. They've actually put an article out on the matter. They didn't come speak to it, though, I guess timing with regards to the matter didn't align with the schedule of the chair of that association. I am concerned that we're introducing additional fees at a time with a market that...we have some and have had some changes in the dynamic. The condominiums have moved more to...I can speak in my ward, have moved more to apartments as opposed to condominiums. This does present a bit of a burden and I think may result in less recycling as opposed to what we hoped to as having more. It is going to the budget process. I think I may end up supporting this and the amending motion today. I have encouraged the association to definitely line themselves up to come, to speak to this at the budget process when that time comes. And I expect that many condo association presidents and residents that are in those should come to speak to this and the other matters that, you know, we're raising and particularly in this time of hyperinflation and affordability that we're facing coming forward. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise this afternoon. I'm not going to support this motion or the amendment going forward. I've heard from many residents in my ward that are condo owners that, you know, are...have downsized, have moved into condos and are on fixed incomes and are already paying large condo fees. To add more money to their budgets I think you know, really squeezes them in a way that, you know, it...and not in a fair way. So, from that perspective, Madam Speaker, I won't be supporting this motion or the amending motion today. And hope we can find a better way to move multi-family waste diversion in a more effective way that doesn't squeeze the residents in condos that are on fixed incomes. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Any other speakers? Councillor Orlikow, yes.

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah, I'll just stand up to just clarify what I understand is that, the issue that Councillor Chambers is bringing up is not part of this. That has been referred to the budget process. So, if he's saying it shouldn't be referred to the budget process, that's fine. But again, I just want to be clear for everybody that, to approve this today, number one is not part of it. It's being referred to the budget process. So, we'll leave it at that.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you to Councillor Orlikow for that. Yes, I fear in trying to clarify matters with the amending motion and the by-law, we may have muddied the waters slightly. Apologies for that. But Councillor Orlikow has done a good job of trying to clarify. The proposed fee for multi-family has been referred to…it would be referred to the budget under this. There's a small commercial fee that would come in to effect for each of the 4R depot. It's my understanding from some staff that that's a request of the commercial operators. They want to start using the 4R depots. So, hopefully that will be approved. Give some credit to 10 years ago. I wasn't here yet, in fact, nobody from St. Vital was here. That was during the by-law…bi-election period. That must not have been an easy vote in some ways in looking back for someone like Councillor Gerbasi who I'm sure wanted that program to go through. Here was a breakthrough on garbage and recycling and the thought of a pilot project on compost. Yet the means to pay for it was a flat rate fee. I know that troubled Councillor Eadie then, it's troubles him now. He's certainly influenced my thinking on it. But I want to commend councillor…well, there were several councillors and Mayor Katz who voted for that program. It's certainly has improved our diversion rate. We've plateaued. We may even have receded slightly, but from that 2011 period until the Mayor

Bowman took over, well into…for several years, we have made great progress on our diversion rate. More work to be done, obviously. Compost will need to be discussed by the next council, but some good progress was done there. Councillor Eadie has talked about, well, should it really be a flat rate? But I'm sure there was difficulty back 10 years ago that, keep in mind, there were…the 14…13 straight years at that point of tax freezes and suddenly there is a $50 fee. Roughly equivalent to a 3% tax increase. That had to be debated. So, I'm pleased that system was brought in. It took effect October 2012. As Aaron McDowell would say, the month of…the nightmare month of…the garbage apocalypse, I think was his term, we had some issues back there in October of 2012. That got worked through, though, and new operators have been pretty effective, too, I think. So, we'll have this debate either internally or otherwise about what to do with the multi-family units. There is an equity argument both ways. Hey, why shouldn't they pay if houses are paying? On the other hand, is this fair to people in condos and apartments who aren't paying now? To be discussed. But for today, at least the vote is really on referring that to the budget and implementing the relatively small issue of the 4R depot fee for small commercial.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. With that, we'll vote on the amending Motion 2. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Klein and Chambers noted in opposition. All in favour of the main item, as amended? Contrary? Councillor Klein and Chambers recorded in opposition. And the item carries. Mr. Clerk, Item 2.

Item 2 – Update to the Ten-Year Water and Sewer Financial Plan

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

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, I pulled this. I just wanted to commend some very good work ongoing from our…from our sewage dream team as I referred to them. They may not like that. Moira Geer and Cynthia Wiebe and Lucy Szkwarek, the author of this report. Very good summary of the numbers, some of the issues. In a way, it's a good news story saying because certain projects have been delayed, where actually, would be able to afford some capital items without having to change the rate structure. One of those is the CSO increase that I put forward with others here. That's…that won't be debated as part of the budget. I have referred to the CSO plan as $2 billion. That is really not fair. That is including the 100% markup we put in contingency and we continue to refer to the transit plan as a billion, so I think it is only fair that we refer to the CSO plan as a billion. There may be increases there due to the contingency but we'll see that's separate than construction inflation, which will have its effect on both the CSO plan and on the Transit Plaster Plan. But some very good work here. And I should say, there was some comments there earlier about the Mayor. I'll just say, we didn't get going on the North End under the previous mayor. We have gotten going under the north…on the North End under the current mayor. It's hundreds of millions of dollars. It's a very important project. I would hope, we probably all hope, we get going on the biosolids building phase two, under the current mayor, some time within the next year. We've got about a year less a day left to us, I think. So, I certainly would like the keep going. But we've…we have done some important work, some environmental work. You see some of it listed in front of you. Hopefully, we will continue to, my own view, and accelerate the CSOs program. But I think that North End project is a huge environmental commitment and it is a huge step forward under this mayor, so I'm pleased that we've become able to do that. So, not much controversial in this report. I've told Ms. Szkwarek if I don't retire, she can't retire. So, that's…you know, if I'm back for another four, she has to stay back because we really have been getting great numbers and data out of the departments I have to say. So, very pleased with that. And to be debated, I guess, where we go and on CSO, but there's a billion-dollar plan, but frankly, if we do $45 million a year for 20 years, we're most of the way home, subject to construction inflation. But that is a separate issue.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Any further speakers? Any further speakers? Councillor Mayes, do you wish to close? I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We now have a notice of motion before us. It's Motion No. 3, moved by Mayor Bowman, seconded by Councillor Orlikow. It will appear on the next regular Council agenda. It's regarding race to zero campaign. And we shall read the resolved.

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

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

WHEREAS Canada is facing a climate emergency, be it wildfires, flooding or heat waves, the country is experiencing the climate crisis in cities firsthand, and action is needed;

AND WHEREAS recognizing the urgency of the climate crisis, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities' Big City Mayors' Caucus (BCMC) committed to acting to keep global warming to below the 1.5 degrees Celsius goal of the Paris Agreement, which means reducing global emissions to zero or net-zero by 2050 at the latest;

AND WHEREAS in advance of the upcoming United Nations Climate Change Conference COP26, BCMC declared support for the Cities Race to Zero pledge as part of the United Nation's Race to Zero campaign and urged all Canadian cities to join Cities Race to Zero;

AND WHEREAS the Race to Zero is a United Nations campaign to rally leadership and support from businesses, cities, regions, investors for a healthy, resilient, zero carbon recovery that prevents future threats, creates jobs, and inclusive, sustainable growth;

AND WHEREAS acknowledging that climate change is a serious global challenge, the City of Winnipeg developed a community climate action plan, an initiative called Winnipeg's Climate Action Plan: Planning for Climate Change, Acting for People;

AND WHEREAS the Plan outlines the City of Winnipeg and the broader community's commitment to work together. It provides a framework to proactively, meaningfully and effectively mitigate climate change by reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions setting the goal of achieving an 80% reduction by 2050;

AND WHEREAS the City also initiated a GHG emissions reduction modeling and financial analysis project called The Community Energy Investment Roadmap which will forecast energy use and emissions, and provide an estimation of the costs and benefits of implementing actions needed to meet climate targets;

AND WHEREAS PlanWinnipeg 2045 set out to meet and exceed greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets of 20 percent by 2030, relative to 2011, and net zero by 2050, by working towards partnerships with the community, businesses, and government bodies including Indigenous, Federal and Provincial governments;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. *That Council place on record its support for the United Nations Race to Zero campaign.*

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. That will appear on the next month's Council agenda. We'll now have question period under this committee. Councillor Eadie, first question.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thanks Madam…Madam Speaker. I'm rising to ask a question about, so, our chairperson pointed out that yes, it's…this mayor…this council…this council, who got the North…okay, I'll call it the North End Sewage Treatment. Apparently, that's the licenced name. Supposedly, we can't change that in our licence application, but it is serving all of North Winnipeg as well as parts of CentrePort and other municipalities around, Madam Speaker. Anyway, and I…my question is, I believe work is undertaken and there is some kind of construction or preparation happening, where Chief Peguis Trail comes into Main Street, and right across the street there…they've been cutting down some trees, they've been doing some kind of work, hasn't been fully described. And I would just like to find out if that is the North End, the headworks, prep work getting ready to establish a staging area for the workers? That's the question, is this…are they…is that what's happening there? They're setting up the station?

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

Councillor Mayes: No idea, but I can certainly look into it. But I…I would like to answer something Councillor Eadie raised earlier, and it was a fair point about that report, about solid waste utility and a consultant's report that was 1,200 pages or something, not to be confused with the 1,200 page CSO report. That's a fair question, Councillor Eadie, to say, "where is that?", if we're making votes on things based on a report, where…where is it? That's a very fair questionable…I'll certainly follow up with the staff to try and get that released. I think that's a fair request. On the North End, I will…I'll follow up and see what I can get, and get that information.

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

Councillor Eadie: I'll just follow up. Did you know that people are…thought that we were starting the Chief Peguis Trail West extension, and everybody was hopeful, Madam Speaker, and they were actually going to be happy with the people in Kildonan, Old Kildonan and Mynarski? But anyway, so I'm wondering if…if he knows that, and I would just throw in, you know, in some neighbourhoods, it's no longer the garbage apocalypse, but it is a garbage disaster in some neighbourhoods around the city.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Do you wish to respond, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: We had some litigious former contractors, so I won't take too much. In terms of an ongoing garbage, I mean, I'm sure you're in touch with the administration. In my ward, I certainly think service complaints have gone down, and we get those 311 reports. So, that's my impression of our solid waste pick-up. Of course, it is two different zones now. It isn't one private firm. It's two different firms, so there…there may be variances. That would be interesting to see, actually, which…if it's different between the two zones. That's a fair request. So, we'll follow up on that and see if the staff can perhaps give us a report back on that. We've had the new…we've had the new firms in for a few years now at least, so there probably pretty good data to take a look at the rate of complaint, versus prior arrangement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes our question period under this committee. Next committee is Innovation and Economic Development. We'll get right into question period. Any questions for our chair? Any questions for Councillor Browaty? None today. Let's go to the next committee; Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Gilroy, on the report dated October 13th.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED OCTOBER 13, 2021**

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move consent and agenda, please.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? This is Property and Development, Councillor Eadie. I think you wanted to speak to Item 1 – the Cannabis Cultivation. Okay. So, we'll pull that. Councillor Lukes. Four? Okay. Item 1 and 4 have been pulled. Okay. I'll call the question on 2, 3, 5 and 6. Okay. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Cannabis Cultivation in Residential Areas

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

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

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. And I rise and I know, Madam Speaker, that you are supportive of what I'm going to have to say about this report. And so, to start, again, I appreciate the work of the City's administration. We had a couple of people from the Planning Department do this on...off the side of their desk. It's a very complex matter. And so, I'd like to thank the administration for actually trying to get outside of a box because I think there is a box, a misunderstanding about why zoning exists because there are cities in the past and probably still are where there is no zone. I believe it's Houston, Texas where they had...or was it Dallas? Anyway, there's a city that never had zoning and it just...like it sounded pretty crazy. But hey, business got done, Madam Speaker. Business got done. But was it necessarily good for the people? Let's wonder. But you set up in residential, is established for residential. And there are people growing medical cannabis who live in their homes. We heard from Mr. Stairs today. And I appreciate everything he has to say. And he's got a legitimate concern. There's no doubt about it. Especially for those who…it was difficult in the old days, Madam Speaker. Medical cannabis, when it was first brought in and the reasonable access to medical cannabis, which is a reasonable right of those people who need medical cannabis, to get it in the best fashion, the best way that they could. And back then, the prices were huge and the quality of the medication was poor. Then we moved to 2015 as he explained, and then they added…and they added in the ability for edibles, creams and so on, which is a fair amount of produced production that has to happen in order to convert that cannabis into these other products. And the level of prescriptions has gone way up, which is what Health Canada is certifying, who actually, you know, back when they originally formed it, they actually said you could only have up to four prescriptions, four certified…licensed certified growers, whether that be done by two people for those four grow operations or by four individuals who could probably do it in the same house as well…same address, because that's the Government of Canada's rules. Now, they put those rules in there because there were concerns. Inside a building, Madam Speaker, let's talk about the health concerns because I'm really…need people to understand. Particulates in the air, that's what causes smell. We have banned smoking indoors and it's the particulates in the air that are a health hazard to others, not just what you're inhaling. Similar goes for almost any odor you smell in the air. Some aren't going to cause you a problem, but there is the health issue of people with allergies and asthma. Those are health issues and the people who live near these things, their health is affected. Their health. Inside a house, if I end up going in a house, let's say it does change, and somebody has to move out of a house and move into an M1 zoned address, what will happen is, whoever buys that home…and here 's the problem and this is probably why Health Canada said only that many in one address, is that the mold issues and other health issues that could affect one's health is there. So, we need to remember that, too. Let's not forget, there are many other health issues surrounding these things. So, what we're proposing to do here, it's not perfect. There…you know, if people really want to abuse it. But ultimately, we're giving, in this motion, we're giving our administration, I think it is 180 days, six months, to come up with by-laws and they will be looking in…when they're looking at implementing it, thinking about what future outcomes could happen to the abusers of the system. We, you know…I'm not going to accuse any one individual or anybody of the abuse of the medical cannabis system as it exists in this city or any other city. Health Canada needs to make some changes as well. I'm not for banning individuals from growing their own, but you know, ultimately, on the market, there is a cheaper way. So, when I hear about the concern about making it more expensive to do the grow, what I...what I think we should do, I'm not moving an amendment, but it occurred to me, Madam Speaker, that we should do the...somebody needs to do the economics, the specific economics related to producing medical cannabis. And the stuff they're retailing out there right now, it would work for a lot. Like, the quality and the…like, it's amazing like the measurement, like you can get 26% of this and you know. Anyway, it's amazing how that market has developed. But somebody should do the economics so we…before we put together the by-law to determine. Because when you have people buying a house for $400,000 or $500,000 and all the production equipment and the upgrades to the electrical and the cost of the water and the proper filtration and ventilation required for growing indoors, Madam Speaker, like, let's do the economics of this because, you know, we had one presenter today who decided that they don't want to grow their own. They can get it cheaper for what they need on

the open market, where, you know, increase the…increase the level of production from them. That gets the per cost, cost per unit down. I know these people are out trying to make a profit. But you know, really, the cost per unit goes down. That is why they're growing so many…growing so many in one house, the cost per unit goes way down per production unit. It goes way down the more plants you have, to a certain point. And, anyway, so maybe throwing the idea out there or anybody in the public, if they want to do the economics of growing your own medical cannabis and maybe the extra costs for making edibles, creams and so on and so forth because that is a real production process. Growing is part of it and cultivating, but ultimately, it is what I call production. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie. Any further speakers? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I know, Madam Speaker, you don't often step down from the podium to speak so I just wanted to note various…various speakers today, thank you for your efforts on the medical cannabis front. So, I just wanted to make sure that's on the record. I can't…I won't take credit for the progress on this file. Councillor Eadie, Councillor Lukes and Councillor Sharma were certainly mentioned. So, my thanks for your work on this.

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

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, Councillor Mayes covered what I was going to do. And I'd like to thank him through you, Madam Speaker, for recognizing our colleagues who have, like you, who have…have moved this on through.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, I want to thank all those involved with having got this issue to this point so far. It's a really important issue. When they brought forth the legislation on the federal level, this wasn't the intent to have our suburbs smelling like they do. That's…that's…and therefore, it's up to the city, it's up to the municipalities to deal with it, as we are. It's a fascinating group of individuals. Carmen Neufeld and Laurie Monk and all those that came together to work as we know it today. Bear in mind, there were many others involved in this as well. Again, I want to thank Mike Janzen of the Elmwood-East Kildonan Lions Club. Well, sorry. Yes, he is past president of the Elmwood-East Kildonan Lion's Club, but as a citizen, and as a constituent whom I represent from Valley Gardens, who was on this my very first year as a city councillor. The problem...and part of the frustration for many people who have been vigilant on this issue, such as the people we heard from this morning in delegation, is that he was on the issue…Mike Janzen was on this issue before the federal legislation came through. And much to his frustration, and the frustration of many others, it was very difficult for the City to act until we knew what the federal…federal legislation would be. And so, I just want to thank all these individuals for being…for their vigilance and their patience, which is…can be a rather frustrating combination, but that's what it took. It took vigilance and patience in order to have to wait for the federal legislation before we could react as a city or a municipality. Because, let's face it, we couldn't write the by-laws until we knew what the federal…federal laws were. And that was part of the conundrum. And anybody…anybody who was getting calls on this issue before the new federal legislation, I think you felt it. You felt people's frustration on this. I also want to thank a fellow constituent whom I represent, MLA Matt Wiebe who've I never mentioned in this chamber, I think, before. But as a…as a provincial representative, and also someone who I represent living as well in Valley Gardens, someone who, again, shared in that frustration, shared in that vigilance of speaking with people and speaking with me on this issue for years. And he, just so you know, Matt Wiebe is very much in favour of this motion today. He is already speaking with many of the people that have been working on this for years, including those that were in delegation this morning. And has positive views on the potential for what I think we're about to do today. And thank you. Leave it at that for now.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers on this item? Councillor Gilroy to close.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, Madam Speaker. And yes, I do want to also thank the councillors that were involved in this. I know that councillor…Councillor Sharma, you were very, very, very much involved, Madam Chair, along with Councillor Eadie and Councillor Lukes. So, I just want to thank you. I think this is one thing that I saw during the delegate process where you heard loud and clear that this wasn't really about infringing on privacy rights, it's about dealing with the designated growers. And I think that that was clear from everybody involved in this and everyone presented really well on this fact. And I know this is an issue that's been growing since there's been legalization of cannabis and I think it is critical that we, as a city, look to how we can make sure that we are supporting neighborhoods and what...how we want to see neighborhoods…neighbourhoods feel and grow. And I think that it's important that we look at, you know, where we allow cannabis designated growers and I think that what we have in front of us here is a report that will come back to Council that will have some…some way of looking at how we can manage that without infringing on rights of people to use cannabis. And I'll call the vote.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Gilroy for that close. I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Next is Item 4, Mr. Clerk.

Item 4 – Sale of City Owned Property – 49 Higgins Avenue

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This item here, on 49 Higgins was about an issue that two neighbours that own businesses would like to purchase the land for market value. So, not at a discounted cost, but at market value, from the City in order to grow their businesses. Both of the neighbours are in agreeance with this proposal as well as the area councillor, Councillor Santos who spoke favourably about this. And our...at our committee, we did support this. It is going against our Council…Council by-law because we do usually let our properties go for tender, for sale. And...but this is allowing a direct sale to two owners that will share in the cost. And I think it supports the area in which these two businesses thrive. They hire a lot of local people and I support Councillor Santos on this as the area Councillor. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. There were some speakers. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today in support of this motion to proceed with the direct sale to these two businesses that you heard from the delegates...the delegate that spoke this morning. It does present as an opportunity to develop economic development in the core area through the sale of this land and the expansion of these business. You also heard, Madam Speaker, the fact that if his business remains status quo and not able to grow, he'll quickly exceed the capacity that he currently has and will have...will be forced to sell that property and relocate elsewhere potentially in one of the RMs. And that's something that would be a great travesty in terms of the jobs and opportunities that could be afforded to residents who are living in the Point Douglas area or in the core area of our city that these two businesses have been hiring en masse, providing them with training and good paying jobs as well as based on the proximity that they live to this…to this business, they are able to cycle to work, reducing the amount of cars on our roadways in the core area and contributing to greenhouse gas reduction. So, again, for a lot…a myriad of different reasons, this is a good deal for the City of Winnipeg and for these two businesses. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Without a doubt, what Border Glass and Duxton are presenting represents a unique opportunity in the Point Douglas area. They have been very good at explaining to the Property, Planning and Development Committee, EPC, other members of Council on the economic and social and environmental benefits their proposal will bring to Winnipeg and Winnipeggers. And I commend them for their work…their very hard work because it's a lot of hard work showing up here at city hall or to these committees and presenting. But to be clear as our chair pointed out, what this motion requests is that Council disregard the recommendations in the Real Estate Management Audit, specifically related to the processes for land sale transactions. Improving real estate processes and developing policies are exactly key issues, many of us sitting around the chamber here today campaigned on in the election 2014. I am concerned that the City, the taxpayers, may not receive the true market value for the sale. And we won't know that because if the land doesn't go on the market, we won't know the true market value. We've been seeing multiple land sales sell 30% higher than list. And yes, some of these are in the south end, but they're also in other parts of Winnipeg. It is a very hot market. Much has changed and many City policies and procedures and industry practices are now in place as a result of the 2014 Ernst & Young audit. As I noted, Border Glass and Duxton have put together a very good case as to why they should have the opportunity to be awarded a direct sale to the property beside them. They've clearly presented how they will increase employment, increase activity in the core, how this direct sale will enable them to contribute to Winnipeg's economy and health. COVID is presenting many situations where we really have to look at the many policies and processes that we have in place. And we have to have a second look. And as Councillor Mayes often raises, there would be no point in us being here if we couldn't look at unique cases and situations that may reach beyond the current processes and policies put in place. I did not support this motion at PP&D. There've been other motions like this that have come forward that the committee has not supported that have been very good motions related to affordable housing and the like. But I will be supporting this motion now. And I will be saying to other developers and landowners and the like, if you see city-wide benefits as to why policy and process should not be adhered to, City Council is here to listen. I wish Border Glass and Duxton all the best. And I will be supporting this motion.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to talk about a number of issues. But first I'd like to actually thank Councillor Santos for moving this at the start through our community committee, Madam Speaker. We are concerned about the economic…economy of Winnipeg and ensuring that there is jobs and all those things. And Councillor Santos has brought this forward and I'm very appreciative because the sale itself is very important. And what I'd like to point out, Madam Speaker, so we had a number of audits when we were in our first term. There was the fire hall audit. There was

the real estate audit. There was the police station audit. And what was discovered was, there was nothing open or transparent with a lot of the dealings going on in regards to those situations. Nothing showing up in a report. I would point out that today, Property and Development, they're providing us and were very clear, I heard them, they were saying that, you know, there are circumstances where this does not follow our real estate practices, Madam Speaker. How open can you get? You have a…we have a commissioner who looks into this stuff which was recommended by those audits. That is in place. They will point out that you have a policy and this is not going against it. There couldn't be anything more open and transparent about our vote today that, yes, while we are not exactly following our real estate policy, it's very clear when we vote today, it's open and transparent. Anybody in the public can see it and hear it. So, let's be clear about that. There's a significant difference about what we've been doing now versus what was happening before. I also wanted to point out...now, I was disappointed that the secondary plan was removed from here. This is a more of a political thing, Madam Speaker. You know, I know that, you know, that decision about secondary plans, everybody wants some secondary plans in their area. We're talking about putting money in the budget. How are we going to prioritize deciding on, you know, which neighborhoods get secondary plans before another? Which concerns...are the concerns of south Point Douglas more important than the concerns of Glenwood? I don't know. But you know, we need to be able to evaluate and say what's important. But what I can say, Madam Speaker, is I wanted to point out that in the Point which is north Point Douglas and south Point Douglas, they are intertwined even though there is a railway track down the middle that divides the Point Douglas Ward from the Mynarski Ward. If you talked to my friends that I went to school with or that I hung out with over the years, that I've worked with, who live in the Point, if you ask them about a street in south Point Douglas, then they live in the north Point Douglas, they will say, well, that's the Point. That's the Point. What we did is we divided up neighborhoods that supposedly are different. Yeah, there is a lot more residential in north Point Douglas, but if you look at the south Point Douglas and you look at Complete Communities 2.0 and you look in the map, their actual definition of this more employment area called south Point Douglas, goes north of the tracks. But if you look at our city maps for the neighborhoods and how the wards were split, it says the CPR rail line is the boundary between the two. Now, we have Brown and Rutherford that has been there for ages. That actually doesn't fall into south Point Douglas. Only the even number side of Sutherland falls in. Brown and Rutherford's at 5 Sutherland. Okay? It's an M1. There are M1s on the other side of Sutherland. So, this fictitious map, right, that...like, it doesn't necessarily take into consideration. And really, there are...I can't tell you how many people I know who worked at Brown and Rutherford and also Kip Kelly, which used to be in south Point Douglas, I can't tell you how many people who lived in north Point Douglas worked there. These two neighborhoods are tied. If you look at what has been happening in terms of our social strife, the social problems that we're having in south Point Douglas and north Point Douglas, there is no difference. You go under that underpass on Main Street, Madam Speaker, there is no difference. There is no difference. We have issues, not necessarily that are going to be totally taken care of by secondary plan. But what happened is, I see Main Street Project calling for a group of businesses and residents and organizations to come up with a safety and plan how to get rid of all that garbage and make it more safe, but it defines the area only as the south Point Douglas side, Madam Speaker. How are we resolving the issues? So, when you think about, and it's not in here and it's too bad it's not because there could have been a source to put together a secondary plan, and the thing is, in north Point Douglas, a lot of the work that would be required to create a secondary plan, it's already being done. The Point Douglas Residents Committee, as Ms. Flynn's pointed out in her presentation to the committee, Madam Speaker, so you know, I actually don't know why, other than for somebody who was saying, well, that isn't fair that you take that money and we're all arguing about political...the reality is, is that…and to say that, you know, because you have a housing plan that that is going to make things work better than a secondary plan, well, it is not necessarily true. I see a beautiful secondary plan that got established in a certain area of the city and it actually helps solve problems when people are appealing. It is a guideline for us to make decisions as we hear the appeals on a number of items. Anyway, I just want to conclude. I hope they don't need to grow that fast because the sale is not going to be completed until after Complete Communities 2.0, which is waiting for OurWinnipeg 2045. So, Madam Speaker, hopefully that's...you know, hopefully it will be this council that votes on those by-laws. But at this rate, it looks like it is going to be like it happened with the previous iteration which was passed, actually, we voted on that, Madam Speaker, in our first term in, you know, only…we were only in office for about six months and we were asked to vote on that…on the by-law. So, hopefully that gets done. And I just...you know, this is an important area of the city that…it's the oldest area...it's actually the oldest area of the city, pretty well. The settlers were the first residents. And actually, south Point Douglas was a residential area as well until the railway came through. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gilroy: You can call to question.

Madam Speaker: I'll call to question on Item 4 – Sale of City-Owned Property – 49 Higgins Avenue. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We'll now move under…on to by-laws under this committee. Oh, yes, Motion 6. We just had a new motion circulated a few moments ago. Motion 6 is moved by Councillor Nason, seconded by Councillor Gillingham and it is regarding field of honour plots. Mr. Clerk, would you…would you read the resolve?

Clerk: Therefore be it resolved: 1. That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back on the following: A. Amendments to the Cemeteries By-law No. 130/2007 to ensure that any person who meets the qualification to be interred in a Field of Honour, shall be permitted to receive a plot at no cost. B. An annual average cost estimate. 2. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS Remembrance Day marks the sacrifice of the many who have fallen in service of their country and the courage of those who still serve;

AND WHEREAS many municipalities, including the City of Winnipeg, have dedicated space in Fields of Honour reserved only for the interment of persons who have qualified military service;

AND WHEREAS the Brookside Field of Honour at the Brookside Cemetery is one of the largest and oldest military interment sites in Canada;

AND WHEREAS the Transcona Cemetery also has a separate Field of Honour where veterans are interred;

AND WHEREAS the Cemeteries By-law No. 130/2007 establishes criteria for interments in all municipal cemeteries, including the Fields of Honour;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

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

    A. *Amendments to the Cemeteries By-law No. 130/2007 to ensure that any person who meets the qualification to be interred in a Field of Honour, shall be permitted to receive a plot at no cost.*

    B. *An annual average cost estimate.*

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. This is an automatic referral to this committee. Now by-laws, Madam Clerk. Madam Chair.

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

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 76/2021 and By-law No. 92/2021.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 76/2021 and By-law No. 92/2021

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move that By-law No. 76/2021 and By-law No. 92/2021 be read a second time

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 76/2021 and 92/2021.

Councillor Gilroy: And I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 76/2021 and 92/2021 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Gilroy? Any questions for the Chair? Seeing none, next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. And it's the report dated October 6th. Madam Chair.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS DATED OCTOBER 6, 2021

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I'd like to move consent agendas...agenda Items No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, with particular thanks to you, Madam Speaker, for the online park and athletic field and reservation system which is Item 5. And thanks to the colleagues who gathered in support of this work, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of consent? Contrary? That's carried. We have a notice of motion from our previous Council meeting and that appears today. That was moved by Councillor Rollins and seconded by Councillor Chambers. And there is also an amending motion to go with that. Councillor Rollins to introduce the motion and your amending motion.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS NOTICE OF MOTION

Item 1 – Establishment of Safe Access Zones for Health Care Facilities and Public Schools

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: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: I just want to read the resolve if we could first into the record.

Councillor Rollins: Yes, I was going to do that.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk.

Clerk: 1. That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back to the Executive Policy Committee in 60 days with a report creating options for the implementation of safe access zones considering prohibition of protestors from coming within 150 metres of medical clinics, hospitals, healthcare facilities and K – 12 schools and contemplates a safe access zone fine regime structure. 2. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks - Notice of Motion - Item No. 1 Establishment of Safe Access Zones for Healthcare Facilities be amended by deleting Recommendations 1 to 4 and replacing them with the following:

1. That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back to the Executive Policy Committee in 60 days with a report creating options for the implementation of safe access zones considering prohibition of protestors from coming within 150 metres of medical clinics, hospitals, healthcare facilities and K – 12 schools and contemplates a safe access zone fine regime structure.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins to speak to the motion and the amending motion.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Sometimes you work so collaboratively, Madam Speaker, with my colleague, the other Chair of Protection, councillor and Assistant Deputy Mayor, Markus Chambers, that one reads the amendment into the record and not the original motion. And so, I will say that it's absolutely friendly and appropriate that that one was read first. This, of course, is a motion to enact safe access zones around clinics, hospitals or healthcare facilities that prohibit protesters for coming in from a distance of 150 metres. And that City Council also establish safe access zones and a fine regime for anyone that comes to harass young students with graphic, violent imagery and misinformation around schools. And by this, it should be clarified, and thanks to a friendly amendment, it now is K to12 schools. Madam Speaker, Council shouldn't be silent in the face of protests that serve only to harm people's health and disrupt healthcare delivery. We have the responsibility to protect here. In particular, we have the responsibility to protect vulnerable people that enter schools, children in K to 12, for instance. And those, Madam Speaker, who might be not be feeling well that are entering into hospitals. The so-called silent vigils, Madam Speaker, against healthcare orders that impacted delivery of healthcare at HSC, were anything but passive. They took place in multiple communities across this country from Halifax to Winnipeg's Health Science Center. Statement, Madam Speaker, from that day; “We have heard from staff and patients who experienced difficulty accessing our facility who were aggressively harassed wearing masks.” Statement, Madam Speaker, “Some patients opted to cancel their appointments rather than approach the protesters standing near the entrance.” Statement, Madam Speaker, “Shared health respects the freedom of individuals to protest. People need do it in a peaceful way that doesn't disrupt people's access to medical care.” In the days following, I heard a concerning theme in this city. What could be done? What possibly could be done? Well, I want to point out a few facts. As the mover, first of all, I want to assure folks this isn't a blanket restriction. The safe access zone laws, they do infringe free

speech. You might be concerned about that. But this motion is not a blanket restriction, which is why it is constitutionally sound. And why, as someone who hits the streets routinely, me with placards, wrote it and I want it to be supported today for sure. And there are examples from other jurisdictions. Decades of examples, in fact. BC law has successfully deterred protesters and protected people at clinics for 25 years, time tested, Supreme Court tested cases. City of Calgary in 2020, passed an amendment to their temporary signs by-law, limiting signs and advocacy messaging and the 150 meters. Sound familiar? I took it from somewhere. At Calgary schools during school hours. Many have wondered, Madam Speaker, why I wrote about abortion protests specifically. The specific kind. And to this, I will answer in a minute. And others have wondered, is this similar to that legislation of Nahanni Fontaine of St. Johns? And the answer is no, that's legislation. But in the first instance, I'll explain with respect to abortion. My friend Lisa in grade 7 was...and this is not going to be trauma-informed, Madam Speaker. She was raped by a friend of her father's and uncle who had impregnated her. When she got her abortion, she needed an escort because miscreants outside of the clinic disrupted her. She needed, actually, a pillowcase over her. The decades of protests, the fire bombings outside of abortion clinics, the reason why it's relevant here is that it literally led to legislation like that of BC's. It literally led to the by-law that is found in Calgary. Harassment, sidewalk interference, protests, video recording of healthcare officials and/or patients or both, this is the subject of concern on both counts. There is absolutely feminist history here of legislation that I…I can't ignore. I didn't ignore it when I wrote it. Calgary's by-law, the school safe zones temporary signs by-law, it was passed in 2020 like I said. The amendment restricts advocacy messaging on public streets near schools due to harmful impact this messaging hasn't...has on unwilling viewers. This by-law amendment in Calgary was created for the safety and protection of students, their caregivers, school staff who do not want to be exposed to messaging while attending schools. That is why, Madam Speaker, principals reached out to me and said thank you, we want this. From Pembina Trails to Winnipeg School Division and maybe they have to other councillors. Advocacy messaging is defined in the Calgary by-law, advocacy groups are defined and it further clarifies it doesn't apply to students in climate change-like protests that may ignore...that they may be organizing. It just doesn't. So, while I wish it was the first time we had seen something like this, like the COVID-19 protests at HSC, it just simply was not. Our residents, at least my residents called on us to intervene. We have a duty to protect and define some of that protection. And there is protection in six other jurisdictions in this city. There is by-law precedence in this country, and that is what this is suggesting. And I want to thank my colleagues for prompting the changes to not only clarify what I meant by the kinds of protests that I wrote in the motion, but also to acknowledge that this does take work from the Public Service. And with apologies to the Public Service for the 60-day notes, I'll understand if it's later. But it also takes time to define a fine regime. One needn't be concerned about the history of women's health if you don't want it. I, along with others in the country, have considered this and thank goodness it forms a really good precedent and thank goodness it provides the reassurance…the constitutional reassurance, this isn't about freedom of speech. I do want us today to listen to the frontline, whether it is in an educational setting or the healthcare setting. And I do want us to act with that duty to protect and understand that the stories of disrupted healthcare is what compels us to respond. As the Shared Health rep said, it is disappointing to witness, profoundly disrespectful to the dedicated healthcare workers and educators who have continuously put health and well-being of patients and we know, as educators have their students, first. Let us do this. Let's create access zones. And I hope that it is unanimous today. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Councillor Chambers, the seconder, you were the seconder of the amending motion. Your opportunity to speak.

Councillor Chambers: Yes, but there is the amending motion, so am I speaking to that or something separate?

Madam Speaker: You can speak to the…both the notice of motion from last month and the amending motion.

Councillor Chambers: Okay. So, with that, I'm speaking to both.

Madam Speaker: If you wish.

Councillor Chambers: Yes, I do wish. Thank you, Madam Speaker. It was Evelyn Beatrice Hall who coined the phrase "I do not agree with what you have to say, but I will defend with my life your right to say it." And as Councillor Rollins has indicated, this isn't a total restriction or ban on people right to protest. I have been involved with protest march…marches here in our city and do support people's right to protest. But where it comes to accessing services that are in critical need, health services, our education platform in terms of getting children educated, I think should be off-limits to protests. I think it doesn't serve a purpose at those locations and at those venues to protest. Even during times of war and battle, medics are off-limits in terms of when they're flying by with wounded and injured members who are, you know, defending our country and our values. So, taking that example and extrapolating here, our hospitals should be off-limits to protests. Our schools should be off-limits to process. It's only the right thing to do. I empathize with those individuals who want to protest, who have a voice to share their concerns or their points of view. Again, I may not agree with it or I may agree with it, but I simply would not stand in front of a hospital or in front of a school protesting that right. There are appropriate places to do that, where legislation is made or by-laws are made, either at the Manitoba legislature or here at city hall. And I believe it would be more effective in having that message heard rather than the message that came up, what we saw when people

were protesting at our hospitals. The message was simply lost. The big story of that day is the fact that they were protesting at a hospital and the message that they were trying to convey was lost. So, again, Madam Speaker, I support the intents and have happily seconded this motion and the amending motion. And indicate that, again, everybody has the right to protest, but it is the appropriateness of the location that is in concern here. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Rollins and Councillor Chambers for bringing this matter forward. I also want to thank both of them for very thoughtful remarks right now and deeply personal remarks as well. I think many Winnipeggers were disgusted as I was with the protests outside the Health Sciences Centre. To see in, certainly, media reports, healthcare heroes across Canada discussing the harassment and the nature of the protests outside healthcare facilities across Canada including here in the City of Winnipeg was something that I think the only term I can think of to describe what they were undertaking by protesting outside the Health Sciences Centre was and is disgust. These are the individuals who are literally on the frontlines of battling COVID in our community and we see right now a disproportionate number of individuals who refused to wear masks, are not vaccinated for various reasons being treated in intensive care units in the Health Sciences Centre. And we owe it to those that have been battling COVID in the wards and in the intensive care units for far too long to not see what we can do to help make things better for the work that they do as well as the patients that they serve. I have had dialogue with individuals who did have their treatments affected and felt that they were harassed in trying to just get healthcare for themselves. And so, I think with this amendment, I think this is a very wise amendment because it will provide us with the opportunity to hear from the Public Service to ensure that we are doing our due diligence, that we are finding that appropriate balance of competing public policy interests that we have an obligation and a duty to protect. And that, of course, that is freedom of speech. But also, the right for individuals to enter facilities without unduly and inappropriately or unlawfully being subjected to harassment and intimidation. And so, I'll be supporting this. Hopefully my council colleagues can support it. I also want to recognize the role of the police, that there are…there are levers that the Winnipeg Police Service can and does exercise in the provision of their services. This council shouldn't and I don't believe this amending motion or the main motion attempts to weigh in to the operations of the police service. That is not purview of this council. This is looking at other levers that are within our purview. And so, I just want to take this opportunity to thank those working in our ICU units for the outstanding work that they do and I want them to know that Winnipeggers appreciate the work that they continue to do as we weather this storm. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Actually, I'm going to kind of reference police and laws in the same way that the Mayor did, but to use it as my reason to not support this motion. I believe that the laws are already in place that would prohibit and do prohibit intimidation and harassment, any unlawful behavior by anyone involved in a protest or…of that matter where the Winnipeg Police Service, as other police services, have the tools available to them to enforce those laws if there is a contravention. So, if someone is unduly harassed or…harassed, intimidated, anything like that or if protesters are breaking the law, there is federal laws in place already that oversee. On the one hand, guarantee the freedom of expression, freedom to assemble, but on the other hand, make sure that those don't go too far. And so, for that reason, primarily, I won't be supporting this. I also look at this and wonder, well, does this mean that if you can't have protesters coming within 150 meters of medical clinics, at hospitals, healthcare facilities, what about labour? What about nurses strikes? What about healthcare workers strikes? Those are protests. A strike is a protest. So, what about all the unions? Though teachers don't strike, and we've had the…is my understanding if I go back. But I think there is other education support staff that have the opportunity for job action. Will that prohibit them? Custodians, educational assistants, if they have…if they have labour grievances, can they, therefore, no longer protest as well? So, and I think inevitably, once you start listing locations, you inevitably miss some and so, that would be, also, my concern with putting specific locations down that you're going to end up unduly, unintentionally missing some locations that maybe you want to capture and that. So, I am not in any way in favour of people who are protesting doing so where they are interrupting and harassing healthcare workers or people going to get health service. That is not my…that's not the reason I'm opposing this whatsoever. But I do believe the laws are in place, the tools are available to police service members already to make sure that protests are done in an orderly way that permits people to express their views and their speech, whether it's members of the public, whether it's members of unions, labor groups, what have you…students, what have you. So, for that reason, I won't be supporting this motion.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think the amendment was important. I'm going to support this. If I recall, it's calling on a report back in 60 days, I believe, Madam Speaker, even with the amendment. Because I think that is very important to come back with a report. I want to thank Councillor Rollins for getting this moving. Many of these protests do happen on City owned assets; streets and sidewalks. And then, you know, there's the…it's actually Crown property a hospital. School divisions are Crown property. Winnipeg's properties are ultimately Crown property in that the corporation is created by the Province. Madam Speaker, so, I don't want to get into how messy a protest can get. So, the first thing, though, I want to point out, the police service's responsibility and ability to deal with things are one thing and so…so are the federal rules. But Madam Speaker, you know, I actually attended with the Police Service here, some training about situations. And we talked about a particular protest that came into this room and, you know, basically, it was determined to be peaceful protest. It wasn't, Madam Speaker. I was assaulted. Not being able to see, I was assaulted by the loud noise. I couldn't hear where I was going. I figured, I'm going to get the hell out of here, but I couldn't because I couldn't hear anything. That is an assault. So, it's…you know, it's very nuancy about how things go. And I'm not filing a complaint or anything. You know, I know that passions were high and there is racism, there's no doubt about that, Madam Speaker. There's no doubt about that. I just wanted to point out, though, the idea and the protesting related to racism, I was quite proud, not only as a school board trustee, but as a human being. In the Maples Collegiate unity group…and if Chuck Duboff, I don't know if he's listening, he was the teacher leader for the unity group of teenaged students who organized a protest of sorts, a march, a protest, and the assembly started at the Maples Collegiate. So, whatever provisions we provide here, if the students of a, you know, high school, it's highly unlikely you'll see a K to 8, but if you see a high school, Madam Speaker, and it's their organization of the unity march that we went from all the way from the Maple's Collegiate to the provincial legislature, that was really cool. And there was…there was, I don't know, a few thousand people, Madam Speaker. And it was great to see students of all colours, of all races, saying this is…and of different genders, identification or whatever. Like, it was excellent. So, there are protests that are important. And so, if we're coming up and I think we need it because in my life, I've been involved with a number of women where, you know, they've been attacked in terms of their position on things by other groups and protests and this COVID thing really raised another big issue. There's no way that this should happen. And you know, many of the protests, they actually have to file for permits and stuff through the police service. It happens. I think it's through the police service. And, you know, Public Works sometimes have to block off some streets. But ultimately, you know, these are important tools, if they walk by a school. And the last thing, there are some slight problems in that, if I was still with 110 as a custodian, as referenced by my colleague here, and we were on strike, we would need to protest at the administration building way less than 150 meters or whatever the number you're talking about from Tech Voc High School. And so, whatever we implement, you have to take into consideration some of these things. If you have a…if a healthcare union is having issues at a hospital, it's not the…although, the specific hospital is there, where you should be protesting, and I don't think there's any healthcare provisions being made at the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority's building. I don't think there's any kind of medical, actual procedure, anything happening there. That's where you protest. If you're…you know, depending on where the school division is. Anyway, like, there are ways to deal with that because there is a right to strike, there's a right to do whatever, but we know that even in strike situations, it's sometimes can get violent. It can. And then where should the strike be? Because if the province…well, I'll say it, I stand up for labour. If the Province is going allow scab labourers to come in, then you should be protesting and striking at the legislature, not in front of a hospital. Anyway, I'll leave it at that. I'm supportive of the amending motion and the motion as it will be amended. And I want to thank Councillor Rollins for bringing it forward because some of those women in my life were very appalled with what was happening during COVID. And I don't think those protests were asking for permits or anything like that. So, you know, and unless there was some violence, I don't see what the…I mean, the police service can push them off or whatever. But anyway, I think it's important that we do establish some ground between protesting and those issues and I mean, anyway. So, if a…again, I just want to point out, if a high school is organizing then that's not illegal. They're the ones who are putting this together. And I think that we need to make sure there's certain conditions that ensure everybody gets to express their opinion while keeping people safe because ultimately, that's what it's all about, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. We'll now go remotely to Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A year ago, an analysis was done by Jan Malek of The Council of Canadians stating that the right to protest is an important part of Canadian democracy and we have the right to freedom of expression. Section 2 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the freedom of expression, freedom of association, and the freedom of peaceful assembly. Protests are a way for people to express themselves for or against decisions made by the government or other powerful institutions. People have taken to the streets throughout history to stand up for what they believe in. But more and more, we are seeing examples of this freedom of expression being criminalized. Malek goes to go on to say that people across the country have the right to take to the street to speak out against the actions or inactions of our governments and other power (inaudible). Winnipeg was built on the foundation of one of the bloodiest protests in the history of Manitoba. And we celebrate it a hundred years later. Why is that? I'd like to think it's because people actually cared about not only their right to free…fair wages and better treatment, but because they knew it was something worth fighting for. I want it noted that I do not condone vandalism or acts of violence that arise from heated and emotionally charged protests. Our democracy is at risk if our right to peaceful protest is limited. According

to the Canadian Civil Liberties Association on your right to gather and protest, while the Charter protects many of the rights that are crucial to effective protests, laws limit this right in a very real way. Provincial legislation may restrict blockade on public roadways and assemblies on certain pieces of public property. Municipal by-laws often limit how, when and where protests can be held. This is what is being discussed today. But according to Caroline Hodes, associate professor of constitutional law University of Lethbridge, in June of 2020, her article, 'Do you have the right to protest? The Coronavirus's Impact on Freedom of Assembly'. In the article, Caroline explains that harm is the key limit on charter rights to freedom of expression and assembly. Section 2 of the Charter protects the right to freedom of peaceful assembly, but has received limited attention by the courts. Therefore, many freedom of assembly cases have been argued under freedom of expression. If harm can be proven, limits on freedom can be justified. Where harm is absent, freedom must prevail. But the concept of harm, however, remains subjective. And we are seeing that today, how subjective social media and mainstream media is reflecting only one side of the story when it comes to protests worldwide. CCLA goes on to state, if we allow too many restrictions on the fundamental right to protest, we silence the voices of many in our society, particularly those who may have limited other means for making their views known. It's worth remembering that protests are intended to cause disruption and this protected activity in a democracy. Strong protections for the right to protest are essential to meaningful and informed political debate and discussion. A democratic society welcomes debate and disagreement on the key issues of the day and protests is a big part of this process. Protests, yes, can be messy and disruptive but they're also crucial in our well-being as a society. We as Council have been through so many different types of protests right here at city hall and we did not limit them or change any by-laws. So why change it now? Finally, I'd like to add a couple of statements from RCMP officer Corporal Daniel Bulford who has recently spoken up about where our future is heading in Canada. He says, and I quote, "Visualize in your mind, what is your line in the sand that you are not willing to let them cross? We are free citizens in this country. We should have the flexibility as a country, that if you feel comfortable with it and I feel comfortable with it, and we want to have a conversation inside of a home, that's our right to do it. Visualize that line in the sand about what you're not willing to let them take away from you. When you look at history, these things don't happen overnight. They keep…they happen in increments. They will incrementally take more and more away from you. And they only do it because we allow them to do it." End of the quote. I think many Canadians are getting tired of the restrictions and the mandates. The social isolation and psychological mental warfare that this pandemic has caused between families and between neighbours has got to stop. This is not the Winnipeg that I call home anymore where my mom immigrated to 40…immigrated to 41 years ago. We need to stop living in this constant fear of each other. We…where we are just…where we're starting to treat people unfairly and unjust. These constant divisive government restrictions and motions like these that keep coming to Council just keeps adding to the negativity, the fear, and the hate for thy neighbour. I feel we are so close on the last mile where we can call it an endemic. I remained positive last time Council brought forward a divisive mandate motion, but today, that line in the sand has been drawn for me. Citizens only have the right to vote every couple of years, but protests provide opportunities to express your view and grievances at any time. I refuse to participate in these types of negative political theatrics that try to unhinge Canadian democracy by limiting the right to protest and the rights to free expression. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Santos. Mr. Deputy Speaker, could I hand over the Chair to you? I'll be back momentarily. The next speaker is Councillor Gilroy, followed by Councillor Orlikow. Over to you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, thank you. Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam…thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise and I want to support Councillor Rollins and Councillor Chambers. And I really want to thank them. I was a member of the school board when we put together the little black book and I think Councillor Orlikow behind me will remember the challenges we had about teaching sex education in schools. And I really feel that it is vital that we make sure that we have safe spaces in our education centres and in our healthcare facilities so people can access. I'm very confused, I don't want to make this about COVID, because for me, this has nothing to do with COVID. It really is about making sure that people have access to education and access to our healthcare…healthcare system, which is critical. And we have a right to education and we also have a right to access to education. And when I go by the Health Sciences Centre and I see people lined up, whether…whatever…whatever the causes of the day, I think that people have a right to make sure that they get through those doors without feeling harassed or making sure they can physically access the perimeters of the healthcare system or physically be able to get to the doors of their education institute without…without feeling harassed or without feeling guilt or without having that physical barrier of accessing whichever facilities that they have. We know through what we're seeing globally that protests are changing. Behaviours of people are changing. We know that here within our own council chambers, what we're seeing within the general public. And this by no means stops protests. We…I take…I am part of protests all the time. I've been an advocate on many certain issues and carrying that flag proudly, and I go and I protest. But there are places where we should be doing it and we should make sure that we have access to those that don't want to participate in that and have that right that maybe disagree with us. But to have that right to access that healthcare facility or that education facility. We're not always going to agree on different…on issues. We're…there's going to multiple people that disagree on issues, but people have the right to access it no matter what side of the debate that you're on. Access critical healthcare. Like, I can't imagine not being able to get to a door if I'm actually accessing Health Sciences Centre for an emergency and I can't access a

door because of a protest outside. That person's life could be in physical danger. So, by all means, protest. And let's figure out what that is, whether it's a distance away. I think we should have the right to protest, and I'm not arguing that. But I do think we have a right to look at our by-laws and what we have in front of us and try to get ahead of the game when we're seeing these things happen in other cities and how do we move forward as a city. How do we be proactive to ensure that we have safety for all, including those that are most vulnerable that are accessing our healthcare facilities and our education facilities that did not ask to be involved in the political matter of the protests that were taking place. They just want to be able to go to school or they just want to be able to go to their healthcare appointment or receive critical life-threatening healthcare. So, we have to look as a city, how do we protect that? How do we protect that, but also, protect the actual right to protest? Because we…I don't think any on of us here doesn't want to make sure that we can't have protests. We're all political. We all understand the need for process and advocacy on many issues, and I could guarantee that most of us in this room, if not all, have participated in some kind of protest along the way because we are political people and we all are advocates on many different issues. But we also need to respect the rights of those that don't want to protest. That want to access healthcare facilities and want to access education facilities without the fear of being…without the fear of being harassed, without the fear of their photos taken, without just being able to physically get to there. And not to mention, I think Councillor Eadie raised some really valid points that I never even considered; people with disabilities. And I want to thank Councillor Eadie for that, because you know what, I never…I never would have thought of that. And I can't imagine what he must have felt that day that we had a protest here and he couldn't see or hear what was going on around him. So, by all means, I'm very much in favour of protesting. In fact, some of you might see me protesting with my signs, but I think we should have rules and guidelines around where that should be. So, I just want to thank Councillor Rollins and Councillor Chambers. And I think, Councillor Eadie, you've raised some very valid points as well. And I rise and I am in support of this and I look forward to this report coming back so we can debate it more because I think there's more to say on this topic. And I think we'll be debating some of the thoughts that the administration might have on this. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Mr. Speaker…Mr. Clerk or Ms. Clerk, I can't remember who was next in order.

City Clerk: Councillor Orlikow. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, please.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. Yeah, there'll be some people today who are going to try to make this way more into what it is. It is an (inaudible). What it is, is access. Are you waving at me or…Councillor Schreyer? No, sorry. Clerks? Okay, sorry. So, what we're talking about today is…you know, and we've got a lot of quotes probably taken out of a book or taken from somebody and lots of different quotes and that's all lovely, but you know, I did take a fair bit of work in the human rights land and it's called, when freedoms collide. And they do, freedoms do collide. In a case, it is someone's right to sit in front of a healthcare when someone's lining up to go in and say, you suck for using healthcare. We only like private healthcare. You're a terrible person for doing this, as they're trying to get in. Well, they have…is that their right to protest? Well, yes. But is that…what about the person's right to access building without being harassed? Labour unions were brought up. If we had a labour union who was sitting there as people were leave…trying to get into a building, and they're swearing and yelling at the people that are waiting to get in, that's wrong. Wrong. If the labour union was doing that or any group was doing that in front of a school where little children are, that's wrong. Children have a right to be able to access education. It's a fundamental right. It's a fundamental right. I want to bring that up. That's why the rights collide. And it's also a fundamental right to be able to protest whether or not absolute. Not absolute. If you are very disruptive in schools and you start doing things like breaking windows and you're really having problems, your access to education gets limited. It's not a fundamental right, but you do have a fundamental right, in general principle, to go into a school. You also have a fundamental right to gain healthcare access. Those are fundamental rights we have in society. And no group, I don't care what group you are, has no right to block your access to those…to those facilities. Again, or to start using profanity and graphic images to scare people. As little kids, they're sitting around their recess and they have these graphic images of whatever the protest is just to scare them and they go home and tell their parents there, that's just wrong. That is not. They can go protest somewhere else, in a park, there's many places. So, this is very important. This to me is very important. On the school board, I was disgusted at some actions by some groups. This was way before COVID, where they'd sit right in front of the school door, the only entrance into the school, and they'd block people and get us signed petitions. They don't have the right to do that. Parents would have to go around back and try to get in with their kids into the school because they are so scared by this. That…they don't have the right to do that. Do they have the right to do a petition and go down to, I don't know, the park across the street? Do they have the right? Absolutely, they do. And I will defend that as well. So, again, what we're really talking about today is not COVID. We're not talking about the great conspiracy out there. What we're talking about today, we're talking about the fundamental right of people to be able to access healthcare and education. And so, again, the initial motion that Councillor Rollins brought forward, I did have a few concerns on, but she's addressed those in this amendment, it's called working collaboratively together. So, again, I appreciate the efforts that Councillor Rollins brought forward to get the report coming back so we can discuss it. And

Councillor Chambers, I appreciate that. So, we're going to move forward on this. But again, for me, it's…it is a battle between the right to have access to fundamental rights which is education and healthcare in an environment that is safe and free of coercion versus, they have to go across the street. They have to allow access to come into the property. Again, there are some tricky words here and that's why I really appreciate the report, such as prohibition of protestors. We're going to have to define that a little bit more. And again, that's why the report will come back. So, again, when you balance off the rights, again, the rights to have free speech versus the right to access safely schools and…schools and healthcare, there has to be a balance in here. And I believe we're trying to find that balance. So, again, I'll be wholeheartedly supporting this. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Mr. Clerk, is there anybody else wanting to speak? No. Councillor…

City Clerk: Councillor Schreyer would be the next on the list, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Schreyer is next, okay.

City Clerk: Yes, sir.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, please proceed.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. This is a good debate. This is a good discussion. I really appreciated it because I believe…I believe we're being sincere here. I believe people are bringing up on points that are important. They're explaining their values and we have to come to some sort of decision. In this case we're talking about a report. And I don't know who to speak to. I mean, there was such good speeches on this to explain where Canadians are coming from. The last speaker was Councillor Orlikow; (inaudible) to my memory. Good speech to explain clashes of freedoms. I mean, I couldn't have said it any better than that. And this is the job that we have in representing and dealing with when we have colliding values, colliding freedoms, colliding obligations. And this is our job. This one is a little touchy because we're talking about our rights and freedoms. And whether we're dealing within an edge of the wedge. If we allow this, then what? And these are people's concerns. And they are legitimate concerns. But as Councillor Orlikow and…has made the point, it…we're not talking about getting rid of these rights and freedoms. Councillor Rollins made the point, are we going against the constitution regarding our very heartfelt sense of our rights and freedoms as citizens of this country. At this point, the report has to come back, but the point is, at this point, to the best of her knowledge, no, I believe that. This is the information she has been given based on how this motion has…has been modified and proved et cetera, at this point before we get the…before we get the report back to us. I believe the administration is going to take this into…to heart in terms of everyone's concerns over rights and freedoms. I cannot tell you how many protests I've been witness to. I couldn't possibly tell you. How could I know? I've been witness to them for over 50 years. I couldn't remember…I couldn't even tell you the first protest I was at. How could I? I come from a culture of dissent. I'm just witness to it. Don't blame me, it's not my fault. I was there. And at the same time, I'm also witness to, besides dissent, a culture of governance and what one might consider progressive governance. Bringing in progressive legislation including a legislation of empowerment that creates another form of dissent which can be protests as well, such as what Councillor Rollins was speaking, which…about…during her speech. So, yes, protests can come from all different sides, different values, and yes, as has been stated, we…people have died for us to have this right. So, in this case, how do we deal with it? I am worried. I mean, councillor…Councillor Gillingham made good points. What about a picket line? Well, I want to know, because we're talking about…it's not just a century year old…a century long right. This is longer than that. And we're coming down to the core of what sustains our democracy when we're talking about protests. Having said that, as Councillor Orlikow said, when rights collide this is meant to be specific. I'm going to support this motion because it's specific to, as Councillor Gilroy says, safe spaces to provide those services that are our rights. Or not our rights, those which we establish as being…well, our Public Services that we voted on. That we pay taxes for. In that respect, there are…they are our prerogatives. So, I don't know how this all plays out. What I have been worried about in the last year or two is thin out edge of the wedge legislation. I have to admit this, edge of the ledge legislation that we can hinder this, we can stop this, and where does it for from there? That is a fear of mine. I'm going to be straight up it. That is a fear of mine. Having said that, I can see why this has come about. The intention to me is clear. And I'm going to support this. It is, of course, a function of what the final…final motion would be after we get a report back from the administration, which this motion is all about. So, I truly appreciate the conversation, the discussion, the debate today. It's really important. Vigilance is important. And there may very well be thin edge of the wedge legislation that comes in. Well, you do this and you do that and one more thing and where are we? And that is my fear. I don't think that is what this is. But having said that, I will truly appreciate people's concerns about…about that. Where we go from here and the ramifications because we can never forget that. That might not be what this is one is about. But we can never ever forget that there could be an evolution beyond the intent of this which is not in the best interests of our democracy and our human rights. Having said that, at this time, I'm supporting this motion. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Monsieur Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you for the recognition, Mr. Speaker. And as per your calling me Monsieur Allard, I would like to make a few comments in French. Thank you for that.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: So, thank you for the debate. Thank you for all of my colleagues' comments. I was undecided when I heard the motion. I was moved when I heard the story of Councillor Sherri Rollins and her friend. I was…when Councillor Gillingham spoke about the right to protest at the level union rights, worker rights, I was then undecided, but I think it was the statement from Councillor Orlikow who gave me the reasoning that I needed to approve this motion. It's hard when we see the values like freedom and safety be finally contrasted where we have to decide if one is more important than the other, but I think what's important, the dance and the nuance and that's what Councillor Orlikow has communicated. I think by his comments, we have to do the work to define what it is a protest, define the terms. And so, what we're doing today is asking for a report. And it reminds me of a conversation that I had and one that was against the mandated vaccines by the Province of Manitoba. They were against the gathering regulations. And so, this person had told me that there was Supreme Court decision in 1970 that already determined that it's not legal at the Supreme Court level to control protests. And to this person I said, with the context of today with COVID-19, with the risk of public health, that for me, human life is the most important value in this context. So, I approve the health regulations of the Province of Manitoba. So, I think it's a debate that needs to have nuances and today we are asking for a report. I think it's a good thing to have a report that we can then have a more informed debate. We are talking about terms that are well defined. And ideally, a place where we can more quickly address the comments of Councillor Rollins and the story of her friend. That we can address the worries of Councillor Gillingham in regards to protesting (inaudible) and important at the employees' rights. Thank you to Councillor Orlikow for summed it up in a way that gave me confidence to support this motion. It's maybe the fact that Councillor Orlikow is a veteran of this council that he can explain motions like this that are difficult where I can finally choose a side. So, thank you for your attention.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Monsieur Allard. Mr. Clerk, is there anybody else wanting to speak?

City Clerk: We have no other speakers, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, Councillor Rollins to close, please.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much. So, there is a strong association between anti-vaccination and the belief in conspiracy theories and in particular, Mr. Speaker, a significant link between anti-vaccination and the resistance to having your freedom taken away. And so, again, I am hoping that the motion is unanimously passed today. And I will be calling for a recorded vote. But there's no one that…I was reviewing as folks were talking, the protests as far back as I can remember that I've attended; protests on Clayoquot Sound in Ottawa. Environmental protests in those early days, literally dressed up like a tree. Prochoice rallies in the '80s, '90s, 2000's and really, just a few weeks ago. Labourer…labour…organized labour that I've been part of. I was part of the Public Service Alliance in Canada. And of course, was…went on strike as the Public Service Alliance and had a few demonstrations. I also marched with CUPE Local 110.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Rollins, just, I'm sorry to interrupt your close. Just hold your thought for a moment.

Councillor Rollins: No problem.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would like to ask Councillor Chambers. I missed his ability to close on this amendment.

Councillor Rollins: Yes, you did.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Did you want to close on the amendment?

Councillor Chambers: Yeah, I'm just going to be very brief.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You did or?

Councillor Chambers: I spoke to the motion and the amending motion, but just to close…I'll close. Again, very brief. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm hoping that, you know, members around this council today will support both the amending motion and the original motion seeking a report back from the Public Service. I respect the comments made by Councillor Gillingham as well as Councillor Santos, but I also want to recognize the comments made by our Deputy Mayor, Councillor Orlikow on this matter. The right to education. The right to public healthcare. Those are fundamental rights that

need to be respected. And that's why we've tabled this motion and the amending motion to seek input from our public service is to protect people's basic fundamental rights to healthcare and to education. So, thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Sorry.

Councillor Rollins: Oh no, that's fine. I was simply reviewing in order to assure those who think that freedoms are being curtailed, Mr. Speaker, that I wouldn't deter given history of past protests and demonstrations that I hold dear, itemizing them as I have while folks have been talking and listening. I want to mention the head tax. Protested that on immigration as an unfair head tax. You know, 1919 general strike, guess what we did? We marched. I'd never…I'd never curtail. And I think it's interesting that the CLC was quoted here and Maude Barlow, because Maude Barlow, herself, has flown across the country, including in provinces that have this legislation. Years and years of work, in fact, supporting those. In particular, in prolife movements across the country, she has, so it's interesting to hear CLC brought up here. So, I'm disappointed, but not surprised to hear this type of sentiment expressed in the chamber. But like I said, the Supreme Court is so sure about legislation that we can borrow from. More appropriate, I think, the Calgary by-law and others. Because, and it's pretty simple, the patient's right to access a necessary medical treatment in an atmosphere of privacy and safety and dignity, that takes precedence over freedom of expression in specific contexts in limited ways. And so, when protestors appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, it's often times…it's declined. They decline to take the case because the law stands as constitutional. And so, this shouldn't be seen as a scary inhibition of freedoms. This really should just be seen as a protection that we're going to work out. And thanks to colleagues, we're going to slow it down and we're going to talk about it more perhaps. So, with that, I'll call for a recorded vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Rollins. And so, in respect to the call for a recorded vote, all those in favour of the amending motion, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Santos, Gillingham, Klein and Nason

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That amending motion passes. So, I'll call for people in favour of the amended motion, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Santos, Gillingham, Klein and Nason

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That motion passes. Thank you. And I will pass the Chair back to our…Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We'll now move into question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Rollins? Any questions for the Chair? Seeing none, let's move on. The Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Allard, on the report dated October 12th.

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

Councillor Allard: Is this the motion? No. I would like to move the consent agenda. I do want to be recorded in opposition to report 5.

Madam Speaker: Okay, you'll have to pull that. Pull 5. Any other numbers?

Councillor Allard: I thought we had in the past moved consent and allowed for people to record in opposition, no? Is there a reason why we're not making…

Madam Speaker: I don't recall. I want to just clarify that.

Councillor Allard: May we confer with the Clerks please? Because I thought I had recalled an instance where that had occurred.

Madam Speaker: I think we may have done that. Mr. Clerk, do you recall?

City Clerk: Yes, Madam…Madam Speaker, we have set the precedent. We were doing with other people, too.

Madam Speaker: So, our process is we're bouncing around. So, thank you for that. We do have other ones being pulled, so councillor…Mr. Chair, that was Item 5?

Councillor Allard: Yes, I'd like to be recorded in opposition.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, and we'll do that when we…when I call the question on consent.

Councillor Allard: Okay.

Madam Speaker: And then you'll bring that forward once again. Thank you.

Councillor Allard: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: There was another item to be pulled? Eight is pulled. Two? Any other? On…that was a standalone. It was a notice of motion. So, we'll hear that after.

Councillor Allard: No, I think it's part of the regular agenda. It has to go back to Council.

Madam Speaker: Are you asking about the…

Councillor Allard: Oh, it's Report 11, Councillor Eadie, I think. It's the…yes.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Okay, I'll call the question on 1, 3, 4 and 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10. All in favour?

Councillor Allard: Aye. Opposition to Item 5, please.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard is noted in opposition to 5. And Councillor Klein, you are for 5 and 9. Councillor Nason is just Item 9. Pardon me? Just after three, there's a recorded vote. We didn't have more than three. There was just the three. Yeah. Nine. One more for 9? Okay. So, 9 was Councillor Browaty and Nason. So, again, calling consent on the items and we've noted who is in opposition. Thank you. Carried. Item 2. Pardon me? Do you…we've pulled No. 9. Yeah. Item 2.

Item 2 – Changes to the Low-Income Transit Pass for Not-for-Profit Agencies

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

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

Madam Speaker: Item 2, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, I just want to rise quickly. I thank the IRPW committee for directing the original motion from the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee. Or was it from…I can't remember. It might have been a referral from Council. But I appreciate that the standing committee referred it to the proper place. And I just want to rise, I'm in support of the report. And I just wanted to indicate, I didn't realize with the WINN Pass, I think that's the low-income bus pass, and its terminology, and I didn't understand that there was a number…a certain amount of work happening underneath the…underneath the policy that the City's developing on poverty. And Councillor Santos and I had an excellent discussion and meeting with Winnipeg Transit representatives and they are considering, and I didn't know this, and really, what the motion was calling for was to establish a third-party ability to refer people to buy a low-income bus pass. And it's my understanding they're also working on a low-income, like, single fare, because even at 50% for a bus…monthly bus pass, people don't have that kind of money in a lot of circumstances. So, I think it's really important. And they only need a couple for…a couple of tickets to…or tokens or whatever to get to a doctor's appointment or what have you. So, Madam Speaker, again, I just wanted to thank for their direction and thank the City's administration. They are considering the concept that we have not-for-profit organizations, agencies, trying to help people get their lives back together. In a lot of circumstances, there's no income tax return to refer to and so on and so forth. And there's no EIA, actually, to refer to, as well because people…some people don't understand it, not everybody that you see out there that looks like they're not being caught by the social network that's been established under the Province and the Federal Government that, Madam Speaker, they're not all getting income assistance. For various reasons, they're not eligible or they've been kicked off. So, anyway, a low-income bus pass, living in a city like Winnipeg, you really need, like…and actually, the reason you have a public transit system is…one of the main reasons to have established one is that, there are many people who don't have the ability to own a car, to do this or do that. So, our public transit system always needs to consider the needs of people working for minimum wage, which is still…minimum wage is not enough to take care of one's self, let alone a family. And so, anyway, I'll leave it at that. I appreciate it. And I would like to thank the administration for doing all that consulting…consultation for the…I guess you'd call it the anti-poverty strategy or policy for the City of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie. Any other speakers on this item? Seeing none, Councillor Allard, back to you, Mr. Chair.

Councillor Allard: Yes, thanks, Councillor Eadie. Thanks for raising this originally. I will say, it's unfortunate the Provincial Government has backed out of the…what we thought would be an agreement where there would be information sharing, therefore, reducing the burden on people that are on employment and income assistance to qualify for the low-income bus pass. That happening, a pragmatic solution is what's being proposed here, which is having…or part of a pragmatic solution is having third-parties validate the need for low-income bus passes. And so, thanks to my colleagues for raising this as an issue. I think this is a…this is a good stop gap considering the Province's has pulled out, particularly on employment and income assistance, and it also expands the potential recipients by allowing these third-parties to validate who does and who does not need a low-income bus pass. So, thank you. Please support.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the vote on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 8.

Item 8 – Including Active Transportation Criteria in the Road Renewal Budget

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

Councillor Allard: Yes, so the recommendation on this is for deferral. So, if you're pulling this, you're pulling it so that we can debate a deferral so that everything…so that that's clear.

Madam Speaker: Extension of time.

Councillor Allard: Correct. Thank you, for the proper terminology. So, I think…I think it's reasonable. I'll be supporting the proposed extension. And I'll wait to hear from my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. So, I'm speaking to including active transportation criteria in the road renewal budget. So, I'm not really clear why we even need this motion. And hopefully, maybe the Chair can speak to it when he closes. There's two interesting statements in this motion; despite being the policy of Council to build active transportation during road renewals in line with the City's Pedestrian and Cycling Strategy using road renewal dollars, there have been many cases in which this policy has not been achieved. So, that's a, you know, in the motion. And then it goes on to say, the outcome of this practice is that road renewal dollars that would normally have been assigned to active transportation and not spent on active transportation, and less active transportation facilities are built than could have been with renewal dollars. So, I guess my question is, you know, why has this not been achieved? And I can only see two reasons why this wouldn't have been achieved, because we have a policy that says we should be doing this. One reason that I see that it's not achieved is, of course, we don't have enough funding or any AT funding to incorporate into road renewals. And the other reason that I could see that it wasn't achieved was, you know, when we're doing a road renewal and we do a section of the road, we don't want to just install a section of AT if there's no connections to either side. So, those are the only two reasons that I can see why this hasn't been achieved. So, the motion asks for criteria that Public Works must follow, but I argue, we have criteria, we have the Pedestrian and Cycling Strategies that must be looked at and considered as the budget…as long as the budget allows to incorporate the active transportation. So, my understanding is, that Councillor Allard in his role as Chair of IRPW, he should be ensuring this existing criteria is applied. As Chair, he has the power to do this. And if construction can't occur due to funding…to lack of funding or not connecting, that's understandable. So, I'm not sure why we have this motion in the first place because we have criteria in place. I will support it. I look forward to what comes back to Council in 180 days. But I'm really not sure why we're even doing this and maybe Councillor Allard can clarify that in his closing remarks.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I wasn't going to speak to it, but somebody pulled it down. I will be supporting this particular motion. And I'm going to explain why I'm supporting this because there is a supposed idea that AT is built into policies already there from the Pedestrian Cycling Policy and Strategy, Madam Speaker. But ultimately, it's not. So, there are certain design practices that we know can work on local streets. So, I'm leaving the regional road thing aside because regional roads do pose the most danger. And somehow, we do need to incorporate safe cycling so that it's safe for pedestrians and cyclists because on the regional roads in my ward, there's a fair number of cycling, pedestrian collisions as well. And while it's not life threatening, it really hurts. So, but on local roads and incorporating design; now, I can't see that it would actually cost all that much more money to have a local road, like, for example, I'll use the greenway. So, the policy in the Pedestrian Cycling is, is that certain streets are greenways and they are indicated as such, Madam Speaker. Now, when it comes to…actually, any local road which can be a collector like Hartford Avenue in our wards, Madam Speaker, or it could be just a regular residential road like Powers or Machray in my ward, many different depending on…anyway, there's a whole bunch of them across the city, Madam Speaker. Now…so now, we have a…something I agreed to, which was a pilot thing for the greenway to do traffic calming. Like, technically, it would have been nice if when they do the design that gets bid on for a local road like on Powers, and there's been lots of reconstruction on Powers as I…as, actually, Councillor Lukes when…was the Chairperson of IRPW, I took her for a drive and said, would you ride your bike on this? So, and…I've made some progress. The City has…actually, I shouldn't say "I", I should say, the City has made some progress, but now they've put in speed bumps. There's no need for speed bumps. Like, aside from Grosvenor and Councillor Orlikow's first experience…contrary to certain areas of the city, traffic circles work great in the North End. I'm sorry to say, but that is the truth. Nobody complains about them because it's not wrecking their car. It means they have to slow down when they approach an intersection. Now, you can't tell me that those little traffic circles is throwing a lot of huge amount of money into dealing with a local road. Like, it's not. Really, it's not. We're not talking about, you know, Southdale and those big, I call them, traffic…anyway. There's two different terms. Anyway, that's a different mechanism than these little traffic dots in the middle of the intersection. Anyway, but they work really well. And so…and narrowing a

street, for example, Hartford, you know, I…it was too late for me. They didn't put it in the design. So, we got a crossing at McKenzie and Hartford, a short block away from your ward, Madam Speaker. And there's probably kids in your ward going to École Belmont for…for learning French. It's all French, it's a French milieu school. And so, but that intersection doesn't warn traffic controls but it would have been nice that we followed a good practice which was, we can either put a traffic bump out near that intersection to narrow it so people slow down or we could have put in a circle. It was a full reconstruction. But I was told, oh, it's too late. You let us know too late. Well, anyway, so we have, as Councillor Lukes said, we have these things in place but we don't have these things in place. So, I'm voting for this because we need to figure out when we're doing, especially on the local roads, because to provide safer cycling there, it's a minimal cost if it's an extra cost at all to do a narrowing, to put in a little traffic circle, to do the…whatever that makes it safer. And it's really important that…the most important thing we need to do for our greenways and the policy is, we need more money towards the local street program in order to make it cycle friendly. Because I'll tell you, riding through a ton of potholes, I invite you to take a ride on Powers from Dufferin to Selkirk Avenue, see how that feels. Unless you got one of those bikes with the extra shocks. Anyway, thank you, Madam Speaker, I will be voting for this report.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yeah, it's an extension of 180 days, if I understand correctly. So, I wasn't going to speak to it, but you know, I did look and I saw a lot of familiar names that had presented correspondence. The usual individuals. Many of them are the usual individuals that speak with regards to active transportation. The challenge I have is one where it's taken 13 years to advance a active transportation pathway along Transcona…or in Transcona along Pandora Avenue. This year saw some major road renewal on Pandora. However, we still have a gap. You know, there was comments made earlier about where you don't put them where they start and stop, no where. Well, in Transcona, that's happened in the last two years. It stops at Wayoata and doesn't start again until over at Redonda. We get the last…basically, the last two blocks to get done…three blocks, maybe. But yet, that will have to wait until we do more renewal on that street. Whereas, we also did Day Street as part of this undertaking this year. Two blocks going north from Pandora. However, as part of the strategy or policy, that AT was not done at this time because of the cost of the undertaking. They did the roadway, but they didn't do the AT. This couples and adds on to road work that was done on Day Street last year. There was several blocks that were done north of Kildare to McMeans that AT was put on and just ends at the end of the block. When we're building these, we need to have them go somewhere. Residents in my neighborhood shake their head. They ask, well, could they not have at least connected it to Transcona Trail in the north end? That would make a little bit of sense. In the case of Pandora, could they not just finish the AT on Pandora? I know the costs and the costs are going to go up and up and up. I can guarantee it. The cost of concrete, cost of asphalt, the cost of propane to heat the asphalt to patch the holes that are in the asphalt. We're going to…we're going to be paying all over the place. The thing I would like to see, and this is more just commentary as the report goes forward is that if there's sections…and my colleague from River Heights-Fort Garry…I've got to look, it's hyphenated. And we think of…well, I just, you know. It's one of things, Madam Speaker. We've got a simple one: Transcona. You know, I had the pleasure of driving on Corydon many times and that's seen a lot of heavy rebuilding, but yet, there's no AT on that road. There's probably other streets that need AT or AT enhancements in that ward. So, what I'd like to see is, as we do these roads, if the road that's designated to get the AT doesn't get the AT, that funding should be allocated in some manner or form in that same ward area to support enhancements to AT where appropriate. So, I'll leave it at that. If my colleague, the Chair of this committee wants like to talk offline about it some more, I would appreciate that and welcome it, but those are my comments for today.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. Because, you know, River Heights-Fort Garry Ward is the centre of the universe, I think it's important for me to get up and talk about it. Thank you very much. Yeah, I look forward to getting the report back in 180 days. I'm still quite convinced that it's not every road in the City of Winnipeg should have AT. I do believe we have an AT plan. If you want to amend the map, then do that. That's a fantastic idea. But Cordon is not part of the AT network. If we want to put some revenue into, I'd be more than happy to do some more on Harrow, for example. Some protected bike lanes there. It's this right road with the sharrow kind of model there. Harrow is just so busy and that's actually…I was actually just texting Councillor Allard recently, now I won't, about the fact that next year, Harrow is up on the block to do some resurfacing. And I hope we can get some better protection on Harrow. But we have to do it in a manner that makes sense. So, we do have an AT map and an AT plan. And we do need to focus on where the breaks are already. You know, Councillor Nason has said, you know, we have this great route, but in the middle, you're missing a couple of pieces already. So, you know, I don't believe we should do AT on every street. I do see traffic calming on many streets, but I'm more than happy to have this debate and discussion going forward. I do appreciate it. So, when it comes back in 180 days, I definitely am very supportive of the fact that if it's supposed to have AT and we do a renewal on that street, we should put it in. But again, the idea to do AT down Bishop Grandin, Corydon, all these other streets, that to me, it just messes the plan up. We should be focusing on finishing the network we have now because right now, we know the problem is in our network that we don't have that connectivity as Councillor Nason's talked about of moving people around.

So, before we start doing a whole bunch of new projects, I would like to finish the projects that we have on the books right now. But again, maybe the councillor will convince me otherwise going forward. I'd be more than happy to talk about it in 180 days. So, thank you very much.

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

Councillor Schreyer: River Heights might be the center of the universe, but the Elmwood has the most bridges. So, we're the most connected to everybody. And that's a fact. That's five bridges from Elmwood crossing the Red River. That's five separate bridge pier structures. That's not including…that's not including the sidewalks alongside both sides of the Louise Bridge, put it that way. Pardon me? And…well, there you go, plus an overpass. Five bridges and an overpass. And so, yes, active transportation and how these coincide with these connections is a big issue. Because it is an issue of how we connect from northeast Winnipeg into downtown. It's hard to get to downtown without going through Elmwood. It's possible. You know, you can go through St. Boniface if you'd like to. If you want to go down Provencher, but you still might have to go over the Nairn overpass. So, so let's face it; how things connect through Elmwood matters to the city's structure. Perhaps more than how they go through River Heights. But we're not going to go there right now, we'll have that argument on another day. So, the issue, I have to say, previously, I did vote for the initial Active Transportation Plan back six years ago. I was reticent to do so. I challenged a couple of points, which were clarified and made me change my mind or it made my mind up here in the chamber because Councillor Gerbasi made the point, is there was two issues with the Active Transportation Plan. One; that included in it, for some reason that I didn't think had anything to do with it, that we would recognize the possibility of looking at the city, abdicating responsibility for maintaining the sidewalks in the winter time. To me, shouldn't be part of it. Now, Councillor Gerbasi made the point which convinced me that, if I were to go there, she would do everything to go against that. Well, she's no longer the city councillor, but I will hold it to her while I can, while she's still alive and well because I know she is. To come out in case…while I'm a councillor, that for some reason, the city…the City's looking abdicating its responsibility to maintaining what I say is over 95% of the active transportation system in this city, which are sidewalks. And there's no reason to trivialize that in any way, shape or form. Why trivialize the fact that sidewalks are the paramount medium of active transportation in the city? Why trivialize that in any way, shape or form? How do you get to an active transportation trail? How do you get to the bus? How do you get to the store? How do you get to your car? How do you get to school? With the sidewalk. So, why would I want this to be in jeopardy? Of all things. The aspect of active transportation, we built first in this city. Not just in the city, but this is an evolution of urbanization in so much of our world. So, why would I want to trivialize that? So, nonetheless, I did vote for the active transportation. Also, I did show, much to actually the surprise of some people, including Jenny Gerbasi herself. I did explain…show, because the notes we very clear. And hats off to Bike Winnipeg because they had excellent notes, but it did show how. They did not show the costs of certain aspects of the public engagement and things like this. And so, I made my points, but I didn't vote it. But the issue…look, I mean, you know, for Councillor Gerbasi at the time, her point was…her priority was downtown connectivity and having those routes downtown. That's all very well. People may vote for something, people might get…an issue might get a majority vote but it might not all be for the same reasons. And I'm not convinced at all that we voted on the active transportation, that it got a majority vote because all councillors had the same motivations, it was for the same reasons, I'm not convinced of that at all. Because if I consider the ward of Transcona as an example, because I have certainly bicycled around Transcona as well from Devonshire Village, you know, all the way over, approaching the east perimeter. You know, wonderful active transportation trail as an example, but I don't believe, as Councillor Nason I think would make the point, I do not want to put words in his mouth, that it is not the priority of people in suburbs such as Transcona in terms of why the active transportation…active transportation trails are so important. It is not because of the downtown active transportation lanes. It might be some sort of connectivity throughout certain regions of the city. How does Transcona link up with North Kildonan and East Kildonan and Elmwood, that might be part of it. Of course, the challenge for us is, how do you cross…how do you cross Lagimodiere? That's a big issue. And I can never let…people won't let me go of…go of that one, I don't blame them. So, for some people, their priority is, how are you able to get around your region of the city? Not go downtown. That wouldn't be the priority at all. But how would you get, let's say, from anywhere in northeast Winnipeg to the area around Kildonan Crossing, my side of Lag, all those shops and Kildonan Place on Councillor Nason's. And so, these are issues that I guess, well, must stay in the realm of consideration. I'll just leave it at that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Back to you, Councillor Allard for the close.

Councillor Allard: Thank you. I did not expect such, well, not vigorous but so many comments on an extension, but thank you very much, Madam Speaker…on behalf of…for Madam Speaker, for my colleagues, through you. Just address a few points to Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Lukes, I would remind Councillor Lukes of our organizational structure. We have a Chief Administrative Officer who reports to Executive Policy Committee and Council. Ultimately, makes the decision on the hiring. I'd also, Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Lukes, remind Councillor Lukes that I lose a lot of votes on the Public Works Committee of Council, but…so, it's not…we don't have a structure where the chair directs behind closed doors on Council policy. So, I wanted to make that point clear. This is a…this is one of a triumvirate of motions that I had moved on climate change at the last Council meeting with Councillor Gilroy. Thank you very much

for moving that with me, Councillor Gilroy. This particular report is at…is and was amended at IRPW to look at the road renewal reserve as a funding source for active transportation. So, that's the distinction here. And I did pull up the budget, which explains the problematic as I understand it. So, this is…this is the 2020 budget…2021 budget overview update, appendix A. It's PDF page 89. Page 1-81, the bottom says, "Adopted 2021 budget overview" and…so, this document says, "On May 14th, 2008, Council concurred in the recommendation that the policy be adopted to incorporate active transportation facilities into any reconstruction or rehabilitation required on any infrastructure identified as an active transportation facility in the proposed active transportation network. On July 15th, 2015, Council adopted the Pedestrian Cycling Strategies as the long-range pedestrian and cycling transportation policy for the City of Winnipeg. Depending on the proposed street renewal treatment and the planning and priority status of the proposed pedestrian and/or cycling facility, the Regional Street Renewal Program may implement the intention of the Winnipeg Pedestrian and Cycling Strategies." So, Madam Speaker, there's administrative discretion in the…in the building or not building of the active transportation cycling facilities during our street renewal program. And so, there's also a few irons in the fire. There's a report coming asking the Public Service to report back on the last two years of active transportation not built on…during road renewals. Though, as I read this budget sheet, I think the report should probably be expanded to look at more than just street renewals on the…because the language is broader than just street renewals and that is what the report's calling for. But we're going to get a report showing all the active transportation facilities that were not built as part of road renewals. Have been working with the Public Service on this looking for more, well, more certainty about what happens with…with active transportation being built, especially in terms of road renewals, but across the city in general. Especially when we're doing road renewals or any type of road treatment because once we treat the road, it's going to be like that for the next number of years, most probably. And Councillor Nason…Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Nason, our active transportation plan looks to capitalize on the opportunity to build the links of a complete active transportation network while we're doing road work. So, that's why we don't have a complete network built overnight. If I had my druthers, we would. But I'm one vote on Council and there's several priorities and there's a number of things that we need to address. Like Councillor Mayes would say, our sewer facilities, a billion-dollar plan or Transit Master Plan, $1 billion. Anyway, I digress. So, that's the reason why I moved the motion on the road renewal was to identify new, potential funding source for active transportation facilities as road renewals occur because we know that they're not always done. And in many cases, there are reasons why. I understand the case of…in the case of Roblin Boulevard, where there was a sharrow and there was a painted bike lane was in the active transportation strategies document, and so, in that case, I'm informed that there was a utility move that was…would have been required that would have substantially increased the cost. I think what we need is to better understand when we build or not build active transportation on a road renewal or any other treatment. And I'm working on getting that clarity. We have a report coming to Public Works. And…so, this is one of…one of many motions and reports that I've called for. But Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Lukes, I don't tell…the Director of Public Works does not report to me. I do not hire and fire the Director of Public Works. Council does, Council policy directs the…directs the Director and it's not like I can wave a magic wand and get whatever it is that I want. So, I'm moving motions. I'm getting reports. And I'm having these debates. And so, please support the extension. And I hope that when the debate happens, I know that I'm looking at the road renewal reserve in the future as a potential source for discrete active transportation projects. The distinction here being, currently we can't use the road renewal reserve for active transportation as a stand alone project, but we can use it when it's being built as part of a road renewal. So, there's probably too long a speech for what I thought would have been a simple extension request, but people said a bunch of stuff and I wanted to respond. So, thanks for your attention. Please support the extension of time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. With that, I'll call the question on Item 8. All favour? Contrary? That's carried. Item 11, Mr. Clerk.

Clerk: Nine.

Madam Speaker: Nine.

Item 9 – Updating the Transportation Master Plan to Achieve 50% Mode Shift

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

Councillor Allard: All right, well, this one I was expecting a debate on. So, I'll briefly introduce this. Our Climate Action Plan calls for a 50% modal shift by 2030. To be clear, that means that half of trips will be taking…would be taken not by a single-passenger in a vehicle. So, that means…it means the person who's not the passenger…wait, no, it means…choose to be taken by the…by the passenger…by a passenger, it would be a transit trip, it would be active transportation or any other means other than a private vehicle being driven by only one person. That's the mode shift. The opportunity is that, according to our 2011 emissions report, 50% of our greenhouse gases come from private vehicles. So, that is why this is the…this is a cornerstone policy of our climate action is the modal shift. And we are not getting there. And so, part of why we're not getting there is that we need to update our Transportation Master Plan which needs an update. And our Transportation Master Plan doesn't have a 50% target on modal shift. So, that's why this motion is here. So, if you, like

me, believe that the human race should have a future on earth, I would encourage you to support this and many other motions like the one that we considered earlier today with the Mayor's…the Mayor's caucus asking for action on climate. We have a Climate Action Plan, we need to implement it. One of the biggest implementation pieces is to allow for a modal shift of 50% by 2030. We need to act. We need to act now. And the Transportation Master Plan is what informs how we will move people in the future and which projects should be prioritized. So, this motion seeks to confirm what is already Council policy. This motion seeks to capitalize on what is the lowest hanging fruit on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. So, if we're not going to do this, then I…it's hard to imagine a scenario where we reach our climate goals as a city. So, after private vehicles, we have buildings that we need to insulate. After that, we have organics that need to be recycled so that they don't become methane instead of…instead of CO2. So, those were the big three for climate. And this is by far number one. And it's the low hanging fruit. So, please support. I really look forward to what my colleagues have to say on this. But this is the low hanging fruit. We have to do this if we're going to go do our part on climate as a municipality.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I enjoy walking on this earth and living here. And I wouldn't intone that anybody was voting to end the world or not just on this particular issue. Mode shift; I'd like to start off by saying that I'm not voting for this idea to go to the 50% mode shift. And the reason is, well, the new Federal Government has made further promises about setting…setting how much limits or whatever on carbon and that sort of thing. But ultimately, the federal carbon program…carbon tax plan is…well, actually, redirecting money to people…all Canadians that comes from that money. I don't know that that was the best strategy, but what I do know, is that it is pushing people into, not a mode shift, but into a…an almost zero carbon footprint by putting people in private individual gas powered cars, into privately owned electric powered cars. We have a councillor or two who may…who have electric cars. They haven't shifted their mode, but they are not producing carbon. Thank you very much. I'll let you rise and speak to that. But I took a ride in that car, it's a beautiful car. But Madam Speaker, I just…I didn't hear anything about consideration given to…Councillor Wyatt and I, at the time, we were calling on the City, actually, putting money towards fast charging electric refuelling stations, which is really popular across the country, but again, what that's doing is, it's not doing a mode shift, it's really reducing carbon by allowing people who own electric cars to recharge quickly and make that more convenient because ultimately, transportation and family and individuals' decisions are based on convenience. And that's why I'm hoping our new transit system master plan will shift people into that mode of transportation because that is way better than, say…to say that, you know, it's not ride share. Whatever, you…you know, this…the true rideshare…and, you know, like Peg City and different things like that, those are cool ideas and lots of people are transitioning to that. And it's the price point that's helping, but you know, they also offer electric vehicles and they need recharging, whatever. Anyway, Madam Speaker, clearly, I don't know that we need to set, and I don't really want us, the City to say we're going to do something. We already are. I don't know what we're going to measure it. But the measurement that's probably in there right now, whatever level that was, we haven't even got there if it is there. But we will be promoting shift. But you know, like, the reality is yeah, there's some people who are going to ride in the winter, but let's be serious, Madam Speaker. You know, even when I was…you know, I was thinking, well, yeah, if it wasn't that cold, but you know, ultimately, people are not going to ride…huge shift to riding your bike in the winter. Come on. So, like, I just…you know, I was supportive of 7 and 8. This one, I just, I can't support it. I shouldn't go on so much. Everybody wants to go. But when I vote on this, I'm voting because I think that the federal…not quite sure how the Province is going along so good, but they are…kind of came on to the carbon tax thing. That's going to go help. I wish one of those levels would offer some kind of…from those collected dollars, offer that to either to our transit system or offer it to…offer it to individuals to buy their private electric cars so it's even more affordable. Because the more affordable…the more of those cars that they make, the more affordable they are, there will be a lot more of them. And ultimately, it's about convenience. That's what people need. Their lives are complex, very busy. Yes, some families have stood their ground and they're doing this and they're doing that and that's fine. That's fine. And I think there are a number of families that will do it, but you know, by setting this 50, that's not going to…just setting it, it's not going to change it. Nobody, you know…they already…our city already said no to fast charging stations. We already said no to that. We should be doing it, but we already said no to that, Madam Speaker. So, anyway, I'll leave it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, can you ask you the question.

Madam Speaker: You're asking for the question to be put?

Councillor Nason: Yes, please.

Madam Speaker: And that is in order. So, there's going to be a vote on calling for the question now and no further debate. I don't believe there's a response in the Procedural By-law on that, Mr. Clerk. Is there a rebuttal from the Chair? I don't believe so.

City Clerk: No, ma'am. You would simply call for the vote and whether the question be put now and debate be stopped.

Madam Speaker: But we're going to vote on whether the question be put, correct?

City Clerk: Correct.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so we'll have a vote on that. Everyone understands that correctly? Councillor…Councillor Nason has moved that the question be put meaning that any further debate or closing not take place. So, we'll vote on that, that the question be put on this matter. All in favour? Contrary? All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason and Rollins

Nays

Councillors Santos, Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 7.

Madam Speaker: Excuse me. Yeah, you counted my vote? I was with Councillor Allard. Okay. So, the vote count?

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 7, with Mayor Bowman absent. And Councillor Orlikow, sorry. Do you have Orlikow? 8-6, sorry. My apologies.

Madam Speaker: So, the vote passes, Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk: The vote to call the question passes, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Now I'll call the question on item…Item 9. All in favour of Item 9, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Santos, Allard, Bowman, Chambers, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Rollins and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Madam Speaker: Yeah, Councillor Allard is not counted. We'll have to have you just step off for the vote. Yes. Opposed? Well, sorry, I was looking at the Clerk. I'm confused. Yes, all those opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Gillingham, Klein, Nason and Schreyer

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 6, with Councillor Orlikow absent.

Madam Speaker: Item 9 passes. Onto Item 11.

Item 11 – Monthly Reporting on the Winnipeg Transit Plus Trip Priority System

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard to introduce Item 11.

Councillor Allard: Yes, so as part of our effort to increase the modal shift in the City of Winnipeg, we are…we have introduced a trip priority system which is…it's getting a lot of people more rides using Transit Plus than were available in the past because the system is now more efficient. Unfortunately, that came with reprioritization of what used to be

essentially was a taxi service for priority trips. Well, maybe that's not fair to say it was a taxi service. But it removed the priority system where if certain people, based on the type of trip, were able to book a pick-up and a return time. And I think many around this council table were skeptical about the administration's ability to provide the level of service that would be required with Transit Plus given the very important nature of the service especially for those who need healthcare services, in particular, dialysis. And I…you probably have received calls from people who are not…are not…well, are not pleased that we've gone from a system where there could be bookings for pick-up and return times. But I do think that we are…we are more than likely, I do think that we're moving a lot more people with this new on-demand service having experienced the on-demand pilot for regular transit in St. Boniface. So, this is a request to not have the Public Service report back in writing every month. I think the intention was to have them report back verbally every month. I can't recall any issue for which we report…we've required reporting in writing every month. So, I think it is reasonable for the Public Service to provide verbal reports monthly as this service continues to roll out. So, that's why this motion is here. I've received complaints and I want to get reports, but I don't think we need to have a monthly written report and that's why this is here at Council because it started here at Council.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I did. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I get a lot of calls from the so-called working people with disabilities that somehow got this beautiful…losing their beautiful work trip taxi. Let's not define things and make it all controversial. Ultimately, the goal, there is skepticism. I just, it's okay to have a verbal report, I appreciate that. However, I'm taking calls, the same calls that, actually, Transit Plus is taking, Madam Speaker. And there are workers who are being dropped off and not picked up and they're sitting out on a street where, you know…and close to where there's been murders, fires, needles all over the place, people's safety in question because they are being dropped off at work before the doors open. And they've got to sit around there for 20-25 minutes. And when you have a disability, guess what, you're vulnerable, very vulnerable. So, we have to consider those things when we're delivering the trips. So, I don't want to get into definitions. We're trying to serve persons with disabilities and we all on Council wish to do that. But now, in the transition, and it's still early, but once…like, you're changing the system. People who are going to work, they're still being given a window of when your pick-up is. So, it's not on-demand. Some are still getting this pick-up window stuff. So, if you're going with a taxi service on-demand for Transit Plus users and it's first come first serve, what you need to be able to do is deliver and say, your pick-up time is this. We traditionally gave a window for the private companies to deliver on that service for pick-up and delivery because scheduling software and so on, supposedly was not adequate. Now supposedly we have that, Madam Speaker. However, there are still issues of people saying they're being given a window. Now, if I have to leave work everyday and my boss is watching me, aren't I going to get fired because the window says I've got to be out there before I get off work. And my workday is already been defined because of the old Transit Plus system. You know, for a lot of people with disabilities, their employment is quite precarious. It takes you a long time to find a job where people are willing to accommodate you. It…you know, you want to keep everybody…if you want to be productive in your job, you want to work, Transit Plus needs to deliver appropriately. And we're going to be debating another issue which I think will help. But if it's going to…like, if we're providing this window thing and it's first come first trip…come for trips, you know…actually, with regular transit, there's a schedule. It tells you the bus will be at William and Main at 5:42 p.m. Now, it might be a touch early or a touch late, but there's no 15 or 20-minute window. You know, it's difficult. And then, your trip's going to go. And yeah, so if you give a specific time, the expectation is that the person with the disability will be there at that time. Now, windows were developed traditionally, for you people who don't understand how Handi-Transit used to work. So, anyway, when I hear these verbal reports I'm hoping that Winnipeg Transit, through their Transit Plus people, will be able to give us a verbal report how that's going because the individuals who I get calls from, they've been filing their grievances and explaining the problem and the next monthly verbal report I hear, I hope I'm hearing them report that we're having these issues and here's what we're doing to resolve it. That's what I want to hear. So, because that's what the people I get the calls from are talking about. I'm not…you know, we changed the whole thing. Once we get to this family of services and improvements, we'll even be able to give better service to those persons with disabilities. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be relatively brief even though this is a very charged topic. Since the new system has come in place, yeah, my office has received lots of calls. Unlike the Transit Plus system, I've received a lot of social media inquiries as well about some of the challenges. And yeah, they're…what I'm hearing, there's a thirty-minute pick-up and drop off window. It's the drop off that seems to be the biggest problem for the transit…or the users of this, you know, because of the time it takes to get the treatments and stuff. They are sitting around and they're worried. Most of them are seniors that are worried that they are not going to get picked up. But the biggest and loudest complaint and I actually got a compliment last night by my Twitter from a user of the service, is that they've at least now put up a recorded message to advise that there are extended times to wait to book your trip. Much like 311, there are extended times being taken to book trips. Residents have reported to the media upwards of an hour, sometimes getting disconnected while booking their trips. And they have to do this multiple times a week. It is a challenge because they're now fearful that

if they don't follow the letter of the requirement now that it's an on-demand, first come first serve, that they are not going to get their trip to their life sustaining therapy. It's a challenge. It's a fear. And it's a real cost if they don't…if they're not able to access Transit Plus. Now, I know there's a huge gap from a perspective of providing Transit Plus for life sustaining therapy. It's a challenge, and it's a challenge that's being vacated I…you know, I'll say, by the Provincial Government on that. I don't think we're being…I don't think we should be providing that return trip. I think there should be another medical related trip that persons can get home as quick as possible. It's a draining situation when it's a medical related trip. And I think much better can be done for those, you know, I don't want to throw the term out loosely, but semi-vulnerable situations when it's a medical related matter. We can do better. I want to thank the Chair of the committee. We did have a conversation last night because I did want to discuss the opportunity to possibly amend this to make it a written report. He explained very articulately why there's a challenge with having it as a written report, particularly on a monthly basis and I want to acknowledge that conversation we had. And we also, during that conversation, shared that we both have that same concern. There are things that need to be done. This needs to be monitored closely. These are the early weeks. So, having proactive conversations, proactive disclosure from the Public Service of challenges they might be facing, if they're facing challenges with dealing with the call volumes, that needs to be addressed ASAP. We need to find solutions to it. And I think working together with the Public Service collaboratively and those in the community that are using, to be the listen, to feed that back to the Public Service so that they can provide a prompt and accurate response to the challenges we're facing. Thank you.

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

Councillor Allard: All right, thanks…thanks to my colleagues for their comments. We will be monitoring this situation closely at Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. I wanted to put maybe jump off of some of what Councillor Nason's saying, when the Province arbitrarily cut 50/50 funding to Transit, they cut 50/50 funding to Handi-Transit. And a big part of Handi-Transit is providing healthcare services. So, I think this is an example of how reckless that arbitrary cut was by the Provincial Government without having corresponding revenue to support our Handi-Transit…our Transit Plus program. So, I wanted to make that point because I don't think it's been made yet today. I've made it in the past. And Councillor Eadie, I think you said Filmon brought in. I think you had said Filmon originally brought this support for Handi-Transit in. Is that correct? Anyway, I'm out of order. I know. Yeah.

Madam Speaker: Let's get on with the meeting.

Councillor Allard: Back in order. All right. I've got to be careful, somebody's going to call the question. I won't be able to speak.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, yeah.

Councillor Allard: Yeah, right. Can't do it when I'm speaking. Really? Anyway, yeah, so please…please support this. We'll be getting monthly updates. We're all monitoring this closely. And I didn't know you could call the question like that. It's interesting. Can you call the question while somebody's speaking, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: I don't believe so.

Councillor Allard: Why don't you? Okay. Please support this. And I look forward to debating the other reports.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. With that, the question on Item 11. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Rollins recorded in opposition. And it's carried. We're now moving into the notice of motion. It's on the agenda. It was brought forward at last month's Council meeting. If you could give me a moment, I want to pull it up. It's the motion moved by Councillor Mayes and seconded by Councillor Nason regarding Transit Plus. Councillor Mayes, to introduce.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
NOTICE OF MOTION

Item 1 - Partial In-House Service for Winnipeg Transit Plus

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.

Councillor Mayes: All right. It's been a long day, but it's been about 10 years of leading up to this. So, I will use some of my time at the front to talk about numbers and some of my time on the close to talk about…about some other items. So, this…and thanks to Councillor Nason. Sincere thanks for backing this and seconding it. It's certainly a very important motion to me and I know Councillor Nason, since his election, has been very interested in issues pertaining to Transit Plus. So, I really do appreciate his support on this. And we'll see if we have an unlikely political coalition put together here of the willing to support this. So, a little bit of history; Transit Plus, first Handi-Transit, brought in several decades ago. Originally delivered entirely by the City of Winnipeg in the 1990s. Actually, in the 1980s, services began to get contracted out. Multiple City reports have indicated over time that there was a period when it operated 70% contracted out, 30% in-house. So, the model that's proposed here in the motion is feasible. It certainly has a historic basis that 30% be in in-house. The motion has had a somewhat long voyage, the original motion to get here. Mid-2019, we had approved a series of Transit Plus contracts. I then made a motion to take a look at bringing 30% in-house. It first voyaged to Councillor Orlikow's Innovation Committee in March of 2020. Rather a good report, actually, that said…and that report says, "Prepared in conjunction with Transit". That's in that report. The people at Innovation said, you know, we could do this just for wheelchair related calls. We could, it's 30% of the call volume, we could do that. Councillor Orlikow's committee I think rightly says, interesting, let's send this on to IRPW for a look. It arrives there in June and is ultimately voted on in July of 2021. What comes of that report? And it's on DMIS, it's quite detailed in terms of the costing. I don't agree with the costing, but it's quite detailed. So, somewhat disturbingly, Transit says in the 2021, can't do the wheelchair only calls. That would violate the Human Rights Code. Very frustrating in a sense. Why didn't you say that in 2020 when you were consulting on the original report? Kind of a moot point, though, because to their credit, to their credit Transit staff go and say, well, we did cost out what would it cost to bring in 30% by call volume. Well done. I don't agree with all of it, but kudos to them for doing it. I appreciate that. So, the look is at 30% brought in-house by Transit staff. They do say, well, we've costed this out as if it's going to be all 27-foot Crestline buses. It's going to be all the big busses because we're going that way, current and future contracts will require that. Not quite, 44% of the current contracts at least don't require that yet. How do I know that? We voted on it. Back in 2019 and 2018, there were a series of votes here about how to go about contracts. The last one, the last one, the most recent one, that doesn't burn off until 2026, involved cars, not busses. So, there will be a period of transition to the busses. But let's not be too nitpicky, Transit costed it out that way. We're going to have to go to all 27-foot busses. All right. Most of the costs, Transit Plus has said, is in the hourly wage rates that are going to be paid. That's fair enough. But my critique of the costs has a number of (inaudible). One is the…there's a cost estimate. This is what it will cost if we go in-house. Compare it to the privates, and we…we estimate the privates will only go up 2% a year. I have to say, there is no support for that calculation. If you look at our own volume one budget figures, what's an average ride cost, it has gone up 19.6% over a three-year period. That's our figures. That's not prepared by anyone outside. That's in the City of Winnipeg's budget. That's 2016 to '19. Forget about 20, it's $45 a ride in '20 due to COVID. Throw that out, the cost increase for the private operators has been far and above 6% a year, not just 2% a year. So, I would critique the

costing there. We have had had some issues with Transit costing on the U-Pass. Councillor Lukes, I think, put some outside assistance…spoke pretty well to that. As did Councillor Allard. I've had some issues and I'll come back to that with Transit Plus, costing on the 500-metre rule. I feel I lost seven or eight years of progress on that because I bought into the costing I was given. I'm not making that mistake again. So, the 2% annual increase for privates is certainly artificially low. It's also worth noting, this isn't a debate just about cost. It's also a debate about service levels. And I've heard no one say, things are going great with service. We all continue to get complaints. I've also…would point out, Google Handi-Transit driver complaints or Handi-Transit petition, you'll see from January of 2020 and you'll all may remember a petition that came in from a number of drivers who worked for Handi-Transit, they were, frankly, not willing to even go public. It was an anonymous thing. They hired Council to put forward human rights concerns. They wanted it all brought in-house, these people who've worked for the current system. So, it's not as if the current system has (inaudible) labour relations, I have to say. And our City response had tended to be, they're not our employees, go enforce the Employment Standards Code. Patrick Stewart is the one who got up here and said, they're not covered by that Employment Standards Code because they're independent contractors or are purportedly independent contractors. So, we've got issues with service levels. We've got issues with the way drivers are being treated. And we've got issues with costs. As I indicate, I don't buy that it's going to be only 2% increase per year for the private operatives, and I'm using City of Winnipeg data to support that argument. So, the service, it's in a transitional phase now going towards the buses. One of the arguments was, well, we need to have…we need to have a cohesive system. Yes, surely that would argue toward bringing some of it in-house, rather than leaving all of it in the private hands. You may also say, well, is this…what's this…is this like garbage and recycle? No. Remember, garbage and recycle was one big contract city-wide, then we went to two. This is very different. This is a series of votes on smaller contracts that tend to be 7 or 8% or 15% of call volume. Interestingly, we voted on this in around 2011 or '12. It then vanished from our docket for several years due to a legal interpretation by City staff that we didn't have to vote on it. Then weirdly reappears at IRPW committee in '18, and then comes to Council in '19. So, we did vote on a series of these in 2019. So, we've…it's…it's not…it lends itself to a model where City staff, and we're giving two-years of notice, that's what the Director said he would require, so I'm not disagreeing with that, two-years of notice. Who to bring in? Well, all you…you can keep going through. That's been a particularly good operator, we'll leave that one alone, but we should bring in this one. He's been a…he/she's been a bit of a rogue. We're going to bring 7% of call volume in. You can get up to 22 to 30% that way. Does it…why two years? That's the amount indicated by our own staff to get ready. So, this is a model. Why 22 to 30, you might ask. Frankly, if there is a cost, 22 would be less than 30. Additionally, the way the contracts work, it's hard to get precisely 30 if you're mixing 7, 8, 15%. If you go back and look, as I have done, at what things cost in 2011 versus now, you would you see contracts have gone up about 100%. If you want me to clarify that, I can. Certainly, the report in 2011 used to talk about $8 million for about 8% of call volume. Now, it's double that for 8% of the call volume. So, the cost with the privates have certainly increased. That is inarguably true. It is in our own documents, so that's not being made up by some third-party. And I did want to thank, James has been at this for a decade with ATU, and Romeo who's been at this relatively recently, and Zac Fleischer who used to work at ATU, all of whom have battled for this moment' Patrick Stewart and others in the community. It's not simply a union item, it's a service item. So, final comment on costs for now, there's the issue of, well, we'll have to buy the buses and we'll have to find a place to store them. To be blunt, the private operators aren't giving us free buses and storing them for free. It's a capital cost as it is. Lastly, the issue in that report in IRPW was, well, we'll have to build a bigger Transit garage. With respect, what we voted on in April was a Transit garage with a $200 million estimate Class 5. There's a $200 million margin of error there. I would say it might save money if we actually put the buses in that, but the idea that, my god, we can't afford this, but we've given you a proposal for a garage with a $200 million margin for error. I find that pretty thin. So, I will speak some more on close. Again, thanks to Councillor Nason. I think it's very do-able and I think it's the right time to do it.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And you know, when it comes to good policy, politics really shouldn't play a factor into that even if we're on the typically opposite sides of the paradigm. I want to open by saying that one of the former drivers of Transit Plus, one of the contractor drivers, Mr. Singh who's a resident of Transcona, I want to say that is he still in my mind. The challenges when we have a service that's providing supports to persons who are vulnerable, who are in need of support for medical transport and we're delivering them in vehicles that are held together with garbage bags over windows, rope holding doors closed, suspension that's throwing people around that are…that are…have mobility challenges, we are not doing them a service. We are doing them a disservice. And we've seen this in my short time. You know, many of you, I know Councillor Browaty just celebrated his 15th year in Council, I suspect he's seen more than his fair share of challenges with regards to Transit Plus in his time on Council. We control the schedule. Being able to ensure that people are getting where they need to get to, when they need to get to, and still being respectful and responsible with regards to the drivers. We owe them that, at a minimum. And we continue to fail it. We continue to say, no, you know, they're a contracted agency, that's where they need to be. And I can go back through the minutes of Council, but I remember one of those comments, one of those meetings where we were here, and if you don't vote for this, you're voting for…against safety of transiting people in Transit Plus because we were voting on the contracts. We were voting on the contracts for the independent contractors because, you know, they need to buy new vehicles. We heard through presentation today that some of our longer buses have been around for 20 some odd years. So, if a seven-year contract

vehicles are depleted, and we know through some of the posts we've seen where windows are broken, they're taped up, suspensions are less than exciting, what kind of support are we providing those that we're entrusted to deliver Transit Plus to? You know, I think by going down this route with this undertaking, we're providing an opportunity to raise the bar. Perhaps, you know, with financial prudence, because I know there's concerns. And yes, as Councillor Mayes mentioned, the jump in cost was exponential. The growth of contracting this out. We can challenge them to do better financially. When we're…if we, as the City, and ATU as a partner on this, with delivering Transit Plus service for 30% of the rides, can deliver a service that's better, more economical, more efficient, I think that's the right way to go. And I think, you know, if we do still have the contracting out, well, they need to pick up their boots and do a better job because I think a motion today in support of this puts them on notice that they've got two years to clean up their act because we're not taking it anymore. The residents that we serve are not taking it anymore. We demand a quality service for those individuals using Transit Plus. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be voting against this. How are we going to pay for this? The costs of this service, of bringing Handi…pardon me, Transit Plus back in-house have already been shown they'll be over $2 million per year. The costs include an additional 73 FTEs, 28 new vehicles. The cost, which was not calculated in the report that came in July, of ending contracts with the current providing…the current contractors that are providing the service right now. And I know there's this idea of, well, if we just wait till those contracts conclude and then one by one move…move…pull that service back in-house, the department said that that's really not feasible. And so, there would have to be a cost associated with negotiating ending the contracts with the service providers that are currently providing the service. If we look at the mill rate support for Transit as a whole, and the report that was given in advance in July, talks about the integration of conventional and para-transit services which is referred to as a family services…family of services model. If we look at the mill rate support to Transit as a whole that we have provided as a city to subsidize Transit to ensure that service continues, with 2021 being an anomaly, granted, we had to backfill substantially in 2021's budget to cover the impact of COVID-19. If you take the cost, though, from 2016 to 2021, the jump is significant; well over 40% mill rate support increase. An anomaly year, granted, in 2021. Went from 60…about $70 million in 2016 to $104 million of mill rate tax support to Transit. If you take that anomaly year out and you just take the 2022 projection before COVID, about $78.5 million, it's about a 9%...8 to 9% increase from 2016 to 2021 in the cost of providing transit service the mill rate support. We're in a…continue to be suffering through or going through COVID-19 and its impacts on our transit service and its impact on our transit ridership and the corresponding impact, of course, is that revenues from transit have dropped significantly. We will be forced, once again, in 2022's budget to, once again, inject additional mill rate support to help Transit. It's no fault of Transit. It's not their fault. None of my comments are in any way disparaging on Transit. I think we have excellent operators, excellent workers in that service that do a great job. But the reality is, Transit is bleeding money right now. Now is, in my mind, not the time to be adding to the cost of providing any sort of transit service. In bringing 30% of the Transit Plus service back in-house will not automatically solve any problem that may exist currently. All of our offices get e-mails and calls about…complaints about the current transit service in the same way that we would get calls about Transit Plus service. Just because it comes back under the…our own stuff, doesn't mean automatically all the challenged and problems and issues go away. And currently, we have agreements with the service providers, the private contractors and if there's issues related to the level of service being provided or the type of service, then those can be addressed within the contract. Those can be addressed within performance measurements and clauses of accountability that can be factored into and built into the service agreements that we currently have with those providers. I've said consistently on this matter, I'm not in favour of bringing 30% of Transit Plus back in-house. It will cost us. It will increase the costs to provide that service. It will increase the size of the City of Winnipeg's Public Service. It will increase the size of assets that we need, the number of busses that we need. It will increase the…either the size of our current garages or we'll have to build new garages or add to garages. Things will just continue to grow and magnify. And I don't believe this is the time when we're still in the midst of a pandemic and have some financial struggles that this is the time to be adding anything that, in my mind, is discretionary at this point. We have the provision. The provision is being offered as a service through the private contractors that we have currently. We can maintain that. If there are issues around the quality of service, the type of service they're providing, complaints related to the service, those can be addressed through mechanisms that are at our disposal for no extra costs at this point.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be supporting this actual motion. And I know that Councillor Mayes who is championing this motion and I believe Councillor Nason is the seconder, which is great. But Madam Speaker, one aspect of history I should mention, and we were following the…I know it's…the voodoo economics, not the voodoo economy, but the voodoo economics of the original privatization of what was left being delivered by the City of Winnipeg and our excellent service people. There was a focus in and the whole thing was, they were all concerned about the per trip cost. And it was costing the City's operations more money per trip than the private providers we had who were driving people in taxis, not wheelchair vans or anything like that, Madam Speaker, people were being transferred. People like

myself who would be blind, quite ambulatory, I can get around, right. You can take a taxi. It's not a problem. And then you get a trip because that's…somebody who is blind, doesn't nearly qualify because they're blind. Not based on one's ability to utilize the existing system. And the existing system today is way better than it was back then. But it was a per trip focus. But…and, you know, they wanted to get it done because the demand from persons with disabilities is no different than the demand for transit from population without disabilities, Madam Speaker. No difference. We all want to take the bus and get to where we want to go just as much as anybody else. And so, you know, that historical look, though, at the per trip missed the whole thing about…so, there was an efficiency in per trip costs. But the City was transporting non-ambulatory passengers that didn't have any alternative, couldn't get into a taxi cab, so on. Right? Those were the people that were being transferred by us. And therefore, there was a higher cost to it. It takes time to load and unload and all that kind of stuff. Those are the issues. Now, we're talking about escalated prices today in our new contracts. And I just wanted to mention that we, the City are paying those private contractors to buy the proper equipment, the kind of equipment that doesn't match the equipment that Councillor Nason described, which does exist. So, the private sector, where's the money coming from? They can't buy the vehicles, so we, under contract, Madam Speaker, we're paying for those vehicles. When I hear, you know, voodoo economics about, you know, we're talking micro economics here when it comes to delivering Transit Plus. And we're talking about a family of services coming in the future. And I don't know that we need to set aside the money in '22, but if we do, let me point out something that's very simple. You don't have to end the…when the contract ends, their vehicles will bepaid for, so the private sector, they're not losing out. But guess what, Madam Speaker? We, the City would still have to pay out those contract dollars which incorporates the cost of vehicles. So, you need to put up some cash upfront so we have the vehicles. You know, we need to hire more…we don't have enough Transit drivers as it is. We need to, you know…we need to increase that ability, Madam Speaker. There's no doubt. So, the…but we're paying for the wages of the private sector as well, Madam Speaker. So, what you have is, when you start up a business, you have start up costs. And you deal with those start up costs, Madam Speaker, by you're bringing in revenue. Well, here in our case, we're spending money on a contract. So, we invest the money, but we get it back…we get it back from that company because we're not paying them anymore. That's how you pay for it. Now, let's get into what really is important, Madam Speaker. We're improving the transit system all together. We need to have a direct management of at least a portion of Transit Plus as our ATU people have explained to us. They are right. We need to have direct control because handling things through a contract has led to poor service. We know that. Over the years, it's led to a poorer service. Yes, everybody is working hard to do it, I'm just saying, there's a digression. And we have extra staff, just so you know, we've had to hire extra staff to handle complaints. It used to be only one person to handle complaints, his name was Jarvis Bowhunt. And then when we privatized everything, he was lucky, he was close to retirement, he retired. Because you know what, it wasn't a one or a three-person operation no more, Madam Speaker. We had to hire more staff to do this and do that. Anyway, so really, the argument that we can't afford this and to bring in an extraordinary event, Madam Speaker, this is what I was trying to point out about strategic planning and things like that. You know, we have an extraordinary event and all of a sudden, we're using that as an excuse to not provide efficient, effective service to people who deserve it. It's wrong. We can do better in improving this system moving into the future when the new routing system comes, which is a couple of years away, even less now, probably. We need to have some control. We are going to have to put some money up front to get this rolling. The whole garage thing…anyway, I'll leave that one to Councillor Mayes. He's totally…he's totally got this under his…he knows what he's talking about. So, you know, I just…think out of the box people. Yeah, they said, well, think out of the box back then when we privatized stuff. But you know, there's issues. And the prices do escalate and they go up because we have to have better quality vehicles to provide the service that people have the right to. We have to do all these different things. Anyway, it's pretty simple; the contract money that we used to pay out for the private contract, which incorporates the cost of proper vehicles, the human resources to deliver the service, and frankly, you know, I heard that those drivers aren't getting paid…compensated appropriately. Like, you know, they love their work. I know the private service providers. They love their work. They want to help people with disabilities. I understand that, but you know, like, they've got life issues too and issues to deal with and if they can't afford to live and get a decent wage, how are they delivering that effective service? So, I'll be voting for this and I encourage you all, don't listen to this voodoo economic look at bringing in-house, this delivery service. Because a portion is going to brought in so that we have more direct control. I think that's essential that we have, moving into a better system.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, would you take the Chair just for a few more speakers? There's a list of about five. Councillor Rollins is next.

Councillor Eadie: Councillor Rollins, okay. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: I'll be back in a…shortly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Rollins, please.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. And I appreciate the colleagues that have gone before me. I was hoping that we'd have a good debate on this. It's deserved. So, I want to thank, first of all, the movers; Councillor Shawn Nason, Councillor Brian Mayes on this motion. I agree with the chronology that there's been a few iterations here of getting to a percentage of in-

house delivery. I'm going to tell you why I'm supporting it today. I read with interest the ombudsman report on what was called Handi-Transit back then that had one more ILRC players. Before, it was Terry and now it's Patrick Stewart, named after my favourite Star Trek actor. And Patrick now and Terry like before had had it…has had enough. The compliant that it's unfair and biased and unjust, oppressive and unreasonable, I'm worried that it's as true today as it was when the ombudsman report was written. So, take…take the words of users, where they said in one instance, a person who was blind was unintentionally dropped off at a random location due to a disagreement between passenger and driver. Another one that missing family member's funeral, they had to miss it, and the driver allegedly insisted on hugs from clients. Client's soiled themselves not being able to return on time to their parry call. And finally, a person wanted to go to the gym but that's not a priority. So, they missed that class. Problematic. Let's compare and contrast to the casework that came into my office last week. I work…medical appointments used to be a priority. I'd call on the Sunday before eleven to book my rides for the coming week for work and medical appointments, and they would be scheduled and not always at great times, but I'm fine with that and I understand this is a shared ride service. But to be told there's no rides available, I waited 90 minutes. I tried to get up early, another person, 8:00 a.m. when they open on Sundays. So, I called exactly at 8:00 and after listening to their message for a full two-minutes, I was in the queue for 30-minutes before I had to hang up. I only had three hours sleep. I had to go back to bed. I called back at 10:30, two and half laters after they opened and I was on hold for another 90 minutes. I finally got through, and then it was too late to get a ride to work. This feels like a complete and total breakdown in service. Now, this is calling 5 to 7 days in advance, just in context. Another person, wait times in excess of over an hour every time you call. I've waited an hour and forty-five minutes at one point. I just want to go to school and work. So, this is a service that has had broad level policy issues and specific incidents that continue to be gathered from users. And previous, in the lead up to the ombudsman report, of course, you probably know more than I do, that it was characterized by ILRC doing access to information requests on this service. So, we've just voted to just get verbal reports. And on the one hand, I absolutely get it. You know, sometimes, you know, they are difficult to produce and the quality could be augmented verbally. But on the other hand, it's a really important record on a human rights issue that I don't think we're getting right. This is about trying to create a barrier-free environment in the city, but unfortunately, it's not even barrier free to the callers and users, but moreover, it's failing at substantial equality. Now, as opposed to not being able to get to the gym, now, people are being probed. Can you handle that hour? Can you handle that hour? What do you mean when you have to get at work at 9:00 to arrive at 10:30? That makes no sense. So now, people with disabilities in the city are being asked, you know, again, maybe in this judgment free way, they are being probed. You know, well…you know, is it okay if we drop you off at work, you work starts at 8:30 a.m., but is it okay if it's within the hour? What on earth is that? So, you're…you know, it's value-free, it's not about gyms now, but now you're being probed on whether or not you can go to your doctor's appointment or work within an hour. That's what we're doing for the sake of efficiency and for the sake of our budget, for sure. And so, I don't know. A lot has been said about whether or not this has a budgetary ask. We have seen this. We have seen that there have been costs, there have been concern about models, but more often than not, we're just not managing the issue. And I am afraid we won't ever get to the budgetary real asks because we're not…we're not managing it at all. And I don't…I don't…in some important way, for me, this is about not…you know, this is about more concerted attention to this issue. Handi-Transit, you know, is requiring users to book trips to…whether they are medical appointment, whether they are getting to work, whether they're going for groceries, to the gym, socializing. They've made recent changes and you know, in voting and supporting this motion, I think it's about more concerted effort. It's about contributing positively not to inaction, but contributing to making sure this is…this is still given the attention it warrants. And bringing it in-house is about governance, ultimately, for me. There is too much…there is too much being placed on external systems here. We had a whole system go down. And that was accounted for, I was told, because it's an external provider. I will be in front of the pack, a policy activist, a committee that…a policy advisory committee that I am told does not like this motion. So, I will be sure to hear from them if I'm wrong in this vote today. But I'll have time. Because I don't believe that this will result in immediate actions. There's not enough of this motion. But I'll have time to hear from them, but in the meantime, I'll take it from the advocates that I have heard that are supportive of in-house delivery from governance reasons who have had the history of working on the ILRC action that led to them having enough and going to the external body, the ombudsman. And so, for all those reasons pertaining to governance that you watch it closer, you don't stick it further away. And you don't let yourself have the excuse as a city, as an organization, that it's just some other provider's problem. This, like our conventional service, should be our problem. And I don't like the distance between us and them. So, I'm voting for in-house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Mr. Clerk.

City Clerk: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Before we proceed, you should really move a motion to go beyond 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Sorry, who's moving…I'll pick Mayor Bowman, your motion. Thank you. All those in favour? Thank you, that is carried.

City Clerk: The next registered speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is Councillor Schreyer, followed by His Worship Mayor Bowman.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Up next, okay, Councillor Schreyer, please take the floor.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. So, three issues we're dealing with in terms of why we're looking at this, from my understanding, from what we've heard today. Service standards for the customer, labour standards for the driver, and cost standards for the taxpayer and rate payer. So, to me, that's about it in a nut shell. And I'll be honest, because we've heard those three issues here during this debate here on this issue. I would…I'm going to go out on a limb and say, the least…the one that motivates me the least, I'm not saying it's not important, is the labour standards for the driver. I think…I'm not saying they're not important, I'm just saying, the other ones are really important. Councillor…and I'm convinced as well…reassured, actually, kind of…by Councillor Rollins reports from people in terms of how this is getting really dysfunctional. Now, maybe that has been…maybe that's been the way it is for a long time. But quite frankly, I don't trust how things are going in the last decade when it comes to services. I think they are falling, they're faulting. And although these are anecdotal, but they're powerful if true, I believe they are true. And people can't live like this. People need to get to work. They need to get to school. They can't be there an hour and a half late. Like, I wasn't allowed to go an hour and a half late, why should someone else? So, what's the point in having these services if this is what it's coming to? Cost standards is one way to put it. This is…this is the big one for me. And this is the one to which we have an obligation to answer. I appreciate, once again, Councillor Mayes' going down memory lane in terms of giving a chronology. And I really appreciate when he gives these chronologies of how things have been going over the vast number of years. And I can just…it's like…it's like just a documentary on the radio. And hats off to Councillors Mayes and Nason for this motion. Councillor Nason made the point that politics shouldn't play a part in this. And yet, let's face it, that's really hard because we're all human beings. We're all involved in implementing policy. No matter where you are in this thing called city hall, no matter where you are, humans are political animals. We can't help but…it's our job to create policy, thus, politics where objectivity, where our biases, our own individual values, for which we're elected to have, by the way. Our own values, as we represent tens of thousands of people, 40, 50,000 people if not more, to have those same human values as we go about making these decisions. And that's the challenge. So, in here, I believe what…we're going to learn something and we better. Learn something, i.e. account. We'll have accountability for what we're doing. Because that's the thing when we offer a public service by the Public Service. There's an accountability to it. See, 20 years ago, we sold the gravel quarry, the City-owned gravel quarry in the name of, we're going to save money, and we never found out if we saved money. Now, that's not my opinion, I'm not saying that we don't know. The administration is telling all of us, told me in public, we don't know. There is no accountability on that. So, when we're talking about, you know, when we're moving from one mode to another, bringing in the in-house workers or we're privatizing, when they actually move into bringing in in-house workers, there's actually a greater sense of accountability, so then you actually make…you can make a comparison as to whether it's actually viable or not. And we'll find that out. So, let's deal with these issues. How are we going to pay for this? Well, same way we pay for when a private company gets the contract to provide these kinds of services. We pay for it. One way or the other, the taxpayer's going to pay and the rate payer's going to pay. That's just the way it is. So, who's going to pay? The same way we did it before. We've been asked this question before when it came to snow removal, garbage collection, recycling collection. Who's going to pay for it if it's private…if it's not privatized? Well, the same people, the taxpayers who pay…who fund when a private company gets…gets the contract. Well, who's going to pay for their infrastructure? Their start-up costs? Well, the taxpayer. So, it's going to…that's…that's what's going to happen. In this case, we're going to have an accountability, and because in this case, we're going to have a mix. Remember, we're only talking about 30%. So, when you have that mix, you're actually in some form of position to make a real comparison both in terms of labour and customer standards and in terms of outright costs. There you can make your comparison, and that's when the taxpayer has accountability. If we could get that same analysis even to the…even today, it's fascinating how different councillors provide different statistics into why they are or not in favour of the motion. If we could get that same level of analysis on why it is…now, we know, that the cost of a bridge in Winnipeg has gone from 12 million to almost 200 million in the 30 years before COVID, well, we'd be learning a lot. But we don't get that information, Madam Speaker. We don't. In this case, or Mr. Deputy Speaker, excuse me, Councillor Eadie, and in this case, this provides us with that accountability and that cost comparison. And that's what I call real Canadian economics, real Canadian politics, that's their tradition. But we've been getting away from that. We…I know, many people know, that when we provide that mixed economy sort of thing for public services, we get...actually, we get accountability, and we get some form of real accounting within that industry. Winnipeg is the only major city in the country that does not have at least one quadrant for recycling and our garbage that's being done by in-house…in-house workers, City workers. We're the only major city in the country. There are some cities that's have it all…city…done by city workers, all in-house. What, in Vancouver, Calgary, things like that, but we're the only one that has a completely privatized. Well, guess what? It's really hard to have any realistic accounting and therefore, any real accountability to the rate payer and to the taxpayer when you do it that way. Now you can say, well, because it's better that way. Well, if we know that, that's great, but if that is the case when it comes to recycling and garbage collection, why…why doesn't every city do it like that…why doesn't ever city in Canada do it that way? None of them do it that way, just us. And we're the ones that can't offer that accountability. We need realistic accounting and we need real accountability to the taxpayers for the services we provide, including for Handi-Transit. This is a great motion. This is one way we can do that. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I want to thank my colleagues for all of their comments. I think everybody comes to this issue from different places and different experiences on different ends of the political spectrum. I think this is a…this is a…I would respectfully submit, a very ideological motion. And that's fine, that's the purview of Council, that's the purview of councillors, that's why elections matter. And while I respect some of the views...well, I respect all of the views that have been made around the table, I don't necessarily agree with some of them. And I'm just going to speak to the issues. This motion reads 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 1st, 2024. There is nothing in this motion that speaks to service levels. There is nothing in this motion that provides any guarantees that the service will improve. That's something we could do under the current provision of service through the private sector. We could, as a Council, work to address the service level requirements. There would obviously need to be work done by this or future council if that really were the issue at hand. What is this motion about? Well, we didn't hear from...we didn't hear from riders today, saying, you know what, I want to talk about the service levels. We all get complaints about Transit. We also get complaints about Transit Plus. And I want to first and foremost thank the operators of both services for the work that they do because it's important and it's difficult work. What we can say...and I do feel obliged to put some comments on the record because I will revisit them post-2024 if this motion passes, which I suspect it will. What we do know it will result in is we know it will result in more ATU membership. That's why ATU was here, and that's their role. They can come, and they can defend the union, and they can try to increase their membership. That's their job, that's their role, and I respect that. This will increase the size of government and we know it will increase the costs to taxpayers. The most recent report that we have from our Public Service estimates and additional costs on an annual basis of over $2 million. I suspect, and I want to put this on the record, that the costs will be greater than that. If this passes, time will tell. It is a blank check. There is nothing in this motion that caps how much this would cost. And so, I don't feel it's responsible, even though it wouldn't take place until 2024, and I may not be here, members of Council may not be here. There's an election and voters will ultimately decide who earns the right to be back when this is actually implemented if it passes today. I found it very telling that ATU was the only speaker today or delegation to speak to this. As I've mentioned, there was nothing in the motion that even tries to address the service levels, which the City can address by way of contract with the current service providers. And so, I won't be supporting this. Had there been a debate and a discussion about service levels, that would be one that I think would be more deserving of the riders and more deserving of the complaints that I know members of Council receive. I do think it's quite telling that Councillor Eadie, our Deputy Speaker, and I'll just say this, as a ribbing comment, is wearing an orange tie today. I know it's for Halloween, but it…this is a very ideological debate. There's a reason I'm wearing a blue tie today. I am a fiscal conservative. I respect taxpayers. I know that this will cost more money, and there's no funding source identified for where this money would come from. It will cost something, and that will be from other City services or services of Transit. Again, if this motion was about service levels, the therefore be it resolved would actually speak to service levels. It does not, and we shouldn't try to pretend it does. It does guarantee it will cost more. We know it's going to…it's going to benefit ATU, and that's fine. I know ATU has been very active in lobbying members of Council, myself included. I spoke with them this week and…think it was this week, and welcomed the dialogue. They didn't provide me with tangible evidence that this would be a cheaper service or that this would improve the service levels because I don't think it necessarily will. So, I'm going to be voting against it. I respect the fact that there will be different views around this table. There's different relationships with ATU. There's different views of the private sector or public sector. There's different views on the effectiveness of Council and Public Service to address service levels in the current service. And that's something I respect. But I...I do want to put some of these comments on the record because I do believe post-2024, if the service comes in, and my hope is that we don't make a decision today that gives a blank check that doesn't address service levels, but my...I do want to put these on the record because I'll want to revisit them in later years. And I want to stand with those that expect us and sent us here to be responsible stewards of taxpayer dollars to scrutinize service levels and where we can make a difference to improve service levels, that we do so. But let's not kid ourselves. Therefore be it resolved; just direct…it just…it's quite simple and I appreciate the honesty in it. The service model, 22 to 30% of Transit Plus total annual service hours are provided in-house, period. So, I'm going to be opposing that. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Mayor Bowman. And you will continue to be a taxpayer after 2022. Councillor…I think, Mr. Clerk, it's Councillor Chambers.

City Clerk: We have on the list Councillor Lukes, followed by Councillor Orlikow and then Councillor Chambers.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm back. If I could take the Chair. That's Councillor Lukes, followed by Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I want to say I support the Mayor and everything he said here. I actually feel the same way that the points that he's articulating. My comments are a little different, but I'll add onto his. I want to thank the representatives of ATU. We had multiple, very good conversations about this motion. There are so many existing and future opportunities that needs to be considered before we shift Transit Plus in-house. There are many parts

in motion, many variables before we support today's motion. Currently, the service on-demand pilot is underway. That holds great potential for use going forward for areas that are not already…that are not ready for full service. There are…they…these are shorter buses, but I think we need to hear the final results of the service on-demand before we make assumptions. Today, we heard that there is the potential to use the same vehicles, shorter buses for service on-demand and Transit Plus and create a more cohesive service delivery. That's very appealing, but I'd like to see more data on that. What we had heard from ATU, and it does…it sounds very appealing, that instead of a sort of a silo-based approach with Transit Plus over here, and service on-demand over here with the same vehicle, maybe there's a way for synergy. It possibly holds great opportunity for this. But again, I think it should be looked into further. The City has a transit funding request into the Federal and I believe Provincial Government. There's great optimism that funding will be secured, but nothing is confirmed yet, which will impact the storage of any new buses. I do believe the Federal Government also recognizes every city in Canada still having transit challenges due to COVID. I am optimistic they'll be looking at…into some kind of transit stimulus for supporting cities. And COVID has dramatically changed the number of people working from home and taking transit or not taking transit. Cities will have to look at how working from home impacts transit use. Perhaps there's an opportunity to shift the frequency to move, instead of using more money, but to move funding to support other services such as Transit Plus. I think there's an incredible amount of change happening in the realm of transit service right now in the world related to transit and I think we should wait and see how the concept of working from home is understood. I think we should wait and see how the service on-demand works out. There's many variables in play. And I want to thank the ATU representatives for the insight and wisdom that they bring to the conversations I've had with them. I won't be supporting today's motion because…to the points Mr. Mayor has made, to the points Councillor Gillingham has made. And you know, if we continue, you know, moving forward like this, ultimately, our taxes will ultimately have to be raised. Residents will want taxes raised. I think we do have the opportunity, we've got contracts in place. And I think if the service is the issue, which, I don't really get many calls on it, but if service is the issue, then we can adjust that in the contracts that are existing right now. I think we really have to realize we're bleeding a lot of money through Transit, and we're at a very, very unstable time financially. And we need to use a little more fiscal conservatism towards how we spend our money.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. I just would put on the record, I believe that we should go in-house. I think it's a vital service that should be done in-house. But if we're going to do it, we don't do it with a motion like this. This motion that we have today, words matter, it's very…just says, do it. I don't know what the cost is. We heard names like voodoo economics. Well, that's because you don't like the other outcome. We heard a whole bunch of things. But the bottom line is, we don't really know. The department…there's some questions about the 2.5 million, how that never come up. I gave a call. I got a quick answer from Transit. I'm not sure why it was that hard. You know, they're going to have to put 15 plus million dollars to buy buses. Where are we going to park them? We don't have a North End yard yet. But again, somehow we can put them into the Fort Rouge yard, but we're telling the Fort Rouge yard's completely full. So, there's a lot of contrary information coming back and forth. But we as Council don't care? We're just going to say, go for it. We're just going to write you...just do what you want and tell us how much it costs later and tell us how you actually buy the buses, all those things. Well, again, we talk about words today, which again I love how words are used, and I understand why. We ask, what do we do? Good policy. Well, good policy is before you actually enact a policy, you know what you're talking about. You know how much it's going to cost both in the short term and the long term. You know what type of service enhancements are going to happen or not. You do good policy by getting reports back and you discuss it and you put it in the budget process for Finance. That's good policy. Policy with a one liner that says, just do it and I don't know if it's going to improve service or not, or how much it's going to cost. That's not good policy. I'm very concerned as a Council that we would support something like that. I feel badly for myself right now because my ATU members and people who have supported me in the past will be pissed off at this. But again, I'm here for the City of Winnipeg. I am here for them. I've listened to them quite a bit. I tried to decipher that last-minute spreadsheet they sent last night, which also they did not provide to our department at all. That one just came out of the blue and it has some nice little Castlebury will do that on-demand stuff. Again, out of left field, we have never even talked about that yet. But again, they never gave us really an opportunity to review that document they provided. So, that's okay. We know that the Transit Policy Group, they may have other ideas where they think the priority of this investment, if efficiencies do happen, should go. They may want to have more routes throughout the city. Again, we're just going to bypass that group in this case. I've also heard, as Councillor Rollins said, this is not their top priority to be investing the limited Transit dollars we have, but that's so be it. But my main concern here is the fact that this motion that Councillor Mayes has been working diligently hard for, very impressed, it's just a one-liner that says, just do it, I don't care how if it actually improves services or not, I don't care how much it costs, I don't care what the implications are, I just want it done. And unfortunately, that's what that motion says to me because it doesn't have any report behind it. The only report we have is from July that had some numbers in there. That's all we have, from the 30% from the wheelchair one. I saw that. And that was $2.5 million and there's more discussion and that. I actually thought, and I'm waiting to hear some confirmation, maybe Councillor Mayes can say at the end, but that motion before got sent to the Budget Working Group. I'm not part of that group, so I'm not too sure. But maybe it's been defeated there already. I don't know. Or they can't find the money yet and they want to two…24…I don't know. Maybe it hasn't been

referred there and I missed something, but that's where it should go or it should be a little more explanation of okay, these are the service issues we have, how much are we going to address them? How is doing this in-house? How much will it actually cost in capital? When will that happen? And it's not that onerous. We do it for everything. I'll be more than happy to come in here with a report tomorrow and say, I want to plant 10 million trees by next year. I don't care how much it's going to cost. Wasn't my problem because the motion just says that. Just do it. Again, that's not good policy. Not political. Political…this is very political for me. And I think I'm going to be…if I was very political, I would still be supporting this motion. I would be. Because I do believe in in-house. I think we should be starting to go in-house. But to set this precedent of just make the motion as a one liner saying just do it without any type of report, without any type of substantiation, without any analysis of the information that ATU has provided us just last night or yesterday afternoon, that's bad policy making. I really believe that. I know some councillors do not believe in our administration. They think they're…they may have some questions about what their ulterior motives are, I don't. I think administration will do what we tell them. But for me to know what I'm doing, I kind of know…want to know, how much this will cost, really. So, you know, you want to buy so many vans or buses? That's fine. But they're X dollars times, whatever it was, 15 of them, 28 of them, whatever it will be. That's fine, but let's have that money up front (inaudible) because we have a lot of demands on our finances. This here, to me, is a priority. It's a service that we should be providing, and I believe it should go in-house. But I won't just sit here and just say, okay, just because I believe that, I shouldn't look at any other information. I shouldn't look at how much it's going to cost, where that money is going to come from. What, are we just going to raise taxes for it? Well, say that. That's fine, but we don't know that in this motion here. This motion just says, do it by 2024. And again, I'm not sure if I'll be here, but it doesn't matter. The precedent that this sets, to me, is very concerning. Councillor Gillingham has been very clear, and we've slipped a little bit this year, we've worked very hard in the last couple of years, if you're going to put a motion forward, especially if (inaudible) cost item, please try to tell us where the money is going to come from. Well, in this case, we don't even know where…what the money will be. It just says, doesn't matter. And where are you going to find the money? Doesn't matter because this is a good idea. Again, we have a lot of wonderful ideas and a lot of really important things to do. But again, proper policy process for me would be saying, again, I did mention before about maybe referring it to the budget, but again, I heard that it's already there. Or getting a report back that sort of analyzes a bit more because I do, actually, kind of…I do kind of support…I actually would probably like to just start 100% and get it over with. There's an incremental approach. But I wouldn't actually support that even unless I had some information that isn't just a councillor who has a very good background on very good research skills or another councillor who's calling everything voodoo economics or whatever. It doesn't really matter. We all have our own opinions, and that's fine. But what I would like to have is the experts who I…we hire to help us understand the implications of what these motions are. But in this motion…so, it's not just 30% in-house, I would probably be saying the same speech for any of the great, great ideas that are out there unless it has a funding source and a report back. Councillor Rollins today was fantastic. She said, okay, we need a report back on the zones. That's exactly what we should do. That's a…this here, Councillor Mayes has mentioned before that he's a little tired of going around and around in circles and has lost a little bit of faith. That's fine. I haven't. I think it's a wonderful idea, but to sit here to do a one liner and to say, just go do it without any financial…in my opinion, financial understanding of the implications of it without having a discussion with ATU with how you gain those numbers. Because I saw some interesting numbers there. Could be all accurate. But again, we've never had a chance to review it. So, in my heart, I would love to support this. But as a councillor and as a person who represents the City of Winnipeg and trying to do good policy, you should know what you're voting on before you vote on it. That simple. And in this case, I don't know what we're voting on, so I can't support it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Klein: Madam Speaker, if I may, would it be prudent to move in the interest of the concept and of the movers, this to be heard at committee?

Madam Speaker: You're moving referral to committee?

Councillor Klein: Exactly.

Madam Speaker: Okay. That's certainly in order, a referral to committee. The mover does have an opportunity to rebut that. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, I would strongly oppose that.

Madam Speaker: Three minutes on the clock, please.

Councillor Mayes: I've heard today…I'm not going to impugn anybody's motive. I've heard it's all just for ATU, there's nothing here, there's nothing here, there's no (inaudible). I moved in 2019 for a report on the cost of getting 30% brought in-house. We got two reports; one at Innovation. Transit had been consulted. Transit then produced a separate report on bringing 30% in-house. It went to the committee. We have had the reports. We have had the chance.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, it is in order. He can rebut for up to three minutes, why he feels this is of an urgent nature to deal with today.

Councillor Allard: I'd like to know if we can call the question.

Madam Speaker: No, because he's got the floor. Continue, please.

Councillor Mayes: The clock's still running.

Madam Speaker: He's rebutting referral. Yeah, he's rebutting to…that this matter go to committee.

Councillor Mayes: No problem. I had hoped to get this hours ago, which is why I wanted to call the question on the earlier item. If people were concerned about service levels, why didn't they raise it in every chance they had; May of 2019, twice in June of 2019, July of 2019? A number of reports that called for contracting out. Nobody said, I'm a little concerned. And yet, the people are saying, I want to do something. I want to do something. I've been told, well, you don't care about service levels. I do. So does Nason. So do a number of other speakers. Councillor Eadie's talked about this for years. The time is now to actually debate this and to make a decision. Transit has said they need two years of notice. This has no budgetary impact in 2022. There is no operating impact, there is no capital impact. This has no operating impact in 2023. There may well be a capital impact in 2023. We would have to discuss this. Where is the report? The report exists. I asked for it in 2019, we got to two years later. If we want to wait another two years and miss the next multi-year budget cycle, I guess we could pretend we're doing something and do that. The time to vote on this is now. The concept is to give the two-years of warning, which Transit asked for. I don't agree for a number…for reasons I gave at some length with the Transit numbers. No one has refuted that. No one has said, yes, that seems reasonable, only a 2% increase in the private operators. You have massive increase in public costs. Oh, what are the private costs been like over the last year? Oh, over 6% increase a year. Therefore, let's predict they only go to 2%. It's a silly assumption. So, it's all ideological, you don't care about service. Well, somebody show me what they've done to…that reflects their concerns about these items. Rollins is right, it's a human rights issue that we haven't got right. Eadie is right, there are service issues here that have been going on for years. We've got people using ropes and twine and garbage bags in the car. If we're ever going to do something on this, let's do something on this. If we're going to have an OurWinnipeg provision that says we believe in a living wage that would cover our subcontractors, too, and then, a report a month later saying, for god's sakes, don't bring it in-house, it'll have costs. I'll live with this in 2023, '24, '25. I'm quite happy to. But let's not impugn motive, to use Councillor Allard's phrase, for those of us who are saying, look, we're trying to do something to improve the service. This isn't all about pandering to ATU. No one else has been putting forward any other suggestions. So yes, I think it is time to vote, to have a vote on this today, to get on with it. What are we going to do? Delay more years on this?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. We'll have the vote now to...the vote before us is, Councillor Klein had proposed this be referred to the appropriate standing committee, which is Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. So, that's the vote in front of us. All in favour of a referral? All in favour of a referral? Recorded vote. Please rise if you're in favour of a referral.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Klein, Orlikow and Schreyer

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. The referral motion is lost.

Councillor Orlikow: So, if I want to refer this to the budget process, may I do that?

Madam Speaker: Someone can if they have not spoken. Yeah, you've spoken. Councillor Klein, your opportunity to speak to the item.

Councillor Klein: It's…it's a…I've spoken in great detail with Councillor Nason about this and Councillor Mayes. And I understand 100% the frustration that both are feeling. You may recall, Madam Speaker, through you to my colleague, that quite often in 2019, I was asking questions about what are we doing about service levels? What are the penalties? And you know, I was told there's penalties and there's a system in place for that, but I questioned the ability of that service and whether or not it was being utilized. So, service has come up several times, but I was not supported in a lot of ways for that. And I appreciate that. But here we are today with a dilemma before us in the sense that people that we serve and are elected to serve have a right to a certain level of service. If we turn it over to...and it's not impugning, Madam Speaker, anybody who works for the Public Service, but you've had the opportunity for several years to deal with the service levels. We know there's complaints going in about the service levels, but we're not hearing any great feedback on that, but that's on us as a Council because we're not demanding these reports. We're not asking for data. We're not asking for reports. And we're not asking for numbers. And for…we're not holding them accountable for the service issues. And I…so I feel with…I feel the pain that Councillor Mayes and Councillor Nason are trying to resolve here. I get calls from residents that have concerns, that have waited an hour or are two minutes late to get outside and the van's gone. These are service issues, but I am also going to agree with my colleagues that have said that it's not clear whether or not bringing it internal will fix that problem. And again, Madam Speaker, through you, it's not impugning anything upon the Public Service or those that provide the service today, but we haven't done anything to this point. We haven't…we haven't used the mechanisms that apparently are in our control through the agreements with the service providers to hold them accountable for the lack of service, for the dignity issues. We haven't done that. We've put millions towards legal every time they ask, but here we are debating whether or not we should provide a service that provides dignity as well as comfort and safety to residents that require it. That's something we have to look at. That's something we have to be considering, and that's why I wanted to try and have this go to committee for more debate because I don't think it's a bad motion to talk about. I want to support my colleagues, I do because you know...and when one of my colleagues has always said, sometimes you've got to pick the battles you want to fight. And this is a difficult one because I really believe this is our fault. We, in 2019, talked about it a lot. We learned that there was a $20 or $25 charge that we could…penalty we could give drivers or the service providers. And I asked, back in 2019, well, how many have we given out? And I never, ever got a reply, ever. So, waiting two years and actually getting the report in two years, I thought was oh, we're getting better because some of these questions related directly to the service, but it wasn't important here. And when we talked about the service, and the date escapes me, where I talked about the gentleman who sent the note, sharing what happens in Brandon, that people on dialysis do get priority. These are all service issues. Nobody wanted to talk about that then, either. I really…I know I can't do it again, but I don't think this should be a divisive matter on this council. And normally, you have to be divided against me, not Mayes or Nason, Madam Speaker. So, maybe we should be looking at a different approach to this and a different solution. Maybe sending it to the Budget Working Group or maybe somebody else could send it to EPC for discussion. I don't know, but the concept is right. Their heart is in the right place. We can stand here and be fiscally responsible for this matter, but I can list 50 in the next five seconds if I was able to speak like an auctioneer, where we're not considering fiscal constraint. There's many, many examples where this council does not…does not follow fiscal constraint. And this isn't one of them where you want to say, well, I'm not going to do it because it's fiscally irresponsible. So, I'm hoping my colleagues, again, if this is, you know, two people that have put forward a motion that I think deserves further discussion, it doesn't need to be shot down here. There are varying opinions, yes. So, why not have it go to a different committee and have a longer discussion about it? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be supporting this motion. Councillor Mayes has, for sometime, been talking about the Ottawa model. I think he was talking about that in the context of garbage pick-up. And so, I think the concept is applicable here. I think if we have a mix of the public and the private sector, we can have an idea of what it costs to run the operation from the public sector. We know that the cost has been going up very fast over the years in terms of…in terms of our contracts, and we will also have a certain flexibility with our public forces that we don't have with private sector. There's many reasons to support a mixed system. In terms of needing a report, this council's many times passed motions with no reports when this council decides to do so. So, I feel…I feel this issue is not different than other issues that we've considered and that we've passed as a Council without a motion. I think we should do this. If I called the…if I called the question earlier, I thought…I thought we could have the vote, but since that failed, I thought I would explain why I was supporting the motion. So, thank you, Councillor Mayes, for having brought it forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be relatively brief. If our regular fixed-route transit system was completely privatized and not publicly funded, we recognize what that cost would be to individual users, and we also recognize that if that system failed in terms of moving residents around our city back and forth to work, back and forth to appointments, back and forth to shopping and things like that, our office would receive a myriad of calls to fix it, to fix the system, and that's what we're hearing now from those in our city that are challenged in terms of mobility and getting around our city, getting back and forth to their jobs, getting back and forth to their appointments, and affecting their quality of life

as well. So, that's why this motion has been presented, to improve the service standards that are currently out there in a private...in a privatized world. And I'm not disparaging the private owners or the private businesses that are providing this service, but we've got to raise the standards for those that are using the service that are the most vulnerable citizens in our city. It speaks to who we are as a city. If we cannot provide better service to those that are most vulnerable in our city, especially knowing that we are a winter climate city. And that they have needs in our city to get back and forth to work, get back and forth to appointments, and as I said, shopping, and just the other quality of life issues that they should enjoy here as well. So, I support this motion. I recognize that there's going to be a cost attached to it. Councillor Mayes has indicated that reports have come back to us throughout 2019 and 2020, and we need to study and evaluate those to see the percent…the proper percentage to be brought back into the city and also recognizing, from a dispatch perspective, that is also controlled by the City. So, there are inequities in the system in terms of Transit Plus that we need to get a right balance to ensure that the service standards do improve, and…including the vehicles that are out there that are providing the service. That's my two cents, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I think the one thing we can all agree on around this council table here is that Winnipeggers want quality municipal services. They want their garbage, recycling and yard waste picked up on time. They want their parks and boulevards cut. Soon, they're going to want their snow plowed. The expect their traffic lights to be timed for their commutes. They want their water to be…and sewer services to be clean and safe. They expect the police, fire and paramedics to be there when they need them. They want their buses to show up on time. They expect quality parks, libraries, rec facilities from other municipal services. Winnipeggers, I also believe, want more services all the time, but they don't want to pay more taxes, and in fact, I don't think Winnipeggers particularly care if their services are being delivered by someone that has a union card in their pocket. This motion and the way it's framed I believe is purely ideological and political. We've got reports from our Public Service that are very clear that this is going to cost taxpayers more. And why 30%? If the concern is about the quality of service, are we creating two tiers of Transit Plus? Transit Plus and Transit Plus Plus? You get white glove treatment, perhaps, if it's the municipal employees providing the service, but then the other 70% of service, it's status quo. Again, if you tender a contract properly, you get the changes that you desire. For those of you who haven't been around for even that long, look at the change that's happened in our solid waste program. We changed the terms that were in the last contract that we bid on and the services, I believe, improved quite dramatically. Sure, we are probably paying more. On the other side, on October 24th, 2007, during my first year of Council, I voted in support of providing 311 service in-house, but we did it differently. We're not just saying, we're doing 30%, and no matter the cost, no matter how we're doing it. We went out, we hired consultants, we worked with the union to get concessions. We did all the things to try to make an in-house delivery model competitive with other models. Competitive with…we looked at a model where we entirely contracted it out. Have a call centre, their employees, everything. Looked at a hybrid model where you would have a third-party owning and operating the facility and equipment, but we'd have City employees staffing it. We ended up choosing a model where we rented our office space, we bought the equipment, we bought the technology, it was fully in-house. There's a little bit…no irony lost on me today that there's a motion this morning talking about the problems and the delivery of service at 311, a fully municipally run service. It's not about who delivers the service, it's how we decide we're going to set the standards and what we are expecting of our constituents. So, again, I'm not going to be supporting this motion here today, but thank you very much.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise and I will be supporting the motion that's in front of us here today. I think I…I liked what the Mayor had to say in terms of, you come from a different perspective, so I am using what I've learned within my own office dealing with this and also what I've learned with the UN Safe Cities, who I got to meet with a lot of different woman that are from the disability community on the issue of Transit Plus and their safety in Transit Plus. So, I do come from this from that lens and that perspective. And I also did hear in the debate some key things that Councillor Mayes had said in terms of now we are going to be, with our contracts, ensuring that we…that people are being paid a fair living wage. And that will impact cost and service delivery down the line in terms of when we do contract out. I do believe that it is important that we have really important services in terms of service delivery when it comes to most of our vulnerable people. And if that's where we're going to improve anything, that's where we should be improving it. And we have a…we have a portion of the population that is extremely vulnerable and really rely on the service and rely on the staff, people who are providing that service. And in terms of what we know, is we've had an outcry of people going to the ombudsman, calling on the City to make changes, and there's definitely a need there. We have all felt it. I think a lot of us has gotten up and asked questions regard…regards to Transit Plus and wanted action. And so, this is one way we can act. I think that this is the time. We have a few years. It's not like this is happening tomorrow, and a lot of discussions will have to take place, and a lot of stuff we'll find out between now and then. And of course, there are budget processes that we'll have to go through in between there, but I think that this is…this is the right time. I think Councillor Mayes had made pretty good points in terms of, if not…if not when? I mean, we have an ombudsman report. We know that it's been critical for the disability community. And you know what? We do need a few years if we are going to change things, we would

need a few years to prepare and plan for that. And if it isn't any kind of service that should be in-house dealing with our most vulnerable people, is one I would support. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Try and deal with a couple of factual points before some soaring rhetoric…Vandal-like soaring rhetoric. There was a study. The study did cost out the idea of bringing 30% in-house. It was at IRPW. It wasn't just the wheelchair service. In fact. Transit did cost that out, to their credit, and they also costed out this other model as well, which is 30% of call volume. Why 30%? Already spoke about that. That's the historical level that we proved we can deal with. That…there's history on that. Why 22 to 30? Nason and I bending over backwards trying to find, saying, well, if you're really concerned about costs, maybe we just do 22% instead of 30. There, we've saved a quarter of the cost right then and there. Well, you're not concerned about service, it's all just ideological. No one's brought forward any other great alternatives to the petition that came from the drivers through a lawyer that was dated January 21st, 2020. There are human rights concerns here with the way the independent contractors are being treated. Rollins is right on that. There are issues with the service. Nason's talked about it, Eadie's talked about it. They're right; the plastic bags, the rope handles, the complaints that come in. So, it's not just ideological, it's something more than that. It's an attempt to try to deal with a system that has issues where some of it has been in-house. Well, I want a different…I want more reports. You've…this is the opening. I moved this more than two years ago. We have a…it's two years in the future to take effect, more than two years because that's what Transit asked for. Gillingham says…Councillor Gillingham says, well, we might have to payout penalties. We're straining to make sure that isn't the case. You can bring these things in in a sequence. Moreover, why haven't we voted on any of these for the last two years, you might say? Because Transit's been extending them due to COVID. This actually is the historic opportunity where you've got a bunch of them stacked up, short-term renewals, where now Transit could say, we'll give you two years, we'll give you 18 months, we'll…we don't want you back again, you're one of our problem operators, this one over here, this one's been great. So, this is the moment to actually do this, and if we're concerned about penalties and we have to give two years notice, this will never end. You will never get to a scenario where you don't have to pay penalties, it becomes a shell game. So, we're giving the notice. There's no cost in '23. Sorry, there's no cost in '22. Might be a capital cost in '23. I can see that. We're trying, Councillor Nason and I, to reduce the potential costs of this. Well, you're not concerned about service levels. I think I've spoken about that at some length, that there hasn't been…all of those contracts that were renewed back in 2019, no one brought up, hey, we should tighten up the requirements. We should change the way we do this. It was all just, this is the cheapest, we're going to do that. Councillor Gilroy makes a good point; well, if we really believe in OurWinnipeg, OurWinnipeg has that provision of how we're going to have a living wage that would expand to subcontractors. So, the savings from subcontracting suddenly start to dissipate. The idea that it's much, much cheaper to go in-house or to go…to stay with the privates, again, no one's refuted the numbers I've given. Hopefully, that's because they're from our own budget documents that say the cost per ride has been increasing far more than 2% a year. That's irrefutable. I guess a couple of things; the…I appreciate…no one has said, well, I want 100%, so I'm going to vote no, which I appreciate. This is a realistic compromise, I think, from people across different political parties and different EPC, non-EPC. It…who knows what the new council may do, but I'm trying…we're trying to work with Transit to say, you want two years' notice? Okay. But at some point, we have to make a decision on whether we're going to do this. We did ask for reports. We got a report. It's…talks about this exact level of service. Where did you get this level of service? It's historically based. If costs…if we're being accused of cost is your only concern, I suppose we could turn around and say, well then, you don't care about the service levels. You're only concerned about the cost. We're not doing that. Everyone wants a better service. I've heard no one refute some of the numbers that have been put forward. The idea that because it's private, it's cheaper and therefore better, I just don't buy, frankly. And Councillor Eadie who's probably the most experienced user of this service doesn't buy that either. So, I do appreciate his work on this over the years. So, we come to this. It'll probably be a close vote. It will not have a budgetary impact in '22, but it may well in the future. I certainly think it'll have a lesser budgetary impact than what's being reported here. The one thing I do know, I stood…I got a report. I got a report back in 2013 about Handi-Transit, as it then was, and the 500-metre rule. And I got a report that said this was going to cost $600,000. And Sam Katz and Scott Fielding and some other people didn't want to put that in the budget, and that's okay, and I backed down. But I've got to say, when I found out seven years later that that was miscalculated and was way high. And Dave Wardrop who isn't with us anymore at the City; Dave Wardrop said, you're right, that was…methodology was poor. You're right, it doesn't cost that much. And to the credit of the Mayor, Councillor Gillingham and others, we did get that in the budget at long last. Very proud of that. But I backed down then, I have no interest in saying, well, I'm going to trust completely and implicitly these numbers that are put before me. I have raised my objections already. I'm standing my ground on this. I think we should bring some of this in-house. If I could do it, I'd probably do it sooner, but again, in the spirit of trying to work with Transit, we're going to go forward and say, no, we'll wait until 2024. No one…hey, the users didn't show up. Well, Colin Fast and Lorne Remillard didn't show up either and they've objected to this in the past. I think, to some extent, people are caught up in other matters. This wasn't widely publicized. So, that none of the riders showed up today, they have in the past, and they have…and I think Councillor Rollins said well yeah, they're frustrated because they feel they haven't been listened to. And the Chamber didn't show up today. They've criticized this in the past. But I don't impugn…I don't suddenly think, well, the Chamber must be on side

because they didn't show up. So, it's about more than money, it's about more than kowtowing to ATU, it's about a level of service for a community that I think deserves a model that reflects both options. Councillor Allard is right in saying, it's like the Ottawa garbage and recycle model, right. You keep some of in-house, you contract some of it out. And therefore, you endlessly have a balance. If it gets too expensive, you have to talk to your workers. If you have a rogue private operator, you can threaten to bring it in-house. That's what Nason and I are trying to do here, again, trying to use a model that succeeded in other cities. So, thank you to all for speaking. Thank you for…if you're considering supporting it. I do think it's an important item. It's not ideology, it's about trying to bring in a level of service, and after years and years and years of discussing it, I think now is the time for action. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. With that, I'll call the vote.

Councillor Nason: Recorded.

Madam Speaker: Call for a recorded vote. All in favour of the motion, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Santos, Allard, Chambers, Eadie, Gilroy, Mayes, Nason, Rollins, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Gillingham, Klein, Lukes and Orlikow

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

Madam Speaker: Motion passes. We'll now move on…onto by-laws under this committee. Councillor Allard.

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

Councillor Allard: Yes. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 100/2021, By-law No. 101/2021.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 100/2021, By-law No. 101/2021.

Councillor Allard: I move that By-laws No. 100/2021 and 101/2021 be read a second time.

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

Councillor Allard: I move that…

Clerk: By-laws No. 100/2021 and 101/2021.

Councillor Allard: Jumped the gun there. I move that the rule be suspended and that By-laws No. 100/2021 and 101/2021 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. Any questions under this committee? Councillor Eadie.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker and my colleagues, please forgive me, but I have to put it back on the record, and so it's a did you know question for the Chairperson, Madam Speaker. Did you know that I learned from Mr. Terry Beeman who fought the fight about trying not to privatize trips back in 1998/99, who I work with? Did you know that he informed me that our Winnipeg Public Transit system, which it wasn't actually explained I don't think in the Master Plan, but did you know that it was all private sector delivered transit system in Winnipeg, and there was a cry from the public that the services that they relied on were not working; and this City of Winnipeg's Council voted to take it over and do publicly delivered transit system? Did you know that?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, I believe, I did know that because I believe Councillor Eadie let me know. But that was some time ago. So, thank you for the reminder of what is old is new again.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you to the Chair. Of course, the 2021 road construction season has been one of the most robust and aggressive road construction seasons that we've seen in a long time. I've had a construction projects in St. Norbert on Pembina Highway, which is the entrance way to our City from the South, that has carried on now since mid-July. We got Councillor…Oh, okay, sorry...which has been going on since mid-July. Residents in the area have been very frustrated, and seen barricades put up with no activity around the construction sites. The area south of Ducharme to Trappistes, have been concluded, that construction there has been concluded, so traffic is moving a bit more freely. But there are utility cuts that are to the North of Ducharme, extending all the way to the Perimeter Highway in the Southbound direction of Pembina Highway that continue to be under repair, barricades there, no activity going on. I'm asking you, through to the Chair, when residents in St. Norbert can (inaudible) back this construction to be completed, so that they can access their homes and the business…surrounding businesses without these barriers in place.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you, Councillor Chambers, I think you're referring to two different projects. Thanks for the heads up on the question. I did get information from the Director. So, one's a road rehabilitation project on Pembina Highway from Ducharme to Rue des Trappistes, which is more or less completed, as landscaping is all that's remaining. The other works in the area is a utility repair being conducted by a contractor on behalf of the utility. Our enforcement staff met with the applicant's subcontractor on site, and determined action to be a pre-hour inspection for all Pembina Highway cuts near Grandmark…near Grandmark…sorry, near Grandmont Boulevard on Friday, October 29, 2021. Then look for the open cuts the days following, additional follow up by our By-law Constable on Monday, November 1, 2021, will be done to ensure progress is being met. So, I can't say exactly when, but there's progress, and please keep it in touch, and we'll get you more information as required.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Chambers: In situations like this, are…how are contractors held accountable in terms of not only the safety concerns, but the access concerns that have been raised by residents in St. Norbert, and will this contractor be held accountable for the lengthy delays in construction in this area?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, thanks for the question. So, I can…I can offer maybe some insight, having chaired the Construction Working Group. I know that utility cuts are complex because they involve…they involve organizations that are legally superior to the City of Winnipeg, like in the case of Manitoba Hydro. I don't know if that's the case here. But in those cases, we basically have to wait, and there are…there are provinces in Canada or at least in Ontario where they have reformed legislation on utilities, so that this type of work can happen faster. So that would be a legislative reform, not a reform that we can do at the municipal level. However, any…you know, any further information I can provide or if there's ever a case where it's not a utility that's involved, I'd be happy to hear about it, and see how we can better service it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question.

Councillor Chambers: Final question. Can we assess whether or not we have the tools to hold those utility companies accountable for the work being done? Is this something then, that we have to look at tabling a motion to get the provincial government to hold those contractors accountable for the lengthy delays that impact on, again, just access to their homes off of a major road?

Councillor Allard: Yes, thanks for the third question. I'd welcome a motion to that effect. There's legislation in Ontario that we know is superior than legislation in Manitoba. And also, generally speaking on contracts in general, first year project management, says there's a…when it comes to project, there's a triangle, scope-cost-schedule. So, if you change one, you have to change the other two. So if we…if we want to limit the amount of time further, the contractors are on the road, that increases the amount of risk, that increases costs, so it is a balancing act, but there's always ways to get better at a balancing act. But in terms of that legislation change that we can ask the province for, in terms of expediating locates, they're called in the industry, I'd welcome such a motion we can consider it as a Council, maybe ask the Province to make those changes, and that flows from the Construction Working Group that Mayor Bowman asked me to chair.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, I jokingly said to the Chair last night that I was going to come armed with a fleet of questions and is actually… I just…I want to ask, you know, with regards to what's been going on for several years. We used jokingly #TrappedInTranscona. There seems to be a disconnect between the various infrastructure groups, Water and Waste with regards to road closures and construction. We ended up this summer, we were getting (inaudible) being done on one regional road that was the alternate detour route for a truck route, at the same time Pandora was being done. I was creating some traffic chaos for a period of days and weeks actually, utility cuts were being put in place in the same area, creating some very hazardous situations. My question, now that I've pre-ambled a little bit, hopefully I can articulate it, is there a debrief that's done at the end of the year to look at between the various departments, how they can do better with these street closures, to make sure that they are in alignment with each other and not making driving and transiting the area more complicated?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, thanks for the question. In terms of construction staging for roads, I am assured by the department that project managers do their best to stage the construction in a way that affects Winnipeggers' commutes as little as possible. I've heard complaints across the City this year because there's…there was so much road construction, I mean, we're spending more than we've ever spent before. I don't think it matters whether you were in Transcona or any other part of the City, I think you had issues with traffic circulation given the gargantuan amounts of road work being done. However, the point of better coordination between utilities, there's always, yes, Public Works does talk to Water and Waste, yes, Water and Waste talks to Public Works. But I think…I think we all know cases or we all suspect there's been cases where the coordination could've been better. To that effect, Councillor Nason, if you want to move a motion just to ask for annual reporting on coordination between Water and Waste, Public Works and road projects, I think that would be a good one. I mean, they tell us that they're doing it, but I don't see anything wrong with having a public annual report to show how they've done and how they might be better in the future.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Nason: Yeah, in Transcona, currently there's a collector road named Peguis that's closed. Is it City policy to force all traffic in a…in a neighbourhood out by a local road, one local road?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I think I can say that no, it is not the City policy to force traffic down a local road when there's a regional road that is closed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. No further questions? Let's move on to the standing…to the Governance Committee of Council.

Councillor Eadie: Would you like me to?

Madam Speaker: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you could take the Chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will, and we're introducing the Governance Committee of Council September 21st, 2021 meeting reports.

**REPORT OF THE
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED SEPTEMBER 21, 2021**

Councillor Sharma: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'll introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Item 1. And this is the report dated September 21st, 2021.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. Nobody wants to stand it down, so I will call the question.

Councillor Sharma: That's the next one. Go ahead.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Nason? Oh Mayes, okay. Sorry.

Councillor Sharma: Do you want to stand it down?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: So, you can introduce it. It sounds like he stands it down. Can you speak to it, Madam Speaker?

Item 1 – Voting Requirements By-law

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Introduction. Sorry, introduction.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. I think the report is pretty straightforward. We'll hear from Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Worn off all the good will. Very final...look at the very final point in Appendix A, though. For future reference, we all know that you can't sell parkland; lands owned as park. We got into that on Councillor Rollins' riverbank property land intended as parkland. But the last point…there's also, dating from when Mrs…when Dorian Desmarais was on Council, a lease of a parkland for more than five years, also requires two-thirds vote. So, it's just useful. I'd wondered if that was still in. I'm glad to see it's still in. This mattered when we discussed contracting out golf courses in 2013. This...it became a two-thirds requirement because the leases were going to be five years or more for the golf course. So, just useful to note, that's not…it's analogous to the Section 205 that says you must have two-thirds to sell parkland. It's a policy that says, yeah, we're going to treat a lease of over five years like a sale. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Any other speakers? All right, to close, Speaker Sharma or Madam Speaker.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'll call for the question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, I will call the question then. All those in favour? All those opposed? Nobody is opposed. That is carried. Thank you. Moving on to the Governance Committee Council meeting of October the…

Councillor Sharma: Fourteenth.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Fourteenth, 2021. Madam Speaker.

**REPORT OF THE
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED OCTOBER 14, 2021**

Councillor Sharma: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'd just like to note there is an amending motion to go with this item. So, it will be stood down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, okay. Do you want to speak to it? I believe the amendment comes from Councillor Mayes.

Item 1 – 2022 Schedule of Meetings and Update on Remote Participation in Council and Committee Meetings

**Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Sharma,**

WHEREAS the proposed 2022 schedule of Council and Committee meetings has an Appeal Committee meeting scheduled for September 23rd which is the day after the final meeting of Council in September;

AND WHEREAS the schedule of meetings proposes that Council prorogue between September 25th and October 31, 2022, due to the 2022 general election;

AND WHEREAS the regular City Council meeting in September should be the last meeting of this Council prior to prorogation for the general election.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 1 of the Governance Committee of Council report dated October 14, 2021 be amended as follows:

- *Add the following to the end of Recommendation 2:*

  "with the following amendment,

  A. Amend Appendix A by changing the September 23, 2022, Appeal Committee meeting to September 21, 2022."

Councillor Sharma: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Again, a very straightforward report. And I do support the amending motion. It is a very simple change. It's asking for a date change of the Appeal meeting that was scheduled in September next year. And the motion outlines a new date that just falls before our prorogue period.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. The amending motion, Mr. Clerk, was from? Councillor Mayes.

City Clerk: It was, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Did you want to speak to that, Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Mayes: This comes out of a nightmare meeting I attended in 2014 in which was the day after the final Council, which I thought would end things. Instead, I spent the whole day staring at my watch thinking, I should be door knocking while certain other councillors who are no longer with us, talked at some length. So, I think to even the playing field, we should all be done on the last Council. The Mayor can end on a rousing speech, and we will be done on this term of office, and we can all go our separate ways. It just, frankly, seems unfair unless Councillor Gilroy has this sort of masochistic desire to come in as Chair of Planning the day after the last Council. So, I'd move to either get rid of that meeting, that would be my preference or move it earlier. But it's not my rotation. It frankly seems completely unfair to have one group of councillors come back for what, as we know, could be a 14-hour session the day after the last Council.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right. Thank you. No need to close, I don't think.

City Clerk: The speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pardon me?

City Clerk: We do have Councillor Nason who wishes to speak to the item.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Oh, I thought that was Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: No, that was Councillor Mayes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Oh, Councillor Nason. Sorry, Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: No, that's okay. Yeah, well, we look alike. Anyways, I won't belabour this. You know, it is interesting, we've had so much talk about Integrity Commissioner and stuff like that. I just want to be…I just want to…perhaps the mover or seconder want to speak to it, just want to ensure that this does not present, you know, an advantage by moving it at this point because last Council this was in place, this was a meeting, and now it was clearly articulated that we're moving it to ensure that we can go out and door knock as opposed to do the business of Council.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. Did...who's the seconder to Councillor Mayes' amendment?

Councillor Sharma: Call Councillor Mayes to close.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pardon me?

City Clerk: No further speakers, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further speakers, Mr. Clerk? Okay.

City Clerk: You can call for the close on the motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. Did Councillor Mayes want to close then on his amendment?

Councillor Mayes: My own preference would have been to postpone or get rid of that meeting. To Devi…to Councillor Sharma's credit and the Clerks, they said, oh no, we're still going to have that meeting, we'll just move it earlier. So, I don't think there's a shirking of duty, it's trying to even the playing field. Once you're done on that last Council meeting September 25, I think, we're all on an equal footing. So, it just seemed to me that was more fair. Perhaps I was flashing back to Harvey Smith, speaking at some length on 2014, but I liked Harvey. I got along well with Harvey. But in any event, that said, I think it's more equitable if everybody ends on the same day.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right, thank you, Councillor Mayes. To close, Speaker Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I thank Councillor Nason for his comments. It's really no issue to move the meeting. It's just being moved to earlier that week. So, in a span of two weeks, we're having two Appeal meetings. The second one may not even be necessary, but we won't know that until next year. And of course, when the amending motion was put forward, we did consult with the Clerk and make sure everything was in order. We all know that we're meeting just in this chamber during the pandemic, and that will be the case next year until the end of December. So, with that, I'll ask you to call the question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will be calling the question first on the amendment. All those in favour? Any opposed? None, that is carried. Madam Speaker, I'm calling the vote on the amended motion. All those in favour? Is there anybody opposed? No, that is carried. Thank you. Would you like to take the Chair back, Madam Speaker?

Councillor Sharma: If you wanted to just continue, we'll go into by-laws.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will continue. There is a by-law on this?

City Clerk: There is, Mr. Deputy Speaker. By-law 63/2021.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: By-law 63/2021. Madam Speaker.

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Sharma: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'll move that By-law No. 63/2021 be read a first time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Is anybody opposed? No? That is carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 63/2021.

Councillor Sharma: I'll move that By-law No. 63/2021 be read a second time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Are there any opposed? That is…what? That is carried.

Councillor Sharma: I'll move that the rule be suspended...sorry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You can go ahead now, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Sharma: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 63/2021 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour? Is there anybody opposed? No? That by-law is carried.

Councillor Sharma: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll move adjournment.

Councillor Eadie: I was going to ask if you would like to move adjournment. All those in favour? Nobody's opposed? That is carried. I'm a little confused.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 7:14 p.m.