COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, January 27, 2022

The Council met at 9:45 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 Schreyer.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good morning to all those here in person, those remote, of course, and watching these proceedings. I want to continue to remind our citizens to be vigilant in our battle against COVID and thank all of those healthcare heroes and other community leaders who are doing their part to help protect themselves, but also, our community. Since our last meeting, Madam Speaker, we have lost 100 Winnipeggers to COVID, 100 Winnipeggers. On December 15th, we had 139 Manitobans in the hospital with COVID-related illness. As of yesterday, that number had increased by 581, 720. From 139 to 720. Our ICUs in the last month since our last Council meeting have gone from 34 up to 49 patients in Winnipeg ICUs. I want to continue just to remind us all to be vigilant. Thank you everybody for doing their part. Typically, I would be removing my mask during these proceedings. I know there is a directive that's been provided from our CAO to members of the Public Service and the request has been made to members that will be appearing in-person in delegation to just continue to wear their masks throughout…when they are present, with exception of when you are consuming coffee or a beverage. But I'll…you know, I will be following that directive, of course, encouraging my council colleagues just in the interest of safety for our Clerks and all those that are physically present here today. Madam Speaker, today is International Holocaust Remembrance Day. As a result, the City has lowered the flags and has lit the Winnipeg sign here at the city…the flags at city hall, I should say, and lit the Winnipeg sign in yellow to acknowledge and to raise awareness of this very important day. In 20…in 2005, the UN General Assembly designated January 27th as International Holocaust Remembrance Day. It honours the anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau, the largest Nazi concentration and death camp, where more than 6 million innocents were systematically murdered during the second World War. And I'll take this opportunity to remind us that any anti-Semitism is still a scourge. It continues in our community. It continues across Canada as we've…many of us have seen in recent days. And we need to continue to battle it in our community. Also, in terms of battles, we need to continue battling mental health challenges. Yesterday was Bell Let's Talk Day. Of course, talking about and combating stigma related to mental health and supporting those that do suffer from mental health challenges is something that continues throughout the year. I want to thank all members of Council for their continued advocacy and support in that respect. January 29th will be the anniversary of the Quebec City mosque shooting. I want to encourage all Winnipeggers to mark the day with fellow Canadians. And as a result, the Winnipeg sign will be lit green to show our support to our Islamic community here and, of course, from coast-to-coast-to-coast. I have had recent meetings with other levels of government including Premier Stefanson. I want to thank her for her accessibility. I have also had the opportunity to visit with over 70 schools over the last week and a bit offering support and encouragement for teachers as well as students. February 1st will mark the Chinese New Year, the year of the tiger. Also, want to acknowledge Festival du Voyageur is getting going and ready to start their celebrations. Winnipeggers will see many ice sculptures created throughout the city even though most of the events will be virtual. I am looking forward to celebrating it with Councillor Allard and others on Council. And lastly, Madam Speaker, I want to acknowledge that we have 11 Winnipeggers, both coaching, official and athletes that will be competing in the upcoming Olympics. I want to wish them, on the behalf of City Council and all the citizens of Winnipeg, all the very best and congratulations for representing Canada at the upcoming Olympics. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Megwich.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just to acknowledge that Sunday, January 30th is the kick off to Black History Month 2022. And will be the 41st anniversary for the local organizing group here in our city. The global

pandemic continues to impact the ability to host in-person events throughout the month of February known as Black History Month. Black History Month was created to focus attention on the contributions of African and Caribbean communities throughout North America. Black History Month seeks to honour all black people from all periods of history, from the enslaved people first brought over from Africa in the 17th century, to black populations living in North America today. For 2022, Canada's theme for Black History Month is February and Forever; celebrating black history today and every day. The theme which was announced on Friday, January 21st, 2022, Councillor Browaty's birthday, was also Lincoln Alexander Day here in Canada. Lincoln Alexander Day celebrates a leader who fought for racial equity as Canada's first black member of parliament, cabinet minister and Lieutenant Governor General of Ontario. Throughout his life, the Honourable Lincoln MacCauley Alexander exemplified what it meant to be of service to others, becoming a passionate advocate for the equality of black Canadians and the advancement of education, race relations and youth issues. I encourage all of my councillor colleagues to consider participating in any of the scheduled virtual events throughout the month of February, 2022 organized again by Nadia and Rhonda Thompson and the volunteer organizing committee of Black History Month Manitoba. Black History Month is not only for the black community, it is an entire month of education and sharing to increase equity and inclusion. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Going remote to Councillor Schreyer and final speaker will be Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, if I may, I am willing to go after Brian Mayes. I don't know what he's going to say. I don't wish for his announcement to be redundant. And he may go ahead of me if that is all right.

Madam Speaker: Certainly. Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Sure. I had in my notes today, say something positive about Kelly Shields who is our retiring Chief Municipal Assessor. And it's an interesting legal role. The City Assessor is a bit legally separate from the City of Winnipeg. We have been blessed with a good run of assessors…Chief Assessors during my time here; Nelson Karpa, Mel Chambers who is familiar to all of us in the chamber, and now Kelly Shields. It's sort of lucky, sometimes we get notice of people's retirement. I have called up people to chastise them or praise them and I've been told, well, no, she is retired. You are like two weeks too late. You go, I never…I didn't know this was happening. So, in this case, we are a bit lucky, so we are able to say a bit about Kelly. I didn't always agree with Mr. Shields. I quite strongly disagreed with him on some of the litigation we were having with the school boards. But he was somebody who was passionate about their job, wasn't clock watching, wasn't putting in time. This was somebody who was into their work and I appreciate the work he's done. We are, as always, reloading it with strong replacement at Assessment with Tim Austin. A man who loves a good gravel back lane local improvement discussion, Mr. Austin. So, he and I and Councillor Allard have talked quite often. But you know what, I talked with Kelly and Tim and Mel over the years and, you know, you'll raise the question about, well, what about the biggest mobile home community in Winnipeg is down in south St. Vital? How's that assessed? And they'll say, oh, this is interesting stuff. You will be interested in this, councillor. And they start talking about licensing, and you go, this actually is interesting. So, it tends to be a group who are passionate about their work and, frankly, as I think I said years ago, if you didn't have Assessment here, the rest of it would all be either theoretical or redundant so we have to have a good arm of our operation here to bring in the revenue. So, I wish Mr. Shields well and look forward to Mr. Austin stepping in and carrying on. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Councillor Schreyer, your opportunity for morning announcement.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, I have mentioned the passing and the contributions of people and politicians of many colours over the years that I have been here, such as…as have my colleagues. It happens to be that in recent days and weeks, we have had the passing of three prominent new democrats dear to the hearts of many Canadians including myself. It includes former federal leader, Alexa McDonough who had been leader of the Nova Scotia NDP back in the '80s, into the '90s then later, the second woman leader of the federal NDP from the '90s into the '00s. I don't have enough time to speak about what she's meant to so many, including myself. But to merely acknowledge for a sense of closure that she spent her life in public service and meant so much to so many. As well, we've had the passing of Jake Howen, former MLA for Churchill. He was a prominent cabinet minister in the 1980s. And again, I don't have time to talk about his contribution to so many. But he strove and dedicated his life to making life a little bit better for so many Manitobans and in particular, those of northern Manitoba, and in particular, those of First Nations in northern Manitoba. And I just need to say this as well. We have just had the passing of David Woodbury, former president of the Manitoba New Democratic Party, past treasurer of the Canada's New Democratic Party. And I have known David, well, since I…I've known David for, well, over 30 years. And I've known him in different capacities. And I didn't see him too much during COVID, but I happened to have the pleasure of just working with him briefly in the last federal election. And it was good to see David. David, he has meant a lot to us. He has served us in so many ways. The titles of his positions don't really demonstrate what he meant to so many. Politics can, well, there can be conflicts amongst the people that get

along the most and that's the nature of politics. But with David, despite any disagreements, I was pleased to know that he was on our side. And our condolences to his partner, Becky Barrett. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

MINUTES

Councillor Eadie moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on December 16, 2021 be taken as read and confirmed.

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

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: We will now move into delegations. First up, we'll hear from Austin and Amy. They are in support of Item 1 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated January 19th, 2022. It's regarding Strategies and Tools to Enhance Neighborhood Liveability via the Doing Business in Winnipeg By-law – Problematic Business Activities. They will be appearing via Zoom. Madam Clerk, do we have the delegation on the line?

Clerk: We do. Austin and Amy, if you want to go ahead and start your presentation, you can begin now.

Austin: Hello, everyone. Thanks for having us. I am Austin. I am a full-service sex worker.

Amy: Hello, I am Amy. I'm also a full-service sex worker and we are both members of Sex Workers of Winnipeg Action Coalition which is an advocacy group led by sex workers and including allies. So, researchers, people in public health, for example, aiming to make sex work safer in Winnipeg.

Austin: We are 100% against exploitation and trafficking, but we are also 100% for measures that will actually help people.

Amy: We were not allowed to present our slide show, but we have submitted them to Council. If you have the ability to follow along with our slides, please do so.

Austin: So, we presented last Thursday at the Executive Policy Committee meeting. And after we spoke, the EPC then removed recommendation number four which sought to partner with organizations that do not see us as workers or as people deserving workers rights. We see this removal as a good step towards listening to sex workers. Yet we have concerns about what is to come and we are here to address that.

Amy: We wanted the licenses removed because they were and are not for the benefit or safety of workers. They increase the control and surveillance in sex workers' lives and places of work and thus, reinforce stigma and increase violence. As such, this by-law and licensing are used as a tool to enforce the criminalization of sex work. Aspects of this by-law prioritize tools for law enforcements and include unnecessary rules for workers that simply exist because of the stigma surrounding sex work. For example, body rub practitioners not being allowed to lock their doors in their workspace. This isn't about safety, this provides constant access for by-law checks by the Winnipeg Police Service. Criminal record check requirements for licenses, and this was based on the assumption and association of sex workers with criminality and deviants, and is a barrier for those simply trying to work. The mandatory providing of clients' names with meeting dates and times; this is extremely invasive and unnecessary. No other business or workplace in the city are required to provide this. And dress codes dictated by the City. This is paternalizing and controlling.

Austin: There are also large fines associated with various violations. And sex workers are the highest fined group out of all the businesses and workers included in this by-law. And so, all of these things mentioned are harmful and stigmatizing barriers for sex workers and become more violent and harmful for workers who are marginalized by systematic oppression. There are others like organizations who we heard at the EPC delegations who also want licenses and the by-law removed, but not for these reasons, and not for sex workers' safety, but to abolish sex work.

Amy: We fear that anti-trafficking campaigns and partnerships will come through additional amendments or separate motions or by-laws so we want city councillors to be informed about why this is harmful to sex workers and exploited persons and to not allow further policies or partnerships or motions that under the guise of ending exploitation and trafficking, in fact, increase the surveillance and harassment of sex workers. These campaigns instill fear by targeting the

way in which we work and keep ourselves safe. They cause an environment of indifference, stigma and violence towards sex workers.

Austin: And so, surveillance equals more violence and more criminalization. There is no evidence that these campaigns and tools help exploitation and trafficking, but there is evidence that shows how these tools harm sex workers and those experiencing exploitation and harm within the sex trade. So, what actually helps combat trafficking and exploitation? Ethical anti-trafficking initiatives and support services. So, the so-called Combating Human Trafficking Act passed in Ontario parallels aspects of what is being suggested and imagined in this report. And in response, the HIV Legal Network urges the government to adopt anti-trafficking strategies that are rooted in human rights and that address the numerous structural barriers including poverty, precarious immigration status and lack of access to affordable housing, health and social services that contribute to the risks of human trafficking. Fighting sex workers will not end trafficking. What is overwhelmingly clear, based on research, is the need to address the actual root causes which cause harm in many communities including in sex workers' communities.

Amy: Anti-trafficking organizations that seek to end demand and abolish sex work ignore the structural harms that contribute and cause exploitation of trafficking. Sex work abolition is harmful. At the EPC, we heard a delegate that spoke about being willing to work with the City and Winnipeg Police to shut down massage parlours and offer assistance and help to those there. And this is considered as providing some kind of rescue or support to people in sex work, but in reality, this is taking workers' livelihoods away and creating an environment of fear. And to suggest that this is anything close to support or services distracts from the actual needs that sex workers are asking for.

Austin: To be clear, we want the licenses to be removed, but the repeal cannot lead to closures or additional by-laws or policies that seek to ban sex work. You cannot prioritize abolitionists motives. When sex work abolitionists are prioritized or consulted for by-laws and policies that directly affect sex workers, what we get are frameworks and tools that attempt to eradicate sex work, but in reality, increase harm against us and increase harm for those experiencing exploitation. You must meaningfully consult and work with sex workers. And this goes beyond just listening, it involves meeting our demands as we are the experts of our own lives and work. This is what keeps us safe and prevents exploitation.

Amy: And so, we have prepared a list of essential action items needed from the City. And they are as follows: we want an acknowledgement of the harms that criminalization has on sex workers and vulnerable folk. This needs to be cowritten with sex workers. We want an acknowledgment that trafficking and sex work are not the same thing so that responses to these two very different realities can be addressed. When distinctions are made between sex work and trafficking, sex workers human and labour rights can be upheld and the root causes of exploitation can be addressed. Policing and incarcerating are a way out of social problems, doesn't fix them. We need investment in social programs, supports and services that actually work towards dismantling systematic oppression, which is the real culprit of exploitation, trafficking and violations of human rights. We want an official recognition that sex work is work. This can begin to work toward ending the stigma and oppression that surrounds sex work and increase sex workers access to health and social services, community supports and meaningful support networks.

Austin: We need meaningful collaboration with sex workers on any motions, amendments or recommendations about anything to do with adult businesses in the city. We know that another report will be generated after these proceedings and sex workers need to be involved from the ground up, not used as afterthought. We also want SWWAC trainings for councillors and other City employees. These trainings…these trainings will help support employees to recognize their biases around sex work, educate on decriminalization and also how to meaningful engage with sex workers in the city moving forward. We also need the City to commit to looking into harmful programs operating in the city such as John school and the Winnipeg Police Service doing undercover stings on sex workers, which they call outreach, which involves police officers posing as clients to gain entry into their workspaces. These alarming realities are framed under the guise of preventing exploitation and yet, they are clear examples of the ways that law enforcement is used as a blunt and overreaching instrument to stop exploitation, but actually harms sex workers and criminalizes our livelihoods.

Amy: The repeal cannot lead to the closure of sex workers workplaces or lead to the enactment of more laws or policies that seek to ban sex work from the city.

Austin: We demand that sex workers be able to continue to work in Winnipeg without police involvement and surveillance.

Madam Speaker: Amy and Austin, the time is up on the clock. Okay. Councillor Rollins…Councillor Rollins has moved an extension for two minutes if you'd like more time. Do you require more time?

Austin: Yeah, just like, 10 seconds. I'm on my last sentence.

Madam Speaker: Okay, she'll move one minute. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Go ahead, please.

Austin: I'll just repeat what I was saying; we demand that sex workers be able to continue to work in Winnipeg without police involvement and surveillance. And this is a workplace safety issue. And that is all we have. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Amy: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: I will ask you to stay on the line and we will hear from another individual on the same topic and then come back for questions. Next is Dr. Claudyne Chevrier who is also appearing in support of this item. Are you with us Dr. Chevrier? Welcome.

Claudyne Chevrier: Yes, good morning. Thank you. Hi, I am here as a researcher who's done extensive work in the last decade on access to health and social services for people selling and trading sex in Winnipeg. I am here to support the Sex Workers of Winnipeg Action Coalition because I know that meaningfully involving sex workers in initiatives that relate to their work is the only way to increase safety and well-being. I am in support of the removal of the licensing for escorts and body rub practitioners in the city because they do not contribute to keeping sex workers safe. In the same breadth, I am for the continued and ongoing involvement of people currently working in sex work in the development of any future initiatives that relates to sex work. I am also against any initiative that would increase surveillance, policing or attempt to ban the sex trade. I appreciate that members of the Council…the City Council are concerned about the health and well-being of people selling and trading sex. Not everyone is concerned about exploitation and that this is what has motivated the discussion, the removal of the by-laws. I want to reiterate that sex workers are concerned about exploitation more than any non-sex worker here can be. As the last the delegation mentioned, fighting exploitation without further harming sex workers would mean addressing the root causes, working towards increasing sex workers' access to health and social services, community supports and meaningful support networks. In support of that last point, I just want to share some insight from my doctoral research on access to health and social services for people in the sex trade in the city. I finished a PhD in community health sciences in 2020 at the Rady College of Medicine at the University of Manitoba. My research documented the completely unacceptable experiences of discrimination, stigmatization that most of my participants encountered in health and social services. It also made a lot of recommendations for current, future social and health services in the city and those included following the principles of harm reduction. So, that means being client-centered, nonjudgmental, facilitative, non-coercive, evidence-based. It also means that programs should be planned and evaluated. That would include the meaningful consultation of sex workers, ongoing training on the realities of the complexities of experiences of sex work and recognizing the difference between sex work, exploitation and trafficking. So, for my research, I did formal, semi-structured interviews with 39 sex workers and people selling or trading sex. I did 12 interviews with stakeholders over four years of participant observation. For the sex workers I spoke to, the average age of participants was 36 years old. It ranged from 20 to 55. 52% indicated that they were Indigenous, 17 of them were white. I spoke to people who met clients outdoors, in bars, massage parlours, online. All of this to say, I spoke to a lot of people from an extremely diversified group of people. At the end of my interviews I asked them to make recommendations to service providers and for service. They wanted service to be more…services to be more compassionate, to show more transparency, to use appropriate careful language, to educate themselves on the very realities that are encompassed in the word sex work, to hire more sex worker, and above all, to respect their humanity. One of the most devastating results I have is that the majority of people I spoke to answered this question about services by telling me that they want to be treated like human beings. Talking about 30 people out of the 39. It was really crushing, personally, to hear interview after interview, people telling me that this is how terribly we are failing sex workers in our communities. I am telling you about this to show that it is not just today, it's not just the sex workers you just heard, it's not just the sex workers in the report that are asking about services, about policies, a general climate that isn't stigmatizing, that doesn't make their lives more dangerous and complicated. My research shows that there is a climate of stigmatization in all health and social services in the City of Winnipeg that includes City services, that includes policies and by-law. As someone who has spent the last decade doing my best to be an ally to sex workers, I'm asking you to make sure that the removal of the by-laws will not lead to more of this, to increase surveillance and policing of sex workers or worse, attempt to ban sex work. In short, I'm asking you to support sex workers rights to health, safety and labour protection. Thank you so much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will now take any questions for our three delegations. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, in representing sex workers in the city of Winnipeg, I was…we were all actually sent a link to a video that was produced in Vancouver that demonstrated how…what efforts we are trying to do in terms of dealing with trafficking has had human rights and ill effect on sex workers. And Madam Speaker, I'm just wondering if either of the presenters could give me, being blind, just a verbal description of one the incidents on that video that demonstrates that it's actually harassment of sex workers?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Would one of you like to answer that question? Dr. Chevrier, Amy?

Claudyne Chevrier: Sorry, just if I understand the question correctly, you are referring to the video that was produced by SWAN Vancouver on the harms of human trafficking? And you are asking to prove that the cartoon represents harassment? Or that that's what their describing?

Madam Speaker: I will have Councillor Eadie restate the question.

Councillor Eadie: I just…Madam Speaker, I just want to make it clear, because I couldn't see it, I would like to hear a verbal description of a real world situation where sex worker ended up getting...well, basically, their workplace safety and human rights violated by efforts to try to stop trafficking. There is an example in the video. I just…looking for a description, Madam Speaker. Detail, sorry.

Claudyne Chevrier: Thank you. I don't remember the exact content of the video. And maybe Austin or Amy, the other delegation would like to speak on this. But I will say that what is described is law enforcement showing up in workplaces uninvited. And under the guise of outreach and making sure that people are safe, which can lead to situations where people might be...if for example…in that example, people might have, god, their immigration status might not be up-to-date or there might be issues. And it might lead to criminalization for other issues that do not relate to sex work or the sex trade or being involved in whatever form of work they were involved in.

Amy: Yeah, that is a great example, Claudyne. And in the video, there was an example of police inviting...there was two examples. One that comes to mind that happens here in the city of Winnipeg, is where police do a sting which me and Austin were describing, where a sex worker shows up at a location or a sex worker is at a location and the police, they pose as a client and they come there, just like Claudyne was describing. So, in the video, there's two examples of sex workers showing up at a location thinking she has a client and it was actually the police. And in another situation, it is a massage parlour and they're working and police enter under the guise of checking their immigration status as Claudyne said or by-law licenses and then fine them or arrest them or attempt to rescue, as they call it. So, that was the description or that was some of the scenes in the video.

Austin: Thank you, Amy. I will also say that there was…there's one moment in the video where a worker is trying to work like outside on the street and a police officer or car comes by and it is clear that she doesn't want to be interacting with them and fears being criminalized. And so, heads away from the more, like, lit area of the street which suggests that criminalization pushes sex workers underground or away from more public areas.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, we appreciate your presentations today. Have a great day. Next, we will hear from Vicki Poirier. She is in opposition to the same item attending via Zoom. Good morning, Vicki, are you with us?

Vicki Poirier: Yes, hi. Hi there, yeah, I am for the licensing if it will make the workers safer. Escorts and bike riders, even, should both have licenses if it makes people safer. Perhaps consult with Sam Katz on what you are planning to do. He used to have an escort service in the '80s. These workers, sex workers and escort workers are essential workers. Without them, rape and murder will go up. Is more missing and murdered women your goal? We should be making these women safe. They should have a right to work, make a living, lock their doors and not pay cash grab fines. These guys should have no right to barge into their workspace unless they're just hoping to see naked women. Like, come on. Get binoculars and sit in your window and look in other people's windows if you're going to just be a voyeur. You don't have…you shouldn't have a right to barge into somebody's space. Anyways, sex workers and escort services need to be respected, accepted and thanked. You can't stomp it out. You'll only drive it underground and more unsafe conditions. They have a right to have a driver safely take them to their hotel room to meet with a client and all of that. I mean, and who cares about their immigration status if you're going to keep having just open borders and people walk into Manitoba all summer long. Who cares if they are illegals or not? What business is that of yours? They are people trying to make a living and trying to keep rape and murder down. If you can't understand that that is an essential service, then there is something wrong here. Like I said, talk to Sam Katz. He knows all about this. He owned an escort service in the '80s. He's a great guy.

Madam Speaker: Vicki, I'll have to ask you to be respectful and stick to the facts, please, on the topic. Let's stick to the facts and not opinions.

Vicki Poirier: Also, I noticed that the sex workers and escort workers as well as johns don't have to show vax passports. So, I think that makes them essential workers, right?

Madam Speaker: There are no placards. Vicki, you have presented many times at Council before. So, I think you should be familiar with the rules. There's no placards. Please stick to the facts. You have just a few minutes left. Do you have anything more to add?

Vicki Poirier: No, I'm good. I'm saying, be respectful, let them do their job, find ways to make them safer and stop fining them for ridiculous reasons and stop letting police officer barge in on them hoping to find them naked. And woohoo, look what we saw. That's ridiculous.

Madam Speaker: That is the end of your presentation. Are there any questions for our delegation? Seeing none, thank you for your presentation. Next, we have Simarpreet Singh. He's in support of Item 8 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated January 19th, 2022, regarding Support for Legal Challenge Against the Province of Quebec Bill 21. Simarpreet, welcome. We have 10 minutes for you on the clock.

Simarpreet Singh: Thank you. Good morning. Thank you, Speaker Sharma, Your Worship Mayor Bowman and honourable members of Council for giving me this opportunity to speak. I want to thank His Worship Mayor Bowman and Councillor Nason who put a motion forward to provide financial support to legal…for a legal challenge against Bill 21. My name is Simarpreet Singh and on behalf of the World Sikh Organization of Canada, I am speaking to you as a proud Winnipegger and a proud Canadian. These days I am pursuing my PhD in chemistry and hope to promote science in future by teaching as a professor in a university. Many friends of mine who wear a turban or hijab are pursuing their education degrees to become teachers in future. I'd like to believe that we are able to follow the dream of becoming an advocator in this city and this province without having to choose between the identity and a career. But I can't say the same for my fellow Canadians who are residing in Quebec. Even for myself, I wouldn't be able to teach in public universities and (inaudible) based on how I look and not my qualifications. Quebec's Bill 21 reinforces systematic racism and discrimination in Canada. This discriminatory legislation impacts visible minorities the most. People who wear their articles of faith such as turbans, hijabs or the kippah as part of their identity cannot become teachers, they cannot serve in public offices, they cannot serve their communities regardless of their qualifications. Recently, we saw an example of this in Chelsea, Quebec where a teacher was removed from an elementary classroom because she was wearing her hijab. Imagine what impact that has on children. It tells the children that discrimination is legal and it's okay in 2022. This discriminatory legislation is disguised as secular law, but in reality, Bill 21 impacts people who possess invaluable knowledge, talent and experiences and forces them to choose between their identity and employment. Bill 21 also sets a dangerous precedent to allow provinces to override and undermine protected fundamental rights enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights of Freedoms. This bill is clearly an infringement of the fundamental rights and freedoms. And just as the Canadian Charter guarantees freedoms and rights for all Canadians, a law such as Bill 21 that violates freedoms for some of us should be a concern for all of us. This is a Canadian issue that transcends beyond the borders of Quebec. We, as Canadians, must protect our rights as guaranteed by the Charter as we fight Bill 21. Community organizations such as the World Sikh Organization are battling the Quebec government that can virtually throw unlimited resources behind the legal battle, whereas we have to fundraise on the backs of racialized minorities. It's just not a level playing field. This is why the fight against Bill 21 needs support of every level of government to stand for our Canadian Charter and values. I was pleased to see the original motion in December which intended to provide a one-time financial contribution of up to $100,000 to the joint legal challenge. It showed that this council had taken action and stands shoulder to shoulder with fellow Canadians against the discrimination sanctioned by Bill 21. Then, at the EPC meeting, the motion was amended to state that the members of the Council can publicly condemn Bill 21 and lines stating about financial contribution of up to $100,000 was removed. In 2019, this council unanimously passed a resolution led by Councillor Nason and Councillor Lukes condemning the Bill 21 to take a stand against discrimination. And we sent a message that Winnipeg doesn't support laws that create a space for intolerance. Every councillor has already publicly condemned Bill 21 by voting unanimously on that resolution. So, I ask you to reconsider the original motion without any amendments and put your words from 2019 into action. Now is the time to reflect on how the members of this council want to be remembered in history and fight against Bill 21. Councillors, our fellow Canadians are once again being marginalized and need to see action from leaders like you. And just like in 2019, I will leave you with these words from the Prime Minister Diefenbaker, "I am a Canadian. A free Canadian, free to speak without fear, free to worship god in my own way, free to stand for what I think right, free to oppose what I believe wrong, free to choose those who shall govern my country. The heritage of freedom I pledge to uphold for myself and all mankind." Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Simarpreet. Are there any questions for our delegation?

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thank you, Mr. Singh. You and I have formed a stronger friendship and relationship in the time that I have been in office and I appreciate our conversations and meetings that we have had over the last several years. With regards to the amendment that I did second to the Mayor, I have heard from many varying and sometimes disgusting perspectives. But with the way that the Mayor and his Executive Policy Committee have amended this motion, Item 2 does allow for members of Council if they choose to go this route. I know it is controversial we're spending $100,000 of taxpayer money outside the City of Winnipeg, and you know, you are a constituent of mine

and a voice that you trust. Would you be offended if I used some funds that are available via Community Incentive Grant to support a led challenge from the World Sikh Organization if you were able to find funds to match those funds, would you be in support of that type of approach?

Simarpreet Singh: I think I would be in support of that kind of approach. Because like I said, this, it borders Québec. So yes, I would. At this point, any kind of support would be appreciated just because we are against a government that can virtually throw unlimited resources. And we have to fundraise on backs of racialized minorities. Then fights against injustice always come back to the people of colour, racialized minorities, slowly fundraising against these legal challenges.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. (Speaking Punjabi) I am against Bill 21 in Quebec. The issue is how we go about supporting that from another provincial jurisdiction. And in this case, part of the problem we were dealing with is that we didn't actually know the cost. We say we're going to do $100,000, $100,000 toward what exactly? And this is part of the conundrum some of us were struggling with. What is the cost that we are contributing to? Much of the time at city hall, we deal with the budget and we're contributing to a certain, specific budget. And this was part of how we are trying to deal with this. And for someone like myself who's against, you know, Bill 21 in Québec, how do I explain this? How do I justify this working with the constituents and the taxpayers that I represent? And I am asking. Simarpreet, if you would accept the idea that members of Council would try to find out because it could determine how much they might want to support for funding, the cost…the specific cost of any particular case. Do you think that is a reasonable way for some members of Council to look at it?

Simarpreet Singh: Definitely. And with respect, this is not a one-time contribution...the original motion did not say the one-time contribution of $100,000, it said up to $100,000. So, I just wanted to put that on the record. Second, if the Council wants, I can connect the councillors who are interested with World Sikh Organization, the National Council of Canadian Muslim and the Canadian Civil Liberties Association who are fighting this in court and start those talks. The main objective is if enough Canadian big cities apply enough pressure on Bill 21, then maybe another level of…another…other levels of government can also undertake this challenge, mainly the Federal Government would be ideal.

Councillor Schreyer: A little bit on the side, but Simarpreet, you are very polite, of course, thanking members here for providing the opportunity for you to speak. Bear in mind, you know, we are merely fulfilling our obligation to facilitate your right to speak here at City Council. And I just want to mention that that is your right, sir. And thank you for being polite with us and thanking us, but it is our obligation, our duty to you to provide the opportunity for you to speak today and I'm glad you did. Thank you very much. (Speaking Punjabi)

Simarpreet Singh: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, thank you for your presentation. Oh, Councillor Nason, I see your hand up.

Councillor Nason: Perhaps I'll figure out how to use this internally. So, hopefully the Clerks can take my hand down. Just further to Councillor Schreyer's comment about not knowing the full cost, Mr. Singh, of a legal defense. I mean, I guess I'll take an approach some of my colleagues do. Did you know that City of Winnipeg is currently involved in a…what could be perceived as fishing expedition, where we don't know what the total cost would be in regards to the police headquarters? We don't know the complete legal cost of that, but Council has voted to move ahead with that. Do you see the comparison?

Simarpreet Singh: Yeah. There are…these costs of future are usually unknown. There is always some contingency for these projects. So, I hope the Council can also make this comparison and provide support for this legal challenge against Bill 21. Thank you, Councillor Nason for that.

Councillor Nason: I had one final question. Just…again, just reiterating. Community Incentive Grant Program; are you actively considering making an application for that?

Simarpreet Singh: I will be talking to the World Sikh Organization executive members that there…this is an approach. If the motion passes with the amendment from EPC that this is an approach that we can use to get any kind of funding from the City of Winnipeg, yes.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes, you had your hand up.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. I'm going to speak to the item on the agenda instead. I want to thank Mr. Singh for coming and for his continued advocacy as always. But I will speak to it on the agenda. Changed my mind. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, have a great day, Mr. Singh. Thank you for your presentation. Next, I will call David Grant. He is in opposition to three items: Item 9 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated January 13th, 2022. It's regarding Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure. He's in opposition to Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks, the report dated January 14th, 2022. It's regarding the Winnipeg Police Board – 2022 Strategic Plan Update. In opposition to Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment dated January 12th, 2022 regarding Financial Incentives for Composting. David Grant, I see you there. We have 10 minutes on the clock for you, sir.

David Grant: Thank you. I would hope this isn't judged to be off topic, but I have been following the rules on making these presentations to you and to the committees. And I am not sure how many people in the room are aware that the rules have changed a couple of times this year already on how we make presentations. It would be nice if in the agenda that's published a note was made or a link was provided to the form that we must fill out if we're going to take part in writing or in-person. So, it would be nice to have that.

Madam Speaker: David, if you could get on with your presentation. Any questions about our procedure can be taken offline with our City Clerk or myself. It's your presentation, please, on the topics.

David Grant: Okay. Charging stations. This agenda item is evidence that no one at city hall reads the documents submitted by the public. It also proves that no one in a very large city bureaucracy knows how to find available information. I should do an aside here if I'm allowed, that the three topics that I will speak on, I am in favour of the topics, but I am opposed to the details. So, please don't feel offended. Anyway, very good standards exist for charging stations for electric vehicles. If they're put in in Winnipeg, it won't be the first in the world. Details...sorry, dozens of very competent engineers in Winnipeg work in the groups which continually improve these standards. I believe you should abandon this topic beyond simply supporting Manitoba Hydro or anyone else who decides to builds these. How does paragraph 3 remain in agenda Item 9? In spite of repeated reminders, EPC still pretends that FCM is an authority on charge stations. Why did Winnipeg decide that a room full of mayors would be the experts in electrical engineering? The world outside city hall recognizes that IEEE is the real authority while the Canadian Electrician Association is a good local source of information. It is easy to discover that IEEE has an active chapter right here in Winnipeg. I'd suggest that Council use the available resources and still support charging. Next topic; I've strongly supported composting, as have presenters here for years and I have since I was about three. I'm not impressed with the idea of subsidy of companies who may want to divert a trivial amount of waste from the landfill. We already have a test program in place. Remember that those who decide how to handle their own compostables are not as green as you are told they are. Some of us never put such material into the gray bin. Some of us take the time to run proper backyard composters. If you force them to take a green bin, some folks will use it properly, many will not. No evidence has been provided that this arrangement will reduce the GHG greenhouse gases arising from household waste or that it can be done without degrading the neighbourhood. Please recall that the Samborski Company was reverting a lot of waste from the landfill, as Council seems to want, and composting it very well. When the smell of it drifted into some of the ritziest parts of town, the full force of media and government came down on them. And expect noses to be out of joint, so to speak, when composting is not done right which this might lead to. This program is a symptom of spending without well defined benefits. If the methane production for a tonne of waste cannot be quantified than green plans should not be made. Remember that even if food waste takes up space in a landfill, its relative dryness means that most of its greenhouse gas will result many years or centuries in the future. There is also data on the greenhouse gas resulting from waste in dry climate landfills and in domestic composters. So, the data is available and probably should be studied and compared before charging off in the direction of subsidizing a new company to do a new business activity for the city. Objective analysis of the data should have been done before we decided to reinvent the wheel like this. Where there is professional analysis of GHG benefits of backyard versus green bill…green bin composting, where is that? Remember that every tonne of waste collected in green bins comes at a very high cost in extra fuel and truck wear. We already stop a truck in front of every house twice a week. Soon this may be three trucks a week per house. That is an awful lot of fuel and an awful lot of tire wear and carbon produced. So, someone should do an analysis of that. We have a lovely program. We have a pilot program in place. I would like to see the results of that pilot program analyzed carefully before we start off in a new direction with this plan. Under the WPS strategic plan; I support the quest for stable funding for our essential police service. I note that city hall has been very busy consulting. In all that consulting with people on the phone and taking part in little breakout meetings. I have taken part in them. I strongly support the service. But no one has dared mention the greatest reason for funding of WPS being uncertain. Please remove the fine income portion from the budget of the service. This essential service should be funded directly from city coffers if you're serious about stable funding. Otherwise, a 2020 shortfall is going to happen again. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, David. Any questions for our delegation? Seeing none today…

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yes, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Grant, for your attendance and advice, yet again. Look, the issue of electric…of creating charging stations, electric charging stations, isn't new to us. We have been dealing with this since last term since I was first elected. This is a 'you may know', Mr. Grant, these issues of electric cars are not, by no means, new to me, but we do sooner or later have to bite the bullet and do something at city hall. Finally, we are, now you're questioning sort of whom we should be consulting with. And I understand. So, Mr. Grant, I need to ask you, we should…we should listen to this. I am…because I am kind of surprised the one organization they say that we should be consulting with is the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, which is a fine organization to consult with. I am kind of surprised it's the only one mentioned specifically. Mr. Grant, what organizations do you recommend we consult with specifically?

David Grant: I think the simplest thing would be the local organizations. The IEEE and the CEA have local activities, they have local members. So, if you are looking for standards, you can go to organizations like the Canadian Standards Association. And IEEE prefers lots of standards. That is what they do for a living. And there are tens of thousands of very competent engineers providing those standards. So, I would suggest going to those two. And there is nothing wrong with talking to FCM, but the report suggests that FCM would be the one and only place for information on how to build these things. And I think there is a great value in after you've decided consultants or standards to apply to talking it up at an FCM meeting of comments from FCM members. So, if Toronto or whatever…Kelowna has installed stations and there is a problem, it will pop up at the FCM meeting. But the place for standards is the people who write standards. And I was part of that organization for decades for a few of those organizations. And I am still president of the local chapter of one of them. But I would suggest that. So, thank you very much, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Sorry, you said the IEEE and?

David Grant: Oh, the CEA; Canadian Electricity Association. And as I say, the Canadian Standards Association is a good general purpose source of standards, but in this case, it is pretty specialized. CSA does things like hockey boards and consumer stuff more.

Councillor Schreyer: Okay. Thank you very much, sir.

David Grant: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, David Grant, for your presentation today. Next delegation is Muriel Gerarda St. John in support of Item 9 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. It's the report dated January 17th, 2022 regarding the Proposed Sale of City-owned Property – Part of 4540 Portage Avenue (John Blumberg Golf Course). Our delegation is attending via Zoom.

Muriel Gerarda St. John: Can you hear me?

Madam Speaker: Yes, we can.

Muriel Gerarda St. John: Thanks. My name is Muriel St. John and I am a volunteer with Crescent Park Rescue and OURS-Winnipeg; Outdoor Urban Recreational Spaces. And I am also a retiree at the University of Manitoba. I presented previously at the PPD and EPC Meetings and now I am presenting to the other city councillors as well, who will be casting a very important vote here today. First of all, I would like to thank the City of Winnipeg for giving its citizens the opportunity to speak today. Secondly, I would sincerely like to thank the Mayor and each and every city councillor for their courage, fortitude and vision for making the Winnipeg planning documents to include a master plan for green space, a biodiversity plan and a nature corridor plan for the 2022 budget. In doing so, you are recognizing the United Nations data of ecosystem restoration 2021 to 2030. According to the UN, this means not only helping to restore ecosystems that have been degraded or destroyed, but also conserving ecosystems that are still intact. As Winnipeg citizens, we look forward to your plans and their translation into action. Thirdly, I sincerely want to thank you for the approval in principal for the purchase of an additional 1,000 acres of greenspace for our much loved growing city. We are definitely moving in the right direction. Greenspace in most cities is a scarce resource especially in Winnipeg with only 6% compared to the national average of 9%. According to the park people, city parks report 2020, Winnipeg ranks the bottom third for total city land area that is park and for the amount of natural area in these parks. There was a comment made at the previous EPC meeting regarding the amount of land that is parkland among cities that can be based on the percentage of land that is parkland or land area for population. Whether you compare the percentage of city area that is parkland or hectors of park per 1,000 people, Winnipeg is below average. Either way, Winnipeg comes up short. No matter how you slice it, Winnipeg is behind in greenspace. The issue before us today is that the City of Winnipeg is now planning to sell 200 acres of the historic John

Blumberg (inaudible) Golf Course including 40 plus acres of naturalized parkland along the Assiniboine River. Greenspaces provide many environmental and social benefits. According to the Eos science news by the American Geophysical Union called 'Growing Equity in City Greenspace' I quote, "Greenspaces in and around cities collectively known as urban forests can mitigate regional and local flooding, storms, reduce water scarcity, improve air and water quality, regulate temperature and aid soil nutrient cycling, all the while sequestering carbon." World Wildlife Fund Canada states that one-third of greenhouse gas emissions results from the destruction of trees, ground cover, peak lands and post lands. In John Blumberg's case, not only trees and ground cover, but loss of part of the river corridor. In order to safeguard our city and address the dual crisis of biodiversity loss and climate change, we have a golden opportunity right here in Winnipeg and right in this moment now to act by saving John Blumberg Golf Course. You can't put a price on that. In an article written in the reputable scientific journal (inaudible) called '50 Shades of Green; Pathway to Healthy Urban Living' states, and I quote, "Disease rates tend to be higher in urban areas than in rural areas. More greenspace in cities could reduce these rates." The distribution of greenspaces also matters in terms of accessibility and equity for its citizens. With a visionary plan to purchase 1,000 acres it makes no sense to start this visionary plan off by selling land that the City already owns. Winnipeg is a growing city. And it is predicted that the largest planned growth will be in the west of the city. We are extremely fortunate that John Blumberg is nearby which will make Blumberg easily accessible for the newest residents of our city. Picture this destructive scene; with the trees being torn down, the ground being rooted up, the river corridor lost to its citizens, the habitat loss, new housing being put up and then this greenspace is lost forever. Where is the public good? The common good that our democracy is based on. Remember, these greenspaces belong to all of us Winnipeggers paid for by taxpayer dollars over many years. We would like to see a biodiversity walkway for bird watching and wildlife on the 40 plus acres along the river. We would also like to see cross-country skiing on the golf course in the winter. Something to think about; should scarce greenspace be sold before proper assessments have been carried out in the forthcoming policies that you have promised? Because once this land has been developed, there is no going back. I would encourage the Mayor and City Council to read this book which brings hope to our Canadian democracy called 'Value(s): Building a Better World for All' published in 2021 which won the 2021 National Business Book Award and was written by the Mark Carney, the former governor of the Bank of Canada and former governor of the Bank of England. And now, the United Nations special envoy with climate action and finance. Unfortunately, he states what has happened in our society is that the market economy has come down into our society at the expense of our social and human values. Everything is about money in our society and we have a present crisis of values. We need to get back to our human and social values. He states, and I quote, "Every financial decision should take climate change into account." He also states that we need to consider important human and social values when making financial decisions that include fairness for all citizens, responsibility but with accountability, solidarity versus divisiveness, sustainability for the environment, building resilience from the shocks of climate change and making decisions that consider the well-being and opportunities for our children and our grandchildren. It will cost more to buy greenspace in the future and we already have John Blumberg, we also have to look at the long-term picture regarding the vision for the city, regarding climate change mitigation and our mental and human health. We don't want a short term financial and political picture but a more long-term approach that considers social and environmental aspects. We've recently experienced the United Nations climate change conference in Glasgow, Scotland. And Canadian governments at every level: federal, provincial and municipal, need to step up to deal with the climate change crisis. As voters, we are asking the City of Winnipeg to see the urgency I've been given today. We ask the City administration to look at more creative, responsible and sustainable solutions to find money. This means without selling off greenspace. The $13.68 million realized for the sale of Blumberg will not do anything to eliminate the $102 million park maintenance deficit and it will not be enough to purchase significant greenspace within the city. And remember, every financial decision should take climate change into account. It is up to you, city councillors, Blumberg does not have to be sold. City Council can remove it from the surplus list. In voting to keep John Blumberg, your city councillors will be following the UN directive to conserving ecosystems that are still intact. You will also be following the policy vision of City Council including the master plan for greenspace, the biodiversity plan and the nature corridor plan. I thank you very much for your valuable time here today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Muriel. We have another delegation on the same item in support. So, if you can just wait and we will come back for questions shortly.

Muriel Gerarda St. John: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Shelley Sweeney is next. She is appearing in support of this item. Also attending via Zoom. Good morning, Shelley. We have five minutes on the clock for you. If you could unmute.

Shelley Sweeney: For many years, the 200-acre John Blumberg Golf Course suffered from benign neglect. New managers took over three years ago and substantially improved the courses and the number of golfers increased by 30% just over last year's numbers alone. Affordable rates and lack of dress code make Blumberg particularly attractive to seniors, families and children. Metro Winnipeg purchased Blumberg in 1964 followed by Little Mountain Park in 1965 and La Barrier Park in 1969 in order to add 1,000 acres of greenspace to the 1,000 acres that the City already owned. All three are outside the city proper. The City also acquired both Assiniboine Park and Kildonan Park before they were part of the

city. It is important to keep in mind that Blumberg is the only significant greenspace close to St. James which has only the much smaller Sturgeon Creek and the 30-acre Living Prairie Museum. Blumberg is only a kilometer from the edge of the city. Buses that go to Assiniboia Downs and the Red River Ex could go to Blumberg. Blumberg could also be a cycling destination as part of an active transportation corridor. In any case, the soccer pitches and baseball diamonds next door are not in question is essentially meaningless. Blumberg was intended to be a park that would include a single golf course, a toboggan run and a natural area. The City changed course in 1969 and had two professionally designed golf courses added in order to attract professional golf competitions. They also added cross-country skiing in winter, but eventually discontinued it. But Blumberg could have a lot more additional use by the general public year-round without it having to cost millions. The proposal is to sell John Blumberg for $68,000 per acre, which is more than what a City Appraiser valued the land at in February of 2020. However, that was before the pandemic drove land prices through the roof. Now $68,000 per acre for a fully serviced site is a fire sale price when unimproved farmland 600 meters away from Blumberg is currently selling for $148,000 per acre. Schinkel Properties, the company that is hoping to purchase the golf course is selling their lots next door to Blumberg for an equivalent rate of $420,000 per acre. So, at least we can know that land in that area is both valuable and sellable. Much smaller amounts of greenspace inside the city limits cost significantly more than what Blumberg would achieve. If the proposed development went ahead, likely a sizable number of Winnipeggers would move there where they would pay lower taxes while enjoying Winnipeg amenities and all future tax revenues would go to Headingley. This sale is generally a bad deal for the City all around. John Blumberg is significant green infrastructure. Golf courses are zoned parkland by the City. The Complete Communities report considers municipal golf courses as major nature preserves and greenspace. This is in line with other municipalities across Canada. Blumberg is a cost effective, climate resilient service. John Blumberg is not like the golf courses of old. Provincial regulations ensure that Blumberg follows a strict nutrient management plan. 100 to 200-year old trees are scattered across the course. The City planted an additional 3,000 trees and shrubs. The majority of these trees would be cut down to facilitate the development. This goes against the goals of the Million Tree Challenge launched by the City. We do not know a great deal about the early history of this piece of land, but given its strategic location, we know that it must have been important to both Indigenous peoples and early settlers crossing the Assiniboine. Blumberg has an enthusiastic following. Its rebirth is essentially a good news story. It would be a tragedy if City Council sacrificed John Blumberg for short-term gain that would be quickly dissipated. Once this greenspace is gone, it is gone forever. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will now take questions if there's any. Any questions for our delegations? Seeing none, thank you for your presentation.

Councillor Schreyer: Councillor Eadie had his hand up.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie. Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I understand having to watch all the Zoom to make sure. It causes a bit of a problem. Anyways, just…it's just a really quick question. We have heard lots and many presentations. My question is, really, is did you know that, you know, with Council supporting EPC's recommendation on this, it actually doesn't take off the potential sale of John Blumberg in the future. It requires us to rescind the 2013 decision by Council to declare it surplus to the City's parks needs.

Shelley Sweeney: Yes, thank you very much, Councillor Eadie. And we really appreciate you bringing that point up. Really, what the Council needs to do is to take John Blumberg off the surplus list. Thank you for that and I am glad that you reminded us.

Madam Speaker: Seeing no other questions, we thank you for your presentation today.

Shelley Sweeney: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: I will call forward individuals that are here in the chamber with us. They can come forward. It's Mr. Bob Schinkel in opposition to the same item. And the delegation following is Alan Klippenstein. If I could just ask you to leave your mask on, sir, during your presentation.

Bob Schinkel: Thanks for your time. My name is Bob Schinkel, I am from Schinkel Properties. Just want to give you a little history about ourselves. We are a family owned business started in 1986. That makes me the old guy. We own and operate three hotels in the Winnipeg area. We have a property management firm in Winnipeg. All in all, we staff about 140 residents of Winnipeg. We think kindly of Winnipeg. Our son, Justin lives here as well. You have a tough decision to make today and I respect you as councillors. You put a lot of time and energy into your position and I commend you for that. I want to talk a little bit about the proposal and how we got here. So, as you all know, 2013 Blumberg was deemed surplus by the City of Winnipeg meaning that it wasn't of interest in the ownership of the property. In 2020, Council recommended to sell the property and administration put out an RFP. So, we in good faith spent time and money and we actually put two

proposals out. The first proposal was 36 acres…included 36 acres of park and greenspace. And just to put that into context, that would be about 170 city residential lots in size. Our second proposal has 64 acres of park and greenspace. This is the one that was not approved by administration. Both of these proposals would provide the City of Winnipeg with a park that could be used by residents year around at no cost to the taxpayer. It is open…this greenspace would be open to public and they don't need to maintain it as it Headingley…it would be…fall into Headingley's responsibility. We had the first and second of six proposals that were looked at. Administration recommended the first which was the 34 acres of park at $13.7 million. The property was appraised at $9 million, so our offer is in the range of $4 million over the appraised value. And we think that that has met your target price on value. In terms of the process, the way I see it, it's Council's attempt to fix a problem replacing an asset that's under-utilized outside of city limits, out of reach of many and replace it with something better that more people can enjoy. The City will be retaining the 70 acres of ball diamonds and soccer fields next door which are clearly very well utilized over the summer period. This gives you a total of 106 acres of…with our added greenspace. This would compare in size to the St. Vital Park, which is 100 acres in size. It gives you lots of room for food trucks, ice skating, skiing, walking trails and trails within the development. The development we are designing is walk and bike friendly and it…and the…we think it would be a very good addition to the neighborhood. We've actually had talks with Headingley in terms of expanding the greenspace from that 34 acres. We recognize the importance of greenspace. I want to talk a little bit about Blumberg. Blumberg has a tree problem. Trees don't grow there. The soil is alkaline. It is like a bald prairie when you drive by it and I should know. The exception to that is the southwest corner of this property where there is a stand of trees which we would try to maintain. The City has a tree planting program planting 3,000 trees in a year. I would highly suggest that you save that money. Can you imagine a park without trees? This is not and will never be the Assiniboine Park. I encourage Council to take a good look at that property before they make a decision. So, where are…we are looking to replace your assets. Administration suggests Blumberg regularly serves 2,000 golfers during the summer golf season of five to six months. $13.7 million is a lot of money to serve 2,000 golfers over six months of the year. The Nature of Things says and I quote, "Golf requires more land per player than any other sport." This is a play to pay service, it's not available to everyone. Closing this course would help Manitoba Golf. It would benefit the other struggling courses including the three City-owned courses. I want to talk a little bit about location. In real estate, the old adage of location, location, location; and I think it surely applies here. This property is in the wrong location for the city. The only way to fix this is to sell it and buy the property back at the right location in city limits and accessible to people. So, you might say, sell and then what? What could the City replace this asset with? A cursory look through MLS, very simple search, found 60 acres on the Seine River, very comparable, it's on a waterway, it's treed, it looks very suitable to a park, it's within city limits, it's east of St. Anne's Road and it's easily accessible and it has a lot of residences nearby. Interestingly enough, asking price, $60,000 an acre. Compares to our offer at Blumberg of $68,000 an acre. This is just one opportunity. There will be many more. There is nothing like having money in the bank ready for opportunity when it arises. This money, I understand, will go into transformative fund. This $13.7 million gives you ammunition to buy replacement property. $13 million is a start to a solution. Golf years ago was a good thing. And previous councils did a good thing with promoting this, but today it's not so much. Things have changed. Times have changed. These 200 acres are serving a very select few. It's outside of city limits and it's hard to reach for the average person. So, I ask you, how do you expect to fund the transformative fund? You have a goal of $100 million. Are you…how many $500,000 libraries are you going to need to sell to reach your goal of $100 million? Here we are struggling to discuss the selling of a golf course that's not in city limits, costs the City every year and is utilized by very few people for six months of the year. Council, you are today's visionaries. Past councillors had a vision for golf course and they were not wrong, but times have changed. Golf has changed. Recreation has changed. You have an opportunity today to invest in the transformative fund. You can build something that you will be remembered by. What you decide today doesn't matter today, it matters in the future. This transformative fund will be a vehicle to enrich public spaces within the city. There is no question it is an ambitious plan, but it is going to require real good, tough decisions by you guys. $100 million is a lot of money. $13.7 million is a good start. Folks will remember you by this. What you did and how you did it under your watch.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentation, sir. We'll now…if I can ask you just to stand down and we will call the next delegation. Alan Klippenstein who is also appearing in opposition to this item. He's here in person with us. And we'll have five minutes on the clock. Good morning.

Alan Klippenstein: Good morning. Nice to see you all. Again, to introduce myself, my name is Alan Klippenstein. I am the Director of Real Estate Development with Schinkel Properties. And I was the one that put this RFP together. Firstly, I think that it needs to be, you know, restated that as per the Public Service defines, this is not a greenspace. This is…this is a golf course. We're not talking about selling a park, we're talking about selling a golf course. But we should also not lose sight of the fact that 70 acres adjacent to this space is a park. It is…it's the baseball diamonds, it's the soccer fields. That is not part of the sale. So, years ago, I used to live in St. Vital. I would not be able to get access to this golf course. There's no public transportation that I could take to get there. This is…this is very exclusive area to get to. You know, not only…not only is this a golf course, but you have to pay. It's quite expensive. You have to rent or buy clubs, you have to pay for the green fee, plus you need a vehicle to actually drive there. It was asked by Council in the EPC meeting last week, how much money it would take to turn this golf course into a park if that is the direction. The Public Service said that it would take millions of dollars of re-investment to turn this into an accessible, functional park. And even with millions

of dollars invested, this is still not accessible by public transportation. A lot…a lot has also been talked about, the importance of greenspaces of golf courses. However, the CBC actually came out with a documentary that talked about the negative impact of golf courses in aspects of how much water is used to maintain them and the herbicides and pesticides used to service them. The sale of this provides the means to make changes. Through our development, these greenspaces could be upgraded to utilize natural prairie grass and medicine grasses. Our plan includes 36 acres of public space and over 13,000 feet of walking trails. This could…this would then be in adjacent…adjacent to the public space. We feel like we are adding good value here. I think you all have a fiscal responsibility to your ward. This sale is over $4 million more or 50% more than the appraised value of this land. The proceeds of this sale is intended to be used to provide direct benefit to each of your wards. That said, this is the third meeting that I have been to. And through this, you know, I feel that there is a perception and a fear of what this sale might mean to you. However, through that, there is also quite a few questions that have come up. You know, how are we going to be able to buy more land? You know, how are we going to support Winnipeg's tree canopy? And how do we improve our parks? Well, this is a golf course. You know, this is not accessible by transit, public transportation. By not selling the pay to play golf course and without canceling other public services or raising taxes, how are we going to achieve those goals? Here is your chance to raise $13.7 million without impacting a single Winnipeg resident. A vote in favour of this sale is direct action to better your wards. Any questions?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will call both delegations back and take any questions at this time if there's any. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I think for Mr. Schinkel, you had mentioned 2,000 golfers, but there are obviously far more rounds than that played per year. And I think it's in disputed that the number of rounds has gone up in recent years, obviously, pandemic has a role in that. But I am wondering where you got the figure 2,000 golfers because it's tens of thousands of rounds per year?

Bob Schinkel: I got that from your administration. They quoted, I think, 37,000 rounds if I am right. And then, I think they quantified that. They took that and they quantified it over the period of the six…five to six months of golf. And that's how they came to…and it is not my number, it is their number. They came to 2,000 golfers on a weekly basis, like your regular kind of golfers that came to Blumberg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? And let's bring the questions and answers through the Chair. Councillor Mayes, followed by Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Mayes: There was a reference made to a property in St. Vital, which I've spent a number of years trying to get the City to purchase 60-acres. You're right, it was set at $60,000 an acre, just east of St. Anne's Road. Just for clarity though, you did say it was easy to access. There is…there's a problem of an intervening river which is east of St. Anne's and (inaudible) and an intervening railway track the runs north-south. So, I appreciate…I would love to see that land in the City's hands. You are right on that, but just, not as easy to access as suggested.

Bob Schinkel: Yes, I have also looked at that property and with great interest because of that…the waterway. There is an access off the perimeter. And yes, it is up for challenge, without a doubt. But there are some options. One would be to cross the river by bridge from St. Anne's. The other would be to get a railway crossing which, I mean, the bypass crosses that same railway track. So, those are the two options or there's really three options: the existing, maintain the existing, which the Province would not like…they want to eliminate those accesses, understandable, it's a safety factor. But I think a very…the other two options are also very real options to build that bridge across the Seine or to get a railway crossing from the other side.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Schinkel, you talked about the fact that this is…it's not a park, it is greenspace. I don't think that's up for debate. And if the property was sold, that money could be used to buy additional greenspace. But it's still a reduction of greenspace in the sense that it's going to be developed into a residential context. And the purchase of greenspace or new greenspace, I mean, it's a net reduction of greenspace because greenspace is there already. But what would happen to this space is that it would be developed into a residential context. So, I'm just wondering if you can comment on that or if we can agree, Madam Chair, if Mr. Schinkel can agree that it is a net reduction of greenspace through its sale.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Schinkel.

Bob Schinkel: Yes, it's clearly a reduction. 200 acres, you know, going down to 34 or even 64. And you know, I think that 64, although that hasn't been a discussion, if that is an option, if that's more palatable to the City, we are totally open to looking at that second…which is our proposal number two, that was administration's second choice, was our 64-acre

greenspace. So, yeah, it's a reduction in greenspace, but it also gives you the money to go out and buy additional greenspace like these 60 acres as an example, so.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Chambers: Second question, Madam Chair, through you to Mr. Schinkel, that greenspace is already there. It's just a matter who owns it.

Bob Schinkel: Yes, that greenspace is there, but how is it utilized? I mean, you can have all the greenspace in the world, and if you can't utilize it properly, what is the point, right? Like, I think if…to me, those…and using that Seine River property as an example, it obviously requires a little more research, but buying something like that would be much better utilized. If you are familiar with the Blumberg golf course, I mean, that is not a pretty golf course. I don't care what anybody says. It ain't pretty.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Mr. Schinkel. Last question is for Mr. Klippenstein, sorry. You had talked about the use of weed control products at Blumberg. But are you aware that weed control products are used on all golf courses?

Alan Klippenstein: Yes. Yeah, my point to that was that there were some delegates and even in the EPC meeting there was talk about how this was a...you know, there was a lot of benefit to keeping this as a golf course. I just wanted to point out the fact that there are quite a few pesticides and herbicides that are used across all golf courses to maintain them. So, it's…so, there is…there is a flip side to that conversation.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Councillor Chambers asked some of my questions.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I wasn't going to ask any questions. I've kind of listened to what's in the media. Listened to the various meetings where the voting's happening on this RFP, Madam Speaker. Councillors have not been in the role of negotiating or working on those RFPs directly. So, some people want to cast aspersions that somehow, we have been bought off to make a vote. But Madam Speaker, and I am in no position to negotiate. But had it been part of the RFP, would…I am wondering if Mr. Schinkel would have still maintained the same price if we kept the greenspace from the riverbank back say, you know, whatever distance, if they would still have gone ahead with this agreement and the City just kept that piece along the river.

Bob Schinkel: Yeah, we can surely negotiate that. And our…if you look at our detailed plan, the bulk of the greenspace was actually along the river. So, the lots...there is a large greenspace to the…on the southeast portion which…of the river. And then, as you get further west and southwest, the greenspace narrows down. But the lots…the residential lots never actually go onto the river. Like, there is a green buffer between the houses and the river. So, and in answer to the question, like I say, we can negotiate all of this. We had two conceptual plans that we put out. We are open to negotiation with the City.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Anything further? Moving to Councillor Schreyer and then Councillor Allard.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's a question for Mr. Klippenstein. I believe it was Mr. Klippenstein that, in more ways than one, sort of asks the question of Council, how are we going to deal with our fiscal and budgetary challenges? He mentioned the fact that we all have our fiscal responsibilities to our ward. That is how he phrased his presentation. Asking us how we are going to deal with our fiscal and budgetary challenges. Since it's asked that way in context of his own presentation, I've got to ask the question, does Mr. Klippenstein realize that it's actually infrastructure construction costs that are far and away being the biggest change in the pressures on our fiscal and budgetary problems here at city hall in the past generation and more?

Alan Klippenstein: I guess to address that question, councillor, we understand there's budget constraints that the City deals with. I believe that the goal from the City was to set up a transformative fund to take the sale of this property to put into that fund which was specifically earmarked for…to buy additional greenspace or enhance additional greenspace. I think that's a fantastic…I thought the vision of the City to do that made a lot of sense as this is a greenspace that benefits very few. And like I said in my presentation, doesn't actually have any public transportation to.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you. And sir, what would you have to say about Councillor Eadie's comments about the City keeping parts of…parts of this along the river?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Alan Klippenstein: You know, we would definitely be open to negotiating with the City. As Councillor Eadie mentioned, and as we would describe on the…our site plan, we try to...we actually, and as Bob Schinkel said, we are actually pulling the housing back from the river to put our park adjacent to the river. We realize that is…that's the place where people want to be, they want to have that river access. So, on our conceptual plan, that is where the majority of our park space is.

Councillor Schreyer: And Mr. Klippen…sorry.

Alan Klippenstein: So, further to what you were saying, yes, we would be happy to negotiate with the City as to the location of to…as to where the park is located.

Councillor Schreyer: Now, to either Mr. Schinkel and/or Mr. Klippenstein, would you say that along the river there is actually…where there is potential to maintain and grow the trees?

Alan Klippenstein: Sorry, say that again.

Councillor Schreyer: Would there be along…near the river, is that the area where it's most conducive to planting trees and maintaining…maintaining the trees?

Alan Klippenstein: Yeah, the goal…the goal would be to try…

Madam Speaker: Just if we can pause for a moment. Yes, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I am concerned that Council's starting to enter into negotiations with the proponents. I don't want to get anybody in trouble, including me. The tender process and the RFP process is very clear that councillors should stay out of trying to negotiate, especially in hypotheticals. Not that I don't appreciate the comments, I'm just…a cautionary note.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. The questions, let's stick to the report in front of us.

Alan Klippenstein: I think I can address that without…without diving in there. So, part of the RFP process had a bunch of different metrics that they were…they were using to grade…to grade the RFP. It wasn't just based on price, but it was based on…on price, cohesion with the RM of Headingley and a bunch of different factors. And so, part of those factors were accessibility…

Madam Speaker: Just pause. Councillor Nason moves extension, is that correct? For two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Alan Klippenstein: Yeah, so part of that RFP had set goals as to what…what they were looking for. And part of the goals of that was to do exactly that, provide more access to the river as well as maintaining the trees.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, if I may, just to understand. I'm not sure this is a point of order.

Madam Speaker: That was your three questions, Councillor Schreyer. We can come back to you, but we'll go to Councillor Nason now. I believe you had three questions.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, I've got a point of order or point of information. I am not asking a second…another question.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, I did not have a question.

Madam Speaker: It's Councillor Allard, I mentioned…meant. Councillor Schreyer, what is your point?

Councillor Schreyer: Is Councillor Orlikow (inaudible) bother to give Councillor Orlikow the time to make the point that there's certain things that we are not allowed to discuss publicly while there…this is on the table and while we've got delegations discussing these points. Can we have more precision as to what is and is not allowed for our people in delegation to discuss and what councillors may not ask of them? Because I don't understand.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. I will ask our City Clerk to respond to that.

City Clerk: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As with all items, the question that should be directed to the delegates should deal with those matters contained within the report of within the actual RFP that was presented.

Councillor Schreyer: Are we saying that the delegations went beyond that? I can tell you, it will be on record that I only responded in my questions to that which was mentioned by the delegations.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. I've noted your comments as well as Councillor Orlikow's. I'd like to continue. There's one more speaker, Councillor Allard. Councillor Allard, do you still have a question? We can't make out what you are saying at all. There is bad service there. Councillor Allard, we couldn't make out…can you hear me?

Councillor Allard: Given (inaudible)

Councillor Lukes: And off the visual.

Madam Speaker: We cannot make out what you're saying, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Given that the delegates…can you hear me now?

Madam Speaker: That concludes our time. That concludes our time for questions under this topic. Thank you for your presentation today.

Bob Schinkel: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next, we'll move on to Philip Mikulec. He is in support of Item 2 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. The report dated January 13th, 2022 – Updates on a Permanent Car Share Parking Program. Welcome, Philip, joining us remote. Could you turn off your YouTube? Great. Proceed, please. Thank you.

Philip Mikulec: Thank you. Yeah, sorry, there was some feedback there. So, hello, councillors. My name is Philip Mikulec and I am the Managing Director of Peg City Car Co-op. So, I'm here today to say thank you to both IRPW and EPC Council members for supporting the proposed on-street regulation brought forward by the Winnipeg Parking Authority. More specifically, I would like to thank Councillor Allard, Gilroy and Rollins for supporting the pilot project in their wards. It was a big part of us being able to collecting data to make sure the program would work as intended. And last but not least, I also want to give a big thank you to the Winnipeg Parking Authority's team who worked tirelessly to make the pilot and the car proposal a reality. I hope that all councillors will support the Winnipeg Parking Authority's recommendation regarding the on-street car sharing project as it will help incubate the growth of car sharing in Winnipeg. More specifically, in Winnipeg means…car sharing means fewer privately owned vehicles, which in turn, reduces congestion and parking pressures. So, as the Managing Director of Peg City Car Co-op, I am excited to show my support of the on-street regulation of the Winnipeg Parking Authority developed as it aligns with the needs of car sharing in Winnipeg and closely matches regulations developed in other Canadian cities. By supporting the recommendation, you will be part of building a more sustainable, equitable and diverse transportation system in Winnipeg. You will also be joining a long list of Canadian jurisdictions to support a diverse mobility options across the country like car sharing. I am happy to answer any car sharing related questions if they come up. And that concludes my presentation. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions for our delegation? Seeing none, thank you for your presentation today, Philip.

Philip Mikulec: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: We will now move in to reports of the Executive Policy Committee. I would like to ask everyone when we're voting and you are remote, if you are in support raise your hand and leave it raised until we call your name. When we get to voting to items, if you are remote, please raise your hand and keep it raised until your name is called by the Clerk so we can record everyone appropriately otherwise it will be a really long day. Now, the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated January 19th, 2022. Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 19, 2022**

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

Madam Speaker: We do have an amending motion on Item 13, Mr. Clerk, is that correct? No, we do…we do not. Okay, so the Mayor has called. Item 10 is pulled. No. 8.

Councillor Schreyer: No. 9.

Madam Speaker: Councillor…just raise your hand and I will come to you, please. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Twelve

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: One.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Nine.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Any others? So, we are pulling 1, 8, 9, 10, 12. And that's it. So, the question will be called on 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Item 1, Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Strategies and Tools to Enhance Neighbourhood Liveability via the Doing Business in Winnipeg By-law – Problematic Business Activities

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

Mayor Bowman: Sure. I will be brief, Madam Speaker. I want to thank my council colleagues, notably councillor…councillor…we have a number of councillors, actually. I'm going to offend someone. Councillor…we have Councillor Gilroy who's done a lot of work, Councillor Rollins, Councillor Gillingham. Many have really put their minds to this. And I want to thank…I want to thank them for their leadership efforts. I also want to thank community stakeholders that we've heard from at respective committees including the delegates that took time to join us here today. This is a…this is a big vote today. And I look forward to hearing from my council colleagues and hopeful that we can support this today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. First speaker on this topic. Item 1. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to thank all of the delegations that came…came to talk about this issue. I think, in particularly, the sex-trade workers. I think it was a very informative discussion. And I was very informed myself as somebody who also represents the UN Safe Cities Initiative and we were able to mitigate some of the concerns that they raised. I think we still have more work to do, but I just wanted to thank the delegations and thank Councillor Rollins for a lot of the great work she's done on this file. I really have appreciated what she has done. And I am happy to support and I am glad that we did not concur with the recommendation. I think it was Item 4 that is now taken out. And want to thank the committee for all their work. Councillor Rollins and all the many delegates that came in delegation on this very important topic. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to echo what Mayor Bowman and Councillor Gilroy have said, just expressing appreciation today to my councillor colleagues involved in this work. Our Public Service who I think did an excellent job over the last several months. And all of the delegations, all the stakeholders who were involved in any way in getting us to this recommendation today. As the report says, the objective is to prevent human trafficking and sexual exploitation. That is what this change is focused on; on protecting the vulnerable, reducing exploitation, the opportunities for exploitation, reducing the opportunities for human trafficking. And so, removing licensing is a good first step, but it's only a beginning. We have a long way to go to ensure that we are a city that is protecting people and protecting the vulnerable. So, looking forward to more work in the future. And I will be supporting this today.

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

Councillor Chambers: Councillor Lukes actually had her hand up before me.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Chambers, yeah.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I also want to echo the comments of Councillor Gillingham and thank Councillor Gilroy and Councillor Rollins on the work that they have done on this file. I had the opportunity to meet with SWAC and to listen to the concerns that they have raised. I was actually quite enlightened by the conversation that took place with them, not fully understanding some of the challenges that they go through and the fact that they have actively made the choice to be engaged in the work they are engaged and the fact that they also are very much against sexual exploitation. So, again, the measures that have been taken today with respect to the by-laws, I am supportive as well. And again, want to thank the work that has been done. And thanking all of the delegations that did present, and those…including those that took the time to reach out to us as city councillors to express their concerns and work collaboratively to getting this on the books. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I will be supportive. My thanks to the delegates who came forward. It is an interesting evolution. If you look back to our agenda of February of 2014, which I remember because I was Chair of Protection and Community Services at the time. There's a debate about licensing, there's a debate about terminology, there's also Councillor Havixbeck…then Councillor Havixbeck appeared with Diane Redsky who is obviously still involved, to her credit, talking about trafficking, talking about exploitation. I think some of the thinking evolves over time, but just, I think it is worth noting that the interests in…of our police service in trying to prevent trafficking and exploitation continue. I think that merits mention. I think there have been a number of delegations of our EPC and today that were pretty critical of the police. But I think there is more of a consciousness now than eight years ago about human trafficking and about exploitation. So, it is not…it is not a new concern by any means. It is not…it's something that other councils have wrestled with, other former councillors have raised. So, I just wanted to note Diane Redsky's ongoing involvement. Former Councillor Havixbeck's involvement. And you know, a lot of energy has gone into…has been put into this and pleased to see it moving forward. But I think I would agree with what Councillor Gillingham had said that, ultimately, really, this is about trying to find a balance, allowing people their right as workers, at the same time, trying to reduce risks of trafficking and exploitation. So, this is an attempt at that balance. Perhaps eight years from now there will be another…another attempt to revisit the thinking. I don't know. But for today, I will be supporting the EPC result.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. Much of my remarks are reiterating what's already been said. I want to thank the delegations that came. I watched through the presentations. I want to thank Councillor Rollins, Councillor Gilroy, people that worked on this from the Public Service. And I really want to thank the individuals that contacted my office, and we had extensive conversations and met and discussed and one particular resident from my ward we had very, very involved conversation on this. And I just really want to thank those individuals for reaching out. And it takes a lot of courage sometimes to reach out, but you can see that the pendulum moves and the dial is moving. And I think this is very progressive. Yes, for sure there is more work to do, but I think this is a really progressive step forward. And it's through the advocacy and through the work that many of the presenters came forward with that is moving that dial. So, I will be supporting this today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further speakers or Councillor Eadie, go ahead.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I'll attempt to be short on this one. Lots of actual serious issues brought forward on around sex work versus human trafficking which can involve human trafficking for the purposes of sex. So, it's a difficult issue that the presenters, Ms. Redsky and Ms. Smith, you know, are passionate. So, like, I don't believe that any presentation on this is disingenuous. I had an opportunity, Madam Speaker, to review what had happened in the early 2000s when my predecessor, former Councillor Lazarenko and a number of others along with, really, a consultation committee which involved some very prominent people who have worked in the city center. And mister…well, I won't get into all of them, but one is Ms. Mary Richard and others who tried to come up with a way to deal with the serious issues. Again, with, well, a lot of it for those who are being abused and violated in this area of human trafficking. The…you know, trying to resolve that issue, which a lot of the basis that people do get abused in this system is, first they are made...well, they're encouraged to get addicted on serious drugs and then they are used and abused. Awful. And we do need to do something about that. But I am supporting EPC's decision here. Difficult work and I have respect for all sides. One of the, you know, issues I did want to mention, often in these kind of...well, anyway, I won't get into the licensing thing or whatever. But you know, I heard from sex workers who are very concerned about their workplace and being safe, staying healthy

while undertaking work that, really, they've decided that that is their occupation. And I am not going to hold it against them. Sex work has actually been happening for thousands of years. So, given that, I am going to decide. But I just want to point out that, you know, there is somehow you say you take away licensing, therefore, you know, you are kind of legalizing or licensing or whatever. But ultimately, the Downtown Zoning By-law allows escort services, allows for various kinds of sex work operations. That's not changing in the zoning. That in a way itself and is sort of saying well, these kinds of operations are not…while we don't want them to happen city-wide, which I know sex workers believe that it should be allowed city-wide, but ultimately, the zoning by-law tried to deal with societal, ethical, moral concepts and it is still there. So, those grandfathered operations and thing, they're there, Madam Speaker. So, ultimately, I am great…okay with getting away from licensing because if you are talking about practice and licensing, just think about a registered licensed nurse, a registered licensed whatever, they have their own colleges that set the standards and what the expectations are, Madam Speaker. I would challenge the sex workers if they want to have their workplace rights respected and dealt with, I think that maybe they should be looking at...and massage therapy, which has got nothing to do with sex work, I mean, they have a college…or, well, they're trying to establish it and establish a practice that meets standards and deals with that, Madam Speaker. So, there is a lot of issues that sex workers are going to have to still continue to lobby for in terms of protecting their ability to undertake their occupation. And I think I will leave it at that. And I hope that…it is my understanding that maybe we might be considering when it comes to policing and different things. I note that we have on the agenda a legalized drugs motion, which I think is...I should say, legalized drug usage. So, you know, if we had a…when it comes to policing and that sort of stuff, because I think it's still in the criminal code, sex work or whatever, that we do apply a more of a human rights perspective on dealing with human trafficking. And I think that is done by working with various sex workers associations across the country to come up with some sort of standard of how to deal with the human trafficking that everybody can agree is going to work to resolve our...and as Joyce Smith properly points out, and Ms. Redsky properly points out, Madam Speaker, we have a serious problem in this city and every major city in this country. And you know, we need to respect some divisions here and how to deal with that. So, one of the ways is, if you're going to come up with a way to deal with human trafficking, you need to include those sex workers in ways that would be more appropriate to deal with it. So, thank you very much and I will be supporting EPC's decision here.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing the hour, we should recess now and reconvene at 1:15 p.m. Does that work? Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
January 27, 2022 at 1:28 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of January 27th, 2022. We are on the Executive Policy Committee dated January 19th, 2022. And it's Item No. 1 – Strategies and Tools to Enhance Neighborhood Liveability via the Doing Business in Winnipeg By-law – Problematic Business Activities. Our next speaker on this item is Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is good when we as a Council hold space for discussion on community safety and harms, including stigma that cause harms. And really, not just matters narrow on criminalization. The by-law was wrong, Madam Speaker, and it's good we are changing it today. Because the notions...the motions and the notions it portrayed were wrong. And it's good that, again, we are changing it today. So, Madam Speaker, given the interest in the item, I would like to call for a recorded vote.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? I will call the question on Item 1. All in favour, please rise. Councillor Eadie, we'll just have to wait till this vote is over. Councillor Eadie, if…Councillor Eadie, if you could just stand down on the floor. Yeah. Can you please keep your hand raised if you're on the screen, until your name is called.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any opposed? I think you captured everyone.

Clerk: Councillor Nason has not voted.

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise. I did see Councillor Nason's hand earlier. Councillor Nason…

Councillor Nason: I was not present when the question was called, Madam Speaker. I apologize. I got back just as you started to count.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, I had seen your hand during the vote, is that correct?

Councillor Nason: It was in support, but I wasn't present when the vote was called. So, I don't know if I'm in order.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you for that. Then we'll leave you off the list. Thank you for being open about that.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 14, Nays 0, with Councillors Nason and Eadie absent.

Madam Speaker: And the item carries. Thank you. Next, Item 8.

Item 8 – Support for Legal Challenge Against the Province of Quebec Bill 21

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This…this Bill 21 should offend all Canadians. It is not in keeping with the values that we all hold dear here in Winnipeg and throughout Canada. I commend Council previously voting unanimously to condemn Bill 21 as well as its support in principal for the legal challenge that had been initiated some time ago. There was recently a call made to municipalities and municipal leaders to join that legal challenge. This is one way in which all members of Council can show their support for the legal challenges while we continue to do very…very good work in the community. We have, of course, the new Human Rights Committee of Council. Councillor Chambers and I both serve on that committee. Members of Council have…have continued to support a number of initiatives in our community led here at Council to better protect and promote human rights in the community that we all love. Of course, we want to make sure that Winnipeg is a place we can all be proud to call home. We also want that for our fellow Canadians in the Province of Quebec. And so, this motion is certainly one that I am hoping members of Council can support. And for those that do wish to financially support, they can obviously do so at their discretion. I do think it is important that we communicate to our residents that our support for the legal challenge, our condemnation of Bill 21 is unwavering. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I asked to have this one stood down. Actually, for me, it…this…well, as it's amended, it's fine. But I totally just wanted to speak to it in terms of…so, Madam Speaker, we can refer to people or initiatives, but ultimately, Council is going to vote on this motion that respects the human rights of Muslim, Sikhs and others in this country because it is a City of Winnipeg issue in that we fall under the charter and rights and freedoms as well as the constitution of this country, although the province created this entity, we don't be have the same acknowledgment as the Province of Manitoba might. But Madam Speaker, as a person in this country who at 24 years old suddenly became totally blind, and you know, you never really realize the discrimination and things that even are in place that supposedly were there to help persons with disabilities. The idea, Madam Speaker, was they are trying to help, but it actually violated our rights. And we have challenged many times. It is not unlike the human rights challenges to wear one's turban as a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. We as Canadians, we have individual perspectives, but ultimately, I don't want to get into a too severe debate about why Quebec has a perspective that it wants to ban religious related things. But for some religions, it is actually full culture, Madam Speaker, as you well know. And so, I will be supporting this because I understand that human rights are so important. And in my career as city councillor and prior to that at the City level, I have always demanded that human rights are extended. And when I see what I think is a violation of one's human rights, I personally believe and hope that the vast majority of Canadians believe and the supreme court, actually, believes that from that perspective. Given that, Madam Speaker, the issue of providing money from local community services; I am sorry, I really…you know, contributing to that effort while we deal with many violations of people's human rights in my ward and the many different groups that demand to have funding from…from the councillor office that I at least have discretion over as the elected representative for the Mynarski Ward, I won't be able to find money to contribute to the actual legal challenge. I don't know if this group has pro bono services, but Madam Speaker, I, too, have tried to go to the supreme court and fight an injustice, a violation of my human rights, and it's very difficult and I understand the demand. It costs lots of money. But in the end, I had to find the excellent services pro bono, although, I had to pay all of the costs associated other than the legal bill. You know, I hope that they have enough already in their fund to fight it, and I will leave it at that, Madam Speaker. This, for me, is a very important message that we need to send to Quebec and to the courts, that the City of Winnipeg and the people of Winnipeg believe that we need to respect people's rights because if we start saying we are going to take away rights of one individual then we start taking rights away from others. And it is never a good thing, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: This year marks the 40th anniversary of the patriation of the Canadian Constitution, at which point Canada could then amend its own constitution in-house by a formula among parliament and provinces. As well as it's the 40th anniversary now of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms which became part of that in constitution. It was a different form of constitution from what we have had before in the sense that we never had a charter by which the…that specific of a charter by which the courts would decide certain issues. Until that time, we didn't have a written constitution based on the British conventions, our constitution was not…was not fully written. It included statutes, common law, very much like the British. Of course, we did have the British North American Act, but at the same time, we did not have a charter of rights and freedoms by which the courts could interpret what they can now based on this law passed in Quebec. So, in the last four years, different story. And we have to take into account that, yes, we do have those opportunities and others have the opportunities to take things to court to the supreme court, to these levels of justice for interpretation of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. It applies here. We still have that convention and that perspective in this country in terms of what is decided by dem…by democratic rule and what is decided by interpretation of courts. This is where we are at on this issue. I happen…I happen to be opposed to the bill they passed in Quebec. Having said that, my concerns are how we deal with this as a City Council here in Manitoba. And so, I was uncomfortable with…actually, be honest with you, I wasn't going to be able to support the original motion as it was written. This, I find, is a decent compromise in the sense that it doesn't really change anything. Councillors can and the Mayor certainly can, if they wish, put money into this. And especially with the Mayor's budget, you know, a lot of the budget has…at least, pre-COVID, being used for travel, in other words, expenses outside of the province and that can be the same here. And on that basis, I find this a decent…a decent compromise. Independent of my…of my opinion. I'm not basing my judgment on this motion based on my opinion of the bill, it is based on what are we supposed to do about this on a municipal level in other provinces? And that is what it comes down to me, it comes down to me and in this case, we will leave that up to the individual councillors and the Mayor. Thank you.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker.First of all, I want to thank our mayor, Mayor Bowman, for his leadership on this matter and Councillor Nason for co-signing this motion. I want to reiterate that I condemn Bill 21 in the strongest possible terms in terms of what it represents, the restrictions of religious rights and freedoms. Today, we are here, we're…had talked about at the beginning of our Council session, the fact that today is Holocaust Day, that we can't forget the millions of Jews that were lost during the Holocaust. And as a multi-cultural society, we need to recognize that and support and remember those instances. On Saturday, January 29th, I will be participating in the memorial of the six members of the Islamic community that was shot in a mosque in Montreal. We have to recognize that more needs…more work needs to be done locally, Madam Speaker. We are not immune to these issues at all. I don't know that wearing a religious garment or a religious artifact equates…how that equates to proselytizing if you are a member of the…or an employee of the Provincial Government. And I see this Bill 21 as a restriction on those rights. For me, I can't support sending money outside of our province knowing that there is more work to be done here. And as the Mayor has indicated, he and I both sit on the Human Rights Committee of Council and would have dedicated a lot of that work to these issues. For me, I am prepared to make a private donation towards this cost and not utilizing any tax dollars in support of the defense of that individual who has been fired and terminated from her position for wearing her religious garment. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Going remote to you, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. As a human rights city, and as home to the Canadian Museum for Human Rights, we as Council have in the past and continue to put forward a united front and speak up against Bill 21. And for that, I am very proud of all of my councillor colleagues. In this councillor…in this council chamber, we have stated that Bill 21 is discriminatory. I condemn Bill 21. I simply find it absurd and so restrictive of Canadian rights. I will put on the record, I am very, very disappointed in the Federal Government's lack of action on Bill 21 and that I am very appreciative of the work of the Human Rights Committee of Council. I, too, will be making a personal contribution towards the legal challenge and I want to thank Mr. Singh for his continued advocacy. And for the Manitoba Islamic Association for their continued advocacy, also. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers?

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: Yes, I would like to address the chamber in French. So, I like I think all my councillor colleagues have stated our opposition to this. I would like to share my perspective because I think it's a little different than what has already been shared. So, I am against the bill. Council has already taken a position that we are against this bill and are for human rights. My (inaudible) on the financial contribution for legal fees to use the judicial system to encourage the province of Quebec that find the law illegal. I don't think that this is productive for a number of reasons. We have the Mayor of Montreal who has been stated they are against the bill. Who had asked us, municipal councils of Canada, to not finance this fund because it will encourage Quebecers who had supported the bill to consider other jurisdictions imposing on Quebec. So, the mayor had asked us to not participate because she wants to change the opinions of Quebec. And with our participation, we could possibly…probably…if we contribute, we will solidify the opinions of those in Quebec that are for the bill. The second reason that I think that it's probably not the best way to fight this bill is because of the clause "notwithstanding" of the Canadian Charter. Finally, the province of Quebec, if the supreme court finds that the bill is illegal, just simply using the clause "notwithstanding" will continue to work as it should. Finally, what we need is a public and a Quebec government who are not okay with this bill and to change this bill because finally, the supreme court will be in favour or not. They will probably find the bill to be illegal. Quebec can just use the "notwithstanding" clause and can always continue to put into use their laws. So, I am against the bill. I don't think we should finance the legal battle because of what we heard from Quebec, the municipal governments there. And also due to the fact that even if this wins, and it will probably be won, Quebec can continue and will probably continue to apply this law. What we should do is hope that the people of Quebec will change their opinions in regards to this question. And I hope that they do it (inaudible). So, thank you for your consideration. I will support the movement, but me personally, I don't see how productive a contribution would be. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Next speaker? No further speakers. Mr. Mayor, back to you for close.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Appreciate the views shared around the council chamber. I'll just say this; a Canadian is a Canadian is a Canadian. And when there is an attack on the fundamental human rights of any Canadian, whether they reside in the province of Quebec or elsewhere, they're deserving of our protection as fellow Canadians. If there were such an attack on human rights here in Winnipeg, I would welcome the support from Canadians from coast-to-coast-to-coast. And quite frankly, if the opposition were more effective, both nationally and within the province of Quebec, these appeals made to councils across Canada would not be required. And so, I want to be very clear, the condemnation of Bill 21 needs to be heard loud and clear across Canada from coast-to-coast-to-coast. That is how we mobilize the protection for human rights here and throughout our country, including Quebec. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I will call the question.

Councillor Nason: Recorded vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yes, thank you. There's a call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: Item 8 passes unanimously. Item No. 9, Madam Clerk.

Item 9 – Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

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

Mayor Bowman: You know what, I think there's some great work done here. I want to thank my council colleagues, including the Chair of our IRPW, who I know has been supporting this and many other green initiatives for some time. Not exclusive to Councillor Allard, many members of Council, I know, are quite passionate about these initiatives. So, I will wait to hear from my council colleagues and just appreciate the work by everyone in our community as well as around the council chamber on this…with respect to this matter. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor…any speakers on this item? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, there is certain passion to this, I suppose. Back when I was a child, I had the chance to drive around for a few days in Manitoba's very first electric car. And you don't have to take a word for that because the Manitoba Electric Vehicle Association are a witness for this. And this is…we're talking 50…almost 50 years ago. Over 45 years ago, believe it or not, Manitoba Hydro got from Quebec, a full electric car. Batteries in the trunk, batteries everywhere. Couldn't go very far for very long, but it was a full out electric car. Yeah, I would say it changed my perspective on life. It changed my life in a way. And in fact, last term, it was a pleasure, like a number of other councillors, to support Councillor Wyatt's motion on this in terms of electric charging stations. I have given my explanations before why Winnipeg really has an extra obligation to most other places on earth in terms of dealing with this. We all have our obligations to climate change and mitigating the impact of greenhouse gases. The reality is that there are very few places on earth, very few jurisdictions on earth like Manitoba that can make such a difference by changing to electric vehicles. It's not the same. I'll say it again. It's not the same if you're in Alberta. No offense against Alberta, it's just the reality. If you're in Alberta, and you charge your electric car at an electric charging station, you are charging it with 75% fossil fuels. That's the reality of it. In Manitoba, when you charge your electric vehicle, you are charging it with essentially 100% renewable hydroelectricity. And there is a big difference. And most of the world, unfortunately, is more like Alberta or the United States. So, it matters what we do. We brought this forth last term as well. I brought forth the issue, which again, I'd like to see these changes. Things are progressing. The issue of electric golf carts, they've been around for decades. And I had to sort of give an explanation to the administration as to why there was an ever-changing enhancing feasibility for electric vehicles. I am glad to see…for electric vehicles on golf cart…on golf courses. So, I'm glad to see the administration sort of changing their position on that as well. Some things take time. And so, I think those members, Councillor Allard and others, that are involved in bringing this back. I mean, there is nothing wrong with looking at other jurisdictions to see what they do. It is just that every year that we don't do it, we are…we fall that much shorter. It makes it that much more challenging for Winnipeg to fulfill what we consider our mandate to decreasing our fossil fuel footprint. I believe there is nothing we can do in this city to reduce our fossil fuel impact than conversion to hydro both for buildings and for vehicles. Now, I consider that a fact. You know, I understand it is not exactly the way city hall looks at it. But it looks like it is changing now. So, we have to move. We have to, actually, consciously acknowledge, publicly acknowledge, that there is nothing more we can do. There's nothing better we can do for climate impact…reducing our climate impact as well as for the…just the common sense of accepting the fact that fossil fuels are finite. The only one that isn't, essentially, within our jurisdiction, our purview of sensibly dealing, is harnessing the…harnessing greenhouse gases from landfills. There is a place where we can actually make use of carbon…carbon emissions, if you will, without taking fossil fuels from the ground. It is still methane, but at the same time, it…it is not...it's not coming from the ground, it's not going to take millions of years to create. And so, I need to say that as well in terms of having a full…rather, a more full context in terms of the relevance of what we are doing here. We want to reduce the use of greenhouse gases. We want to reduce the use of fossil fuels which is almost entirely greenhouse...we want to reduce the use of greenhouse gases, which is almost entirely fossil fuels, but the most important thing to do is reduce our fossil fuel intake. Because for the future, we can't say that in 100 or 200 years there is no good use of fossil fuels in the ground if they don't have the same concerns in 150-200 years in terms of the use of fossil fuels; oil and natural gas out of the ground. We can keep it there, leave it there. And if we need greenhouse gases for these things, bear in mind, we can use…we can use landfills. That is much more practical source of natural gas than taking it from the ground from which you will never get it back. Whereas, you can…it is a constant source at landfills. In this case, in terms of looking at conversion, facilitating the conversion to electrical…electric vehicles, I can't think of anything more practical. And I have been waiting my life for this, waiting another term, apparently. And so, I am very much in support of this. Having said that, you know, we had a very good presentation this morning in terms of with whom we should be consulting. I have absolutely nothing against it, in fact, it's a good idea to consult with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. However, there are others. I will just make the assumption that, despite for some reason it is mentioned specifically in the…in the…in the motion that we will take…the administration will be taking the sensible approach and be looking for consultation from whatever sources that are practical and sensible. And having said that, I am in support of the motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker on this topic, Councillor Allard. If you could unmute.

Councillor Allard: Apologies.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: So, I'd like again address the Council in French today. This proposition was initiated by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities who were involved in the installation of charging stations, specifically in areas of Winnipeg. The reason that we're seeing this initiative, this proposition with Council today is because it has to do with external organizations. So, for that reason, it's why it came up through to Council. And also, because it's something that affects multiple departments at the same time. So, I hope we can support this proposal. It's really just a general proposal of how we can the City of Winnipeg approve installing charging stations in Winnipeg to see more electric cars and at the same time, recognizing the work of FCM who has already done work on this and (inaudible) by their efforts and we can start to work together. So, I ask for your support. I hope that you can approve this proposal.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Any further speakers on this item? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor to close. I'll call the question on Item 9. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Madam Clerk, next item, 11…10.

Item 10 – Citizen Member Appointments – St. James-Assiniboia Museum Board (Historical Museum of St. James-Assiniboia)

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm not…I can't recall at this hour who pulled this matter, but I will wait to hear from my council colleagues. I will just take this opportunity to thank the citizen members of the St. James-Assiniboia Museum Board (Historical Museum of St. James-Assiniboia). Beautiful part of our province. I know Councillor Gillingham represents it very well. And I just want to take this opportunity to thank the volunteers for their work.

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

Councillor Klein: Through you, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to thank the volunteers of the museum that's located in Westwood. For those of us that aren't exactly sure where it's located. And I am proud to represent that area. And I also want to take an opportunity to mention the fact that we should acknowledge all the volunteers, especially during the last two years of COVID, that have continued to do their best to run City-owned facilities, to offer programs as well in our community centers and so on. The volunteers have really stood out, they've really come to the forefront and I want to make sure that we acknowledge them as well as all those members of the St. James-Assiniboia Museum Board. So, thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Yeah, I'll just…my apologies to my council colleague. I heard Councillor Gillingham speak at length in the past about volunteers in St. James. And so, had obviously presumed that this was still technically in St. James. And so, to Councillor Klein, I appreciate his support for the museum and for the volunteers. And hopefully everybody can support this, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 10. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Item 12, Madam Clerk.

Item 12 – Rezoning – 2735 and 2737 Pembina Highway – File DAZ 213/2021

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, I'm really proud of the level of growth and development that we have led on in Waverley West. This has been a big part of my vision for the city has been to support a growing city. A city in which we are welcoming more and more residents here. I know as part of that, we have put a lot of effort into the developments in Waverley west. And I want to thank council colleague for her work as well in the ward. I think having members of Council support the growth and development of increased residential options for our residents city-wide in every corner of our city is something that is really important. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next speaker? This is Item 12.

Councillor Lukes: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Yes, thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. It was nice to hear those comments from you. I have not ever spoken to you about all the development that is occurring or you've not spoken to me about all the development that's occurring over the past five, seven years in Waverley West. So, yeah, quite a bit is happening in the ward. I want to speak to particular this rezoning. This report proposes two parcels of land to be rezoned and then the proponent is proposing to build an 8-storey, 181-unit apartment block on Pembina Highway, which is a priority one road with high frequency transit surrounded by many amenities. So, I know, as many of you know, outside of downtown, corridors are targeted areas that provide the best opportunity for mixed-use density. Not only do they provide good transit service via the primary transit network, but they're also based around commercial opportunities allowing people access to greater number of goods and services in a single trip. Densification along corridors help reduce the number of trips made in vehicles and thereby, have a positive impact on the environment. We have designated corridors in Complete Communities 2.0, but we also see and support intensification along priority one roadways that have transit and priority one levels of snow removal. Some have noted if we sold Blumberg, that would be supporting urban sprawl. That's a

perspective for sure. So, in that same train of thought, support for development projects along priority one roads and corridors to increase density becomes even more important, which I hope councillors all support. I am really pleased to be supporting the rezoning of these two addresses on Pembina Highway and pleased to be supporting the transformation of Pembina Highway, University Crescent and the transit corridor with increased densification. Densification is not easy. There is a lot of challenges, as we all see from the e-mails we get, but we have to wear two hats. We have to wear our councillor ward hat and we have to do what is important for the city. This is a great project and I encourage all of you to support this and other projects focused on increasing densification in our city because it is extremely easy to meet the 50% of greenfield that we've set out that is so easy. And it is much harder to support the 50% of infill development that we've set out to try and reach. So, as the member representing the far south suburb of Waverley West, which has been demonized so many times by so many urbanists, I really, you know, want to say that I am really pleased and I really feel I am doing my part in helping densify the city of Winnipeg. So, thank you for your time on this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? I'll call the question. All in favour of Item 12? Contrary? That is carried. Madam Clerk. That concludes this section.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: We will now move on to motions under the Executive Policy Committee. Motion 1 is moved by Councillor Rollins and seconded by Councillor Chambers. It deals with the decriminalization of small amounts of drugs. This is a notice of motion and will appear on the February Council agenda. Motion No. 2 is next, it's been circulated. Moved by Councillor Chambers, seconded by Councillor Lukes. Deals with the protection of indigenous languages. It's an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. Motion No. 5 is moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Sharma. It deals with the election year funding announcements. It will be an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. Motion 7 is moved by Mayor Bowman, seconded by Councillor Rollins. It is a notice of motion regarding mask use in the council chamber. It will appear on February Council agenda. We will now have by-laws under the Executive Policy Committee for second and third reading. Mr. Mayor.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Rollins,
Seconded by Councillor Chambers,

WHEREAS criminalization makes it difficult for people who use drugs to access harm reduction services, increasing risks and subjecting them to even more health harms (such as injury, and disease), and/or social harms (such as joblessness, and homelessness);

AND WHEREAS many Canadian researchers have suggested racial bias within police investigations, and prosecutions of drug crimes resulting in Black and Indigenous people dramatically over-represented in drug possession arrests and convictions as a result;

AND WHEREAS people who use drugs, including peers and self-advocates who use drugs, Manitoba Harm Reduction Network, Mom's Stop the Harm, are encouraging Winnipeg to move away from a criminal justice and/or abstinence approaches towards a public heath approach with community-based organizations and the health and social services sector;

AND WHEREAS Vancouver, Montreal, Toronto and Edmonton are already calling on the federal government to decriminalize small amounts of illegal drugs to take on the drug poisoning crises and prevent further deaths;

AND WHEREAS The provincial government is responsible for funding and coordinating primary health care including mental health and addictions supports and services; and

AND WHEREAS All levels of government have a role to play in improving public health outcomes for residents including actively championing harm reduction methods, housing-first, safe consumption sites, safe supply, and other measures which can help save lives;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. *The Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) request the Federal Government for an exemption for Winnipeg under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, to allow the possession of small amounts of illegal substances within the city's boundaries.*

2. *The CAO make all reasonable efforts with the federal government to set up a process as stated above to allow the possession of small amounts of illegal substances within the city's boundaries under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, and from the first formal confirmation from the federal government that they are committed to working with the City on a process toward the issuance of the aforementioned exemption, begin quarterly reporting to the appropriate Committee of Council with verbal updates on the continuous work and milestones until decriminalization is achieved within Winnipeg with the support of the Federal Government.*

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

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

WHEREAS International Mother Language Day has been proclaimed by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in November 1999, for every year to be celebrated on February 21st;

AND WHEREAS throughout the course of history, many individuals have fought to protect linguist rights and freedoms. UNESCO selected February 21st in honour of the Bangladeshi people's sacrifices made to protect their mother language;

AND WHEREAS countries throughout the world celebrate linguistic diversity and multilingual education; language is a critical component of ones' identity and culture; by recognizing mother languages, we cultivate understanding, which in turn helps create more inclusive societies and a world richer in cultural experiences;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg has defined itself as a Human Rights City through its leadership and its ongoing work of collaborating with all groups to grow our knowledge and commitment towards making the vision a reality; by recognizing mother languages, we cultivate understanding, which in turn helps create more inclusive societies and a world richer in cultural experiences;

AND WHEREAS the United Nations (UN) General Assembly adopted a resolution proclaiming 2019 as the International Year of Indigenous Languages on the premise that Indigenous languages matter for development, peace building and reconciliation; the Indigenous Languages Act, which is intended to support the reclamation, revitalization, maintaining and strengthening of Indigenous languages in Canada received Royal Assent on June 21, 2019;

AND WHEREAS the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada calls to action identify and recognize the significance of language rights and preservation of culture; the mother tongue is a substantial part of what defines each of cultural identity; it's a heritage that transports specific knowledge, expressions, feelings, traditions and local history;

AND WHEREAS the Welcoming Winnipeg Policy, "Reconciling our History" Policy was unanimously adopted by Council on January 30, 2020, to resolve the absence of Indigenous perspectives, experiences, and contributions to the stories remembered and commemorated in the city. One of the objectives of the policy is to support changes that promote Indigenous reclamation of land, space and/or language;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That Council acknowledge February 21st, 2022 as Mother Language Day, dedicated to the protection and preservation of languages and cultures;*

2. *That to be consistent with the United Nations General Assembly (Resolution A/RES/74/135) which proclaimed the period between 2022 and 2032 as the International Decade of Indigenous Languages, to draw global attention on the critical situation of many indigenous languages and to mobilize stakeholders and resources for their preservation, revitalization and promotion, that the City of Winnipeg declare the decade as International Decade of Indigenous Languages;*

3. *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 Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Sharma,

WHEREAS in response to concerns raised during the 2014 Civic Election, on February 22, 2018 Council placed a moratorium on any funding announcements pertaining to expenditures from Land Dedication Reserve, Community Incentive Grants and Per Capita grants in the sixty (60) day period prior to the 2018 civic election;

AND WHEREAS Council has not adopted any permanent policy regarding the prohibition of funding announcement in an election year;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That Members of Council be prohibited from making any funding announcements pertaining to expenditures from Land Dedication Reserve, Community Incentive Grants and Per Capita grants in the sixty (60) day period prior to the 2022 civic election;*

2. *That the Integrity Commissioner be directed to report back to Council through the Governance Committee of Council with amendments to the Members of Council Code of Conduct By-law 19/2018 to restrict funding announcements in an election year;*

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

Motion No. 7
Moved by His Worship Mayor Bowman,
Seconded by Councillor Rollins,

WHEREAS Winnipeg continues to face a global COVID-19 Pandemic and its challenges, such as the increased transmissibility of the Omicron variant;

AND WHEREAS the Chief Administrative Officer has advised the Public Service to avoid in-person meetings, but that where in-person meetings must occur, much like Council and Committee meetings, they are to remain masked for the duration of the meetings aside from actively drinking or eating;

AND WHEREAS consistent with that direction, City Clerks and those appearing in delegation have been advised to follow this same process;

AND WHEREAS direction has been consistent from health officials that wearing a mask, watching distance, limiting your contacts and getting vaccinated are fundamentals in keeping ourselves and one another safe.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a mask requirement while participating in meetings in the Council Chamber and Committee Rooms for all employees and elected officials be observed.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2ND AND 3RD READINGS

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law 122/2021 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Councillor Klein has been recorded in opposition. Thank you.

Clerk: By-law No. 122/2021.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that By-law No. 122/2021 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? There is Councillor Nason in opposition and? Councillor Klein. That is two. And Councillor Schreyer. So, that would be an automatic…it's just the three of you? Yes. So, the item carries. Now move on to by-laws, Mr. Mayor, for all three readings.

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 10/2022, By-law 11/2022, By-law 12/2022, By-law 13/2022.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 10/2022, By-law No. 11/2022, By-law No. 12/2022 and By-law No. 13/2022.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I move that By-laws No. 10/2022 to 13/2022, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 10/2022 to 13/2022, both inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 10/2022 to 13/2022, 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 is carried. We will now have question period under this committee. Any questions for the Mayor? Councillor Gillingham.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. Yeah, one question to you, Madam Speaker, to the Mayor. Of course, COVID-19 continues to impact transit ridership, and therefore reducing transit revenues. Excuse me, yesterday the Federation of Canadian Municipalities issued a press release calling upon the federal and provincial governments to provide transit funding to help offset losses related to the pandemic. That it was Big City Mayors' Caucus, whose cities, ours included, is most impacted by the reduction of transit revenues. Can the mayor provide council with information on what conversations he is having with the federal provincial governments to provide transit funding to Winnipeg to assist us in this really unique and really challenging situation as the pandemic continues to impact transit revenues?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Through you, I want to thank our Finance Chair for not only his question but also his ongoing leadership to protect and defend Winnipeg Transit. Public transportation is a major component in our battle against climate change. And it is one that I am grateful for the work of all members of council to support transit. Of course, it takes dollars and it takes budgets to do so. And so, the advocacy of the Big City Mayors' Caucus in particular has been ongoing notably at the federal level. We had opportunities this last year to have direct dialogue with the Prime Minister of Canada as well as respective ministers. That dialogue is ongoing. More recently, I continued that dialogue with local members of parliament. And yesterday's joint press release by Canada's Big City Mayors' was to press the emergency button on public transit as the pandemic stretches on, we know that our revenues at the fare box are much less than they would normally be. And so, we are urgently renewing our call to the federal government in partnership with provinces including the Manitoba government to help assist with covering the 2022 transit operating shortfalls. We know they are significant that was reflected in the dialogue and the difficult decisions that council has to make in most recent balance budget update. Councillor Matt Allard, I mentioned our finance chair but our IRPW chair has unwavering in support public transit as our other members of council. And I wanted to thank him for his leadership as well. At the provincial level, we have a lot of

work to do. My dialogue is ongoing with the provincial government. I am anticipating a meeting with the new Minister of Municipal Relations in the coming weeks. And one of the items that I will be prioritizing in the meeting is with respect to transit. Public transit dollars need to be shown. We need the support of our provincial partners in addition to our federal partners. And one of the things that is a policy of this council and I will be underscoring both privately and publicly as I am doing right now is the need for the restoration of the 50/50 transit cost sharing arrangement that was unilateral canceled by the provincial government. Since 2017 when the Province of Manitoba removed the 50/50 transit cost sharing agreement, the City of Winnipeg and Winnipeg Transit has lost grants in excess of 40 million dollars that we would have otherwise been able to benefit by our provincial partners. Winnipeg Transit is important for climate change. It is going to be important for the economic recovery and it is how we meet the STGS that are embedded in our Winnipeg. So, you build a city through a modernized public transit. So, while we continue to advocate for the approval of our ICIP request so that we can begin with more than 500 million dollars in combined financial support to help implement the transit master plan. We also have an operating issue with the pandemic going on as long as it is. That is why it is important to do our part to try to get the other side of the pandemic. But in the meantime, I will continue to advocate at the Big City Mayor's table directly with federal officials and closer to home with our provincial government for the immediate restoration of the 50/50 transit cost sharing agreement. Just to put that 40 million dollars in perspective, that would be and I am not suggesting that we do this. But just to put those dollars in excessive 40 million that would amount to a 6% property tax increase. These are real dollars that affecting municipality and we have increased our subsidy, our mill rate support significantly for Winnipeg Transit to keep the buses rolling, to help keep our essential workers going, our hospitals, and other locations throughout our city during the pandemic even though our transit ridership is down. It is the right thing to do to keep the city moving. It is also the right thing to do for public transit. Because we know that there will be implications long-term from the pandemic with respect to public transit. And I know that I speak for all members of council when I say that Winnipeg Transit matters. And for that reason, the call was put out federally and I will continue to advocate locally to our provincial government, our new Premier for the restoration of the 50/50 transit cost sharing arrangement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any other questions? Seeing none, let's move on, the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor…Councillor Gilroy, I understand you will be declaring a conflict on Item 1. So, if we can…Item 11, pardon me. So, if we can deal with that item first, perhaps.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED JANUARY 17, 2022

Councillor Gilroy: I will just stop my video.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Sorry, Madam Speaker, is this PP&D?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Schreyer: I believe Councillor Eadie wanted to stand one down.

Madam Speaker: Yes, I will get to that. Thank you. So, Councillor Gilroy has declared a conflict on Item 11. We're going to deal with that first. Mr. Clerk, who would be moving that on behalf of…Councillor Eadie?

City Clerk: Per the committee, Councillor Klein agreed to move it.

Madam Speaker: Yes, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Is the Clerk about to read the name on the report?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: I'd just like to know which report.

Madam Speaker: Item 11, Madam Clerk.

Item 11 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 376, 382, 386 and 388 Young Street – DASZ 43/2021

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein, are you moving that on behalf of…

Councillor Klein: Yes, Madam Speaker. Yes, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein moves Item 11. All in favour?

Councillor Rollins: Sorry, on the item, Madam Speaker, I got the name of the chief wrong. And so, I just want to acknowledge that and see if I can correct it. And it's in the meeting of the…it's in the…in the…

Madam Speaker: I was in midway through calling of the vote.

Councillor Rollins: I know, and I am sorry, Madam Speaker, but I don't think you can hear me with my mask on. I apologize. I will try to speak up.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, I need a break from this mask for a moment myself.

Councillor Rollins: Yeah, I apologize. It is really just to correct…

Madam Speaker: Okay. Given that reason, I will allow it to be stood down. Councillor Klein can introduce the item.

Councillor Klein: To introduce the…so, I want to stand down Item 11 and I would just call for the vote.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, you've stood down…

Councillor Schreyer: Are we standing down right now, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes, there are speakers for this item and I am taking a speakers list. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Schreyer: No. 9?

Madam Speaker: We are on 11. Councillor Rollins, to speak to Item 11.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I do really appreciate this. It's also a matter of protocol. I did have a relationship with the former chief of Opaskwayak Cree Nation. Chief Valentine, however, was elected in 2021. And so, it is a matter of protocol that I think it should be corrected. It would read the same way in terms of the original motion that was passed at committee. It's a small editorial change. So, if it doesn't matter, I would like to reflect that change or note that change in the original rationale that I supported the motion.

Councillor Klein: Form if we're suggesting a change?

Madam Speaker: I haven't heard that just yet. Councillor Rollins, continue.

Councillor Klein: Yeah, I'm sorry if I misunderstood. I can't hear. It is muffled. So, I wasn't sure.

Councillor Rollins: Yes. Thank you, Councillor Klein. It is…it is just a matter of fact who is the chief of the Opaskwayak Cree Nation right now. And I mistakenly noted a different chief when I originally moved the motion. So, I'll let you confer with Clerks, Madam Speaker, but I wanted to note that change. It doesn't…it doesn't change the thrust of the arguments I made at the time with respect to moving the motion and my full support for the housing project and the City's role in that. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Your…what you have said today will be on the public…public record, certainly. Other than that, written motions are required. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Do need a little bit of clarity on the…which reports were pulled?

Madam Speaker: Nothing yet, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Okay, thank you.

Madam Speaker: We are dealing with Item 11. We're dealing with Item 11, I've said it a few times because Councillor Rollins has declared a conflict. She is the Chair of this committee, so it would make sense. Councillor Gilroy has declared a conflict, so we are dealing with that item first.

Councillor Klein: I'm sorry, I just wanted to make sure I heard it correctly.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Okay. So, we're dealing with Item 11 and then we will go back to see if any items are going to be pulled.

Councillor Rollins: I have understood through my colleague Councillor Mayes, Madam Speaker, that a point of order is in order. It doesn't require a motion when it is an editorial change. So, I just want to seek clarification. And there is precedent, apparently, of doing just this, changing the name of a person. And so, I will lean on my councillor colleague, Councillor Mayeswho, in fact, informed me that this was a point of order.

Madam Speaker: I will have the Clerk respond. I've never come across that. If you need a minute, Mr. Clerk or if you can respond now.

City Clerk: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Any changes to the report would be required to be in writing. Certainly, as you mentioned, the comments from the councillor will be on the public record as well as the public recording.

Madam Speaker: Great. Thank you. Where were we? The next speaker? Any speakers…further speakers? Seeing none.

Councillor Mayes: Trying to clarify that exchange I had with Councillor Rollins. My understanding is, there is a point of order where you can correct misstatements, factual misstatements on the record. Usually…and when I did this in the past, there was adversarial. Someone got up and claimed they'd never voted for a tax increase and they had. They had voted for a budget in 20…the year is irrelevant. Here, this is Councillor Rollins trying to correct her own factual misstatement, but it's in a recommend…it's not…it's not part of the actual motion. I don't think. I think it's in the supporting recommendations.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, she did make the correction and it's on the public verbal record which will show in Hansard. That is my understanding, but we can certainly talk offline if we're missing something. But I do take the lead from our Clerk on this one. Councillor Klein, to close.

Councillor Klein: Just call the vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of Item 11? Contrary? That is carried. Yeah. Councillor Gilroy, you are back. Thank you. And if you would like to introduce your committee.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. And sorry everybody for the…for a little bit of confusion on that one. So, I would like to advise that the Item 1 has been laid over for 30-days. And I'd like to introduce the report…sorry, my phone. Introduce the report and move adoption of consent of agenda.

Madam Speaker: Okay, 4 will be pulled, there are…there's amending motion. Any others? Councillor Eadie, 8 – Transformative Fund, 9 – John Blumberg Golf Course. Councillor Mayes, 7 – Bird Friendly Urban Design. Councillor Orlikow, 12 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 514 Wellington. Any others? Seeing none, I will call the question on 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10. And that is it. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Item 4 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 307 and 311 Grassie Boulevard – DASZ 31/2021

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Madam Clerk. Okay, we have Motion 4 that the mover, Councillor Lukes and Councillor Gilroy, you agree to rescinding that? Yes.

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

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That Item 4 of the Report of Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated January 17, 2022 and amending Motion 3 moved by Councillor Nason and seconded by Councillor Klein, be referred back the East Kildonan Transcona Community Committee to reopen public representations on the item.*

2. *That all costs associated with the reopening of the public hearing including posting and advertising be absorbed by the Planning Property and Development Department.*

Councillor Lukes: Yes.

Madam Speaker: We have Motion 3 before us. Moved by Councillor Nason and seconded by Councillor Klein. Okay, so we'll be dealing with that. And that's it. Councillor…and we'll just vote on the rescinding that motion. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Councillor Gilroy, to introduce Item 4.

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

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 4 of the Report of Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated January 17, 2022 be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendation 1.A.i.a in its entirety.*

- *In Recommendation 1.A.i.b, delete clause 11) in its entirety.*

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Just one moment. Yes.

Councillor Orlikow: Are we…isn't Motion No. 4 kind of off the table now that Motion No. 6 is here?

Madam Speaker: That's right. Motion No. 4 is off, which we just rescinded and it's no…

Councillor Orlikow: So, No. 3 is the same thing? Isn't…No. 3 would be off.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, you know, we have to rescind No. 3 as well. Thank you for that. Yeah, lot of paper here today. Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein, you wanted Motion No. 3 rescinded? If I can just see your concurrence on that.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, I'm somewhat confused because Item 6 seems to refer to Item 3 or Motion 3. So?

Madam Speaker: Yeah, Motion 3, you have it in front of you. Do you wish to rescind that motion because you have a different motion, which is in order, Motion 6?

Councillor Nason: Understanding, but I need to seek clarification from the Clerks because, as I mentioned, Item 6 makes reference to Motion 3.

Madam Speaker: It's…okay, yes, I see that in the body, Mr. Clerk. It says it's amending Motion 3. So, we would leave Motion 3 as well?

Councillor Nason: And refer both items if successful and amended, I believe, if I understand correctly.

Councillor Orlikow: Wouldn't it be an automatic referral with no instruction? No. 6; would that not be the proper way to go through this process?

Madam Speaker: I'm going to ask the Clerk here. We are rescinding 4, we've established that. Mr. Clerk, on the others. Hands down, please. Let's hear from our Clerk right now.

City Clerk: Thank you, Madam Speaker. These are amending motions. They're certainly not automatic referral. Item…Motion No. 4 has been rescinded. Motion No. 6 does refer to Motion No. 3, so we would have to amend Motion No. 6 should Motion No. 3 be rescinded by the mover.

Madam Speaker: Well, motion number…yeah, 6 probably needs to be recirculated I'm thinking. Okay.

City Clerk: Yes, correct, Madam Speaker. Yes, if Motion No. 3 is rescinded.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, I think there was a typing error earlier, perhaps. So, do you wish to have Motion No. 3 rescinded yourself because you are on the motion as well? So, Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein, do you wish to have Motion No. 3 rescinded?

Councillor Klein: Sure.

Madam Speaker: And we can just clean up, Mr. Clerk, Motion 6 and recirculate it because it should not be referring to Motion 3. There's no need.

Councillor Nason: I would indicate that we don't have a valid motion if we don't have one in writing at this point. Would that not be accurate, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: I'm sorry, can you restate that? I was having some trouble hearing you.

Councillor Nason: Well, I have difficulty rescinding a motion if I don't have a valid motion to refer to. As noted as Item 6 needs to be recirculated.

Councillor Klein: Madam Speaker, can I request a five-minute recess to clean this up and then we can come back and regroup?

Madam Speaker: I want to take Councillor Eadie's question first. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Actually, it's a point of privilege for the member of Council who can't look at this and see what the heck you are talking about. Is…what is…and I hadn't had an opportunity to read my e-mail. Motion 6, could you please read it so I can figure out what is going on?

Madam Speaker: Yeah, okay, I appreciate that, Councillor Eadie. I will call for a short recess for that very point so this can be cleaned up and we can read the proper motion into the record. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
January 27, 2022, at 2:51 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I am reconvening our Council meeting of January 27th, 2022 after a short recess. We are on Item 4 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 307 and 311 Grassie Boulevard. We're just sorting out these motions here. I have Motion 3; moved by Councillor Nason and seconded by Councillor Klein. I believe that's going to be rescinded. Can I hear your concurrence?

Councillor Nason: Yes.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Motion 6; moved by Councillor Klein and seconded by Councillor Nason. I believe that's being rescinded. Can I hear your concurrence?

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

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That Item 4 of the Report of Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated January 17, 2022 and amending Motion 3 moved by Councillor Nason and seconded by Councillor Klein, be referred back the East Kildonan Transcona Community Committee to reopen public representations on the item.*

2. That all costs associated with the reopening of the public hearing including posting and advertising be absorbed by the Planning Property and Development Department.

Councillor Nason: Yes.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Item 8 is the new motion. Madam Clerk, if you would read that into the record, please.

Motion No. 8
Moved by Councillor Klein,
Seconded by Councillor Nason,

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That Item 4 of the Report of Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated January 17, 2022, be referred back to the East Kildonan Transcona Community Committee to reopen public representations on the item.

2. That all costs associated with the reopening of the public hearing including posting and advertising be absorbed by the Planning Property and Development Department.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy, your opportunity to speak to the item and the amending Motion 8.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This item is a subdivision and rezoning for a residential multi-family-medium which is 72-units. This item has been laid over a couple times. And I know that there's been lots of delegations in regards to this item. The amending…for the amending motion, I would support Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein's amending motion to have it go back to community committee for further review. I would prefer that than making some changes at the last minute and that's dealing with it at Council. I'd rather that go through the community committee process so we can have…hear from our administration on this item. So, I would support the amending motion that's in front of us here today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Councillor Klein, your opportunity to speak to the main item and amending Motion 8 that you've moved.

Councillor Klein: Item No. 8, I will just…like to hear from some of my colleagues. But I will say, for those of you that didn't like the concept of a planning commission, here we are. So, I will allow others to speak and then…and close. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to correct, you know, or clarify the mention of the layover a couple times. It was laid over once because signs were not picked up in a timely matter to properly advertise. Then it was further laid over for consultation with the Public Service to try to find answers to a very complicated traffic concern that was in the area. The challenge that I have and the challenge that I have with this motion, even though I am the seconder of it, that I do find the process was done properly and considered seriously. The challenge that I have is that I made calculation in discussion with the Public Service to open a route in a neighborhood that, subsequent to that time, the Public Service has made changes in the area that I think have positively improved the situation on the direct route in front of the property. There is an expense to going back and I see at this motion is that it's going to be borne by the Property, Planning and Development Department, but there's also the expense of time to the applicant. Expense of time to those that will have to take time away from their work to appear at the hearing. To sit on Zoom calls all day, come downtown, pay for parking all day for this hearing. We as a public body have hearings. And once public representation has been closed, members of the hearing body and members of the approving authority must not receive or consider any new information outside of the public hearing process. It is stated that this is to ensure that the interested parties have an equal opportunity to hear and respond to representations. I guess this referral back to community committee will do that. But you have to ask, why are we going back? The councillor who made the motion to move the motion to impact the change on the area thought closely and wholeheartedly that there's been sufficient change in the area plus overlook one little matter of Devonshire West being open. Put forward a motion that have now removed. But it…there was comments in the planning approach and I know Councillor Klein mentioned about, you know, the planning authority and the Province, how great and wonderful it will be to remove from that. I can tell you by the stress that I am under, 100% bring it on. Take this stuff away from us. Let the Province decide. Apparently, they are an independent body. We are in the pocket of developers. You know, that slander has been thrown out probably at many of us. All representations verbal or written become part of the public record. Submissions from a hearing body must be received prior to or during a hearing. It cannot be made following

the conclusion of public representations. I don't know if we are adhering to that with this. I did submit and circulate to my council colleagues after working with the Clerks yesterday my amending motion that apparently gave whole to a motion that was rescinded just prior to this by two councillors that, you know, wants to throw this back to the community. I am not sure if the hearing that we had was not long enough, but there certainly was several points of discussion with regards to (inaudible) that was mentioned through there along with, I believe, very specifically mention of having an opening on (inaudible). The matter will cause delay, and I think it is untoward. I am not comfortable with this, but I am seconding Councillor Klein's motion as it is in my ward and I am on the body that would be hearing it. I don't wholeheartedly support this motion though. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I rise. I am quite concerned about what I have heard today, Madam Speaker. And you know, I've…you know, I have been on Council now, this is going on my 12th year, you as well, Madam Speaker. When it comes to these subdivision applications and building density, we all know that there's people opposed, people who are for it, and there's all these issues. So, I am actually, just going to…like, if I was on the hearing body, Madam Speaker, and I look across the city, there are medium density and high density, residentials, Madam Speaker, where you have to get off the street, off of a 60 mile per hour street, and pull into your driveway, into your parking lot so can go home to your apartment block or to visit your friends, what have you, Madam Speaker. So, this thing went through a fair hearing process because it had to be corrected a couple of times because it wasn't done…notice…notification properly and so on. And there's been many, many applications. Now, because somebody decided that they want to believe that...and we hear this all the time from people who lose in hearings, that they see that they lose, that it was an unfair process. And we've put in place and they are in place, fair processes as recommended by Clerks and P&D and all the work we did that you set up these hearings. So now what happens, Madam Speaker? Somebody decides they don't know the area. I know Grassie really well, Madam Speaker, very well. And you know, there is issues because, for many years, it's a street that has had...it's basically almost like a highway because there isn't a lot of development along it. But a lot has developed on that road over the last four years, even five, Madam Speaker, and medium density is warranted here, but it going back to a hearing…so, we have one issue that is of the utmost concern, Madam Speaker. And after hearing it, and then really looking at the situation, the councillor in the area, and EKT essentially, but the councillor who's under pressure, but you know, I've been under huge pressure, too, and you have to live with it. I don't support a planning commission because it's just going to bring in a whole host of other problems that you as councillors aren't going to like. Aren't going to like because you won't have any say. And when you go to appear to the planning commission, they'll basically ignore you. That's what will happen. Now, Councillor Nason has provided the alternative to deal with this situation, and now I'm hearing that Council...I'm going to…I'm going to reluctantly support it, too, because I think…I think the attitude, Madam Speaker...actually, I shouldn't say why people are voting. Sorry, I don't want to be out of order. But ultimately, Madam Speaker, this has been looked at very seriously. The complaints have come to all of us by e-mail. I haven't responded to any of those people because we're not supposed to. So, I don't understand why anybody's messing around with this. The traffic situation is most understood by the councillor for the area, you have to respect that. And I know in the past we have other councillors here, I actually voted with them because I think they were right, but sometimes I voted against them because I thought they were wrong on zoning requirements. But I didn't go, like, send it back for hearings and this whole rigamarole. I think it's a waste of time, Madam Speaker. The resolution was in Motion 3, which got rescinded. It was appropriate, it was the best thing to do. And there will be continuous looks at our various traffic situations in the councillor's area. Like he said, some things have been resolved already, Madam Speaker. But essentially, you know, I guess I'm going to have to vote for this. I just…you know, anyway, I don't...anyway, Madam Speaker, I'll vote for referring it back to a hearing, but what a waste, what a waste. Just because one councillor thinks some violation happened.

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

Councillor Allard: Yes, perhaps the movers can clarify; but I'm concerned about the wording of the costs, including posting and advertising. I heard Councillor Nason talk about people's time, parking, I'm thinking about architecture fees. I'd like clarification on what including the cost of posting means in terms of what…what are we actually committing to in terms of dollars if we support this motion with that part of it? So, that's basically a question and my comments. I'm leaning on…I'm leaning with voting no if I can't get any…if I can't get clarification on that because words like 'including' don't limit the number of things that you can actually add after that, so. Those are my concerns.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Orlikow, followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And again, I'll accept that I may be wrong, and then the closers will have an opportunity to clarify for me. So, generally, what I'm seeing here today is that there is a request to go back to reopen the whole public hearing, not on the subdivision or rezoning, but on the private access…the private approaches under the guise that somehow there actually is a public debate about private approaches, which is not actually accurate because things like apartments and condos, have a…they're actually, to clarify, as non-residential. And then in our private

approach by-law that we just did, (inaudible) from my next…my next discussion, Public Works and/or the director will do that in a separate process, and they'll…that won't be...it isn't part of a land development planning process. Again, I know it sounds strange, but it isn't. So, if we're sending this back about private approaches, there actually…it even says that on page two, I think, the public…department advised, private approaches require a separate application to their department. And so, if this is about a private approach, the public hearing process and the land development process doesn't include private approaches as part of that bundle. I think that's terribly wrong. I do believe it should…they should. Again, people have talked about land planning commission, well, this is kind of that model where they've taken any ideas about private approaches for apartments and condos, and actually removed that from the (inaudible) and my understanding, I had quite a few chats and I never really got clear understanding. But private approaches aren't part of the applications. They're now separated out and that will be done at a later time. So, if this requirement to send it back is really due to the private approaches, which I believe it is. I've heard nothing about rezoning or subdivision, then you know, that's not going to really adhere to anything. Because again, that preview, and we did it as a Council, private approaches are under the previews for condos and apartments. It's not a preview for Public Works and/or the director. So really, what should happen today is if the councillor is so concerned about this, he should vote no to the application. And that's the cleanest, simplest way to do it. I know somebody else maybe later on who will be doing that, but that's what it is, to ask Council here to know what a private approach is, that's very difficult, and the impacts it does just last minute. So, I do understand going back, but again, it's not germane to the public hearing process. Public approaches aren't…we removed that out under 2021. So, while I understand and I commiserate with the councillor, you're at the point now in the day or the process or the cycle where you're either in or you're out. But to go back and open up a public hearing on rezoning and subdivision, if there was an issue there, something's potentially wrong there, I understand, but what I've heard today, it's about a private approach and how it's configured. So, to me, that is not germane to the public hearing process. I know, and I'll get to that later on this afternoon. So, for that reason, unless I hear something different, that it's more than just a private approach, I think the cleanest way and if there is that much concern for the area councillor, he should just vote against the whole application.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah. Number one, I think Councillor Klein got off the best line of the day in terms of, yeah, this probably does speak to the need for a planning commission. Number two, in response to Councillor Allard's concern, which is not a bad point to raise about the costs, I would just say, one of these many motions that floated around here was from Councillor Lukes and Councillor Gilroy. Councillor Gilroy is the Chair of the committee, she was prepared for a long and second Councillor Lukes' motion about the costs being absorbed by the civil service. So, if your vote's hinging on that, I guess I would just point out, I think in this matter, Councillor Gilroy was prepared to send it back with the costs being absorbed. So frankly, I'd have voted…number three, I'd have voted for the area councillor's amendments. There maybe wasn't enough support for that. So, I'm supportive sending it back, give the area councillor a chance to see if he can work something out on this. Ultimately, this process, that there has to be a reason why these things roll up from the community committee to the Planning Committee to the Executive Committee to Council. There has to be some ability to amend, to change these things, otherwise, why are we here? Why are we dealing with this? We could be…we could be doing budgets, we could be doing other matters. So, it's a very awkward process with people e-mailing you and you can't read their e-mails, all of this. So, yeah, let's send it back is my thinking. We'll let the area councillor try and work something out. The others on the community committee may have no desire to keep hearing this, I wouldn't blame them, but hopefully, something can be worked out on this traffic issue and we never have to deal with this again. But I mean, there has to be some ability to move these things around. Otherwise, why have…why have four votes on them between the...if it's all supposed to be about local control, we just have them die at the community committee or be approved, but we don't. We have them go on this month-long voyage and then the admin can speak to it, but the public can't, so I'll support the compromise motion here to send it back to community committee.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This issue has certainly gotten more complicated than I thought it would be, but I've been following along on this one because I'm on that community committee, and it's right across the street from where I just had an issue that had some conflict within the community. In this case, a few things just to say for the record. Look, I understand how Councillor Nason feels. He's talked about, let there be a planning commission already. But you know, I'd have say, and I know I'm not the only councillor, this is probably the…this is the…sometimes the worst part of the job, these development hearings and the appeals. And for good reason, it's pitting, you know, neighbor against neighbor, and also, it is the time, when on occasion, something will be heard like Councillor Nason's and the pocket of the developer, which is unfair. Having said that, Councillor Nason made the point; well, just give it to the top planning…planning commission already. Look, we're all human beings. We are all political animals. At least when it comes to someone like Councillor Nason, there's an element of accountability and care, including, you know, he'll make a decision despite how he's going to get attacked on it, but at least there's even accountability in terms of his response to that. I don't know if it would be any better if we had a planning commission. How would it be easier on the planning commissioners? So, there's the question. If Councillor Nason was a member of the planning commission, how would he feel? In this case,

it's different. We are elected, and we are judged, and we can lose elections over this. And so, yes, it is hard. Having said that, I don't see a better way. Sometimes yes, I feel just give it to another board. And yet, do I feel that that would offer enough accountability when I will say for the record we have a lack of accountability as it is at city hall. And sometimes the one...you have at least…not one line of accountability being the elected city councillors on these issues. So, I'm going to leave it at that. I wish I could respond to and solve this issue to the questions of Councillor Allard. But I can't, but nonetheless, I will continue to vote with the local council on this one. Thank you.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I guess this is a…it would be probably a point of order. I'm wondering what would be the process if we were to refer it back to community committee without having to re-advertise, without having to re-open the public hearing. My point being, I do believe that we should hear from our Public Service before we go and make any changes to what was recommended at that time. I don't think the public's comments and concerns regarding the traffic issues of this proposed project would change with a new public hearing. So, I preface...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty, thank you. The question was, I believe, we do need to open up representations, and the motion, as it's written, is in order, and that is the path forward. Representations would have to be opened, and I see the Clerk nodding. If you wanted to add anything, Mr. Clerk.

Councillor Gilroy: Point of order.

Madam Speaker: If I could let him respond first, Councillor Gilroy.

City Clerk: Thank you, Madam Speaker. No, you are correct. There is no way to refer the matter back to community committee without reopening the public hearing and re-advertising (inaudible) public delegations.

Councillor Gilroy: Just a question, Madam Clerk, if it was to be moved to standing policy committee, though, then it wouldn't have to open a new public hearing. It would be the same public hearing, and we would be able to ask administration questions. Am I correct in that, Madam Clerk...I'm sorry, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes, so, Mr. Clerk, is it possible to move the item and open up public representations or not to the standing policy committee?

City Clerk: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, the matter could be referred back to standing policy committee. However, your ability to do anything at that place is limited. All you could be doing is asking clarification of the Public Service. The hearing is closed.

Madam Speaker: There wouldn't be any new information?

City Clerk: No new information, no new delegations. Nothing of that sort.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Any further questions? Seeing none, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Would there be the…and again, I shouldn't even ask. Would there be the option, just referring the public, private approaches to Public Works? Not re-opening everything, just moving…because it sounds…no? Well, I think I need explanation why because the community committee or the planning committee don't…they don't have any say on the public, private approaches, so it's not part of the land development process.

Madam Speaker: We're getting into a lot of questions here that are for PP&D staff. And so, let's deal with the motion that's before us. Are there any further speakers? Councillor Browaty, is that all you had or did you want to use your speaking time? You're good. Councillor Lukes, onto you.

Councillor Lukes: Yes, thank you very much. This came through standing policy committee and then EPC and then today, we were made aware that the area councillor wanted to make changes. And I just wanted to hear from the Public Service what their opinion was on the changes. So, to Councillor Gilroy's point, I don't know if it can go back to SPC so we hear the Public Service's comments. I want to respect what the area councillor is wanting, but I already voted on…I already voted on it, and now changes were being requested and I wanted to hear what the Public Service was going to say. So, I don't know if it could go back to standing policy committee, as Councillor Gilroy had mentioned or, I guess…

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Next speaker is Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. And similar to following up on Councillor Lukes' question and others questions, my question is, if it could go back...I guess we're looking for process…it's a process question. If it could go back to standing committee, at the standing committee, obviously, information could be provided by the Public Service in response to questions, but can any potential amendments or changes be made by committee members at that point? It's one thing to ask questions, but can…based upon those questions, any amendments, changes be made to what is before us now?

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Gillingham, for your remarks. And just want to remind everyone, you can certainly frame things as a question, but this is not question period, we do have a motion before us. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Klein, do you wish to close?

Councillor Klein: Madam Speaker, I think we've heard many comments and suggestions on this. And we know, as Councillor Mayes pointed out, that Councillor Lukes and Gilroy have moved almost the exact same motion previously. But I am happy to change the motion and refer it to PP&D, but you know, this is happening because of others. This is happening because there was a lack of collaboration. There was just people opposed to or not sure what the area councillor was doing. And I've been told, oh, I don't know how many times, multiple times, that our job is to, you know, think about our ward and about the city, but most of the time, and I've heard it from many members of…that have been on Council for several years, that we support an area councillor's decision, that we respect an area councillor's decision. So, I'm happy to move it to PP&D. I am working with a colleague to try and have this understood. But listen, the simple answer is, you can vote no to the amending motion, and then you can vote yes or no to the motion for the development. Either way, I think we've spent a lot of time on this issue and we need to move on, and once again, use this as a learning opportunity, a teaching moment, that a planning commission is the right way to go.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. First and foremost, this is our job. We don't have a planning committee. This is our job right now. With the scenario that I have in front of me, there are sometimes, you know, things come through, and they're a vote, and they're an easy one. This is a difficult one. There was a request from the area councillor to make some changes. I know there's some issues within the area, so that's why I think I am supporting the area councillor by moving it…moving it back. And just so I can have some clarity, Madam Clerk, on this, did Councillor Klein move it to SPC or is it still going…moving to community committee? I'm just not sure if there was a (inaudible).

Madam Speaker: The motion is in order the way it's written. It's on the floor. Okay. Seeing no further…

Councillor Gilroy: No, I'm not done. But yeah, so, I would have preferred it going back to the standing policy committee because I think we could have had those discussions without opening the public hearing up and then taking a little bit longer. But I do think that this is an important one because there are some other issues when looking…when raising kind of a red flag with the administration. I came back with a lot more questions than I had answers, so that's why I am supporting this, moving back through community committee, and up through our process. I think that, you know, sometimes we want to make sure that we get these right, and these are one of these moments. There are times that we have to do this at Council, and this is one of them. This is our role, this is our responsibility, we have tough jobs, and I think that we should be taking this seriously. And we don't need a planning committee. This is our job. And as the area councillor, I do respect that he has some thoughts on this and I think that there's further discussion that needs to be had. So, that's why I'm supporting him and the amending motion here today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, if I could just ask…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, there's no more speaking time. That was the…

Councillor Nason: I was going to ask for a five-minute recess. Just…we're hearing an opportunity for a friendly amendment. I just wonder if there's the will of the committee to just stand down for five minutes.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, yeah, it's…the motion is in order, it's time to vote on it because we're sending…setting precedent to stop the meeting. We did a recess earlier, so I'm unfortunately going to have to call the question now on the motion as written. Okay. So, Motion 8, we'll vote on the amending Motion 8. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Nason, Browaty, Gillingham, Allard and Santos

City Clerk: The vote, Madam Speaker, Yeas 16, Nays 0, the item is referred back to community…

Madam Speaker: We'll…do we need to vote on the item as amended?

City Clerk: Apologies, Madam Speaker, the vote is Yeas 11, Nays 5. The item is referred back to community committee.

Madam Speaker: Community committee, that's correct. Okay. Moving onto the next item, Madam Clerk.

Item 7 – Bird-Friendly Urban Design Guidelines

Councillor Gilroy: Madam Speaker, I'll wait to hear from my councillor colleagues on this item. Whoever stood it down.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, I'll try and pick up the pace here. Just…probably should have pulled it at EPC, pull it here. My notes say, fan letter to Karin Kliewer. Karin Kliewer…I may not get along with everyone in the Planning Department, but there are some really terrific planners. Karin Kliewer is our person on the Food Council, one of the people who helped get Food Council started. Also does other work in the Planning Department. So, this is actually a pretty report and has some climate (inaudible) climate change, but fits into our Climate Action Plan in terms of biodiversity. So, it's a good report. It's moving us forward in keeping with what other cities are doing. So, I can't mention…I have no mentions to the shrikes who soaked up a fair bit of discussion time around Blumberg, that's still to come, but it's a good initiative, and hats off to Ms. Kliewer for helping get this done.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker on this item? Seeing no further speakers, Councillor Gilroy, back to you. Councillor Allard, have you raised your hand?

Councillor Allard: I think so.

Madam Speaker: Okay. It's…sorry, your screen, it's difficult to see. Go ahead. It's the sunshine.

Councillor Allard: I want to say, I'm supportive. And my mother who is a conservationist would be very happy to hear that we're doing this. And those are…those are the extent of my comments. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Back to you, Councillor Gilroy, to close.

Councillor Gilroy: You could call the question.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour of Item 7? Contrary? That's carried. Tweak…tweet? Madam Clerk, next item.

Item 8 – Transformative Reserve Fund Policy

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy, to introduce Item 8.

Councillor Gilroy: I'll hear my councillor colleagues out on this one.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to this report. Debate is limited actually, Madam Speaker, because of the order of the agenda, but...so, I'll try to stay within order and speak to why I don't support this transformative fund. It had lofty ideas when it was moved in the beginning. And the concept was, yeah, I heard somebody

mention something about an estimated $100 million when they were talking about the net…the following report. This transformative fund, Madam Speaker, the concept is to sell off...you know, take one sale out of the picture and look at what's the potential for this transformative fund. Not to mention, and I hope my colleague, Councillor Santos will speak to how it changed and it doesn't meet what its intention originally was. But I want to speak to, Madam Speaker, I looked at the policy and there was a number of changes. I sent an e-mail to, I think, all my colleagues on it or at least for sure to the Property, Development and Planning Committee. It's unfortunate that some members of that committee didn't read it, but not…anyway, I don't want to say who, Madam Speaker. But you know, essentially, the problem is, $1 leases or, you know, a lower lease cost for a seniors group or a daycare and so on, and there's a number of those in my ward. There's a number in other peoples' wards. There's community renewal corporations and different other things, mostly sort of in the inner-city area where we have all these older buildings. A lot of the City's buildings that are outside...well, actually, we've had a sale in the past that sort of got rid of a senior's group in the past, and the point is, though, that property was sold to a private developer, Madam Speaker. So, what is the potential of a daycare or seniors' group to buy a building that does need repairs? And just think about this; so, there's one of these buildings over…over on Dufferin Avenue with a daycare in it and part of it is a seniors. And outside, there's actually some greenspace that I put money into on LDR because it's City-owned property, and the kids have a wonderful place to play and stuff, which is a City service greenspace, Madam Speaker. But I digress because what I'm trying to say is, is that if you want to sell those buildings, the reality is, the seniors' group and the daycares won't have the money to buy it, so a private developer is going to buy them. That's how the City is going to get some decent money. And then what are you doing? Even though you say we don't deliver daycare service, we don't deliver senior service unless...well, we do it in an offhand way because I know that Garden City Community Centre in your ward, Madam Speaker, for sure does provide some services for seniors at a funded, City-owned, but NGO governed community…governed by somebody else, but nevertheless, City-owned property. We're not talking about selling off community centres, are we? I don't think so. So, Madam Speaker, what happens is, they're going to be out on the street. There is a social good and importance to the city. What are these families going to do with their kids? What are the seniors going to do? You know, think about it, Madam Speaker. You know, the reason we have these buildings and we lease them out to these NGOs who actually raise money to do their own programming, we don't give them money for programming. Although, I give the odd Per Capita Grant to a seniors group, but most of those are going to seniors who are living in rent geared to income facilities in my ward, privately owned. But so, what is the ability for this fund to actually raise the kind of money needed to buy property? I heard a reference to some greenspace at 60G per acre probably being marketed to the private sector. As soon as the City starts saying they're going to buy land, Madam Speaker, what happens? I can tell you what happened for the Waverley underpass, cost us a half a million dollars an acre, Madam Speaker. Unserviceable land. That's what happens to the City. That's what happens to the City, Madam Speaker. So ultimately, this is a useless thing, and I don't like the policy that we're going to empower the Public Service to sell off these buildings. And ultimately, the first offer will go to the daycare and the senior, that's fine, but you know what, Madam Speaker? If they want to make any kind of money that's going to go into this fund, they'll have to sell it to the private sector. And then, what they'll do is, they'll hugely jack up the rents if they keep the building, but often, private developers want to build something new where they can make a lot more money, Madam Speaker. So, that's the reality. So, I can't support this. And I urge all of you, given how I think you're thinking on this other thing, you know, really, it had great ideals, it was very interesting, but it's not going to work, and I just think we should just…it's changed, too, and we should just vote it down. I hope my colleagues would agree with me. But anyway, I can't in good conscience vote against this because in order to actually make money selling these buildings and I haven't got a list of which ones they're going to try to sell either, so I have a big concern with that because all of these buildings are actually providing important services to the neighbourhoods in the Mynarski Ward.

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

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, during the meeting, I had…I was quite confused when this policy came forward. And I did support it at PP&D, but I had a caveat that I wanted to have an offline discussion with the public administration to get some further clarity on some of the wording that was used within the fund policy. And I didn't want to debate it online. And so, I thank the Public Service for meeting with me last week and getting some further clarification on some of the language that's used. And from my understanding and having discussions with the Public Service that this policy was going to be utilized to purchase new parkland or greenspaces. And so, like, I agree with that. I think, yes, we as a city need to purchase greenspaces and new parklands and, you know, and develop them. I think that's something that our city desires and needs wholeheartedly, and we're doing amazing work with OURS-Winnipeg to develop a pasture greenspace plan like we did the amendment during the Complete Communities discussion, but there was an aspect of this policy that simply stated in section 3.5, that the transformative fund, reserve fund, shall not be used for expenses related to capital improvements. So, I was really confused about that. I didn't understand what that meant. And it basically means you cannot use these funds to either A) do capital improvements on a parkland. Like, you can't. You can't upgrade the park by having new play structures or spray pads or any capital investments. So, that became, for me, as a challenge myself. And so, I had to go back and kind of recollect and remember what the discussion was when we were having this discussion during the multi-year budgeting process that it was my understanding that this reserve fund was supposed to support investment or reinvestment and transform, "transform" City of Winnipeg delivery of services and reduce the city's

infrastructure. And that's…that is defined in here. And when I advocated for the spray pad reinvestment strategy, I want to remind my City Council colleagues that on November 26th, 2020, we conclude…we concurred in the recommendation which supported funding future spray pads investments from the transformative fund. So, I asked the question of the public administration, in this policy, it specifically states you cannot use this fund related to capital improvements. So ergo, you cannot use it to fund spray pads. So, I know I supported it then. I got further clarity. You know, and with this specific issue, unfortunately, you know, when you have one policy that needs a fund, a transformative fund, and now, there's going to be no money in the transformative fund to fund spray pads, I am changing my original support for this transformative policy and will be voting against it. I don't think it's necessary anymore. Like Councillor Eadie had mentioned before, where how are the votes going to go for the next item, this fund may have actually no moneys in it. And...and to add, as well, I did confirm with the public administration the list of City assets and leased properties is going to be coming back to PP&D later on this year. So, you know, I don't think this is a dead conversation. I think we can have further dialogue with PP&D and the administration on how we're going to deal with these properties. I am a representative of the inner-city and I do have challenges myself. I have senior centres. I have daycares. I have non-profit organizations that are in leased buildings. I get it. And so, we…maybe we could have that dialogue further down the road at PP&D, but this transformative fund, I don't think is important. It's not necessary anymore, especially if the spray pads can't even be redeveloped with using this fund. So, I'll leave my comments. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'm not going to be supporting this motion today, and I'd like to share why. First of all, I want to thank my colleagues. We had a discussion about this; Councillor Eadie, Councillor Santos and others. And I truly enjoy hearing their perspective on it. And upon reflection, I do look at this as, really, smoke and mirrors if you will. This is a way to say that we can't add more greenspace because we don't have the money. And I really, truly believe that we need to find a better way to manage our funds and our budget. So, just simply selling off the assets owned by residents of Winnipeg, I don't see that as the appropriate approach at this time. So, I'm going to support my colleagues in opposing this motion.

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

Councillor Lukes: Okay. Just give me one minute. Sorry. I'm just going to pull the transformative fund up. Oh, dear, I've lost it now. I actually like this motion. I don't have it in front of me now. I actually like it. I see it as a way to purchase greenspace. I see it as a way, an avenue to create a fund that enables us to maybe at some point purchase the Lemay Forest or the Sumka lands or to purchase empty lots…or to purchase lots in the inner-city and make more park space. You know, the three items that it indicated that the funds would come from would be Blumberg, 30% of other golf courses. I'm not too sure that any funding will come out of those two options, but the surplus buildings and such that the City has, I really hope some funding's going to come out of that because the cost of maintaining so many of these facilities is, in my opinion, you know, long overdue that we remove some of them. Now, I know that's going to be a very contentious issue for councillors. I don't have any in my ward, so it's not really a concern of mine in the sense that, you know, I'm not going to be directly impacted with the sale of a building, but I just don't see how we're going to purchase pieces of land. I know when I was the councillor for the St. Norbert area and tried to find funding to purchase what's now called the Lemay Forest, there was none. There was just none. So, I actually really like the concept of the transformative fund the way it's set up now. I agree with Councillor Santos. It's completely changed from what it was set out to…you know or the intent or the discussion that it was set out to be, but where it's at now, I actually like it, so I'll be supporting it.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you. I'd rather wait. If someone else can clarify Councillor Santos' explanation. If anybody can, before I speak, explain her explanation of the evolution of this, I'd rather wait.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, I can go to Councillor Chambers and possibly come back to you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure, sure.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I stand in support of this item, the transformation fund. I think it was Joni Mitchell that sang, "We paved paradise and put in a parking lot." This is an opportunity to reverse that and get rid of the parking lot and create paradise. Again, if we're selling off our old buildings, City-owned old buildings, it's help…going to help reduce our infrastructure deficit as well, and take the City out of that, the millions of dollars that it costs on an annual basis to...or in terms of our infrastructure deficit, to maintain buildings that are considered surplus, that are old, that are aging, that again could be repurposed. Whether it's creating more greenspace or selling off those assets so that, again, we're not having to put money into them and they're not being used to their full…fullest potential. So, again, I do

support the transformative fund. I do think it's an opportunity for us to purchase greenspace. I've got two areas in my ward, as Councillor Lukes had indicated, Lemay Forest in St. Norbert and Sumka Forest that's in the old Vermette area that I see as opportunities for the City to capitalize. I know that there many, many groups in the city that are advocating for greenspace to continue. I recognize that the city of Winnipeg is low in terms of its greenspace allotment as compared to other North American cities and, certainly, European cities that value greenspace. So again, I am in support of this transformation fund, and hopefully, we can find and identify city infrastructure, more so municipal accommodations that are not being fully utilized to their fullest potential and potentially sell them off or as I said, turn them into paradise. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. Still reeling at the Grassie one a bit, so excuse my little bouncing back and forth a bit. The transformative fund; words matter. Transformative. So, when I first read it, I understand…I'm not sure where Councillor Santos had talked about it can't be used for capital. It can. It always has been the intent, it was for capital. But again, now they've narrowed it down to just parklands. Well, again, I don't intend to leave that forever, but again, I plan to try to get this transformative fund passed today and then at a later date, come forward to talk to Council about what I believe the transformative fund was for. What's for three main areas, which was the repurposing of wading pools to spray pads, that costs money. Not the spray pad itself, but to dig up that old wading pool and then put a garden in there or a mini dog park in there, that's going to require some funds. So, that's…but that's transforming a service. The other one we talked about is co-locating or having staff move from a building to another building. Well, to do that kind of co-locating, either staff and staff or third-party lease, third-party lease, that costs money. It's not going to be free, they're going to have to do some lease hold improvements and make that happen. The idea about removing greenspace, this one is accurate, and replacing it with greenspace, that was kind of the idea, however, I don't see it and I intend later on to remove the concept of residential development from the repurposing plan. It's just...it's not in the cards. People spoke very loudly and clearly on that matter. So, I agree, I don't think…but again, if we want to make a golf course into a forest or part of a golf course into a forest or a playground or something, that costs money. So, all these areas do cost some money. However, as been correctly noted today that there probably won't be any money, but this provides…this provides a shell going forward. So, how…because we're going to face this repeatedly over and over again. As we try to transform our services, we have to be very honest and say, that does…transformation and change costs money. It's not free. It's difficult and that's why the transformative fund was set up. Now, somewhere along the line, it moved over to, you know, let's just go buy two forests. I would love to go buy two forests, absolutely. Love to have a whole forest full of money trees, it would be fantastic. But again, that's just one of the ideas what I think should be in here. But at this point, at this juncture and this date, the bones of the transformation fund are fine. They talk…and again, it gets us to remember that change is difficult and change costs money. Now, some councillors will say, well, I am never, ever, ever going to sell a third-party leased building even though it costs us $500,000 a year just to maintain and keep. Well, that's fine. We'll have that discussion when the building review comes forward, and then maybe it's just City…City admin buildings holding, take out the third-party lease buildings. That may be something Council will decide at that time. I'm not opposed to that, either because we do need to look at moving forward. We need to be looking at how are we going to help Winnipeggers move forward. And the transformation fund, as Councillor Lukes has mentioned, is one of the first times I believe that this council's really stepping up to say okay, things are changing. We really got to figure out a way. You know, really, we could have done the LOR, Land Operating Reserve to buy a forest. We're not really…to me, that's where it comes from that…if want property to property. But again, they feel it's important to do that specifically for a tree canopy. You know, I personally would like to have just a canopy done, and maybe buying a forest is good too, but what options do we have going forward? This is a little limited in its scope, but my intent would be, again, I want to see where this is going first because if it doesn't pass at all, then there's really no point. But the intent would be at a later date to add in some of those other transformational service ideas that we had. Again, we're still going to need to find the money, however, and I know we can say, well, there's no money, so this is a sham or whatever. No, it's a structure that reminds us that it's going to be difficult, we're going to have to find some ways to fund this. Maybe it will be from property tax, maybe it will be from some grant down the line, I don't know, but the structure will be there for us. And so, then we can actually start moving some of our services, some of our old services that just, really, is not viable to keep them going, but we also respect that a lot of people who use those services, they love it. It may be a wading pool in a specific park, and they want to make sure that, you know, they have a spray pad a block away. But what are you going to do? Just leave an empty wading pool there? You can't…it's not that easy just to fill that up and pretend it to go away, you have to invest into those areas. Same thing with the co-locating. So, I think the bones are here. It's not exactly what I wanted to see out of this, but again, I'm one…1 of 16. But I do intend to come back with some amendments on this at a later date. But first, let's just approve this one. Like you say, it's really, to me, there's no…if something magical happens or changes and there's a whole flood of money coming in there, yeah, then the worst case scenario is that we'll look at buying some forest, that's not the worst thing for me, in my mind. If no money comes in, there'll be plenty and ample time to do some amendments into this. So, I want to thank the administration even though we didn't agree passionately along this path, I will be supporting it today because the bones are there. It keeps us on the track to remember, transformation is not easy and it also…it does cost some money.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Councillor Gillingham, and then Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Orlikow for his comments and his work because back in 2020 when we were putting the budget together, Councillor Orlikow really had a big hand in forming the concept of the transformative fund, and I thank him for it. A lot of other councillors did too, but I just kind of wanted to acknowledge the work Councillor Orlikow put into it. The City of Winnipeg has a large portfolio of assets. Many of those buildings and other properties need maintenance dollars now. All of them will eventually need maintenance funds to make sure that they are brought up to...up to date, up to speed, in good...in good repair. The question, I think, that we always have to ask ourselves as individuals elected to represent the people of Winnipeg is, are we being good stewards and carefully managing the assets that are under our responsibility? And also, we need to ask the question from time to time is do we continue to need all of the assets, the entire portfolio that we have right now or is it the responsible thing to do to review everything that the City owns and determine where some assets are deemed now surplus. And we don't need the buildings anymore. Where we can co-locate users in a way that all of those user groups can continue to deliver their programming and can help share some of the costs of the operations of the building. Working with the user groups to see that that happens. And as we get talking about that, the question was, well, if we find little bits and buildings, excuse me, that we can sell, that we don't need anymore, let's make sure that any sale proceeds don't just kind of get…kind of bled into the overall operating budget to buy pencils for department A, B or C. Let's strategically reinvest those funds, any of those proceeds to meet some of the goals that we have. And so, that's why the transformative fund was set up with…with the specifications it had. And now, the report before us talks about reinvesting in greenspace and natural habitat acquisition, as Councillor Orlikow and others have pointed out. This is the framework…perhaps, if we get this framework passed, more discussion can happen, and maybe that…the opportunities for what this transformative fund could be invested in could be expanded once again. But I really think this is…this is part of responsible leadership on our part to make sure that we are carefully looking at the City's…having our staff carefully look at the City's entire portfolio of assets to determine what is still needed, what should be maintained, what should be invested in. A lot of my council colleagues, I've said it…I've heard you talk about it, other councillor colleagues talk about as well, Madam Speaker, is that what this pandemic is showing us, for example, is that a lot of people are working from home. I don't know. Are we going to have staff at the City of Winnipeg continue to work from home or from other…other office locations? Do we need all the office space we have? I don't know. You know, this opportunity we...this is the opportunity that we have, and we've called upon our...our staff to take a look at the needs for the City of Winnipeg and, again, comparison with the portfolio we have. It's about the possibility of right sizing the City's asset portfolio right now in a responsible way, and about taking any proceeds of sale and making sure that we use them through a reinvestment opportunity strategically to meet goals and targets that we have…that we have set. And so, I think it would be, actually, kind of a meaningful thing if we…if the time comes to sell a building the City no longer needs that is maybe not environmentally friendly at all, that would need significant investment to fix the windows so that it's not, you know, emitting energy loss, and take those proceeds and turn around and purchase greenspace, I think that's kind of an important opportunity that we should really, really consider. So, I appreciate the work that our staff has done on establishing this transformative fund and the report before us. And I'll certainly be supporting it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker. A number of things to talk about. I do appreciate everyone's comments on this and the work of the administration. Bear in mind, it appears…it occurs to me that the administration is rarely looking at what assets that can be sold. We don't need this motion, you know, to sell some of these assets. Councillor Orlikow talked about making amendments to it at a later date. Why not try and rehash this better before…before we move this, so there's a greater understanding? From what I've heard, people are supporting this for different reasons, that happens a lot, and in this case, I think it matters. Now, it's got a great name. Let's face it. Name something transformative, transformation, it's a great title by which to, you know, to sort of having an outlook, you know, a positive outlook on a new concept in terms of not just selling public assets, but a way to spend that money. Unfortunately, at this point, given we're talking already about amendments to this, whether it passes or not, pass it and make amendments, we already have concerns in terms of how it's already changed based on what Councillor Santos has said. It looks as if amendments have already happened before this, and then we're talking about making amendments later. I would like clarity on this issue for reasons that Councillor Eadie said. Well, where are we…what's going to happen to some of these non-profits kind of thing? And where's the specifics in terms of where we can spend the money and how? and I don't believe I'm the only one who's uncertain here. This is a big issue. We're talking about selling out public assets, once you do that, it's done. I'm not saying I believe we should be selling off some of these buildings. Doing it in the name of calling it transformation and change, that's all very nice, but how progressive is it going to be? I like the idea of buying greenspace, but of course, look, it's not me making this up. It's been mentioned during this debate, you know, the idea of selling golf courses to buy greenspace. I'm a little concerned about that, okay. And also, it's been said during this debate, when we were about stave off greater debt because of infrastructure and…deficit. The greatest transformation we can do in terms of staving off debt…by the way, if we sold off all of our buildings, how much would we stave off debt and tax increases or going into further debt? I put on record to you that we would measure it in months, months only. That is how grave the issue of infrastructure deficit is and staving off greater debt. I did not mention these issues. I did not initiate mentioning these issues

in this debate on the transformative fund, they were mentioned by others. And so, I say, if we want to be transformative in our approach to...not my words...staving off greater debt and infrastructure deficit, let's deal with what are the primary causes. We're dealing with the police on having public consultation on financing the police budget. We should be doing the same thing on infrastructure because it's not just me who's come to the conclusion. Now, how it is, is unsustainable. We've got to stave it off. We've got to deal with infrastructure deficit. Unfortunately, this transformative fund will not do that. So, what it can do, though, it can be transformative for our communities, for parks, for greenspace, yes, but I'm not convinced…I'm not certain in terms of how that will work. I'm uncertain, and I'm skeptical, quite frankly, given my colleagues of the Louise Bridge trio there of Councillor Santos and Councillor Eadie in terms of…in terms of what we can and cannot do with this. It will not…look, if we're really serious about deficit and infrastructure deficit and staving off greater debt, it's all very well that we use this...this great title, transformative fund, in the name of that. But let's be realistic, that's not…that's not what's going to cut it. But for those who are going to vote for this in the name of infrastructure deficit concerns and staving off greater debt, I will hope that, you know, minds will change. Not values. Keep your values in terms of dealing with some real transformative stuff in terms of dealing with infrastructure deficit. And it won't be this fund. It's not going to do it at all. And so, if we're serious about that, we're going to be dealing with infrastructure…infrastructure…construction costs and construction inflation, that's a fact. Other than that, you know, yeah, I'm not against selling…I'm not against selling, it's just I think we need to deal with our amendments at a time when…in a way that we all have clarity and I…that's not happening today. I ask that we vote against this and bring all people's concerns together. Infrastructure, parks, further amendments, clarity and let's vote against this today and start again. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank our Deputy Mayor. Councillor Orlikow has been visionary in championing this back in 20…in March of 2020, when Council adopted the...its first ever multi-year balanced budget. Councillor Gillingham worked collaboratively with Councillor Orlikow, members of Council, on doing something different. And I'll just say…I'll just say this, you know, the intent with the transformation fund, including, of course, the reserve fund, is to try to think and act creatively to address the priorities of our residents. And I'll be supporting this. I appreciate the fact that Councillor Orlikow has indicated here today a willingness to work collaboratively with council colleagues on how we can make improvements and adjust this going forward to better meet the concerns that are being raised. But I'll just say this, it is very easy to say no to things that are different and that are new. There are only 16 citizens in the City of Winnipeg, thought, who ultimately have the responsibility to be visionary, to think creatively and try to find ways to address the priorities and the concerns of our residents. No single policy is going to do that, but this is an effort to do something different. And so, you know, like many votes, it's easy to oppose, it's easy to just say no and to point out things in here you may not like, but it's incumbent upon all of us that where we see issues, where we are willing to work collaboratively together to work on making those amendments. And for that, I'm grateful for the leadership of our Deputy Mayor. I'm going to be working with him going forward, and would encourage all members of Council, including those that may oppose this vote today, to see how we can make improvements to the transformative reserve fund policy going forward. But hopefully we can approve this today and then do some further work together as colleagues. Thank you

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I just want to thank everyone for the great discussion today. I think it was good and I'd like to put some thoughts on the record as well. And I do want to thank Councillor Orlikow, a lot of work went into this. And he did a tremendous amount of work and I just want to thank him because I think this is a good motion. I think this is a really good idea. First and foremost, I want to put a few things on the record from what I heard. This is basically saying that we're going to have a bank account, and that we're going to put any of the sales if we get any, into the bank account, okay? That's all this is really saying. As Council, we still have to decide whether or not we want to sell properties. Like, it's still going to have to go through a certain process. The…right now, our administration is reviewing our real estate process with their lease agreement holders. They're actually working with them and communicating. They're asking questions on what…if they would be willing to co and relocate together, if they're willing to purchase, and also, if they're willing to purchase for $1 for some of the ones that would have, really, a hard time purchasing their spaces. So, I think that there's a lot of work that still needs to be done on the real estate side. So, for those that are afraid that we're making that decision on selling daycares and that, that's not part of this. All this is, is really, a bank account. And right now, if we sell…if we decide to sell something, it just goes back into the City coffers. And I also want to remind everybody, part of OurWinnipeg is looking at increasing our greenspace. We all decided on that if we voted for the OurWinnipeg. For all those who voted for it, we decided on making sure that the city adds greenspace. And that's about, I think, 1,000 acres that we've got to add. So, we're going to utilize money that was…that was in our real estate to make sure that we're buying this property. I think that's a really good use of money, instead of it going back into the…you know, into the kitty, right? And so, I know that there's going to be some changes coming forward. We don't know what the vote is going to be at the next one, which really will...you know, that was a large portion of funding that was going into the transformative fund, but that doesn't mean that there isn't other…other property that we might be wanting to sell in the future that could be used in

order to start getting some money together. And I think that that's key. And I'm somebody who really believes in greenspace, and I think that, you know, as much as I'd like to see more community services, and I think that's another area that we've really got to look at, I'm not sure if it's going to be this blunt. I think there has to be a little bit more work done with the budget in regards to that, because I think it's going…there's going to be a lot of work around our community services that needs to do happen. But we need to do greenspace, and we need to do trees. That was part of our Climate Change Action Plan. That was part of OurWinnipeg. And right now, this could be a very good plan in order to get us started on doing that. So, I hope you support it. I want you all to know that that doesn't mean that you're selling off the...you still have to declare something as surplus. There's still a process that we're going through. The City administration right now is working and collaborating, actually, with our stakeholders that are in some of our buildings, and I have them, too, in my ward. And of course, I even asked the question, will some of these be sold for $1? And they might very well be and that that might set them on a course for being able to use something collateral to do any fixing up they might have to do towards the building in the future. So, there's a lot of work being done by our Real Estate Division. I want to give them a lot of credit because they've put a lot of work into this, too. But this is just a start. And this is, is saying, right now, we're going to have a bank account, and we're going to start putting any proceeds into this fund so that we're actually going to be able to have some seed money in order to, you know, get…you know, reach out to get that 1,000 acres that we need, to get that…the tree counts that we're wanting for climate change, and that's all this is at this time. Other than that, you know, if we decide to sell a building tomorrow, that's just going back into the City coffers. So that's my pitch. I hope that you support this. I think we will have more dialogue after the discussion that we're going to have in the next…after the…after the next vote, but I encourage you all to support this. I think this is really key in investing into, not only in our Climate Change Action Plan, but also making sure that we get to that 1,000 acres that we're going to need to increase our park space. So, that's my pitch and I hope that you'll support it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. With that, I'll call the question on Item 8 – Transformative Reserve Fund Policy. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Klein, Nason, Schreyer and Santos

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 5, with Councillor Allard absent.

Madam Speaker: Okay, next item, Item 9.

Item 9 – Proposed Sale of City-owned Property – Part of 4540 Portage Avenue (John Blumberg Golf Course)

Councillor Gilroy: Madam Speaker, I'll wait to hear from my councillor colleagues. We'll get the ball going on this one.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, let's first look at…so, our Public Service negotiated based on RFP and all those kind of things. And I'm not going to get into too much of the gory stuff, nuts and bolts of this stuff, but you know, ultimately, I hope that whoever is voting against the sale, I hope that one of them, they'll…I mean, I can do it, because I was of that Council, to rescind the surplus decision by the then-Council in 2013. Because ultimately, we've all faced a lot of discussion and dialogue about losing a golf course, but not only that, but losing greenspace. If golf eventually doesn't work there, it could be repurposed. It is…it is there. The same for all golf courses. My original vote was not to declare it surplus and sell it, any of our golf courses, because it is greenspace, and if it needs to be repurposed to something else, it can. And in the winter, it can be utilized for people as well. I heard people talking, Blumberg, I believe, they have some cross-country ski there as well. Windsor Park, of course, the Nordic Centre. Anyway, I don't want to get too out of here. But so, let's say the sale of $13 million goes through. It goes to Land Operating Reserve until the by-law or whatever…until you establish this transformative fund. So, it's going to the Land Operating Reserve, whose purpose…the purpose of that (inaudible)…but the purpose, originally, of Land Operating Reserve is we sell land, and then we can use that money to buy other land that the city needs. Okay, people? That's Land Operating Reserve. So, let's look at that. Oh, I can use right now. I can move a motion to use LOR money to go and buy some parkland. It doesn't need a transformative fund. You can use the money to buy the…transformative fund...anyway, you know, and the reality is, $13

million; what are you going to do? So, just to be clear, Madam Speaker, if that money ever did go into a transformative fund, this so-called $13 million, net profit to the City; if it did, the reality is, for us people with old wards, where the old part of Winnipeg is and the old parts of Transcona and the old parts of North Kildonan and all these places we want new greenspace along the river, how much do you think it's going to be for North Kildonan or Elmwood, EK, to buy green…make greenspace on Kildonan Drive or Scotia? Houses are selling for half a million dollars on the river side. So, who is…like, so, the $13 million, if we did sell it, it could be used to buy parkland, absolutely. But where? In Waverley West, where supposedly, when they do development, the developers have to provide greenspace. They have to provide park space, Madam Speaker. Wonderful thing, you know? So, you know, the reality is you could have all of this wonderful park space and everything if we had the 13 million. Well, the reality is, it wouldn't show up in my ward, where you'd have to buy up all kinds of residential property to make greenspace. What I need money for is to actually...and I would hope that if that money came in there, there needs to be some improvements done to the parks in Mynarski Ward. Lots of them. And we do own some properties that could be converted, but what are we doing as a city to convert it? We're saying, oh, that community group has to do it. If no community group wants to do it, Madam Speaker, then it's not going to happen. So you know, anyway, there's too many questionable things involved with the sale here. You know, it was a fair process. I'm not saying…you know, it was a fair process, we negotiated. The Public Service undertook what the Chair of Finance and others wanted him to do and they did it because Council had already declared the property surplus. And anyway, so...but, you know, the issue is, I'm not convinced...you know, actually, if the RFP...and if we wanted park space, it's easy to say the 36 or 64 acres or whatever, you know, if we wanted to keep some of it, why did we even put up that for the sale if you wanted to keep park space? Which I…you know, to some degree, I was okay with golf. You know, hopefully, those rounds of golf would go to our other City-owned golf courses to up their rates. But the reality is, a lot of the golf rounds plays at John Blumberg would probably go to the private sector too, which is good for them. But essentially, I'm going to vote against this, Madam Speaker. And one other point though, is that $13 million, you know, you're going to take things away and use it for transformation…$13 million to be transformative. You sell off an asset to an NGO, don't forget, the budget…the EPC recommended to us this year in our budget that, in 2023, there's no Community Incentive Grant Program for those organizations. And part of that is, is NGOs and not-for-profit groups in the various wards can use that money to buy property, actually, to provide a community…important community services besides community centres. And, you know, paradise (inaudible) community centres, but there's no paradise for our kids and seniors. So, take the paradise. We'll keep the John Blumberg paradise. I'm voting against selling it. And I'm really saddened to hear all the debate and issues around this because, you know, you've got to think whole city, not suburb. Please consider the city, the whole city. The Mayor, Madam Speaker, campaigned on representing the whole city, the whole city. Why are we not moving motions and doing things that are important for the whole city?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Chambers. Mr. Mayor, you'll be next, yeah. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to rise in opposition to the sale of John Blumberg course. As I mentioned this morning when the other delegations were here, it does represent a net reduction of our greenspace. You know, this is an effort...again, it's akin to robbing Peter to pay Paul or if I'm being gender neutral, robbing Petra to pay Paula. And so, it's an opportunity to keep this greenspace and look for other opportunities to purchase the lands that were discussed earlier, like I said, Lemay Forest or Sumka garden…Sumka Forest. But those represent either equal or moving forward in increasing our greenspace inventory. It's also been recognized, Madam Speaker, that Winnipeg has less greenspace available than other North American cities, including cities like Montreal and Toronto that dedicate higher percentage of their geographic area towards greenspace. And, of course, European cities, they have high…triple the amount of greenspace that the city of Winnipeg has. So, again, not wanting a net reduction of our greenspace, recognizing that the sale of this asset will turn that golf course into a residential development, reducing our greenspace, this is not the way to go. We want to go forward, not backwards, and this is what the sale of John Blumberg represents. I do disagree with Mr. Schinkel's comments this morning that John Blumberg is an ugly golf course. Anytime that you get green grass, the opportunity to walk and enjoy nature, I think is a beautiful thing. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Mayor Bowman: Sure. For more fulsome…for those that are watching these proceedings, I provided more fulsome comments at Executive Policy Committee. I'm going to try not to repeat them and set a trend here of brevity on a matter late in the day, just because, for folks who do want to hear my more fulsome comments, they can always view them online. What I will say is, I will be supporting the sale. I know the recommendation from committee will necessitate those that are in favour of selling to vote against what's before us today so that perhaps, the Clerks may want to…or the Speaker can revisit that just before voting so everybody is clear. I'm just…firstly, I want to thank the developer and all those that put forward and responded to the RFP. I think we should acknowledge the time and the work that they put into it. The reason why I am supporting it is the same reason why I and many members of Council supported the RFP when it was issued, including the scoring criteria which is mapped out on page 7 of the administrative report that does specify provisions for future green parkland…parkway along the riverbank. I think the appropriate time to debate it if there was a desire to have

more greenspace, I think that would have been a more appropriate time. But that being said, I appreciate the honesty of one of my colleagues at Executive Policy Committee who just simply said he changed his mind. And Council, ultimately, does have the ability to make decisions today, notwithstanding a process that has taken essentially nine years to get to this day. That being said, I do support it. Appreciate the work of everyone, and also respect the contrary views around the council chamber on this matter.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'd like to remind Council members to…proper decorum is to be at your seat, either in your office or remotely. Councillor Allard, if I could just ask you to maybe disconnect while you get back to your desk. I've just been alerted to that.

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, I am in my seat. My daughter currently unmuted me. I don't know that there is any order or rules of order or procedure other than being in a seat. I picked up my child from daycare. I don't see why I should be precluded from participation. I am wearing a suit, and my daughter has her...her hand very close to the mute button.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, thank you. We can talk offline. I am concerned about your safety. And I was alerted to this. So, we will talk to you later. It's always been in the seat. I know remote brings…

Councillor Allard: What kind of seat are we talking about, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yeah, it's okay. We will talk later. Please drive safely. That is the priority. I was just alerted to it. I didn't notice you myself on the screen.

Councillor Allard: I will.

Madam Speaker: The next speaker is…who is the next speaker? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm in favour of opposing the motion...I'm in favour of opposing selling Blumberg. So, I'm in favour of the motion not to sell. And I will be brief. I understand…I…bear in mind, 100 years ago, when the…it's been said before, but the Kildonan Golf Course wasn't in Winnipeg when Winnipeg bought that land and constructed it. We don't know what the future is. Headingly has been part of the city, and I'm not going to assume that it won't be again. It's certainly on the margins, and I guess technically because it is city-owned land, it is within our purview of trying to optimize our amount of greenspace. Judging from the debate we've had just in the last hour, being told that we actually have to increase our greenspace, that's the...the intent, I guess, of the City somehow in some sort of consensus, and I'm not going to oppose that. But if that is the case, I don't believe we're ever going to be able to sell a golf course, which is fine with me. I think trying to maintain and optimize and maintain, it's not enhanced the amount of greenspace we have, given that we've just been told by Councillor Chambers and others that, you know, there are other cities that have notably more greenspace than we do. And I don't think we have...if we're going to try and approach the intent or the…what those other cities have if that's our intent, I don't think we can ever sell another golf course. And if we do, if we think we can, I'm going to be asking Councillor Gilroy, then, when it comes time for questions to the Chair, you know, what would we have to make up for if we sold a single golf course? And I'm not exacting…expecting an answer right away, but that should be the addendum. If we ever sell a golf course, how much greenspace would we have to buy just to make up for that? Not to…not to go beyond it, not to enhance our greenspace, just to try and make up for the fact that we sold all that greenspace. That would be a big issue. Anyway, at this time, I don't think it's necessary. I'm kind of nervous about selling off greenspace to buy greenspace. Makes me…makes me uneasy. And given just the way inflation rates work with property, I don't think it's in our long-term interests. So, on that basis, I'll just leave it at that. And vote in favour of opposing the selling of Blumberg.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I won't be supporting the sale of Blumberg. I definitely was interested to see, when the process began, what would be the response, and you know, we heard good arguments about it's outside the city of Winnipeg, we could use those funds to enhance our City-owned assets. We talked about in the day how Blumberg Golf Course was draining the funds from the City quite rapidly. So, but again, things have changed. I'm pretty glad we don't have a land planning commission right now because we're actually able to change our mind, which appears today is going to happen as Council's going to change their mind because we did support the RFP. Now, some people will say we reported…we supported the RFP and hell or high water, that's what has to happen now because you gave that support before. Well, that's…as people have mentioned that to me, I'd say that's completely inaccurate. I've dared to see kind of how this would work. Always had some reservations. I didn't support declaring it surplus the first time. So, I had some reservations, but now we're here today. Great debate, lots of…lots of passionate people. And I do really want to single out the developer did not do anything wrong at all. So please, people, do not disparage the developer. Came forward through a process, put an application forward based upon that process. But again, even in that context, now as

I've learned, and this is the problem with the fact that it is in the city of Winnipeg, those development plans mean nothing. We're not going to be…there's rezoning. We're not going to do the subdivision. Once we sell it, that process has to go to Headingly. So, I'm not sure what Headingly is going to support or not. But again…so, unfortunately, we can't…we can't actually…and then (inaudible) we can't actually change their report either, which we heard a little bit this morning how Council...some councillors were trying to find some way through it. I actually did that as well, just to see that option. Worked pretty hard on it, but it ended up, every time I went through a path about re-changing the RFP and segmenting land out, the words, "You're going to get sued", was quickly…and it's true. And that's why we had the real estate guideline, the book, to make sure that councillors don't do that kind of stuff. Because the RFP process was fair and open, and for us to just re-change the whole RP process mid-stream to one developer's benefit, we'd be in trouble, and rightfully so. So, here's a couple of the things I have noticed, and what was brought up to my attention, and I do have the glory and the pain and the agony about the Parker Lands that was sold way back when before most of the councillors were here in the infamous land (inaudible) swap. One is the environmentally sensitive land study was not done. That needs to be done, period, because we're hearing every blade of grass is integral to the…and it is. And I understand why. But again, we really need that report ahead of time. We also know that so the zoning…that's not going to happen. I also heard very clearly from people...and that's why I say, selling golf course greenspace may be a problem. I think I'd like to have the debate about clubhouses and parking lots. That may be another debate. But again, I've heard today, and people do not want to transfer, trade greenspace for greenspace. Fair enough. I've been brought around quite clearly on that, and I agree. We also know that that drain, we had the report recently, regarding golf services, the numbers are bouncing up pretty significantly. So, I do believe that if the vote does support today to not to sell it, that this golf course should go to the repurposing plan in the golf courses. And maybe we can see about halving off a park or maybe a forest at the front part. But end of the day, the land will still be ours. The land will be the City of Winnipeg's to do what they need and maybe in another 13, 15 years…do we need to keep the land off the highway? Well, maybe, maybe not. Again, but that debate is over for today, in my opinion. We took a look at it, we gave it a shot, but again, I support what I've been hearing by groups from OURS-Winnipeg. A number of my residents and…and other councillors who have called me to try to sway my vote, and they did a very successful job. I would tell you in the year ago, I would probably have been more leaning to selling Blumberg. But after I've listened to everybody, I've read…thank you everybody, including the committees, gone through each committee, and heard everybody, what they said, and made my notes, I am convinced that selling Blumberg is not in the best interests of the City of Winnipeg or our residents, so I will be voting not to sell Blumberg.

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

Councillor Mayes: I don't know if I'm speaking last, but I know in 2013, I spoke first with a bevy of numbers being presented, and then Councillor Vandal luckily spoke last and was terrific. So, it's important to put the context into place here and where we've come over the nine-year arc. Councillor Orlikow, as a matter of fact, is probably a little modest. I think he did oppose surplus in 2013, but he didn't…he didn't mention that today. I did vote for surplus in 2013. And to an extent, as the Mayor's indicated, I have changed my mind, but to an extent, and I'll come back to that. So, 2013, where were we? I'm out for a run, there's a bus that goes by…City bus with this giant responsible Winnipeg sign on the side of it saying how the golf courses are losing a million dollars a year. And I said, what the hell is that? What is that? That's a City of Winnipeg logo on there. And there was a lot of controversy about that and the numbers were wildly inaccurate, and we talked about that on the floor of this council. The…take a step further back from that, mid-2011, there's a golf audit that comes in and it's interesting to see what that had to say. City of Winnipeg…and this is the take that it had on greenspace and open space. 20…in 2011, the City of Winnipeg maintains open spark…open park space at a rate that is 50% greater than required. The City of Winnipeg has in excess of 3,600 hectares. Even with predicted growth in the Winnipeg population, there will still be a sizeable excess of open park space in 2020. That is what are staff and consultants laid in front of the Council of the day in 2011. And I think OURS-Winnipeg who drive me crazy on occasion, but they pointed that out, they thought that was a problem and they were right and they are still right today. This numerical for machine that produced this idea that, oh, there's excess park space, there's excess greenspace, I thought that was odd math then and I think we've turned the corner on that in saying, no, we're not…we're not in a surplus, we're trying to add more. So, that was the context, it was the context in 2013, as well, a vote to whether we should privatize operations at three of the courses, that did not get approved. So, what did get approved was the vote on Blumberg. On Blumberg, though, if you look at my comments on Hansard, I do say it's 27 holes, we could…let's take a look at...maybe we'll get a proposal to develop nine. We can still have a full-on golf course at 18. We unfortunately didn't pursue that option. Councillor Vandal talks about…also says, there are 27 holes, we should look at some options, it'll all come back. So, I appreciate the frustration of some of the people who've put in on the RFP saying, well, you're changing your minds now. Well, we do that from time to time. We had an RFP about whether we should privatize operation of golf courses in 2013 and we decided not to. So, this does happen sometimes, you have a failed search where you don't go forward. So, I'm not faulting the developer here. I'm not faulting this proposed sale price. What I do think we have to be aware of, though. I think there has been a change of heart, a change of mind in the city of Winnipeg about the importance of preserving greenspace, so I will not be supporting this sale. I do think, as Councillor Orlikow says, it should…the course should be referred to the process where we're looking at some options for our courses. There's certainly all sorts of other recreational uses next to the 27 holes here. So, maybe something can be done with that. I think Councillor Orlikow is right on that. But ultimately, and

unlike the Mayor, I think I am repeating myself but…from EPC, but I think some of that context needed saying. As Councillor Vandal said in 2013, yeah, we're going to have a balance. We have some public, some private. Some of the public courses are directly run by the City and are unionized, some are not, such as Canoe Club, such as Tuxedo. So, we have a balance. We have a mix. We don't make a profit on some of our arenas. So, no, we don't make a profit on some of our golf courses, but that's part of operating a public/private mix. I will say in praise of our last couple of...the thing that has turned around from 2011, 2013 is, we now take a dividend out of golf. We've had some very good years. Al Shane who was running…I think started to turn the ship around. Ben Faye, who's our current guy there has been terrific. And I think I'll end by saying, you know, the…in one of these debates I took a line from an old Meatloaf song, which was…I think Al Shane has managed to build an emerald city out of these grains of sand. So, (inaudible) it seems timely to use that quote given the events of the last month and the passing of Meatloaf. But you know, it's a humorous reference, but Ben Faye has done a good job with our Golf Services. We have turned things around. The pandemic, of course, has driven up the numbers in the last couple of year, but I think…I think the underlying facts have changed here. Our view of greenspace maybe has changed a bit as well. So, I will not be supporting the sale, and I want to go forward and add more greenspace in the city and not sell off some of what we have now. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, this is an important decision for Council. We have to consider the aspirational goals of enhanced and expanded greenspace for our residents while acknowledging…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham, we're having trouble with your connection.

Councillor Gillingham: Can you hear me?

Madam Speaker: Sure. Yes, can now.

Councillor Gillingham: Can you hear me? Do you want me to start my video or just go audio for this?

Madam Speaker: You can try your video if you'd like. Let's try it again.

Councillor Gillingham: Are you there?

Madam Speaker: Yes, go ahead. It's working. It seems to be working.

Councillor Gillingham: This is an important decision for Council, we...sorry. Is it working? Okay. We have to consider the aspirational goals of enhanced and expanded greenspace for our residents, while acknowledging the real world…acknowledging the real world considerations that John Blumberg is currently a golf course only. And that the golf course is located outside the city of Winnipeg limits. As a councillor, I've always tried to advocate for a thoughtful approach towards City assets and the long term focus on avoiding spreading ourselves out too thinly. Blumberg…Blumberg was declared surplus land by the City in 2013, almost nine years ago, before I was elected to Council. It would take significant financial investment to maintain it as a golf course through the coming years, which, by design, limits the numbers and types of users for that land. A person has to pay to access the site in the summertime, so it is not accessible to Winnipeg families for use as a public park. Further, it would take millions of dollars to convert the land from a golf course to other types of parkland and accessible greenspace in an effort to allow more people to use the space. Even then, only those with a vehicle would be able to get to the site. If we're considering a property that requires such investments for future use, we simply must take into account that the property is in whole other municipality. This is not a Winnipeg greenspace. It's not the same as Little Mountain Park or La Barrier Park, those are public parks, and they're used as such. John Blumberg is a golf course, and it's a golf course in Headingley. And with sincere respect to the good people of Headingley and to those Winnipeg residents that have affection for the course, who drive out to golf Blumberg, I believe Council has a responsibility to prioritize investing in the maintenance and acquisition of parks and open spaces within Winnipeg where more citizens and Winnipeg families can easily make use of them. Earlier this month, Council received a separate report that put the price of revitalizing failing park amenities within the city of Winnipeg limits at $102 million. These are the neighborhood and regional parks and open spaces accessible to families within Winnipeg that need investment and upgrade. The sale of Blumberg will enable us to invest in Winnipeg parks, to reduce the maintenance deficit, and can provide us an opportunity to acquire new greenspace, park land, forest within the city of Winnipeg. And so, potentially preserving forest and greenspace within the city limits that are currently in private hands. These properties inside of Winnipeg could be made available to the public with easy access for Winnipeg families. An independently appraised value of the golf course came in at $9.2 million. The open RFP process concluded on Blumberg and recommended sale of the property for $13.7 million. That is $13.7 million in proceeds that could go towards revitalizing park space and the tree canopy in west Winnipeg, east Winnipeg, south Winnipeg, north Winnipeg, and central Winnipeg. Prior to the pandemic, both private and public golf courses were facing a situation of over supply and under-demand. And despite the increase

of golf's popularity over the last two years of the pandemic, Blumberg golf course lost money again this last year. Even with the sale of Blumberg, the City will still have several golf courses, many golf courses, that are available as public courses. And the City will still be competing with the private sector in the business of golf. If golf popularity begins to wane once again after the pandemic is over, then the subsidy required to run Blumberg in the future years may only increase. I golf myself, but I have a difficult time putting a priority on saving a golf course outside the city of Winnipeg that a limited number of city of Winnipeg residents use. And I find it difficult to make the trade off, especially with the knowledge that it will make millions of dollars through the coming years to establish something other there than a golf course and hundreds of thousands of dollars, for sure, through the coming years to maintain it as a golf course. To vote against the sale of Blumberg Golf Course is to commit Winnipegger taxpayers to spend hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars, in Headingley over the coming years. And that is why I support the sale of the John Bloom…John Blumberg Golf Course.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Councillor Gillingham, pardon me. Next is Councillor Klein, followed by Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Klein: I'm starting to get a complex, Madam Speaker. I get called many names, but anyways. First and foremost, look, there's no argument that the John Blumberg Golf Course would be worth much more if it was City land. The comments that we have to spend money outside of the city of Winnipeg, the City financials and golf reports clearly state it's around $.70 per round for maintaining the course. We have a contract with somebody to operate the facilities. Maybe we should be better negotiators and charge a little more for that. But really, what we're not talking about is the real wild cards here, and that appears that the real wild card is the fact that we ignored Bill 37, which has been pross…passed by the Province. The report does not consider or provide any insight, thoughts or opinions on Bill 37. So why not wait until the new provincial landscape is clear? Bill 37, as much as we want to ignore it, has been passed and it is coming forward, and it will define density in the capital region. It will ask all of our communities to work together in the capital region. What about potentially seeing a business that was going to be built within the city limits being moved across the road and down a little bit because they saved $6, $7 million right away by not being in Winnipeg? The land could be worth millions more, millions more, if we wait until the smoke has cleared with Bill 37. Surely, it's advantageous to wait until we know the new landscape. I don't see how any civic leaders can say the sale of the…of this John Blumberg Golf Course will benefit the city today. And why now? We're saying that we need a transformative fund, which passed, unfortunately, to replace…or to eliminate our buildings and some of our greenspace to buy and build greenspace in the city. Well, we're going to sell greenspace that's considered within the city to many at $68,000 an acre. What are we going to purchase land for? We have 1,000 acres that we agreed in the OurWinnipeg to put into the city. Even at $100,000 an acre, which I think would be impossible to find within the city of Winnipeg, that's $100 million. $13 million is a drop in the bucket, so why not wait? If I'm hearing my colleagues correctly, we need the money, we need the money. Why not wait and get the best dollar for it? Does this offer consider the significant increase in sprawl? This council talks about often the benefits of building up, densification, yet, here we are, allowing sprawl just across the road, with all the property taxes going to the RM of Headingley, while all the residents use the Winnipeg infrastructure free of charge. How can you support that way of thinking? How does the city sustain itself with that kind of thinking? With a population of 20,000 plus just outside, using all of our amenities, taking advantage of the snowplowing, taking advantage of everything that we have to do in the city to sustain the city for $13 million when they're not making one contribution back to the city. We have heard from many people that we need to get a handle on the sprawl. And there is significant sprawl already outside the city limits to the south and to the northeast. With the Rosser Airport development, to the northwest. There's even some sprawl now outside the city to the east. Now we want to add more with this Blumberg project. Based on rough estimates after speaking with a couple of people within the industry and one professor, this development would provide space for around 20,000 people. Where are they coming from? I keep hearing we're growing to a city of a million, but we all saw the e-mail that said our population in 2021 is, in fact, dropped below that in 2020 and 2019 or 2020 maybe over. So where are they coming from? The report does not provide insight into the financial impact of lost property tax revenues because they're not coming from abroad to buy these 20,000 residents. It won't be limited just to outside residents. 20,000 people will be living in such a development and utilizing our services. How can we approve something when you don't see a cost-benefit analysis? How can you approve something when you don't see any of the other bids? We're not allowed unless we sign a non-disclosure. We can't really talk about them, so why see them? We don't know what's out there. And it would appear that we have a sense of desperation for this sale and many other taxpayer owned asset…assets. Why are we so desperate to sell it? Is it because of bad budget decisions over the last several years? Are we now in a position where we are forced to accept a bad deal and whatever money we can get out of desperation for that money? If it's true, then one would argue the land should be sold at a much higher price. If that's you're thinking, you have to sell it for more. We got an evaluation of land that's a few years old, and we only saw…and we only got one. Did you read it? Did you see it? Why wouldn't we get another one? That's a lot of land. The City of Winnipeg is prepared to sell more taxpayer owned assets in the coming months and years, and this is proposal is nothing more than yard sale economics. Well, we can't take care of what we got. Why? Once they're gone, they're gone. This council is constantly talking about collaboration, and because of those claims, I asked the Public Service if they actually had consulted with the RM of Headingley, the answer was no. So, I spoke to the mayor of Headingley directly, and he said he had the door shut on him when he offered the idea of working together. However, he has made public sample drawings of what the RM would do to improve this valuable greenspace

and his commitment to working with the City on a mutually beneficial arrangement. Negotiating, working together. The RM's plans does not appear to be consistent with the desire of the developer. Period. It's been in the media and he's said it. Imagine what could be done if we actually worked together with our neighbours. That's what we're missing. I heard that we should be looking at the bigger picture. The bigger picture isn't selling off a $30, $40,000 asset for $13 million so you can say we can buy a park down the road. The bigger picture is, what can we do with it? How can we work with the RM so it doesn't cost us money, that we all benefit? Listen, this is a big moment. You either want to start selling off the city because of bad budget decisions or we want to start negotiating and doing what's best for our city. What could be there? What could the RM bring to the table? What could the Province bring? There's too many questions. There's too many unknowns. There's too much data missing. So, I won't be supporting this.

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

Councillor Lukes: Well, okay. I'll tell you, Councillor Klein, where those 20,000 people want to be, they want to be in Charleswood. They want to live in your ward in apartments. So, we can discuss that at a future date.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, on topic and through the Chair, please.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, Blumberg. Blumberg. Sorry. He's quite passionate there. All right, so I won't be supporting the sale of the Blumberg for the following reasons. So, for sure, Blumberg is not a city park. For my decision making process, this is not at all about saving a golf courses…a golf course. Golf courses are not at all comparative to a public park, they are restrictive to only paid users. Our family has deep roots in the world of golf, so I can say this with a little bit of authority. They are very restrictive to private use. I see the golf course as a place holder of space in time. Not utilized in the most public manner, but a placeholder that I believe even last year cost the City around 18…$18,000. So, to be clear, I'm not voting to save the golf course. I believe the golf course lease is up next year, and I think Council should have a very close look at how this space can be made more publicly accessible. Why does it even need to remain a golf course? We need to discuss this in detail when the lease renewal time comes. And I'm just going to speak about another piece of land outside the city, City-owned land, like this Blumberg piece of land is, but this particular one is a park, and it's La Barriere Park. And for the 20 years that I've been going to La Barriere Park, 20 years ago, it sat in peace and quiet, probably since it was created. You'd called it dormant. Nothing was happening there, other than some wild weekend parties. But over the last seven years, I've partnered with many Council members to improve facilities at La Barriere Park. To date, I believe the City has invested City funding over $125 million in upgrade. Through much advocacy, funding was secured to upgrade the main road total area. And the City Parks Department is working to increase the native grasses and natural areas in the park. Last year, it was reported a 90% increase in use at La Barriere. So, for sure, one of the main reasons is because of the pandemic. For sure, COVID has completely focused the way we're looking at greenspace now versus pre-COVID. But the 90% increase also comes because of the upgrades we've made, and I think one of the key reasons is because of the tremendous growth we've seen in the very, very close development of the newer part of the Waverley West Ward. Growth in southwest Winnipeg is going to happen. The continuation of the development in Charleswood, and the proposed residential development in the CentrePort area. In summary, I see a long-term opportunity here. I see the demands of a growing city, and even the RM growth, and a need for people to get out of the city and have open space, whatever form that may be, and to have river access. I've kayaked many times down the Assiniboine. Councillor Chambers and I helped fund kayak launce in La Barriere. There are lineups to use this kayak launch. I'm confident at some point as we evolve as a city and as we grow, potential future funding will evolve and we can…we can transform this place into public space outside the city for everyone to enjoy. So, I really…I can't vote to sell it.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And with respect to the point of order, I just wanted to thank you. When I see someone driving during a meeting, I just think that that's distracted driving, Madam Speaker. And so, I wanted to point that out because all too often, I'm a pain for you, Madam Speaker, but sometimes when you're leading meetings like you have been today, I think you deserve some praise and that was beyond the pale. I have two main focuses this term, Madam Speaker: the model of housing first and harm reduction will be no secret to you, but in terms of climate justice, I really search out for the cool and the blue and the green that we do here on this Treaty 1 land and the traditional homeland of the Métis nation and where we get our water from Shoal Lake 40. And luckily, as councillor for Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry, I'm really fortunate to be the custodian of so much that is cool and blue and green. Two golf courses; Wildwood and Crescent Park golf courses are so much more than just golf courses. It ain't about the game for me, it's about cross-country skiing, walking, jogging. It's about birders and wildlife watching and more. Winnipeg City Council did indeed place these things at the heart of our policy when we passed the planning amendments calling for greenspace master plan, a nature corridor plan, and a biodiversity policy. And recently amended city planning documents, OurWinnipeg 2045 and Complete Communities 2.0, have set that higher standard for Winnipeg on environmental and ecological protection of greenspace. It is one of the highlights of this term for me to sit with the community, like Save our Seine, like OURS-Winnipeg and Crescent Park Rescue, and so many who held that pen with me, and I want to thank them because some

of them were here in delegation. And I, of course, always want to thank this council who supported those amendments. I think that we all should look back with pride on them. The profit margin here is not the number one issue for me. I do agree with…that the math doesn't work on the 13 million from the sale in so far as we would turn around and just purchase more inside the city, I don't think that math works. But you know what also doesn't work? Is the economics for cool, blue, green reasons for sure, but also, the basic economics of not wanting to literally have a hat in building our own sprawl, to Councillor Klein's point. Not wanting to build our own sprawl. Not wanting to build up the bedroom community in Headingley. No, thank you. Given flight we have evidence in our housing reports, I think that there's a particular piece here on economics to pause. And...and there's really good work of good people on this council like Councillor Gillingham and Councillor Orlikow, along with capital region leaders, who have been working on strengthening incentives of cooperation, responding to all of our local needs, and yes, adapting to changing economic conditions. And I agree that this type of work, it's this type of work that will lead to all boats floating or higher taxes, you know, and a better tax rate for all. But I'm going to return to the review of the riverbanks. The focus on this historic trade network, where Red River carts went up and down all the way to what we know now is our national park, The Forks, the land along the river and as my friend, Pam points out, the Gowler Creek, which are…originates in Warren, Manitoba, flows through the golf course to the Assiniboine River with its surrounding low lands. This is perfect natural green infrastructure for flood control and cleaning. It is another habitat on the property that we should probably have paid respect to, the creeks that provide fish spawning habitat all the way to the Assiniboine. And I think that that is where I want to leave it, Madam Speaker. I won't be changing my vote from Executive Policy Committee.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Okay, seeing none, Councillor Gilroy, do you wish to close?

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, Madam Speaker. Thank you very much. I just...I did want to talk a little bit about from a little…a couple of things from what I heard from people speaking here today, and I really love the discussion. But I just do want to remind people…and I will not be changing my vote, first off, from EPC. I just…I really couldn't fathom in my mind selling potential greenspace, whether it's a golf course or anything else, at this moment when we're trying to increase the greenspace that we do have. And...but I do want to kind of pull back because I do want to remind people, I think our administration takes a lot of the backlash from some of our decisions, and I do want to remind people that it was us that asked for the RFP and so our administration just followed along. They went, you know, with the highest bidder with what they intended to do with the land. They weren't asked to go out and collaborate, they weren't asked to do any of that. They were asked to put out an RFP, and they did do that, and now it's up to us to make those decisions. So, I just really want to say that because I don't think that that's necessarily fair that we're saying we're not collaborating. We do have a process at the City, and we are following it, and maybe the next steps will, you know, allow for that collaboration to happen a little bit more fully, but we set the initial steps in the RFP, and the administration was just following the process and the guidelines that we set forward as Council. So, I just wanted to make note of that. And I also…you know, listening to OURS-Winnipeg, you know, it was…it was really an eye opener for me because they said that when Kildonan Park was purchased, it was not part of Winnipeg. And like Councillor Lukes, I go to La Barriere Park and just love it. And it's actually further out than even…even the golf course that we're talking about, Blumberg, right? So, it's even further out and it's a beautiful, beautiful place. And I go from Winnipeg, and I make that a destination just because we don't have a lot of that urban forest close to us, so I go looking for that where I can to get out in nature. And so, it is critical that we look at that as we're making decisions on getting rid of property. I don't know where we're going to be in 100 years, and…but I do know that the decisions I make right now is going to impact that. And sitting as Chair of Property and Planning, we're also seeing all the different developments coming forward through that end of town, and we are seeing that there's going to be some residents very close by. So…and that might be able to ride their bike or walk there, I've got to know the distance. Councillor Klein probably knows that better than me because he…that's his area. So, we…outside the perimeter, we do have a community that the City of Winnipeg owns and they do need park space and all that kind of stuff. So, we have to be reminded of that. I think Councillor Klein brought up some good points of in terms of, you know, where do we go now? Maybe there could be some collaboration with Headingley. You know, I'm not…I'm not stuck on this being a golf course, I think those are going to be decisions we're going to have to make eventually down the line, but what I do know is that with the way we're moving at Council, we've made an effort to say, hey, we're going to look at increasing our greenspace. We're going to look at building up, not out. We're going to look at biodiversity, increasing trees, and really making sure that people in Winnipeg have a place to go. And note, people might have to drive there right now, but you know, that could very much change in the future. There are some collaborations with the different communities, and I'll let Councillor Gillingham and Councillor Orlikow take some of those on. So, I don't know where we're going to be down the line, but I do know that this piece of property is critical in maintaining our park space, especially somebody that comes from the inner-city that just doesn't have any. Like, I have nothing, right? And once it's gone, it's gone. So, I love the debate, and I will keep to the vote. And…but I do want to thank the public administration for all their hard work. Really, all they did was, really, listened…you know, did what Council asked them to do and that's what they've come back with. So, I want to thank them and I'll call the vote.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy, and with that, I'll call the vote.

Councillor Klein: Madam Speaker, if I may. Just clarify exactly what we're voting on and such?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I've been asked to do that by the Chair as well. So, it is a call for a recorded vote. The recommendation in front of us is from the standing policy committee, and that recommendation is to not sell the land. So, if you vote in favour of the recommendation, you're voting to not sell the land. Okay? So, all in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Chambers, Eadie, Klein, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Gilroy, Nason, Schreyer, Lukes, Santos, Allard and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty and Gillingham

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

Madam Speaker: Item 9 passes. Item 12, Madam Clerk.

Item 12 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 514 Wellington Crescent – DASZ 16/2021

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair…or Madam Speaker. So, I will not and I have not and I shall not be supporting this application, and I'll tell you why. First issue, and we kind of dropped onto a little bit today, and this one's a little bit different, is about the non-conforming private approach. This non-conforming private approach that is being proposed is not going off onto Wellington Crescent. Wellington Crescent is a drop-off delivery spot, the private approach is for all the cars and vehicles on Kingsway, Kingsway, a residential street that is packed by Kelvin High School on one side down the block and St. Mary's School right beside it. So there, this private approach, which I believe underdetermined at this point till Public Works has their say, doesn't really matter, I will not support this non-conforming private approach. And why? Well, if anybody's been in the area, this private approach, including the wrong times of day, i.e. 9:00 and 3:30, 4:00, will cut across a sidewalk that is very, very actively used by students from both Kelvin and from St. Mary's School and of Westgate Collegiate on the other side of the river. Astronomical amount of people are trans…going back and forth. We've heard repeatedly from the Planning Department that they do not support private approaches on residential streets because they want to have a walkable neighborhood, which I agree 100%. Sometimes I go over top of them and disagree with them on certain ones, but I do understand. But in this case, because an apartment and a condo are considered non-residential in our Private Approach By-law, that is not…some reason, it's different. I don't know how it's different because there's actually much more activity going on in this easement. This easement is going to spill onto Kingsway. People who have…which is…Kingsway, is an active transportation route. It's one of the ones we planned in the books. It's in there. We're going to have to do a crosswalk, which is also being approved, just needs to be funded, to get to Munson Park across the street. However, in the morning, you will see cars all over the place in that area because cars are queueing to drop off or pick their children at St. Mary's School or Kelvin High School's kids are driving around…or staff, to find parking spots. So, it's a very, very active corner. It's a very short corner, too, and a very difficult corner to get onto Wellington Crescent because of the winding road. So, why not do it down the back lane? It's a terrible shaped gravel back lane. And that is definitely something I don't think the neighbourhood wants as well. But it's a terrible idea to put it on the back lane as well. So again, could you go off onto Wellington Crescent? You could. You could. But again, the department hasn't proposed that. And I think also because of where the St. Mary's School exit is, that would also cause some big problems. So…and then, the other one is, by doing as a private approach, one of the bigger issues we have in the area is, again, because all the staff that from St. Mary's and from Kelvin High School and students are parking in that area. We're not only going to lose a tree, which kind of missed in the public hearing, but we're also going to lose two more parking spots. And again, dump all of that traffic into a really congested corner that is super dangerous to get on to Wellington Crescent. So, again, the easement is a terrible idea. I've listened to the neighborhood, they've explained it to me quite clearly, and that is why…one of the primary reasons this cannot be supported. Again, as we talked about before, and I think Councillor Lukes and a couple of other councillors mentioned it, of course we want to look at developing up, but sometimes these lands are...have so many barriers to it, you may not be able to do the match you want to do. But again, that's not before

us today. The application is what it is. That was the developer's determination, and that's what it is. So, again, it also…I don't like this because it creates a precedent. A very…a bad precedent in the…again, there's only one RMF-S in the area of Wellington Crescent. It's an old historical house that was tri-plexed. Across the street, where the report says there was multi-unit buildings, it's not multi-unit, it's R1 property. And the reason why that's so…I can't remember the name of it, those are condos that are side-by-side. And then, behind it, incorrectly stated in the report, which was not changed, to my dismay, it says RMF-L is a property behind it. It is not, it's R1-L. So, again, the other precedent that was mentioned up is this will actually promote demolition by neglect. So, an area person who's worried about getting rezoning will just allow these historical homes to get…go to the point of no return so they can demolish it, and then apply for an RMF. The neighborhood is concerned about that, and so am I. So again, I do not support the RMF properties along that stretch of Wellington Crescent for the same reasons that the department has said, well, we can't have an easement on Wellington Crescent. It's a very difficult street to get on and off. And I do not support easements going into residential neighbourhoods. I think that's just a really bad idea. So again, so that's the RMF. The other one is, I do believe strongly, and I was shocked to find out that the heritage planner was at the PP&D meeting discussing this after the public hearing. Well, I was told that they can't be a part of the public hearing. I just don't know why that was so, but that was so. So, regardless of that odd change, the ACD process, we did approve that. We approved the area, and we approved the key elements. We did that, going forward. We haven't approved the actual planning yet, but we said, these are the elements you've got to keep. Well, that included making sure the sidewalks, the boulevards, the trees remain, all the elements that this, actually, plan is actually impeding, but there's no mention of that in the report because it's not supposed to be part of the report. I wholeheartedly disagree with that. The neighborhood, it's spending an astronomical amount of time working on this to bring something forward to Council. We should have been respecting the neighbourhood. They only have a few more months left before it'd be coming to Council. Again, it's not like it's the same thing as the infill guidelines where it's all across the city in mature neighbourhoods, it's a very small local group that's spending an astronomical amount of time on this. Again, we're disregarding not only the heritage elements, a previous vote, we're also, in my opinion, disregarding that work and the…from that neighborhood. And so, finally, the last one is, the overwhelming lack of support from the neighborhood, overwhelming. I don't know of anybody from the area...I've got maybe one e-mail with two lines on it from someone from the neighbourhood, but that was it…in support. Everybody else is opposed. Again, why are they opposed? They have many different reasons why; shadowing to some people, too much density, the easement, historical significance. There's a whole bunch in there, but end of the day, by voting for this one, I believe it's very disrespectful to that neighborhood and to what they're trying to do. So, those are kind of the highlight reasons. And I really appreciate what Councillor Nason have…Council mentioned a couple of times that you go with the area councillor, and I appreciate you do that today as well. Again, this is a very unique area. Again, we're going to work through this. I've seen the votes. I do agree with many of us today, the process is fraught with problems. I would have loved to come and present at each one of these SPC meetings or EPC, but this is the only chance I had. And again, there are some misinformation. There are, I think Councillor Gilroy said, well, we just…we're not going to wait forever. We're not waiting forever. We're waiting maybe a few months. Again, the process…the developer said it's taking forever.

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

Councillor Orlikow: There is a long history back here. I understand there's a long history back there, but the development application hasn't been delayed. Again, we're willing to send whole applications back again about, you know, things, and that's going to delay it as well. I'm not asking for anything more than we gave Councillor Nason already today. So, again, except I am…I am…except, the fact is, let's listen to the neighborhood. Let's be worried about the kids. Let's be worried about the traffic. Let's respect that neighborhood, and let's just pause until the HCD plan is done. Those are my requests from the Council today, I feel very strongly about it. I think it sets an incredibly bad precedent going forward, but I am one councillor and I hope you'll see it my way. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie,

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I'm going to support Councillor Orlikow's recommendation not to pass this particular development. Madam Speaker, I just want to say, we didn't give another councillor an opportunity to describe why the proposed amendment went through, Madam Speaker. And what I just heard today, the first argument related to traffic issues and private approaches and that sort of thing, Madam Speaker, and I have looked to, Madam Speaker, as the councillor for the area as expert in evaluating the situation there. And I always loved Kingsway, Madam Speaker, just to be clear. I used to work at Kelvin High School and also various other schools through in around that...well, not so much by Wellington Crescent, but often walked and I biked to work as well, Madam Speaker, in the area. And so, for the life of me, no matter the condition of the back lane, I'm not understanding why there needs to be…in this case, there would be a non-conforming private approach when there's an existing back lane, a right-of-way. Yeah, it's in bad condition, and if they want to make it convenient for the people that are going to live at this property, then you know what, that private development can pay to pave the back lane, Madam Speaker, because this is the biggest problem we have with infill and development in all our old neighbourhoods, Madam Speaker. The reality is, sometimes the infrastructure doesn't support a development. It needs...and if it is to support it, then, you know, the developer should pay to fix it. And with this level of

units and living, I think that's plenty, Madam Speaker. So...but ultimately, I appreciated having the description because the description that you would have heard from the prior councillor about non-conforming approaches is that there's a whole bunch of private driveways off of Grassie all along it, all along it because there's no back lane between Jacques and Grassie. So, if people would have listened and just followed the guidance of the city councillor for the area who did a lot of studying about it, Madam Speaker, it wouldn't be a big deal. Anyway, I will support based on just that whole traffic flow thing and what's going on there. I understand there are private schools and public schools and lots of people that are…whatever, but the thing is, the back lanes there for…to develop an approach, and it does cross the sidewalk as well. But you know, the thing is, though, it is established public right-of-way, people drive in a back lane, they know what that means; that means they have to follow proper driving rules in back lanes. It's very difficult to follow back lane driving rules off a street like Wellington, as councillor…Councillor Orlikow is appointed. So, I'm going to actually vote with the councillor on this one. I'm not voting opposed to this development because of the historical…or history on this property, I'm following the guidance of councillor on this one. Thank you

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

Councillor Nason: My name mentioned a couple of times by Councillor Orlikow. It certainly is a frustrating day. The hearing process, then gets overturned, it's happened to me, I think a couple of times now when they don't listen to the area councillor when the area councillor is asking for something simple and it's turned down. The community committee voted this down. Went to standing committee, it was overturned. I am one of the parents for the Westgate community that goes down Wellington. So Councillor Rollins know where my daughter does go to school. And we're going to beat Louis Riel today at basketball. So, I probably should have got in my car, put my headset on and drove to the game so I could take my daughter, but I'm sitting here right now. I understand where Councillor Orlikow's coming from. I didn't see an amending motion. I guess he could have brought one, he could have brought one maybe to amend the back lane, but I'm hearing that, you know, that's not what gets done. I'll support him today, but it's only because I'm frustrated and angry. Thank you

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker. Okay. Seeing none, Councillor Gilroy, do you wish to close?

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, Madam Speaker. Thank you. Thank you, everybody. I know this is a very…we had a couple of tough ones here. I am concerned when we say that we're always going to support the area councillor. There are some things I do when in terms of grass and stuff, but I do think that it's really important that we try to stay neutral as councillors. I think it's important that councillors advocate for their area and they do a good job doing it, but I think we need that check and balances of the different committees and going through the process that we have. And I think that that's really critical. So, it concerns me when we're talking about just supporting an area councillor. A lot of emotions and things get charged in an area, and we have to make sure that we have a process in place that allows due diligence and the opportunity for all views to move forward through our systems, and I think that we're doing that here today. So, I just want to raise that because that was raised a couple of days, and I think that both councillors have done a really great job advocating for their communities, and they should. And I think that councillors should be neutral when they're trying to make decisions impacting these areas when we're not in those ports, right? So, I wanted to raise that. So, this was a difficult one. This was a heritage building that was torn down, and the community…I mean, and it was just torn down. So, there's some aftermath of that. There's some impact within the community. You can definitely feel it when they come in delegation. They are still in a lot of pain of losing…losing this building, and that's understandable. So, my decision to support the project was coming from, okay, now this could be three different lots, which according to the consultation, you know, people didn't want. They were using the same masting of the building that they lost, so a big old home that's now going to be turned into four suites. And also, too, thanks to the work of Councillor Lukes at the committee, these are actually going to be accessible space. Now, the…what's in front of us here today, it isn't…you know, that'll be up to Public Works to deem the safety components, but it was the wish of the community…of course, they don't want any development there. They don't want this to happen at this point, but the…what they…they did want, is they wanted it off of Kingsway so they wouldn't…so there wouldn't be people coming down the back lanes. That was a request which they followed. Another thing is they are keeping some of the heritage elements of the building. So, they're keeping that…the fencing that's along there. That was a request from the community. And they are trying to keep as much of the trees and stuff that are…were original, so a lot of those trees will be preserved. Now, in terms of the…there was a lot of talk around the heritage designation because that community is undergoing that, and...but when I looked at the development, I felt that it was still…like, just because you're going to be having a heritage designation, doesn't mean in that community…doesn't mean you're not going to have development happening, you're not going to have density, right? And so, so I think the density was warranted in that location, especially the low…very low density that they were looking at. And I also believed that the…that the building, I mean that…this is also, too, very...up for debate because everyone had their varied opinions on the building, but architecturally, I really thought that they did a good job trying to fit it into the existing community. A lot of the same stone and stuff was used, and they tried to architecturally design it. So, it wasn't no modern build in the middle of, you know...in the middle of the community. So, I thought they did a really good job. But thought it would have really met…met the target of the heritage designation if it was in place right now. So, this was a tough one. I know that…I know that this was not

easy for the community and the area councillor, but you know, I think that this...you know, it is a low-density unit, 12 suites, so I think that, you know, I support this, and I hope others support it, too. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question. Call for a recorded vote. All in favour of Item 12, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Klein, Gilroy, Browaty, Schreyer, Santos, Gillingham, Allard, Lukes and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillors Chambers, Eadie, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins and Nason

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

Madam Speaker: Item 12 passes. Yeah. We'll get into by-laws next. Councillor Gilroy.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, I'd like to move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 1/2022, By-law No. 2/2022, By-law No. 3/2022, By-law No. 4/2022, and I'll...yeah, sorry.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Recorded in opposition?

Councillor Klein: Yes, please

Madam Speaker: The first one? Noted. And that passes. Councillor Gilroy. We'll need to read it into the record. Just a moment. Sorry.

Clerk: By-law No. 1/2022, By-law No. 2/2022, By-law No. 3/2022, and By-law No. 4/2022.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move that By-law No. 1/2022 to 4/2022, both inclusive, be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Councillor Klein noted. And that carries.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 1/2022 to 4/2022, both inclusive.

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 1/2022 through 4/2022, both inclusive, be read a third time and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? How many are recorded in opposition? Councillor Klein, Councillor Nason. Councillor Browaty, did you say? No, okay, so just the two. Which by-law, Councillor Nason? All of them?

Councillor Nason: My apologies. For the…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein, yours?

Councillor Nason: No. 1/2022.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Both of you for the same; 1/2022. And the rest carries. We'll now have question period under this committee. Any questions for our chair? Councillor Nason.

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

Councillor Nason: I know golf courses, Madam Speaker, are a hot topic, and I'm also well aware of some challenges we have with mobility in the area of Plessis Road, so I'm wondering if the Chair can advise with regards to the 2023 expiry of the lease for Transcona golf club if there have been communications of where we are at in getting that sorted out?

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Councillor Nason for the question, through you Madam Chair. I will look into the lease. I'm not sure when that lease expires, but I can look into that further and get back to you. And hopefully I get some information back to you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions?

Councillor Nason: I do have a second one.

Madam Speaker: Go ahead.

Councillor Nason: With regards to the vast amount of community spaces in Transcona, Madam Speaker, that are still without long-term leases, when can we expect some assurity from the Planning Department…Property Development? Thank you.

Councillor Gilroy: Sorry, I didn't quite understand the question. Can you repeat it?

Councillor Nason: We have many facilities in Transcona, daycares, senior centres that are in overhaul. When can we expect longer term leases?

Councillor Gilroy: Okay so right now, the public administration is doing the review and they're actually working with the components centre in those centres to look at, you know, how we want to move forward. If we want to sell or if we going to lease or if we're going to combine leases. So right now, they are…you know, they are on hold until this review comes back to council, and then that they are in the process, and I know they just…they were at our committee, I think last month, talking about it, so hopefully, we can get an update soon. It will be coming back to committee.

Councillor Nason: Last question I have, Madam Speaker. With that, I'm trying to fathom here, I'm hearing here from my senior community that they're already being told about moving up. Is that why we're having fear in the community now?

Councillor Gilroy: I don't know, Councillor Nason. I would be here (inaudible) for me if you want to…if somebody wants to send me the e-mails you received or something, I can follow up.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move to the next committee; Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. Councillor Rollins, on the report dated January 14th, 2022.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED JANUARY 14, 2022**

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to move consent agenda Items 1, 2, 3, with thanks to the standing policy committee.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. There's no motions, no by-laws. Let's have question period under this committee. Councillor Eadie.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thanks, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I've been getting inquiries from people about, you know, public works has described that in clearing the snow in the past I guess back in December with this severe cold, it

was really an inability to deal with of what developed into really icy runny conditions on our regional streets and, you know, for a fair bit on our collector streets and so on Madam Speaker. And ultimately, we're just wondering…I'm wondering if the chair person could find the information about how many accidents that the fire, paramedics services ended up getting into as a result of the really bad conditions. For example, on McPhillips was really bad and other streets. I'm wondering if you could get us that information and make it public about how many accidents resulting because of those conditions on the road.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I'm happy to inquire with the department. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move on. Next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Allard, on the report dated January 13th, 2022.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED JANUARY 13, 2022

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. By-laws, Councillor Allard.

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

Councillor Allard: Oh, I always get caught with this. One sec.

Madam Speaker: Will you move that By-law 6/2022 and 7/2022 be read a first time?

Councillor Allard: So moved.

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

Councillor Allard: Okay. I move that by-laws numbered…

Madam Speaker: We'll wait for the Clerk, just a moment. The Clerk will read out the first section.

Clerk: By-laws No. 6/2022 and By-law No. 7/2022.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I move that…I move that By-laws No. 6/2022 and 7/2022 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 6/2022 and By-law No. 7/2022.

Councillor Allard: And I rule that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 6/2022 and 7/2022 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We'll now have question period under this committee. Councillor Eadie and Rollins.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, similar to the firefighters but more specifically, Madam Speaker. So, we had conditions on our streets, on our regional streets, our collectors' streets where our buses operated every day in the ruts and the pure ice. And one can say that you can drive to the conditions, but I know when you get into situations of that much ice, it doesn't matter what speed you travel at, doesn't matter Madam Speaker. If there's nothing to grip, you're going to have accidents, Madam Speaker. and so, my question is…and Public Works, you know, has a reasonable excuse that they weren't able to deal with it properly during the snow. But my question is how many employees in Winnipeg Transit are being penalized because the street conditions were totally inappropriate for operations? If you could get back with me that more information, Madam Speaker, I would really appreciate it because I don't think it's fair.

Councillor Allard: Thank you for the question. I will endeavor to get those answers from the public service and get back to the councillor. I'll start an e-mail chain with the Chief Administrative Officer with you in a copy, and we are, and we just voted on basically a total review of our snow and ice control policy, and so we can certainly ask whether or not there have been situations where it has been suspected that that policy has not been adhered to, and any other possible changes to the policy.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question from Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker through you to the chair, many Winnipeggers are seeking information with respect to snow clearing policy these days and expressing concerns. I'm wondering if he could tell us, Madam Speaker, the background of the policy's motions that led to the snow clearing policy review and provide council with next steps, timelines, what we can anticipate in the coming months.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard, you're on mute.

Councillor Allard: Oh, whoops, I was muted. There have been a number of motions from various councillors, various committees, asking about service to take a second look at our snow and ice control policy. The motion that we just approved, the intention was to bundle all of those ideas into one motion and ask the public service to report back this summer in one big motion, and the intent was to try and capture all of the questions asked by councillors. And so, from now till then, if there's any additional questions, I know I for one as the Chairperson for the IRPW would welcome any additional amendments to that motion so that we can have those questions answered in the report coming this summer.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Okay, Councillor Nason, and then Councillor Lukes.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, I think you're frozen.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, (inaudible)…sorry. I'm frozen?

Madam Speaker: You're good now.

Councillor Nason: I'm in City Hall, so that should not be a challenge here, Madam Speaker. I'll start again, in the interest of public safety, recently Council passed a motion to allow for a reduction in speed on Marion. I want to ask the chair if there's a particular reason why Marion West or sorry, East of Dufresne or Dufresne is absent of a 50 kilometre an hour sign which just happens to be a photo radar installation.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Councillor Nason for the question. I'll be sure to follow up the public service asking that question.

Councillor Nason: Wait, we certainly have enough signs on that location. Further to that, I'd like to know, like that one got put up right away, but yet at that same motion that was passed at Council, we're still not having the one on Plessis, which many residents in the area were calling for. When can that be installed?

Councillor Allard: That's an excellent question, Councillor Nason. I'll be happy to put the public service and ask for a response.

Councillor Nason: Will the media and social media be utilized for those (inaudible) installed as well as it was for Marion?

Councillor Allard: Thank you for the very specific question. I'll be happy to ask our public service to comment on their proposed communications on the changes that happen as part of that report that we approved as Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you much…thank you very much. Councillor Allard, in 2016, a motion was moved at Public Works for the public service to identify cost required to improve snow and ice removal on the active transportation network. So, I really appreciate and support the motion today regarding, you know, the process on service improvements to the snow clearing and ice control program, but I'm finding it absolutely incredible that it will be done by July 5, 2022 because of the…when I moved the motion in 2016, it didn't happen until 2018, almost over…just about two years later. So, you know, to think that between now and July, we're going to have a big report, I mean, that's a miracle if that happens. I guess my question to you is do you really believe that we'll have a report on July 5, 2022?

Councillor Allard: I don't see why not. Council's asking for it. We have a comprehensive list of question. I think Council's been clear in its, in its desire to have changes, reviews. As part of this motion, we have an annual reporting mechanism. I think it's clear to public service that this is a high priority for Council and Winnipeggers, and I don't expect any delays.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, well that's great. In 2016, it seemed to be a high priority, but it did take a two years and then took another…

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: A year to two to implement it, but that's fine. That's all the question I have. I will remain optimistic.

Madam Speaker: Any other questions?

Councillor Allard: (Inaudible), Councillor Lukes.

Madam Speaker: Any other questions? Seeing none, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. We'll get right into question period. Any questions for Councillor Gillingham? Any questions? Okay. Seeing none, next, 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 DECEMBER 6, 2021

Councillor Mayes: Yes. We've got two agendas here. First up, I'll introduce and move adoption of the consent agenda Item 1, and that's the report of December 6th, 2021.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of Item 1 – Air Quality Program and Protective Information? All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Councillor Mayes, on the next report.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT DATED JANUARY 12, 2022

Councillor Mayes: Yes, at the risk of upsetting those who want to get out of here on the other one, I will move…introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Item 2 and pull Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on 2. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Financial Incentives for Composting

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, a relatively small item and coming out of existing funds, so no change to the budget here. But I do want to thank Councillor Klein who had been pursuing this over some months with a couple of different versions. And

sometimes we need to cooperate here and come up with something and Moira Geer and her staff went all in, took a look at this and said, well, we can't do some of what you want, but we can do the other part. So, I do think there's something here we can incentivize. Social enterprises, possibly to do more, pick up in areas with poverty, possibly to do more pick up in multi-family areas. It's an opportunity and the Green Action Centre deserves some credit for raising this sometime last year as well. So, it is not...it is not...Councillor Gilroy had expressed some concern, I think, that nothing should undermine the pilot project, nothing should undermine what would be a potential city-wide program. This is not doing that. This is very clearly an interim measure. This is in place until we're finished the pilot project, then the Council of the day will have a vote. And I did want to give some credit to the Mayor who is…we're underway with the pilot project. We didn't get that done under the previous mayor. We're going…we're doing it now in five or six…five neighbourhoods across six wards, so the pilot project will be completed, there'll be results. There will be a big vote here in a few years. Maybe I'll be here. Maybe Councillor Browaty will be here to cancel out my vote. Who knows? But in any event, in the interim, we do have this measure that uses existing resources to try and encourage people to do some organic pick up. I hope to take advantage myself. I should be doing that. And again, thanks to Councillor Klein for pushing this forward. I think it's a worthwhile initiative.

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, really quick because we don't have a lot of time, and it is a good news story. I just wanted to say that, again, Councillor Klein, it's not exactly what he hoped to achieve, but what's there is good. And I just wanted to say that in the Mynarski Ward, North End, I'm engaging with the...one of the private compost offerings to try to bring a compost service into the North End, where we have all kinds of issues that the pilot project is not going to demonstrate when it comes back because they refuse to actually run a pilot in the most difficult neighborhoods in the city. So, anyway, this is a great report, and thanks to Councillor Klein, at least something temporarily is going to be in place to increase people's ability to compost.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Schreyer, if you could unmute, please.

Councillor Schreyer: Great. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I did appreciate...well, look, it's a good issue. And I'm all for...often for...usually for the pilot projects because we have to keep an open mind in terms of finding out what we're going to learn. In this case, I appreciate Councillor Klein's contribution on this because he's sort of in a position to answer some questions we've been…that people have been asking us since I've been elected in terms of what is possible and what are the alternatives? You know, look, I've been involved actively in the environmental cause here in Manitoba for decades. Don't have to take my word for it, even Mayor Bill Norrie gave me the City of Winnipeg Community Service Award for my environmental activism back in the '80s. However, I have to admit, when I started the environmental issue, part of what I was doing was, it was idealistic, and there was nothing wrong with that, but if you're going to be truly environmentally inclined, sometimes you're going to have to come to what might be not obvious conclusions and uncomfortable ones. And when it comes to the issue of composting, you've got to be serious about this. If you're truly concerned about the environment or whether you want to look like you're concerned for the environment, they're not necessarily the same thing. Sometimes we have to make difficult decisions, including those that are counterintuitive, and they're counterintuitive to those who just think if we do something environmental, then it's good, but there could be a cost to it that's greater in terms of, well, there's different parts to the environment. There're different parts to our ecology and our economy and our energy supplies, and they're all interrelated. In terms of the issue of composting that was raised this morning by David Grant, he made an excellent point that we cannot ignore. He made the point, if we're serious about the impact of composting on…on our greenhouse gas emissions, on our environmental impact, we have to ask this…we have to answer this question: what is the environmental impact of the fossil fuel combustion…combusting vehicles that are doing the composting pick up throughout the city? What are the…what do we…what have we found out from other jurisdictions? How much fossil fuels are being burnt into the air from the equipment going around the city collecting compost? As an environmentalist, I have to ask that uncomfortable question and I need the answer. And if I don't want the answer, how I call myself an environmentalist? Now, it's an uncomfortable one, isn't it, because we all say, well, composting is good. And yes, it is, how we do it matters. And I've had my concerns over the years. Happens to be that Councillor Klein's motion here can be part of that solution in terms of answering these uncomfortable questions if you're really concerned about the environment. What's the cost to some of these programs to the environment as a matter of fact. And so, I'm glad that we have this program so far and thanks to those that put their work into it, and we'll continue learning. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: No, let's just call the question.

Madam Speaker: Call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried.

Councillor Browaty: Nay. Record in opposition, please.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty, yes. Noted, thank you. We'll now go into question period for this committee. Any questions for Councillor Mayes? Councillor Chambers.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you to the Chair of Water and Waste. Multi-family development in St. Norbert has come to a grinding halt on the basis of sewer capacity issues. St. Norbert, it should be known as not part of the combined sewer district. Developers I have spoken with have told me that Water and Waste has allocated the number of units that they can be…they can build based on sewer capacity issues, but there's no data that provides support to those numbers. I've been told by the department that curb close studies are being conducted, and that those studies have to be continued throughout the winter months as land drainages in the spring will formulate part of that data. My question is, can the department provide the current data which has led to the allocation for builders with respect to the allocations of units?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: It's a fair question. It's also a good question in that sometimes people equate oh, we're running out of space, it's a combined sewer issue. And Councillor Chambers has a good point here. It isn't always the combined sewer issue. There are areas like St. Norbert where that's not the problem. There are areas that close to the boundary of our two wards, River Park South along St. Anne's Road, where you're having…people told various different things if you're on the east side as opposed to the west side on how much you can develop. So yeah, there the combined sewer restriction and we saw some of that referenced earlier, I think on the…on the Wellington report or the Grassie report then there the hydraulic issues that you get into different smaller areas. I can ask the staff, I think it was Moira Geer who referred to the irreplaceable, Michelle Paetkau. And Michelle Paetkau is our expert on how much capacity is left basically. As a Master's degree in this, and I mean there are a lot of issues here about biosolids, about measuring how much capacity is left, growth in the city, population predict, you know, wildly different projections in population now, so I will…I will talk to the staff. Ms. Paetkau's been very good, coming up with these sorts of answers. I mean it's, to some extent, it's a mathematical calculation of measurements of flows. But you know, it's a fair question about…it's something that I have no memory of five, six years ago around here, and now, this comes up all the time, how much space is left. You said six units, and now, you say three. How can this be? All these sorts of questions, and the answer is, I think if Ms. Geer was here, Director was here would…she would say it's because it's starting to become an issue. Our capacity is really becoming a big part of the workload now for Water and Waste, so it's a good question, and I'll do my best to get an answer on that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, given. I know we're almost done, but I'm moving a motion to suspend the rules to go past 6:00 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That's in order right now. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Any other questions for our chair? Okay. Let's move on, Standing Policy Committee on Innovation and Economic Development.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DATED DECEMBER 14, 2021

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I was going to keep my comments to being very short, but now that we have unlimited time…just kidding. It's my pleasure to introduce the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Innovation and Economic Development dated December 14th, 2021 and move Report No. 1 as consent.

Madam Speaker: Okay. It's been stood down. Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Open Data Annual Report

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It's a fantastic report. Winnipeg continues to win awards for the amount of open data that we've made available. Many people in public are able to access this data and use it through open source tools. It's really a fantastic news story, and I'll wait for comments from my colleagues now.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I'll try to keep my comments short. I, of course, am voting in favour of this report. And Madam Speaker, yes, we have received, I think, award…I think it was, we were the most open city in Canada. I think that's what it was. But Madam Speaker, and also, not only are we providing open data, but you know, we're doing well in the smart city stuff. So, Madam Speaker, I will be supporting this report, but I want to point out some issues because while I was listening to EPC and interaction with a number of community groups were quite concerned about their ability to contribute and, you know, get reports and do that. And yes, Madam Speaker, we are...well, I think it was the most open city in terms of data, but Madam Speaker, I'd just like to point out some smart things that I think we need to try to work at in the future because I've tried to use the open data as well. Not issues of blindness, but It's open data, and it's pure, total data. And Madam Speaker, unless you are an expert researcher who knows how to ply maps to extract data from those open databases, and how to extract it and have information that makes sense so you can analyse it and do some work to point out issues that we might be having related to various city data that we collect, Madam Speaker. And so, it would be really smart...and, I know…you know, our Public Service has done a great, excellent job in putting this thing together, and I know that they're short on resources, and they achieved a lot without, you know…with the efforts they can do, Madam Speaker. But I would just point out that while this is an excellent report, we need to figure out somehow that we could create and offer up templates for extracting data from the open data that's there because, you know, like open data construction projects, and whatever, all that stuff, but it…that data means nothing if you don't know how to pull it out and put it together to look at the situation, you know. So, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to point that out. It's what I hear from...and there are researchers out there that...well, you know, if you've…I've been doing...I think…I like to think I'm an expert researcher analyst when I have time, but you know, like, learning the new ways of extracting data, I know that we use the geometric or whatever system to extract certain reports that our city…our excellent Public Service is very intelligent and knows how to do it, but it takes a lot of time, Madam Speaker, to put together those templates. So, I think there's room for improvement. Let's not just rest on our laurels. This is a great report, but let's improve the ability of Winnipeggers get the data and be able to look at it themselves because when we put out this open data, we're saying, well, we're open. You could get all the reports you want. Well, you know, most Winnipeggers wouldn't know how to…how to do it. So, I think, you know…figuring out how to extract, you know, 10,000 records is pretty easy on the open data, but applying some sort of form to bring it to have some sort of kneading when you extract that data is the difficult thing. So, to…Madam Speaker, to the Chairperson overseeing this, if you could just…I'd like to give my...well, I'm sure the CAO and others are listening. The Public Service, excellent job on implementing initiatives that this is actually a good story from our mayor. Over the years, we've proceeded quite well, but we just need to have…add a little more meaning to it and ability for any Winnipegger to go there and find the data that they're…information that they're looking for. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thanks, Madam Speaker. And appreciate the compliments from Councillor Eadie. I think this is a report in which I hope all members of Council and the Public Service, Winnipeggers themselves, can take great pride in. I want to thank our committee chair, Councillor Browaty, has been absolutely steadfast in supporting this for many years. And I just want to highlight a few notable points from this report. It is important to recognize that Council has requested the Public Service submit an annual report to Council, detailing the progress on the City's open data program so that they can properly advise Council and, in doing so, members of the public on our progress and our successes of the preceding year. Some of the key achievements in the last year include Council adopting the International Open Data Charter. Winnipeg has moved…years ago…a few years ago, we were ranked 21st in Canada on the Open Cities Index, we are now most recently ranked third in all of North America. That is an outstanding achievement to which Winnipeggers and our Public Service and Council should take great pride in. There's also been, of course, the global recognition from the Intelligent Communities Forum, naming Winnipeg, for the first time ever, as the world's most intelligent community. That is an accomplishment that was…that was achievable through a number of efforts. I do want to thank and compliment Economic Development Winnipeg for their efforts, but also, the open data program contributed to us achieving that global recognition, and I think that's noteworthy. There's been a release of 25 new data sets from the linear referencing system, which is a base map layer, to the Winnipeg Fire and Paramedic Service call logs and light detection and ranging or LDAR, data, among other data sets. The concept is really simple. You liberate that data, you make it available, and our…our residents can utilize it, they can use it when it's open…when it's open data in machine readable format. The entrepreneurialism and the innovation in our community can really be fuelled through a lot of data that we have here. I know in recent news we've seen criticism of other levels of government for not putting out as much data as some folks would like. We're going hard on trying to really get as much data out as possible, and I think that really is something that's in everybody's best interests. The fourth open data hack-a-thon was hosted in a virtual space with 30 participants looking specifically at Public Works data. A Pembina Trails early college collaboration with workshops and presentations to grade nine and ten students, which

led to a student-built web application for parking information. And then, of course, the launch of the voting information system website, with Council vote records displayed in a friendly, searchable format. Our work continues. Great progress, compliments to everybody, including, of course, our Public Service, our committee chair, members of the committee and all members of Council. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker. It's kind of a big brother question that…you know, that I've got to answer about open data. And I understand there's a great amount and powerful data that's collected every time you click a key stroke. Recently, a member of this council chastised us with regards to the lack of logins for the GL. I'm just wondering how that information's disseminated. Are they…you know, is information being shared with certain members of Council to be used for political gamesmanship and to shame us? You know, if you want to talk about integrity of the system, open data is...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Yes, ma'am.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, let's not impugn the motive of others.

Councillor Nason: Well, I'm just…I guess the question is, how far will we go? Will all the key strokes of councillor also be included in open data? Is that an open data item? Because our logins to our computer…how many times do we take key swipes to enter our office at city hall? I'm sure we'll get shamed for that because…

Councillor Browaty: Point of order. Point of order. Councillor Nason, you're out of line here. The point is…there's no big data centre available.

Councillor Nason: I'm sorry. You called a point of order...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, let's stick to the facts, what's in the report, please. And let's be respectful. Yes, it is late, but we still need to maintain respect and decorum in this chamber.

Councillor Nason: (inaudible) the rest of my questions. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next speaker, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good comments all around. These are peoples' concerns. And as the councillors before me have represented. I really do like how Councillor Eadie, and there are cheers from the gallery for Councillor Eadie in terms of how he's made the point in terms of making sense of this data. You can see analysis can be subjective, but it's not necessarily subjective. There are ways in which we can spot trends, we see patterns, we can make groupings, and that's a way in which we can make greater sense for people from this raw data. Now, it's a good thing. I'm not…it is, essentially, but people's concerns should be dealt with. One is, that if this is open data, and we're talking about construction projects and stuff like this, if this is really going to help us as a society because it can, data can, what's missing here? What's our biggest problem? I've been saying for years, our biggest problem is we...our budget is not sustainable in dealing with our biggest problem, and that is the change in infrastructure costs, the costs of construction. We...open data could be very, very helpful here. As an example...I'm not…I'm not making this up. You might not like what I'm saying. But bear in mind, earlier in this year, based upon something that was in last budget, the City was going to do some sort of…what some councillors thought was going to be a report on construction inflation. In this…in this little report, small report as it was, they didn't realize that what they had said was, in half of the construction industry, in either 2016 or 2017, there was a 30% increase in construction costs. When I asked them about that, they couldn't answer me. Well, what good is data that doesn't give you the patterns and helps you understand? Everybody would have gained from answering my question. The City administration would have gained from answering my question. They said it's complicated and it wasn't really within the realm of the report to actually answer the questions regarding construction inflation. That's too bad, Council is worse off for it. We're considered to be the most intelligent city in terms of data, but I can tell you something, I as a member of Council can't say I'm all the more intelligent because in terms of the potential for what this can do. (Inaudible) our biggest problems. I mean, it's not just this city, it's all cities. This is our society here. But for us to sort of put our heads in the sand…in the sand and say, this data portal, for which we're considered the greatest open city in Canada or North America or whatever, can't help us with our biggest problems, which are data related, showing what the patterns are, and I'm supposed to feel good about this? Well, we just kicked off a public consultation on police budget, right? So why not use the data...the best we can do, all we can muster in solving our biggest budgetary and fiscal problems because I'm saying, they're not sustainable. We can't continue this way. So, this is all very good that we're doing this. I think what we should do is that apply…is apply it to our biggest challenges, ones that we do not have a choice but to deal

with as a council, as a city, as accountability…in terms of accountability to the taxpayers, but offering that people in terms of public consultation. If we're going to have public consultation on the police budget based on whatever factors we can, what is stopping us from taking a bigger role and dealing with the big one? Because the police budget isn't the big one. What's stopping us? What's stopping from enhancing our use of this data for something that is really beneficial? That everyone in the city…that every member of Council, that the entire administration can agree upon. And I'm not asking anybody to change their values unless their value is to withhold public information from the public. If it is the motivation to withhold taxpayers' knowledge of their own tax money in terms of how it's changing, year by year, decade by decade. If that is your motivation, I understand why you wouldn't want to conclude it in what's considered the most intelligent city's database or something like that. So, let's be positive. It's easy to say no to things sometimes, as the Mayor said, but let's make this most useful. If we're so good at this, if Winnipeg is so good at this, let's use it to solve our biggest problems. Let's do that. Let's be positive about it. Let's all agree to it. Let's all say yes and enhance this thing. This thing, as intelligent as it is, to be our greatest tool to deal with our biggest problem and not deny it. Thank you.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Further to Councillor Eadie's point, I mean, yes, I mean, to do the coolest and most in-depth dives of information available, you need to have some additional skills and training. I mean, yeah, you or I can poke in there and get some information out of it, but how do you combine data sets? There's 184 unique data sets. How do you combine it with, say, temperature data from Environment Canada? Rain flow, rain gauge checks from across the city, perhaps there's better ways of determining where the next mosquito outbreak is going to be based on one of the new data sets this year. There's, you know, these hack-a-thons, where you get people who are really smart and know data analytics, they can take this data and do wonderful things with it. The idea isn't, Councillor Nason, to be big brother and to try and track what you're doing on your office PC, I don't think that's at all what this open data notion here is, but again, it's a very exciting piece. We were named most intelligent city this year for the year. And again, number three in North America in terms of open data. So, again, the information's out there, and you know, you can do neat things with it. I bet you can even, you know, take historical data and inflation and figure out exactly some construction inflation stuff out of this, too. Anyways, those are my comments, and I move…I move this.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. All in favour of the item? Contrary? That's carried. We'll now have question period for our chair, for Councillor Browaty. Any questions? Okay. Seeing none, let's move on to the...yeah, we'll move on to the Governance Committee of Council. Councillor Eadie, you'll be in the Chair. Go ahead, so I can move the by-laws.

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Sharma: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll move that By-law No. 8/2022 be read a first time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour? Are there…are there any opposed? No, okay. That carries. Clerk?

Clerk: By-law number…oh, sorry, By-law No. 8/2022.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Sharma: I'll move that By-law 8/2022 be read a second time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right. All those in favour? All those opposed? None? That's unanimous. Thank you.

Clerk: By-law No. 8/2022.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you. I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 8/2022 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right, I'll call the question then. All those in favour? Any opposed? That is carried, assuming unanimously.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Madam Speaker…Councillor Sharma. All those in favour? Is anybody opposed? Not. Thank you.

Councillor Sharma: Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 6:12 p.m.