COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, July 21, 2022

The Council met at 9:39 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 Lukes.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And now, onto you, Mr. Mayor, for morning announcements.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. And good morning to my council colleagues, those that are joining us in-person in the gallery and watching us online. Madam Speaker, I'm going to highlight just a couple items this morning. Firstly, I want to just advise Council that I was honoured to address UN stakeholders virtually recently on the importance of sustainable development goals as part of the Canadian mission's participation in the UN high level political forum dialogue on sustainable development. As the only Canadian mayor that was asked to address stakeholders at the UN, there was particular interest in this council's leadership and the leadership of our Public Service in embedding in the OurWinnipeg 20…2045 plans, the UN sustainable development goals. Of a particular interest was also the work that United Way of Winnipeg is conducting with respect to the Peg indicators report and the new…the relatively new usage of the voluntary local reporting as a measurement tool. And so, I want to applaud Council. I want to applaud the Public Service. Our efforts to embed the UN sustainable development goals so that we can build a more sustainable future for us and our kids, and of course, for the plant, is something that is being noticed globally and was tremendous honour to address UN stakeholders in that respect. There's a few reconciliation efforts I want to just comment on that have happened since our last Council meeting, Madam Speaker. On June 28th, I had the privilege of joining many of you and our Public Service for the fifth…first…sorry, the fifth Indigenous Accord signing ceremony at The Forks. We welcomed many new members. We now have over 200 and…I believe 220 partners to Winnipeg's Indigenous Accord. This is really trying to create that ripple effect of action in the community where it's needed the most. And want to thank all those new members to Winnipeg's Indigenous Accord, as well as the unwavering support of this council and our Public Service for our…you know, for all of the efforts that we're taking on our journey of reconciliation. I had the opportunity to visit with Chief Kevin Redsky at Shoal Lake 40 First Nation on July 5th. And was able to drink the water from their new water treatment plant, tour the new school, the new water treatment plant and visit with members of the community. Really, was quite an emotional day travelling on Freedom Road. I've had the opportunity now a few times. Was advised that I was the first mayor when I first visited Shoal Lake early in my first term, since Bill Norrie to visit the community. And so, I've been there numerous times and really just was reminded of this council and previous councils' leadership to deliver Freedom Road. Amongst governments, we took the lead and was pleased that the Province and the Federal Government got on board and also helped support the construction. Lastly, yesterday was a historic day with the public signing ceremony at The Forks for Naawi Oodena. This is something that this council at our last Council meeting unanimously supported. This will create Canada's largest urban reserve in the entire country and something that I think all members of Council should take great pride in that support. There was a recognition of the efforts of our negotiating team led by our CAO and the collaborative government to government position that the City of Winnipeg took to affect now the third urban reserve in Winnipeg, but again, the largest in Canadian history and something that I wanted to just note. And you know, that story of peace and partnership with the treaties and Treaty 1 initially envisioned is something that we're better realizing today than over, of course, the many generations that have occurred since the signing of Treaty 1. And that spirit is going to be needed going forward to give life to the aspirations and hopes that we all have for the development of the former Kapyong Barracks. And I hope this council, future councils, as well as residents, continue to support those efforts to improve the economic opportunities for all peoples in the city of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Our final speaker, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Hello, bonjour. I will be speaking in French and English for those who want to use interpretation.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: While our world faces global warming records and another year of extreme meteorological conditions caused by global warming, July 20th, the PPM of carbon in our atmosphere is 419.13 and it is more and more everyday in relation to gas (inaudible).

Councillor Allard: As our world faces record breaking heatwaves and another year of extreme weather brought on by climate, the July 20th carbon PPM in the atmosphere is 419.13, which is more than ever, and growing everyday along with other greenhouses gases that are warming and changing our climate. So, I wanted to make a point, as I did last Council, to that affect. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard.

MINUTES

Councillor Klein moves that the minutes of the meeting held on June 23, 2022 be taken as read and confirmed.

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

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: We'll now move into delegations. I'll call forward Tanya Palson, Executive Director of the Manitoba Building Trades. She is here in-person with us, others joining her. To be heard in support of Item 1 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated July 13th, 2022. It's regarding the Introduction of a Sustainable Procurement Action Plan. Welcome.

Tanya Palson: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Orlikow: Just a point of order. I appreciate everybody's here today to speak, but this is unusual and it's a precedent setting moment. Just want to make sure we're all clear, it's usually only the speaker who comes down to the floor to speak, but I just want to…if this is acceptable to the Council, that's fine, but just be wary that, in the future, we couldn't say no to another group maybe we don't love as much or have more concerns with. So, I'll leave that to your ruling, but I just want to raise the point.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, councillor, and that's a good point. We have had others join the speaker in the past, but certainly not this many folks. We'll let it go. There's one delegation today, but noted, and we'll keep that in mind for future, Mr. Clerk, if folks could let us know if there's more than one or two others joining them at the podium. Proceed, thank you.

Tanya Palson: No, good to know. I think last time we had submitted everyone's names, and this time, it just got put under mine. So, I'll just good morning, Mayor, councillors, Madam Speaker. Again, you almost got away with a Council meeting free of delegations, so I'll be brief. But again, thank you for the opportunity for us all to present, even in this unusual manner, on an item that is so important to all of us here today. I've been a bit of a regular in these chambers when it comes to the social procurement file. So again, today I am here as the Executive Director of Manitoba Building Trades, but more than that, I'm also fortunate to be speaking as a representative of the We Want to Work Coalition. And this coalition is made up of the social enterprise sectors leaders from organizations represented behind me, including Build Inc., Mother Earth Recycling, Compost Winnipeg, Persons Community Solutions, Purpose Construction, Seed Winnipeg, the Canadian Community Economic Development Network, and as well as LITE: Local Investment Towards Employment. And this is certainly not an exhaustive list of all the coalition members, but on behalf of the We Want to Work Coalition, we're presenting in favour of Item No. 1 before you. And we support the recommendations from the Public Service and adoption of the Social Procurement Action Plan. For many of these organizations, today represents over eight years of planning. It's been four years since the establishment of the coalition. And I'm going on three years now of deliberation, conversation, discussion with City administration and various councillors working towards seeing the action plan before Council today. You know, this represents a significant step for the City of Winnipeg in seeing social, economic, environmental value for our community while achieving the city's purchasing needs. And the achievement of division and goals of the sustainable procurement as outlined in the action plan, would greatly improve the social, economic and

environmental conditions in our community. So, it's exciting, to say the least. We'd like to thank the Public Service for their tireless efforts to arrive at this point by Social Canada, as well, for the engagement in policy development expertise brought on to get to this point with the action plan and Mayor Bowman and members of Council for their interest and engagement with this policy development. We appreciate and recognize the positive benefits of social and sustainable procurement practices for our city. You know, should this go forward today, we now have four pillars within the sustainable procurement potentially being ethical, environmental and Indigenous already in place and now, adding a social aspect. Procurement is obviously one of those areas that even the term draws the least level of excitement or interest, but it's certainly an important area rife for impact. And I think for those timelines; the eight years, the four years, the three years, some of that is just kind of breaking through the why are we talking about procurement and trying to get people to actually understand what it is that we are talking about. But the potential impact is significant given the amount of purchasing undertaken by the City. So, adding that social impact as a consideration when purchasing just…it does not negate or supersede critical considerations like cost for quality, in fact, many of the organizations behind me today have successfully competed and been awarded work based on just a cost competitive basis. But it means that when a purchase is being made, in addition to checking for costs and quality, you know, you're already asking for, is this an environmentally friendly option? Is this an ethical supplier? Is there an Indigenous-owned bidder in the mix? But now you're also asking the question to the evaluating supplier or better…any companies who you're purchasing with public dollars from, do you have additional social impact built into your service or product offering? And can the City assign a value to that social impact as an additional consideration to the dollars that are going to be spent anyways? A big area for consideration is often, does the supplier or bidder employ under-represented populations or individuals facing barriers to employments? That obviously has a big impact in a city like ours. Are they partnering with social or employment service organizations for these populations? You know, are they contributing to workforce development in these populations they're training and apprenticeship programs? These are all the types of questions that the action plan will kind of help us finalize in various segments of your purchasing as to what's appropriate where and when. And the action plan puts forward an interim process to adopting these questions into your bidding process. So, to oversimplify, if you're comparing two bidders, you know, you have one bidder at a cost of $10 and the other bidder at a cost of $10, but included in the second bidder's is, I know they're servicing, you know, they have employment for barriered individuals which could have outcomes like reducing municipal expenses in the areas of social services or crime prevention or creating pathways for workforce recruitment and development. So, you're paying the same amount, but you're evaluating what actual value you're getting out of it at the end of the day. Your commitment to social procurement will make a difference in the lives of Winnipeggers who need it most, most importantly, and support the existing social enterprise sector, much represented behind me, but also, create incentives for more innovative social businesses to develop and meet the demand that you guys would be able to generate. So, getting into you what is before you in Item 1 today, we just wanted to reiterate that within the specific action plan, there are a few areas we particularly support. I believe you…you know, this is very re-iterative of what we presented last week at EPC. So, one is the aligning of this action plan to achieve the desired outcomes of the City's existing strategies, you're putting it into your sustainable procurement policies, not creating a whole new kind of procurement purchasing process that would have to flow through to your administration. Two, we value that the action plan ensures that sustainable procurement practices are also fair, open and transparent. And three, the inclusion of resources to the action plan can be fully implemented and ensure that Winnipeg receives the intended social, economic community benefits of this policy. You know, additionally, we appreciate there's a phased in iterative nature of this action plan, which I think will allow for more innovation, partnership development and refinement of the policy over the next three years. You know, we support the inclusion of a dedicated staff person just to serve as a social procurement liaison. This is an essential position that we've seen, not only in the other municipalities, but also in, you know, provincial departments like Manitoba Housing and the like. Furthermore, the inclusion of a multi-sector advisory stakeholder table, social procurement purchaser and supplier roundtable, the Indigenous procurement engagement event and an operative post-tender debrief to all bidders upon written request. These are all aspects of resourcing the plan that we view to be critical to the success of it. We also include…or support the inclusion of retaining a third-party expertise to support the implementation. The services (inaudible) social as a facilitator to get us to this point. I think we're immeasurable and given the potential for immense impact and you know, wanting to get it right, it's definitely a worthwhile investment. And so, we really support and thank that the Public Service had included that in their recommendation. You know, it sounds like a lot going into it, and I think the ongoing consultation will be super important. I can speak from my experience in the construction industry. It's not often that you're getting all the various sectors within our industry at the table, not only at the table, but agreeing on the same initiative. So, it says a lot for the backing of this action plan, because that is the case here. And I would be remiss not to mention the pathway to possible community benefits agreements on large-scale projects, which has exciting potential for diverse recruitment and workforce development. Something that, in my industry specifically, we're in dire need of. So, in closing, once again, thank you, Madam Speaker, Mayor Bowman, Council in support and interest of the development of this social procurement framework and now the action plan, as well as the various leaders and members of the Public Service for their collaborative efforts in getting us to this point, and willingness to respond and include and adapt based on the feedback. That's been the most engaging process that I've, certainly, been a part of so far with the City. And you know, and proof in the point of letting us kind of do this unusual set up as well, too. Yeah, so that's it. And thank you. And I can take any questions, or if there's any questions for various members, they're here.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. There are questions, but just before we do that, I'd like to ask the guests to return to the gallery and then we'll take questions. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Thanks for the presentation. You've talked to us many times about procurement and my questions maybe a little off of…degree off of where you were presenting, which was valuable stuff. But also, on the agenda today, there's some other procurement issues. There was a…there was a report recently that terminated at Finance Committee called 'Lessons Learned from South End', and a lot has gone wrong in south end pollution control plant in terms of the work. A lot of cost overruns. A lot of what we've discussed here has been skilled labour, that phrase just keeps coming back to us, skilled labour. Any thoughts on how we move forward? I think the lesson I've learned is probably that key word: skilled labour. That's how I take the lessons, others would have different lessons learned, I guess. Talk to us a bit, if you would then, about what we might do. North End, I would very much hope will be tendered out, announced, funded, rolling, hopefully before this mayor is done because I think he deserves some…the opportunity to announce that. We will need federal and provincial help. What then, as we go forward on North End, what…what can we do to promote consideration of skilled labour as part of the lessons learned at the south end?

Tanya Palson: Yeah, it's a bit of a procurement, how you're phrasing your procurement, it touches on social procurement. It could also be done without a full social procurement landscape in addressing that, but what something like, say, a community benefits agreement was something that this plan is proposing to put in action, or at least find a high impact procurement opportunity for. Timing of which, with the tendering of the next phase of North End, will kind of be the biggest question and if the action plan goes forward, we get to kind of discuss that as early as December. So, there is some opportunity there. But you're essentially, without trying to get into the minutiae of how labour is provided, you know, you're hiring a contractor, you're often not considering who that contractor's hiring from their labour force. The contractor doesn't come in with, you know, all 300 or 400 or 500 people they need at peak for that project. So, you're able to put in for the bid process, whether through a community benefits agreement or just sort of a more thorough procurement process. Questions around the labour supply, not just the trades themselves, but where the labour supply is coming from, with a CBA model on something like this, if you're setting targets for the number of, you know, Indigenous represented populations, the number of not just employment hours, but apprenticeship hours, you're by necessity creating a certain type of labour pool that a contractor will have to meet…to meet those requirements that you're asking for. So, if you're asking for, you know, apprenticeship hours plus apprenticeship advancement and you're able to, with a social procurement liaison, monitor that, you're also ensuring a more skilled workforce because you can't have apprenticeship hours with, you know, a bunch of people who are in unregulated trades kind of being put to do trades work. So, it's a bit of a complicated system, but certainly, what we saw at the south end is, there was none of those questions even asked. So, in the North End, we would want to be looking, if possible, whether through a community benefits agreement framework, through a social procurement framework, or just through more thorough tendering asking some of those questions around labour skill, which, you know, any contractor worth their salt is going to want to have the skilled labour on there anyways. So, you're signalling to them that you're looking for that and you're watching it and you're monitoring it. And by necessity you're…potentially, you're not going to overcome all issues, but you're potentially overcoming the issues of, you know, having a contractor backfill with a lot of labour that is legally okay for the project and legally okay for what the provincial standards are, but might not actually have the experience required to do the work.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Tanya. Next question is from Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm always filled with comfort and hope when Tanya Palson or someone from the Manitoba Building Trades is here to speak with us publicly, as well as work with the City to get good work done well, including Sudhir Sandhu, whomever it is. Now, today, it feels me with comfort and hope to see so many people, I'd say younger than I am, who showed that they are ready and willing and able to work and do some really good work on behalf of their brothers and sisters in the city of Winnipeg in industries that…some of which I've worked in. But I was more of a grunt. We're dealing with people that…well, the people that are skilled, certified tradespeople. I worked with them, they're all my bosses. I was the unskilled person that did whatever he was told in a lot of these construction…construction jobs. It is very comforting to see that we're working seriously together. Sometimes we reinvent the wheel. I do know that the Gary Doer government, when it came to…

Madam Speaker: Question, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. Thank you, Madam Speaker. At least on the City of Winnipeg level, we're doing some serious discussion to see how we can do things better. And I want to know, you know, we're going to be taking lessons from this. I'd like to know, are other building trade organizations throughout the province…throughout the country, are they going to watching us? They can learn from us, too. Are we going to be speaking with different cities and municipalities from provinces across the country on what we learned here today? Or what we're learning here for this project.

Tanya Palson: Yeah, I mean, there's been…in the action plan and the framework itself, there's been extensive consultation and kind of jurisdictional review. So, that's been undertaken both by the third-party, by social as well as your public administration. So, a lot of even what you've got before you today is informed by those jurisdictional scans. I think that there is going to be eyes on because it's going to be potentially Winnipeg's first big foray if it were to be the North End plant, but certainly, there's a lot of Canadian municipalities who have gone through this pathway, but it is still, you know, a thing of recent five years, something new. So, you'll be a case point going forward for the next municipality that wants to take it on. And…but I also think that in terms of…you know, there's a lot of…a lot of the, kind of, community groups and social enterprises behind me today are very much (inaudible) with the purchasing and services side, so I don't want to take too, too much away from how that will impact them as well, but on the construction, there's definitely lessons that we can learn from specific projects in other municipalities, too. So, I think it will be a give and a…a give and a take going forward. But certainly, something that, you know, should this go well, the next…you know, the next Winnipeg that's looking to take this on, we would be part of their review and they'd want to see lessons learned from how we pull this off.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And it's good that Councillor Chambers is following me because I was going to salute his efforts to bring this forward today as well. I know we had competing motions, but we ended here together and hopefully, we'll end up together around the table supporting this. Manitoba Building Trades did support and provide input towards our motions. It's nice to see that the industry is united or showing a united voice on this matter, Madam Speaker. But I guess my question for the delegation would be that, you know, as we move forward, do you see this as a significant step forward to help marginalized individuals that are having barriers entering the workforce?

Tanya Palson: Yes, absolutely. And I don't want to speak too much, again, for the organizations that are represented behind me, but you know, that's what they do. That's like the core kind of aspect is working with barriered individuals and more diverse workforces. So, you're stimulating…you're potentially stimulating a market for them to sustain themselves, but also, grow and herd new social enterprises to come up. And almost the entire purpose of the social enterprise is just to address those issues. And then certainly, on the construction side, we're always looking for recruitment and workforce development, that's one of our biggest challenges right now. So, having, again, kind of that market led approach where a big owner like the City of Winnipeg is indicating that that's a value, it's another pathway or (inaudible) you know, incentive for the contractors to work with the labour suppliers like us to be really serious in increasing those numbers of diversity recruitment.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. With the challenges in the recruitment and retention of employees, is the…is the labour force also facing that on some of the more challenging contracts?

Tanya Palson: In terms of construction labour force or just in general? Yes, I mean, construction has its own sort of unique recruitment and retention challenges. I think what we've seen is, when you're not…if an owner or a project owner or government isn't specifying the need for specifically apprentices and apprentice advancement, what could happen then is that value goes base back to cost. And so, there's less incentive for the contractors who even want to bring on more apprentices and want to advance them. Apprenticeship wage scale all the way up to red seal wage scale in the skilled trades and the industrial, commercial and institutional sector is higher than if you're not specifying that. So, it is cheaper to bring on a lot of labour that is not unskilled, but maybe not be on the pathway through apprenticeship. One you're an apprentice, you're on a certain wage scale. So, that does change the cost calculations and, you know, I'm not here to say that, you know, labour is a reason for massive cost differential…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We have another question for you.

Tanya Palson: Not saying that that's the…you know, should be considered as like a big ticket item and the baseline of what you're doing, but when you're having somebody bid on a really competitive basis, you're using two different labour calculations. And if you're not understanding that you're not getting the same value for that, you could be looking at, you know, even if it's just a couple million dollars in difference, that's the difference between skilled labour advancement through apprenticeship and a bunch of trades helpers coming onto the site. So, it's not a fair, competitive process where…you're indicating that that's what you want to see, when the contractors can be bidding fairly appropriately to that actual labour cost.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Does Winnipeg have the sufficient pipeline of skilled labour to support growth to a million people?

Tanya Palson: For the city population? It's…I mean, the construction industry as a whole is probably looking at nationally a deficit of 8,000 people in the next five years, and we're seeing across the country people not having the ability to meet their requirements of the infrastructure demand, which is why prioritizing something like this, we are indicating you want apprenticeship and trainees on-site is really important because you have people caught in the mix of bidding for a bid or bidding for workforce development and unfortunately, the way our industry is structured right now, which is not a…not a problem that is entirely on governments to solve, but it certainly is from a market perspective, a market can drive more investment, more advancement and more collaboration and that sort of thing.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you to Ms. Palson, I…first of all, I want to thank all of the stakeholders for their hard work in collaboration in getting us to…

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

Councillor Chambers: Getting us to a social procurement action plan. I would just like to know at a high level, what was the most difficult issue to overcome and how did the group work together to overcome that issue in terms of moving us forward and, of course, the work by social (inaudible).

Tanya Palson: That's a good question. I don't know if it's…I'm trying to think back over the past three years or so. And I'll look for nods or…of approval or disapproval; I would say the education piece of understanding what exactly we're talking about here and what social procurement is and getting the buy in on that and the impacts of it. It seems like something that on paper seems simple, but even, you know, last week, we were trying to talk to a reporter about it and it's hard to put it in just a few sentences of what the impact is going to be. So, I think that that's where you see those eight years and the four years and the three years. You know, and councillors like yourselves coming on and kind of getting it and leading the charge and seeing that this is a direction that they're going. And I think that was the biggest challenge, overall. Yeah.

Madam Speaker: Second question, 50 seconds.

Councillor Chambers: Yes, and very quickly. In terms of growing this out, will there be an education communication piece so that Winnipeggers will be able to understand the value of social procurement and see the investments that are being made in a workforce to bring this forward.

Tanya Palson: That's a good question. I don't actually know the specifics of that in the action. I know, as I listed here, there's an extensive amount of engagement with potential participatory stakeholders, but I know in early days, you know, different groups like the Chamber of Commerce and stuff have been at the table and are ready to kind of promote this and, you know, have not shown an opposition to this, too. So, I think if not in the action, there's certainly kind of supporting stakeholders within the city that will be looking to want to explain this. But I don't…I can't recall if it's specifically listed in the timeline for three years.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes our question period today. Thank you for your presence, Tanya. We'll move on to reports, Mr. Clerk. First, is the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated July 13th, 2022. Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED JULY 13, 2022

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 through 18.

Madam Speaker: Item 2 has been pulled. Item 4. Okay, we're on the reports of the Executive Policy Committee, July 21st, 2022. Reports 2 and 4 have been pulled. And I'll call the question on 1, 5 through 18. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 2 – Human Resources Strategic Alignment of the Flexible Workplace Program

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

Mayor Bowman: Sure, thank you. This is a report to be received as information asking for the Public Service to report back in…sorry, this…yeah, this is…this is…sorry, this is just to receive the report as information. I'll wait to hear from my council colleagues, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'll reflect back that when Council was informed by the CAO and the implementation team that they were putting in a flexible workplace program, the team sent us out an e-mail saying, because we didn't…there was no indication in it how it would improve and benefit residents. The statement was that better customer service would occur provided by a more engaged workforce with less turnover. Better value for money from a more productive and performance city workforce. More responsive City services provided by a more agile and resilient Public Service. This was what the CAO and the implementation team indicated to us that would occur with the flexible workplace program. Just to note, I am supportive of flexible workplace, but I'm also supportive of accountability. So, this report in front of us is an attempt to highlight how I find those claims to be incredible, but an attempt to highlight how these claims will come to fruition. But in the report, in my opinion, the report falls dramatically short of identifying how that will happen. When the report came forward to EPC, not one question was asked to the Public Service by either the Mayor or any member of EPC. No questions asking how will you present the metrics. What are the measurements? What are the baselines? What are the targets? Where is there discussion about performance review? In the Innovation and Economic Development Committee recently, we saw the opportunities from COVID report come forward. In that report, there was an example of travel time savings. This is taken right out of the report, "Based on assumptions that 90% of these meetings would have been in-person, the average and the average attendants of three people at an average cost of $50, would produce an annual savings of travel time of $1 million." The report went on to talk about the print savings. $77,000 in direct cost for Fleet print hardware, maintenance and consumables and $42,000 in direct costs for high volume print consumables and maintenance. So, metrics. So, when I look at the report…when I look at strategic direction number two, "Continuous improvement and innovation". So, drive, continuous improvement and performance measure in key processes and procedures across the organization. But when you look at the goal, it says, "Strength and linkages between service level goals and their measurements to help communicate and drive performance". I've been here eight years, I've never received a list of service level goals. I could be mistaken, but I've never seen a list. So, I'm really curious to know how the department's going to measure that. Strategic direction number three talks about collaborating to improve internal and external communication engagement with elected officials, residents, employees and business. Yet, it just talks about how they're going to improve communication with employees across departments. There's no mention of how communication is going to be improved with elected officials, residents and businesses. Strategic direction number four, it talks about improving the efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of City services. And it talks…it does not speak to how…it talks about customer service satisfaction. That's it. It does not speak to how efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of City services will be…will be improved. And there's a lot of reference to the service level satisfaction reported in the annual citizens satisfaction service survey. I think many of us have commented in the past. I think, Councillor Mayes, you've been commenting on that, that the survey needs a revamp and that the oversight of remote employees very much concerns me, also, because the Mayor and his Executive Policy Committee have provided no oversight or accountability to the four statutory officers. In 2017, the first and so far only annual performance management sub-committee was appointed. There have been no annual reviews in 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021. So, if we're not even overseeing the four statutory officers, I have serious concerns about, in general, the oversight of the 10,000 employees, let alone the 1,400 working from home. I state all of this because there's a…because taxpayers believe, as do I, that we are here to ensure accountability. I don't feel this report in front of us today and the plan of action provides a level of…the level of accountability we should be ensuring. I look forward to the next council being more aggressive on having the Public Service present metrics and comparative analysis in reports. I'll work towards that goal if I'm here and I hope others will. But I just find the report in front us today doesn't address any of the great claims, maybe slightly, any of the great claims made for better customer service, better value for money, more responsive City service, more productive and performance City workforce. More engaged, less turnover, more agile and resilient. I mean, those are great claims. Everyone should work from home, I guess, if we can reach all of this, but I just don't see how in this report that was brought forward on how it's going to happen…how that will occur. I won't be supporting the report. I'm not bringing forward any motions today. I've been told, you know, not to interfere in the administrative actions, that the Mayor and the Executive Policy Committee deal with that. So, I'll wait till after the upcoming election to try and get a little more accountability out of this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers, Item 2? Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, my acclaimed council colleague from Waverley West, Councillor Lukes, raises many good points, but I do want to…and I don't speak on behalf of Executive Policy Committee, Madam Speaker, but I do want to shed some light on where my thinking was in approving. And really, what is in my head when I'm interrogating this item. And that is, of course, service to Winnipeggers and, of course, the strategic plans and policies that this council has passed. Maybe not a majority of this…well, certainly, a majority of these…of this council, but plans that are transparent and publicly adjudicated like OurWinnipeg 2045. Plans like our multi-year budget and the updates. Plans like community trends and performance reports that Public Service put, really, their hearts and minds to that are transparently held. I absolutely…and finally, a regional strategic plan that we're a part of and I know Councillor Lukes supports, Madam Speaker. The purpose, though, of the strategic planning process of Council can be improved and that's where my colleague and I agree, Madam Speaker. Strategic plans really serve to set policy direction, which we do I think well in this chamber, but the priorities and alignment of resource allocation, well, that's up to the Susan Thompson Building led by, none other than, Mike Jack, Madam Speaker. So, when the Public Service comes and says this is how I can deliver results for Winnipeggers, well, I think it's up to us to listen and then really fiercely consider that. And that's where Councillor Lukes and I agree, Madam Speaker. But where we disagree is that these…the priorities of the Public Service are not open and transparent. They can be found on our website. And I think that those of us that have supported them, it's incumbent upon us to see those results delivered and that is a serious discussion at each and every standing policy committee. And that, Madam Speaker, I think is important to consider as we consider this item and, hopefully, our support for it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Any further speakers on this item? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor to close. Okay, I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Lukes is noted in opposition and it carries. Next item, Madam Clerk.

Item 3 – Building Safer Communities Fund: Initial Proposal Overview

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I stand in support of this item, Building Safer Communities Fund. This is simply having Community Services, the department, apply to this public safety fund. But I stand as Chair of Protection, Madam Speaker, because I want to make sure that, on the record, we as a Council put on the record, Madam Speaker, some words with respect to the public safety moment we're having in Winnipeg and why actions like this is so critical. We…this fund will enable…if we draw down funding, will enable us to grow some of the good programs Council has grown over the last term. In particular, community safety grants that we've been working shoulder-to-shoulder with community. Community like the Bear Clan. Community like the Mama Bear Clan. Community like the Downtown Community Safety Patrol and more. So, community-based strategies and initiatives, building capacity to better understand the nature and scope and impacts of the type of prevention and interventions that Winnipeg needs. Enhancing evidence-based and targeted prevention, intervention activities is what this item is about, Madam Speaker. And I think at this critical juncture of Winnipeg where we're seeing crime severity index rise and we know we're top 10 in Canada, in Winnipeg, and that we oftentimes trade spaces, I think, with Thunder Bay for homicides alone, that we should be rising and speaking to this item, supporting it, moving it along and acknowledging the work that we will continue to do to make Winnipeg a safer place.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You can hear me, I hope. Oh, there we go. Am I unmuted, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: We can hear you just fine. Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: Okay, thank you. Trying to get used to the controls. All right, I'm in total support of Community Services applying to a program to find extra resources to deal with issues of a safer city outside of downtown as well. I just wanted to take this moment to talk about what's happening in the North End on Main Street and Selkirk Avenue where potential customers are often faced with aggressive behaviour and other issues related to the social ills that this city is experiencing more than just downtown. So, and for the businesses and speaking as a board member of a BIZ, a couple of BIZ's, and talking to the people who are trying, and I'm talking very small businesses, who are trying to survive and provide their goods and services to customers who want to come to shop and to engage in services in a safe place. So, any efforts that…and any resources that we can find to enhance…not just the Bear Clan, because the Bear Clan does exist on Selkirk Avenue and yet, despite the great work that they do, which is very important, there's issues of being able to identify problematic situations for evidence-based information to try to resolve the various safety issues along Selkirk Avenue. So,

absolutely, I'm very pleased that we're applying for this. And I just want to remind people that the West End and the North End are having huge problems just like downtown and we need to be able to have the resources to help focus on preventing and providing the ability to address these unsafe situations that are occurring all too often. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor, to close. Okay, I'll call the question on Item 3. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Madam Clerk, Item 4.

Item 4 – Market Lands Southern Development Site

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, do you wish to introduce the item?

Mayor Bowman: Yes. This is a report to be received as information. There was previous desire to have additional information concerning the Market Lands Southern Development site and this report contains that information, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, if Councillor Lukes was upset that we didn't ask enough questions on Item No. 2 at EPC, she must be delighted with me on Item No. 4 because I certainly asked questions at EPC and voted against this, which is relatively rare when something is to be received for information. But if you don't feel there's enough information, then I think my only option was to vote against. There's a sentence in this report that troubles me. I do think the next council really must take a long look at our relationship with CentreVenture and ask some hard questions about what it is we are trying to accomplish and ask another question: what do we mean by the word of 'we'? Because I've sat now through a number of meetings where I've been told, well, they're part of us. It's one and the same, they're part of the City, we should treat them the same. And then, something completely different if any time there's a disagreement. It's an arms length vacancy, they have an independent board, they can say whatever they want about you councillor. Well, somebody choose a lane here because it's either one or the other. Councillor Rollins is fond of the phrase, two things…these two things can be true at the same time. Well, actually, not in this instance. And I'm not indicating she has said that about this. But either this is an independent arms length agency that will occasionally take us to task or it isn't, but it can't be when they're asking for money; part of us, one. We are all together in this. And simultaneously, an arms length agency which can freely criticize Council at any time it wants. So, we need to have a discussion. We desperately need a Council seminar on that. I've heard there may be one coming just to discuss what is going on with this project and if there are other projects in which CentreVenture is underway. I'm not aware of others, but I look forward to the briefing from the CAO and some sort of Council seminar. It has, obviously, been impacted by COVID, the speed of this particular project. I know during the rather unproductive period when I was Chair of Planning, this was in the mandate letter, let's get this going. I remember talking to the Mayor about this back in '18. COVID has complicated and delayed everything, I think it's fair to say, because certainly, the plan has been out there since 2019. But to know that and to come in here years later and see the sentence, "Several other funding commitments have been secured, however, they have not been publicly announced by those respective agencies and we remain respectful of their processes and timing." I've tried over the past week to get some details on that. I do not know yet what other funding commitments have been secured. None that I've been made aware of. So, it is troubling years in with an agency that sometimes we're told is part of the City of Winnipeg and part of us and they are us, and then to say, well, we must respect their independence and their processes and we'll tell you other funding's been secured, we just won't tell you from whom and how much it is. That's not really information. I'm not really receiving that as information. So, questions remain, serious questions remain, perhaps it's all unfolding as it should be and I'm pleased to see the northern site, which is the less tricky of the two sites. But the northern site, there's an RFP for sale. Again, the wording here kind of shimmers a bit. The one bit it says it's for sale, the other bit says it's just an RFP for proposals, not really something we need to land on today. But northern site is the one without the caveat on it. The southern site, always going to be trickier. That's the one with the longstanding restricted covenant or caveat on it. I certainly don't wish to be seen to be faulting U of Winnipeg, there's an acronym here I won't go into, 2.0. U of Winnipeg's actually been on a bit of a roll developing housing in that odd bit of Councillor Gilroy's ward that comes in south of Portage right by the Art Gallery. U of Winnipeg's, I think, really done very well developing a couple of sites in there over the last four years. I think we should be proud of that. That's some good work there. So, pleased to see that partnership with CentreVenture, but from my view and, again, some of our colleagues criticized us for not asking enough questions. I feel I've asked questions and I haven't got any answers that satisfy me, so for today, I'm going to be voting no and I would hope to get more answers as this project unfolds. It's a hugely important project for the future of the city and for the future of this area. But where are we going? What are the other funding commitments? What are we on the hook for? None of that really is clear. There are loans discussed in here. We're told, well, that's all with the independent arms length, the new entity. Okay, but we're also being told that they are us, we are them. So, what is the City's exposure on this? So, shovel not yet in the ground, clearly. Don't mean to criticize CentreVenture, but I think we desperately need to have the debate and discussion here as to what is it we expect of CentreVenture. If they are truly arms length, that's fine. That's fine. If it's an independent board, independent agency, that's fine. Don't come to meetings though and then say, well, you

have to subsidize us, give us TIFFs because we're part of you, you're part of us. I really find this to have been a very muddled operating model and something I think the next council's really going to have to very publicly debate. For today, I don't know what other funding commitments have been secured and since it appears that I'm not allowed to be told, even though this is an agency affiliated with the City, I'm going to vote no. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? I'll call the question on Item 4. All in favour? Contrary? Okay, we'll have to have a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I tried…I had my hand up. The icon hand up. I did want to speak to it, but you know what, I'll just leave it at this point.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, we're now voting on the item. Do you wish to vote in the affirmative? Yea or nay?

Councillor Eadie: I'm voting yea, but I'm disappointed I didn't get a chance to speak. Thank you.

Nays

Councillors Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason and Schreyer

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

Madam Speaker: Item 4 passes. Noted, Councillor Orlikow absent. Next, we'll move on to motions, Mr. Clerk. Notice of motion under this committee, Executive Policy Committee. It's from the June 23rd Council meeting and it was moved by Councillor Rollins and seconded by Councillor Nason. It's regarding low-barrier transitional housing. The motion is on your online agenda. Councillor Rollins, your opportunity to introduce.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTION

Item 1 - Options for the Creation of Low Barrier Transitional Housing

Moved by Councillor Rollins,
Seconded by Councillor Nason,

WHEREAS to address street-level homelessness and substance use, the City of Winnipeg must invest in safe, supportive, culturally appropriate housing, and mobile outreach services;

AND WHEREAS research indicates more than two-thirds of those experiencing homelessness in Winnipeg are Indigenous: survivors of legacies of colonization and cultural genocide including Residential Schools and Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women, Girls and Two-Spirit people;

AND WHEREAS more than half of people experiencing homelessness in Winnipeg have been in the care of Child and Family Services, meaning they are also survivors of family separation, abuse and neglect:

AND WHEREAS more than half of people experiencing homelessness have traumatic brain injuries, while nearly half are living with physical and/or mental health disabilities;

AND WHEREAS a consensus position of voices of lived experience, Indigenous community leadership, non-governmental housing and shelter organizations have come together to outline for Council what could enhance security, peace, dignity in transitioning people from encampments, bus shelters or sleeping rough.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That the Winnipeg Public Service report back to the appropriate Committee of Council within 90 days with options to:*

   A. *Create housing by partnering with community organizations to run low-barrier transitional housing specifically to transition people from encampments, bus shelters or sleeping rough; including directing the Winnipeg Public Service to develop options and alternatives to include:*

      i. *a Minimum commitment of 150 new low barrier transitional housing;*
      ii. *assistance of a facility, such as a city owned building;*
      iii. *creation of safe consumption site(s) and additional mobile services connected to housing and treatment options;*
      iv. *creation of additional community-based crises stabilization spaces and services;*

   B. *Budget options to enhance outreach grants to cover costs of 24-hour services within the City of Winnipeg, with casework supports;*

   C. *Funding options and alternatives for implementation of the City's Poverty Reduction Strategy.*

2. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to consult the Province of Manitoba on the intent of Recommendation 1 above, as well as:*

   A. *Increasing income supports and rental benefits to address the Housing Crises in Winnipeg.*

   B. *The creation of a working group to increase joint-work on poverty and related community grants, funding mechanisms on poverty reduction and 24/7 safe spaces.*

3. *That pending the report back within 90 days, that all matters having a budgetary impact, as contained in Recommendations 1-2 above, be referred to the 2023 budget process.*

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And if my council colleague from Transcona wants to share time, if he wants to indicate to me, I'm happy to do so. No? Madam Speaker, this motion is perhaps not the first between Rollins and Councillor Nason, but it is a memorable one for me this term. All of Council, Madam Speaker, has been involved to less or more extents on street-level homelessness and substance use that we've seen in the city of Winnipeg. And investments in safe, supportive and culture…culturally appropriate housing, I think, has been…including a housing unit that we've built over the last term, is going to be the legacy of this particular term that we once again have the makings of a housing unit in the city of Winnipeg. And I want to particularly acknowledge the Housing Committee; Councillor Gilroy, Councillors Orlikow, in that discussion. Something that predates the absolute crisis that we're in, Madam Speaker, is that…the work of the Housing Committee of Council. And in that, the housing needs survey that University of Winnipeg did along with partners, which really spoke to what would come if we had more social crisis in Winnipeg. And certainly, we saw that during the pandemic. So, we know that two-thirds from those…from the study of those experiencing homelessness in Winnipeg are Indigenous, that they're survivors of legacies of colonization and cultural genocide, including residential schools and missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls and two-spirit people. And Madam Speaker, that includes families of this very Council. So, I want to acknowledge that, too. Our residents, our neighbours, it's a family affair, homelessness. And the (inaudible) housing that is the solution, housing first. So, this resolution resolves to create housing by partnering with community organizations to run low-barrier transitional housing, specifically, to transition people from encampments, bus shelters, or sleeping rough, including directing the Winnipeg Public Service to develop options and alternatives to include a minimum commitment of 150 new low-barrier transitional housing, assistance of a facility such as…as a City-owned building, creation of safe consumption sites and additional mobile services connected to housing and treatment options and creation of additional community-based crisis stabilization spaces and services. Work continues on this front, Madam Speaker. It, in some respects, don't…it doesn't require emotion. Just last week, Sunshine House took to the road with mobile services and a harm reduction van. Just last week, we saw announcements of more low-barrier and commitments from those running in the election, Madam Speaker. Just last week, we saw more creation of stabilization spaces and we know one of those spaces happened to be something that this council moved. And it's an unlikely space that I'm going to mention, which is Winnipeg's rebuilding of the public washroom on Main Street and the good work of Jacob Kaufman and Ma Mawi that's happening there, Madam Speaker. Work continues, but this motion will help. And this motion will help because it was crafted by the very community that came and really spoke truth to this power, this municipal government to talk about what will work and what won't work in terms of addressing the issue of homelessness in the city of Winnipeg. So, this work…this work, these words are very much crafted in community by members of the public that came forward and said, don't do this, do that. And Madam Speaker, just like the social

procurement and all the folks that were here, came to Council, so too did community-based organizations. And sometimes, as a council, the easiest thing to do is to listen and regurgitate in the form of a motion, and that's what this is. It continues on the motion to have budget options to enhance outreach grants to cover costs of 24-hour services within the city of Winnipeg with casework supports. And Madam Speaker, not last week, I was with Minister Rochelle Squires and the Chief of Winnipeg Fire/Paramedic Service and a bunch of staff and you know what, Minister acknowledged that we were first in at Velma House with respect to 24/7 safe spaces. That's this council. That's this multi-year budget. That's these updates. 24/7 safe spaces, Madam Speaker. And that is our…a legacy of this council and I want to acknowledge that and for those that will continue talking about that during the election. Funding options and alternatives for implementation of the City's Poverty Reduction Strategy, we passed it, we must have funding options, Madam Speaker, and we always knew that we were going to do that work. The second part of this motion is that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to consult with the Province of Manitoba on the intent of recommendation one above, as well as increasing income supports and rental benefits and the creation of a working group to increase joint work on poverty-related community grants, funding mechanisms on poverty reduction and 24/7 safe spaces. Madam Speaker, I've met with some members of the PC caucus and I know that there are some like-minds over there, despite me wearing different political colours than them. But Madam Speaker, most of us just know that there needs to be more rigor to the work of community safety and housing first, and that's what this motion does. It sets up in 90 days, pending report, and it acknowledged that all the matters mentioned has a budgetary impact. Maybe it's the budget that we've put in place. The two FTEs that we tied to the rapid housing initiative to create more company for Noah Yauk property development. That report I look forward to, Madam Speaker, because you know what? I look forward to working shoulder-to-shoulder with community-based organizations that have been on the frontline and have had an enduring role in shaping policy. And it's really up to governments to acknowledge their policy entrepreneurship and really adopt it and put it into action. That's what this motion does. And I want to thank my council colleague from Transcona. Madam Speaker, it is hard when you find yourself in a conflict, any conflict, but to get in and out of that conflict in a productive way and in a way that serves Winnipeggers, well, I think all of us councillors can learn from my colleague. And I want to just say that I'm proud to be signing on to this motion and I look forward to a unanimous vote on it, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a really important issue. And unusual circumstances by which we've dealt with it in the last Council meeting and the months leading up to that. It's kind of…it's important…what we're dealing with is just sort of one aspect of it, one dimension of it, but it's important. But it's larger…it's a much larger issue than that of which we speak here. But the City is trying to do our part. This motion's trying to do our part as a municipality. It's much larger than any one level of government, but we're doing something. And I want to talk about low-barrier housing. I think the first time I heard the term was from Councillor Chambers. And I just want to give a little bit of a history lesson here. Not really. I'll just say this, it's not like we're living in a great golden era of infrastructure development or infrastructure care for homeless. We're not. And it's important…if we care about this issue, it's important that we know that. That doesn't mean that we can't do important things right now. Because of the cost of infrastructure, we just don't have the budget to do what we used to do. What we used to be able to do in terms of housing. And for those that are concerned about what I just said, the history is there. So, you can check for yourself. We're living in a trough, an era…not a golden era, we're living in the trough era in terms of what we can do for affordable housing. But what we did last Council meeting, what it looks like we're trying to do now, is important because things aren't getting any…any easier. And the challenge of homelessness isn't getting any easier. And I'm going to go out there and say, having been watching my entire life in terms of the issue of how we solve these social issues, how governments are involved, and to see for all the good will and all the good work that's been done over decades and then you see…you still see these challenges and these problems expressing themselves in different ways. And it breaks your heart because so much good work has been done over the decades. And it's not an opinion. I mean, just if we're willing to talk about infrastructure and housing, then quantifiably, we can just say, these are facts. We used to do more. Having said that, right now, I think we're…it's unfortunate. We're getting smart on the issue of low-barrier housing because I think it's the most important think…thing I've seen as…since I've been elected in the last eight years in terms of governments responding…responding in a very real and practical and sincere way. And unfortunately, that means low-barrier housing. I don't know in the area…in the 21st century, the era of reliabilities and things like this, I don't know where this is going to lead us, but this is something that we have to do. Last Council meeting, we weren't going to solve any issue, it was an expression…it was a wake up call that what we're doing isn't good enough. And if that debate spurned on this motion, that's an excellent thing. So, I'm very grateful that Councillors Rollins and Nason and others have come up with something at this point that I think is rather realistic and deals for sure. I'm not really into rah rah stuff when it comes to poverty and housing. This issue isn't a rah rah issue, it's not a feel good issue at all. It's a feel bad issue, if you will, and we're trying to come to terms. I stated in the last Council meeting that I think one of the most important things I've seen since I've been elected, I'm not really directly involved with it too much other than it's near my place, not far from where I live, just across the river and a bridge, is N'Dinawemak 24/7 shelter on Disraeli. And I've spent more time there than I…I've spent more time there than I have on a bus in the last six months since it's opened because it's something very real. This is something that actually can change people's lives. Yes, only one life at a time, and it can only do so much, but it looks like we're going to do more. And it's really important. So, you know, we

deal with conflict in this chamber. We deal with conflict…our job is to solve problems here at city hall. And it looked like, as painful as the last Council meeting was, and the weeks that led up to it, and I know this was painful for Councillor Nason as well. Not just him. That we're actually on the road on this and actually dealing. And that's a good thing. And so, this is something that we can continue to learn from. And in that respect, we'll see, this just might be a good era for learning to…and adapting to an evolving society and evolving challenges that we have. 50 years ago, when we were building literally thousands of affordable housing units per year in this city and province, the challenges were different. Things change. And it looks like right now, we're being sensitive to that at city hall. And Councillor Rollins just mentioned bringing the Provincial Government into it, which you have to. And so, basically, I consider this, in terms of dealing with real problems, we…we're dealing positively at this point and I just look forward to the work we're going to do on some really unfortunate issues. But it doesn't look like a band-aid, and it doesn't look like we're putting Christmas present wrapping on it and pretending it's all a wonderful thing. It looks like we're actually dealing with some important and very unfortunate issues and I'm very grateful. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First, I want to thank Councillor Rollins for the olive branch that led to this motion being created. We spent some late hours the night before Council and some early hours in the time leading up to Council to put the fine tuning of it. This is a budget referral that the next council will need to deal with, should it be adopted today. The things that led up to the creation of this have not gone away. The bus shelter in Transcona was the site this week of a stabbing. The bus shelter in question, also shortly after the last Council meeting, had the windows broke out. I'm not sure of the circumstances surrounding that. Drive throughout our city, we see a lot of the challenges. We see the media releases that we're getting near daily of stabbings and other violent acts in our city. Homicide rates are extremely high. We're getting…we got notice this week of inflation rates of 8.1%. Affordability is becoming a real challenge and has been for some time for marginalized individuals in our city. Will this be the solution to solve all these problems? No. The sector has asked for this. The sector has asked for us to bring this forward. We listened to it, we put it on in the manner that we have for the next council to consider in amongst all the other challenges our councils of the day to come will have to deal with; financially, morally. The RHI funds that were provided federally for the City of Winnipeg to pick the winners of them, I had the opportunity earlier this week to visit one of those benefactors. I finally got to Henry Street to Salvation Army. I've visited many of the providers over the years, going back to the days of the CAO sleep out, and…but the one place I had never got to was the Salvation Army site. So, I visited the new suites that they've got that are near ready. I was impressed with how quick they'd gone from approval to being near ready for occupancy. I think it will help. But there is much, much more that's needed either from Indigenous-led supports, from city supports, from provincial supports, from federal supports. It's all of us together as a community, all trying to pull together and help those that are challenged in our community to find success for the remainder of their time on this plane of earth. And you know, we'll have discussions and I know that there's lots of political discussions that are being lobbed out there of, you know, individuals that have the fix for this. Well, to date, we've done not a great job. Hopefully, tomorrow will be a better day than what we're seeing around our community in some of the ways we're treating…the social disdain for those that are suffering on our street, is challenging. I know in my community, some of the social pages people have shared some of the reports on there. It's discriminatory and people should be ashamed of some of the comments that are being made. And we can and should do better by those that are marginalized in our community. And hopefully, this motion, if adopted today, will be a step forward and our future councils will be able to deal with this in a more effective way, and hopefully, reduce some of the challenges we have in and around our communities. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm just going to make a short commentary. I really appreciate Councillor Rollins and Councillor Nason for bringing this to the forefront. It's not like we haven't been talking about the issue now for, well, actually, for quite a long time. At least within the two terms…from 2014 on. The lack of affordable, decent housing for people who really live in poverty. And I just wanted to mention, though, to focus in on what is the hope, because I did hear about the Salvation Army. I haven't visited it. We had the Rapid Housing Initiative. There's a couple of them in my ward. One of them is having difficulty because of the building they're trying to renovate. But 126 Alfred is up, running, is providing housing for young Indigenous people who are living here in Winnipeg. And they're providing support services for those youth to be able to be…get employed and work and be able to build their lives like many of us have been lucky to do for our families. I just also wanted to note, all is not so bad in…on Main Street in terms of, we have…I was excited to hear, and I'm happy that it's moving along. There's a development application happening to build brand new housing, brand new building, housing on Main Street just short…just a little bit north of the underpass. And this is a private…totally private sector initiative that I think will provide the kind of housing that people need. It will be…it won't be like many places throughout the North End, which are cheaper, they're in bad shape. They're not exactly the safest places to live. And so, there is hope. There is more building along Main Street going north. The way they're trying to build it is to make it affordable from a private sector perspective. And so, I just thought I'd leave it at that, that there's a lot of initiatives, but as Councillor Nason has reflected, my frustration as well with what is happening here in our city that…you know, we should have been

on this in a more appropriate way years ago, but let's move it along. And thanks to the movers of this motion. I, of course, will be voting in favour.

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

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, given that this was in large part offered by community, I'll just ask for a recorded vote.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of the notice of motion before us, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: The item passes unanimously. Next, we're on to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Oh. Oh, yes. Okay, okay. Let me go back. Yes, my apologies, we have Motion 1; moved by Councillor Nason and seconded by Councillor Klein. It's regarding a grant to the Southland Park Residents Association. Councillor Nason.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, I would like to seek suspension of the rules so we can deal with this today. Timely manner.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of suspending the rules to hear Motion 1 today? Those opposed? It's carried. Councillor Nason. Now, would you like…shall we read it into the record, the resolve, Madam Clerk?

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

WHEREAS Southland Park is an important community in the Transcona Ward;

AND WHEREAS residents of Southland Park are engaged to improve the quality of living in their neighbourhood including amenities to enjoy daily life in and around their neighbourhood;

AND WHEREAS parks and open spaces that are well maintained lead to a healthy community;

AND WHEREAS the Southland Park Residents Association (SLPRA) wish to undertake a beautification project that would involve establishing large flower pots on the curbside entering the community on Royal Mint Place, as shown on Attachment A;

AND WHEREAS the SLPRA worked collaboratively with the City of Winnipeg Staff to determine the appropriate scope of this work, as indicated in the letter of support from the Public Works Department, provided as Attachment B;

AND WHEREAS the SLPRA has indicated that they wish to complete this beautification project within the 2022 summer;

AND WHEREAS approving this funding as soon as possible will ensure that overall project costs do not increase due to inflation;

AND WHEREAS Parks and Recreation Enhancement Program Funding can only be disbursed in public right of ways when approved by Council.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That a grant in the amount of $6,500.00 be provided to the Southland Park Residents Association, funded from the Transcona Parks and Recreation Enhancement Program, for the purposes of implementing the beautification project along Royal Mint Place.*

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason, to introduce the motion.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be brief. The Southland Park Residents Association has been a very active and a legal entity for now just over two years. And they have been working very diligently to improve the look and feel of their community. They've planted flowers along the entry sign. The challenge is, and the reason why this is here today, is that they had made an application to the Public Service, however, our policy doesn't allow for improvements on public boulevards without a waiver of Council. Given the time of year and the ever present construction inflation that my colleague Councillor Schreyer speaks of, this would not…this would not get done in a timely fashion and end up likely costing sufficient…more dollars, plus they'd like to realize this in the remaining time we have this summer. So, with that, Madam Speaker, it's a small amount of $6,500. And I'm hoping to have the support of Council on this matter.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Nason, do you wish to close? Can call the question. All in favour of Motion 1? Contrary? That's carried. Next is Motion 2, also circulated today. Moved by Mr. Mayor and seconded by Councillor Orlikow. It's regarding appointing Jason Egert as our Acting City Auditor and it will be an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. Now, we'll move on to by-laws, Mr. Mayor.

Motion No. 2
Moved by His Worship Mayor Bowman,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

WHEREAS Bryan Mansky, City Auditor, announced his retirement from the City of Winnipeg effective September 23, 2022;

AND WHEREAS Mr. Mansky recommended Jason Egert, Deputy City Auditor, be appointed Acting City Auditor until such time as a City Auditor is hired;

AND WHEREAS Mr. Egert has over twenty-five years of audit experience in both the private and public sector;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Jason Egert be appointed Acting City Auditor, effective September 24, 2022, until such time as the City Auditor position has been appointed by Council.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 1 ST READING ONLY

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law No. 85/2022 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 85/2022.

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

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that the following by-laws be read a second time: By-law 75/2022, By-law 76/2022, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 75/2022 and By-law No. 76/2022.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that By-law Nos. 75/2022 and 76/2022 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor, onto the next section for all three readings.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law 93/2022, By-law 94/2022 and By-law 95/2022.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 93/2022, By-law No. 94/2022, By-law No. 95/2022.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that By-laws No. 93/2022 to 95/2022, both inclusive, be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 93/2022 to 95/2022, both inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 93/2022 to 95/2022, 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's carried. We'll now move into question period. Any questions for Mayor Bowman? Councillor Eadie.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. We heard discussion about the CentreVenture market lands south efforts and work and a discussion about CentreVenture being an arms length City of Winnipeg entity. But I was wondering if the Mayor…I can't remember, but if the Mayor could let us know, I believe, the Provincial Government does provide some element of funding to allow CentreVenture to continue its work for the downtown of Winnipeg.

Mayor Bowman: If the question is, can I comment on whether or not there's provincial funding to CentreVenture, I can certainly…I can certainly endeavour to ask the Public Service is they are able to apprise the councillor. I couldn't say off the top of my head. I know that there have been programs that we've partnered in the past. Live Downtown Program, for example, is one program that comes to mind that has done some really good work in our downtown where there was provincial and municipal support. But I couldn't say off the top of my head to what extent operating funding, for example, for CentreVenture may be provided by the Province. But I can certainly reach out to our Public Service and ask that they provide the councillor with that information.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Eadie: Just a follow-up question; if you could find out for me or maybe the Mayor knows, are all the board members of CentreVenture appointed by the City of Winnipeg or does the Province appoint any of those members?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Again, I can endeavour to get that information. That would be a question for our Clerks. I don't believe there are provincial appointees on the CentreVenture's board, but again, can certainly endeavour to get that information to the councillor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Moving on to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Councillor Gilroy, on the report dated July 4th.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED JULY 4, 2022

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move Items 1 through 17, please.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes? Councillor Mayes. 5 has been pulled. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, 1 and 15, please.

Madam Speaker: Okay. That's all. Councillor Nason? 4. Okay, I'll call the question on 2, 3, 6 through 14, 16 and 17. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Madam Clerk, Item 1.

Item 1 – Award of Contract for the Construction of the North District Police Station at 100 Sinclair Street – Tender No. 442-2021B – Project No. 2017-108

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, Madam Speaker. This is a…this is asking…the Public Service is asking for a cost over-expenditure just due to the construction inflation in order to get the ball going on the North District Police Station. That's what we're here dealing with at this time. And happy to listen to what other councillors have to say.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes, was that yours?

Councillor Mayes: No, I think Councillor Eadie said (inaudible).

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, Item 1.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I asked to have this stood down. I will be supporting EPC's appropriate decision to move forward on a…what is a badly needed north district police station. I just wanted to speak to a little history of this because I don't think that some of the presenters that showed up at P&D or EPC understand how we got to the point where we're having to deal with such a high level of inflationary factors. So, I'm going to go back to…I'm going to go back to the history of the north district station. Just quickly, the four district model was…came into being under Glen Murray with Chief Ewatski at the helm, Chief of the Winnipeg Police Service back in and around 2003 to 2005. And in that whole plan, they knew that they were going to need district style police stations in order to do the work. And so, they did the east district station, they did the west/south police station, because I think this…whatever happened there happened. And then, the next one that was supposed to be built was the north district station as part of that plan, because the existing infrastructure there is…it's totally…it's like a derelict building. Anyway, so but what happened was, the whole Winnipeg Police headquarters fiasco came along in approximately 2013 when we knew that this thing was going sideways and escalating up in costs. This councillor stood in front of the media and said how disappointed I am that this is going to have a huge effect on the ability of the Winnipeg Police Service to have an appropriate north district police station, which was supposedly scheduled to be started around the time this was happening around 2014. So, what happened was, because of the huge escalations in cost, the Winnipeg Police Service was actually looking at a piece of property in order to build a north district police station and the Public Service, P&D, said, no to the Molson Brewery lot at Redwood when the current chief…the chief at the time wanted…thought that that would be a great place for us to have the north district police station. But what came back was, oh, it costs too much. We can't afford to pay what they're asking for that land. So, progress further, this thing's been laying around being worked at because the police service needs to have proper workplace safety and health operation going on here. And so, what we end up, jumping to the future, and it took a long time and is, I…you know, I had a role in delaying it because I thought it inappropriate to use a chunk of the old exhibition grounds, our North End recreation and sport facilities that we don't have enough of in the North End and so, we delayed it because we wanted to see an expression of interest in potential private properties that might be there. And again, oh, we can't afford it because we're trying to contain the costs. So, it did get delayed. And then, in…after 2018, I mean, at that

point, listen, we need to provide a proper place for our police service to operate out of in the north district. And EPC has confirmed that, but because of all these delays, the fiasco and all these issues, we see, look at that inflation. That inflation wouldn't have been there if we built it when it was supposed to be built in the first place. And so, this is what we're stuck with. I also wanted to mention that I still am not comfortable that we had to take a piece of the North End and…also used by some groups in the West End as well as in the central area, used old ex grounds for various kinds of sport activities. And…but we, as Council, and I appreciate the support, we worked it out so that at least we got fair compensation for what we lost. And some of that won't come to the Mynarski Ward until…until the old station property is sold. But again, I thank my colleagues. But you know, it's far too late to think about, let's build it somewhere else. Inflation is always there. It's really high now, but it's not going to really go down all that much. And so, I'm voting to support this acceptance of the bid offer and the escalated costs. Thank you.

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

Councillor Lukes: No. Mine was 16.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. At PP&D, I spoke briefly on this item and I didn't support the item. I'm going to continue with that position today. I won't be supporting the item, and there's various reasons for that. I think that we're in a financial position right now, especially with police spending, that we have to be cautious. But most importantly is, the buildings are not being used as described or as hoped when they were originally announced. I can point to the west district that's on Grant Avenue, for example, Madam Speaker. Previously, they would have had detectives in that building, they would have had other staff, they would have had front counter staff so that residents of the area could go to that police station and they could, you know, file a complaint or get information that they needed without having to go downtown to headquarters. So, there was a necessity, there was a thought, there was a plan behind that expenditure. But today, there are no detectives in our district police stations, none. They all work out of Major Crimes now. There are no front office or front facing officers to speak with residents, file complaints, talk to them about issues that are going on in the community. This change not…this changed the…the front officers changed because of COVID, the detectives changed a long time ago. And now, COVID is…the rules have passed, but however, due to scheduling and due to other unforeseen circumstances that have hit the police service, it's my understanding and been verified that they no longer have officers or plan to have officers at those front doors. So, without that ability, without the plan that was originally approved by a former city council that described the need and the work that would be done in these stations, that's all changed now. And I think because that's all changed now, we should be revisiting this situation. At our former police headquarters, we…or at the new police headquarters, we know that we have three floors empty, vacant, that cost the City over $500,000 a year. Should we not be looking at utilizing that space? We know that in west district, the seven patrol cars that leave out of west district spend 95% of their time in other areas of the city responding to 911 calls. They're not in the community, they simply go there to understand what's happening that day, they have a meeting, they pick up their weapons, their uniforms and the keys to their vehicle and they head back out. This is the time for us to put on the brakes and say, the building that you designed, that you want to build, that is now costing us $31 million, and I did ask the Public Service, the $6 million more they're asking for; how much is that actually for construction, and they said, $3.5. We cannot continue to do it this way. I think we should be putting the brakes on this police station right now. We need to find out how we're going to manage all of these resources and why we need a 25-30,000 square foot building for about five to six full-time staff during the day. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, very briefly. I support the item, as I did at EPC. Just for clarity though, in a few recent meetings, we've heard reference to the south district station. In fact, we've heard referencing to the west/south, a term I've never heard and I'm thrashing around on the internet and can only find reference to it as the west. It's on Grant, as Councillor Klein indicated. The one police head office in my ward was closed in 2014 by the police service very shortly after the creation of the Winnipeg Police Board. So, we also had a presentation recently where the speaker indicated a good example of a P3 project in the city of Winnipeg with the South District Police Station, which was not a great example in that it does not exist and as far as I know, over the past decade has never been discussed. So, just for clarity, there is no south district station. I certainly support the, as I have consistently, support this new north district station going in, replacing the old building, but I think it's important for clarity about what has been done with the district model. We do have east on Dugald, we have the one west, we will now have north and there's, of course, the troubled police headquarters downtown. But there is no south, there isn't an office in Councillor Chambers ward. There isn't one in mine. The one that was open on St. Mary's Road has been closed now since 2014. So, I do think that's important to put on the record. Thank you.

Mayor Bowman: I'm very pleased to hear Councillor Klein refer to police costs. That's great to hear. I know that has been an issue for some years as we've tried to build a more sustainable long-term budget through multi…multi-year balanced

budgets that are predictable for all of our departments. For…to hear there are concerns about there needs to be staff in the district police stations, and then in the next breath hear we should move people into the police headquarters, doesn't seem consistent to me. But I don't think it really matters because this council is prohibited, under the Police Services Act, from directing the operations of the police service. What we're being asked to do today is to vote on a capital expense, not to directly intervene in the operations of the police service. I think the questions being raised are fine. I think those are questions that we've had ample opportunity to raise, and I'm glad that some of the questions that were asked, there have been responses from the Public Service. But I just want to…for those that are viewing these proceedings, I think it's important to remind everyone that the Police Services Act, this is provincial law, does prohibit elected officials from directing the operations of the police service. And so, it really is incumbent upon police services under the overarching oversight of the Winnipeg Police Services Board to manage their operations as they deem appropriate. It is incumbent upon this council, however, to provide the overall budget allocation, and in this case, you know, to support through Property and Planning the decision before us today that relates to the property itself. And I'll be supporting it, of course.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you…well, sorry. In terms of this discussion with respect to the north district station, I can advise that currently officers are being redeployed from the district stations to downtown foot patrols. This is more operational than…an operational decision than it is a matter of, does there need to be a north district police station with a limited number of staffing in there. The current operation out of Hartford, Madam Speaker, is a very tenuous situation. The building itself is past its end date in terms of heating and cooling, ventilation. It's out…it's outlived its usefulness in terms of the size and scale of that building. You know, originally designed for 60 officers is now housing 157 officers. So, it's certainly past its useful lifespan. So, the north district station, Madam Speaker, does need to move forward. We do need to vote on this today. It is a matter of providing service to that community. The fact that it is partnering with WASAC and allows us to start that process of building trust and confidence back in policing, back in the community by partnering with this group and exploring opportunities to build strong, sustainable relationships within the community. This is the starting ground, Madam Speaker, as I see it. So, I'm hoping that Council will vote to move this project forward. Again, recognizing that the current facility is long past its lifespan. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Pleased with the conversation that we're having around the…this circle here. In particular, Councillor Klein's and His Worship's. There's different ways to look at this, but I'm going to be motivated primarily by Councillor Gilroy's when she said construction inflation. And I can't help it because it's the truth. So, glad I'm not the only one picking up on this stuff these days. And I'm just going to say a few things about that. One is, we can solve this in the short-term by allocating the money for something we have to do. Councillor Chambers made the point that we have to deal with this today. Time is of the essence. But let this be a lesson to us. How are we trying to deal with costs when we don't find out…when we don't bother to try to find out? I've been saying construction inflation for, you know, seven years, almost every Council meeting. And as time goes, I'm not the only one. But if we're going to solve a problem, you have to understand the problem. But when we don't try to find out what's causing construction inflation, how do we…just adding more money isn't a solution. Sure, it is in the individual project if we have to get things done like a police station. But having said that, when…there's no guarantee of a sustainable economy and a sustainable budget if we don't understand what's threatening the sustainability of our economy, the sustainability of our budget. And that's part of the problem here today. So, so look, it's all very well. We're dealing with this piecemeal, we're dealing with this as an individual issue, but it's been said, not just by myself, that we're dealing with the problem of construction inflation. You really want to deal with all these things? You really want to deal with a sustainable economy? A sustainable budget? And I would say, on that basis, a sustainable environment is find out what the problem is. We've never done that at city hall in my seven and a half years being elected. We just say…and of course, I say this in umbrella term; construction inflation. But what is it? Saying construction inflation doesn't relieve us of our obligations to explain to the taxpayer why their taxes are going up. Their rates, fees, fines and levies are going up. Their services are decreasing in certain sectors and we're selling…we've sold more debentures in recent years. That's the reality of our budget and I've never blamed this on any one level of government; not this level of government, not any particular politician here. I've never said that. This problem is gigantic, but yet again, we're dealing with one particular problem: the cost increase for the police station. And we're missing the big picture. It's all very well we're going to settle this today, but the reality is, this is part and parcel of something much larger, dangerous to the sustainability of our economy. And I think it's unfair, also, when we're giving…we give…by our lack of action to find out what's causing construction cost increases. Not just in the last year or two or this term, but every single year and every single term and every single decade. What's unfair is it's implied it's somehow to do with the workers or the police budget itself. The police budget is a challenge for us to deal with, but I don't want to give the impression that it's the police budget that's causing us the increases in our taxes, rates, fines, fees, levies and reducing services and putting us more into debt. It's not fair. It's not the police budget. But it is the cost of construction as it continues to increase. That's a fact, that's not my opinion. If we want to deal, we'll deal with that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers. Councillor Gilroy, back to you.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I want to thank everybody for the debate. We did hear from our Public Service on this issue. There is a need for a North End police station, as you all are aware and I think Councillor Sharma, Councillor Santos and Eadie…Councillor Eadie knows very well how much that is growing out there. And I think it's important that we realize that there are different models of policing right now. That might be one model that they're running out of, but there might be other models that could be looked at in the future. And we have to be prepared as a city, we have to be planned as a city. It's important to understand that right now, there has been changes to the…to the Remand Centre that requires a lot more holding in holding stations, which we don't have. We have a lack of holding stations, so they are requiring these holding stations at other police stations, and that includes the one out in the North End that is there now that is in terrible condition and really needs to be replaced. So, we do need to make sure that we have these facilities available. And I know this is a hard decision for everyone. This wasn't my favourite place to put a police station. I was vocal about it, but that decision's been made. And we all know that construction inflation has gone up and that's the reality. And it's gone up for all sectors, not even just the city, that's all construction sectors. So, we're seeing that. We're impacted by that here in the city. I think it's time that we move forward. We have to build a city into the future and that does require police stations. And so, I hope that my councillor colleagues support this motion here today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. With that, I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. There's three other items following this that have been pulled in a moment. There's three other items that have been pulled and I made an error, there's also Item 16, I circled it, but I did not call it out. So, I just wanted to bring that to the attention of Council. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Madam Speaker, I would just like to be recorded as opposed to that last motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That's noted, Councillor Klein in opposition to Item 1. Moving on, Item 4.

Item 4 – Amendment to Council Decision – Declaration of Surplus Land – City-Owned Property Located at 1121 Wabasha Street

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Gilroy: Councillor colleague on this item.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That was stood down by? Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a few short words on this. Some of my colleagues here may have been on Council in 2013 when this first was put on the agenda. Others again in 2018. And we've had some other motions that have come forward that start this, stall this, comments made by the Public Service that implicated a broader sale of this property. Where we've landed today, though, is a smaller piece of land. We do have…it's listed park land right now, which is challenging because we've got 1,000 acres of park lands that we're looking to add to our rolls, even though we've seen, especially in this year, we're having a hard time maintaining what we have today. But at the end of the day, this piece of land will be severed and…but will still maintain park land surrounding this land, which I think will add to the value of it as part of the community and as we move forward as a city with the great Transcona aquatic park that's right by it that will get…that gets used during the summer months quite heavily when we have staff. But today, with this matter that's in front of us, I am supportive of it. It does call for some re-investment in the Transcona Stadium site. I know that there's a lot of need on that site still remaining. And whatever's left will go into the Transcona Ward's park recreation enhancement program. Hopefully, that will remain on future budget years, unlike community incentive grants. But anyways, regardless, this will require, I believe, the support of two-thirds members of Council. I will be one that will be in support of this item in front of us today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Gilroy, back to you for close or I can call the question?

Councillor Gilroy: Call the question.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of Item 4? Contrary? That's carried. Madam Clerk, Item 5.

Item 5 – Glenwood Neighbourhood Infill Planning Project

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. There are positives, there are negatives. There are some positives here. I do think James Platt who's been tasked with this out of the Planning Department has really made a good effort trying to talk to the community and come up with something workable and come up with something within the timeframe. This is not the end. This is going to a public hearing from here if it passes today, and it will. So, it will be moving forward in some fashion. I think James Veitch who has been our Acting Head of Planning and I certainly hope he stays on in that capacity for several more years if I'm still here, because I think he's shown some real respect for the neighbourhood and has made an effort to try and understand some of the issues coming out of the community. So, this is a step forward. I want to thank Councillor Gilroy. This was a process that grew out of the infield guidelines and it was an amendment along with the gravel lanes provision that Councillor Gilroy, I think, understood and helped to move forward. It was certainly very important in the community I represent. But the word community does matter, as Councillor Lukes in her prayer today talked about how the municipal level of government is that which is closest to the people. That is worth remembering. That is worth remembering partly because it is an ongoing struggle with our own civil service at times to remind them that we are the elected people. We go to the community events, we knock on the doors, we go to the church services, we go to the community centre picnics. We talk to the people in our communities. It's important to give that weight, I think. I know Councillor Gilroy when we had the whole debate about the Starlight proposal, over and over again, Councillor Gilroy very effectively, and I must say, I voted against it and she certainly…I was certainly on the losing end of that vote. Councillor Gilroy talked a lot about community and what the community needed and wanted in that area. So, with that as backdrop, I do think it's important to think about that as we go forward into the next council with some of our discussion of how we want to proceed with infill. We will never find an area that says yes to every proposal. And I think there's a difference to be made here between we've all voted for the occasional condo or apartment building in our wards where the community came out and didn't want it, they just wanted it somewhere else. This is usually somebody saying, well, I want to build up, not out, just not up next to me, that's the wrong place. Further out, we've had this with Councillor Chambers where people keep saying, go further out, go further out, then we get outside of the perimeter and they say, this should be inside. This should be that way. So, you can never satisfy that, you just can't. But I think that's different than an ongoing 138, I think it is, approvals in a row for variances in a particular area. Councillor Orlikow is the author of a very good phrase about this, which was, we talked in OurWinnipeg about communities of stability, these are no longer communities of stability if you just keep approving change and just keep saying, well, it's low to moderate densification, but we'll never tell you when you get to too much densification. There is no end to it. It's just a…we'll just keep saying it's low to moderate. It's not my ward alone. Councillor Orlikow has had…taken some bruises, I think, in the Beaumont area. Councillor Rollins has certainly had a number of these hearings over the years…in recent years. But…and I've been door knocking in Glenwood over the past four or five days and, you know, people…people have some concerns, but one of the concerns they have, and I say to them, there's a report coming, come to the public hearing. The buildings…and Platt has really tried here, I think, to incorporate the guidelines to build the height limits lower, they're narrower, way more effort on tree preservation than what we've seen to-date. Hopefully, we get some wording in there about permeable driveways, because there is real concern about what this is doing with…to the sewer system. There's also a real concern about what it's doing in terms of power outages, but that's more of Hydro matter. But this, this is what I wanted to really talk about today in the Glenwood context is, time and again, we have pretended that it's all going well. We have pretended that if you're opposed to this, well then, by golly, you're in favour of climate change. No. You can't convince people that having their fence knocked down is a good thing or having their fence fall into the pit next door is a good thing. Or you can't convince them that when they call the City and say, the developers just tore down my fence, it fell in the pit and the 311's scripted response, and it is a scripted response, is to say to the people, go sue the…go sue the builders. And they say, we don't know who they are, they show up in an unmarked van, that's your problem. And then I go to meetings with the Planning Department, not with the individuals I've mentioned, and I'm told, we think it's gone well in Glenwood. We think it's been a success. And I say, really? I've had hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of complaints. I'm the local elected official. And the response from the planners is, we don't get those calls. At some point, it's still a democracy. At some point, the local elected official has some role here, which isn't simply being a ombudsman or a complaints department, it's trying to recognize the reality. And the reality is, we have done a very poor job at enforcing standards with some of the lot splitting, with some of the infill projects that have gone on to-date. I still get constant complaints. There's no fencing; oh, we forgot. Same builder a week later, we forgot again. No, you're just making that up, with all due respect. There are some builders who have…Mr. Sawatzky has reached out to me many times, tried to problem solve. That's the spirit, that's…you know, that's helpful. But we just need to stop pretending it's all gone well. We need to stop pretending that if you're…express concerns, somehow, you're a nimby. Somehow, you're just all against progress. Somehow, you're in favour of climate change, we need this to save the planet. Well, at least with the guidelines, we're going to be having the same set of rules for Armstrong's Point, for Wellington Crescent, for David Asper's Street, maybe. Not sure if that's in the infill area or not. But I mean, part of the frustration is, we even forced the need for lot splitting very differently in different areas of the city. There really has been an issue of class here, I have to say. And that, hopefully, is ending with the standardized guidelines. But for Glenwood, this is a step forward, but we need to do better than say, there was to be an infill ombudsman appointed years ago in the

budget. Well, we decided you can just send your…your complaints to Alana Crocker's secretary, Councillor Mayes. That's not really the same thing. Let's stop pretending it's all gone well. Let's stop pretending that somehow people should be happy if their property is damaged. Does that happen in new areas? On occasion, but you don't have 138 builds in new areas all going on in a couple of years all jammed into existing areas. So, there are areas of the city like Bonavista, brand new area, where issues arise with development. But let's just take a more realistic view of this and say, we can do a better job of it, but we have to have some improved enforcement. There are other issues, too, about keeping some of the revenue and improvements local and I've tried to work on that with Councillor Allard over the years and I think we're inching forward. But we will have this public hearing, we will hear an earful from people in the district. Some of them have indicated they're not voting for me because I've allowed this all to happen. It is frustrating, but I think that the real issue here is if we're going to move forward with guidelines, let's have some enforcement, let's be realistic about that. Let's admit it hasn't all gone smoothly. It hasn't all gone according to the textbook that some of the planners seem to quote from. So, let's take a more realistic view. Let's get some enforcement out there so people aren't being told a scripted response; go sue the builder, none of this is our problem and it's all going great. That's not acceptable. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be brief.

Madam Speaker: Really?

Councillor Schreyer: Did I hear really? Clock's ticking right now. And just to say, you know, when it comes to the City of Winnipeg, I've seen nothing like it in my time elected. I didn't know I'd be spending this much time and consternation, which I've shared with my fellow councillors, dealing with development issues, appeals, you know, in residential areas and I've seen nothing like what we have in the Glenwood neighbourhood of St. Vital. You know, our hearts go out to these people because it is an area that is natural for development. At the same time, people live there and they live there for certain reasons. We all have our reasons why every single one of us has voted for and against appeals and development projects. And at least in the case of the Glenwood neighbourhood of St. Vital, some greater clarity that perhaps we can use with the rest…for the rest of the city. But the residents of Glenwood neighbourhood deserve this, as do other residents amongst the city and that we can learn from this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Orlikow, to be brief.

Councillor Orlikow: Oh, no. This is my one…this is my day. No, I'm kidding. First of all, yeah, I just will be…I will be supporting this, absolutely. This is a…this is…you know, we win some votes, we lose some votes. People brand you for whatever reasons on a win or a loss. You did that for that reason. It doesn't really matter in that regards because you have to be true to your neighbourhoods. And that's what I love about Winnipeg and why I didn't like the infill guidelines. They were monolithic in their approach. Glenwood is the same as Beaumont, is the same as Sir John Franklin, is the same as this neighbourhood which, actually, to me, just mitigates kind of what makes our neighbourhoods and Winnipeg so great, the uniqueness of them. So, if we all agree, and I think we do, we even have the website with it in OurWinnipeg that show the different neighbourhoods and the characteristic…defining characteristics they have. Again, it gives people choice where they want to live. And again, I also know that there is some…the drive to change some of the neighbourhoods and, you know, places with lower property values, that property value's getting up there, the housing stock's getting a little bit older. So how are we going to change? So, when I was fighting and lost the idea that I would like to do ward by ward infill guidelines that have a little more contextual reality to it rather than this book that we got, it didn't work out. But again, it's a pilot project. So, I was very excited when Councillor Mayes, with his skillset, got this one in there because I am keeping an eye on this. And now, what I see today is that in a very short timeframe that the Public Service has been able to at least get something coming forward that's unique, you know, just an amendment here and there. Doesn't mean Glenwood's all of a sudden, we're going to put a bubble over it and they're never going to have any more infill development going forward, but maybe we can make it so it's not so brutal. As we know on the Appeals Committee, if we don't have a Glenwood application…appeal in there, I get confused because we always have a Glenwood application in there somewhere because they are getting incredible amount of infill developments happening in that neighbourhood. Again, we see it now growing as the demand continually increases for residential housing in other neighbourhoods, what I call the post-1940 neighbourhoods; single bungalows, little bit older housing stock, but nice, big yards. So again, I still have a real big problem with the idea of how we're doing it because we're wiping out mostly trees. And again, I just really want to stress how very pleased I am, it's not exactly where I want to go, with the arborist reports that the department's putting in now. Those are incredibly helpful and a good strong reminder to developers, don't raze a whole block. You know, make sure you protect those trees and what we can protect. I really do appreciate having those arborist reports in the model to help my decision making process. However, I do support this. I will be supporting it, but I say this not…I say this selfishly, because I believe using this as a template, if I do get re-elected, to look at specific neighbours that are beginning or will be under pressure, such as the Beaumont neighbourhood, the Maybank neighbourhood right now, three other neighbourhoods that are under a lot of pressure, but they're not the same as say, for example, Crescentwood or River

Heights because they have larger homes on there and that's a little bit harder just cost wise for people to rip down a big old house and then try to lot split it. It's difficult. So, those…it may come, but I believe working with the neighbourhood, we can find where we can densify properly that has, again, as Councillor Mayes said, if you want 100% agreement, we'll never get that. But again, maybe we can look at it neighbourhood by neighbourhood, maybe it's a little more Council directed, maybe led. Doesn't have to be always the planners having a little offshoot. Again, I will be continually working on that. So, I do want to thank Councillor Mayes for putting this in because this is a template that shows that we can do it. We can respect individual neighbourhoods, secure that uniqueness of them, but also, make…help them grow in a way that they support. Again, the other issues such as, I still can't believe we don't have our own by-law officers going out there to make sure that developments are, you know, happening accordingly. And they're not either, you know, putting the hole too big or wiping out fences or leaving the areas a mess. I do really support the idea of community benefit where some of that money from the development either it's increased taxation or permit fees stays within the neighbourhood to mitigate stuff like curb cuts. Some of those curb cuts, yeah, we repaired, but they're not that quick. Maybe we need to add some more trees now because they lost three trees in a private property. So, how can we do that? So, I do support that. But really, at the essence of this one, what I do support is the differentiating of this holistic mature neighbourhoods, they all are the same and we're just going to do it this way. I don't believe in that. I believe that we can get that density targets we want. I do still believe we can do density targeting. But again, lost that one too. But what we can do is we can celebrate the uniqueness of those individual communities, neighbourhoods we have. So, that's what this…I'll be supporting this. We'll see what happens with the public engagement. I do…and I also thank Councillor Mayes because it's not going to be easy for that process. Glenwood has a lot of strong feelings and they've had a really…a lot of years of having, like, maybe five developments on one block, every year for the last five, ten years. Well, you know, I personally think that's a lot of development for a neighbourhood to handle on the same block. So, can we look at some of that stuff? So, I do know we're in a pilot project, our two year kind of window with the mature infill guidelines, but this gives me a ray of hope that I'll be able to, in the next term, use some of these examples to look at some of the specific neighbourhoods and I hope we all can. That will allow our neighbourhoods to grow in a way that isn't just so monolithic, it's more unique to the character elements of why people move to those neighbourhoods. So, thank you, Councillor Mayes. Thank you to the Public Service for showing me that it can be done. And I look forward to following-up at a later date, but as of today, I will be supporting this going for public engagement.

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

Councillor Gilroy: You can call the question.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on Item 5. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Next, Item 15.

Item 15 – Amendments to the Vacant Buildings By-law No. 79/2010

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy to introduce the item.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, Madam Speaker. This is actually a very good…a very good news story. And I think it's Councillor Klein and Councillor Nason, I think, that originally had put this forward. This is…this is about looking at our vacant buildings and fires around our vacant buildings. And for many of us that experience fires around our vacant buildings, it's very scary for the residents that live around there. And this is making sure that the ownership and the cost is on to the owners that own these buildings. And I think that as we're trying to make sure that we're getting people to sell these buildings, get rid of these buildings, this is another thing that we can do, is to put the onus and the cost and the burden on to the owners to try to get them to deal with their vacant buildings more fast and efficiently. So, I think this is a very good motion and hope my councillor colleagues here support it today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? This was stood down by? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I stood it down, Madam Speaker. I will, actually, be voting for this report's recommendations. But I just…I have to say that my office and the Mynarski Ward, and I'm sure, like, some of my council colleagues have many vacant derelict buildings. There's 202 in the Mynarski Ward with something like 160 to 80 of them in three neighbourhoods alone. Now, yes, it is important that these vacant and derelict buildings do pay the cost when they are set on fire. There is a cost, of course, under the by-law that requires them to pay for inspections and so on and boarding fees and on we could go. And those, to this point, have not resolved the problem. I haven't seen what the number is across the city, but I must say, that the complaints-based system that we operate under…well, first, I must mention that there is an arson taskforce that does look at various vacant derelict buildings that have already been set on fire, but are not torn down. And we know that to tear one down, the owner must provide a…what they're going to do with it in the next two years, serious commitment to the city, that something will be built in its place, which is an underlying problem. But in no uncertain way, we need to be clear, this is a cost recovery method here. What we need to do is get away from this complaints-based system, because I have irate residents and they're rightly frustrated and irate because they present a serious safety risk,

not only from fire, but also, from illegal activities happening in and around these vacant properties. Not all, but many, many, many of them, this is what happens. And so, what we really need to do and I didn't have the time to write it up, but you know, this will cost by-law enforcement extra money, maybe, but the arson taskforce is trying to manage some of this, which I give them kudos for. And that team has an…has police officer as well as fire firefighters involved with it. However, what needs to happen is we need to manage this proactively. We need to assign and we could work with and ask the police service, fire fighters, by-law enforcement, to put together a team that goes by and monitors these houses all the time in a frequent basis, rather than the complaints-based system, which the police service, really, under the stress that they have now, can't even attend because it's not necessarily an emergency, which they're trying to respond to. So, I hope that my colleagues can understand the frustration of the residents. I'm frustrated. I've been trying to get this thing fixed since I was elected in 2010. The problem only seems to get worse. So, what we need to do is rather than this stupid complaints-based system, we need to be on it. Proactive, a team that monitors, in just in my ward, 202, 202. That's crazy. Every…almost every one of them presents a safety health risk. There's garbage all over the place related to these things, too. People are dumping their garbage, it's awful. And you know, people in this city don't even understand. I hope the people who are listening, there is a garbage vacant derelict property, huge problem in this city, and this one method, which is presented from Councillor Klein and Councillor Nason, a cost recovery for fighting fires. But listen, what about the cost to the residents who are nearby? People who end up getting victimized…their property being victimized and stuff because they just happen to live near them. It's not appropriate. Let's get proactive. So, I support cost recovery, absolutely. But we need a better plan. This complaints-based thing doesn't work. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Seeing the hour, it's time for Council to take a recess. Is that the will of Council? Okay, before we do that, I'd like to recognize someone I just see that walked into the gallery. It's former speaker of the Manitoba Legislature, Mr. Denis Rocan. And I see he has a guest with him. I believe that's you, Mario. Welcome. Council will now take a recess until…are there any other speakers for this item? Seeing none, Councillor Gilroy, do you wish to close?

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, Madam Speaker. Just to let everyone know, this is just a report back. Councillor Eadie made some very good points that I support, but this is just a report back. There would be more information coming back to the committee. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question on that item. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Council will now recess and reconvene at 1:00 today. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
July 21, 2022, at 1:04 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon, I'd like to reconvene our Council meeting of July 21st, 2022. We're on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated July…oh, pardon me, not the Executive Policy Committee. Yes, Property and Development. One moment. Property and Development Committee report dated July 4th, 2022, and it's Item 16. Madam Clerk.

Item 16 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 230 University Crescent – DASZ 15/2022

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

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

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy, thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. So, I just wanted to highlight this exciting project. This is the next step in the development of the former Southwood Golf Course, now called the North Campus Lands. This site is approximately 112 acres and was not accessible to the general public for over 100 years. And now, it's opening up. The development group is proposing to start…is proposing to subdivide 112 acres to create a total of 50 lots, three public reserves and new public and private streets and lanes. They're looking at 10,000 new residential units by the time the development is fully built-out. High density, multi-family and not one single-family house. The land will be leased to consortiums who are interested in developing the lands. The North Campus Lands proposes to create three public reserves which will have a total area of approximately 8.7 acres, which is the requirement as per the development agreement parameters, but in addition, they will be developing and protecting 7.5 acres of waterfront greenspace. So, taken together, this is approximately 16.2 acres of greenspace within the proposed development, almost double what is required in the development agreement

parameters. And it will be a very engaging community, it's not solely, at all, student housing. The plan includes…encourages larger, taller buildings; 15, 18, 20 stories high. High-rise towers above podium base. It includes institutional uses and residential density to create a lively community, which is critical to have mass population to support local businesses, campus activities and public transit. And there's a few points in here that I want to highlight, some of the benefits of transit and the focus of this new community. So, multi-family residentials, instead of for people that, you know, aren't dealing with parking all the time, instead of 1.5 parking stalls per dwelling unit for multi-family, the plan gives a minimum requirement would be .75 parking stalls per unit. Restaurants, instead of one stall for every 100 feet, would be .5 stalls. Personal services, instead of one parking stall for 250 square feet, the minimum will be .5 stalls. So, really focused on maximizing transit. And we've had an incredible opportunity with the North Campus Lands development team. Besides the fact that additional greenspace is being provided, the development team has been very focused on suring…on ensuring University Crescent remains and is enhanced as a gateway entrance to the university and to the centre for national…to the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation. Initially, the Public Works Department wanted the multi-use paths beside University Crescent, the developer and many from the active transportation community wanted to see them separated. And rarely…rarely we have…not rarely, but not as frequently, do we have a development or a developer come forward and say, look, we want to use up this space. We want to have better active transportation. So, with much good work and highlighting the high density, the pathways will be separated. And I want to thank the North Campus Lands development team for being so supportive of greenspace protection and ensuring safe, active transportation routes. I want to thank the Public Service Public Works Department for understand after much discussion the importance of separating active transportation from busy roadways. So, University Crescent on both sides will have an addition of trees and will have the separated active transportation pathways. And for the record, and for my council colleagues, I just really want to reiterate that we simply cannot underestimate the economic engine that post-secondary institutions bring to our city and province. We saw that during COVID when they shut down, there was a lot of really negative economic impact. It's been a long time coming to get to this point for the university lands. Many planning sessions and many discussions. Years. And now, we're at the point that the North Campus Lands will start development. I'm so very pleased. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Any other speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Gilroy, back to you or I can call the question.

Councillor Gilroy: Call the question.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of Item 16? Contrary? That's carried. We have no motions. We'll now get into by-laws, Councillor Gilroy, under this committee.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 1ST READING ONLY

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 97/2022, By-law No. 98/2022 and By-law No. 9/2022.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law 97/2022, By-law 98/2022, By-law 99/2022.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

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

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to read…I'd like to move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 100/2022, By-law No. 1…101/2022, By-law No. 102/2022, By-law No. 103/2022, By-law No. 104/2022, By-law No. 105/2022, By-law No. 106/2022, By-law No. 107/2022, By-law No. 8…108/2022, By-law No. 109/2022, By-law No. 110/2022, By-law No. 111/2022 and By-law No. 112/2022.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 100/2022, By-law No. 101/2022, By-law No. 102/2022, By-law No. 103/2022, By-law No. 104/2022, By-law No. 105/2022, By-law No. 106/2022, By-law No. 107/2022, By-law No. 108/2022, By-law No. 109/2022, By-law No. 110/2022, By-law No. 111/2022, By-law No. 112/2022.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move that the By-law No. 100/2022 to 112/2022, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 100/2022 to 112/2022, both inclusive.

Councillor Gilroy: And I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 100/2022 to 112/2022, both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We'll now have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Gilroy? No questions, let's move on. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. Councillor Rollins, the Chair, on the report dated June 29th, 2022.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS DATED JUNE 29, 2022

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move consent agenda Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, please. With thanks to Protection, Community Services and Parks.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer. 2. Any others? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Just to confirm, this is not from the special meeting, is that correct?

Councillor Rollins: That's right.

Madam Speaker: No.

Councillor Rollins: Sorry, Madam Speaker. That's right, there is still another item on the special meeting we held at July 12th for the two billion trees.

Madam Speaker: So, just Item 2 has been pulled; the One Million Tree Challenge. I'll call the question on 1, 3 through 6. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 2, Madam Clerk.

Item 2 – Winnipeg One Million Tree Challenge Annual Report

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This motion, ultimately, and the final program report for One Million Tree Challenge Annual Report was successfully moved at Protection, Community Services and Parks adding a grant for $70,000 for Trees Winnipeg to be referred to the 2023 budget review process and that funds be identified from the 2023 Urban Forest Enhancement Program. Of course, there's an attachment: One Million Tree Challenge Winnipeg Update for 2020/2021. Much good work here to be discussed and looking for Council's ongoing support for the program.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Appreciate this report and Councillor Rollins' comments on this. It's the first time that actually heard talk about some specific money and that's my concern. She actually mentioned $70,000 towards…towards tree development in this city. And it's important to talk about numbers and talk about costs, and that's my concern with the report. I don't expect the City of Winnipeg to solve the great environmental and tree challenges. It's been part and parcel and I believe we're doing that, but if we are going to offer report such as what we're doing here, I would expect that report to include costs all along the way down the report. And while this issue of the tree challenge has come to different committees, I believe it was either…believe it or not, that we have an environment committee: Standing

Policy Committee for the Environment, which is Water and Waste and Riverbank Management and the Environment as well at Finance. I've asked these questions of the administration in terms of costs and I haven't received that information. And so, as an example, when it comes to a city budget issue or even if it's not a city budget issue; what if it's a Federal Government budgeted…budgeted issue? And what I mean is, if we're dealing with charities, that means that there's tax deductions. That means there has to be a financial accountability for each tree for which there is a donation, a tax deduction or some sort of presentation to Revenue Canada in terms of the number of trees that have been offered for what cost because that's still tax money. One way or the other it is, because if we're dealing with charities and foundations, if it's a tax deduction, that's, well, an opportunity cost. That money could have gone to something else, so why did it go to trees? But how much did it cost? I don't know and I didn't get it from this report. But let's…that's one aspect. The City is working with foundations and charities, so what are the costs involved if we're going to…if the City's going to do a report? Also, what is the role of the City…City tree nursery? My understanding over the years and working at the Manitoba legislature in infrastructure, it was my understanding that the City's tree nursery had a larger role in things. And when…when you have that, you actually have a great level of accountability as well. I do not see that in this report. I do not know the role of the City tree nursery. I've asked questions about this and I do not know the costs directly to the taxpayer for what this is costing as well as through those foundations that are involved with what is the tree challenge. So, I don't know what to say. Like, we have to have an accounting. This is a nice report. Oh, and by the way, in recent times, I mean, all of Council's working on certain aspects of this, we just learned that the tree canopy in the city, the part that's on City-owned land, is 10% of our tree canopy. That's interest…that's an interesting statistic, and I'm not the only councillor that found that rather relevant fact. So, the tree canopy in the city is only…only 10% of it is on City land. That, however, doesn't allow us to turn our back on our obligations to, you know, the tree canopy on City-owned land. As an example, it is the City's goal right now of replacing only half the trees that the City has to cut down due to primarily to disease of elm and ash. And yet, the City's goal is to only replace half of them, but we're not even doing that, we're doing something like a…closer to a third. So, in terms of the City's actual commitment or obligation to the tree canopy on City-owned property, I don't have much of a…we've known this for a while that the City's only replacing a third of the trees, not even a third of the trees, even though they're trying to replace only half. We need more information on that and I suspect that if the issue is financial, we should know about that, everybody in Council. So, I guess I'll leave it at that. I've asked the administration numerously for their sort of hard data on costs. And happens to be, I don't always agree with it, but I do appreciate his contributions; David Grant sent a submission on this issue and he said it is…if this major annual report is to have any credibility, it should not be hiding the costs and failures of the program. So, yeah, of course, humans are really, really good at learning from mistakes and, you know, I know we're in a role where we talk about the positivity of things, but we have to learn from our mistakes. That's how we improve and that's how we evolve positively when it comes to these things. I don't want to make a big issue out of mistakes, but I do want to make a big issue, a gigantic issue over accounting for costs. If the City's going to be involved, if the taxpayers are going to be involved, they have an absolute right to an accounting of City expenditures, including trees. If we're going to have a sustainable economy and a sustainable ecology, how do we go about our environmental projects, including trees, without a proper financial accounting? That does not exist in this report, and on that basis, I cannot vote for it. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think the report speaks for itself. I want to thank Councillor Rollins and her committee for their work. I also want to thank Trees Winnipeg for their efforts. I think it's entirely appropriate to refer the $70,000 grant Trees Winnipeg to the budget so it can be, you know, a decision in the budget. I want to just take this opportunity, and the reason I did want to stand and speak to this, to thank all those Winnipeggers, both organizations as well as individuals, who have been supporting the Million Tree Challenge. There is a website. You can register your trees. You can plant a tree today and register, it geolocates in an anonymized way so that your tree can count towards the Million Tree Challenge. The simple concept with the Million Tree Challenge, as members of Council and the public hopefully know, is as we grow to a million people, we plant a million new trees. It's one of the ways that we can help build a more sustainable planet, but also, just how we can build a more…an even more beautiful city is more trees. There are some areas of the city that have the benefit of a lot of trees, others need more. There's more work ahead. You know, I live in Charleswood, I've got the benefit of being very close to the Assiniboine Forest. It's an absolute jewel, but I also try to visit other areas of the city as well. Bunn's Creek has become a family favourite. And you know, just to enjoy the trees and the outdoor space. So, just want to encourage everyone to please continue to support the Million Tree Challenge. Thank you.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. Part of our community building on this model. First of all, I'll just be very clear what this program is; Councillor Schreyer was talking about public trees, private trees, well, this program, it does say public trees in here, but not…and there is a little bit of grey area regarding some parks, but where they're really focusing on now is schools, how they're going to be a big program of this summer. They started already. They had a little bit of a, how do we say, a hiccup. They've lost some staff over COVID. They lost two of their key staff. They just hired another person recently who actually was here today but didn't…didn't know about registering properly and unfortunately called

me a little bit late. I would have had the gentleman come forward today to answer your questions directly. But again, what we're doing here today is we're going to just say, hey, $70 grand, put a pin on it, throw it off to the budget and we'll see what goes on over there. So again, to get that information Councillor Schreyer is looking for, and I'm not exactly sure what is exactly he wants to know, because the cost of planting a tree is really dependent on where you plant the tree, how big your tree is, and again, also, how…who's maintaining those trees after the planting. So, it's not just planting a tree, that's actually the easier part, the harder part is actually, especially last year summer, is making sure they don't die off because of the drought. So, that's another…that's a whole other realm of cost. But they do…they have spent the last couple of years and I hope people have had an opportunity to go to their website with their counter, some resources on there. It is…got to give their past director kudos to that, they've built a…they have built an infrastructure now. They've finally got infrastructure that's good to go. We also do this relief program, twice a year now, where thousands of trees go out. Now, the problem with that program is I…last year, I think Councillor Gillingham was with me this year, Councillor Sharma came out too and she refused to go up a tree, but…so did I. I said, I'll pass on that. But again, we had hundreds and hundreds of people coming up to pick up trees. Now, I personally believe that Million Tree Challenge, to register those trees at the moment. It's a little bit of an organizational headache that they just weren't ready for it, but they do expect and they hope that people will take those trees homes and register themselves. I don't think they are. I don't see this big uptake after the…I look at their little ticker cupper after that, it doesn't really go up that high after the relief programs. So again, what they're saying here is what we're getting registered. I believe Million Tree Challenge does…is still struggling a little bit. They're working with the nurseries as well. How many private trees are getting bought from nurseries? How to register those trees. So, I know you want maybe specific data and people want more specific data, but we still are having troubles counting the trees. I can tell you in my heart and my understanding is, lot more trees are going out the door than are actually being registered at this point. That's…getting registered, to me, I'm sorry, it's still a secondary issue. The primary issue is getting those trees in the ground. So, I'm really excited about Trees Winnipeg's program. They've already contacted a number of schools, I believe throughout the whole city of Winnipeg, to do a mini forest throughout the school divisions. They also have another program, I've had a couple of community groups; Councillor Rollins and I are going to be meeting our colleagues that are from tree programs to talk about the…the other item coming forward later. But Trees Winnipeg has already helped engage in that and how can they support that and they're very excited about the billion tree…two billion tree challenge document as well, to be participating in that as well. And so, I'm in fairly regular contact with Trees Winnipeg. They are an incredible group of people that have incredible knowledge. It's one of those things when, you know, when you got elected, how much sewer pipe do I need to learn about and we do, we learn about sewer pipes, we learn about, you know, what kind of aggregates we're using. Well, again, it is a specialty product here, these trees, and they have a board that is very broad, all the way…reconciliation trees, they're looking at doing some reserves, as well, outside the city, it wouldn't count to this. But their program is growing leaps and bounds. They have one employee, so I'll leave it at that. The $70,000, I'll have that debate if I get re-elected in the budget time. They are running on a shoestring budget because all their money is going into either buying trees and they don't buy them from the City of Winnipeg nursery because the City of Winnipeg's using that stock themselves and they go to the nurseries. They have to go to the private nurseries to purchase it, and they do now. At the beginning of the Million Tree Challenge, the nurseries were very concerned about, will this be back filling the City's obligation, and it's not. So, the nurseries are much more onboard now and they're streamlining out their coding system so they can get those trees registered as well. They're doing an incredible good work. I do wish they had more trees identified in this project because I do know they have been planting…or getting other people to plant. But again, it will be a partnership. They are kind of specifically exempt for the parks area, a little bit grey area. They're not doing boulevard trees. They're not doing median trees if we ever do those again. They are specifically on private lands and/or public lands if you called schools, even government buildings; I think Hydro has had them do some work for them as well. So, again, I loath to think that someone's going to say, you know what, just to refer this to the budget, the $70,000, I don't even want to allow that to happen today. Allow that to happen today for the budget process. Have your chance to talk to them. I'll be more than happy to get the board here to talk to you about any kind of details you want, but Chris will be more than happy to talk to you directly. The guy just started about a month ago, so he just got up…he just got swinging on it recently. So, I think today have a little bit of faith. You're not spending the money, you're just referring it. I will be supporting it and I will be advocating for that $70,000. Again, but if it ends up being more information before they actually commit to it, today is just asking refer it to the budget process and show that solidarity, show that partnership opportunity. They would have been here today if they didn't…we just…they just had a little…it's a new person, didn't understand how that…the process registering for delegations work. So, I don't think…we should give a little slack on that. And like I say, again, it's really just a budget referral. So, I think this is not the time to say, you know what Streets Winnipeg? No money for you, goodbye. They are…actually, really are helping the City of Winnipeg in general, not the city…the residents of the city of Winnipeg to help increase our tree canopy. So, I'm very happy to support this referral. I'd be actually happy just to let the money go today, but again, I do believe that when we're looking at expenses like this and other items are coming up, it should be referred to the budget. But again, what we have today is a referral to the budget process. Their budgeting is okay, their budget's okay for today, so they…they negated that, no, we can wait. So, that's fine. And…but again, if you want to have some more details about their accounting and stuff like that, you have plenty of time before the next…the actual decision is made. So, I'll be supporting this and I do thank tree…million tree…Trees Winnipeg for this work and all the support they're providing all the community groups out there. It's very helpful. It's another lens to our…our tree program is limited, how much resources that we can put in there

from helping community groups grow and develop, but not the easiest, Councillor Lukes will say. Some of these programs are not the easiest. They take up a lot of time, so having Trees Winnipeg here to help us, or help those community groups to be able to do the planting, is something we should not lose sight of as well. So, I'll be supporting this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. The bucket ride at Kildonan Park was fun. Something else. That's how I went up in the tree. Any other speakers on this item? Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be very brief. It's great to see that there is some momentum in getting the trees planted, getting new trees planted, net new trees to our city to help our tree canopy. But we also have to recognize that we have to hasten our maintenance schedule of trees as well, so that we give them a fair chance in preserving them as we move forward so that it's not that continual cycle of planting or re-planting trees to cover off the dead ones that have been harmed, whether it's through weather events or the many (inaudible) emerald ash bore or the Dutch Elm Disease or any of the funguses that evade our tree canopy. We need to focus on those as well and have a proper maintenance schedule to mitigate the concerns that rise of our existing tree canopy. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you. Can you hear me, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Loud and clear, thank you.

Councillor Eadie: Okay, yeah. Thank you. I'm going to vote to support the budget referral of $70,000. And if still around, I will be supporting moving that into the budget as Trees Winnipeg has provided us an excellent…the city-wide…an excellent service. And I just wanted to, actually, speak to some of my involvement with this Million Tree Challenge and Trees Winnipeg and the efforts of corporate and private individuals to ensure that we can get trees planted. And I have to plug Telpay and Louise May for their excellent tree giveaway, the sapling giveaway, which was for one year there, 10,000, which is the year I worked with them to get trees into the North End and various areas. Ms. May understood that the tree canopy in our old neighbourhoods like the North End have suffered quite bad experience in terms of having to take trees down, old, mature, very mature trees as neighbourhoods…well, I mean very mature trees as well, in River Heights and elsewhere. But I just wanted to say, though, and mention; the tree sapling giveaway, while it was for private land, I have to say, that the people who live probably everywhere in the city, took some of these trees that were giveaways and they planted them on public property. And we talk about the right tree and the right place that the City is talking about. And I believe Trees Winnipeg was promoting as well, ensuring that people remember that the City has to look at the best places on public boulevards to plant trees and care for them. But you know, it just demonstrated working with Ms. May out there and (inaudible) brown giving away trees, how important this is for people. And I think we need to support the continuation of Trees Winnipeg who is seeking other forms of funding to continue their programs that work with the people. And you know, probably they'll be playing some role when we get to our special meeting report coming up after this. So, I'm in support of the budget referral and keep up the good work Trees Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Next speaker. Seeing none, Councillor Rollins…oh, Councillor Schreyer, yes.

Councillor Schreyer: Point of order; I don't have a problem with voting for $70,000 for Trees Winnipeg, but…okay, but I may not itemize. Often with resolutions, they're itemized and we can separate them for votes, this is titled 'One Million Tree Challenge Annual Report'. It's an over 20-page report, but then it includes resolution one.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, there's no clauses. Are you asking to vote on clauses individually? There really isn't an opportunity to do that.

Councillor Schreyer: There…there's not…I may not vote on the report and the proposal of $70,000 separately. They're two different issues to me. I'd rather…I'd like to vote for the $70,000, not vote for the report.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, there's no such method of voting that way today, just by clause, what we've normally done. Thank you. Councillor Rollins, for the close.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am so happy, Madam Speaker, to work with my council colleagues to understand how budget is presented. And I just want to remind councillors that, through you Madam Speaker, that we've literally won awards on our budget layout, the Public Service has, not us, in terms of how the budget has laid out. And specifically, budget lines for urban forest renewal program formally known as the reforestation improvements and urban forest enhancement program and, really, more that is really laid out in several different ways throughout our budget documents, Madam Speaker. But this, this is different. This is simply a grant of $70,000 for Trees Winnipeg to be referred

to the 2023 budget. And this is different, Madam Speaker, because this is really our…about our partnership, our One Million Tree Challenge partnership. Probably understand…important to understand the money and the people power that it's leveraged and how we want to keep going with the partnerships that my colleague, Councillor Orlikow, really detailed and not forget that we…we, through the work of Mayor Bowman and Mayor Bowman's office, as well as Martha Barwinsky, really led the corporate sponsorship program and the program known as Million Tree Challenge, which began, of course, with Canadian National Railway's donation of one million. Soon after, Telpay announced their commitment of 250,000. The Winnipeg Foundation made their $1 million commitment and so on and so forth, Madam Speaker. It's exciting. It deserves a unanimous vote and I'm glad that through the debate today, Councillor Schreyer may have changed his mind to be able to support that $70,000 grant to keep going.

Councillor Schreyer: Point of order, Madam Speaker. Just for clarification, we're not just voting on the $70,000, we're voting on the report, which shows no…no financial accounting. That's the title of the motion.

Madam Speaker: That's correct. You're voting on the report in front of us. The whole item; the report…

Councillor Orlikow: We have two motions in front of us. It does not say to receive the report as information, it says the grant of $70,000 for Trees Winnipeg be referred to the budget process and then authorize all necessary things to implement the intent of the foregoing. That's what I'm voting on today.

Madam Speaker: So, it's refer to the budget with the attached report. Yeah.

Councillor Orlikow: Yes.

Councillor Schreyer: Give me an understanding of why the item is titled 'Winnipeg One Million Tree Challenge Annual Report'?

Madam Speaker: Okay, Mr. Clerk, I'll let you respond and then we're going to move on.

City Clerk: The report in front of Council has two recommendations: one that a grant of $70,000 for Tree Winnipeg be referred to the budget review and that the Proper Officers do all things necessary. Should an amendment wish to be made, such would have to be in writing, otherwise, Council will vote on the two recommendations in front of you, as stated.

Councillor Schreyer: Again, Madam Speaker, I don't understand why it's titled 'One Million Tree Challenge Annual Report' based on what our Clerk just said.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, we'll continue this conversation offline. I think what's in front of us is the budget referral with the attached supporting report. So, you're voting on the item as a whole, as we normally do. Okay, with that, I'm calling the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Schreyer recorded in opposition and the item carries. Okay, Councillor Rollins on the report dated July 12th, 2022.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED JULY 12, 2022

Councillor Rollins: Yes, Madam Speaker. Protection, Community Services and Parks was so nice we did it twice this month, Madam Speaker. And for the first time ever, Protection, Community Services and Parks had a special meeting on trees. And we were so excited to do so. The urban suburban tree planting stream, homegrown Winnipeg tree planting program, was unanimously moved on to Council for the successful application of the Two Billion Trees Program. And I want to thank the public servants who, you know, really offered the best in class, the best in the nation report and I'm going to yield…while I know he is…he has his own time, Madam Speaker, but Mr. Mayor has a particular story to tell, Madam Speaker, with respect to, you know, Winnipeg's story and the Million Tree Challenge and in the context of Canada's Two Billion Tree Program.

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

Mayor Bowman: I'm not able to deliver on the build up of these remarks. I just want to…I want to applaud members of the committee; Councillor Rollins, Councillor Chambers, for…I know this was a special meeting and appreciate the collaboration through our Public Service with the Federal Government. In furtherance of our Million Tree Challenge, when the Prime Minister announced that Federal Government's two billion tree effort, I did have dialogue with the Prime Minister

to see if there were opportunities for us to partner and work together. We've got a program here, a model that can help deploy trees. These dollars will certainly help plant 70,000 additional trees in the city of Winnipeg, something that we should all support. And so, I would just ask wholeheartedly that we support this initiative. And I did want to just speak and put some comments on the record of appreciation to our Prime Minister and his government for allowing us to partner in this respect.

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

Councillor Eadie: Again, just…is my microphone on?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: Okay. Thank you, Madam Speaker. And definitely a big thank you for our Winnipeg Public Service, specifically the people working Parks, Open Spaces, Forestry Branch, for putting together an excellent application for funding to help match the money that we're spending to plant…we managed to find in the budget to plant new trees in place of trees that we've taken down and to help speed up our process. Because, again, I'll speak to the issue of neighbourhoods are demanding replacements of their trees. And the trees are very important to the people who live in neighbourhoods all around the city. And especially for those who have lost huge amounts of their tree canopy, like in my ward along Inkster, it's been devastating. And…which was Inkster Boulevard was…when I could still see, was a beautiful tree canopy, a boulevard that looked wonderful. Now, it's basically, in many sections, tree (inaudible). And we need to start replacing them. So, I wanted to say that I'm glad that the Two Billion Tree federal effort…Mr. Trudeau, our Prime Minister, has obviously understood and had the Federal Government provide the ability to achieve a two billion tree planting across the country. It is an effort to stem climate change in terms of the trees soaking up all that carbon. And I guess you call them carbon sinks, but we also call them beautiful trees. And it's my understanding in reading this report, our success is that we over…I believe it's over five years, are hopefully going to achieve almost, or hopefully, like a two to one tree replacement. That's sort of unpredictable at this point, but definitely will improve what the tree lobby wants us to achieve and is asking for the commitment of Council in the future to achieve that two to one replacement of trees that we've had to take down. The sadder part, though, I have to say, is that it's going to take, you know, ten to twenty years to see those…the real canopy form again, even longer. But at least we're, along with the assistance of the Federal Government, going to achieve for our kids and our grandkids, a wonderful treed city called Winnipeg, which it once was and it still has many, many trees. Thanks. Obviously, voting for this and I'll remind…remind the Mayor that Councillor Eadie and Councillor Nason are also on the Protection, Community Services and Parks Standing Committee.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to vote for this to enhance the tree canopy of the city. I'm not sure if I ever talked about this, by…well, I wouldn't call it a profession, there are people that are better at it than I was over the years, but I did spend a few years as a tree planter, seasonally. And not my greatest contribution to the Winnipeg (inaudible) tree canopy, but as the city councillor for Elmwood-East Kildonan, I was able to guarantee 100% reforestation. My understanding, as I've been told, the first councillor to do so. Guarantee 100% reforestation for a neighbourhood in the city. In that case, there was actual account…accounting for how much it would cost, but of course, we're talking about 100% reforestation of trees taken down on City-owned property, which is primarily our purview. It's great that we're involved with the Two Billion Tree Challenge, which includes the Federal Government, but I've got to say, in doing my research on what we're getting into here in terms of these bold claims. Bold claims are great. Bold strategies are…and goals are great. They tend to work when you can account for them. And when you can't account for them, then you're in trouble because you don't know what you're doing when things cost money. So, I'm willing to vote for this. I want to see the report afterward. And that's…that will tell you. That will tell you what things are costing. I have to say one thing because it was already mentioned in the…in the debate on this item, we've congratulated the Federal Government, and that's great. But I've got to say something, in doing my research on trees, because it matters to me, it matters to the people I represent, it matters to all Winnipeggers, I cannot find the information from the federal website or from specific foundations that are involved with trees. And I can't find the financial data. So, I've, in fact, hired someone to try and find that information. Can't find it, you've got to go to Revenue Canada. And so far, it's not accessible information. So I'm saying that because that's part of the problem when you're…when you're planning such a project of such national scope. We're talking about billions of trees. But when you're talking about this, you're talking about the taxpayer, one way or the other, but the taxpayer is going to be involved and there's no way around that. So, the taxpayer deserves accountability. Of course, we all do, let's face it. We have a national strategy for trees, and it's really important when you have a national strategy for something to know what the costs are. There's costs put here in terms of the specific allocations that are going to be coming to the city…to the City project. Mentioning it in terms of the Two Billion Tree Program, that's a little tough for me, because I can't find that financial data in terms of what's that…what that's costing the Government of Canada, what that's costing the taxpayer. Therein lies a dilemma. Having said that, in terms of the specifics mentioned here, I'm willing to support that. I'm glad to see that the City is taking on the same level of seriousness that I've committed to a few years ago. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank the work of Chair Rollins, Councillor Chambers, Councillor Eadie, to get this here today. Just to let Councillor Schreyer know, just a strange paradox between the $70,000 he wasn't in favour of the last time, this is actually…

Councillor Schreyer: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I was in favour of that (inaudible) the report is titled.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, continue.

Councillor Nason: I'm sorry, there was chatter. I didn't hear your response.

Madam Speaker: You have the floor, go ahead.

Councillor Nason: Thank you. $70,000 and the last report; this will affect 70,000 trees to the positive. I believe it's up two. Anyways. So, it was just kind of an interesting…that these numbers parody. The Federal Government providing this, hopefully, will have a positive impact on all 15 wards of the city of Winnipeg. That they're distributed evenly and fairly. Not quite sure how that plan will fall out, but I do know in the Park City of Transcona, we've lost a large amount of trees. Not as many as my colleague for River Heights-Fort Garry. I go over to River Heights a fair bit and see the loss of trees there. But these trees that we're losing are taller than this room that we're in and we're replacing them with very marginally small trees. So, you know, a couple of generations forward, hopefully, they'll have trees to celebrate. Perhaps our ashes will be spread amongst them to celebrate and look back fondly at the decisions we're making today with regards to adding 70,000 more trees to our urban canopy. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Rollins: My pleasure to close, Madam Speaker. Why? Because this is all good news. This is a $3.2 billion program of the Federal Government. Over a period of ten years, by 2031, they want to see trees planted. And not only trees planted to support the city of Winnipeg, but to support our people power, like Trees Elmwood, that I know Councillor Schreyer, Madam Speaker, has supported. Like Trees Riverview and Trees Mulvey that I helped to build in my ward. Like all of the extra organizations that we might not even know about that Councillor Orlikow and I have vowed to meet with all the people that have grown up over time in support of trees in the city of Winnipeg. Why? Because this money will help not-for-profit Indigenous organization to plant those two billion trees. What is great about this item, Madam Speaker, is that transparently and for all to see, the appendix C of this item contains the Urban Forest Renewal Program and the Public Works general capital fund that is impacted by the funds we're getting from the Federal Government. What's great is that this includes the plan program expenditures to our capital budget, but also the reconciliation of the plan program expenditures to financial impact statements. It's all here. It's all transparent. And it's all good news, Madam Speaker. I hope this is a unanimous vote.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We have no motions under this committee, no by-laws. We'll now have question period for the Chair. Any questions for Councillor Rollins? Councillor Nason, followed by Councillor Allard.

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

Councillor Nason: Actually, I have a question for the Chair of the Winnipeg Police Board.

Madam Speaker: Okay. And that does fall under this committee. Chair of the Winnipeg Police Board, so question to Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Nason: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. We've heard lots of rhetoric in the public's fear of late with regards to the Chief of Police and responses or lack thereof, particularly from the Premier of late. I know several members of the Police Board are appointed by the Province of Manitoba, I'm just wondering if the Chair will be convening a meeting, special meeting to discuss the Chief of Police's employment.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Sorry, if he could repeat the last bit of that question; the Chief of Police is, sorry?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. If you could restate your question.

Councillor Nason: Again, with regards to the Chief of Police's employment with the City of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: If you could restate the question in whole. Councillor Nason, would you do that, please?

Councillor Nason: Will the Winnipeg Police Board, under the guise of Councillor Chambers as Chair, be convening a special meeting to discuss the employment of the Chief of Police?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Well, through you to Councillor Nason; the Chief of Police is currently employed with the Winnipeg Police Service as the Chief and has a contract through to November of 2023.

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

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to the Chair; have some questions about outdoor pools and levels of service for hours. Recently, I understand there's a lifeguard shortage. I understand that's being worked on. I understand the positions being looked at in terms of what's required and what's offered from the City of Winnipeg. That being said, I had some follow-up questions from the media asking how is it that we make decisions based on which pools are open, when, who decides the pools are open on weekends, how are the hours determined. So, I was wondering if the Chair would lend…lend the Chair's assistance as I…as I look to get these answers. I have to say, I've had much…much correspondence and good answers from the Public Service, but I wanted to ask the Chair if…if required, if the Chair would be…could be of any assistance offline.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I really do appreciate the question. It is ongoing work for me and the Public Service. And if councillors want to look quickly at winnipeg.ca and circulate the poster that is there to folks who might want to have a job as a aquatics instructor, an instructor guard or wading pool rec tech b, the posters are up. And the posters are up because the City of Winnipeg are always hiring for these three positions. And so, I think it's important to mention and I would ask all Winnipeggers, as I have through the media, Madam Chair, seriously, quite seriously, over the last week to really circulate that job posting. Why? Well, we're in a tight labour market, Madam Speaker, and that is having impact on ours. We are endeavouring to follow our Council directed policy, which is to have the wading pools open and pools open. However, sometimes when people resign, there is shortages at a particular site. The direction…the Council direction still stands. We have directed, through the work of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks, through the Recreation Strategy and the work of this council that passed it unanimously, that higher needs areas are to be taken into consideration and levels of service are to be taken into consideration. That being said, Madam Speaker, the current constraint is around our summer season being only eight weeks long. University students and others want to start working in May, usually, not July. And our wading pool jobs are staffed primarily by high school students and students who finish school the end of June. That's a constraint that we face each and every year. We also, as we knew and as I think I've reported before, we have a lifeguard shortage. With two years of COVID, Madam Speaker, we were unable to train and have lifeguards meet qualifications. And to that end, I'll be the first to call Mayor Bowman back into service as a lifeguard. I'm joking, but not really. It's not…it's not seen as a career path, as we know. It's…you might be a lifeguard one day, mayor the next, right? It's not…it's not necessarily a career path, per se, but it is a stop in a lot of people's careers, including Mayor Bowman's. Most work for a few years and then they find a career job. All this to say is, in answer to Councillor Allard's question, it is complicated. While it is the case that we have levels of service, we've directed the Public Service through the hire needs, when a particular site loses staff, it does take time to re-adjust. And sometimes they lose staff in that week. So, we've…I invite anyone who has questions to contact me directly, but I wanted to put some comments on the record in terms of the schedules that are intermittent. It's a short season, only eight weeks. And I am assured that the Public Service is doing its best to sort of roll with the punches of the very competitive labour market, the very tight labour market, knowing that we're not the only sector that are having issues getting the frontline and getting the first scales of our jobs. In this case, three particular jobs and getting recruits for those.

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

Councillor Eadie: There we go. Audio unmuted. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Actually, my first question is to…through the Chair to the Chair of the Winnipeg Police Board, as Councillor Nason had done. And correct me…the question is, correct me if I'm wrong, but there's two appointees from the Province on the Winnipeg Police Board. And it is the Winnipeg Police Board who hires and evaluates the performance of the Chief of Police.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, question for Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: So, in…

Councillor Eadie: Correct me if I'm wrong.

Councillor Chambers: Yeah, I'm just trying to think of the provincial appointees. There are two currently.

Councillor Eadie: That is the number that they appoint to. Okay (inaudible) the by-law.

Councillor Chambers: Yes. And the Winnipeg Police Board is responsible for the evaluation…the hiring and evaluation, annually, of the Chief of Police.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. Madam Speaker, I have a second question for the Chair of Protection, Community Services and Parks. And given previous answer, my question is; should we maybe not advertise to, say, retirees who once worked as lifeguards to maybe work for those lower wages to help provide wading pool services to Winnipeg?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: So, in terms of the advertisement, you know, we are essentially inviting anyone to apply, Madam Speaker. And you know, with respect to folks that have worked for the City of Winnipeg, have experience, you know, they'd be welcome to apply too. I will relay Councillor Eadie's comments, Madam Speaker, to the department with respect to calling back staff who may have worked for us previously. But you know, all hands on deck. You know, all the help to look at filling these positions and then having the critical discussion that we should probably have on these first tiers and…of our Community Services staff to make sure that we're delivering the services that Winnipeggers want and need, and that's their wading pools, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Eadie: Final question, Madam Speaker. Has Community Services, pools and pads, have they looked at rotating staff to various pools outside of the areas as identified as a high needs area?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: I think the question is, have they looked at rotating outside of the needs…high needs areas. And I just ask through you, Madam Speaker, for Councillor Eadie to clarify that he means, you know, to shift into the areas of highest need.

Madam Speaker: Okay, I'll move on, that was third question. I can come back to Councillor Eadie, next is Councillor Browaty. Councillor Browaty. That was three questions, we'll move on, we can come back.

Councillor Browaty: Sure. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. My question for the Chair of Protection, Community Services and Parks is in regards to our libraries. We know during the COVID-19 pandemic, library hours were reduced and even coming out of the pandemic, there was some essential reductions in hours, I think the cleaning and whatever. Can you confirm; are we operating at full-steam now? It does still seem like the library hours are a bit limited.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. Madam Speaker, I appreciate this question on library hours. We are currently on a summer schedule and that means it's the same…you know, it's really the same summer schedule, Madam Speaker, that we've had for at least a decade. It pre-dates my arrival on the scene this term. Victoria Day through Labour Day is the summer schedule. The only reduction of library summer hours right now is in St. Boniface where we don't have enough French staff to open Mondays and Wednesday evenings. So, there is a slight reduction, but you know, in St. Boniface, in particular, but it isn't…this summer does not differ for the summers that we've had in the last decade. Library staffing currently is sufficient for these summer hours except, like I said, in this one instance, in St. Boniface where there's insufficient French staff to open Monday and Wednesday evenings, Madam Speaker. So, you know, really status quo with respect to libraries for the last decade and the last decade's worth of library hours. And Madam Speaker, just to sneak in a response to Councillor Eadie really quick, we…Community Services does have a floater…floater staff in pool clusters. And so, I want to note that for Councillor Eadie, and then I'll endeavour to get back the…the, you know, direction to Community Services that he had indicated through the last two questions, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Eadie, I'll go back to you, if you'd like to continue.

Councillor Eadie: Actually, no. Is my microphone on?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: Oh. I believe the Chairperson has actually answered my question. I wasn't talking about rotating staff from the high needs areas, I was talking about if they're rotating…if they're rotating staff at…to pools so that other neighbourhoods have an ability to bring their kids locally for that wading pool experience. And I think you just answered it about the staffing moving within pod areas for whatever, is that correct?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Rollins, do you wish to respond?

Councillor Rollins: Yeah, I mean, the…thank you, again, through you, Madam Speaker, to Councillor Eadie. Up on the recreation, leisure and parks website, there is a listing. I encourage Winnipeggers to look at that and look at where there are closures, which is noted in red on top. And then, as much as councillors can get the word out, that would be great. But, you know, through you, Madam Chair, to Councillor Eadie; you know, sometimes the closures are due to staff sometimes health and sometimes staff, you know, resignations and so, the…you know, it is…it isn't necessarily site-specific, but I can get more information for Council. And certainly, I've asked the department to update me and all of Council, including a council seminar should we, out of the summer season, be looking at anything that would impact the leisure guide. So, not exactly what Councillor Eadie's looking for, Madam Speaker, but an answer nonetheless. And I'll get back to him through the department.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And that concludes our question period under this committee. Next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Allard, the report dated July 6th, 2022. We do have some amending motions.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED JULY 5, 2022

Councillor Allard: Yes, I would like to move automatic referral for report 4 and I'd like a counted…a standing vote or counted vote.

Madam Speaker: So, okay. So, councillor, we're going to pull Item 4. We're going to pull 5, there's amending motions. Any others? No. 1.

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, I was looking to move automatic referral to committee for Item 4.

Madam Speaker: That can be done later when the item needs to be pulled.

Councillor Allard: Okay, and I would like a recorded vote on that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: When we get to that, you'll repeat it.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, I will.

Madam Speaker: Any other items to pull? 3, okay. Anything else? Okay, seeing none, we've pulled 1, 3, 4, 5. I'll call the question on…councillor…Mr. Clerk, you were saying? Councillor Lukes pulled 3. 1, 3, 4 and 5. There's amending motions with 4 and 5.

Councillor Allard: On Item 4, I would like to move automatic referral to committee of the motion. Standing vote, as well as the…as long as the motion's…as well as the motions that are attached to it. She's trying…she's trying to move the report.

Madam Speaker: So, we're back exactly how we thought. I'm going to call the question on Item 2.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, point of order. It's the…Chair of the committee has not actually moved the items that were…you're calling a vote on.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, if you could move your agenda. There are a number of items that have been pulled and you also requested to pull 4. Okay, so do you want to move consent?

Councillor Allard: I will move consent agenda with those items having been pulled.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Okay, we've pulled 1, 3, 4 and 5, okay? So, I'll call the question on 2 and 6. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Madam Clerk, Item 1.

Item 1 – Air Force Way Realignment Phase 2 – Amendment of Project Authorization

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to stand this item down just to point out, again, though the costs have increased from $1.5 million to $2.5 million, this realignment of the road of Air Force Way, which is in the St. James Ward and goes into the 17 Wing. I know lines and bends…the road also bends around and services the west side airport…southwest corner of the Winnipeg Airport's Authority land as well. Just to remind everyone that the…all the costs are fully recovered or covered by the Department of National Defense. And I just thought I'd take the opportunity to remind us, as a Council, and remind Winnipeggers the great value of 17 Wing. 17 Wing the…well, some of the most recent estimates I've seen, show that it has a population impact on Winnipeg of over 5,000 people; Winnipeg and the surrounding area. And it employs, directly on the base, employs over 2,000 individuals, and then there's indirect jobs as well. And 2…over $200 million of economic impact for our region. And so, there's such a great value to having 17 Wing and the Royal Canadian Airforce here in our midst and I think we should never take that for granted. There's been times when air force bases and army bases have been moved out of…out of communities and we just want to…I want to state, once again, how much we value the men and women of Royal Canadian Air Force. And some of the…these armour…some army individual…staff working there as well, but it's home to 17 Wing headquarters, home also to 1 Canadian Air Division, 2 Canadian Air Division. And finally, I'll just comment that next week was a change of command and Commander Colonel David Proteau will be leaving his post after two years. And Commander Proteau has done an outstanding job working with the City of Winnipeg, with businesses within the city of Winnipeg. I know that he's had a good relationship with Mayor Bowman and the Mayor has reached out to the colonel as well and…to establish a good relationship. And one of the things that Commander Proteau worked very hard to do is to work…to advocate for and work on behalf of the spouses and partners and family members of forces members. Often, forces…Canadian Forces members will move to Winnipeg, get transferred to Winnipeg and they're working on 17 Wing in one of the many units, but it's quite often their partner or their spouse that has some trouble sometimes finding…finding a job. And so, with…through partnerships with some individuals and some organizations within Winnipeg, there's a much better process by which those that are partners and spouses and the skillsets that they bring to Winnipeg can find work and can find work quicker in our city. And so, I just want to commend Colonel Proteau and Chief Warrant Officer Claude Foucher for their work. I want to thank him for his service. In fact, Colonel Proteau is ending his military career after 30 plus years here in Winnipeg. He is retiring. He indicates he's going to come back for one year as a reservist, but then he and his family are staying in Winnipeg and after a lengthy military career in the air force, is retiring and will be living here in our community. And so, I just want to thank colonel…through you, Madam Clerk, put on record my appreciation…our appreciation to the city to Colonel David Porteau. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. That's Item 1, any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Allard, do you wish to close?

Councillor Allard: Just call the question.

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

Item 3 – Winnipeg Road Safety Strategic Action Plan

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

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you. This is a budget referral. I think the only change from the standing policy committee is that we wanted to ensure that the budget referral was net new dollars and not dollars that were coming from other budget lines that might have been consolidated in the view of enhancing road safety. So, I think that's the substantive change from Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Public Service report. I'd like to congratulate my colleague, Councillor Rollins that got the ball rolling on this with federal…with federal gas tax back then in 2019, I believe. So, we have a consultant report, we're moving it up to the next budget. And looking for…looking for, well, action on road safety as soon as we can have it. As we're aware, there's about $7 million in infrastructure renewal. And it's $7 million in

transportation engineering enhancement program upgrades that have not yet been done that are warranted and unfunded, and this road safety strategy, I'm sure, will be looking at that as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. So, I just want to reflect back on the history of this road safety strategy. In January 10th of 2017, I brought a motion forward to have the City of Winnipeg develop a road safety strategy. On January 30th, I hosted an open house with Public Works and external road safety advocates. We had about 65 people come out. We had Dr. Montufar as a panel guest. We had Dr. Miranda Morero, an associate professor of civil engineering from McGill come out. Rebecca Peterniak was a transportation specialist at Fireseeds North Infrastructure and now works for the City, our score. Sargent staff…Staff Sargent Riffel who was the traffic division leader at the time. Dr. Lynne Warda who was the associate professor or is the associate professor in the department of pediatrics and children's help. And Mr. Escobar who was the transportation manager at the time. It was a great discussion. It was a, you know, really relevant…really relevant meeting. Four and a half years later, and a lot of persistence, I'm really pleased to see this report coming forward going to the budget process now. But you know what, it's made a lot of progress, I guess, for the city. Road safety is more than infrastructure and it involves more partners than just Public Works. The focus on road safety must include a culture shift in the way we think about an approach transportation. And it must be led by elected officials. But to do that, we really need to understand how we approach road safety today and how we need to change our approach. A road safety program embraces other stakeholders, not just Public Works. Improved collaboration between various stakeholders who are working towards the common goal of improving road safety is critical. And it is an increased holistic approach to traffic safety through implementation of projects that address the seven Es of road safety: engineering, enforcement, education, engagement, evaluation, emergency services and equity. So, again, it's more than just infrastructure. I'm really pleased to see this report here today. I thank Councillor Rollins for her role on the Executive Policy Committee where you can maneuver money and have great influence on individuals. Thank you very much for moving it. And I look forward to more discussions with the new council and new mayor, whether I'm re-elected, acclaimed or none of the above, I will be here discussing road safety. Thank you.

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

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, it was great to hear my sister in the struggle of road safety, Councillor Lukes, speak. You know, I really looked at her, as a school trustee, to safeguard young Winnipeggers to 33,000 students that were in my care, Madam Speaker, before I got here and was delighted to be able to see her work up close and personal. And I know, Madam Speaker, when we talk about being an employer of choice, because we're trying to recruit, when I think of Ms. Rebecca Peterniak, I think of how we're doing a lot of things okay to be able to attract that force and talent that is Rebecca Peterniak and the good work that she's doing each and every day for Public Works. There's, of course, all of our public servants are and…but I can't name them all every single meeting. I wish I could. Madam Speaker, I, too, stand in favour of this…of road safety and moving this along. It is important because sometimes you have losses like I did the other day when Councillor Lukes called and said, "can you believe what's happening at the site on Pembina and the parking that's being handed over to a corporate entity right next to a school." That is going to be problematic, Madam Speaker, and that was a decision that was made, I think, without sufficient attention to the school community and what that parking adjacent to the school means. So, Madam Speaker, I think each and every day we have to move this road safety piece forward and I just thank my colleagues on IRPW and those policy entrepreneurs that are going to, hopefully, stay on Council and like Councillor Lukes and keep moving it forward each and every step, Madam Speaker. And I agree that we need all of community involved in the discussion of road safety and that's what we're going to be doing for the next few months, I bet.

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

Councillor Allard: If you want to call the question.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on Item 3. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Item 4, report on the Snow Clearing and Ice Control Policy. Madam Clerk. Sorry.

Item 4 – Reporting on the Snow Clearing and Ice Control Policy

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: All right, there's my cue. I'd like to refer this…

Madam Speaker: Your cue now.

Councillor Allard: Back to committee with the amending motions. I'd like a standing vote as well. Counted vote.

Madam Speaker: You're referring the item back with two motions; Motion 4 and Motion 5 to the committee. Do you wish to speak?

Councillor Allard: I don't believe I have the right to speak.

Madam Speaker: I believe you do. You can.

Councillor Allard: That is a good point.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, you can speak for a few minutes if you wish or…

Councillor Browaty: Three minutes to explain yourself.

Councillor Allard: Well, I think this is the most simple way to sort out what's going on here. We had a motion from EPC that was going to be a middle ground looking at exploring private/public service delivery. We now have two counter motions proposing two opposite directions, and we don't have the information. So, I think we should send it back to committee and sort it out.

Madam Speaker: And there's no rebuttal since you're the Chair. Okay, so with that, Councillor Allard is asking it fall back.

Councillor Allard: Recorded vote.

Madam Speaker: Of the item and the motions. All in favour of referral back to the committee, and that would be the September meeting, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Klein, Lukes, Nason, Orlikow and Rollins.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 7, Nays 9.

Madam Speaker: Referral is lost. Moving forward with the item, Councillor Allard, your opportunity to introduce the item and…and a motion that you've sponsored.

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

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 4 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated July 5, 2022 be amended as follows:

1. *In Recommendation 9, delete the words "to provide a verbal report to the Standing Policy Committee" and replace with "report back to Council"*

2. *In Recommendation 10, delete the words "to provide a verbal report to the Standing Policy Committee" and replace with "report back to Council"*

Councillor Allard: Thank you very much. So, first of all, it's good to see this report ready. It would have been nice to see this report come out a few…a few months ago, at least parts of the report. This report proposes the privatization of 200 kilometres of sidewalk snow clearing. We've always had sidewalk snow clearing done as needed by the private sector. What we haven't done, according to our administrators, is talk to our workers, and we know from the past that when we do that, we open ourselves up to grievances, potential liability, all sorts of process issues, moral issues. And so, the

direction at EPC was to go and talk to our workers. Go talk to the…go talk to CUPE and look a…look at different levels or different models for our service delivery. We were told by the Public Service there wasn't time, that we're already late, which you know, begged the question why there was no time and why we were already late on the extension of contracts. And we were offered, really, what was, I think, a bit of a zero sum game of, you know, vote for this or vote against…vote against sidewalks, I think the reality of the situation is much more complex than that. And I think we're opening ourselves up to liability and problems, moral issues and why don't we talk to our workers before arbitrarily making a recommendation and putting Council in a corner where we don't have…where we have to make it…well, we have to debate motions at Executive Policy Committee because we didn't have a proper debate at Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works and we have to craft a motion that says, please, at least go talk to the workers and see what a public delivery of service look like…looks like. We've had many complaints on snow clearing this year with some of our private deliveries…private contractors delivering the service. I don't think it's fair enough to have a debate and that's what we were going to do at EPC. We heard from the Public Service that if they were directed to…or if we didn't take away the direction to negotiate with the private sector, which I believe is a delegated authority that they already have, that they could have some options ready for us in September. And so, to the movers of the motions saying, don't talk to the workers and go ahead and privatize 200 kilometres of snow clearing, I don't think that's responsible. I think we're opening up ourselves to all sorts of issues. And I think we had come up with a very good solution at Executive Policy Committee and going back to the original Public Service recommendation I think is rushed, problematic and will cause hardship to the City of Winnipeg if we…if we support that motion. So, please support my amending motion, which is to send things back to Public Works, have the Public Service talk to CUPE, have the Public Service compare the delivery of private versus public delivery for this additional 200 kilometres of sidewalk snow clearing, and in time for September where we decide, Council decides whether or not we approve these contracts or not. Because if you vote for my colleague's motion, all of this is a moot point, and perhaps the next thing we'll have is a grievance form CUPE to say, why weren't…why weren't we considered in the delivery of this service, we do a better job. And a lot of people might agree with that statement. So, those are my introductory remarks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Councillor Lukes, your opportunity to introduce Motion 4, which was seconded by Councillor Browaty.

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

WHEREAS the Winnipeg Public Service does not have enough sidewalk clearing machines to improve snow and ice removal on existing sidewalks and pathways in the 2022/2023 season;

AND WHEREAS there is a short window to secure enhanced snow and ice removal for the 2022/2023 season through the private sector;

AND WHEREAS in order to deliver improved snow and ice removal for 2022/2023 season, Council must make a timely decision to ensure costs are kept at a minimum;

AND WHEREAS if the decision is delayed to September, it presents the situation that it could cost taxpayers more.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 4 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated July 5, 2022 be amended by deleting Recommendations 8, 9, and 10, and renumbering the remaining accordingly.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. So, I'd been speaking to Mr. Cantor yesterday and today. We all want to see improved snow and ice removal on sidewalks and pathways. I recall councillors on the media complaining and begging for snow removal on sidewalks and pathways. We have a report that came to the Public Works Committee that clearly states the City's going to purchase more sidewalk clearing machines, but the timeframe to get them will be at least a year to procure and receive the machines. The report is very clear that we cannot get those machines for this coming winter. We can't get them for 2022-23 winter. The report to Public Works says that if we want to improve enhanced snow and ice removal on the pathways for this winter, we need to contract out the services. Mr. Cantor very clearly said the staff does not have the capacity to do it. They don't have the capacity to do it. They couldn't do it last year. Last year was an excessive year. I know for a fact, as Chair of Public Works, they couldn't do it back when I was chair. They don't have the capacity, we don't have enough equipment, so we can't do it. So, if we want to have the snow cleared in '22 and '23, for one year, one year, we have to contract it out. And the report is asking that we approve and allow the department to start negotiating rates with contractors, but at EPC, changes were made, delaying a decision till September. So, call up any contractor and ask them, and I did. The delay has the potential to cost taxpayers more money, because contractors only have a limited amount of snow clearing machines, they're out there looking for jobs, everyone's looking for jobs, and if we don't send off

Public Works now to secure those machines, we're not going to have improved snow and ice removal on our pathways this winter. It's pretty simple. So, this motion is just referring back to what originally came forward, the recommendation exactly word for word from the Public Service to the IRPW Committee. We are here to provide a service to residents. I understand this is an election year and ideologies can come into play, but we should be focused on being able to provide an enhanced service this year in a cost effective manner. Residents want the job done, they're not concerned with who does it, they just want the service improved. And if we send it back, if we wait till September and they cost us more, the contractors may not have the machines, we know that the Public Service can't do it because they don't have the machines, so my motion, supported by Councillor Browaty, is to do exactly what came forward at IRPW if we want improved sidewalk and active transportation clearing.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I agree wholeheartedly with everything Councillor Lukes just said. I think the amendment that Councillor Lukes and Councillor Browaty have brought forward is thoughtful, it supports the initial recommendation of the Public Service. We were told initially by Public Works, and we had lengthy discussion at Executive Policy Committee about this matter, that the equipment can be ordered and would take about a year to acquire and that's really the challenge that we in having the Council…the existing Council policy better implemented by the Public Service's equipment. So, I suspect there's unanimous support amongst Council to get the…you know, to get the equipment. I think the issue that we're dealing with in amending Motion 4, which I'll support, is just, what's the interim measure. Residents and snow doesn't care if it's unionized or non-unionized snow clearing equipment or personnel. The people just want to make sure that we're doing a better job of clearing the snow on pedestrian sidewalks, active transportation in a more timely way than we've been able to do. And so, the recommendation was to…was to secure those contracts in a timely manner. We were advised at committee that it was unlikely that if the decision is made in September that they would be able to actually improve the service over the course of the next winter, and so that's one of the reasons why I didn't support referral. I don't want to be responsible for keeping status quo level of service for this year. And the best hope we have to just make improvements in the interim is to follow the recommendation of the Public Service. And so, furthermore, even if we are able to affect, you know, contracts at a later date this year, it's almost certain that it would cost significantly more. People are getting locked down in terms of their contracts. And so, I'm going to support amending Motion 4. I think the overall report is very positive and am grateful for the work of the Public Service and supportive colleagues. I don't think there's much debate on the need for that equipment, in terms of the main recommendation, but I'd like to do what we can right now just to make a decision to have those contracts extended to provide additional supports. Part of the challenge is, we won't have new equipment for unionized staff to be able to utilize this fall. And so, I think the recommendation, what I would anticipate if the amending Motion 4 fails, I would expect that the Public Service will come back in September with the recommendation that we contract out for the interim and we will have compromised the availability of those resources or services, I should say or it will certainly cost more. So, I'd like to just receive the decision today and I think our residents would appreciate that as well. Certainly, when the snow starts falling, doesn't feel like it today, but when the snow starts falling, I think folks will look back at today's vote if we're not able to proceed with great interest.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is an opportunity for me to revisit the decision I made at EPC. You know, based on the conversation that took place with Mr. Cantor regarding the City's lack of equipment, snow clearing equipment, and I believe what is being discussed here in terms of the equipment that is being provided is the snow blowing equipment directly into the trucks that allows for the clearing of sidewalks, but also, the non buildup of snow banks adjacent to the roadways. You know, his honour was…His Worship was correct in the sense that Winnipeggers are concerned about snow clearing and not so much who performs that duty. And with respect to the fact that we are 15 machines shy of being able to plow these additional 200, is it, kilometres of laneway or sidewalk that it won't get done this year unless that task is contracted out. It suggests to me, though, that if the City of Winnipeg is making a purchase of 15 additional sidewalk machines that that service going forward after the 2022-2023 winter season, you know, there will be an opportunity for City staff to participate in that snow clearing or sidewalk clearing task, based on the fact that we've procured additional equipment for that purpose. You know, what we've recognized over these two years with COVID is that it has heavily impacted supply chain and perhaps this is a reason why we can't get these additional machines and recognizing that, you know, Winnipeg or Canadian cities are likely…most Canadian cities or those American cities that are in a certain geographical location would be the only ones purchasing these types of machines for snow clearing operations. So, the production of them, the supply of them, the procurement of them is taking time and we recognize that. City of Winnipeg staff wouldn't be able to do that for the 2022-2023 season, and accordingly, we have to purchase this, there is delays. And again, going forward, there'll be opportunities for City staff to perform these tasks. So, with that, I'm supportive of the motion to bring it back and recognizing that we do need to get something done now that ensures that as we have snow, likely in November/December of this…of 2022, we'll be able to get to the sidewalks and make sure that people are safe as they're walking on our winter sidewalks. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: I have generally found here when someone says, my decisions are based solely on ideology, that I just dig in harder and usually I've been right. So, this is another one where I'm pretty sure that Councillor Allard is actually dead right on this, for the following reasons: we have concerns it's going to cost the taxpayers more if you…if you go with Councillor Allard's view, it's going to cost the taxpayer more. You know what's going to cost the taxpayer more, is if we don't go with what Councillor Allard is saying because we're going to have a grievance as we did in 2016 on the contracting out of the garbage and recycle. You should all remember, most of you were here. Long debate in this very chamber, as well as at committee, about the terms of the request for proposal. Councillor Schreyer's spoke multiple times on this clause B25(21); there's no obligation to award a contract where the prices are materially in excess of the City's costs to perform the work with its own forces. That's the key, it's not in the collective agreement, it's a policy grievance arising under the collective agreement based, saying we are not acting in good faith and implementing those RFPs if we don't do what Allard's saying, which is talk to the CUPE workforce first. There was a grievance in 2016, it was settled. Then, there was a…then there was a grievance that we hadn't implemented the settlement. Then, there was a referral to arbitration, but that was also grieved with…anyway, on it has gone, six years in the pipeline coming out of 2016. Here's what we can say about the settlement from the excellent Ashley Pledger who is with our Legal staff; she says we can say, there is a settlement. Can't say how much it is. How much did it cost the taxpayers? We don't know, we can't say publicly, but we know there was six years of litigation. Cost the union a fair bit, I'm sure; probably cost us more. If there is a settlement, believe me, there's a price tag to it. So, what does Councillor Allard say? Hey, why don't we try to avoid that delay and that cost by talking to the workers. And maybe they can't do it at the correct…at the best rate, but maybe they can. But at least let's avoid this six-year odyssey that we're just ending now on garbage and recycle. That's actually pretty good work, I think. I don't agree with Councillor Allard a lot this term, that's actually pretty good catch by him to say, let's not go down this same path again. That's the responsible position to take with taxpayers. That's the one that offers some savings, maybe not in the next year, but I don't want to be here in six years or have anyone who is here in six years saying, well, that took six years to resolve the snow clearing thing and cost us 10s or 100s of thousands of dollars. Gee, if only they'd talked to the union like it was suggested in July, when there's no great rush to clear snow, in July if they'd just talked to the union. Somewhat complicated by the fact that we're in the midst of bargaining, that's fair, but not…not…doesn't exempt us from the same obligations. Would they win a grievance based on that position in the request for proposal? Probably not, as a betting man, but obviously, whoever was running the City labour relations back in 2016 didn't think the thing was so frivolous that they just said, let's go to a hearing. No, they settled it and then didn't implement, and then there was a grievance and then we referred that to arbitration and then that referral was grieved. Multiple grievances, six year odyssey, we never did the pilot project which was the whole point of the thing, never did do it because it all got enmeshed in this process. Was that a great savings to the taxpayer? No. Is this the responsible thing to do? So, I don't know how if I'm motivated by ideology and others are not, I don't really care. I think Councillor Allard's right in saying, let's try to avoid the costly route that we've just finished going down. Let's have some lessons learned from that and say, yeah, let's…it might delay it, I'm not sure, but I do know I don't want to have somebody standing here in six years saying, whoa, what were they thinking? How could that have gone on and on and on? So, you want to say I'm motivated by all the ideology, that's fine. I say I'm motivated by trying to avoid the very mistake we've just done for the past six years. So, I agree with Councillor Allard, let's have a discussion with the workers, with their union. If it doesn't work, fine, on we go. But let's not pretend that this is somehow simply ideology and that the taxpayers' friends are the ones who say let's just go forward because let's look at the context here; six year odyssey, how much did it cost us? Well, we can't even say. So, let's avoid that and do what Councillor Allard is recommending.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Councillor Rollins, followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Rollins: Well stated by Councillor Mayes, Madam Speaker. So, I can take up a little bit less time. 85% of our snow clearing on AT is done by the Public Service, Madam Speaker. 15% is done out-of-house. The service is important to Winnipeggers. And I supported the amendment at Executive Policy Committee, even working with my colleagues at EPC because I did believe time was of the essence, Madam Speaker. The manner it came to EPC would have halted the ability of the Public Service to get things done for the 2022 winter year. And so, we changed it. But our labour partners, the folks doing the service, should be talked to not only for the reasons Councillor Mayes states, and I don't think that they should be…I think that we should underline some of the things that Councillor Mayes stated, but also, because as councillors, we receive the calls. We receive the calls, many calls when the service isn't done correctly. And so does 311. And 311 and us and the department sometimes would blame contractors for the snow clearing, not only in the unprecedented year we had last year, but prior to. And Madam Speaker, that's sort of not sufficient accountability for that basic service of snow clearing. It's not sufficient. With 85% of our snow clearing on ATV, we should absolutely be doing the investments like Councillor Lukes said. And I do believe, Madam Speaker, time is of the essence, but I do believe in the compromise that was set out at Executive Policy Committee that really worked to make sure that…that…work to make sure that we weren't tying the hands…unrealistically tying the hands to interfere with 2022 snow clearing year, Madam Speaker. So, I'll be in support of the motion and the amendment by Councillor Allard and Councillor Gilroy, Madam Speaker. I do think it is important that we consider not only…if we are going to consider ideology, I think we need to

consider the ideology of service to Winnipeggers and the accountability of the Public Service work in that. And if that means spending more time discussing how we deliver so that we can deliver it and perhaps avoiding costly labour relations strife and…to boot, well, so be it.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I don't think this is so complicated. We've heard from my colleagues, I believe it was Councillor Rollins and Councillor Gilroy that moved a motion that basically said, we want enhance snow clearing in our communities. I believe that was the motion. Fair enough. But the point is, we're looking for enhanced snow clearing. And we talked to residents, they say we want enhanced snow clearing. We've invested a pile of money on sidewalks, active transportation, they want people to take the bus. We don't want the city to shut down in the winter. This last winter, we had a lot of snow. We had an awful lot of snow and I'm putting this so mildly. First snow pile of the year, you can take a plow and clear the sidewalks fine. As the winter goes on, you need blowers. Blowers are slower, they're more expensive to operate, they break down more. We're telling the Public Service to buy more blowers. They're going to hire a new employee. It even specifies, a new CUPE employee to help maintain them. We're going to make better use of our current CUPE staff, CUPE staff that are going to be able to their job better because they've got the right equipment to deal with the snow as the winter goes on. It also was very abundantly clear from the reports, from everything we've heard from everyone, that they cannot do it this winter. The turnaround time for ordering new blowers is fairly extended. So, either we want to go ahead and bring in the private sector to help us deal with the snow this winter or we don't have the improved service this winter. So, middle of winter when residents are calling, it's like, no, I said the only way we're going to do this is if CUPE could do it. Residents don't care who plows your snow. They want it done. But this is a balanced approach. We're going to have the private sector involved now and we're buying the equipment so that our CUPE employees can do it. It's making CUPE jobs even more secure. So, why we're trying to start playing around with this at this eleventh hour when our Public Service came forward with a very good, balanced approach, I don't know. I don't understand it. So, again, I thank Councillor Lukes for suggesting this motion. I was more than pleased to support it and very consistent with my comments both at IRPW and at EPC. Again, either we want better clearing this winter or we don't. If we make a decision in September, it's going to likely cost more if they can even ramp up and do it in time. These third-party groups, you know, Winnipeg doesn't get on the phone and say, hey, you know, we need to buy some new sidewalk blowers for the winter. Private sector can do that, they can buy things that are on their last legs and they can have it on the street this winter. City of Winnipeg doesn't operate that way typically. So, the private sector can help us here. Either we want better snow clearing this winter or we don't.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I take somewhat of an offence to people making statements like ideology because it's an election year. I was around when we had a nightmare winter 2013-2014. That nightmare was related to the private sector providing inferior equipment, breakdowns and all kinds of problems and they couldn't deliver on our snow policy at the time. What did our management come up with? Well, we can fix that problem. What we'll do is we will raise the contract amounts to allow more money so that the private sector could go out and buy equipment so that they could undertake the snow clearing policy as they had agreed to under the contracts prior to. There was also a change in that they changed the zone sizes and contracted out because some companies were unable to provide the appropriate experienced drivers to provide a proper service. I can go back, that's just in my experience. I'm sure that other councillors who have been on Council for a long time would understand that Public Works, when it comes to budgeting and dealing with snow clearing, they do not actually consider what's happening ahead. Now, let's talk about the heavy-duty equipment breakdowns that happen and resulted in the City's inability to do the sidewalks. This is not ideology. This is actually management. I'm not blaming Mr. Cantor. He did an excellent job trying to stay on top of what was an abnormal huge year for snow and weird conditions. So, let's ask ourselves…and what we should be doing is, did they even talk to the workers, the CUPE workers who drive those City-owned machines? They were probably telling the managers, this equipment is really in bad shape. Oh, and did we utilize fleet management in an appropriate way to deal with repair and making sure that we're buying equipment when it's timely? When it's important to do? What we're being asked here to do today is deal with mismanagement of snow clearing and the systems that we use. That's what's happening here. It's an easy thing, as you can tell, to go to the private sector. Yeah, it's easier for them to buy equipment. Come on. You know, we don't have to make it all that difficult to buy our equipment. I don't know what people are talking about when they talk about that. There are ways. We have a procurement process that's important because we're spending public dollars. However, we should have been planning this a couple of years ago when that equipment was known to be ready to break, not work anymore. Why aren't we doing that? So, now, what are we doing? We're being asked…I don't know what are those CUPE workers going to do who aren't driving any equipment for clearing the sidewalks this winter. What is going to happen? Did management put that in their report? Did they? Is it in the report? Does it say those CUPE workers who have employment contracts under a collective agreement and, you know, Councillor Mayes spoke quite well to that, but I also want to say, you know, Public Works when it comes to a bunch of things, I really…I'm disappointed. Because what I don't get…now, circumstances today we're being told it's different, but what we don't get is we don't get a analysis of us doing the work

and for the City itself and our crews, we have more control over delivering accurate snow policy rules. And in the future, we're talking about a new transit system which we all agreed, there had to be a better snow clearing policy related to making…making transit connections because there is going to be a lot of transferring happening as a result of the new system. It will be more rapid, but there is going to be a lot more transferring. There is no doubt about that. And in the winter, that means higher snow clearing. Why? Maybe Councillor Klein continually demands to have a zero-based budgeting and I think it's time that we did that when it comes to snow clearing and other things that we do under Public Works. And you need to evaluate the equipment and you also need to say, hey, if fleet management is cutting back, cutting back, that's what they've been doing, cutting back, is there a reason I voted against the SOA budget on that all the time? Yes. Because you know what, fleet management is unable to meet the demand to fix what we have. So, you know, don't give me this stuff about ideology. I think we can wait another…until September. I want to see some real evaluation here. And I want to know, I want to know why in the budget that was presented in the four-year budget, why there was no equipment replacement plan for sidewalk machines or any other equipment that we use? Okay. Let's be serious here. I'm not talking about ideology. Geez, you know, the way we treat our workers, it's no wonder we have morale problems. You know, it's crazy. Let's do proper budgeting. Let's do things right. I can't at this point…you know, if it's going to cost more for the private sector, who can buy equipment, apparently, really fast, then why…what's the problem if we try to contract them with them in September after we've talked to the union? What's the matter with that? Please explain to me why. If they can go out and buy equipment as fast as that, then I don't see the problem with waiting until September. That's all I have to say. I won't be voting for the amendment. And we do need to purchase the equipment. That should have started already. You know, like that's crazy. We should have had that in the budget last year or the year before when we knew that equipment was ready to break down.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Oh, we're still good. Thank you, Madam Speaker. We're coming at this from different angles and there is a few ways to approach this. Just in terms of ideology, you know, I've been sort of watching ideology my whole life and I've been on different sides of stuff. And sort of being on the sides of issues that people don't assume I should be. And especially at city hall, you'll learn, because we're not a party-oriented Council as such. And votes take place in different ways. And you do learn about ideology, people's values. One thing I've noticed throughout my life is, it's often not a difference in ideology that divides people in their opinions and decisions. It's actually, they're basing their decisions on different information. And some people might have the right information, some people might have the wrong information or they…not everybody has all the information. And so, they end up making decisions that are different from others. And it can all often perpetuate the perception of ideological differences. Often all we need is all the information. In this case, to apply that and have all the information, I think we should talk with our in-house workers. I think we should talk to CUPE as part of that. But there is more to it than that. I mean, we have to remain open-minded. So, I'm accused of being ideological for whatever reasons regardless of what side of a vote I'm on. But I think I try to maintain a commitment to open-mindedness because for all the different points of view and all the information that is offered here just by the individuals in this circle, in this chamber, let alone the administration with all their talent and experience and resources, let alone all the citizens and taxpayers of the city that have insights and values that we have to account to. And, you know, seven years ago almost to the day, almost to the month, I believe Councillor Lukes was, in fact, at the time Chair of Public Works and we had the…we had the vote on active transportation. And one of the reasons I didn't want to vote for active transportation, well, Councillor Schreyer, how can you not vote for active transportations? Motherhood and apple pie, it goes against your ideology. Well, what I want is, more than anything else, sustainability. Economic and environmental sustainability. Without that, what are we doing. But you know, there is more to it than that, because having something that's sustainable, but unfair, well that's a constant challenge. And we all have our points of view in terms of what fairness is. But those that make decisions have an obligation to deal with a full set of facts. My concern with the active transportation, vote we had seven years ago, just over seven years ago, is that it included a clause, it does include a clause to this day, that the City can consider abdicating its responsibility for maintaining the sidewalks in the wintertime. Well, I wasn't getting the impression from the people I represented in Elmwood-East Kildonan, nor for any other people I was dealing with, that the City…that there was a move by the citizens of Winnipeg to agree that, yeah, the City should get rid of its obligation to maintain the sidewalks. Now, I've always said, some people don't like it, but I'm not expressing my opinion, that sidewalks are over 90% of the active transportation system. I don't see how that's my opinion, it's just something I keep saying that upsets some people that for whatever reasons they wanted to prioritize the cycling paths, which is their right. That doesn't change the fact that 90% of our active transportation system, over 90%, probably will be for decades, over 90% of our active transportation system are the sidewalks. So, it's a fact. No one's ever said it's not true. They just have to put it in perspective in terms of what their priorities are for the active transportation system; that is to prioritize bicycles. I get that, but it doesn't change the fact. I was heartened, you know, a few weeks ago when I saw here in Council the fact that people more than ever before since we voted on the Active Transportation Plan seven years ago, that I saw councillors saying, oh, we've got to maintain our priority, we've got to enhance our priority to maintaining the sidewalks in the wintertime. That was good to see. But, of course, it's kind of practical, isn't it? So, you know, to what extent is this an ideological discussion? Well, I mean, some people might say, you know, the City should not be involved. Other cities don't have the government…their city government maintaining the sidewalks. You can have that difference in

political value or ideology. And that can cross party lines as well to some extent. But here in Winnipeg, I've got the…get the impression by the citizens that I represent and by my fellow members of Council that we wish to continue maintaining our…the City's responsibility to maintaining the sidewalks in the wintertime, which is the vast majority of our active transportation system. It happens to be, I mentioned Councillor Lukes was Chair of Public Works, because she just mentioned in her last speech just a few minutes ago that she was told back then that we don't have enough resources. So, the question is, if that's the case, then why? Why are we perpetually with lack of resources? Yes, it is a question of optimizing. And optimizing your resources can also happen when something as unpredictable as weather can have the effect of sometimes not having enough. So, look, I'm going to keep open-minded when it comes to the role of the private sector when it comes to…when it comes to what we're going to do next winter. But I'm also going to stay open-minded when it comes to doing our due diligence, which is our job, and talk with our City employees and to see what they know, what their insights are and what they feel their needs are for themselves to do the job and for the city. I think that's open-minded and I think that's practical. I don't know, I guess you can call that ideological, but I'm not against the idea that we'd be hiring more private sector to get the job done this winter. It's just that I don't have that information at this point. So, we're behind. Well, as Councillor Lukes said, we've been behind for years on this one. So, who ends up paying the price? Look, I just want to stay open-minded, stay practical, consider the idea that we will be hiring more from the private sector for the winter time. But at the same time, I don't know what exactly we're going to do and I didn't get it from this report. What we do need is talking with CUPE and go from there. Then we can make a better decision. Isn't that our job? Thank you.

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

Councillor Orlikow: At least we all have a little zip left in us before the summer. So, again, I really am here today just…these questions I hope Councillor Allard will be listening and be able to answer some of it and my understanding of what we're actually voting on. I'm not getting into ideology right now at all. But what I think I'm voting on, and please correct me if I'm wrong, that we're looking at a one year. Number A, it's a one-year extension. We're not talking about outsourcing it forever. We're not talking about that, it's a one-year extension. Number A. So, the idea is that this is going to be hugely grieved, possible, but for one year I think they understand we just don't have the machines, but we all want to have increased snow clearing. So, I, again, for Councillor Lukes, I did see the appendix, I thank her for helping me on that one. But you know, I'm willing to do for one more year. Yeah, we could talk about what we should have done and could have done, but again, here we are today and we all know that we want to have improved snow clearing going forward. So, it's a one year. This is where we're at. That's what we're asking for. But we're also saying…and again, I don't know why we have to have it in September so urgently, but whatever. I'm sure we can have the conversation and I'm okay with some of these changes from Allard and Gilroy. We should have the conversation and we can have that conversation aside. Overall, do we want to have it in-house or not. But remember, you're buying a lot of machines. We're buying a fair number of machines; 300…$3 million worth of stuff. So, again, I believe that means we're going in-house. That's where…I'm not sure how that's any different. But again, no one's really talking about not spending that money and I'm not either. I think we need to move forward. But I do want that analysis and maybe we'll have to rejig that order later on. But again, I do believe we need to keep that door open as well. I don't…you know, it's not…it is about quality of service. Can the contractors do it better than us? We'll have that debate, we'll have that discussion, maybe in September, probably not. But again, we should have that discussion with them. But we're really talking about just filling in a gap here which is this year. So, yeah, I'm okay with one year. I'm not okay with deciding today that we're never going to bring it in-house or we're always going to contract it out as the appendix said. I'm not that interested in that. But for one year, I do not want to go through this one…next upcoming year without having an improved service. Last year wasn't that great. So, again, I am holding my nose and I'll probably have to get a little kick in the butt because I'll have to hold my nose for another one, too, might be this one. It's really, we should be referring all that equipment and that whole section off to the budget process if it's going to take that long. And I'm okay with that, too, because, again, what we're going to do is say, okay, we're kind of in a jam here people. CUPE can't do it because they have no machines. We haven't actually decided if CUPE is going to do it all. So, why don't we just refer that money for the machines to the budget process, do the extension for one year for the contractors just saying, we don't have machines to hire more CUPE staff to do this anyway. Let's just do that and have that conversation with our labour group and then we as Council have the debate; do we want to bring it in-house or not? Again, that's not here today. So, this motion is a little whack, in my opinion, it's a little all over the place. But again, what I see in this motion is what I call the grand compromise. People have tried to compromise through this and in doing so, it got a little wackity wack in the end. But again, I understand the intent. So, what I'm voting on today is, yeah, I think we should definitely get ahead of…we should get ahead of this and start buying those machines. We find out later on something out, we're not held into it. It's going to take a while to get that procurement going. We may have to revisit that. But again, today I'm okay with doing that. I am okay with one year because we have no machines, to have that contract go forward to the private sector and we should do that now. There really isn't another option. So, we can talk about bring it in-house or not, but we're not going to do that this winter. But I don't believe we should do it for five years. We should have that discussion. It's a very…it is philosophical or maybe ideological and it probably has real numbers beside it that we should see before we decide things. That's my opinion on that. So, I'm actually…I do appreciate Councillor Lukes and Councillor Schreyer and everybody who actually comments because I didn't know where I was landing on this when I

started this one. This is why these debates are kind of important. You get perspective, I got some clarity from people, I agree with some of the things people said, some I don't. But at the end of the day, what I do want and we all want and I've heard that very loudly today, is we want improved services this winter. And to do that for one year, we have to use private contractors. So, I'm not sure that's going to unload a massive grievance on us, but it's not like waste removal where it's forever or a huge amount of that. But again, for one year, I'm okay with that. I'm also okay talking to our staff, getting some more reports and ideas about what is the value for both. Is it a quality of service? Is it just straight monetary? But that's a Council decision to have when we have that information in front of us. So, I'm actually going to be voting for this motion now, unless Councillor Allard tells me I'm totally misunderstanding what I'm talking about, which is totally fine. That's why I got up there to talk about this because I'm a little amazed at the debate that's going on here today. I'm just a little…you know, we're…this is going to be in-house. We have to…we can't vote for this because if we vote for this, we're going to be privatizing it forever. Number 8 says one year. Just one year to stop gap. Again, some people say, well, get rid of number 8 and then we'll just go with what the other side says. We can do that next year. We can talk after we've had the discussion. So, I'm okay with that. I'm okay with talking to our staff. And I'm okay, as well, because I believe it's the right thing to do, in my opinion, and we may have to readjust it, but we have to start moving on it because supply chains are brutal right now. That we may need to start sourcing some of these machines out now. So, even though it may not be moving it to the capital…to the budget approval process, I'm okay with that, too. So, at the end of the day, I thank you all for the input I've received. I do…I share everybody's belief and want that we have better snow clearing, not only this summer…winter, also forever going forward. The public wants that. And so, I'm actually…I was thinking about not voting for this at the beginning of the day because I was…I would have so many questions still in my head. That's my fault. But now, after hearing everybody's comments today, I'm willing to support this motion from the EPC. I'm willing to go as is and I'm not too horrified, even though I don't know why it has to be September, but again, compromise is compromise, to have that reporting back the 9 and 10 to have that discussion with our staff. So, I thank everybody for all their input and all their different ideas that come through today and their positions, but really, I think when…at the end of the day, we all want to have those sidewalks cleared this winter and we do have a bigger debate ahead of us and that will be probably a bigger debate for the next council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of the EPC recommendation. We had a really great discussion with our public servants and I think that it's really important to kind of go over some of those discussions so everyone's aware that maybe haven't heard of the EPC meeting. So, one thing is, we will be going forward today. We did give them the authority through this motion in order to go and do that work, go and find the workers that we need to get the job done. That's not debatable. What we're asking for them in this motion…I also go and get the equipment that we're going to be needing to do the in-house services that we will need in a year. What we are asking them to do is go and talk to CUPE and come back. That still allows them…they were quite clear, the Public Service is on record, they can go do those negotiations, even plan on the additions that we want if CUPE cannot do it in-house. That was clear in that. They are able to do that with this motion. That's what the Public Service really wanted. At the end of the day, once you get that quote, you get the quote, people. So, this is…what we're going to be able to get the equipment. We're going to be able to go and outsource that contract, do that work and all we're doing is coming back in September and finalizing it. So that work is going to be done. I think we're getting what everybody really wants is really great snow clearing. Well, better snow clearing than what we've seen last year. I think there is room for improvements. I put motions forward for that. I do have concerns over our contract workers, especially in areas around me that has back lanes. We're seeing so much…so much cost to people as that equipment is hitting the buildings and we're just wiping our hands clean of it because it's not a City doing that services. We make them go and fight that with the contractors. So, those are major issues that we still have to fight out. But I think we're doing our due diligence. I think…I mean Councillor Mayes said it lot more better than I can. I do remember the issues that we had with the garbage and I think that this helps solidify some of that. Let's do that work. And also, we do need to talk to CUPE anyways, because there are some areas where the Public Service wasn't sure about what they could even outsource. So, I think, you know, last year was a very difficult year. People were…you know, lots of staff were being used. We had snow clearing companies that were, you know, not keeping up. So, you know, there needs to be discussions with even in our own workforce on what can be done and there might be differences even between our staff and our higher up Public Services on what could be done. So, those discussions really need to happen. This is allowing us to have those discussions. Go out and make sure that we're putting those proposals out there and dealing with those contracts in a timely manner. This doesn't stop those discussions from happening. So, I see that this is a path forward. And I hope that my councillor colleagues do support this, because you know what, we did hear from the Public Service that they're able to move forward with what we worked out here today. So, I hope that we move forward with this. I want to see good snow clearing. I think everyone else does. We're just maybe reading some of the lines wrong or concerned about contracting out versus not, but I see that this is moving forward and I'm happy to support this here today. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll just be brief on this one. I think there is a few details that are missed in this conversation. I agree with my council colleague, Councillor Mayes, that there will be an issue with a grievance even if you are doing it for one year. And anyone who's had any experience in negotiating CBAs or working under CBAs would understand that. It's going to happen. What becomes of it, nobody knows at this point. But if we go back in time and we would look at what happened with the waste collection and we look at our record on the police pension, we're not batting a hundred here. So, I think that in this situation, I agree with my colleagues, we have to do something to fix this. But have we considered other options? If we need more equipment and we know that that is a problem and, you know, resourcing that equipment or funding for that equipment right now is difficult, why wouldn't we simply ask the department to double its staff and operate two shifts to do snow clearing when it's necessary? Last year was an anomaly. It was a record year in snow. That's what we heard from many people on this council. It was…it was out of the blue. It hit us. It's unbelievable. We weren't prepared for it and we…you know, we're over budget for it and who knows what will happen next year. It could be returned to a normal snowfall or a snowfall that could break the record for the least amount of snow. We don't know. So, we're sitting here making some pretty important decisions on this and moving forward by throwing darts or having the Public Service look into it, but I think by now the Public Service should have had that report to us. Here's the clause in the contract that says we can or cannot have it. I don't know why we wouldn't have that today. I don't know how we can make a decision without that information in front of us. I thought that was the idea of having the Public Service provide reports. That would be essential to a report so we know definitively what the contract allows us as the employers to do. And not, let's take a chance and see what happens. We can't continue to take a chance. We're back; police pension, waste collection, we can't do that. If we're having a problem with snow collection, you want to privatize it right now, again, why aren't we just saying, let's run two shifts. Let's run two 10-hour shifts. Now we've doubled our capacity to clear snowing and the cost is minimal.

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

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, this was a interesting debate that we've had to this point. I was struck when I heard about the comment made by the Chair that said talk to the workers. Did we talk to the workers with the garbage? Did we talk to the workers with the police pension? I don't think so. We got advice from the Public Service on the police pension that gave us clear understanding that we were in the right to go down this route and we know how that worked out. When I look back at some of the things that have been said about the financial state of the City of Winnipeg, our Chair of Finance has been on the record talking about potential cuts in the coming budget years as a result of our stabilization fund being at quite low levels. I'm quite concerned about that. This looks great going into an election, because you know, Item 5 is kicking it to…part of it to the 2023-26 operating budget. And it's always interesting when we talk about operating budgets because capital budgets we have a fairly clear picture of where all the money is being utilized. Because sometimes motions that we see come through this council say fund from within. This number in comparison to the operating of the Public Works budget seems like a drop in the bucket. Now, this past winter we've seen a lot of different equipment out on the streets. We've seen street sweepers with plows attached to them. We've seen flat decks with water tanks on them to give them a little bit of weight. We've seen what looks like 1970s era highway clearers clearing roads. But now we're trying to add some additional pieces of equipment to clean up some of the mess that we saw last year. That impacted operations at 311, impacted operations in possibly every one of our office. I think the default fallback should be the Mayor's line moving forward. That might get some quicker response. But what I'm not liking here today is particularly on the subject of the operating budget. We don't have a clear look to see if this could be funded from within. Where we're earmarking it, we're tagging it and moving forward. It's what? 300,000 and 87,000, if I'm…got it right here. I don't…I'm troubled by it. You know, the movers of these motions possibly could have picked up the phone and talked to the president of CUPE 500 to find out, hey, what's your thoughts in this regard? You know, have that talk to the workers because they're the voice of the workers. Don't know if any of the movers did that. Perhaps when they close…perhaps when they close, they can speak to that. The supply chain issues, I see…I've seen it this year with our lawn mowing equipment. We've had lawn mowers out of service this summer that have resulted in significant impacts. I can only imagine what it is on snow clearing equipment considering the abuse that they probably took this past winter. And much like our pools, are we going to be able to find contractor resources that are able to do this? And at what cost? They've got us over a barrel, don't they? We want to go and do this, we're going to get contractors to do it, but what are they going to charge us? Many of our new subdivisions were now, in the interest of safety, putting sidewalks at least on one side. There are many without sidewalks. Mine's a 1986 subdivision, doesn't have sidewalks. What about them? What about those persons in getting around safely? What if there is somebody that is disabled in that area? We're not enhancing the front street. What are we doing? It's the what-about-ism, right? So, is this a fair process that we're going to be enhancing sidewalks and likely the 200 miles are likely in all new areas of the city of Winnipeg. Where is it? Where is the 200 miles? If the movers can answer that, that would be great. That might give me some reassurance on this matter. Going back to the budget, the SOA. So, on the fly, we're looking to approve new capital expenditures. Is there a reason why our future-casting didn't see this? Well, there is only a small group that works on the Budget Working Group. Perhaps if there was 15 or 16 voices there, perhaps we could have had that discussion there. But alas, there is what? Eight, nine on that Budget Working Group. But much like the legal fees at the City of Winnipeg, you know, pass a budget, two months later, if not six weeks, come back for a couple million

bucks for a fishing expedition. So, we're spending the money. I can probably guarantee that the votes are here today, but I just don't know which way I'm going on this, Madam Speaker. I'll leave it at that for now. I'm rambling.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Allard to close. Or we have another motion actually. Yeah, we dealt with the other motion. Councillor Lukes, you get an opportunity to close first. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: So, I know I have to get approval to do a third amendment to this one. And I have to write it down. I just…yeah, well, I can send it to the clerks now, but I'm just not sure exactly what I need to do.

Madam Speaker: Well, we're closing right now. We're closing on this motion and Councillor Lukes is speaking, it would be too late to circulate anything at this time.

Councillor Orlikow: Why?

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, may I…Madam Speaker, may I call a five-minute break to allow councillor…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, that's bad precedent, we really have not done that before.

Councillor Eadie: We have…we have done it.

Madam Speaker: It's been different circumstances. That's right. So, Councillor Lukes' opportunity to close now. That's what is in front of us.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. To Councillor Gilroy's point about having the Public Service negotiate; absolutely, they're out there negotiating, they have the ability to do that. The point is, do we decide today so that if they negotiate good prices or whatever prices they negotiate the decision can be made in a week or so, or do we wait until essentially October? And that…that is the question that I have; is it in the next few weeks we decide and get on with this? Or do we wait until October and it maybe costs more? You know, when I read the report and when I spoke to Mr. Cantor, and I did listen to the EPC meeting, and to Councillor Mayes' points that he was making regarding CUPE, I would assume that the department would have looked at these issues when they made the recommendation in the report. In speaking to Mr. Cantor who just got back to me, the Public Service does not consider this a new contracting out initiative. They already contract out these services. They are just communicating that they're expanding it. The majority of this additional kilometres goes to the city in the way of the 15 units and the rest goes to the contractors. So, I hear what Councillor Mayes is saying and other people are saying, but from the standpoint of the union, clearly the department has looked at it. They've made a recommendation. The City staff have 85%. It is only for one year. And they're already…they already contract out services, they're just expanding it for one year. So, you know, I'm asking that you support the motion today so that we can…that we can have snow removal and ice removal on the active transportation pathways. And, clearly, the Public Service has done due diligence, they have looked and considered the CUPE and the agreements and all because they're stating that they already contract out these services, they're just expanding on it. It's just for one year. And it's additional, it's not like…and when I say additional, it's not another 200 kilometres. Goodness, that would be wonderful if we had another 200 kilometres that we didn't even plow, it's the existing ones. To finish the 2,000 kilometres in 36 hours, we need to be able to do more kilometres in the same timeframe. So, we're just getting more people to remove the snow and ice. So, I'm asking that you support Motion No. 4.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard to close on the item and your motion.

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Speaker, thank you very much. So, this…my motion endorses the entire report. The only part of the motion…the only part of the report that is not endorsed is the net new 200 kilometres of privatized snow clearing that is recommended in the report. I heard councillor…Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Lukes; I heard the word, "I would have…I would have assumed that the Public Service would have done something." I believe that that would have been something that, perhaps, some people may have assumed about last time that we had a grievance, and we had to give a confidential amount of money to have a settlement with the union. I don't understand why, as of…as a rule, we don't speak to our workers, we don't speak to the unions that represent the workers when we consider these types of initiatives. It's like you're asking for trouble. And what kind of look is it not even to speak to your own workforce before you go and contract out something that they may or may not be able to do. So, my motion says, endorse the report, however, come back in September and have us make the final decision. Write in the motion at EPC, we authorize, we direct the Public Service to go and negotiate, but not dot the Is and cross the Ts. So, the work is all happening, we would be buying the…we would be buying the equipment as part of this report. The entire report is adopted. The one thing that is different is we're asking the Public Service to go and speak to the workers, go speak to CUPE, so that we don't repeat history again. And we've already…we've already lived this. I'm hearing about costs, well, the costs are completely undetermined if we get into the same situation we got, as Councillor Mayes eloquently put it, with Water and Waste. So, you know, I've

been around the block. I've been…I was there when that happened, and it seems to me very ill-advised to go forward with that path. And what we're doing is we're going to wait…we're going to authorize the Public Service to do what they were doing, and then we can make a final decision in September. And I don't buy either that by waiting it's going to make costs go up. I mean, we're now considering perhaps doing public delivery, and when the Public Service says they can't do it, well, we know we can single-source to buy equipment. We know we can hire people temporarily. There are solutions. And so, if it turns out that public workers can do it better, if it turns out we can single source some equipment…another thing I…another thing I'd like to clarify is that, and I think Councillor Eadie touched on it, and it's a very good question; what were these workers doing when they didn't have the equipment they needed to do their jobs? Because the machines were breaking, and then the workers weren't able to do their jobs. And so, this report's coming really late and it could have come sooner. The Public Service has the authority to bring forward reports. And to be…sorry. To be put between a rock and a hard place to say, please endorse this report that, by default, goes and gives 200 new kilometres to the private sector. We've seen this story before. We might get in trouble; financial, moral, procedural, if we don't go talk to the workers. So, everything is endorsed here out of the Public Service report. The only difference is we make the final decision on private versus public in September, and we're empowering the Public Service to go and…to go and do the analysis and talk to the workers to see what options are available. So, Councillor Orlikow says this is, you know, some kind of compromise. I mean, it's endorsing the entire sector report. All it's saying is, go talk to the workers before we sign off on the private sector deal report. And by the way, we don't know how much that's going to cost either, which somebody else said. So, let's get the numbers. Let's get the numbers, let's get some scenarios. And in the future, if the Public Service is listening, and I know Michael Jack is here, please give us some options. Because it doesn't have to be a zero-sum game every single time. Why do we have to be amending reports to create scenarios where there could be options in these reports. So, anyhow, please support my motion. You're supporting the Public Service recommendation with a single…with a single change of going to speak to the workers before you sign off to the 200 kilometres of net new…of net new private…private snow clearing. So, I think I've said what I need to say. Please support the motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. With that, we'll be voting on Motion 5 first.

Councillor Eadie: Recorded vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: We'll be voting on Motion 5 first. Yes, and there's a call for a recorded vote. This is moved by Councillor Allard. In Motion 5, you'd like to vote…yeah, okay, when we get there. Thank you. So, Motion 5; moved by Councillor Allard. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillor Browaty

Madam Speaker: Okay, we're doing the vote count. Please rise if you didn't rise for the other…the yea, you need to rise for the nay. So, councillor…Madam Clerk, go ahead and do the vote count.

Clerk: Councillor Browaty.

Madam Speaker: And Councillor Lukes. Okay, we already voted for that. What's that? Yeah, so two is nay, Mr. Clerk.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, should we change her vote before we finish with this item?

Madam Speaker: Are we going to keep getting into that? We need to go and rescind the previous vote. Okay. And again, we were doing that because we were out of…out of our locations.

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

Madam Speaker: That's carried. Next motion, Motion 4; moved by Councillor Lukes, seconded by Councillor Browaty. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Gillingham, Lukes.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. Motion 4 is lost. Now, the main item, as amended. All in favour, please…okay. Let's get into that. Okay, there are ten. Okay, we're going to need to read them into the record. We'll have to read them into the record. Do you still want to proceed with a clause by clause or just vote on a certain clause separately?

Councillor Orlikow: Oh, I can do that? I can just pull out certain ones? Oh, absolutely. Okay. Sorry, I'll just get to my notes. I think it's…

Madam Speaker: I just want to verify; Mr. Clerk, have we done that? I'm just…okay, which ones do you want to vote on separately?

Councillor Orlikow: So that would be Number 3, I'd like to pull that one out. Number 4, I'd like to pull that one out. And Number 5.

Madam Speaker: Okay. We'll group those together. So, Madam Clerk, if you could read 3, 4 and 5 into the record, they will be voted on separately together. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Putting on clause by clause, I would ask that 8 through 10, inclusive, also be voted on.

Madam Speaker: Okay, tied to the 3, 4 and 5?

Mayor Bowman: No.

Madam Speaker: No, separately.

Mayor Bowman: Yeah.

Madam Speaker: So, 8 through 11. 8 through 10.

Mayor Bowman: 8 through 10, please.

Madam Speaker: Okay. We need…we need a break first, I think.

Councillor Allard: Point of order; so if we are voting clause by clause, we are voting a yes vote for every clause is a yes vote for the report that we just voted for, correct?

Madam Speaker: A yes vote for the clause is…yeah, as amended, that's right.

Councillor Allard: Okay, so yes, we're voting for the amendments. We're voting for the clauses.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, it may be just easier for all of us, yourself included, if we just did…take the time to go one by one or 1 through 11.

Madam Speaker: Right, thank you. That's a good suggestion. I think we're going to do that. Thank you. All right, we're going to do this clause by clause. Madam Speaker…Madam Clerk, yes, thank you. On each clause?

Councillor Allard: Can I call a recorded vote on each clause, please. I don't want to add any doubt as to (inaudible).

Madam Speaker: Well, if there's any doubt, then we'll call a recorded vote if we can't hear.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, just for…

Madam Speaker: We can do it, I'm just trying to save you time. Madam Clerk, let's do clause by clause and there's a call for a recorded vote.

Councillor Eadie: And madam…Madam Speaker, point of privilege; please read out each clause.

Madam Speaker: We're doing that.

Councillor Eadie: We are. Okay, thank you.

Madam Speaker: I didn't hear you, Councillor Eadie, there's too much over-talking here. Go ahead.

Councillor Eadie: I would just ask a point of privilege, if…before we vote on a clause, if Madam Clerk could read it.

Madam Speaker: She's ready to do that.

Councillor Eadie: Out, it would be very helpful.

Madam Speaker: We will be doing that. Thank you. Madam Clerk, we'll be voting clause by clause, and each will be a recorded clause. if you could read each…read each clause into the record, please. Madam Clerk.

Clerk: Recommendation 1: that the consolidated snow clearing and ice control policy attached as Appendix B to this report be approved.

Madam Speaker: All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: Clause 1 passes. Madam Clerk. Yes, all will be. Thank you. Yes.

Clerk: Recommendation 2: that subject…that subject to approval of Recommendation 1: amendments to the snow clearing and ice control policy attached as Appendix C to this report be approved.

Madam Speaker: All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: Clause 2 passes. Madam Clerk, Clause 3.

Clerk: Recommendation 3: that $3,017,400 in additional 2022 capital budget be approved in the Winnipeg Fleet Management Agency and approved debt limit for the agency to be increased by the same amount in order to the purchase of 15 additional sidewalk machines and lease them to the Public Works Department.

Madam Speaker: All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Klein and Orlikow

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

Madam Speaker: Clause 3 passes. Class 4, Madam Clerk.

Clerk: Recommendation 4: that Council approve new capital external borrowing authority of $3,017,400 for the Winnipeg Fleet Management Agency for 2022.

Madam Speaker: All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Klein and Orlikow.

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. And that clause passes. Madam Clerk, next.

Clerk: Recommendation 5: That in order to fund the additional operating costs associated with the lease of 15 sidewalk machines, a new snow fence set-up and the modification to the snow route signs, the 2022 operating budget of the Public Works Department be increased by $292,500 and the 2023 through 2026 operating budget forecast be increased by the amounts identified in Appendix A of this report.

Madam Speaker: All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Klein and Orlikow

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

Madam Speaker: That clause passes. Next, Madam Clerk, Clause 6.

Clerk: Recommendation 6: that $87,334 in operating funds be referred to the 2023 capital budget…2023 budget process to fund one FTE garage mechanic position in accordance with the CUPE collective agreement.

Madam Speaker: All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillor Klein

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

Madam Speaker: And that carries. Next, Madam Clerk.

Clerk: Recommendation 7: that the draft by-law to amend the Winter Parking Ban By-law No. 76/2011 and make consequential amendments to the other by-laws attached as Appendix D to this report be approved.

Madam Speaker: All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: That carries. Next, Clause 8, would be as…or, pardon me, go ahead, Madam Clerk; the next one, as amended.

Clerk: Recommendation 8: that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to negotiate one-year contract extensions for sidewalk snow clearing for services from beginning October 2022 through April 2023, specifically for the approximate additional 200 km of sidewalk referred to in the report, and that these negotiated contracts be subject to the approval of Council.

Madam Speaker: All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: And that carries. Clause 9, now, would be as amended. Madam Clerk.

Clerk: That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back to Council in September 2022 after meeting with CUPE representatives comparing the snow clearing of sidewalks by contractors and the services being delivered by City workers with options to deliver the level of services identified in this report in time for the 2022 snow clearing season.

Madam Speaker: All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: That clause carries. Madam Clerk.

Clerk: Recommendation 10: that the Winnipeg Public Service be further directed to report back to Council in September 2022 with options for a public sector delivery of approximately 200 km of side…sidewalk snow clearing for the 2022 snow clearing season, and that the report explore options including but not limited to the single source purchase of equipment and the hiring of necessary staff in order to deliver the 200 km of sidewalk clearing which has traditionally been provided by the Public Service.

Madam Speaker: Those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Clause 10 passes. We need to do Clause 11? Okay, Clause 11, Madam Clerk. No recorded vote, councillor…Clause 11, Madam Clerk.

Clerk: Recommendation 11: that the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

Madam Speaker: All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillor Klein

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

Madam Speaker: Item 11 passes. Okay. We're done with that item. Madam Clerk, next.

Item 5 – Warranted Projects within the Traffic Engineering Improvement Program

Madam Speaker: Okay. Item 5, we do have amending Motion 3 to go with this. Councillor Allard, your opportunity to speak to the main item and your amending Motion 3. That was moved by yourself and seconded by Councillor Rollins.

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Allard,
Seconded by Councillor Rollins,

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 5 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated July 5, 2022 be amended by adding the following new Recommendations 4 and 5 and renumbering the remaining accordingly:

"4. That a new capital external borrowing authority of $1,503,570 be approved for the tax-supported Fund for 2022.

5. That in order to fund the additional operating costs for debt servicing, the operating budget of the Public Works department be increased by $30,075 in 2023, and operating budget forecasts be increased by $94,435 for subsequent years per the amounts identified in Attachment A."

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you very much. So, as some of you may know, we've been having quite a bit of debate at IRPW, at Executive Policy Committee for the last four or five months, I think, regarding this issue. In 2022, we…we passed the budget updates, as you are all aware. Some of it included incremental funding for the Transportation Enhancement Improvement Program. Since that time, we had a compilation report of all of the warranted but unfunded Transportation Engineering Improvement Program projects, so there's about $7.5 million projects that would make our streets safer if we were to fund it today. I looked under every stone, I contacted the CFO's office, I did everything I could to try to find the necessary dollars to fund this project. I even found over $5 million sitting in the Transportation Enhancement Improvement Program. I even asked the CFO in June what that $5 million was sitting in that account for, and the…and I also asked the department or...at the same time, and I was not given that list of projects. So, we have $5 million sitting in an account not being spent. We have $7 million in…of warranted and unfunded projects in the transportation improvement...Transportation Engineering Improvement Program that has a goal to make our streets safer, to bring our streets up to our current engineer standards, and these are part of the street. They're…the Transportation Engineering Improvement Program features are built at the time of reconstruction, just like active transportation is supposed to be built at the time of road reconstruction, as per Council policy. The difference here is trying to accelerate the deficiencies in our road network in terms of the Transportation Enhancement Improvement Program, of which there's about $7 million. We've just done a referral to the road safety strategy for, I think it's $21.8 million net new funding towards road safety for the next five years, that's a budget referral, that doesn't happen today. We have $7.5 million, approximately, of Traffic Engineering Improvement Program. Projects that could be done, that could be funded at any time. And yes, the Public Service will need some time in order to implement all of these projects. Not having an answer to what's happening with the $5 million, some of the money not being spent since 2018, knowing that we've known since 2013, internally the City of Winnipeg that low…high mounted lights are a cost-effective way to better…to better safety at lighted pedestrian crossings. So, these are...as you're…as you know, these are...or as you may know, the crossings that we're referring to are the big metallic crossings that have lights that are very high, and the problem with them is that, if you're too close to the intersection, you don't see the lights. And we know that we've had injuries, we know that we've had fatalities at these lighted pedestrian crossings. We know that they are a cost-effective solution to improve safety at these intersections. And we know that they are one of the more cost-effective options in the menu of Traffic Engineering Improvement Program that we've been given by the Public Service to...that are warranted, but unfunded. I don't think it should be a menu. I think we should be funding the whole thing. But I always say...I always say...I often say, a bird in the hand is better than two in the bush. And we had support at EPC for this motion, this would install eye-level lights city-wide, making all of our lighted pedestrian crossings safer. We had a recent presentation from Hido, a volunteer…well, a professional traffic planner, but a volunteer for the City of Winnipeg, and as part of his research, some of the questions are whether or not children are more vulnerable at these lighted pedestrian crossings, whether or not new Canadians are more vulnerable at these lighted pedestrian crossings, and so I hope that we can take this incremental step towards making our streets safer. There's other things that we need. Like, we need some pedestrian half signals around the Transportation Enhancement Program warranted but unfunded list. The Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Committee actually sometimes will approve things that are not warranted and not funded. I can hear Councillor Browaty saying, that was only $5,000, but it wasn't just $5,000; it was $5,000, then it was $250,000. And this is the actual list from our Public Service. I often hear the words, "I'm not an engineer, I want to support the engineering department, I want to support the street division in terms of what should be built where." This is what they are saying we should build and where, the only thing we need to do is fund it and it's unfunded. To the members of the Budget Working Group, we didn't have this information compiled at the time of the budget. And so, this is new information. In terms of sending this to the next budget, I would say, why would you want to do that, because we already know that these are required. We've known since '13, at least, the City's known since '13. It's been known to the

public after that date. But now that we know we know, and wouldn't we want these lighted pedestrian crossings to be safer? I hope so, and for that reason, I hope you support this motion. It was supported at EPC, it's using debt as a funding source. Now, some people may say that debt is not appropriate funding source for these because they don't last 30 years. Well, we just voted to buy snow clearing equipment, which I'm sure doesn't last 30 years. So, Councillor Mayes isn't here, but he would point out that our own documents show that our electric buses are expected to have a lifespan of 20 years. So, councillor…Councillor Schreyer would say, with construction inflation, every day we wait we're going to be paying much, much more. And we know that debt prices are going up, so if you're looking for a deal, now is the time to do it. And so, my preference would be to fund the entire program, patch up all of our streets that we can save to make them safer, as per our current practices from our own traffic department, from our own engineering department. I haven't had support for that yet so far. I have had support; thank you to my EPC colleagues who support it. For this bird in the hand, for this incremental step towards having these installed for our most vulnerable road users. So, I mean, I think…I think that's my pitch. We had much, much more detailed debates at Executive Policy Committee, but the point I want to drive home to councillors who haven't been having this debate over and over and over again is that we have a list, we have the warranted and funded Traffic Engineering Improvement Program projects. That's about $2.5 million. We have the unfunded but warranted projects of $7.5 million. So, those are the projects that we should be building right now, but they're not funded, so they're not going to be getting built right now. The road safety strategy talks about future plans, and we referred that to the budget, but we don't need to wait for these improvements to be built. The Winnipeg Free Press wrote an article saying, yes this would...yes this would improve safety, but these are tough financial times. We know there's $5 million sitting in the account for the Transportation Engineering Improvement Program. We know that Public Service won't give us a list or is not in a position to or…for whatever reason does not have the capacity to give us the list of the warranted and funded projects because presumably there is a list of projects being worked on, but to Councillor Lukes' point about assuming things, I don't know that there is a list. I know there's $5 plus million in an account that's meant to do this very thing, and the Public Service can't tell me what's going on with that money. And if there is a list and if it's a Class-5 estimates list, there's likely quite a bit of flex in that $5 million. Now, Public Works has asked for a full list and they've asked for a report, so in the coming months, we'll have a full list of all the Traffic Engineering Improvement Program projects and what's happening with all the money in that $5 plus million fund that currently is not expent. So, this fast-tracks the low-mounted lights. Some people might say, well, the Public Service can't…can't deliver this as quickly as if we fund it today. Well, if we approve…as we know, for those who've been around Council for a while, once the department has the funding authority, they start doing the work, they start planning to do the work, they start asking for those staff to do the work, the work gets done. If they don't have the funding authority, the work doesn't get done. It's a bit of a chicken or egg issue. So, if we fund this today, the department will tell us what we need to do in order to get them installed. If we approve this today, and we want to accelerate how fast the Public Service is able to install these low-mounted lights, for those of us who are here in September, for those of us who are re-elected, we'll be able to make those decisions of expediting or not the installation. But one thing I know for sure is that, if they're funded, the department will install them. And right now, they're not funded. And I don't think we should wait because these eye-level lights are to protect our most vulnerable road users, and it's an inexpensive way to do it. So, please support this EPC report.

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

Councillor Nason: You know, I am so confused by what Councillor Allard's trying to get to because, you know, the most vulnerable, most vulnerable, most vulnerable, protect, protect, protect. You know, I've got residents screaming at me on the phone because they would like to have a crosswalk. Just a crosswalk. Simple little sign, white sign, you know, that we paint some lines on the road. They would like to have that, but it's unfunded. But yet, we've got overhead lights that you press a button and people can go across when it's safe to do so. Now, the big argument is that the extra lower lights are going to help. Now, admittedly, as I drive across the city, taking my daughter to various soccer, I found myself in the far reaches of Old Kildonan on a street that...I think it was off Templeton or somewhere. It was almost at Route 90, and there was an overhead light, and lo and behold, it had the low-light…low-level pedestrian crossing like and I'm thinking, it's here, whereas Regent or Plessis doesn't have that. So, I don't know how some wards have them. Henderson has a bunch of them. I know there's lots of crossings on Henderson that still need to get done, but yet, there's not one in the ward of Transcona. Now, I know, city-wide, I think, was the response from the Chair as he opened, $1.5 million. You know, I'm just thinking of how many crosswalks that could help protect seniors that are trying to cross from one side of Devonshire to the other side. Warranted, but unfunded. We've got a roadway that's about to be reopened, that will take people from Plessis all the way over to Peguis. This road's going to get very busy. And seniors, vulnerable seniors are going to be affected. We've got another intersection at Kildonan Meadows and Devonshire, same area. Probably needs a four-way stop. Could need a set of lights. Required or warranted, but not unfunded. Peguis at Devonshire, another intersection that is supposed to have a controlled intersection of lights; might have a four-way stop on a four-lane road to a two-lane. Might. It doesn't at this point. So, you know, people are going to be crossing that. Warranted, probably not funded. I think it's developer paid, Madam Speaker. So, you know, I know this is his...he's been very...he being the Chair, has been very adamant that he wants something out of this. That he's pushed, he's pushed, he's pushed. I'm still not clear on where this extra debt that we're putting on is going to benefit the residents of my ward of Transcona. If he can articulate the specific ones, you know, if there's a way to get places like Devonshire as a crosswalk, a little bit of paint, even though we use paint

that washes off quicker than it dries. You know, if there's a way to get those things that'll help vulnerable individuals, seniors, to get from one side of the road to the other safely, I'm all ears. So, we'll see where this goes today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: So, firstly, I want to thank all members of Council for their deliberations on this. I think there isn't a member of Council that doesn't want to make improvements to the safety of our streets for the benefit of all of our residents, including our Chair and others who, on this matter, I won't be aligned with in terms of the vote. So, I do want to explain why I'll be opposing both the amending motion as well as the motion itself, which is consistent with my vote at Executive Policy Committee. It was not a unanimous vote at EPC, and that's fine. That does happen as we saw in the last…in the most recent discussion that we had on snow clearing. Here's the reason why; we were advised at committee by Public Works that these improvements wouldn't be made for two to three years. So, for two to three years it will take to implement these things. In the meantime, there will be a budget. There will be a balanced…there will be a balanced budget update that the next Council will have the privilege of…and the responsibility of voting on, during which the typical funding source for these kinds of things; frontage levees, could be utilized. That would be the most appropriate funding source. We want to talk about fast-tracking, we could fast-track getting…you know, being able to politically say that we're approving it today, that is a true statement. If we're talking about fast-tracking the actual implementation on our streets, there's nothing that could be done today versus the next balanced budget update that would fast-track the implementation of it. That's one of the questions that I had at committee. We did…we did have feedback from our CFO after the Executive Policy Committee vote on this matter with respect to the issuance of debt, in particular. And what we were advised is that the City will not normally issue debt for a period that exceeds the useful life of the asset. So, this is not generally consistent with the manner in which long-term debt is issued. There was…it was pointed out at Executive Policy Committee that buses may be…may be not consistent with those long-term...I'll leave that for others to discuss. But what I will say is, the overall costs, we've been advised of using long-term debt will ultimately cost the tax supported budget approximately $2.8 million to pay for assets of approximately $1.5 million. So just let that sink in. $2.8 million to pay for assets of approximately $1.5 million. This is $1.3 million in debt payments to not speed up the actual implementation on the road, it's going to take two to three years. So, it's $1.3 million. That's…and that's what the amendment rightfully…I'm not going to be supporting the amendment, but for those that want to support approving this today and just using debt, it is an appropriate amendment because you do need to rightfully fund the debt payments. The debt payments are $94,435 every year for 30 years. So, just to put that in perspective, that may not seem like a lot when you're talking about, you know, an annual operating budget in excess of $1 billion, but we are currently funding the Main Street Project van. That's less than $80,000 a year. The Street Links van is approximately the same amount. $90,000 a year, I can guarantee you there will be battles in the years to come, certainly in the next 30 years, about trying to get $94,000 for some worthy project in the community. I just don't think it's fiscally responsible to use debt for something like this that could…could be part of the upcoming budget. It's not going to slow down the implementation, but we're talking…if there's one number I would just highlight for everybody, what we're voting on, if this is approved, as I'm expecting it likely will be, it's $1.3 million in debt that we don't need to. That's $1.3 million over 30 years that could be used for much better purposes to improve safety and fund and support other worthwhile causes in the city of Winnipeg. So, don't oppose the effort, certainly the intention to implement Traffic Engineering Improvements Program. I think it is worthy. It's something that should be debated in the budget. It was in the last budget. There was funding that was part of the budget process, but certainly, the additional items that are earmarked in this particular motion could be funded without having to issue long-term debt. It would save $1.3 million and $94,000 a year in interest payments over the next 30 years. So, for that reason, I won't be supporting it, and would just highlight that $1.3 million in extra debt payments.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And it's nice to hear the Mayor talk about the cost of taking on debt. I appreciate that. This is one of those issues that I think speaks loudly to the fact that we need priorities in the city of Winnipeg. We need to be able to prioritize actions such as this and others to be able to make the right decision as opposed to making them based on political wants or desires. And I'm not saying that's what Councillor Allard has done here. But in order to prioritize properly for the city, we also need to start measuring what the metrics…let's provide some metrics as to why item a is more of a priority than item b. So, for those reasons, I'm not going to be supporting the motion today.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. My head phones ran out of power. Can you hear me?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: I...I truly appreciate Councillor Allard and Councillor Rollins' effort here in terms of making existing pedestrian corridors safer, easier for people driving automobiles to properly recognize that a pedestrian, another user of

the road is able to use a pedestrian intersection. And we must always remember; every intersect…the safest intersection is no intersection, but we do have to allow for other users to get to where they're going, and so that's why we have these pedestrian corridors. And the way they work...I need to be clear, as well; even if you put the lights lower down, that helps the motor vehicle drivers, they still need some time to stop. And the pedestrian user still has to push that button or set off the pedestrian corridor signal and wait till the intersection...till the automobiles stop before they proceed, that is the rules of using a pedestrian corridor. And I'm afraid that I've heard that many of the very troubling accidents that have happened are when pedestrians don't give the automobiles time to stop. So, that's not to say automobile drivers don't make mistakes and seriously disable or I'll say kill a pedestrian or even a cyclist, for that matter. So, it is so important that we do have the lower flashlights. However, I don't…I can't actually support the long-term debt related to this kind of an asset. These are the ones that we used to use cash to capital to pay for. So, if you really want to understand the problem, I heard our Mayor, who's quite proud of the four-year balanced budget that we came up with, and it is important to do four-year balanced budgets. However, what has happened in here, which Councillor Klein continually points out, is that we have been taking on debt for things that should be cash to capital. And we have been doing that because we weren't providing appropriate amounts of money for important programs like this one. Traffic safety: very essential items to take care of. And so, it is troubling that the long-term…even if you were borrowing, it should be short-term for these items. But still, even borrowing short-term money is troubling. Now, the original report has been around and has been adjusted. And I really appreciate and thank Councillor Allard for championing this particular effort. And that there is, actually, money that the service does have in order to outfit, not all of them, but outfit many of these corridors with the lower lights yet. Still, but there's not enough funding to do them all, and I appreciate that. But in that, what money we do have, there…certain…I hope that we have...and I never seen a prioritization of which pedestrian corridors should be outfitted first, but we know that there are certain regional streets that are very…very dangerous. They're all…they can all be dangerous. Wherever you have an intersection, it's dangerous. But we need to...for what we do have, let's get the ones that are the most at-risk for problems to happen. And I'll just point out again, I think because of some of the deaths that we've had related to this, a lot of pedestrians now are paying attention to using these crossings the way they were meant to be used, which is, again, I'll just say it again, when you're using a pedestrian corridor, a fully lit one, you need to ensure that you don't just step out as soon as you hit that button. That's not what you're supposed to do. You're supposed to...just like green doesn't mean go. Green means proceed once the intersection is clear. So, we need…and everybody needs to understand that when it comes to these things. And so, I can't support this particular motion to borrow money to have enough money to complete all of the lower lights at the pedestrian corridors we do have. And I believe in the budget there is money for new ones, and I believe any new pedestrian corridors that are installed are automatically installed with what is now the safety standard of the lower light. But I just...I can't support long-term debt, especially for these kinds of items.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Chair. For sure, I would love to see the flashing lights installed. Absolutely. I'd love to see all of the TIP…TEIP approved but not funded projects approved. I'd loved to see them all. There's so much more we could do for vulnerable road users. But you know, to many of the points being made today; the cost, the long-term…the cost of the long-term debt of $1.3 million, I find that ridiculous to go forward and spend that in long-term debt when we know they can't even install them all in one year. I heard at the executive policy...or Public Works meeting, it would take three years to do this. So, I really am in favour of referring this to the budget process and dealing with it in the budget process. And you know, if we have to do it year by year by year, I think that's much…much wiser use of taxpayer dollars. So, and to Councillor Klein's point about priorities, I'm really, really looking forward to the fact that we will set out a strategic plan and we won't…we'll have a little more guidance and direction on what we want to do and how we want to do it and what our priorities are. So, you know...and I don't think anyone could argue the fact that I don't want to see active transportation improvements for vulnerable road users, but just the whole concept of the long-term debt and the cost of the long-term debt does not sit well with me and I won't be supporting this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I had a tour de force speech on debt ready to go under the North End plant, but given people have brought it up now, might as well…it's earlier in the day, hopefully we'll be out before dinner. I will speak now then. I support…I support the report, as amended, the way it was put forward at EPC. It would be wonderful if we didn't have to use debt on this. And Councillor Allard, I think, tried…gainfully tried his best to get some of that unspent money allocated, but in the end, that report wasn't there, that time wasn't there, so we may yet be able to cover this…recover it all through the capital close out process that happens each year. But on the larger issue of usage of debt, I have to put some facts on the table. Councillor Eadie has talked a lot about this over the years. Councillor Klein has talked about…a lot about this over the years. Councillor Gillingham has talked about this over the years. Of late, I've started to talk about this because I think other colleagues' speeches have started to resonate with me. It…you can…if you round a little bit, the numbers become easier to remember. When Glen Murray leaves office in 2004, the debt's $495. So, let's call that half a billion, shall we? That's a little easier to round up to $500 million. At the end of the Sam Katz period, 10 years later, we've accrued about another $500, put $463 more on there, so you're at about…you're just under $1 billion. Then, in the

intervening eight years, well, it's…actually, to 2021, we've incurred a little more than half a billion: $522. So, we're at about $1485: $1.485 billion, basically almost $1.5 in debt. We do have a ceiling. We're approaching the ceiling. If the answer is, let's just change the ceiling if we get close to it, how about we abolish the ceiling then because there was no point if you have a ceiling and then you just…when you get close, don't care, then just get rid of the sham, I don't think the creditors are going to be pretty…loaners are going to be fooled by that. So, very good data provided by Catherine Kloepfer to give me these numbers. Also saying, we have some room left. We have $115 million in utility room left, and we have $127 million in tax supported side. The bigger concern is actually on the utilities side, I think. She also points out that we have $182 or so that will be retired over the next four years, so that gives us some more room. So, we have, roughly speaking, about $400 million more we could incur over the next four years. But Councillor Klein and Councillor Lukes are right, some priorities are going to have to be set because if you look at what's left, if you've only got $117 left on the utility side, that could be eaten up alone by the transit garage. You say, no, that's going to be federally and provincially funded. No, it isn't. We're in quite heavily on the transit garage. Additionally, it's a Class 5 estimate on $200 million building. It doesn't even have to double in cost and that still would eat up all the room we have left on the utility side. And you're saying, well, transit's a utility. What else is a utility? Hey, our whole water and waste challenges would all have to be funded on the utility side. Now, there it gets tricky because CSO isn't funded out of debt, it's funded as, you know, under the environmental projects reserve. But other projects, such as the ones we're coming to, are funded out of debt. The interim phosphorus removal, that's a debt proposal. Earlier today we voted for more debt around the north district police station. So, some things are funded out of debt, some are not. But certainly, the new council, as Councillor Lukes has said, there's going to need to be a strategic planning exercise. If you've only got a little over $100 million left for utility debt, all of it could go to the transit garage, where are you then on the number one priority of the City of Winnipeg, according to our infrastructure plans, the biosolids building? Which could cost hundreds and hundreds of millions, it isn't funded by Federal or Provincial Government. So, there is a reckoning coming where we're going to have to make some decisions. We have a number of aspirational documents that have been passed by this council. We have a rec master plan that was splendid insofar as the projects it talked about, but there would be hundreds of millions in debt coming out of that. If Ken McKim were still here, he would say, it wasn't all debt and he'd be right. But certainly, a large chunk of it envisaged debt to fund that rec master plan. So, again, there's some hard decisions that are going to have to be made about, do we want to have a debt ceiling? What is our debt ceiling? What can we do? What is a higher priority? What are we legally obligated to do, such as the North End plant? Such as CSO work? So, those decisions are going to have to be made. A final note, though, on…Councillor Eadie is right, some things we used to pay for with cash to capital and we're now paying with debt. So, I appreciate people saying, well, these signals won't last 30 years, and yet, you're going to put payments out over 30 years; what do you think we do with bus replacements, is my question? We've had multiple votes on the electric buses. It says on the page their estimated life is 19 years. It's right on the page, and yet, we are putting in $18 million this year alone on bus purchases. How much did we pay of debt for bus purchases in 2014, you ask me? The answer; as Councillor Eadie would know, is nothing. We didn't have any debt on that. We used reserve money and we used cash to capital. So, we are paying for some things now with debt that we didn't used to. Some of those things don't have a 30-year shelf life. So, I'm not apologizing for voting in favour of this. Will it last 30 years? Maybe not. Can we get going on it forthwith? I sure hope so. I think we all do. So, big discussion yet to be had on our debt, our debt ceiling, our priorities. That will be up to the new council, I hope to be part of that, along with many of you. But I do think…we take pride in…and Gillingham should…Councillor Gillingham should take pride in the balanced budgets we've done. That's on the operating side, though, right? We have continued to incur debt over the years, not in…I would say, not irresponsibly. I think we've done a decent job of that. But we are nearing a ceiling and we have some very big projects on our plate. So, that debate is yet to come. But for today, see my discussion about the buses, there are things we're funding right now that aren't going to last 30 years that we're using debt for, so I'm quite comfortable in supporting this today.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah, I'm just going to be very quick. Still reeling over the last vote and see what happened there because in the last vote we did, we actually put a whole bunch of money towards debt, and no one mentioned anything about debt then. $3 million for that…from approved debt limit. It's mostly all debt, which is fine. I just…trying to figure it out, and I've been told, I walked around, that was likely just for replacement of machinery. Fine, is it time sensitive? Maybe, maybe not, but again…so, I'll get my hands around that. And now…now we're here today again. So, I guess my only question I have, and maybe Councillor Allard can finish off with it, if we do this work…if we approve this today, when does the actual work begin? That's it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Any further speakers on this item? Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. Madam Speaker, two…you know, two reasons that I'm supporting this motion today on increasing road safety and the conception of work that has been led by Councillor Allard here. And I want to acknowledge, at Executive Policy Committee and following that, the work of our CFO, Catherine Kloepfer who, as Mayor stated, makes this motion complete. It's good to have co-authors and the Public Service, always. But Madam Speaker, it wasn't too long ago at community committee that Councillor Orlikow and I put forward a motion having just added density along Pembina,

commercial corridor where you should, we asked the question; how does one cross the road? And we voted on Complete Communities, Madam Speaker, and so one would think outside this office that we would have determined, and the department would have determined, how you cross the road once you add density. And it was a phase three of a project along Pembina, I would note. And we got a funny little item in it with Public Works, contemplating that perhaps this building, this developer, should pay for 25% of any assumed lighting to cross at Pembina. So, we asked further questions on that. Well, 25%, that doesn't get you 100% of the bill for the lighting, what is the other? Well, the answer was, the other 75%, well, maybe that would come from developers on all four corners. But what if there's a building there? It would never get done. This is work that's going to get some stuff done, Madam Speaker. A second story; after decades and decades of density that was developed in this city along Wellington Crescent, Madam Speaker. My majority of residents there are older adults, some of which are retired. Can they cross the street? The answer is, no, Madam Speaker. To get to their grocery store on Corydon, I've been advised that it is best if we also add to the beep-beep lights on Corydon, a low mounted light, but it is unfunded. Madam Speaker, we sort a lot of things out in the multi-year budget. We absolutely address debt, we absolutely find sources, but it is time to look at priorities and plans. And I believe the Chair of IRPW is right when he's looking at accelerating and putting a priority on low-mounted lights, Madam Speaker. And that's why I'm supporting this to move on today and supporting the amendment. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think a lot's been said. I think I…I think I've addressed most of the questions fom the people who have already spoken. To Councillor Orlikow's points or question about when does the work get done; as we know around this table, once there is a funding authorization, the work begins, the planning begins, and if we approve this funding authorization, these lights will be installed faster than if the funding authorization is not there. I don't think anybody would disagree with that. And it makes the next incremental step of if we want to accelerate using temporary staff or new staff makes that next incremental step that much easier again. So, yes, the work will happen faster if we pass this report today. And if we don't pass this report today, then we're going to have not one, but two incremental steps to do. And to Councillor Mayes' point, we may not even…we may not even in the end require the whole...the whole amount because there's already $5 million sitting in an account for which we don't have an explanation. So, we can close some capital projects, and we might be able to get some of that cash back. So, I think I've said all…I think I've said all I…I think I've said all I needed to say at IRPW, at EPC, at Council and please support this motion. It will make our roads safer. It is warranted. I believe we should be doing more. We should be doing the full 7.5 of the warranted projects that are not funded, but at least if we authorize this 1.5, we are doing some of the work that will protect some of the most vulnerable road users in Winnipeg at a cost that our Public Service says is low-cost and an effective way to address safety at these lighted pedestrian crossings. And to my councillor…councillor colleagues who were asking about other transportation enhancement improvement…Transportation Engineering Improvement Program projects that aren't getting funded, by funding this chunk, we also get closer to funding the whole thing. So, you don't eat an elephant in one bite, I think that's an expression. Maybe, maybe not. Anyway, if it's not, then you get the picture. So, this'll be an incremental step. It will get done and we need to do the balance at some point, and it's now on us. As Council, we know this work needs to be done. Our engineers are saying it needs to get done. Not only this, but another...what's the balance? Another $5 million…$5 million? There's still millions of dollars of work to be done after...after the…even if we add this incremental $1.5. So, this is…this is only a step in the right direction, and I hope that you can support this. It's been on the...it's been on the docket for the last five months, and I guess this is the final call. So, thank you for your consideration.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. With that, we'll call the question. It'll be a recorded vote on amending Motion 3: moved by Councillor Allard. Amending Motion 3 first, then the main item. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Chambers, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, and Schreyer

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Gillingham, Klein, Lukes, Nason, Eadie, and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 7.

Madam Speaker: Sorry, could you say that again, Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 7.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Motion 3 passes. Okay, and the main item, as amended. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Chambers, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, and Schreyer

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Gillingham, Klein, Lukes, Nason, Eadie, and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk.

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. The item is lost. No, we're going to move on. I'm…Mr. Clerk can check that if there's an issue. Next is by-laws, Mister...by-laws…by…that's not a question for right now. That's very inappropriate. If there's an issue, then raise it. Councillor Allard, by-laws, please. Andrew, if you have a second.

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

Councillor Allard: I just want to know who killed the lights. I guess we'll find out later. Okay, here we go. I introduce the report...no, I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law 69/2022, By-law No. 116/2022.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 69/2022, By-law No. 116/2022.

Councillor Allard: I move that By-laws No. 69/2022 and 116/2022 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 69/2022 and 116/2022.

Councillor Allard: I move that the rules be suspended and By-laws No. 69/2022 and 116/2022 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Nason recorded in opposition, and it carries. Pardon me? There's another...both by-laws, Councillor Nason or one? There was two read out there. Okay. Thank you. That concludes the by-laws. We'll now have question period. Any questions for Councillor Allard? Councillor Lukes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Lukes: Through you, Madam Chair, I just...you know, I've been reading about this on Facebook, I've been reading about it in the paper, people have been asking me questions, and I just don't know how to answer this. So, Councillor Allard is the Chair of the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Committee and he, for weeks now, is saying he can't get an answer from the Finance Department, I guess, and the Public Works Department, on the $5 million he feels is not being used and that's available to be used for TIEP. How can the Chair of Public Works not get an answer from the department? How can a member of EPC not get an answer from the department? I find it astounding and I'm just not clear on that, maybe Councillor Allard could explain it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Speaker. Through you to the councillor, well, it's really is fairly simple, I asked the Public Service…

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
July 21, 2022, at 4:56 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I'm reconvening our Council meeting of July 21st, 2022 after a short recess. We are now on question period for Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Committee. Before we go into that, Mr. Clerk, I'd like to call on you to clarify the vote under this committee for Item 3…Item 5, pardon me.

City Clerk: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Apologies to Council, we did go back and review the tape to ensure we have the count correct, we had previously announced that the vote on Motion 3 was 9 to 7. After reviewing the tape, it was clear that it was 8-8, so the vote on both Motion 3, as well as on Item 5, were 8 to 8.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Now, questions for our Chair, for Councillor Allard. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: I'm just going to ask part two of the question. So, re-track here. So, I'm just asking about the $5 million, why Councillor Allard can't get an answer. If the department's not going to give him an answer, could he not go to the CAO to get an answer? Like, I'm just really concerned that a member of EPC and a Chair of IRPW can't get an answer on funding at IRPW. It concerns me.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, through you to the councillor, all I can say is that I've asked everybody that I can think of asking, including the CFO in June, and the CFO's answer was that the information was not available from the department. There was plenty of time and the answer is not available and there was more than $5 million sitting in that account that could have funded eye-mounted lights at lighted pedestrian crossings.

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

Councillor Lukes: So, the CAO oversees the staff and if you're not getting an answer from the staff and you haven't asked the CAO, why don't you make a motion and…make a motion to have an answer…to get an answer for the funding? It's really concerning that the Chair and a member of EPC is not getting an answer, and I'm, you know, very concerned about hearing that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to the councillor, we do have a motion, we do have a report coming, what we don't have is the information that I had requested on where that $5 plus million was being reserved for. We are waiting for a report at IRPW.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for Councillor Allard? Okay. Anyone else? Okay. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: So, my understanding is, the projects for the asphalt roads are not out from the funding that Province has allocated. The Province allocated money, we saw that in the report, you approved it; was it on the agenda today, I'm not sure? So, my understanding is, there's no RFPs that have gone out yet and we're at the middle to end of July. I honestly don't even think some of these contractors are actually going to even be able to do this work. So, can you enlighten us on any timeline on the asphalt projects that the Province gave us money for in the spring?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, I understand that the Public Service is doing everything they can to get the money out the door, and I think there is some language in the…in the correspondence that says that there's also the possibility of that money being extended into the next fiscal year.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Mayor...or pardon me, it was Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Can you hear me?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: Okay. Given that...Madam Speaker, given that the Chairperson of IRPW was on the Budget Working Group Committee that decided on a four-year budget that saw in the third year the failing of the City's snow clearing equipment. Were…was the working…Budget Working Group made aware of the issues related to the getting older snow clearing equipment? And was there a decision made to ignore it?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Chair, through you to the councillor, when I asked the Public Service earlier this year, after the budget, why we kept seeing this apparently chronic issue of sidewalks and active transportation corridors not being cleared properly. The answer I got from the Public Service at that time was that, no, there's no issue in terms of resources. There's…in terms of snow clearing, the sky is the limit, we follow the snow clearing policy and if there is an issue, there's an issue here and there, it's a staffing issue. That's what I recall hearing on the public record. And what I recall, as part of the discussions on this latest snow clearing report that we just passed, is that there was new information that was generated by the department that allowed the department to confirm that the department was not keeping up with the snow and ice control policy which justified their request to increase the level of service, including the purchase of new machinery. And the, I guess, the extension of the contracts (inaudible) net new…meaning a net new 200 kilometres. So, I think the answer is, the Public Service was saying in…you know, during the winter season that there was no resourcing issues, to their knowledge, that it was operator error here and there, to my recollection. I stand to be corrected if that's not what the…what the staff said, but I do remember asking our staff directly at the IRPW Committee, and that's the answer that I got at that time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: Second question. To be clear, then, Public Works did not indicate that there was a risk that snow clearing equipment used by our City staff was in a position...was in a position to start failing because of the age of the equipment?

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Eadie; I believe I would recall that type of information given that I had been asking the Public Works staff after the budget why it is that we see, apparently chronic, underservicing of our sidewalks and our active transportation corridors. And at that time, the Public Service said that there was no lack of resources. That's my recollection of what the Public Service was saying. And my understanding in terms of when that changed is after the Public Service was able to compile information. I had moved a motion last year asking for more information on sidewalk snow clearing, on making our sidewalks less treacherous. The Public Service said that once they had the information, they were…they were then aware that we were not meeting our snow and ice control policies as it pertained to sidewalks and active transportation. And that's when this new report was generated.

Councillor Eadie: Okay. So, no heads up when the four-year budget thing was being passed. All right. The…my last question is, simply, did you know that I would have voted to suspend the accounting project rules in order to utilize part of that $5 million for the $1.3 needed to complete the lower-down lights at lit pedestrian corridors?

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, through you to the councillor; no, I don't believe I knew that. I don't believe there was communication to that effect. I certainly welcome that motion if that is what…is what you would be willing to support. I think the problem with that is that the question then becomes, what projects are going to fall off? Like, we have an approved list. We know what's getting built, what's not getting built. If you start getting into the budget without having the list of approved projects, then you start getting into conversations with the Public Service saying they can't guarantee the building of the projects that have already been funded, and I think that's when…that's when we lose the vote, when we start…you know, when people start saying, well, what about this project, what about that project? And the answer to that is, well, we don't know if it can get built or not. So, I mean, I'd welcome going down that direction, but I don't know if we could win that vote.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As we continue to grow out our active transportation network, sorely, some of the early trail ways like Dugald Road are left behind. That are poorly maintained, showing signs of grass growing, cuts that don't get repaired. I'm wondering if the Chair has any recommendations with regards to properly maintaining our older infrastructure so that it may be still useful for residents that depend on it?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I think the question is, how do we maintain older infrastructure? I think the answer is to fund the operations and maintenance of our older infrastructure. I think that would be it, and I would welcome the councillor to move

a motion to vote for a budget, to move motions amending the budget. If there's a will, there's a way. All we need to do is set the policy and mobilize the resources and we can get it done. So, Councillor Nason, if you've got an idea, I'm willing to have that discussion with you and the Public Service.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next committee, Standing Committee on Finance. We'll get right into question period. Any questions for Councillor Browaty, the Chair? Any questions? Councillor Klein.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much. Sorry, I didn't know we were moving onto Finance, so I appreciate that. Just a couple of questions that I just was looking for clarification on. I had them written down. Bear with me for one moment, please, Madam Speaker. I'm wondering if the Finance Chair can confirm that the $1.483 billion in City debt does not include the sinking fund amount of $132 million, which is also debt owing, which would thus make the entire debt to be paid back by the City in the future of $1.615 billion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I don't have that information at my fingertips, but I can certainly seek it out for him as I did last month.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Through you, Madam Speaker, thank you to the Chair of Finance. Also, I'm wondering if the Chair of Finance can confirm that the $1.483 billion in the City debt does not include the $70 million in debt, which Council authorized on January 27 under the Borrowing By-law of 122/2021.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I will seek to provide that information for the councillor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further? Seeing no other questions...Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, it's my understanding that sinking funds are established to collect the money to payoff existing debt. Sinking funds are not debentures. They are funds available to payoff debt payments when they're coming due. Did the Chair of Finance know that?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to Councillor Eadie; that's my general understanding. Again, how it's accounted for, I can't confirm.

Councillor Eadie: Right, anyway. Thanks. And maybe when you answer Councillor Klein, you can give him the proper answer from the CFO.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. Councillor Mayes, on the report dated June 26th.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT
DATED JUNE 28, 2022

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll move the report dated June 26th. I will pull Items No. 4 and 6, therefore, the vote would be on 1, 2, 3 and 5, unless any of those are pulled.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer pulls 2. Okay, I'll call the question on 1, 3 and 5. All in favour?

Councillor Eadie: One…is this Water and Waste? Sorry.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: I just wanted to speak to 1. Sorry.

Madam Speaker: Okay. I'll call the question on 3 and 5. All in favour?

Councillor Eadie: Or, sorry. Hold it. Please forgive me, Madam Speaker. I don't have…I didn't have my thing up. 1 is the comprehensive plan?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: Waste plan. And what number is the procurement report?

Madam Speaker: 4.

Councillor Eadie: Was that stood down?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: Okay, good. And I'd like 1 down as well.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so we've pulled 1, 2, 4, and 6. I'll call the question on 3 and 5. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And we've noted Councillor Klein in opposition to Item 3. Okay. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Comprehensive Integrated Waste Management Strategy (CIWMS) Annual Report

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

Councillor Mayes: I'll wait to hear from…from whoever pulled that.

Madam Speaker: First speaker? Item 1, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be voting to accept the annual report on the comprehensive...anyway, the waste management plan. And I just wanted to point out publicly at this point, myself and Councillor Schreyer have submitted a motion for today that will address some of the concerns that I have from the Comprehensive Waste Management Plan. The...because it's not all that comprehensive in that there's pieces of data that are involved with garbage waste...waste services provided by...through Public Works that don't get reported, and garbage waste is solid waste is solid waste in this city. So, whether it's litter on the ground or abandoned bulk waste on a street or a back lane or in a...parks and open…in an open spaces or on pieces of parks as well. That happens at (inaudible) park quite often near Selkirk Avenue. And what's really the problem here is that this comprehensive plan, which I voted against in 2012 because I didn't think it addressed...it provided a flat system of rules to be applied across the whole city. I think it brags that it has a uniform approach to dealing with waste which, in some ways, I guess, makes it easier to manage in that everybody's supposed to follow the same rules, but it causes problems for other departments when dealing with this. So, those are…that's the kind of concern I have in that…in that, you know…and maybe at some point we'll see recommendations for changes for systems. You know, it talks about the pilot continues for composting program to come into being and it continues to talk about establishing a uniform system, that you know what? A uniform system doesn't work in parts of our city, as I spoke to earlier today on a couple of reports. And so, really, I think an opportunity is, solid waste is a utility, and that utility can provide garbage waste services to other departments. And if we consolidate our different garbage service programs, waste programs, under one utility, we'll be able to measure and be able to report on serious issues of waste in this city. And so, I just wanted to point that out about the annual report. Solid waste has done a lot of good work, mind you. If you read through the program, some numbers are down, but ultimately, it does what's in solid waste domain is reported appropriately so that Council, if they need to come up with better policy solutions and those kind of things, you're able to do that as a result of the data that's collected. However, as I've pointed out again, there's pieces of data that aren't accumulated by solid waste that should all be under what is called comprehensive waste management plan. So, anyway, I am voting for the report, and I thank the Public Service for doing all the good work that they're trying to accomplish in treating our environment in an appropriate manner.

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

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, the report has...this always used to be good news report as the diversion rate kept climbing and climbing, then it plateaued, then it starts to decline a bit. We've talked about this before, the real debate to be had for

the next Council is about…is about compost and how to do that to try and keep the diversion rate climbing. Councillor Eadie perhaps says…sells himself a little short there. He has had some accomplishments on this. This…if I never…I don't think I've ever heard the term 'the bulky' before I got here, but we have debated many times the bulky waste pick-up, courtesy of Councillor Eadie, and as well, I think part of the debate over organics compost will be that the point Councillor Eadie has continued to drill home, which is, if you do continue these flat rate, per household fees, like the garbage is now, then the person with the $2 million home pays the same as the person with a $100,000 home. And I think that was one of the reasons Councillor Eadie voted against back in 2011. It was one meeting before I was elected, but I think that's very much going to be part of our debate as we go forward or as Council goes forward is, is that the way to keep going with this or should it be on the property tax where you'd have more progressivity; the person with the higher value home would pay more than the person with the lesser value home. So, I want to…I know Councillor Eadie has spoken on this issue many times, and I think that's…he's due some praise on those two…those two issues. So, really, that's…the report is pretty straightforward and yes, I'll move the adoption of the report.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. All in favour of Item 1? Contrary? That's carried. Item 2.

Item 2 – Winnipeg Climate Action Plan – Annual Report

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

Councillor Mayes: I'll wait to hear from...I believe it was Councillor Schreyer who pulled this one.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be brief. It's been a bit of a confusing day, but nonetheless, we persevere. On this one, I'll be very brief, I'm just glad to see that we have a Winnipeg Climate Action Plan that's evolving, it's changed since I first was given a briefing on this, and I'm glad to see some positive...a positive change regarding the Winnipeg Climate Action Plan. And by the way, just in terms of the confusion of the day, as we persevere, this is the way for the administration to bring forward an annual report. It's an annual report, that's what it's about, that's what we're voting on, and I'm pleased to see it. The million tree challenge annual report, apparently, we didn't know we were voting on, and we ended up voting for a $70,000…$70,000 budget for Trees Winnipeg, even though it was a report on the last year of activity. In this case…which didn't include any actuals in the report. In this case, we're voting on the Winnipeg Climate Action Plan. This is a future oriented plan, this annual report, in terms of how far we've progressed regarding a plan, a future oriented document and strategy. And so, in that…in that respect, there isn't much in terms of financials involved. We'll get those actuals as we move along, but it's nice to see that we've got a proper action plan as…which is the annual report, and we can vote on this clearly. And if I might say, again, it is dear to my heart because it is dear to the sustainability both of the economy and the environment of this city and this province that we have moved towards including hydroelectricity as being a serious option for building heating in the city of Winnipeg. That's my understanding, that was not…did not exist at the beginning of the creation of the Climate Action Plan, and things are...have evolved regarding some of the extraordinarily important. Some of that doesn't account…doesn't apply to all parts of the world, but it certainly applies to Winnipeg. We can make a huge difference when it comes to climate action and our greenhouse gas blueprint by optimizing the use of hydroelectricity and there are very few cities in the world can do…that can do what we can, and it's thus, a very important obligation of ours, the City of Winnipeg. It's our special obligation. You can't say this about most cities in the world. So, I'm glad to see we're including that so that we have actually a chance to make a true contribution to reducing our greenhouse gases. I don't believe that we're going to achieve them as a national strategy. I do believe we can do that as a city so long as we're dealing with conversion and future orientation towards hydro rather than natural gas. And that is our obligation, that is our special advantage that we have in dealing with climate action. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. It is worth noting, we certainly had some turnover in our climate change office. We have Ms. Becky Raddatz back at the helm now. She had been acting then out, then…is now back in as permanent, which I think is going to bring some stability and some real leadership there. So, the…more to be debated by the next Council here. One item, I know Councillors Rollins and Gilroy, in particular, wanted to get the advisory committee up and running. The motions coming to the next and final Water and Waste Committee, it will get here to Council, we have the staff guarantee on that, so I will be holding them...we have been talking about this for months. Under the budget, we are to have a community advisory committee, that's…that work is continuing, that will be set up before we go. And Councillor Schreyer is right that, certainly, we've taken some steps on the whole issue of natural gas heating. I'll speak a little more to that, I think, around Item No. 6, which didn't get pulled at EPC, so I've pulled it to briefly discuss it today. But yeah, I mean, the work on this continues, and there are certainly going to be serious issues to be debated as part of that strategic plan for the next Council. So, with that, I will thank the authors of the report and move its adoption.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question. All in favour of Item 2? Contrary? Carried. Item 4, Madam Clerk.

Item 4 – Procurement Model Recommendation and Revised Cost Estimate for the North End Sewage Treatment Plant (NEWPCC) Upgrade – Biosolids Facilities Project

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

Councillor Mayes: Likely having lost my opportunity to make the morning papers due to that vote on the low-level lights, I won't go on in my usual tour de force style on sewage matters. This, in all seriousness, it's a big issue, right. I mean, it's…we're trying to get…this is the number one priority under our infrastructure plan. Costs are huge for biosolids, implications are huge. You've heard the math before. It'll take roughly seven years to build, we have roughly seven years of capacity left. What happens if we run out of capacity? Our women of wastewater, Michelle Paetkau and Cynthia Wiebe would say, then nothing gets approved. It's not that…it's factories, houses, apartment buildings; we won't have any space left. So, we really have to get this moving. There are a couple of things to highlight. I think, one: we didn't pull the arguably good news item, I think good news item, that we're moving forward on the interim phosphorus removal. A lot of work championing that by Councillors Nason and Klein. Here we are, we're going to build that and we've got the budget to do it. Doing that, though...and we actually had praise from even the Lake Winnipeg Foundation. Doing that triggers costs under this item, though. You have to build slightly different bio…well, different biosolids building than we had been planning a year or two ago in order to get that phosphorus reduction moving more quickly. So, that's $130 million of the estimated costs. Also, a very big line item here about inflation. We could debate that, I'm not sure it would be productive though because it's just a budget referral. Supply chain issues, annual inflation rate may be different by the time this hits the budget debate for the new Council. So, the good news part is the acceleration of the phosphorus removal, but two things to highlight, perhaps, under number four; the…it is a…it is a massive cost increase. It's interesting, you know, you can have dozens of people in on items that have a very low dollar amount. We've had almost no one speak at any committee or Council on this potential $300 million...$360 million cost increase. These projects tend to have that in Water and Waste. Again, as I've said before, kudos to the Mayor for setting up this separate committee. This would have been buried under IRPW until this committee was created in 2015. So, big ticket item. The procurement itself, this was amended...it was just defeated outright at committee, so a new model was put forward at EPC; the design build. Some controversy there, I think, in earlier months, some debate with the staff, but that's how we landed at EPC was to proceed with the design build model. Wasn't a unanimous vote, but it passed, I believe, 5 to 2. So, yeah, this will be a major undertaking. The other good news is what Ms. Paulson seven or eight hours ago was talking about, social procurement aspects of the North End. This is going to be, really, a pilot project for other…other efforts in this city. Certainly, I will be championing the use of skilled labour here to the maximum extent. We have had massive...well, we've had very substantial overruns at south end. The lesson I've learned from that can be summed up in two words: skilled labour. So, that will be part of the debate. I very much hope the Federal Government comes around and gives approval before the current mayor is done his term. I think he deserves the chance to announce the biosolids building because it's…we've come a long way, actually, under this mayor on the North End. We aren't dodging we aren't leaving, we're underway, we're doing the work on the headworks, hundreds of millions. Hopefully, we'll get the funding nailed down for this and get going. More hundreds of millions, so a major undertaking for the City and important for the City's future, but important to do it with skilled labour and with a community benefits lens. So, more to come in the next budget for who's ever is still around this table, but for today, it's mostly debate about procurement and budget referral.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. This was stood down by Councillor Eadie. Go ahead.

Councillor Eadie: I wanted to stand it down. I don't think I did, but anyway. I just wanted to say that I'm going to be voting for the EPC recommendation that's come to Council. And I just want to express my appreciation for EPC seeing the wisdom to just go with the design build model, which is the model we started out with on this project. And when an owner of a plant such as the size and cost of this, when you go to a design build, this was explained to me by a former City engineer working, I think, either Public Works or Water and Waste, I can't remember, but explained that not only the private sector can do design build, design build can be accomplished through the City itself, but essentially, what you need to have is what's called an owner's advocate. We, long ago, back when we were…just before we decided to split it into three phases in order to financially proceed appropriately, we hired that owner advocate at the cost of tens of millions of dollars over the length of the contract. And we hired the best proponent under the RFP that went out. And you would note, it's not coming to the table here because it's moving within budget, but we did change it to three phases, which means that owner advocate who does much of the same work, actually, most of the same work, that would be done under design build finance. So, but we already have a contract. What would the cost be to break it, because why would you duplicate work on a plant that's going to...with the projection right now, what are we talking now? I think it's close to $900 million. Maybe I didn't memorize all the numbers, but what I do realize is, that we definitely don't want to duplicate work. And there are lots of costs involved with this. And when it comes time that a winning bidder comes in and is going to actually do the construction and work on the new biosolids portion of the plant, that we have a very good CFO. And there's going to be

money coming from the feds, from the Province and from the City and it will involve debt, but the debt will be paid by the water and waste bill payers, in the case of our utility, not the property taxpayers. Although, they are usually one in the same, but ultimately, the funding comes from a different…and the…our excellent CFO and her team have the ability to channel the money that we're spending appropriately to the winning bidder who will construct the biosolids plant in a timely fashion so that they have an ability to do the work and move forward in a…in as fast a way as possible, ensuring that the procurement of materials and stuff will coincide with our owner advocate. And so, the owner advocate can make recommendations to the CFO about how to make out…make the financial payments to the winning bidder so that they can construct the best biosolids plant that we have. So, I just want to…well, it didn't sound like it's unanimous. I just want to express my appreciation that…all I've been reading on this and following it along from way back when, and we do need to get it done. So, at that, I'll leave it at that and thank the wisdom of the EPC's decision to recommendation one, which is to move forward with the design build rather than what was being proposed, which was, well, when we get to the mark conditions eventually in the future, that's when we'll decide. But I don't think, and I didn't read anywhere in there, the factor of, we already are paying tens of millions of dollars to an owner advocate to do a lot of the work that a design build finance situation would. So, and if you break contracts, that costs lots of money. If you don't want to duplicate…if you duplicate the work, that's a lot of extra money. And as Councillor Mayes has accurately pointed out, these are projections with inflation. We don't know what the future necessarily holds. But right now, inflation...and I don't want to debate it because right now, as Councillor Mayes has put it, that inflation, though, in the current environment that exists, it just demonstrates how we're going to have great difficulty in dealing with the…with the financing and inflationary, if it does…whatever exists in the future. So, anyway, I'll be voting for EPC's recommendation on this report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Back to you, Councillor Mayes, for close, if you wish.

Councillor Mayes: No, I think that that's captured the...the main issues here.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question on Item 4. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Item 5, Madam Clerk.

Clerk: Item 6?

Madam Speaker: Item 6, yes.

Item 6 – Community Energy Investment Roadmap to Reach Net Zero Emissions by 2050

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

Councillor Mayes: Briefly. Huge report, lots of effort, lots of staff. I won't highlight any particular person. Aspirational to some extent, but trying to achieve certain zero emission targets. Billions of dollars discussed on some of the pages. One thing to highlight, and by doing this and praising Councillor Schreyer, I'm sure he will just leave it at that. Just let me…let me praise him. But page 52 talks about GSG emissions for buildings, including homes, businesses, institution and industrial buildings makeup 44% of the total emissions from Winnipeg. This is building heating. The majority, 93%, of the GHG emissions are from the use of natural gas. For space heating and other industrial purposes, the remaining 7% of emissions come from diesel, propane and a small amount of wood. Switching from natural gas for space heating to efficient electric heat pumps as well as eliminating the use of diesel and propane will result in the decarbonization of the building sector. So, we have, I think, talked about this more in the life of this council than certainly the other two that I've been part of, combined. This has got to be...we talk about compost to get our GHGs down at Brady. We have certainly talked about electrical buses and trying to get mode shift. We shouldn't forget about this part of the puzzle: the buildings. Councillor Schreyer, I think to his credit, has gotten me on board to try and look at what we're going to do. We still need to try and bring in a motion saying, are we going to try and emulate Vancouver or New York? Both cities have put forward targets to ban the use of natural gas. We have challenges here, but we also have a lot of hydro power available to us. So, it's just striking that that's a big part of the puzzle as we go forward, this building heat…building heating, it's…you know, 40 years ago, it was clean burning natural gas. This was sort of the hero, the new way of doing things. Maybe not the new way, but the clean, efficient way of doing things. Well, in this climate, in this era, rather, in this context of concern about greenhouse gases, we're going to have to really think about this and what we want to do going forward. That leaves…there's also a very big issue of retrofits, that, I think, is going to have to be debated as well around this table. But for today, just to highlight that in the report, something again for the next douncil to wrestle with, the whole issue of climate change and how we're going to approach building heating.

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

Councillor Schreyer: No.

Madam Speaker: Oh, you just pulled it? Okay, right, good. No other speakers? Do you wish to close? Okay. I'll call the question, that was great. Item 6: all in favour? Contrary? Carried. We now have the standing...just one moment...question period. Okay. First, Motion 6: moved by Councillor Eadie and seconded by Councillor Schreyer. It was circulated today, and it'll be an automatic referral to the standing committee. We'll now have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Mayes? Okay. Seeing none...okay. Councillor Chambers.

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

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Schreyer,

WHEREAS the image of Winnipeg is one of garbage and litter all over the place versus Canadian cities such as Calgary and Saskatoon;

AND WHEREAS the Public Works litter bin street beautification program continues to be under funded to the point that the web page for the service states no money in the budget to add bins to be collected along image route and other ugly littered streets;

AND WHEREAS Streets removal of abandoned solid waste runs on a complaints-based system that fails to acknowledge the chronic dumping on right of ways in many areas of the city;

AND WHEREAS Parks and Open Spaces continues to not have enough litter bins picked up in a timely manner in Winnipeg's parks, and the Division's complaints-based system of garbage removal from green spaces by bridges and open city owned spaces fails to recognize the need to deal with the chronic dumping in many areas of the city;

AND WHEREAS the By-law Enforcement Neighbourhood Livability garbage complaints-based process takes too long to resolve health and safety issues in certain neighbourhoods which also have chronic vacant and derelict properties;

AND WHEREAS Solid Waste works with the city's Arson Task Force to remove garbage from at risk, vacant derelict properties to remove the inevitable accumulation of burnable garbage both property driven and abandoned bulk waste;

AND WHEREAS Solid Waste's 2021 annual report on the Waste Management Strategy (CIWMS) demonstrates that Solid Waste cannot provide comprehensive numbers on the Public Works garbage services and private garbage collection from Neighbourhood Livability garbage complaints that go to Rosser instead of Brady;

AND WHEREAS the cost of Public Work's hiring private garbage services can run as high as $800.00 for one complaint of garbage on city open spaces;

AND WHEREAS in the CIWMS annual report, Solid Waste does not keep records of Public Works' abandoned waste complaints that more than likely number in the thousands across the city;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Solid Waste Utility be directed to work with the Public Works Department to provide a report to Council on consolidating all city garbage services into the utility's operations with details such as, but not limited to, Public Works abandoned waste calls for service and costs, and the cost to consolidate the various Public Works garbage services, both private and public, with costs separated.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair. Through you to the Chair...or Madam Speaker, through you to the Chair of Water and Waste; St. Norbert has a property that is developable, but is stagnated based on the sewer constraints in the area even though that St. Norbert is a separated sewer system. I was advised by Water and Waste that they are doing flow studies to determine sewer capacities in the area. And that the flow studies had to be completed over the winter to

assess both the land drainage as well as the sewer capacities during peak hours. My question to the Chair, Madam Speaker is, when will those flow study data be available so we can assess what development can go forward in the area of St. Norbert? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I don't know. I can ask the staff on that. It does highlight an issue. It would be wrong to say that all of our development challenges come in combined sewer district areas. There are challenges there. There are limits you put on triplexes or more; discharge control devices, but St. Norbert, well outside the infill guidelines area, well outside combined sewer area. Riverpark South has some of these same issues, actually. The hydraulics issue, there's just not enough space in…it's not a combined sewer issue, it's just, there's not enough space, that's why the biosolids building's going to be important going forward. So, I can certainly ask. It's not unique to any one site. We've got this now starting to crop up, as those of us who suffered through that appeals hearing on Moore Avenue can attest, this is starting to crop up even on relatively small sites and small…you know, what was approved for 16 units now can only be three. This is starting to become much more of an issue. So, fair question, and I'll try to find an answer for Councillor Chambers.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. No further questions, let's move on to the next committee: Standing Policy Committee on Innovation and Economic Development. There's no report today. We'll get right into question period. Any questions for Councillor Chambers? Okay. No questions, let's move on. Standing...Governance Committee of Council. Councillor Chambers, will you move the report on my behalf, please?

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL DATED JULY 6, 2022

Councillor Chambers: Absolutely. Happy to do so, Madam Speaker. I move consent agenda for Items 1 and 2.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. And now, the by-laws.

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Chamber Chambers: I move that By-law 115/2022 be read for a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 115/2022.

Councillor Chambers: I move that By-law 115/2022 be read for a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 115/2022.

Councillor Chambers: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 115/2022 be read for a third time so that the same may be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is a carried. That concludes our agenda for today. Councillor Mayes, will you move adjournment?

Councillor Mayes: Moved.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: Done before 6:00.

Madam Speaker: Yes. Roll call, Madam Clerk, please.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 5:43 p.m.