COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, June 22, 2023

The Council met at 9:38 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Mayes.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Orlikow, Santos, Schreyer and Wyatt.

INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you. At this time, it's my pleasure to welcome our pages for today's meeting. Joining us is Abigail Rojo from the University of Winnipeg Collegiate who resides in the Daniel McIntyre Ward, and Nicole Sylvestre from St. Mary's Academy who resides in the River Heights-Fort Garry Ward. Thank you for joining us and serving Council today. We'll now move into morning announcements. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

Mayor Gillingham: Good morning and thank you, Madam Speaker. And welcome to all of our guests today. I want to begin by just expressing on behalf of all Council our sincere condolences to Councillor Shawn Dobson at the passing of his mother, Irene Frances Dobson. In a moment, there's a notice…motion, a condolence motion, that we will be bringing forward. And so, we want to express our sincere condolences to him and to his family. Also, at this time, we…on behalf of all of Council, want to express our profound condolences, also, to the people of Carberry at the...pardon me, the people of Dauphin at the horrible accident that took place near Carberry last week. The loss of 16 lives is just beyond tragic. I had the opportunity to reach out to the mayor of Dauphin and the reeve of the RM of Dauphin on behalf of all of us and the staff at the City of Winnipeg and this council express our sorrow and offer any assistance that we could provide to them at this time. And in times like these, really, we're reminded of the strength of our communities and the vital role that each of us plays in offering support and compassion to our neighbours. As Councillor Mayes pointed out, yesterday was National Indigenous Peoples Day and it was a time of great celebration here in the courtyard. I want to thank our Indigenous Relations Division for their work in organizing the event and putting on a very enjoyable, fun, lively celebration with dancing and music and drumming and singing. I also want to note that Kevin Chief challenged me to learn how to do the Red River jig. And so, I look forward to updating Council on my progress. I'm sure most of you are aware that the Provincial Government has made a commitment to the Kenaston and Chief Peguis Trail projects that were included as part of this council's Strategic Priorities Action Plan. And the Province is sharing in the cost of the next stage of both of these projects, which includes updating the design, cost estimates and also on doing the return on investment study. So, that is coming forward. I want to recognize and thank the Province for their support. I also am encouraged by some of the comments made by our federal partners, and specifically, Minister Vandal, on this project. And our Indigenous partners as well, who spoke, certainly, in favour of updating and moving forward with specifically Route 90. Speaking of federal partners, I want to congratulate Mr. Ben Carr on winning the by-election in the Winnipeg South Centre. Many of us know Ben and know him well. I've had the pleasure of meeting with Ben on several occasions, talking about the priorities of our city. I'm confident that he'll be a strong representative for his riding and for all of Winnipeg and we look forward to carrying on the legacy he established by his father, but look forward, certainly, to working with Ben in his new role. And finally, it's the season of festivals and activities here in the city and we see just not too far from here, the Jazz Fest is set up. And I want to acknowledge the organizers of the Jazz Fest and all the musicians and players who are taking part in it. All the audiences who've already enjoyed many great concerts. I'm looking forward to attending the Latin night tomorrow. And Folk Fest, coming up soon, starts on July 6th. So, there's a lot of great music in our community. I encourage all my colleagues and Winnipeggers to get out and enjoy these fantastic events. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. We have a condolence motion for the mother of Councillor Dobson. Mr. Clerk, would you please read that into the record.

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Lukes,
Seconded by Councillor Duncan,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of Irene Frances Dobson, Mother of Councillor Shawn Dobson, which occurred on May 28, 2023.

This Council extends to Shawn Dobson and his family, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Please rise if you're able for a moment of silence.

MINUTES

Councillor Orlikow moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on May 30th, 2023 be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move in to delegations. Our first delegation is David Grant who is appearing with respect to a number of items on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated June 12th. He's in support of Item 6 regarding 2022 Council Report – Workplace Safety. And in opposition to Item 9 – Funding the Municipal Infrastructure Chair at the University of Manitoba, Item 10 – Tax Increment Financing Grant under the Heritage and Economic Development Incentive Program for the Redevelopment of 325 Broadway Avenue, Item 13 – Human Rights Committee of Council – 2022 Workforce Diversity Report, Item 14 – Implementation of Audit Recommendations Report for the Traffic Signals Branch Performance Audit, November 2010 and Item 10 – Cyber Security Audit Report. And our delegation today is with us via Zoom. Welcome, and you may begin.

DELEGATIONS

David Grant: Thank you. And thank you to Your Worship and councillors. Greetings and welcome today to a summer. We sure needed this rain. I want to thank our predecessor engineers who, before any of us were born, provided the means to bring nature's clean water to our city. On EPC topic No. 6 – Workplace Safety: while rising cost in numbers may seem alarming, we must consider how policies have made things look worse. This is not an epidemic of accidents. We should still seek improvement but not blame worker choices for the scary new numbers. Note that this report is silent on seatbelt use and proper footwear choices; both can have an impact on preventing injurious impacts to our workers. Improvement on usage rates are hard to assess if they are not reported for WPS and other employees. In past years, if you got a cold or the flu, that was a health issue, not a workplace injury. If several decades of living your life your way resulted in a cancer diagnosis, the blame did not automatically fall on your employer. Now, both are considered the city…city hall's fault. The City dealt fairly with its employees before these changes were made. I was a City employee for years in my youth and felt very fairly treated. Taken further, staffing costs could rise even more if these policies accelerate. Can they not limit to act...can we not act to limit this escalation? On a different topic, light duties during a recovery from an injury always seemed like a good idea and they could be accommodated when few workers are involved. Now, we understand that this is a big part of the City's budget. One comment on the report, it seems to be very politically correct and as it strives to do that, I think it fails to fully inform readers about the numbers and the changes and why the numbers have changed. On EPC No. 9 – the City paying for university research. Research can be of great value. I spent a large part of my life doing that sort of materials research. So, I applaud the folks at the university doing this stuff. Have City staff further...have City staff provided any summary to Council of the existing discoveries and public…published works on the topics that this money will explore? This has been in place for a while. Do we have a list of what's been discovered and put in use? Is there evidence that City contractors are now using the latest techniques to extend the life of our public works such as paving? Do we still provide grassy soil high above the level of the median spaces which serve to saturate the base of our roadways? We sure like the look of grass down the middle of our boulevards on our busy roads. Few probably appreciate the fact that when rain and snow melts onto that surface into that grass, it soaks in and therefore weakens the base of our road. If that road was…if that boulevard space was capped and impervious, the road would last longer. Anyway, is the failure to protect the sub of the road why Winnipeg and Manitoba roads fail much sooner than do roads in similar soils and weather conditions? As we claim to advance the state of the art, are we completely missing out on how to build long-lasting roads? Rhetorical question, but I think that's something that's worth pursuing. On EPC 10 – TIF; tax increment as an incentive to modify and develop the federal office building on Broadway. I suggest, with respect, that a developer and a bank in combination have more money available for this job than does city hall. We have been in deficit for some time now, understand. Together, they, the bank and developer can afford to develop the property. That is their job. Others have

swerved out of their lane in the past with programs like TIF. That fact alone is not a good reason to do so again, in my opinion. Of course, developers will take free money if offered, but should this program be universal? Should it be just by vote of Council? Is it offered to greenfield developments like residential subdivision and Costco and to individual homeowners? I believe not. I suspect the selling price for the land is enhanced by promises that TIF will be given to the new owner. Is this sort of implied promise during real estate transactions unethical? Will this building sit vacant forever if TIF is not approved today? I suspect not. Has there ever been an independent report on TIF and its implications for city finances? On EPC No. 13 – the HRCC; this is a huge task. It's a very large, comprehensive report and congratulations on the folks who wrote it. It's very thorough. This report fails to describe how the City will get rid of employees that do not match its demographic targets because that would certainly be the quickest way of meeting targets. It also fails in its governance pages to show how these folks will assure that all best governance practices will not be violated in the future. It fails to even lay out any of these practices, the ones that it will enforce. On EPC14 – audit of the Signals Branch; this was a big deal when it hit the media years ago. The City claims to love public engagement and meetings. Will there be a set of such meetings to explain what happened in the past and how it won't happen in the future? That could be the subject of a series of public meetings like the engagement sessions we have. On EPC15 – cyber security; this is probably the most important topic on your agenda. It seems troubling that it will be accepted, "as information" in the way that other topics have been accepted and not acted on in the past. Can we be assured that these recommendations will be fully put in place before the City is attacked? Will all those with access to City computers be reminded to never click on a dangerous link or picture? That's all I have. And, again, thank you for the time to speak.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions for our delegation? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And once again, thankful for…for Mr. David grant for doing his homework, looking through the agenda, and doing…in his way, assisting us. When it comes to Item No. 9 – Funding Municipal Infrastructure Chair at the University of Manitoba, would Mr. Grant not say that maybe it's a good thing to get a…maybe a third-party consideration on the challenges we have in the construction industry in Manitoba? It's only been a couple of months since I was told in this chamber that my statistics are completely inaccurate from the representative from the Manitoba Heavy Construction Association. Maybe someone from the University of Manitoba or the U of W who's actually contracted in to be part of the process could help resolve these issues as to whether my statistics on construction inflation are completely inaccurate. Wouldn't it be a good place to go to, to challenge this department at the university? To see if that's true if I'm that inaccurate?

David Grant: If I can respond, the work, I believe that the U of M is doing is a lot like the work that I did with Hydro which is pure science, pure materials engineering and not cost comparison and not business case analysis. There is a case for doing that work, that cost work. We know that a decade or two ago, Québec had a problem that they found…the media found and waved around the fact that in Québec, if you wanted to pave a mile of road or build a bridge, it was costing about twice as much as it would have in Toronto. And that was strange and then they found out that there was rapid corruption in their government to industry engineering, whatever you want to call it, that conglomerate and they went about to fix it. But until media analyzed that cost data, nobody knew there was a problem. And as you've mentioned, Councillor Schreyer, there are cost escalations in Winnipeg. We don't know…we, from outside who haven't studied it, don't know for sure if that is cost escalation with carbon taxes, whether it is greed or some other factor, but it certainly is expensive to do things in Winnipeg. The thing that bothered me as a materials person was that when Manitoba roads are built at the same time and on the same soil and similar weather as roads in northwest Minnesota, ours don't last as long. And that has always bothered me and the one issue is that we love our grassy boulevards. That's just a tiny one, but it's certainly something that we could look at. You know, impervious barriers and so on, but we aren't. So, yes, having somebody look at the costs and lifetime and lifetime extension techniques, that would be very worthwhile. We spend a zillion dollars on construction and paving, and if we spent 1/1000 of that on a review, it would probably be money well spent. And thanks for raising the issue.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Based on that excellent answer and based on the fact hat it's been said in this…at city hall in this chamber that we've had construction inflation primarily due to COVID. I never said that. That's not true. I never said that. I never gave those misleading statistics. It's also been said it's because of…because of police pension. I never said that. All right. And since it's not based on oil cost, either, I never said that. You think that the research that the university's going to be done based on this report, based on this contract could lead to greater information by which we can actually have answers to these questions finally? And thank you to Mr. Grant.

David Grant: Yeah, I lack response, I guess. As I started to explain before, the work that the doctor, the Chair of Infrastructure at the university will be doing might be…might be expanded into costs, but I believe he's only an expert in particles and asphalt and stuff like that; materials, engineering. So, I don't think it would be his profession, his specialty, but it certainly could be asked of them, but I think that that would be better to have that…actually, it'd be better done by a

motivated media person to look at costs and so on. But the City could certainly put a task group together. Our Public Works folks have good engineers too, they could look at costs. But I think it's probably unfair to ask the PhD working on paving techniques to look at costs. But thanks for asking.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, David Grant. That concludes questions under your delegation. Our next delegation is Mario Lopes from Rent to H.O.M.E. Inc., who is appearing in support of Item 1, the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated June 1st. It's regarding Delegation of Authority for Demolition Permits for Vacant and Derelict Residential Buildings. If you could please come down to the council floor, please. And welcome.

Mario Lopes: Good morning, Speaker, Your Worship, fellow councillors, how are you? My name is Mario Lopes, and I'm a proud affordable housing provider, landlord. I've decided to take a huge risk in my life and invest in an area called the North End. And it has been a challenge. So, I am extremely happy to see Council moving forward with some new motions here, specifically the one to remove derelict and abandoned properties and homes that, as we know, have become crime scenes where, unfortunately, homeless people, those with addictions have broken into and unfortunately started fires on these properties; either hurt themselves or hurt neighbours. And thus, this is called upon resources of local firefighters, the police departments, and then this caused the City Council to change some rules and now make it where that if there's a fire on the property that is a derelict boarded-up designated home, the landlord of that property, the owner of that property has to pay costs of the fire fighting service. So, this has been in the media. This has cost astronomical amounts to fellow landowners that I know of. And therefore, this motion today, to be able to apply for a demolition permit, to be able to remove the derelict home before it does catch fire and hurt someone, number one, because we don't want anyone to get hurt. And then number two, of course, it is an eyesore to drive around the city of Winnipeg and see these things. And, of course, for the basic…the city of Winnipeg tax base, these do not help. So, landlords like myself, we take a huge risk in investing in an area such as the North End. And the North End has challenges. And when I started to buy up these properties, they were rented. But then people started to break in, they started to steal copper water metres, they started to steal electric wiring from the exterior of these homes. And then, at City Council, made a motion and they moved that scrap yards were no longer able to accept these items. This…I thank you deeply for this new motion because this drastically changed how our properties were handled. It made a huge difference. The crime rates, the break and enters, but unfortunately some landlords like myself, the changes were a little bit too late and we suffered and we went through a lot of break-ins and damages, et cetera, et cetera. And it got to the point where we would fix these things up, then they'd be damaged again. Fix them up, damaged again. And it got to the point where it was just not cost effective. So, what do we do? We board up these homes. We board up these homes and then they become derelict. And then we get the by-law officers visiting us and then we get people dumping illegal trash on our properties. Then we get more by-law officers visiting us. Then we got fines for all these wonderful things. So, as you can see, it's a step by step process that has led us to what is happening today. This council has made great steps forward, as I…as I've explained. This is another positive step forward. I thank you for doing this. I am 100% in support of this. All my fellow other landlords are also very in support of this. But there is a next step and the next step is that once this has passed, it's to get this into the media as quickly as possible to make sure everyone knows about this. And then, number two, is now that you've passed this motion or once it's passed later today, the next step is how do we get these actual derelict homes removed? And if the City were to look at considering possibly some type of a tax increment financing or a loan that could be paid back through property taxes because what happens now is that the landlord has to do an abatement test, an asbestos test first, that has to be cleared and then a demolition permit can be granted. And then, of course, these costs of the abatement and the demolition, of course, as you know, tipping fees are very expensive nowadays, so these can be substantial. So, if there's any way of doing the next step after today's motion is accepted of providing some type of a loan, tax increment financing to get the property removed. And then, once the property's removed and we have a bare piece of land, now the final step is then to, how do we create housing on this piece of land and how do we create affordable housing on this piece of land, right? So, there have been positive steps to get to this point, there's a few more left, but if Council works together, and I'm always willing to help if anyone asks, we can get to the point where we end up with what we want, which is a home on the property which is either a homeowner, a proud homeowner or an affordable housing option. We get an increased assessment of that property. We get increased property taxes from that property. We're housing families. We're moving families back into the area which then support the local schools and the local Mom-and-Pop grocery stores, which keeps them open. So, as you can see, this whole thing is a process. But again, I thank the City for what they've done so far. You know, be it the scrap metal rules, changes, which made a difference, and now the motion that you're voting on today which will be another very important step into helping us achieve this goal which, of course, is to help make the North End safer and other areas of the city safer for all residents in Winnipeg. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. First question, Mayor Gillingham.

Mayor Gillingham: Well, through you, Madam Speaker; I want to thank you, Mr. Lopes for your presentation and for your support of the work that Council is trying to do. And really appreciate you being here today and for your investment in our city as well, in properties. My question I would have is, and I appreciate that you said, ultimately, the goal is to take properties that either are derelict properties or just vacant lots right now and ultimately convert them into housing.

Established housing. There's a shortage of housing across the city, so we need all properties to be places people can live in. So, the question is, now that we're moving towards allowing a demolition permit prior to building plans being submitted, what would you think as a property owner would be a reasonable timeline between demolition and having those building plans submitted? Because, ultimately as Council, we don't want vacant properties sitting there for four, five, six, seven years and nothing being done. So, what would you think, as a property owner, would be a reasonable timeline after demolition to get building plans submitted and then ultimately start building?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mario Lopes: So, what's happened and Council may not be aware of this, but inadvertently due to the changes in the laws regarding the fire department to now being able to charge for their time, this has dramatically decreased the property values of these properties. So, now, if you look at any of the MLS records of sales and you see boarded up, derelict homes, homes that used to be selling for $75,000, $80,000 now are selling for $30,000 if not $20,000 because people don't want to invest in them because they're extremely scared that there could be a fire at any point. And then, of course, they can be charged upwards of six figures, it's not six figures, much more than six figures for these fires. So, the only reason or the only way any type of investor or developer will take a chance is if the price is substantially much lower. So now, to answer your question going forward, is once the property is demolished, we have to take some time for the property values to get back up to where they were. So, unfortunately, they've dropped dramatically and they have to get back up to the point to where they were so that the developer can go to their financial institution and say, okay, what's this property worth now and what can I get in terms of a loan to invest and build something on here? Whether it's a…like, most of these properties in these areas are zoned R1, R2 which is single-family duplex. You can apply for a variance and do something larger on the property, but of course, we have some new infill guidelines that were recently enacted a couple of years ago that have also restricted what you can do with those R2 zonings. So, and as we all know, costs of construction have dramatically increased. But to…a reasonable time, I would say, would be either a year to two years and then some type of an additional fee that would be added to their property tax until something happens. But just understand their perspective that they cannot borrow money in order to build anything whether it's affordable housing or for-profit housing or home ownership housing or whatever it is, even rent to own housing, which is a huge thing in the future. Even modular housing which is the future of affordable housing. It's prebuilt, RTM homes that are set on site. None of this stuff can be done unless there's access to financing. So, we need these values to go back up and unfortunately, one of the decisions Council made, which I understand why, fires were an issue and they were costing the city taxpayers money. Unfortunately, values have dropped dramatically.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We do have a few more questions. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much for coming in delegation today. Madam Speaker, part of that delegation was like a love note to work that Protection, Community Services and Parks has done through the good work of Councillor Eadie last term and others on metals. So, thanks for mentioning that. And I can agree with you more in terms of next steps working with the media on public education and I'm happy to partner with you on that, through the Speaker. I've met with demo companies in order to talk about the timeline that you're concerned with and I'm happy to reach out with a package and make sure that you know the package that is coming from CMHC, National Housing Strategy and the City's own Affordable Housing Now Program, through the Speaker. I just want to make you aware and offer that. The public education on…if you can talk to that importance, is my question on…as your first next step, I can't agree with you more, so I just want to hear a quick, you know, one-minute on why you think that's important.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Mario Lopes: So, just to make sure I understand the question carefully, you wanted me to answer on public education?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins, if you could restate your specific question.

Councillor Rollins: Yeah. Your first ask of this council is to work with you in partnership because you felt that this should be a media issue. I couldn't agree with you more. I've done a fair share of that media myself, focused on the tough as nails approach on derelict and vacant buildings. And I wanted to hear from you why you thought that that was vital, the important too.

Mario Lopes: The reason I think that's…I know that's extremely important is because I happen to belong to a numerous amount of landlord chat groups or landlord investment groups, and it's amazing how many items these people do not know. Like, for example, everyone here on Council probably knows that even before this motion came up today, there was a provision in the act that allowed you to apply for a demolition permit without having a new building permit and you could have been granted the demolition permit given the fact that your property would have been deemed, you know, extremely unsafe or for whatever reason. We had a situation on Wellington Crescent that a home was granted that special

permission. So, but it was…but even though that was part of the act, there were numerous, numerous landlords that just didn't know that this was even there, that this wasn't…that they weren't aware of. So, as much as possible as you can get this into the media and then we can share it amongst our fellow landlords so that they know about this and so that they know this is now coming and they understand that there could be a timeline in place or there could be a fine on your property tax if you don't do anything within a certain amount of years, et cetera, et cetera. But at the same time, if you offer them assistance, or here's a program where you can get assistance, and a lot of the inner-city community groups like the North End, Chalmers, et cetera, they have various programs that help you demolish, for example, a garage in the area. They'll give you some money towards that. So, whatever you can put out there, I will do my best to share it amongst everyone that I know of on my social media, so to speak. But yes, absolutely, we definitely have to make that public so that these people understand that and that they move forward because last time I checked, there's about 680 derelict homes registered and I know one activist, Sel Burrows has done a great job of keeping, you know, on top of all this stuff. And you know, hats off to Mr. Burrows.

Madam Speaker: There's a few more questions. Next is Councillor Chambers, followed by Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good morning, Mr. Lopes. I know that you and I have spoken about this. As a matter of fact, it was at a Bomber tailgating. Prior to the game, we were speaking about your vision or your plan in terms of derelict housing. Could you give us a 30,000-foot view of the plans that you and I had discussed in terms of remediation of a lot of these homes and bringing them back onto the market, whether it's as affordable housing or just market value housing?

Mario Lopes: Thank you. Thank you, Councillor Chambers. So, yes, we spoke briefly about this. At the time when we spoke, this motion was not on the table, so that this was obviously one…part of one of the ideas going forward. But at the end of the day, we have to create housing. What's there now does not pay property tax sufficient to what it should be, right. These...if I build a single-family home on these properties, like let's say, for example, I have a lot on Stella. We've all heard of Stella. Okay, don't get scared, but we've all heard of Stella. And I have property on Stella and if I build a single-family home on this property, property taxes will probably be in the $3,000 range; 50% will go to the City, 50% to the Province, estimated. If I build a duplex, it could be $4,000, so $2,000 each. So, the City obviously is losing substantial resources in property tax revenues from these vacant lots. So, anything that we can do in terms of tax increment financing, I know that the Federal Government has various programs that are either in process or coming down the pipeline either through the Affordable Housing Initiative Fund or through the Co-Investment Fund. Sometimes these are a little challenging to work with. CMHC has a great program through the MLI program. But…

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

Mario Lopes: Thank you. CMHC has a great program through what's called the MLI where you can build multi-family and 20 to 30% of whatever you build has to be affordable. The issue with that is you have to start at a minimum of five units. They will not do anything less than five suites. Well, you take a typical lot in the North End or in the inner-city, 25 feet wide, 100 feet deep, zoned R1 or zoned R2, even if you were to apply for a variance, you're not going to get five suites. So, if there was a version of the MLI Program through the MCHC that was for single-family homes or duplexes, even a rent to own option that could be made available so that…so that, you know, those on lower incomes could become eventual homeowners, there's so many different programs. And any time anyone wants to sit down and talk further, I'm here to give whatever piece of advice, whatever that's worth.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thank you for investing in the community. It's really important that we have people like yourself investing. My question is, you talked about tax increment financing and it's interest to me because the issue that we're having is once demolitions happen, we're not getting the property owners to clean them up. And sometimes with older homes, there could be huge costs if they're made out of brick and all that. How could a tax increment financing or some sort of grant from the City help, because my concern is the City might end up having these properties if…or just leaving them in rubbles. So, how could we grant and provide that support in order for that work to be done? How do you see that working?

Mario Lopes: From what I understand, and again, I'm not 100% sure, is that some of the demolition sites that have not been cleaned up yet, and I know you're probably referring to 694 Sherbrook as an example of an apartment site that's not been cleaned up. And you're right, it's a horrible site to drive by. But sometimes, from what I understand, it's dealing with the insurance providers on those issues. And how do you...the only way to do this would be some type of a loan.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor moves an extension of one minute, if you could wrap-up. Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mario Lopes: Ideally, the only way is either some type of a loan and it would not be paid to the landlord, it would be paid directly to the demolition company so that we ensure the money goes where it's supposed to go immediately and that the demolition company is coming in and removing that debris immediately and then that is added to their property taxes and paid back over a period of time. That's the easiest and fastest way to do this in order to get these things cleaned up for those for whatever reason can't afford to do it on their own.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mario Lopes, for your presentation here today. Thank you.

Mario Lopes: Thank you all. Have a great day.

Madam Speaker: Next is Lindsay Robinson who will be online appearing before Council in support of Item 4 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated June 1st regarding Net Zero Ready Building Code. Welcome to you and you may begin.

Lindsay Robinson: Thank you. Good morning everyone and thank you for allowing me the opportunity to address Council today. I would like to voice my support for Item 4 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development regarding the Net Zero Ready Building Code. Before I discuss the rationale for my support, I would like to offer a bit of background about myself to give context to my perspective. I'm a born and raised Winnipegger and proud Manitoban having lived here my entire life. I'm also a licensed professional engineer who's developed years of experience working in our local aerospace manufacturing industry, but have more recently pivoted my career and spent the last five years as a building energy modeler. In this capacity, I technically work with integrated project teams often consisting of building owners, architects, engineers, net contractors, where my role is to use computer modelling and simulation of the proposed building or retro fit to assess the energy and emissions performance for compliance with the local energy codes, certification, and incentive programs. These models are often used for trade-off at MLCs of different design options that can help the team understand implications for energy use, energy costs, and greenhouse gas emissions over the lifetime of the building. This information can then be used to optimize the project design and strategy for achieving sustainability objectives. I have also undertaken sustainable building in my personal life, as my wife and I have now completed a deep energy retrofit in our 118-year-old home in Wolseley. We retained the original foundation and structure while upgrading the insulation, air sealing, windows and mechanical systems, comparable to those of the passive house standard in order to become net zero energy ready. I firmly believe in the importance of accelerating the adoption of new building energy codes and implementing the highest tiers as quickly as possible. Long-term benefits far outweigh the initial discomfort and challenge taking progressive action in the short-term. While there are indeed additional costs to new high-performance building, implementing the higher energy efficiency tiers can save building owners and renters money on their energy bills but crucially avoid difficult, disruptive, and expensive retrofits in future. Recurring energy cost savings are crucial for affordable housing as well and addressing the concerns of energy poverty among low-income citizens. The importance of good indoor air quality has become increasingly evident in light of the COVID pandemic and wildfire smoke events experienced in recent years. Energy efficiency measures such as improved building airtightness and high-performance ventilation can remove indoor pollutants as well as (inaudible) to the infiltration of outdoor contaminants such as smoke, enhancing the overall indoor air quality of the building. Another important benefit is the improved thermal comfort, particularly cold snaps. A well insulated and airtight building with energy recovery ventilation is inherently less susceptible to these types of extreme weather events and is able to maintain a greater degree of comfort for occupants. Together, these aspects result in a healthier and (inaudible) working environment, improving productivity for workers, to learning outcomes for students, as well as satisfaction for all. Energy efficiency in buildings also plays a vital role in protecting the electrical grid. By reducing our overall energy consumption, the demand on the grid during peak times is better managed, reducing the risk of disruptive power outages. When a lower demand for energy is coupled with the integration of renewable energy sources, such as solar, we benefit from not only enhanced grid resilience but also avoid or possibly delay the extremely costly expansion of our hydro electric generating capacity. Rapidly adopting the higher performance tiers of the new building energy code will contribute to our local economy by generating demand for high quality building products such as insulation, windows, doors and efficient HVAC systems. All of which are designed and manufactured here in Winnipeg and surrounding communities in Manitoba. These industries are both ready and willing to produce high-performance products, but they require sufficient market demand to do so, much of which is driven by the minimum requirements of the building codes. Building professionals such as architects and engineers routinely provide technical services both within and outside of Manitoba will also benefit from the increased local demand for their services, but this will also be in a better position to maintain their experience and skill set to remain competitive outside of the province as well where we compete with those across the country and around the world. And finally, energy efficient building allows us to take meaningful climate action by reducing a significant portion of our greenhouse gas emissions. Investing in energy efficiency through building codes at the outset saves money in the building's life cycle and reduces our exposure to carbon tax payments and fluctuations in energy prices. Manitoba is not new to building better, but our current codes are now

woefully outdated and we need to take action to stay competitive in the rapidly progressing environment. Investments in energy conservation and efficiency are investments in our future. In the face of climate change and energy uncertainty, old efforts in conservation are, in fact, the most prudent and responsible course of action. The city of Winnipeg can become part of the solution by calling upon the Province for immediate adoption of the latest building codes and endorsing the rapid progression to the highest tiers to achieve net zero ready buildings as soon as possible. Taking these steps today will help mitigate the risks and reap the benefits of a more sustainable city and province for decades to come. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any questions? Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. Are you aware, through the Speaker, that currently the Manitoba government has submission deadline for June 26th, an extension of their consultation on the building code? As you know…as you may know, they announced that they would be going to tier one. They have extended it till midnight at June 26th, and that's still an open provincial consultation that is open this month. Are you aware?

Lindsay Robinson: Yes.

Councillor Rollins: And second question...

Lindsay Robinson: And I participated in that consultation as well.

Councillor Rollins: Great. And are you aware that that's the place that has the legislation, so that that's a critical time for voices to be carried. I understand your question for this council is to join the cacophony of voices that wants more than tier one that the government is currently proposing, but are you aware that there is a deadline for submissions and can you tell this council what you said to the Provincial Government, you know, in your submission?

Lindsay Robinson: Yeah, for sure. And I did participate in that consultation. And, yes, I'm definitely aware of the deadline. And I essentially iterated all of these same points that by adopting higher tiers, we are saving ourselves some re-training, the falling behind, the lagging behind the overall industry in Canada. There are numerous benefits which I just outlined both for citizens benefiting from healthier homes and healthier work places, but also for our economy, stimulating good paying stable jobs, manufacturing a whole host of economic benefits as well as the critically important piece of contributing to climate action.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Seeing no further questions…oh, one more, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Regardless of the vote today, this issue's not going to go away. As a matter of fact, Councillor Allard has another motion. So, the conversation's going to keep going. And I want to ask Mr. Robinson, what he thinks are the...is the major factor or two that creates resistance against the motion for net zero ready building code, for advancing it to the extent of which we're speaking today?

Lindsay Robinson: Yeah. My belief is that there are probably certain groups which do not quite understand the total cost of ownership, essentially saying that, let's look at a building not just at the…in relation to the cost that we have to do initially outlay to build that building, but let's consider the costs for regular maintenance, repair, renewal, as well as the energy costs. When we take a look at the total cost of ownership, we find that building high performance buildings is the more financially sound course of action. So, that's important education for the industry and the general public at large. And I believe that the resistance is in part not a lack of understanding of that concept, as well as somewhat the less tangible aspects where it's much easier to sell a homeowner on granite countertops and upgrades to their kitchens and bathrooms because these are "sexy" elements to their house, whereas the insulation and air seal are inherently less visible aspects, but nonetheless, crucial ones to long-term financial viability in that building, but also to the thermal comfort which is something that it's not always easy to convey for homeowners or building owners to appreciate.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question or second question, rather.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, would Lindsay Robinson say that given over the course of a 20…25-year-old mortgage, that even though the mortgage would be higher due to the costs of such upgrades in the construction, that in that 20 to 25-year period, there would be...you would have the matching reduction in maintenance cost over that same generation so that it evens out in costs during the cost of the mortgage?

Lindsay Robinson: I would say it definitely depends on a wide variety of factors. So, that building has to be designed appropriately from the first place and, you know, energy modelling and such tools would be ones to use to select particular solutions so that you can be assured that your investment is a good one. So, over the lifetime of the building is where I

would advocate that one truly look, possibly not over the 20, 25-year mortgage. Depending on what solutions are undertaken, that payback may or may not be there after 20 years.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question.

Councillor Schreyer: And yet, at the same time, some of them are. Would you know geo thermal and how long it takes to get your payback from a geo thermal investment?

Lindsay Robinson: Certainly. Geo thermal I would advocate as the ideal energy source for heating and cooling all types of buildings in Manitoba, particularly given our extremes in cold weather climate. Geo thermal will outperform all other technologies currently available. As far as payback, I have heard anywhere in the 7 to 30-year range for geo thermal. So, it really depends on the application. So, for example, by building a high-performance building, we'd lower the loads of the building and, essentially, the need for heating and cooling. By doing so, we can put in a smaller HVAC system, a smaller geo thermal field or a smaller inner-source heat pump to meet those loads. And that piece of equipment, albeit smaller, is inherently less costly, so therefore, we can achieve our payback in shorter periods of time.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Seeing no further questions, that concludes our delegation.

Lindsay Robinson: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, that concludes this delegation. Yes. Next is Mark Newman of Fillmore Riley, who is appearing in support of Item 6 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated June 1st. It's regarding an Amendment to the Proposed Lease Agreement between the City of Winnipeg and the Winnipeg Goldeyes Baseball Club Inc. Welcome.

Mark Newman: Good morning to all, Mr. Mayor, councillors. As noted, I'm Mark Newman and I appear in support of the recommendation of EPC. I have told previous committees on appearance that I was born in 1954 and I am 69 years old. And I said then, why does anybody care? Well, because 1954 is the year the Winnipeg Goldeyes, then a farm team of the St. Louis Cardinals of the National League of Major League Baseball started to play in Winnipeg. And they played at the old Winnipeg Stadium on St. James, which was built primarily as a football stadium, but also had at the south end, a dedicated grandstand built for baseball with proper dugouts. And that's important to have in mind. That team stayed until 1964. It went. There was no professional baseball in Winnipeg. In 1970, the Montreal Expos placed their AAA farm team, the top level of professional baseball outside of the major league, into Winnipeg, the Winnipeg Whips, and they stayed for two years. And they played out of that grandstand at the south end of the football field on St. James Street and then they disappeared. And then there was no professional baseball in Winnipeg until 1994. But because the grandstand at the south end of the old football stadium was demolished to make way for the clubhouse for the Winnipeg Blue Bombers, when the Winnipeg Goldeyes came back in 1994, they stayed…they played out of that old football stadium in the northwest corner of that stadium was home plate and it was a sorry excuse for a baseball field and stadium. Move forward five years, funded substantially by private funding, the new stadium, the present stadium that we have in downtown Winnipeg was built and a 25-year lease was entered into with Riverside Park Management Inc. as the tenant. And that's primarily what we're here to talk about today is the continuation of Riverside Park Management Inc. as the tenant. It has been the tenant for 25 years. That lease expires in about 36 days. And so, why is this important? It's important because the Goldeyes over the years, now coming upon their 30th anniversary of beginning to play, having had just under six million fans come into the present stadium, it's important that that asset to the city, part of the amenities the city has the benefit of, it's important that Council recognize the value and benefit of that asset to the city as a whole, but it's also important that Council recognize the need for that type of facility to continue to be improved, enhanced, and to do so in an accelerated way. Let us keep in mind that that asset, that ball park. ultimately, it belongs to the city of Winnipeg. And it belongs ultimately to the citizens of the city of Winnipeg. So, EPC at its meeting on June 12th, made a recommendation. We are here to support that recommendation and to ask that Council in its wisdom give approval to that recommendation. And again, the primary issue that I am speaking to is the question of the identity of the tenant, Riverside Park Management Inc., as it has been for the last 25 years. Why is that important? It's important because the Province of Manitoba has made available a wide variety of grant opportunities to cultural, sport and various organizations of that type. Grants have been given to a wide variety of organizations to enhance their venues and that is the purpose of having Riverside Park Management as the tenant under the lease. It creates the opportunity for grants to be given to enhance the facility, to improve the facility and to accelerate those enhancements. Like your home, things wear out over time, things need to be replaced. There is no cost whatsoever to the city of Winnipeg in allowing Riverside Park Management to remain as the tenant as it has been for 25 years. Keep in mind, as I've said, that ultimately, it is the City of Winnipeg that is the owner of this property. So, essentially, what you are doing, at no cost to the City, is creating the opportunity to enhance and improve an asset that the City ultimately owns. The facility is used in addition to baseball for a wide variety of charitable events. The Field of Dreams Foundation has put near to $3 million into various city organizations. Baseball Manitoba holds events there. The women's national team holds events there. CIBC Run for the Cure, Cerebral Palsy Stationary Bike Race, the Canada Day

living flag; a whole variety of events occur at this facility and ultimately, this is to the benefit of all including the citizens and the City of Winnipeg itself. So, finally then, I will say to you simply, keep in mind it's ultimately your asset. There's absolutely no cost to the City in going along with the recommendation made by EPC. It enhances and improves the asset and facilitates a baseball team remaining in Winnipeg. And the reason, again, I told you about the prior stadiums and how they disappeared is so that you have in mind the importance of a proper facility which allows professional baseball to be played. So, I'm happy to answer any questions, but those are my submissions to you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Newman for your persistence on this. Many of us thought we had this lease extended back three years ago and we had a good debate here on the floor of the council. Not quite yet. So, here we are 30 days before the expiry of a lease in the middle of a baseball season. So, one of the changes we've made, of course, was to have the lease expire after the 2038 season so Council of the day wouldn't be…wouldn't face exactly this scenario. Thank you for mentioning…as a former Winnipeg Whips fan myself, that team came and went. In fact, the Montreal Expos, the parent club, came and went, as well. But the stadium that you're referring to that was built roughly 25 years ago, hosted the '99 Pan Am games, also hosted the 2017 Canada Games, it is…it's a confusing situation to people. It is on City land, and therefore, should our tenants depart, we'd have to maintain it, but the actual construction of the stadium involved not just public money, there was some public money. I think you talked about this briefly at EPC, but there was also private investment made. So, I think that's important as a sort of context as we go forward and consider the point you're making, which is about…the lease to-date has been with Riverside, that was the amendment made by EPC was to continue it. But just about the construction of the stadium itself was not all…it was in part public money, but there was also private.

Mark Newman: That's correct. Substantially private funding. Thank you, councillor.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to the delegation; I was wondering if the delegation could clarify who is Riverside Park Management? Who is on the board? What is their financial statements? Are these financial statements publicly available? What is the current asset and liability balance sheets of the organization?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, one question at a time.

Councillor Allard: Okay, well I think detailed questions about the organization, because what I have is a report that says the name and nothing else.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Mark Newman: So, Councillor Allard, what I can indicate to you, of course, is that Riverside Park Management has been the tenant since the outset, continues to be today. Certainly, the ball park itself, which is the field and all the improvements, the stands, everything that you see in the ball park is part of the balance sheet of Riverside Park Management. I'm not familiar with the entirety of the income statement or the balance sheet, but I tell you simply that it operates as a non-profit corporation and that's what I can tell you.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Next question, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. More specifically, who is Riverside Park Management? Who is on the board? Who stands to benefit from this transaction?

Mark Newman: So, ultimately, no one stands to benefit in the sense that Riverside Park Management is a non-profit corporation. It does not earn a profit. What happens ultimately, is the facility is improved if the opportunity is allowed for grants to be given. And ultimately, I would say to you that the citizens of Winnipeg as a whole and the City of Winnipeg as well as the ultimate owners of the facility are the people who benefit.

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

Councillor Allard: Okay, thank you. If Riverside Park Management may apply for grants, may Riverside Park Management not apply for grants on behalf of a third party?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Mark Newman: The simple answer is that the lease must be in the name of Riverside Park Management and that's why the…this matter is before you today. That is a condition of the program.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair. Through you to the delegation; you know, the ball park is a downtown amenity. And as such, we're working feverishly to bring more and more residents to the downtown area. Has river…Riverside Park Management considered other options or other events such as concerts or night markets to bring people downtown when it's not in use for sporting events?

Mark Newman: So, I can tell you, certainly, that concerts have occurred in that facility from time to time. I've been there myself on occasion at some of those concerts. There are a variety of charitable organizations that I mentioned earlier that use that facility for their events. And absolutely, consideration is given to bringing as many events as possible and as many people as possible into downtown Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Yes, and thank you for that response. The growth of cricket in our city has grown exponentially. I know that myself and Councillor Lukes and Councillor Mayes, we've made significant investments in cricket pitches across our city, La Barrier Park being one. Maples area, I believe, has cricket fields. Has there been any engagement with those who, you know, and I don't follow cricket as closely as potentially I should, noting that it's played heavily in Jamaica as well, but has there been any consultation with any of the communities that play cricket to potentially host, you know, national or international cricket events at that venue as well?

Mark Newman: I do not know the answer to that. But certainly, councillor, through your question, you've made known that possibility and I can tell you that living near to Assiniboia Park, I do see from time to time and do watch from time to time the cricketeers, if that's the right term, I'm not sure that it is. But I watch them from time to time playing in the park on the fields on the main road off of Corydon. But certainly, you've made known that possibility.

Councillor Chambers: Great. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question is Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Happens to be that my father was scouted by the St. Louis Cardinals, I believe, in 1954 to join their farm team. What happens after that, you're going to find out in his autobiography. And I'll leave it to that. And I think he sees himself as being a…would have been a future Cito Gaston or Tommy Lasorda, that kind of…that kind of figure. But I wanted to note, do you have any other ideas in which the use of this facility could be further optimized given the discussion and what you've already said today?

Mark Newman: So, again, certainly, the team and Riverside are always sensitive to opportunities for the community to use the facility. And again, through your question, you've again made known the need to continue with that consultative process and I'm…it will be done.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: Yeah, I'm just looking at the motion here and I was listening to your presentation. I'm just seeking some clarification. In your presentation earlier, you had mentioned that the tenant for 25 years was Riverside Management. When I look at the document in front of me, it states that it is actually Winnipeg Goldeyes Baseball Club Inc. So, if you could please clarify because if the lease agreement is with Winnipeg Goldeyes public, why are you saying that the tenant has always been Riverside Management for the past 25 years?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Mark Newman: So, the lease documentation, as it was prepared initially, signed, executed and continues to this day, is a lease between the City of Winnipeg and Riverside Park Management. Riverside in turn allows the use of the facility and that's the intention, to be clear, so when Council approves, if hopefully you do, the EPC recommendation, let us be clear that the ultimate occupant and user of that facility for baseball…professional baseball purposes will be the Winnipeg Goldeyes. But the simple answer to your question is, legally, Riverside Park Management Inc. has always been the tenant, that is our request that it continue. The user for professional baseball purposes has been the Winnipeg Goldeyes.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, that concludes our questions for today. Thank you for your presentation. We'll now move in to reports. First, we have the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated June 12th, 2023. Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 12, 2023

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to be pulling Item No. 7. So, with that said, I will introduce the report and move adoption of Items 1 to 6, 8 to 15.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 7 is City of Winnipeg Rapid Housing Initiative. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Item 10, please.

Madam Speaker: Item 10 – TIF under the Heritage and Economic Development Incentive Program. With that, I'll call the question on...

Mayor Gillingham: Sorry. Councillor Wyatt.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt. 9 – Funding the Municipal Infrastructure Chair. Okay. Calling the vote on 1 through 6, 8, 11, 12 through 15. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 7 – City of Winnipeg Rapid Housing Initiative (RHI) Round 3 Update

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor on Item 7.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, I pulled this because this is a good news story. And in this report, you'll see that what this is about is providing more housing in the city of Winnipeg and specifically housing to individuals that may be vulnerable or, really, we would say as Council, we've talked about before, perhaps in this case, where most needed. This is a collaborative effort. You see the Federal Government Rapid Housing Initiative Funding, their envelope of funding. I've said it before, I want to take the opportunity again to express appreciation to the Federal Government for their investment in housing and the building of housing across Canada and certainly within the city of Winnipeg. I want to recognize the partnership of the organizations who were successful proponents. We note in the report, there were twelve applicants, four are being approved for the total of building 57 units. And the names of the organizations: Manitoba Metis Federation, Wahbung Abinoonjiiag, University of Winnipeg Community Renewal Corporation and Spence Neighbourhood; all successful applicants with great ideas to build housing. And housing, if we note here, units for transitional housing for Indigenous youth aging out of care. Units targeting and helping Indigenous women and their children. Units of transitional housing for youth experiencing homelessness. And so, we know right now there are just too many people that are vulnerable. Too many people experiencing, for example, homelessness on our streets and they need housing, they need housing with wrap around supports. And these organizations are not only going to provide the housing, but provide the wrap around supports for individuals as well. And so, in the case, for example, of people struggling, that are unsheltered right now and homeless, if they're struggling with addiction, those supports, you know, will be there for them. If they need access to identification and EIA, any other provincial or federal program, those supports are going to be there. Issues around mental health, issues…those supports will be there. And so, this is a very good news story. I also want to recognize, in part here, the Province of Manitoba also is playing a role. This is the kind of collaborative effort and investment that it's going to take in our city to tackle the challenges we have. And so, it's a very good news story today and I'm really pleased that we as a Council have prioritized housing and playing our part at the City of Winnipeg. I also want to recognize our City staff including our CAO, Mr. Michael Jack, our Deputy CAO, Ms. Moira Geer, and her entire team for the efforts they have put in to work with organizations so they can be successful in their application and building housing that will support individuals in our community. More to come, but this is great news today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Browaty, you have the floor.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise today in support of the report of phase 3 of the Rapid Housing Initiative. I'd like to thank the Federal Government for stepping up to provide proper housing for some Winnipeggers in the greatest need. While I believe we need early…earlier interventions to help people…to help prevent people from falling into the downward spiral of poverty and addictions, some people continue to need supports. While these housing initiatives initially have eye bulging costs for housing unit, it's important to recognize that they provide ongoing full wrap around supports. I also thank former Mayor Brian Bowman in ensuring that we make sure that Winnipeg

takes advantages…take advantage of these federally funded programs while with community partners without permanently downloading the responsibility of housing to the City. During a heated debate on Facebook on the day of our last Council meeting, I referred to my belief that we need to double down on our responsibility as a municipal government to protect law abiding citizens on the public ground and on Winnipeg Transit. In response to a posted comment about the City's financial challenges, there was a suggestion that defunding the police should be considered. In response to that, I used a very poor choice of words to describe the condition of some fellow Winnipeggers. These are Winnipeggers that I witness in distress that day when waiting for the bus to pick up my car from servicing. Addictions can be a terrible thing and affect people in various walks of life. I apologize to you, my council colleagues, and to Winnipeggers. It was a terrible choice of words. Our city has serious challenges with addictions, public safety and crime. Programs like the Rapid Housing Initiative with wrap around supports is part of the solution. We need to tackle these issues head-on and not duplicate programs that have failed in other jurisdictions. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: I just want to thank Councillor Browaty for his explanation. I also want to say that it's hard to find the right words because it's hard to understand the issue. And on that basis, he's got more than my sympathy. We need empathy on this issue. We need empathy all around, including for those of us who are trying to explain it in venues like this. It's not an easy issue. It's not an easy issue for Councillor Browaty to talk about this today either.

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

Mayor Gillingham: You can call the question, Madam Speaker. And I want to thank Councillor Browaty, also, for his explanation and his apology. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Question on Item 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 6, or pardon me, 9.

Item 9 – Funding the Municipal Infrastructure Chair at The University of Manitoba

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, if you'd like to introduce Item 9.

Mayor Gillingham: I'll wait to hear from my colleagues. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, good morning. I rise to speak to this item. I recall when we established this as a council some time ago in terms of funding this position with the University of Manitoba joint funding. I've read the report which is rather thin in terms of deliverables. I know this was a big thing for the previous mayor who is quite proud of his former alma mater. And I would have thought a lot of the stuff that's being reported on here appears to be, even though there's only a one line for each item that was achieved, somewhat administrative in terms of harmonization, implementation planning…of plans, not a lot of meat on this bone so to speak. So, I'm concerned that we are giving a gift of $50,000 a year for the next two years to the University of Manitoba and I really don't see a lot of deliverables in terms of out of the box innovative, scientific developments to assist us with infrastructure. And you know, whether or not we're developing best practices, whether it's bringing in new technologies, I don't see any of that here in this report. And furthermore, I think it should be pointed out, because I think it's quite appropriate to point out, the fact that it was in 2000 or 2001 shortly after the election of then Premier Gary Doer that the Provincial Government unilaterally, without consulting any municipalities of this province, decided that universities should not have to pay property taxes. Instantly. Instantly. It hit the City of Winnipeg's bottom line by over $6 million, $6.5 if I'm going from memory here, but it was well over $6 million. Do we still provide services as a municipality to University of Manitoba, University of Winnipeg, St. Boniface College, Red River? If they have a fire, we respond. If they need a medical call, we respond. If they need road repair, we respond. Services, municipal services are being responded to constantly to the universities, to the up…to the colleges of higher learning, madam…Madam Chair. And yet, they don't pay any property tax. What does that mean? It means that the average ratepayer of the city of Winnipeg is actually going to…is paying that bill on behalf of the universities. That was what, 20 something years ago? What's the value today? What would be the tax that we would be collecting today, and yet, on top of that, we're giving them a $50,000 gift without, from what I can see, much deliverables here. I'm concerned. I'm concerned about the fact that we may just be, you know…you know, it's a nice thing we're doing and everybody likes to receive a grant, including the universities. But I can't support this today, Madam Chair. I'd like to see some more details in terms of deliverables of what this is actually generating for us in terms of outcomes and how it's helping the department of Public Works in terms of technology and products and in terms of what we are doing and maybe the chair or anybody else can enlighten me on that today. I'd like to hear it. However, in light of the fact that we are…we had a hit to our budget that literally overnight, and I've got to say, the municipalities of Manitoba, not just Winnipeg because it's hit Brandon as well, you know, through the municipal association at the time, President Stu Briese, may he rest in peace, spoke and

fought strongly in opposition to this, but we were not successful because it was literally done as a way for the Province to help balance their books with the university on the backs of the citizens of Winnipeg. And it's still there. And yet, we provide services to them every year without any taxes being paid. Now, when…every Winnipegger in Winnipeg love for their taxes to be wiped out…property…well, that's what happened with the universities across this province. Thanks…thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Okay. Remember what I was saying about an hour and a half ago, right. That was that we have a pretty good partnership with U of Winnipeg and we've had a pretty good partnership with U of Manitoba. I know former Mayor Bowman ran on that in 2014, having more of a partnership with the universities. I won't dispute Councillor Wyatt's history, I will add, 2011, capital budget included a grant to U of Winnipeg for the…what became the Ax for the center which is…had a lot of public access and I'm sure we've all been to activities at the Axworthy Fitness Center over the years. That was viewed as a kind of partnership between the City of Winnipeg and others. It's also a capital grant to a third-party which I was told when I got here that we don't do, but that's some other budget debate to be had. I'm voting in favour of this. We've had a pretty good partnership with U of M on this. We've also had…we're in year eight of a five-year grant, I'm not sure how that worked out. In any event, this was an initiative of former Mayor Bowman that I think is worth considering or continuing just as I think the initiative that we started with U of Winnipeg that we talked about an hour and a half ago, the reconciliation project, the inner-city work study is a project worth continuing. Not everyone on City staff agrees with me on that. They seem to support this grant and that's fine. But I'll…I certainly would be looking at our next budget to make sure that, you know, that the grantee of Winnipeg survives if this one's going to survive as well. I think we have had a pretty good partnership with the universities. I'm sure we would all like to see that running track at CMU. Well, maybe not all of us, but some of us would like to see a running track project at Canadian Mennonite U. Maybe I'll…maybe I'll be here long enough to see that. But I think…I think Councillor Wyatt's entitled to his view and that's one view of looking at it. The other view is to say, hey, we've had a pretty good partnership with the post-secondary institutions. You saw an example of that literally in person here earlier today. So, I'll be supporting this…this grant…this extension of grant today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, may I yield to the other speakers before I speak, if that's okay?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. I'd like to move lay over for this item to Public Works.

Madam Speaker: Move referral?

Councillor Lukes: Referral to Public Works.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes moves referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works.

Councillor Lukes: Can I explain why? Can I explain why?

Madam Speaker: Yeah, there's no instructions. We'll just call for the vote. All in favour? And there was call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Orlikow, Santos, Schreyer, Wyatt, and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillors Allard and Rollins

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And the item is...will be on the agenda for the next Public Works meeting. Mr. Clerk, next item.

Item 10 – Tax Increment Financing Grant under the Heritage and Economic Development Incentive Program for the Redevelopment of 325 Broadway Avenue

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I look forward to hearing the comments of others but I'll just simply say that this is an investment in our downtown. There's been a lot of focus, there will continue to be a lot of focus in reinvesting in Winnipeg's downtown to get more people living in the downtown, more people visiting the downtown, more economic activity in the core of our city which is critical to the health of our entire city. And so, I welcome this report here before us. We, in the last term of Council, did adopt a tax increment financing policy and a lot of it is focused, not exclusively, but a lot of it is focused in our downtown to try to incentivize and encourage the development and redevelopment of properties in the center of our city. So, I look forward to the discussion and debate on this item and I will…I will be supporting the report.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in…I rise because I'm not supporting the motion that's in front of us here today. I'm on the other side of things. It's unfortunate, I feel…I struggled when we came up with the TIF program to allow it to go to Economic Development, I really struggled with that and this is a clear reason why. We have 10 million within the downtown and what we really need to invest in housing and getting people to live down there. And that maybe includes some investment into some parks and stuff that we really need to entice people to live downtown. Now, if we were to have people downtown…living downtown, we wouldn't need any kind of incentive for a hotel. We have hotels going up all over the city. There's a lot being built within the Polo Park that haven't asked a dime from the City. And here we're giving a grant, $1.4 million out of our $10 million, to provide to a business that is making money. Now, I know that there's…you know, that they talk about the economic development, they talk about, you know, it's going to bring in more staff, but the fact is that what we need is people actually living downtown. So, I don't think this is a good use of our money when we only have $10 million. Out of that $10 million, we've already used up some, so I think we're down to $6 million and some, in order to build…to build housing downtown. And that's not very much. So, I really encourage us to really take a look at this and say, okay, we only have a little bit of money and where should we be prioritizing that. And that is investing in getting people to live downtown and investing in the areas in which would have people wanting to live downtown, whether that is a park or making enticements to a space, incentives to a space. What we don't need to provide is a business. We wouldn't be needing this if we weren't in the situation we're in. They would not be asking for a grant. A hotel would be able to build this and build it they would if we were to have a downtown that had people living there, working there, and playing there. So, I think that our money could be better spent in building actual housing, so that's why I'm not supporting this. If we had more money, then maybe I would look at this differently, but we don't. There was $10 million set aside for downtown which only leaves about $6 million left and I feel like we need a lot more money in that…more money than that to do the housing that we need to make a downtown that's exciting for people to live. So, that's…that's my vote today. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I stand in support of this report. This building, Madam Speaker, is something that was left by the Federal Government when they vacated the Canada Revenue Agency space on Broadway. And for some time, it has been left vacant. It's something, an adaptation that we want to see on Broadway. This is a signature cultural route. It is a…it is a street that we just invested a tribute, a fountain to the people of Shoal Lake. It is a street that at one end you can understand through the legislature building and walk all the way down to the place making Union Station and stop at hotels, coffee shops, bagel shops, donut shops all along the way, hopefully, Madam Speaker. I'm a little surprised to hear from my colleague from Daniel Mc., Madam Speaker, because I know she did support the Downtown Economic Investment Strategy that we passed last term that prioritizes the downtown by leveraging private and public investments, including housing, of course, Madam Speaker. And you won't find any arguments on the majority of the use of TIF for housing from me, but entrepreneurship, arts, entertainment and tourism that advance Winnipeg's status as an economic driver. This does exactly that, Madam Speaker. It's an excellent project. It's an adaptation of CRA building which is a gift and I'm hoping for full support from Council. And to that end, I do want to call for a recorded vote when time comes, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to rise to say that I will be supporting the report. Though I do want to recognize the concerns expressed by Councillor Gilroy and thank her for raising them. And you know, again, we used to have an office of housing that the previous mayor eliminated. We used to have an office dedicated. We used to have a single (inaudible) with the Province of Manitoba, previous mayor eliminated it. And so, we asked the Public Service

to be doing things on housing and affordable housing and housing downtown, and the vehicle to actually deliver that has been eliminated by the previous administration. So, I definitely hear what Councillor Gilroy is saying. I will be supporting the report because, as Councillor Rollins mentioned, I think this is a good project for the revitalization of downtown, but I definitely understand the point that was raised by the other councillor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, I'd like to join Councillor Gilroy in opposing this initiative. I think there are limited resources and I think the way to fix the downtown is to have people living downtown and I don't think another hotel is going to fix that. And I'd agree with everything else that Councillor Gilroy had to say. Thanks.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. I'm rising to support this project. This project will bring employment to downtown. It will bring opportunities for people to have jobs. We need to have a balance. We need housing downtown. We've got incredible funding coming down from the Federal Government. We've got relationships with the Province. I think…I think we need to have the opportunities to bring employment to create revenue, to put money back into the economy and I think we need a bit of a balance. So, while I hear my colleagues' concerns about housing, I also know on the horizon there are tens of millions coming towards the city for housing, for affordable housing. So, I'm going to support this project. It's a very innovative, creative project. We have so many great bones in our city with the art gallery, with the Human Rights Museum. We've got a lot of activity going on downtown and I think this will be another great catalyst for development.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Rollins: I understand that Mayor Bowman isn't part of the Council anymore, but in so far as it was said on the floor that he eliminated the housing unit, when really, it was a provincial upload.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins, thank you. There was no names mentioned, I think, in what I heard.

Councillor Rollins: He said previous mayor, Madam Speaker. So, that's why I'm standing in a point of privilege. It may not extend, Madam Speaker, in your ruling to a previous member of Council, but in terms of a point of privilege, I am standing just to say that that's factually incorrect. It was, you know, our housing unit was uploaded and, in fact, last term, we did actually put money back into housing staff, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Noted. Councillor Schreyer, you're the next speaker.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I truly appreciate the debate on this one. Very good points are made all around. Everyone's essentially offering good information by which we need to make our decision and the people of Winnipeg need to take heed of this. We do have a problem downtown. We have a problem in terms of encouraging housing. We also have a private enterprise asking for specific help. Councillor Gilroy made the point, though, that our hotels are built in the city, they're built in the downtown area essentially near the airport, they're not asking for this kind of help. Now, bear in mind, we've…I've been saying for years, it happened…it was happening before I got elected, that we've got a problem with the cost of construction. They're only getting worse. They've got…they were getting worse before I got elected. They've been getting worse while I've been elected. They're getting worse right now. They're going to get worse next year. So, it's not merely within the public sector, I never said that. So, we're seeing it here. We're going to see no...we'll see more and more. If you're conscious of it, you'll see that our concerns end up being related to the cost of construction and you're going to be seeing over the next number of years, not just this year, through this term, how it's getting worse and the issues we're dealing with ultimately have to do with our limited budget, more increasingly limited budget, despite the fact we're increasing our taxes, reducing our services and going further into debt, and I mean selling more debentures. So, now we're seeing it in this issue as well. We have to prioritize between putting in housing in the downtown area or encouraging, as we said, use of excellent bones, as Councillor Lukes has said, promoting entrepreneurialism, our downtown and for tourism. So, now, we're…we have to make a decision; does our downtown funding go towards housing or does it go towards encouraging people to be downtown, which is healthy for our city, which is healthy for our downtown? If we don't encourage people from not downtown to come downtown, that's bad for our downtown. It's bad for our city. And here we car…we are…we come to the crux. So, this is how I'm seeing it. We need to encourage, as it's already been expressed by previous councillors, to use the shops, to use the bones, to use our amenities downtown, not just for Winnipeggers to come to their downtown, but for tourists as well, from people from outside the city to come here and enjoy our city with us. And that is, to me, the crux of it. But I'm just going to let you know, this debate's going to get harder and harder on all sorts of the issues we're dealing with as the costs are getting worse and worse. The least we can do during these debates, which are only going to get worse, every single Council meeting while we're all councillors, it's never, ever going to get better until we reckon, until we give an accounting for it, and we've never done that. We've voted against it in

this council chamber to get an idea of why construction costs are going up at a rate that is unprecedented and doesn't…and nothing else compares to it. And how many times do I have to say this, because…well, I'm going to say it so people understand. I'll say it again, we've heard in this council chamber it's the police budget. It's not the police budget. That's not true. And anybody can back me up on this. We say it's COVID. Well COVID for how many years of something that's been happening for decades. We're paying the piper now, happens to be coincidentally just after a COVID bout. Okay, so let's deal. We're dealing with this. We're in…we're in…in conflict with each other over priorities, and this is going to happen all the time, sure. But in this case, why? It's the cost. But you know what, Madam Speaker, I've got a hard time sometimes with the subsidies that we give in the city, I really do. And I question them. Because we could be doing something better than, you know, where does the money go, Madam Speaker? Where does it go? Well, sometimes we need accounting for that. And sometimes when you get an accounting, people might not agree. Oh, it shouldn't go, you know, to make the rich richer. You know, you shouldn't waste your money on people that can't even help themselves. Whatever, Madam Speaker. These debates continue. Madam Speaker, what I do know is, well, everybody's right. You know, everybody's concerns are right here. It's true and we have to admit that. So, today we've got to make a decision. And on this one, because it's really close, I'm not enjoying this and it's only going to get worse, Madam Speaker. I'm going to encourage people to come downtown on this one. I'm going to encourage the development of our downtown area for the sake of everyone, but that include…including people coming in from the suburbs into their downtown and including bringing wealth from the suburbs downtown through people spending time downtown and to encourage tourism from those outside the city, from anywhere else in the province, the country, the world to come downtown and that means coming to Broadway. It is my favourite street in the city, always has been. And we need to do that as well. Is this an easy decision? No. I've got to make a decision today. It's weighing out, you know, 60/40 kind of thing, but that's the way…the way I see this one. And I certainly don't blame anybody, especially a downtown councillor, for saying, look at the state of the people downtown. Look at the state of downtown and how is this solving it. I get it, Madam Speaker. It's a bigger decision, it's a bigger discussion and we'll keep going.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in…rise this morning in support of this motion. As mentioned earlier with respect to the Riverside Management lease that we were discussing earlier, the importance of bringing people back downtown. Here we have a building that was formally used by the Government of Canada. Since COVID, it hasn't been used to its capacity and it's sitting vacant. A proponent has come forward to look at redevelopment of this downtown infrastructure to make it a...to reimagine its use and utilizing it as a hotel, which again will, you know, with the conversion, create jobs in terms of construction jobs and then create jobs in terms of the hospitality sector. This is something that's critically needed downtown in terms of bringing people back to the downtown area, not necessarily residents, although myself have stayed in downtown hotels here in the city of Winnipeg for different milestones whether it's an anniversary, we want to have a staycation or other things like that, but the option should be open to Winnipeggers to have these downtown amenities such as hotels if they want to go on staycations, but more importantly, bringing in that tourism dollar to our city and to our downtown area. It has been said of course that, you know, in order to make an area safe and our downtown safer, crime prevention through social design. Again, having a nucleus of people in a concentrated area helps to reduce crime in that area. Eyes and ears on the streets, Madam Speaker. The nucleus of people who are gathered whether it's at festivals or concerts or night markets or different outside events, again, helps to strengthen the safety aspect of our downtown area. So, I'm very supportive of this project. I think it will be a great addition to Broadway itself. Close proximity to the Convention Center, to the Canada Life Center, walking distance from the ball park to the Human Rights Museum; all of these different attractions that there are downtown. Again, we're seeing, you know, two hotels that are being built that have been stalled economically and, you know, the barriers that are on the streets are causing more congestion in our downtown area. Here, we have a building that, you know, is simply going to be converted, doesn't have the same, you know, impact on construction as these other hotels that are being built downtown. It's a quick fix. It's something that we can move forward with relatively quickly without having that same impact that those other hotels are having currently in our downtown space. So, I am supportive of this. I encourage my council colleagues to support this as well. We need more investment in our downtown area and if we have to incentivize proponents to do so, that's something that we have available to us and we should be considering. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Chambers. Next speaker, Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: I didn't think I was going to speak on this issue but I was listening to some of my councillor colleagues' concerns and when one of my…when they asked for a recorded vote, I thought it was appropriate that I would speak up and give my reasons on why I will not be supporting today's report. After hearing Councillor Gilroy's comments, I actually agree with her. And I want it noted that as a downtown representative, I don't want it to be an issue that's going to come up again between the three of us city councillors who do represent the downtown. We all have our priorities and needs and I just want to make that clear that this is not a personal thing, but it's just something that I have been dealing with in my office for the last five years has been housing. Housing has been a huge demand for my ward specifically, especially in the Exchange District. And we've always been trying to encourage people and simply stating that we would like more

residents to live in the downtown. And with that being said, just previous council, we had actually supported a tax increment financing for a downtown project at 138 Portage Avenue and that one was specifically supported because it was giving 146 rental housing units. So, that is why we supported it then and I want to continue on with that reasons on why I would like to see TIF financing to be actually utilized for affordable housing, rental housing, or any form of housing in the downtown. Those are the reasons why I, at this time, cannot support a hotel. Correct me if I'm wrong, when we usually get issued with RHI funding, hotels are actually interested in converting their hotel rooms into affordable units. So, with that being said, hearing from those type of demands coming in down the pipe for the last couple of years, again, I want to really, really state that, at this point and juncture, for me, personally, and for my ward and the residents that I ultimately serve, housing is going to be one that I would want to stick on the forefront of my mind and should be used for tax increment financing. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Well, I didn't want to get into this, but Madam Speaker, more hotel room space downtown Winnipeg, Convention Center was expanded. We did provide incremental financing provisions for a new hotel on Carlton near St. Mary Avenue. And Madam Speaker, I just…the only thing that I really consider here is, you know, the Hotel Fort Garry, I don't know how they're doing so much right now, but the Hotel Fort Garry has struggled over the years to maintain and keep operating. And it is an excellent hotel and the current owners are still…it's still being operated. But you know, so we're making decisions for new hotels and, you know, it's giving more of a competitive nature for hotel room space in downtown Winnipeg. And I really…I do have concerns about…about housing money, but I did want to say, there is a potential for some more tens of millions of dollars for housing, depending on whether or not an application is successful, Madam Speaker. So, we can't count our pennies until everything's approved, things are signed and things will move along. But I mean, there is more money to try to help. And actually, you've heard me say it in a seminar, I just, you know, downtown is important. For me, the biggest struggle I have with this is that, you know, around downtown we also have issues of need for economic development and so on. Although, I guess you couldn't really build a tourist hotel on Selkirk Avenue, at least at this point in its…in its history. But anyway, nevertheless, I will be supporting this. But I just wanted to point out that, you know, this will be the second hotel that we've supported with tax increment financing. The other one went to, I believe it was True North built the hotel over there on Carlton along with their own apartment block, which is…I mean, all of it is intentioned to make profit. But then, you know, the hotel industry does employ a number of people. I mean, it's not the best paying work, but it does employ people and I think that's really important. And when I visit other cities, Madam Speaker, you know, there is a focus, a lot more hotel space. If you think of Broadway, I think I heard one of my colleagues mention, I mean, you're there, you're in Winnipeg, it's not that far to get over to The Forks or to go to various places that, you know, that allow you to explore downtown Winnipeg. So, anyway, I…at this point, I'm going to support it, I…but I will point out, like, if I'm owning some of these other hotels that have been around there a long time, you know…you know, is the Hotel Fort Garry going to come to us if they have major renovation things they've got to do? Ask yourselves that question; is that…is that going to be coming down the pipe? I don't know, but there's a possibility.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further speakers, Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good debate today. Good discussion, respectful and some good…good points raised by all councillors and this is certainly appreciated from my part. The report indicates that providing a tax increment financing grant of the equivalent of $4.1 million over ten years, is going to do several things; including unlocking an estimated $38.6 million in redevelopment investment in our downtown. And that's not including long-term, the 50 full-time jobs as it indicates that it will be provided. The 140-room hotel, if you…if we even estimated 50% occupancy rate per night. Hoteliers I've spoken to in the last little while, this was last month, have said their numbers have been really strong. There is a demand for hotels and hotel rooms across the city right now. We have the World Police and Fire Games coming up this summer, other festivals as well that are going to put increased demand on those hotels. And that's good news. That's good news for us. So, if we…on this hotel, once it's built and redeveloped, if we even estimate 50% occupancy per night, that's another 70 people in or downtown if it's single-room occupancy. Add to that our staff, that's 100 people, at least more, in our downtown on a daily basis. Shopping at shops, eating restaurants, enjoying the sites, visiting our museums, visiting our sports venues, whether it's the Goldeyes or the Jets or the Sea Bears or…and, you know, any of the museums; arts, culture offerings that are in our downtown as well. So, we need it all. I think Councillor Lukes used the term, maybe, that it's a balanced approach. I think that's fair. We need more residents living in the downtown. We're encouraging, we're incentivizing that. That's offered as well. But we also need more business investment in our downtown. We need more property owners that will take existing buildings like the one that is here, as our…as Councillor Rollins pointed out, a former Federal Government building. We'll take a risk on converting the building, transferring it into a different purpose and a different use, this is what is before us, but we need all the investment. More people opening retail spots, restaurants, hotels, residents, it needs to all happen in our downtown. We're focused on that. Centre plan 2050 is an exciting plan to see that investment in our downtown communities, and this is part of it and I'm glad to support it. I believe it was a called vote, but I call the question at this time, please.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary?

Mayor Gillingham: I think it was a recorded vote.

Madam Speaker: That was earlier. We'll have to call it now or just go regular vote.

Mayor Gillingham: Did you call…you called for a recorded vote? Yeah. It was a recorded vote.

Madam Speaker: All in favour…you…he asked for it right before the vote. I don't take orders earlier. But all in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Lukes, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Schreyer, Wyatt, and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillors Allard, Gilroy, and Santos

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

Madam Speaker: Item 10 passes.

Councillor Wyatt: I know you said 10 to, break now and I know people...

Madam Speaker: Okay. Is it the will of Council to take recess now? There are a number of events over the lunch hour and councillors have asked to drive or walk to their destinations.

Mayor Gillingham: Just to Councillor Eadie's point, I'm just reminded, are there any other items on this agenda to be dealt with?

Madam Speaker: Not on this agenda, no. But we'd be moving on to...

Mayor Gillingham: Question period and by-laws.

Madam Speaker: We do have a Motion 1, just a moment here. Just a moment. Yeah. That would be it. We're on to motions after this. So, we can deal with that at 1:30. Okay. So, let's recess now and reconvene at 1:30. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
June 22, 2023, at 1:37 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I'd like to reconvene our Council meeting of June 22nd, 2023. We're on the Executive Policy Committee motion section. We have Motion 1 from Councillor Gilroy and Councillor Allard. It's regarding public engagement for the 2024-2027 budget process. It will be an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. That's Motion 1. Next is Notice of Motion No. 4; moved by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Duncan. It's regarding back to the office directive. And that'll…that's a notice of motion, so it'll appear on the next month's Council agenda. His Worship, by-laws.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Gilroy,
Seconded by Councillor Allard,

WHEREAS conducting public engagement is critical to ensuring appropriate representation and participation in the budget process, especially for groups that face barriers to participation in the political process;

AND WHEREAS it is Council's responsibility to consider the public's views and perspectives when making decisions that affect the City as a whole;

AND WHEREAS appropriate engagement leads to more informed decision making;

AND WHEREAS public engagement on the budget should be a requirement of the Engage Winnipeg Council Policy;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That public engagement be required on the 2024-2027 Multi-Year Budget as part of the Budget Review Process.

2. That the Engage Winnipeg Policy be amended to formalize public engagement as part of all Multi-Year Budget Review Processes.

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

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Duncan,

WHEREAS during the Pandemic it was necessary to institute a work from home policy to encourage social distancing and to limit the spread of Covid-19;

AND WHEREAS the Pandemic has now been over for some time, yet thousands of City of Winnipeg employees are still working from home;

AND WHEREAS the City owns, leases and operates tens of thousands of office square feet that are presently sitting vacant, costing ratepayers and demonstrating a practice of the inefficient use of tax dollars;

AND WHEREAS much of these empty offices are in Downtown Winnipeg, which contradicts the decision by Council to make Downtown Winnipeg revitalization a priority in the recently passed Strategic Priorities Action Plan;

AND WHEREAS it has been demonstrated in studies conducted that worker productivity falls significantly when employees are not working from traditional office spaces, not to mention the synergy lost for opportunities that exist in common work spaces, such as mentoring, training, and general supervision conducted via employee peers and management;

AND WHEREAS, to date, the Chief Administrative Officer has not issued a 'Back to the Office' directive to all City employees;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council immediately direct the Chief Administrative Officer to end the work from home practice and to issue a directive to all city employees to return to their respective offices.

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

Mayor Gillingham: I'd like to move that the following by-laws be read a second time: By-law No. 121/2022, By-law No. 28/2023.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 121/2022 and 28/2023.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I'd like to move that By-laws No. 121/2022 and 28/2023 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period under this committee. Councillor Allard, question for the Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Speaker, through you to the Mayor I'm struggling to comprehend why we need to change the word, Goldeyes to Riverside Park Management, the Executive Policy recommendation to Council. I don't know what this company is. I don't know their corporation status. I don't know if they have charitable status. They stated they're a not-for-profit corporation, so who is this company, who's on the board of directors, who will benefit from this decision that was approved yesterday?

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We just had that debate before lunch and discussion before lunch. The councillor was able to speak with the delegation. He asked further questions perhaps to follow up with the delegation on that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question.

Councillor Allard: Yeah, well I mean, thank you Madam Speaker, through you to the Mayor, I didn't ask a number of questions from the delegation, I did not have, the specific…I don't think I had many of the specific answers that I was looking for. Does the Mayor know who is on the board and or owns Riverside Park Management?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, through you Madam Speaker, the CAO has…is in the room and certainly has…we just had the debate before lunch and so that information could have been asked at that time to the CAO when that item came up as far as specifics I don't have the specifics right now the councillor is looking for, perhaps he can follow up with the CAO.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question,

Mayor Allard: Well, I mean I know that we had the debates and I think I heard that the Mayor is not aware who is on this board and so I thank the Mayor and I'll follow up with the CAO. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Pleased to rise to working with Councillor Mayes next month. Hoping to bring…will plan to bring a motion. Historically, it was called the North South Transcona corridor that starts at Chief Peguis from Hawkesbury to the north at Lagimidoiere, swings through south and then connects ultimately between Councillor Mayes' ward, my ward Transcona ward, north of Sage Creek, south of Southland Park, a section of roadway was unfortunately named Bishop Grandin just to a few hundred metres just to the East of Lagidimoiere even though it was originally…it was the South Transcona corridor. And one of the great individuals who has done amazing things for our city

and our community and our province who really hasn't been recognized, we've identified it as the Edward Schreyer Parkway and to formally name, especially the section constructed the Right Honourable Edward Schreyer is now is his late eighties, nothing has been done to recognize him in terms of a formal roadway or a significant infrastructure piece in this city. I just wanted to note, my question I'm going to get to it, I just need a little bit more of a preamble Madam Speaker, and that is to say that not only did he spearhead the creation of Unicity, not only did he create MPI, build thousands of public housing units at the time in the seventies, he was the first premier to initiate regular meetings with the predecessor to the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs which was called the Indian Brotherhood headed by Grand Chief Courchene who at that time had an assistant by the name of Phil Fontane who later on became the Red Chief. And he was the First Premier to open up airstrips on into First Nation's so that more than bush planes could fly in with twin engine planes could fly in with airstrips. He ended the practice of private companies holding up First Nation's in terms of ice roads by bringing in provincial ice roads. His work that he did with because we know the work the motion has to go through Welcoming Winnipeg as it should was significant on many fronts especially for our First Nation's community and just wanted to ask if the Mayor was aware and that we're looking forward to bringing the motion to the next Council meeting for consideration. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Through you Madam Speaker, I want to thank Councillor Wyatt for the question. I was not aware, but am now, look forward to seeing the motion when it comes forward and I want to thank you for raising this and appreciate that. I also want to acknowledge…thank you Madam Speaker, (inaudible) in error, I answered Councillor Allard's question. The delegation on the Goldeyes matter was before us and we dealt with that before lunch we did not deal with the matter on the agenda. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just would like to start by thanking the Mayor for his help and support on the vacant buildings work that we've done. I just really want to thank him, we've come a long way and it was a lot…there was a lot of work done by himself. I know the committee, the Property and Planning chair, the committee and also members of the Community Services as well did a lot of work on that so I just want to thank everyone for that. And so my question to the Mayor is on Sherbrooke, we still have debris removal from a building that was demolished and I've sent in a request to general inquiries through administration and I haven't heard back. I've had a couple requests, have not heard back. It's still now going well over a year and I'd like to know where we are in the process and know about that, that building and what's happening and be kept apprised of it and I was wondering if he had any responses, he might not have the answer now but if he could maybe find that out for me and get back to me when he does.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank my colleague for the question and I want to thank Councillor Gilroy because she said she was going to ask me the question ahead of time. It did give us, me some time to try to find an answer and so yes, the request has been received and I understand the Municipal Accommodations has been informed, is in the process right now the tendering process for the site clean-up. So, progress is being made, they're in the process of getting that tender out so the site can be cleaned up, and I wanted to acknowledge the hard work Councillor Gilroy has done and several other colleagues including Councillor Rollins that are dealing with derelict buildings, derelict sites, site remediation, debris that needs to be cleaned up. I want to thank certainly Councillor Orlikow for his work on this as well and just to take an opportunity to just acknowledge the property owners who are living next door to these sites, who continue to be and understandably frustrated with what they have to look at every day when they leave their home or open the curtains in their house and they're looking at a site that has debris that has been sitting on a site for months at a time. And so hopefully it's not going to be…I hope it's not too long, but the process of tendering for the work to be done to clean up that site on Sherbrook is happening right now.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Further to questions regarding Riverside Management, the Mayor did mention the CAO would be appropriate to ask the CAO to answer questions at this time.

Madam Speaker: Okay, not at this time. This would be later possibly when we deal with the item. Councillor Allard, question for the Mayor.

Councillor Allard: Thank you Madam Speaker, through you to the Mayor, I notice that the recommendation, the recommended change is a change that is political from Executive Policy Committee, if the Mayor is unable to answer my question, I would want to know why.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: The request through you Madam Speaker, the request to maintain that Riverside Management be the party to the agreement as has been in the past, that request was made and I support that request.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question, right into the question.

Councillor Allard: So, who stands to gain from this agreement? How much money are we already rebating to Riverside Park Management?

Madam Speaker: Two questions, the first one Mr. Mayor if you wish.

Mayor Gillingham: Ultimately, I'm making my decision to…will be making my decision to support the request to maintain the party being Riverside Management as has been in the past.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, final question.

Councillor Allard: Does the Mayor have any idea who owns or is on board of Riverside Park Management and that would be my next question.

Madam Speaker: The question has been asked and answered Councillor Allard, that particular question you did ask.

Councillor Allard: I believe that my question is phrased differently. Perhaps there might be a different answer.

Madam Speaker: The question's been asked. Next…next speaker? Okay, that concludes our question period. Next committee, Standing Policy Committee on Public Works. Councillor Lukes on the report dated January…June 8th, 2023.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
DATED JUNE 8, 2023

Councillor Lukes: Yes, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce this report. I don't really have anything to say about it. I mean, it's pretty self explanatory. It's just a very good news report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That's Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have Motion No. 2 before us: moved by Councillor Allard, seconded by Councillor Gilroy. It's regarding safety training for snow removal operators. That's an automatic referral to the standing committee. Motion No. 6: moved by Councillor Allard and seconded by Councillor Gilroy. It's regarding snow clearing and ice control policy. Next, we will move to by-laws. Councillor Lukes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Allard,
Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back on the safety training provided by snow removal contractors, as well as City workers, and propose multiple options and budgets for improving safety training during snow removal operations.*

2. That the Winnipeg Public Service, through the Office of Public Engagement, engage with the public and relevant organizations to create a public safety information campaign to communicate strategies to stay safe during snow clearing operations.

3. That the cost for a public safety information campaign related to snow clearing operations be referred to the 2024-2027 Multi-Year Budget Process.

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

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

WHEREAS citizens of Winnipeg have identified that better snow clearing for sidewalks is a matter of human rights and safety of Citizens of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS on June 26, 2023, the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works will consider a public service report on options for snow clearing in the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the report has identified a higher level of snow clearing for sidewalks and the budget implications to improve sidewalk snow clearing;

AND WHEREAS Option 1 found on page 10 of the report is matching snow clearing level of service on all sidewalks and pathways;

AND WHEREAS in Option 1, P3 sidewalks and pathways would be plowed following a 5 cm snowfall accumulation (vs the current 8 cm) and be completed within 36 hours following the end of an average storm (vs the current 5 days), the same as Priority 1 (P1) and Priority 2 (P2) sidewalks and pathways;

AND WHEREAS this option would result in the need for additional internal resources to account for additional equipment, operators and mechanics, in addition to increased costs for external contracts due to the increase in plowing events on P3 sidewalks and pathways;

AND WHEREAS the equipment purchase would require a total delivery time of approximately 14 months;

AND WHEREAS in order to implement this option, it is anticipated that Council would be required to approve the following budget additions in the estimated amounts of:

Item	*Type*	*Estimated Amount*
Fleet Purchase of 54 additional sidewalk machines	*Capital*	*$11,801,900*
Annual costs for Leasing of 54 sidewalk machines, external contracts, Operator 2 FTEs, and Garage Mechanic FTEs	*Operating*	*$7,153,800*

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That Council refer Option 1 contained in the administrative report titled Annual Report on Snow Clearing and Ice Control and Spring Cleanup Programs, dated June 2, 2023, to the 2024-2027 Multi-Year Budget Process for implementation in the 2024 winter season, which includes the following:

A. An estimated Capital cost of $11,801,900 for the Fleet Purchase of 54 additional sidewalk machines.

B. Annual estimated Operating costs of $7,153,800 for the leasing of 54 sidewalk machines, external contracts, Operator 2 FTEs, and Garage Mechanic FTEs.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Lukes: I'd like to move that By-law No. 55/2023 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 55/2023.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, I'd like to move that By-law No. 55/2023 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 55/2023.

Councillor Lukes: I'd like to move that the rule be suspended and that By-law No. 55/2023 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period. Any questions for the Chair, Councillor Lukes? Councillor Santos.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Santos: Thank you Madam Chair, through you to the chair of IRPW or Public Works, the by-law that we just recently passed to reduce speed zone in school zones is perfect timing and reminded me about some situations that are happening in my ward where schools are actually along more regional roads that do not require reduced speed zones. We've had a few incidences where sorry, it's the preamble. We've had some accidents that were near schools but were more on regional roads. Does she know the process of how we can request Public Works to reduce speed limits on regional roads?

Councillor Lukes: Thank you colleague Santos, through you Madam Speaker. So, I recall, I wasn't chair at the time, but I recall when the speed reductions for the school zones was introduced. At that time, it's my understanding that it was provincial legislation because the Province had control of the speed limits for the roads. I am not sure now if we would have the ability to change the speed limit on a regional road or not, I'm not sure I'll have to check into that and get back to you. Good question though because the province now has given the City the ability to change speed limits so good question.

Madam Speaker: Next question. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker, I rise before the Standing Committee of Public Works on Monday on the 26th, we have a report 13, annual reporting on snow clearing and ice control. Thanks to the work the committee has done under the leadership of the chair, we are considering potential options with regards to increased snow clearing for sidewalks AT, the report does outline some numbers and I know there is an option 1 and option 2 scenario to be presented. Is the chair potentially open to a concept of looking at other options in terms of funding? Under the Charter, it's more of an FYI, under the Charter section 432(4), money from frontage tax may be used for upgrading repair placement and maintenance of water for main streets and sidewalks. It would be interesting to get an interpretation of the Charter and that a revenue neutral initiative whereby the existing costs on the tax bill to be shifted to a frontage levy cost, in light of the fact that if we were to do the calculations and knowing what private costs for owners for let's say hire somebody to clean your snow versus what we offer now and what we provide for snow clearing on the streets would be extremely competitive and people would be able to see that. And that in the event we could do that, we'd be one year behind all the time, we always know what kind of winter we have, we always know what kind of snow we have, it would go up and down based on the winters that we've just had and therefore we would never run a deficit, never be out of money in terms of collecting snow like we are now where we're often behind the eight ball if we looked at something like that. I realize that's a big preamble and I thank the Speaker for letting me because I know she's been very valuable as well on this matter on the Standing Committee and working on this. Is it possible maybe to consider, and I know I threw a lot of information too, so anyway, thank you.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. That's a very interesting perspective, so I think that at our committee meeting on Monday we should talk further about that and maybe we inquire with legal what the definition of maintenance really is, right? So, I think we're all open to ideas on improving snow and ice removal in a way that maybe could be cost-neutral-ish so sure let's talk about that on Monday at the committee.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Madam Speaker, through you to the Chair of Public Works. At a recent Council meeting, this council voted against the public service recommendation to settle some wrongful billings that were identified with Tartan Towing. Can the chair of Public Works identify if there has been any news or progress on that file?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Sure so, it's an alleged wrongful billing, So the City has flied a statement of claim against Tartan Towing in the Court of King's bench and it was filed because basically the direction from Council on March 23rd to seek recovery of what the City alleges to be around a $1.1 million overpayment to Tartan Towing, so that's in the courts right now, probably shouldn't be saying anything more about it other than saying the claim was filed and that it is alleged, so we'll anticipate an outcome in the near future.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Browaty: I'm just correcting the record, retract my previous question and add the word alleged to it and I have no further questions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you Madam Speaker, through you to the chair. I believe the seminar for Council on the Transportation Master Plan was around the time of my bereavement leave. I wonder if the chair could share what is the status of the plan and how are things looking in terms of well, mode shift in particular induced demands, anything…anything the public should know or members of Council that were not able to attend.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Certainly, I think all of you would have received at one point a meeting request to have a briefing on the Transportation Master Plan and due to some more refinement that they wanted to do which I totally agree with is they're taking more time to refine the presentation. My understanding is they will be presenting it to us in early September so I think everyone should be really, you know, I think you all should attend these briefings and I think you should really do a thorough read of the Transportation Master Plan recommendations when it comes forward because we are a city without trade corridors to move goods for our economy and we are a city that wants to have a high level of liveability as we densify, so there's going to be a real balance that's going to have to occur from moving goods and, you know, recognizing which I think a lot of people don't recognize is that we are a multi-modal distribution hub due to CenterPort and the hundreds of millions of dollars that the Provincial Government, that the Federal Government have put into CenterPort and that the City is putting into new developments so that we can increase our tax base from an economic perspective, so the Transportation Master Plan, it's a…I'm a little disappointed that it's delayed and it's not here sooner, but better to try and get it even better then so that we can discuss it but it will be, they'll be a lot of perspectives on this and we have to remember that we are a city that is built without a goods movement clearly identified network and that we are a multi-modal global distribution hub so I really look forward to the discussions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Allard: Thank you Madam Speaker, through you to the chair. Is the chair aware that according to the Freedom of Access to Information request which is now available online that only 4% of the traffic on Kenaston is truck traffic and therefore part of the intermodal hub?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Yeah, I'll take Councillor Allard's comments under consideration.

Madam Speaker: Final question.

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you Councillor Sharma, through you to Councillor Lukes, does the chairperson believe in induced demand and are we not not solving the problem by widening the road?

Councillor Lukes: I'll take Councillor Allard's comments under consideration.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes question period. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Finance and Economic Development. We'll get right into question period under this committee. Any questions? Councillor Mayes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: Earlier today, I received a very thorough response from our very excellent CFO, Katherine Kloepfer on a question I had raised about the budget and I want to ask Councillor Browaty just to make sure this example isn't being repeated elsewhere. The issue was I had raised accurately, I would submit in a media and (inaudible) the fact that Transit Plus service has received a 46% increase in the top written budget between 2020-2023. If you were to look at the 2020 budget, 21, 22, 23, those numbers would line up, oddly…oddly, when you look at the 2023 budget, the budget for Transit Plus operating in 2021 and 22, somehow has retroactively changed. The revenue doesn't, but the expenditures do, not the actuals. I understand the difference between actuals and budget, but oddly the budget went up by a couple of million for 2022 in the 2023 budget. I'm told well, it was a reinstatement of different categories. It's been shifted around, but there's no note saying that. I think to maintain the credibility of our document and frankly the comprehensibility of our documents. We have to have some consistency or if you're shifting something around, it has to be said. We can't sit here and redefine the police budget at 400 million in 2020 and then claim we defunded. So can Councillor Browaty undertake to take a look to see if there are any other examples from the 23 budget where retroactively we've changed around the very publicly stated budget figures for such services as Transit Plus or other services.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. Again, I know the Councillor has had frequent conversations with the CFO, but if there's anything that still needs clarification, we can certainly take questions under advisement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Speaker through you to the chair of Finance, does the chair know when the agreement with Riverside Park Management is over? I understand from the budget document that it's in the long-term agreement category and does the chair know how much that is?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty, if you wish to respond, however, it is under a different committee on today's agenda, this item.

Councillor Browaty: Sure. Thank you very much. Again, if Councillor Allard cannot find that information, I can be of assistance (inaudible). I don't have that with me.

Madame Speaker: Thank you any further questions? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I have a question that's right up the alley of the Chair of the Finance Committee. I noted that there's a motion moved on the floor about more robust public consultation on the four-year budget and review and Madam Speaker I'm wondering if the chairperson could give us an idea of what's being planned as we move into the fall.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Eadie. I'd say just stay tuned in the coming days and weeks. We're certainly going to be moving into a robust process to ensure all members of Council and the public have been put to our budget process. It is again our four year multi-year budget and the work we've already done as part of our Strategic Priorities Action Plan will certainly feed in into that process of creating our next four year budget, so thank you very much for the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gilroy or Councillor Eadie, go ahead.

Councillor Eadie: Just a follow up, I think I'm asking this on behalf of Councillor Gilroy, but Madam Speaker, so like, Council has been heavily involved and I'm just trying to get a picture of have we planned how we're going to go out to the public before we vote on the four-year budget?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I thank you very much, Councillor Eadie for that question. As of this moment, we have not publicly announced that process, but again as I said, stay tuned.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy, anything more?

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, sorry I should have asked you earlier, but this started me thinking and maybe I should ask a question so. Just in terms of…there's a motion today that came from Councillor Allard and I, in terms of…because we're on Governance and we wanted to actually do this at Governance, but then we found out that if we didn't do it today, it wouldn't get done in time for you guys to start the work on the budget and part of the thing that the City…one of the things that the City has been working on is doing community consultation and communities that have…are more marginalized, have low income families so we started that work and I'd like really to use that new form that we started in this next budget process so we learned at Governance that there wasn't the funding in place in order to do that. So I guess that's why the motion is here in front of us and I'm really hoping that you take that into consideration because I think it's really important that we have communities that maybe don't necessarily participate as much in the budget process be involved in making…the making of this budget. So motion's going to be going up to EPC, but I just wanted you to hear that from me, would you be willing to consider that in looking at how you're going to arrange the next year's budget process?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, through you to Councillor Gilroy, as she's very well aware as being part of last year's budget process, there was money set aside specifically for this year for communications and public consultation as part of the multi-year budget process and certainly there will be a robust procedure to ensure all voices around this table as well as the voices of Winnipeggers are heard through various forms in the budget.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Moving to the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste and the Environment. Councillor Mayes on the report dated June 5th.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT
DATED JUNE 5, 2023

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll move consent agenda Item No. 1 on the report.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period. Questions for Councillor Mayes? Councillor Allard.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT
QUESTIONS PERIOD

Councillor Allard: Thank you Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Mayes, we haven't had the chance for the discussion yet, but I think it was offered and I don't' think there's anything secret. I missed the debate on the removal of phosphorous and implementing the phosphorous removal in the next phase of the water treatment plant potentially saving millions of dollars as I understand it. Would Councillor Mayes, well, perhaps enlighten us on what was learned and if there are any stones unturned in this debate?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes

Councillor Mayes: Fair question. Thank you for the question. Unfortunately, Councillor Allard couldn't be here the day these motions (inaudible) we wanted voted for it for all three…all three committees. I think what was learned was, speaking personally, that if we don't do phase three, if we do not do the nitrogen removal and stayed with just the interim phosphorous, one is tempted to think that could save a billion dollars, one would be wrong in making that assumption and there was a lot of debate about expanded (inaudible) still being needed, that we would be left with sludge that still has

chemical in it and therefore, would have to be landfill instead of being reused or composted in some sense. There was a lot of debate about operating costs being higher using the chemical method instead of the biological removal method. There was debate about I think Tim Shanks has said, you know, we don't look on the chemical industry as our environmental friends something like that, fair point so (inaudible) chemical which is going from some fairly exotic places, across the globe increasing rapidly in cost, you know, (inaudible) having shot up 300% so it was actually a pretty good debate. It was a fair question I thought. I think…I think the forest fire…I think Lake Winnipeg's Foundation's frustration is you're using this billion dollar obstacle to delay doing anything and my response, that would be…we didn't do a whole lot for a lot of years of late under Mayor Bowman and we're continuing under Mayor Gillingham, we have been takin action, we're doing phase 1, we're doing phase 2, bio salts, it's hundreds of millions of dollars. We'll need money to do phase 3 but the science of it and the math of it survived the scrutiny. I think it was a good debate saying, no we should stay on this path, we have to, the Province mandates it, but very good meeting with Minister Klein, our old friend from former City Councillor Klein is the Environment Minister who said you know his staff remain committed to this path as well, so there was a weird and interesting debate about ammonia and ammonia levels, but I won't get into that in any detail but in response to Councillor Allard's question, I think his motion got a lot of scrutiny. I think it was a good motion to raise, I think it was a fair question, but I think we also got an honest answer that said stay the course, you're not going to save the billion dollars that you think you're going to save if you don't stay the course.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Allard: Thank you Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Mayes, I'm not sure the Councillor will have the answer, but Netley Marsh did come up in conversations, this council chose to support Netley Marsh as a way to reduce phosphorous and probably ammonia in terms of (inaudible) into Lake Winnipeg. Does the chairperson know if there have been successes or communications of Public Services surrounding Netley Marsh?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I know we put some money into that. I think Councillor Browaty actually championed that back some years ago, I could be wrong, might have been Councillor Wyatt but I think it was Councillor Browaty, perhaps with Councillor Allard, I can certainly look into the staff if there's any sort of report on that. I know work was being done. I don't know if it's in the magnitude that it would be needed for this kind of city wide project and again the Province sets province wide ammonia levels, they set nitrogen phosphorous to some extent the regulator tells us what to do here, but yes I can certainly undertake to find out what information the staff has on Netley Marsh.

Madam Speaker: Final question.

Councillor Allard: Thank you. Some other jurisdictions are experimenting with ways that are different than the separation of sewer on storm water retention. Is the chairperson aware and would the chairperson be interested in exploring ways outside of the separation of sewers to mitigate storm water retention perhaps saving money in some cases? Friendly question I guess.

Councillor Mayes: We are underway finally with our 10% of the billion to two billion dollars. I personally think it will be a billion on the CSO work is green infrastructure work that is mandated by the Province so that's tens of millions of dollars. We'll be doing some in Armstrong. I hope I'm still around when we start in on Mission District where there would be like $16 million worth of green infrastructure so yeah it's in the work. Food Council is involved in this as well. Happy to meet with Councillor Allard and talk about this some more. Save our Seine certainly very interested in what we can do in that Mission District in St. Boniface so. I think the question is about green infrastructure. It's…we're mandated to spend it. We should be doing it. We are going to be doing it in Armstrong so the more of it, the better certainly.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question, Councillor Wyatt followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you Madan Speaker. Recently and it's been going to…the debate has been going on for the last year and a half or so, they…or longer, the Pallister Government, prior to the this premier had made a decision to grant rights to an outside province frim to mine (inaudible) Manitoba. This is…concerns have been expressed that the entire aquafer for south east Manitoba could been impacted, multiple mining sites, one processing site removing silicon sand out of the aquafer the fact is we have residents in the eastern side of the city, south eastern side of the city who would be potentially impacted if there is any environmental damage to the aquafer. Would it be possible to look into whether or not we as a city have obtained an independent environmental appraisal or consideration for the potential impact on those homeowners in the city of Winnipeg who do rely still on well water.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: One of these things you learn after you get elected is that there are still hundred…a couple of thousand homes without city water and sewer within the city boundaries. Councillor Chambers having inherited most of those, they used to be in St. Vital Ward, are now with Councillor Chambers and he will have been through many hearings with the word aquafer, comes up a lot. I can certainly look into it. It's a fair question. It's…it is I think largely Transcona and Seine River, riding new wards that have this potential. It's…it comes up a lot down in South St. Vital. I know that the tragedy, the comments are that if we all keep pulling water under the aquafer, at some point, this…it becomes just saline, nobody can drink it so you've got to…you've got to regulate how many people are pulling out of the aquafer. So fair question. I don't know…I mean often I find our staff have sort of deferred to the Province on this, but there may have been some work and to be fair Councillor Chambers has had more involvement I'm thankful to say Councillor Chambers has had more involvement on this than I have over the past five years so I can certainly look into it. It's a good question.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you for that and Manitoba doesn't have a great track record for taking aquafers as one up by Ross that still has to be pumped because of a diesel leak, a jet fuel leak that occurred fifty years ago. Was a test site by one of the airlines, the airline manufactures, my question is did also…is for you to look into whether or not the city made any delegation or any presentation verbal or written to the Clean Environment Commission which was considering this matter as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, I have no idea off the top of my head, but I can certainly ask about that.

Madam Speaker: Next is Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thanks, Madam Speaker. This is just a really do you remember question, Madam Speaker. My synopsis of the debate Councillor Allard's rightful motion that, you know, question stuff but that ultimately what it comes down to is the North End Sewage Plant isn't just about the ecology of Lake Winnipeg and Netley Marsh. It is about the ecology and environment for on land purposes as well so, therefore, we're processing cleaner sewage output that is useable so that's kind of like… I'd like to think of it nutrient removable in those terms rather than it's not just about Lake Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I hope that would lead into a question about the Winnipeg Whips baseball team when he started with do you remember, but sadly Councillor Eadie went a different way. Yeah, that's a fair point from Councillor Eadie about that wasn't a reason given by our staff, (inaudible) we understand the concerns of the Lake Winnipeg Foundation, but ultimately we have to worry about not just the lake, but we don't want to be left with chemical infused sludge that we have to fire into the landfill to put it simply. It's a good point, the additional reason from Councillor Eadie why…why the debate ended the way it did and why I think the Province takes the view of stay the course, keep doing the biological removal, do both phosphorous and nitrogen and there will be a cost certainly, but it would be false to say there would be a billion-dollar savings if you didn't do the biological removal.

Madam Speaker: Next question, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Follow up question. I believe our chairperson Water and Waste attended the meeting with the Minister Klein, was that the general summary of what came out of that first meeting of that committee?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, it was really good, better than I thought it would be. It was…I thought I quoted the media saying. I thought it was more productive than I expected. So to Minister Klein's credit, first thing he said was everybody, if we're around the table, none of this deputy at the table, everybody (inaudible) everybody, so we had four city…we had Moira Geer, Tim Shanks, Cynthia Wiebe there along with myself, a lot of provincial staff, good open discussion about these sorts of issues. So yeah, I think it was…you know, I wish I'd…I wish he'd had hundreds of millions of dollars to announce, he didn't, but it was a good discussion about what, you know, why are people thinking we're doing nothing, that was the course for many years perhaps, we're going now so. Yeah, it was…frankly, it was a more productive meeting than I thought, which was the intent of it, just have everybody sitting in the room so we don't have some of those nightmarish delays we had around getting going on phase 3 where you had people like me sitting in here saying, and there's glory in it for all. Can we not just get going on this and Mayor Bowman eventually navigated that and we are going, but it was a good session with Minister Klein.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. No further questions, second round. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Mayes, I think Councillor Mayes has correctly identified, there seems to be an arbitrary line where if you go larger than two family all of a sudden in our by-law, stormwater retention kicks in and I believe Councillor Mayes has asked questions about service and I wonder what the state of that is I had a few conversations and don't yet have satisfaction of the answers that I've received.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: This is the why is 4 less than 3 debate pertaining to the sewer by-laws that became known that at least at the Water Committee. The incongruently that if you have a property and you put two new houses on it, each with a secondary suite, four units, that's not multi-family because the two units per house, that's not multi-family, so you're fine. You build a triplex now under the sewer by-law, you're multi-family, you've got to do a discharge control device, someone is not being treated correctly here, perhaps the builder of the triplex, one could argue. So good debate about this, with weeping tile come up a lot that the older homes that are being taken down are quite inefficient in terms of what they put into the current systems so our staff have said, really it's…it's…we're not making it worse in the combined sewer districts if we allow two homes each with two units. I think if you allow ten of those, you start to say, well why are we considering these one by one by one so still some debate to be had there, but for a builder of triplexes I might say, how is this fair to me, did I have to put in some discharge control where the person next door there is putting in four units. So still some work to do on this, but yeah, we had a good…this is a clause 8 debate, clause 8 under provincial licensing, talks about CSO work so, it's a good question, but I think we got a pretty good answer from the staff saying it does look, it does…it is counter intuitive that four units you don't have a device, three, you do but you're…but really the net impact is not adding to the problem of the combined sewer district. Hope that helps. It's a bit convoluted and it is kind of counter intuitive, but that's the way the sewer by-law is currently written.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you Madam Speaker, through you to the chair. I wonder if the chair is open to exploring this question further, I understand from industry there is some room for interpretation on this…on this clause the way that we interpret the license so is the Councillor willing to dig yet deeper into this?

Councillor Mayes: Not sure I understood that, on that sewer by-law issue?

Councillor Allard: Yeah.

Councillor Mayes: Okay. Yeah, I think we can…there's a larger debate here about lack of sewer capacity/strength/influence/development patterns, not all of the CSO districts. I've had Councillor Chambers ask many times about St. Norbert and its limitation so it's a debate that's very much upon us and Councillor Lukes and others have said, we need an infrastructure map here including the underground infrastructure, so yeah, it certainly…we should probably…we could…I can follow up further with Councillor Allard about this. It is counter intuitive why we would require a device for three units and not for four.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Since Councillor Mayes is doing so well about answering questions today, another one for him, maybe he's already talked about this (inaudible). But does he have any further updates for us in terms of use of grey water in water efficiency at this point?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I feel like we've just had…we've had…we've had at least one report on this and I feel we've had a recent report. I can get back to Councillor Schreyer. Our staff continue to have concerns about the risk to the system at large that without a backflow valve that the re-used household water will back up into the larger system, it is used in some rural areas. I think it's used in some other jurisdictions. It's used where there's a shortage of water. We don't have that so I can find out whatever the most recent report was for Councillor Schreyer.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Let's move on to the next committee, Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Councillor Rollins, the Chair, on the report of June 1st.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED JUNE 1, 2023**

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I'd like to move, you know, all the items forward. I think that Items 1…4 and 6 will be pulled, so that would be 1 through 14, Madam Speaker, but I'll wait.

Madam Speaker: Okay, okay. Thank you. Yes, 4 and 6 have amending motions. Councillor Eadie. Okay, 1 and 2. I'll call the question on 3, 5, 7 through 14. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 1 – Delegation of Authority – Demolition Permits for Vacant and Derelict Residential Buildings

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins to introduce the report.

Councillor Rollins: You know, Madam Speaker, in the interest of time, I'll sit and listen, but there is good news to go around this whole council. I hope all councillors see pieces of work that they've done in it. And I'll introduce it that way.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I, of course, am in total support of this report. And I just had it stood down. I wanted to say I appreciate Mr. Lopes' presentation. He is the second largest property owner in the Dufferin neighbourhood. The only one who owns more land in Dufferin because of long-term issues with vacant derelict properties is the City of Winnipeg, actually. And Mr. Lopes has a lot of great ideas. So, this…and he did point out correctly that, yes, there is provisions in the by-law already that talk about demolition permits without development plan in a X number of years or what have you, Madam Speaker. So, but what we're really saying here is, is Council...I'm sure this'll be unanimous, Madam Speaker, that, you know, we delegate the authority to the Director of Property and Development. And I think…and hopefully, we can expediate some of these demolition permits. I've already got a couple of Ndinawe over in the North End as to protect the young people that stay at one of their safe houses. They've had to buy up a couple of properties because there was too much untoward activity happening around there, posing a threat to those young people. And they just want to rip it down, and they want to rip it down as fast as they can. Dealing with the Vacant Derelict By-law, as you will see in the next report, Madam Speaker, there's a lot to maintaining and taking care of that. And ultimately, I hear complaints from people who want to, you know, take care of those houses, renovate and I mean, we are in a circumstance where we do need to apply stricter rules, enhance what we do to make sure vacant derelict buildings are safe. But in order to rip down a burnt-out building, today, as…I don't know if those were the factors, but you know, in studying what we've done and the by-laws that came forth, what I think is really important, I don't think it was really mentioned, but yes, demolish the buildings if they're unrepairable or way…cost way too much to repair. Yes, take them down as soon as possible. But whatever you do...and we heard about lots that, you know, they need to be cleaned up. And there's some certain things that happen when you have vacant properties around, especially in low-income areas. What happens is, well, people get this idea that, so we have this vacant lot now, and you know, there's nothing on it, but it looks like a great place to throw bulk waste. It looks like a great place to throw away construction material, especially the closer you are to a busy street. So, there needs to be some kind of provision, and this was analyzed back in the late '90s, early 2000s when they talked about all these vacant properties. You know, going up and down back lanes, I think what has to happen here is, yes, demolish it if you're not going to build anything in the near future, but…and it does cost money, but really, you need to have, like, a six-foot fence along the back of this vacant lot because people just drive down and go down the back lane and they dump this stuff. Then we're calling the property owner, because it…because it was dumped on private property. It's not their garbage, but it was dumped on private property, Madam Speaker, and guess who's responsible for cleaning it up? The owner of the property. So, in order to protect those people with vacant lots until they can find the money to build and develop, we need to make sure there's some provisions there that makes that vacant property less exposed to some of the awful stuff that happens. And there are people who do drive with construction material and bulk waste from other parts of the city, and they just dump it where they think...well, anyway. Nothing I really appreciate, Madam Speaker. But so, hopefully, with that delegated authority, there is a discussion with, yeah...and there's a fair cost to tear down these buildings, and a lot of people don't necessarily have the money or there's insurance. Mr. Lopes I think explained that really well. But given this provision, this will expediate taking care of some of these issues. And hopefully, it isn't just used by people who are speculating on land. I know of one property, Madam Speaker, we dealt with at Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan on a demolition permit. Well, they…they demolished the place before they even applied for anything. And it was a…it was a development group from outside of the city of Winnipeg. So, this is what our director and our support staff who, you know, we say it's the director, but it will be the staff that work under the director who ensure that the demolition permit is appropriate in the circumstance and to move ahead. So, I just wanted to sort of make sure those points were out in the public. This isn't…it's not…it's not going to be…fix the whole problem, but it's one of the aspects that Councillor Gilroy and Councillor Rollins and many of us are being pushing forward to try to deal with what's really a problem in our really old neighbourhoods. And

if you look at the neighbourhoods who are most exposed to this, it is our very old neighbourhoods. So, we have to keep that in mind. And, oh, I'm remiss. I'll speak about it in the next one. Thanks.

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

Councillor Rollins: I'll just call the question, Madam Speaker, with thanks to my colleagues. I think Councillor Eadie summarized it really, really well, and ready for the vote.

Madam Speaker: All in favour, Item 1? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 – Strategies to Address Problematic Vacant Buildings

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to stand…much has also been said about the vacant building. These two by-laws are going to be understood together as a tougher…tough on…as nails approach to vacant and derelict buildings, and getting going, making sure Council is a really good partner on, you know, making our city beautiful, hopefully, by first dealing with blight. I'm not sure who stood it down, Madam Speaker, but I hope they also see themselves in this, in their work. It is…it is with a debt of gratitude that we have our Problem Property Committee that has members of the Public Service that…from Community Services, Community By-law Enforcement Division, the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service, Planning, Property and Development, Winnipeg Police Services and more that work on problematic vacant buildings that are really increasingly impacted by fire and more. So, I want to thank that team for sure in my opening remarks, and I'll listen…wait to hear from a council colleague.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, first speaker on this item.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a great report. All the issues are very well identified, ones that we actually heard. The Mayor and I and the Public Service had meeting with people from the Point Douglas Residents Committee. Although this wasn't the main thing, there are these kind of problems, and the work that our Public Service has put into really looking at this and how can we deal with aspect in a better way. You know, the issue is, Madam Speaker, again, it's not going to go away really easy. And ultimately, what it comes down to for many, not the…not the Mario Lopes' of the world who are buying up and doing property, some of the things we can do actually to help these old mature neighbourhoods, Madam Speaker, that aren't in downtown is, we have a very old housing stock. And you know, to repair and get a house into shape so it's either rentable or sellable, it's pretty expensive nowadays. And there's a lot of people, Councillor Gilroy and I tried at one point to…you can't even buy property insurance now in R2W and certain other postal code areas. And we tried to get a public implementation. The Province basically said no, which is really sad, but I think it would have been a proper solution to assist, and we…maybe the problem wouldn't be as bad if people have insurance to take care of houses that are partly turned or…which seems to be happening to quite a few in the Point Douglas, Daniel Mc and Mynarski Wards. So…but the provisions in here are great. They're trying to stay on top of the negative affects around these. But…and so, I'm in support of whatever they're trying to do. Again, Madam Speaker, it is going to come down to, does that property owner have the money and capability to deal with it. And I would point out, I don't know if we even proved it, but Mr. Burrows and the William Whyte Residents Association accurately pointed out about two and a half years ago that some of these houses that, you know, caught partial fire and they just stand there and there's nothing happening to them, the City actually owns some of those, and they're not doing anything to improve the situation either. Why? Because same reason for many of the other people, where's the Hiroshi? No, that's what it is; where's the Hiroshi? So, I'm going to end, basically, my speech about talking about that Hiroshi for people to do. We just got through COVID. We have some difficult budget times, Madam Speaker. But you know, I hear of this…you know, we call it a dividend, there's money there, that's going to be a saviour for our contingency reserve. That's good. But ultimately, Madam Speaker, we have to say, if we have this extra money that's a dividend, we should be able to redirect some money. Rather than tax incremental financing all over the place, maybe we can provide a different style of incentive that will work better in our old mature neighbourhoods which really do need a lot of renewal. That's what it comes down to. And renewal is expensive, we could give different kinds of incentives. I would also point out, and this was discussed and mentioned. We are applying for federal money to expediate things, Madam Speaker. And I'm going to say…and I mentioned this in the thing. I'm sorry I said I'm sick and tired of hearing about downtown when the North End is burning down, but, like, what we need to do is, these are neighbourhoods and when we look at downtown and housing, that is about downtown renewal. It's about growing downtown and making it better, which I agree with. I don't disagree with that. And we should look at some other neighbourhoods. But you know, in looking at that money, and we want to expediate things, Mr. Lopes has a couple of…he said Stella. Well, the properties he owns on Stella are actually in a…in a very great place. The former MLA of Burrows, she lives right there. She's lived there for a very long time, right…right there on Stella. Not a bad place to build. But it's very difficult, as he said, like, he wants to build multiple units. We need to be able to somehow facilitate a faster process because Mr. Lopes has been working on those two lots now for, like…trying to find a way to make it financially viable for

the last three years, almost four years, I think. So, when we get that money to look at how we expediate getting more affordable housing, we need to look at how we facilitate that. And I know that our Public Service has ideas and will be able to do that. But really, what I'm saying is, what I'm hearing in the community, in the Dufferin neighbourhood, for example, you know, the people who are living there, like, they're sick and tired of this stuff. And we need to do something that expediates the renewal of some of these neighbourhoods. It's very important. So, I just thought I'd throw that out there. This report, our Public Service did a lot of good analysis because they're dealing with it every day. And, well, I'll mention, I'm glad Municipal Accommodations is dealing with Sherbrook. But you know, it's going on some months and it looks like, for example, on Main Street, there's three buildings that burned down. That pile is still around. You know, if it's around much longer, people are very upset. And maybe that's where we use some of our dividend to try to expedite stuff. Like…like, anyway, there's various reasons why various properties are in the state they are. But I would also…well, I'd like to publicly say to the North Point Douglas Women's Centre, that it looks like they're going to move to improve a vacant derelict building on Main Street. And hallelujah, they need the space and they're going to do something about it. So, when you hear from them, because they're going to be talking to us I'm sure, about helping support a new facility for women and men, actually, in the Point Douglas area there…north Point Douglas area. So, anyway, I'll leave it at that and great report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins to close.

Councillor Rollins: We'll call the question, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of Item 2? Contrary? Carried. Item 4, Mr. Clerk.

Item 4 – Net Zero Ready Building Code

Madam Speaker: Okay. And there's an amending Motion No. 3 going with this item. Moved by Councillor Allard and seconded by Councillor Gilroy. Councillor Rollins, you have the floor to introduce, followed by Councillor Allard to introduce Motion 3.

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

WHEREAS residents of Winnipeg who are homeowners and/or tenants are almost always responsible for the cost of heating, cooling, providing electricity and sewer to their homes;

AND WHEREAS the opportunity is greater now not only to adopt the code in 2023, but to endorse the highest tier as the minimum requirement by 2025 because the sooner more efficient buildings are built the sooner homeowners and tenants will see lower utility costs;

AND WHEREAS the highest tier of code by 2025 will result in further savings for residents of Winnipeg who are either homeowners or tenants;

AND WHEREAS builders have the opportunity to market homes with the added benefit of the reduced cost of maintenance over time which will be net savings of money over the life of a new building.

AND WHEREAS The net zero by 2050 target has been included and approved by Council in the OurWinnipeg 2045 Development Plan;

AND WHEREAS Council endorsed the City of Winnipeg Investment Roadmap and that this opportunity is identified. p. 54 55;

AND WHEREAS the Net Zero Ready Building Code will be released in early 2023 and the City can lobby the Province to not only adopt the code in 2023, but to endorse the highest tier as the minimum requirement by 2025.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 4 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated June 1, 2023, be amended as follows:

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

    "1. That the City call upon the Province of Manitoba to enact Net Zero Ready Building Code immediately, and to endorse the highest tier as the minimum requirement by 2025."

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I really do appreciate the motions. Why? It's the…you know, the motions, in essence, are talking about a consultation, words I put on the record, and you can see that it's open till June 26th through the Provincial Government. The Provincial Government also in June, Madam Speaker, announced that tier one was their goal for building code. And I've heard, like I'm sure other councillors have, that this is being met with displeasure. Why? Green economy. Why? Savings for Manitobans and affordability in a fullness of time. Why? For climate justice, climate change and climate adaptation reasons. Why? Because we're still catching on previous codes. Maybe more reasons, Madam Speaker. I'm going to occupy the space, Madam Speaker, that's a bit of a difficult one. I can write a letter to the Manitoba Government right now, today, because it's June 22nd and they have an engagement process right now. In October, there's going to be a provincial election. I'm very concerned about elections, Madam Speaker, and I'll get to my point really quickly in case you think I'm too far flung. This is a great venue for a great many things, but I am concerned that we are the wrong door, specifically at this time, to hear concerns that should be directed at the Provincial Government. If you're concerned about the environment, climate adaptation and change, while I want to be an open door for that debate, it is so very misplaced if we are the only open door. As a city, we can act as an ally. As a local councillor, I'll be happy to put words on the record to a letter to my members of the legislative assembly as well as Premier and the Minister of Environment, Minister Klein who was our council colleague right here. But at this juncture, when there is an open door and a consultation on this very question, I'm not sure that this is the time to confuse the general public who think that this might be the place to lobby. And so, Madam Speaker, given that we have staff that are sitting at provincial tables still working out on code, given that we do get updates on Property and Development, and given that there's an open engagement process, I don't want to confuse the public, Madam Speaker, that this is that venue, that we have the legislative authority and this isn't a federal and provincial issue, right. And so, for that reason, I think even though we can act as allies, I don't want to be the only open door to a climate discussion and a tier one versus two versus three versus four and so on discussion. That space I think is critical in advance of an election. I think it is…it is…it is critical to absolutely act as an ally to groups, but it is too easily confused that this is the jurisdiction that enacts codes. It's not the case, Madam Speaker. And so, for those reasons, I'm not supportive of the amendment this time. There's an open door, it's over at the Leg, there's a former ministerial colleague. Let's direct some business that way. And…because if you're concerned about it, you absolutely want to be directing business to the right government. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Councillor Allard, your opportunity to introduce amending Motion 3 and speak to the item before us.

Councillor Allard: Thank you. So, this is going to be my only opportunity to speak or do I get to…

Madam Speaker: You will close on your amending motion.

Councillor Allard: And how much time do I have for that?

Madam Speaker: That will be eight, I believe.

Councillor Allard: So, thank you for your attention, council colleagues. I believe we have an opportunity, an opportunity that we took…for those who are members of last Council, when there was a change to the way in which we would make zoning decisions, we took a very strong position. We sent our…we sent the CAO to go and lobby on behalf of City Council…on the position of City Council, which at the time, was to ask in the…in the changes that were coming with the possibility of implementation of a municipal board, that we have things like residents having a say, not just landowners, for example. So, we have set a precedent multiple times on calling for action on different issues. That was one. I recall a motion where we asked the police…we asked the Province to ask the police to...to follow…to make sure the law was being followed during COVID-19 when we had blockades if I recall correctly. And so, what the motion calls for is quite simple, and it's that City Council call upon the Province of Manitoba to enact net-zero ready building code immediately and to endorse the highest tier at the minimum requirement by 2025. And so, I'm moving this because I think it is our greatest opportunity as a Council to, at the stroke of a pen, if the Province agrees, to decarbonize the economy and to make…and to put money into people's pockets, and the money into the people's pockets and the pockets that the money would be put in, are members of the public, Madam Speaker. And I had a bit of a…I had a bit of a moment when I was talking to staff about ways to decarbonize the economy as it pertained to buildings and, like, my ballpark recollection of where we're at with greenhouse gas emissions is about 50% for transportation, about 40% for...35%, 40% for buildings, the rest being organic recycling and some very small things outside of that. So, this…after transportation, which is why I was asking questions about mode shift earlier today, buildings are the next one. And I was told by staff that the very best thing that we can do is have the code updated. And so, I'm worried that without taking a strong position, the City of Winnipeg, that the Province makes the wrong decision and doesn't go with net-zero ready and higher codes that are good for the environment. And what does that mean for members of the public and their pockets? It means that, right now, when

you buy a home, you don't know what your energy costs will be. You're told by the…you're told by the seller, well, it really is up to you, it's up to how much…you know, how much you like to heat or cool your home and how much electricity or gas you're using depend on what…what type of building, what type of heating, what type of mechanical that you have. But you really don't know what your costs are. And you don't know what your costs are if you're buying a home, and you don't know what your costs are if you're a tenant for a building because the same thing happens. How much do I pay for utilities? How much…and the answer is, well, it depends how much you consume and it depends on a number of factors. Essentially, the information is not available. And so, I was wondering, given…given that this is such an obvious, a huge leap in terms of how we can make our economy more competitive, putting more money in people's pockets, we know carbon taxes are coming down. We know they're going to get bigger and bigger. We know that the future will be…for those cities that decide to take choices that lead to the decarbonization of the economy because the governments are going to come down and there's going to be greater and greater costs on carbon. And so, why is there such reticence to act on behalf of the Provincial Government? I understand the building code is to be updated every five years. I understand the building code hasn't been updated for 12 years. I understand the building code is going to be updated soon. I also understand the building code may be updated to a place that…and we won't know for sure, but it may be not that good in terms of energy requirements, it could actually be worse than what we have today. We won't know that until the government makes a decision. And so, there is no lobby for the public. We are the lobby for the public. And so, if we ask the Province of Manitoba to increase building code, have better energy efficiency, the big winner is the public. The big winner is the person that buys the home, the person that rents the suite, because those people don't know how much it's going to cost. And over the…we heard a delegation earlier today, over the lifecycle of a building, there are some incremental costs to getting to these higher requirements, in some cases, but if you look at the lifecycle of the building and how many dollars saved over time for those landowners or for those tenants that will be paying less in utility bills. That means they'll be spending more in our economy. That means they'll be better off financially. It means the environment will be better off financially. The environment will better off in terms of reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. And I had moved to do…I had moved earlier to do things like send promotional materials to builders or people who are taking building permits out to let them know what some of the passive ways to improve the energy efficiency of a home was, having a check mark list. Like, you don't have to do it, but maybe you should know. And after talking with staff, I became convinced that the…unfortunately, the best way is to have it right in the building code because in terms of carrots and sticks, this is one of those cases where the code is respected for new builds. And there will be many new builds, and if they happen on old code...I mean, we're already working with a 12-year-old code, the big loser is the members of the public that are paying way more for their utility bills, they're spending way less on local business, and it really is the public. It's grandma, it's mom, it's our children. And in terms of decarbonization of our economy, this is a golden opportunity. So, not only are we, by calling for this, putting a little bit of extra pressure on the Province of Manitoba who is coming up to an election, who...I mean, the parties are going to want to take positions on these types of issues, at least I hope they do. And I think the time really is now to be making a statement on what type of building code that we want to see as a city. And we have done it in the past, and we have done it while hearings were open, and we've even sent our Chief Administrative Officer to go and do the work. And so, if we don't vote yes to this motion/amendment today, I think we're missing a huge opportunity to, from this day forward, if the Province agrees, have lower utility bills, more money in people's pockets, and actually taking a concrete step towards the decarbonization of our economy. So, I really hope that, Madam Speaker, you and colleagues of Council will consider this motion. It costs the City exactly $0 to send this letter, well, perhaps minus the stationary it might cost and the postage to get the letter to the…to the Premier. But this is a…this is a huge opportunity, and if history is an indicator, and they say the best way to predict future behaviour is to look at past behaviour, this could be a 12-year decision the Province of Manitoba is making. And we have an opportunity here to make a strong statement for the public, for our families, for the future. And it's a win for our pocketbooks, and it's a win for the decarbonization of the economy. And for those who are building the homes, for the landowners, they will find ways. And there…oh, the other thing I meant to mention is the new code does have opportunities, new opportunities, things like building taller buildings with wood because there's new technologies that are available. Things that aren't allowed now unless you would get a specific engineer's…a structural engineer's stance saying, yeah, it's good. It's not going to fall down. But there are other opportunities in the code that could offset these additional…these net-new costs that go with having a zero-ready home. So, anyhow, I really hope, Madam Speaker, that you will join me and that…and that City Council colleagues will join me. This is the single easiest thing we could do. If the Province agrees to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and put a whole bunch of money in members of the public's pocket. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: I need clarification, Madam Speaker, on the…I need clarification, Madam Speaker, on the process here. The...the motion itself is to pass this as information, whereas we have an amendment to it. Therefore, if we say 'aye' to the motion, including the amendment, isn't therefore it to pass it as information and then it's gone? I just need clarification on this, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: We would pass the main item as amended, yeah, if that was the case.

Councillor Schreyer: Okay, but therefore, if we say 'aye', it's not passed merely as information? Or is information, in this case, to act on it? Because sometimes it's not. Pardon me? I see the recommendation, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Take a…take an opportunity. We'll hear from the next speaker. And if you just read, as Councillor Allard was saying, page two.

Councillor Schreyer: I…Madam Speaker, that's my question. I'm referring specifically to the…

Madam Speaker: Okay. I'm going to send the Clerk over to you. And next speaker is Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this. I think…I think this is a really good opportunity for us to really take a lead here and show the Provincial Government what we think that we need to do. Part of this will be helping our Climate Change Action Plan that is looking at reducing our climate…our climate change targets by 2045, by 2050, and hopefully even sooner than that. Some cities have been able to actually get on board sooner than that. Part of the Climate Change Action Plan is actually looking at...sorry. Did...okay, yeah. So, as part of our Climate Change Action Plan actually has a part in it that is looking at the community. And this would really meet those community needs in terms of creating net-zero in the community, and I think that it's really critical that we…that as people who will be enforcing the code that we have a voice in what that code should say and where we would like to see it go. I think that that's critical as a city who is responsible for enforcing the code. The Provincial Government really needs to know where we stand on this issue. And really, I think this is the right timing. Governments do not change no matter what. You know, the government still goes on, regardless of elections. We all know that. This is something that I think should be very important to Council as we try to meet our targets, and this will also help to meet our goals around the community, which we need to really work on. So, this wouldn't be any cost to the City. This is all going to be the cost to the developers. And when we look at climate justice, this will allow to make sure that people have affordable homes and affordable energy costs as we move into the future. I look at the two young women who are here today that are working for us, and you know, I know that they want us to do something on climate change. And this is just a small action to say, hey, we as a Council, we'd like to see these codes have higher tiers so we can make sure that we're dealing with our Climate Change Action Plan and meeting some of the targets that we have set in there under the community guidelines. So, I do support this. I hope other council colleagues will consider this. All this is is a letter. So, of course, we won't be making the decision. I do think it's in our purview to write that letter and state clearly on our position on this. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Who could be against net-zero? It sounds good. Other than the…I recall, when we had an operating budget…when we had an operating budget for 13 years, I think it was 2012 when we ended the net-zero. Councillor Fielding, at the time, raised taxes 3.74%, and that was the end of net-zero, and yeah. The net-zero, however, it sounds good in terms of building code. From the architects, the builders I've talked to, two things come up that is a serious issue: number one, the easiest way to get net-zero in a building is put no windows. You have less windows, most heating loss goes right through the window. And that's one of the low-hanging fruit that, actually, some of the architects employ. And what does that achieve in our dark, cold, long winters? Technology is moving along; Councillor Allard is correct. I think we're on the precipice of some major…hopefully, some major changes in terms of insulation, heating efficiencies, glazing technologies. But the cost…the other issue is the cost, right now, of construction which has gone exponentially high, affecting homeowners. Combine that with the cost of borrowing, the average person is hard to qualify for a mortgage to achieve home ownership, so the Canadian dream of owning your own property. We have to be very cognizant that...I agree. Ultimately, the best scenario would be if we move away from natural gas and to clean hydro, which we have abundance of it. Other changes that they can make to the building code quite simply, I mean, not simply, but to look at, you know, every new house, solar panels on the roof in the building code. Automatic. They could do it. Sell back of the utility, it would actually be a form of revenue. We require…working with the Province, one of the major changes that we recommended that the Province actually adopted was after the '87-'88 rains, they brought in the requirement in building code, all new homes have to have sewer backup, sump pumps and pit. A change in the building…simple thing, which has saved us and residents tons of heartache and headache. With the climate change coming, maybe every new home should be…should have…it wouldn't be much to put in the basement, they'll be a cost, you know, tornado shelters on every house…new house. You know, knowing what's going to be happening in the future. Cisterns automatically included under basements. Storage for water wouldn't be much…technology's not that expensive. They do it in Cuba. Instead of tapping into our water, you get water (inaudible) their own water from the roof. You know, these are very and simple things we can do with our building codes. So, the question is, you know, what can we achieve without impacting the homeowners. Cistern would offset their cost of water. Solar panels on the roof would help them offset their cost of electricity. We've got to look at things if we're going to change building code. You know, a tornado shelter can save lives. That would make sense and not impact financially what's happening out there today. I'm assuming the Province did not move on something like this for the concerns that I'm expressing, I'm guessing that. But the cost of a home ownership and the cost of…and the impact potentially on the quality of life, because it would, really, simply be a reduction in glazing to

achieve net zero is the greatest challenge…target right now that you could achieve net zero on a property. So, I'd like to support the motion because it sounds good in theory and the principle behind it is 100% solid. The challenge is, is okay, how do we get there? And what other low…low-hanging fruit in terms of climate change, which I 100% believe in, 100%...I don't call it climate change, climate crisis, we're facing, can we implement with a greater impact for residents without overtaxing, overhitting them? You know, folks are still being affected dramatically by the carbon tax that's been introduced federally. You know, I don't understand targeting the consumers instead of big oil, right. Who made us addicted to gas and fuel. Right. I mean, who were the…who were the guys who, back in the '60s and '50s, went to every municipality across this…North America and told us to…all to rip out all of our trolley cars? GM, which we had only installed about 30 or 40 years earlier to go to diesel buses. Right? Now, that's a class action lawsuit like the cigarette companies that I would love to see. Anyway, those are the things that we should be looking at how can we effect in terms of public policy in terms of…without impacting working families and their ability to still believe that there is access to the Canadian dream. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Lots of good comments by all speakers. For today, I'm certainly with Councillor Rollins who chairs the committee. I agree with her comments. It really does rest with the Province. Certainly, we have passed many motions over the years requesting legislative change. I've been as prolific at this as anyone else, probably everything from school trustees to…to, well, I remember Councillor Morantz wondered why we were calling for a change to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms when the Blue Dot Group came here. I mean, we do this from time to time, but perhaps…perhaps, the lesson we can learn from that under the new Mayor is perhaps a little more action, more action and less words that, yeah, we could write a letter and I've...I don't want to criticize anybody in this because I've...I mean, I'm the guy who put the World Oceans Day motion through, and last time I checked, we're not on an ocean. But maybe a little more focus on the hard decisions that we're going to have to make around climate change and around building heating. Councillor Schreyer's been very...I think Councillor Schreyer put it on the radar here that we should be talking about building heating. I think he quoted me in his election leaflet saying something like that, as a matter of fact. So, it's a fair comment, but for today, I'm with Councillor Rollins. Let's direct people toward a government that is heading toward an election. Maybe we will revisit this after October 3rd. I think that would be fair too. But rather than just writing another letter, maybe let's direct people into another process and we can revisit this after October 3rd I would say.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think the amendment makes this motion more palatable. As Councillor Rollins made the point. You know, this is as well a provincial jurisdiction and there's something we can do about that. Excellent points made on this, in particular in this case, by Councillor Wyatt. It does make me think, you know, when you look at recouping costs, yes, in terms of some aspects of this, it can take the length of a mortgage. Some come back earlier. You know, in some aspects of this, including geo thermal, depending, you can get your…you can get your money back in less than a decade, half a dozen years in some cases. So, the recoupment is within the realm of feasibility because either you're dealing within a few years or you're dealing within the course of a length of a mortgage. Either way, these are realistic ways in which we have to look in terms of how we recoup costs and how our investments are worthwhile. So, there's different ways by which we measure these things. Do you make a profit after half a dozen years? We look at these things. Do you make a profit after a generation? That's…this is what we do in society. So, whether you…if you make your money back or within a certain amount of time, within a timeframe that's feasible that we look at it in other ways in terms of profit. If it applies here in terms of recouping your money and beneficial to optimizing resources being it good for the environment and can be good for the economy too when you're optimizing these valuable resources for the future, then we're in the realm of practicality. Just remember the value of a drop of oil. We don't want to use as...we want to reduce our oil consumption for the environment. We're talking about greenhouse gas emissions, but bear in mind, we're also looking at the economic sustainability of future generations. You want to reduce your use of carbon, not just for the immediate environmental impact, but bear in mind something, if you don't want to look at it from an economic…if you don't want to look at the environment from an economic point of view, just look in the world. Where do we have the worst environmental regulations? Okay. In the least affluent countries. So, if a society is looking desperate, they'll choose different priorities. So, we have to maintain that balance. It happens to be we're in a position to look at both at the same time, both in terms of economic viability, environmental viability and our ability to environmental sustainability because we're...because we want to maintain those valuable, valuable fossil fuels which are so hard to substitute for. You can…you can do quite a bit with geothermal and hydro, even wind. Solar, unfortunately, in our…in our…in our environment, in our latitudes, I'm not saying we shouldn't use it, but we should be realistic in terms of how it compares to other forms of alternative energy. And let's never forget the value of a drop of oil and what it takes to substitute for that. And we want to maintain our fossil fuels. They're incredible…there's nothing more valuable than fossil fuels. There's nothing more valuable than oil and natural gas and we want to leave that as long as possible. Where is the best place to leave oil and natural gas? In the ground. That's the best place we can store it. And to the extent that we can minimize our use of it both in terms of immediate impact on the environment, both in terms of long-term impact on our economy and our society, allowing

future generations that economic affluence to be able to make positive environmental choices, positive choices for our society, that's what we need to do. I understand we talk in terms of, well, technology's going to solve these things. Well, bear in mind, technology is what put us into this situation in the first place. So, I'm not against, you know, the idea that technology will be part of the solutions. What I do know is, when we're talking about the dilemma, and some talk about in terms of an impending economic and environmental crisis, and by I'm not…bear in mind, you can't separate the two, if we have an environmental crisis, we have an economic crisis, let's face it. So, those two issues are intertwined and because of its…it's the technological era in which we live and how our political economic circumstances, who we are as a society, in terms of dealing with that. On that basis, I'll just sum up again, say that the amendment gives this some compromise and gives it some teeth in terms of maintaining the intent of this towards another level of government that we can't live with...we can't do these things without the Provincial Government. I think the amendment's good and I'm going to support this. And bear in mind, I'm always going to say when it comes to environmental issues, it cannot merely be at the expense of the economy because when we do that, it ends up not being good for the environment in a number of these cases. But we do have to look for ways to optimize, to find efficiencies and those efficiencies of positive environmental impacts and I think that amend…this amendment is part of that. We have to keep the conversation going. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker. Councillor Rollins to close or Councillor Allard first for the amending motion if you wish.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you to my colleagues for their participation in this debate. I've been talking about Vaclav Smil ever since I read his book, (inaudible) of St. Vital, the favourite author of Bill Gates who found his work humbling. Humbling because I think Bill Gates spent almost a lifetime in information technology. Vaclav says that civilization is built on concrete, steel, plastic and iron, and those are extremely energy intensive parts of our economy and that only a very small percentage of the workforce is involved in those…in those sectors. I think I recall correctly about 4%. And Mr. Smil laments that so few of the brightest minds end up going into those sectors, they end up going to other sectors, whether it's biochemistry to develop the latest drug or it's information technology to come up with the latest app or maybe it's engineering to come up with the next way to save…the next window that can be as good as a wall in terms of conserving energy. But what Mr. Smil gets into is the problem of energy generation. And Mr. Smil proposes with current technology today, there only seem to be two viable paths in addition to adding all of the things that we have available in terms of renewable energy and those are solar voltaic with…if there were a ubiquitous, cheap way to store energy, which we don't have yet. Maybe we will one day. Lithium batteries will not save us because we still have the problem of energy generation. Lithium batteries will not save us because we don't have enough lithium to power all the cars that we have today, let alone the cars that will be coming online, most probably, as the world builds more concrete, steel, plastic, and I missed ammonia, ammonia being what's used to make fertilizer. And the reason…the reason that Councillor Schreyer was saying we got ourselves into this pickle of being 8 billion people, soon to be 10 billion people, and then, looks like trends are towards the demographics of the world going down. And we do need to use technology to get ourselves out of this and energy generation is a huge problem. We're blessed in Manitoba with hydro electricity. My understanding from talking to different experts in the field is that we do not have enough hydro electricity if we're going to convert all of our heating, all of our transportation, if we convert everything to electric, we don't have enough electricity. I think I had it up on Hydro's page because there's like a number with a bunch of zeros which are really hard to understand. I think it was 30 terawatts and it's simply not…it's simply not enough to power everything. So, why am I not talking about energy generation as it pertains to the building code? Well, it's like Councillor Schreyer said, keeping that oil in the ground, the oil is valuable. The oil…we shouldn't be burning it, we should be using it for all sorts of other things. That's when it's...that's the way that it would be really valuable. And so, the building code is one of those few opportunities we have to reduce the consumption of energy. As I said earlier, it doesn't cost the City anything. It takes a position. We've done so in the past. We've done so on World Oceans Day. We've done so on taking a position on the municipal board. We've done so asking the Province for action on police. We've done so on many, many issues. And so, this won't cut…this won't cost us anything, but it will send a message that Winnipeg wants to see action on reducing greenhouse gas emissions, decarbonizing the economy. But the...I mean, that's…that's a…that's more about the future, it's less about today. Today, I think…I think the argument of getting people...getting money into peoples' pockets, if this…if this is adopted, over the lifecycle of the…of the houses…of the new houses that are built, and keep in mind, most of this would apply only to new builds, existing builds are a whole other ball of wax. But if we don't do this or if the Province of Manitoba doesn't do this and they adopt a lesser version of the code, then every one of those net new homes will be a net cost for the future for those homeowners and for those tenants. And I think it's going...more and more the trend will be those who use carbon are going to be those who have to pay more and more. And I was surprised when I heard that Manitoba Hydro has a program that will subsidize strongly, almost pay for a new gas furnace because I guess Energy Manitoba has a reduction of hydro electricity mandate whether the reduction has anything to do with reduction and consumption of natural gas or not. And so, who's going to be paying those bills? Well, it's going to be…it's going to be future tenants that are going to be paying these carbon taxes. And so, I think they'll be a class element to this as well. The more…the more energy efficient a building is, the less a tenant will have to pay in utilities. There may be a slight adjustment in terms of rents because the builds are going to be more...they're going to be more expensive upfront generally. But I think the public is the big winner here and unfortunately, they don't have a lobby. Councillor Browaty was talking about interest groups, well, this is one of

those cases where there is no interest group other than the people around this table to ensure that we're making the best recommendations so that people will...people of Manitoba, people of Winnipeg will be better off in the future. And so, it's asking for action now that will have very large benefits for the future and it doesn't cost us anything. So, Madam Speaker, I've heard the comments around the table, I know there's some support and there…there's some people who think the time has passed to be asking the Province to make changes to legislation and so I'd like to call for a recorded vote on this question. I know I can't do so ahead of time so I'll have to do it once I sit down in terms of precedence earlier today. But we only have so much power. And 40% of those...of that energy is going into buildings. So, this is a huge opportunity. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. With that, Councillor Rollins to close on the item.

Councillor Rollins: Yes, Madam Speaker, thank you. So, Madam Speaker, I just led a climate energy and investment road map and climate justice prebudget consultation on June 7th. And I want to thank my colleague Councillor Mayes who was with me. And I want to state that across almost every ward, there were representatives that sort of crashed the Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry prebudget consultation on this matter. And amongst them, though, and the reason why is, you know, an exact challenge, Madam Speaker, to the notion that we would be the lone voice out there. There are many climate justice activists in this city; consortiums and groups. And they were represented at the community energy and investment roadmap and climate justice prebudget consultation that I held. And they include Save our Seine. They include Manitoba Sustainable Buildings. They include faith groups from almost every synagogue and church, Madam Speaker. And so, I want to put some words on the record that I can confidently say it's not true that we're the lone voice, that many community groups have, including one that launched on June 7th, consider Climate Manitoba, Madam Speaker, in all policy decisions and all the time, www.considerclimatemb.ca are working to that that June 26th midnight deadline, Madam Speaker. It's…so it's not true that we're the lone voice, there's a strong lobby. And…but I disagree that it won't cost us. And I'd like to reflect on Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Gilroy's statements because what if, Madam Speaker; what if, Madam Speaker, the Province doesn't take leadership? And what if, Madam Speaker, for instance, a policy choice of the Province is to simply say, let the City decide? That would come at a cost, Madam Speaker, and I'll tell you why. And some of it is in the grains of what Councillor Wyatt considered about…and it might have sounded absurdist and it wasn't that the net zero building is a building with no windows, and I quote. Everyone might have looked quizzical, but at the end of the day, that is one option for a net zero building, isn't it? So, it can come at a cost and we know very well that type of cost when the Provincial Government doesn't come to the table in a sophisticated way. For instance, we're the city that didn't have a provincial government. The only jurisdiction, in fact, outside of New Brunswick that didn't have a provincial government that went to the table on transit. We know that that cost us, Madam Speaker. We are a city that didn't see meaningful results from a province in housing at the first few years of last term and the previous term. That comes at a cost, Madam Speaker. This isn't the situation now. And finally, Madam Speaker, here's the scenario and the sophistication of this particular file. The Province has a convening role, Madam Speaker, not just in the engagement, should we or shouldn't we, but a convenient role to play in supporting movement upwards through the tiers. It's different scenario for commercial than it is residential where in this province we're lucky, we're already most of the time building tier three, Madam Speaker. So, the Province needs to ensure readiness. Groups have complexity in this lobby. They're calling on the Province to develop a taskforce and more…more…more…more importantly, directing funds from the Federal Government net zero accelerated building and more. So, it could come at a cost, Madam Speaker. And here's the final cost, and it's a public engagement one, at the June 7th event, Councillor Mayes and I fielded questions, and in your inboxes, Madam Speaker, and to my fellow councillors through you, you too have seen the e-mails as I have calling on us to do more than just tier one. There is confusion, Madam Speaker, and it can come at a cost. So, that is why I'm saying, direct it to the Province. Why? Because Councillor Allard, Councillor Gilroy, in writing this motion, is not wrong on what is at stake, they are just misguided, in my opinion, Madam Speaker, because it can come at a cost. It can be, in its simplicity, ignoring the complexity, the funds and the convening that we need to rely on the Provincial Government to do in both commercial and residential builds. So, that's why it's important to receive these as information today. In a few months, we might be in a different state, Madam Speaker. But for right now, let the community groups, groups that probably understand it a lot better, do their work. They're doing great work, Madam Speaker. There's provincial-wide climate caucuses going on. Councillors can do their part like me for putting on prebudget consultation, Madam Speaker. And we can add the complexity, not reduce it in ill-timed motion, Madam Speaker, that may serve to direct the public to the wrong door and really miscommunicate the complexity of what's before us and the opportunity to draw down these funds, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question on amending Motion 3. Thank you. Amending Motion 3. There will be a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Eadie, Gilroy, and Schreyer

Nays

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Lukes, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

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

Madam Speaker: Amending Motion 3 is defeated. And now, onto the main item, Item 4. All in favour, please rise. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Lukes, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillors Allard, Eadie, Gilroy, and Schreyer

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

Madam Speaker: Item 4 passes. Next item, Mr. Clerk.

Item 6 – Amendment to the Proposed Lease Agreement between the City of Winnipeg and Winnipeg Goldeyes Baseball Club Inc.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins to introduce the item, followed by Councillor Allard with amending Motion 5. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, it's a good opportunity and really full circle, I think, a bit for some of us around here to be able to move this forward. The recommendations today were changed at Executive Policy Committee, but in essence, the work stems back to last term where Council did approve a 15-year lease with Winnipeg Goldeyes Baseball Club where we, you know, for the City-owned land located at 1 Portage Avenue East, Shaw Park, a property that Councillor Santos and I sort of share, Madam Speaker. When Council approved this lease, several amendments were adopted including adjustments and rent extensions and I'd like to thank, to that end, Gord Chappell and the team at Property and Development that stewarded this through. The Public Service also included descriptions of the property, some of that has changed. And the Public Service ultimately here, you know, recommends the work that we have before us and it's been a multi-year odyssey. No one knows that more, Madam Speaker, than Councillor Mayes who, you know, will be very satisfied and may be experiencing the full range of emotions given his heavy lifting, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I also want to acknowledge, you know, the tour of duty that councillors have taken on this file. And I also want to, if I could think of a baseball analogy about catching something or passing something at the pass, but what it…I think it means is catching a ball that perhaps Councillor Allard through Madam Speaker earlier to absolutely every single chair but me, and say that Riverside Management has a board of directors in the CFO of Mr. Jason McRae-King, Madam Speaker. In Mr. Don Ferguson who you might know to be the facility manager over at the Goldeyes. And finally, Mr. Regan Katz who was here today along with Mr. Mark Newman who has been coming to each and every committee on the way to today where they also appeared to answer any questions that we have. And I note that there weren't really any, you know, materially, you know, directed to Mr. Newman while he was visiting early this morning in delegation. I'll sit down and listen to the amendment here. I think I know the reasons why it's being put forward. I think I have in the past, Madam Speaker, expressed, you know, an affinity for the Public Service's report and it's staying intact and the deal going to the Winnipeg Goldeyes Baseball Club and having that named as opposed to Riverside. But in the interest of full disclosure and wanting to, you know, really answer my colleagues' questions, I wanted to put words on the record of the board and words that could have been answered earlier in delegation, Madam Speaker. And it's my intent today to usher it through Council because we are…we are in the middle of baseball season, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Councillor Allard, your opportunity to introduce your amending motion and speak to the item.

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 6 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated June 1, 2023, be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendation 2 in its entirety and renumber the remaining recommendation accordingly*

Councillor Allard: I'd like…I'd like to refer my motion and the main item back to standing policy committee. And I'd like to speak to that before I introduce my motion.

Madam Speaker: You don't have anything in writing. Yeah. Like to speak for three minutes. Okay. So, you can speak for three minutes and Councillor Rollins could rebut.

Councillor Allard: Okay. Well, so I read the report and I used control F and I saw the change which is from Goldeyes to Riverside Park Management. And I really don't know why that change is occurring, who proposed the change. The delegation, if I recall correctly, made reference to some grants that could be applied for and they could only do that if they're a not-for-profit corporation. I'm not aware of whether or not this organization is a charity. I'm not aware whether or not this organization is solvent, not solvent. I don't have that information, it's not in the report. So, the report said Goldeyes. We had the vote at Council, I voted against it at the time. I voted against, in part, because I had asked questions…

Madam Speaker: You're…you've given your answer as to the why you want it referred.

Councillor Allard: I think I was doing that.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, I think we've heard that.

Councillor Allard: But I think…I think I have two-minutes.

Madam Speaker: You're getting into other specifics. The why you want it referred, please.

Councillor Allard: Why I want it referred. Well, it's…it's because we...I think…I think we want answers to these questions. Who…why the change? I don't think anybody has answered the question why we need to make this change, which is this organization. Thank you to my colleague, Madam Speaker, for having named the members of the board of directors, but if I recall correctly, when we last had this debate, and we wrote the lease like on the floor of Council, and I know the report does talk about things that had to be cleaned up from the motion that we had moved at Council because of some wording, I have questions like how much…how much are we giving back on the…on the tourism…on the tourism tax? When is the agreement over? Who is the agreement with? I believe it's in our…it's in the long-term grants section of the budget. So, all these questions are not answered in this report and we have one change and the change is not explained in any…in any…in any fashion. The only thing we heard today from the delegation was that it was for the purposes of some grants. I'd like to know where the idea came from. I'd like to have the opportunity to ask questions of the Public Service. The Mayor said perhaps we could invite Mike Jack to the floor. I think probably it would be more appropriate to have the discussions at standing policy committee where we can get into…in depth into the issue and perhaps make the same recommendation, perhaps make a different recommendation. So, I'd like to move referral back to committee and I'd like to have a recorded vote on that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Councillor Rollins, your opportunity to rebut.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, when things are sent back to standing policy committee, there should be policy reasons. It's not an opportunity, Madam Speaker, for a new chance to ask questions when through Property and Development, Executive Policy Committee, these could have been attended to by councillors. I think, number one. Number two, where is the depth of the concern, Madam Speaker? Solvency; clearly, that's not an issue, but if it isn't clear, I would challenge that, you know, the possession of assets and excessive liabilities is just not at issue here. The access to grants is the answer that was given in delegation this morning. And I would point to two structures Council are very familiar with in that. Number one, we just let our Winnipeg buildings go for that very reason, structurally, and while some councillors disagreed with that, it is one of the reasons Council accepted as an opportunity that we didn't want James Hendrickson

team to miss. Number two, West Broadway Community Center, Madam Speaker, they are also…were sent at arm's length from the City to receive grants. This is a common structure that we are very familiar with. So, there's no depth of concern there, Madam Speaker. I don't want it sent back to policy committee, especially when, unfortunately, when this term, my experience with that is councillors don't show.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. With that, we will have a vote on the referral back to the standing policy committee. All in favour of the referral, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard and Schreyer

Nays

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 13, with Councillor Eadie absent. Sorry, Nays 2. Yeas 2, Nays 13, Councillor Eadie absent.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The referral is lost. Councillor Allard, do you still wish to speak to the motion before us?

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. To you and…through you to my colleagues, so the materiality of this is not…is not in the report. We had the debate…we had the debate when we…when council…well, when we as Council put the lease together on the floor of the council. There were…I think there was more of a…more of a debate then in terms of what we're doing, what the materiality was. I think there was some talk about the tourism grants rebate. I don't see any of that…in this report, this report I think was meant to be a confirmation of the Council direction and I think the report is lacking in explaining this…this change. I would like to hear from the Public Service. If the referral's lost, perhaps I could ask…perhaps I could ask if we can speak to the Chief Administrative Officer. Is…we've done that in the past.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. You're asking to…

Councillor Allard: Well, I mean, I'm still within my speaking time. I'm wondering if I...

Madam Speaker: What is the specific question? You can maybe let me know that and we will go on to the next speaker because some of your questions have been answered.

Councillor Allard: Well, okay, so I mean, the questions like, what is the organizational structure of Riverside Park Management? How many employees does it have? How many assets does it have? How many liabilities does it have? I asked the question of solvency. What are its…what are its…its cash reserves that have insurance for their facilities? Those types of detailed questions that…and essentially, the rationale; why the one for the other? I heard grants, that's what I heard is grants.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. If you'd like to send me your question, please. I did hear some questions earlier that I believe were answered and I'd like to go on to the next speaker for now. Time sensitive questions, this report did go through the various committees as well. Would you like to continue with your speaking time?

Councillor Allard: Sure. Well, I'll continue with my speaking time. So, I think…think the material discussion was had when we last had this conversation. We now have a report that's very light because it's confirming the Council direction. And so, I'd like to have that level of detail that we had last time because I think we had a really good debate last time and I don't see it…I don't see that information here. I see an update to a lease with one change, one word, without having the administrative report saying what the implications are of the report. I do recall asking questions about finances multiple times when we were considering the lease renewal. If I recall correctly, I was still desiring some of those…some of those question...answers to those questions that I had asked on the last round of debate on this. And one of the reasons why I did not support the lease that was written on the floor of council was that I did not have the answers to those questions that I was asking. And I wonder if the organizational structure that we're dealing with is more complex and whether or not we would be better placed to be dealing with a…with a corporation, an individual corporation. So, yes, I would like to go with the administrative recommendation because I know the homework was done by the Public Service on that front. I know I lost the vote on the lease originally, I acknowledge that. I'm moving past that. But I don't have administrative

explanations as to why this change has happened. I asked the question of the Mayor. The Mayor referred me to the CAO. Madam Speaker, you've asked me if I…you've asked if I want to send my questions in writing to the CAO. I will do that after I'm done my speaking time. But what is...what is Riverside Park Management? What are its assets? Will we have the same access to this organization as we would a private corporation? Where are its assets? There's many questions that I know the administration would have asked of the Goldeyes and I don't know that the administration's had the opportunity to ask those questions of Riverside Park Management. And I do recall it being an issue when we last had this discussion that we…some of us were looking for more information and we weren't…we weren't getting it. And I will leave it at that because I think my point's been made. I don't know what the material difference is between these two organizations and the Public Service hasn't weighed in on what the differences are, what the advantages, disadvantages are to go with this type of organization against another one. Still don't know which grants they're referring to or anybody's referring to. It'd be nice to have that information from the Public Service.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. We'll go on to the next speaker. I believe some of your questions were answered. Questions to the CAO are at the discretion of the Speaker. I won't be allowing any questions at this point. I think your questions were answered. Next speaker, Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Madam Speaker. I rise, I will not be supporting this and this just kind of goes back to my time as chair of Property and Planning and dealing with this file. We have had issues in the past getting information on the Goldeyes from the Goldeyes, information that the administration was asking for. And as you…as you all are aware, this deal is quite different than our other teams that we have. They get a little bit more…more money out of the…bang for their buck, should I say. But…and that might be rightfully so, you know, but I really felt that we haven't had the information that we've needed to know how much is coming in to the Goldeyes and I really do feel that changing it over to Riverside will actually make that even worse. So, I am concerned of that just because we've had that experience in the past. I didn't support…support it the last time, I will not be supporting it this time. I don't see…I think this is making it worse than it was originally. So, that's just from my experience working on this file in the past, what I've seen come through Council. I didn't feel any need to send this back because I really think it's a done deal anyway so I didn't want to go through the process again, but that's my thoughts in the matter.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. I'll be supporting it. Yeah, I'm not sure what the big confusion here is today. I'm sorry if I'm missing something. The reason why, and they were quite specific about it and why, but they wanted to, as a non-profit corporation, apply for grants to our asset. That's not bad. So, if it was not our asset, it may be a little bit different. It's a private corporation right now, the Goldeyes, this is a non-profit group. It's better for us. They can't make profit. That's good. That one actually came up in the last lease debate. We had that problem, what are they going to do and how they're making and how much of the vendors all get paid and all that kind of stuff. Well, this is the non-profit group. So, under the Corporations Act, non-profits have to submit their forms in, they're not allowed to make a profit. They can, you know, have some nice dinners, that kind of model, but the Goldeyes are a different ball game. No pun intended, take it if you want, as they are a private corporation who is headed by a former mayor of ours. And that's…they won't…they…that is not the really…when they're saying why are we doing the change, the changes, I'm very happy that it's going to a non-profit. If we're giving them money, non-profits have a different standard than a for-profit company, so I think this is a real big advantage for us, is protecting taxpayers' money going forward. They want to apply for grants, they can't do that as a for-profit and they actually had some issues, I think, with leasing the land because, actually, the management does…the management does kind of run the land itself. So, what I've heard today is, I want to know everything about the Riverside Management Corporation, well, you know what, you can probably go to the corporation's branch and figure that out pretty quickly. And just at the last moment is, if you guys…if we have questions like we're hearing today and you just don't want to vote for it, just don't vote for it. But to come up here and say, I need more information, I need more and more and more, well, I know that trick and I've been around long enough, it means that you just want to put a cloud of doubt over things. We've had plenty of time to ask questions. There's plenty and plenty of time to ask questions through the administration either through the committee system or straight to the department. I understand where the department why they were not too keen on it. I got that. They actually don't really want the Goldeyes to be able to apply for grants because that can take away from grants from other projects. Yeah, well, that's Council's decision. If that's your reason, okay, that's fair enough, but again, I'm going to go back to, it's our asset. Okay. So, it's our asset they'd be putting money back into. So, if they leave, we still have this asset. If we don't, you know…and you know, we'll be…get stuck with this thing and then we're going to have this empty husk of a building saying…baseball diamond downtown, which was not helping our downtown before. But we had that debate already. We had that debate, it was a close debate. Some people say they got past it. I don't believe everybody has got past it. I think people are trying to find reasons not to vote…not to vote for it. Again, I…it was a hard debate in the beginning. I know there's some areas that we don't know still all the details, we don't know what colour pens they use, we don't know a whole bunch of other details, we keep adding that into it. But again, basically, the reason why they're here today, there are…is because they want to be able to apply for some provincial grants, which they need to do as a non-profit. That is fine. Riverside Management

does…in their by-laws, you can see it there, they do…they are actually in charge of maintaining and operating the lands. That's their job. The Goldeyes is a baseball team, but they also want to do other things. They want to have more concerts downtown, they want to bring in other events, and I think any time we can draw people downtown with other events and beyond…and I've got to say, the Goldeyes, it's kind of like the snow bears; it's economical, it's family fun. They can go there. It's not like the…you know, NHL hockey. The Jets are wonderful, but they're not for every…they're out of reach for a lot of people. So, the Goldeyes are a wonderful downtown amenity group that we can have, plus we should be…more stuff in there. So, it's not that, to me, very complicated. So, I'm not sure why we're still having…if you really got past it, that is fine, but all we're asking for today, and we only have a couple, I mean, I think 30 plus days left before this becomes a real big problem and we're not going to be here unless we do it next meeting. But again, I don't want to go back and do this again. Riverside Management: non-profit, so they can apply for grants so they can put money and invest into our infrastructure. That's it.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, followed by Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of EPC's recommendation on this report, Madam Speaker. And I would point out, I'm not sure for a not-for-profit, but if you go to the Manitoba Corporations Branch, I believe all not-for-profits have to list their directors who's on the board. And so, that is public information because it is a not-for-profit. So, you know, I think when we start talking about Goldeyes Baseball in Winnipeg, you know, it's unfortunate…how could I say it? It's unfortunate that it is associated with what it is. But ultimately, baseball has been very, very good for Winnipeg families. So, there was a mention, 1994, we talked a little history there from the lawyer representing the Riverside Management. And, well, even the…even the totally blind guy, I bought…I bought season tickets for the first two seasons. I believe the first season was…actually, '94, the Goldeyes were established, but I believe the first season was '95. And it wasn't the greatest place to be…you know, it's a football stadium. It wasn't the greatest for a baseball stadium. And just the whole way it was laid out, Madam Speaker, I almost had my head knocked off a couple of times by foul balls because, actually, I couldn't afford the best season seats behind the…behind the screen. But anyway, I digress. Baseball, it's an opportunity. It's a much cheaper option if you're into that kind of sport. It doesn't have a roof so you can have outdoor concerts there, unlike if you want to put a roof on a brand-new football stadium, not allowed because of an agreement we have with the True North, as a matter of fact. So, you know, not only did they, you know, gain something for a hockey team, they gained something for all indoor concert events. But so, like I'm going to support this. One thing about the Goldeyes, you know, the main owner of that corporation who brought baseball back to Winnipeg, and I really applaud him for it, I mean, ultimately, he's of a substantial age and he also is dealing with what I'm dealing with and it's probably harder to deal with as you get older. So, if Riverside Management who is managing, ultimately, what is the City of Winnipeg's asset, I think that's a good thing because I think, ultimately, that person who brought baseball to us, not going to be around forever, right. So, I'll just leave it at that. I'm supporting it. I don't see a need to change the name of who the agreement is and I think Councillor Orlikow covered that really well anyway in terms of why a not-for-profit versus the private. Thanks.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this report as well. Thank you for the explanation provided by Councillor Orlikow. It is agreed in terms of, you know, the Winnipeg Jets are controlled or owned by the True North Sports and Entertainment Complex. The Winnipeg Blue Bombers, owned by the Winnipeg Football Club, so on and so forth. So, there are different entities that own our professional sports teams here in the city of Winnipeg. So, I understand the delineation between the team and the corporation that owns it. I think, as mentioned earlier, this is, you know, having a downtown ballpark isn't something that's common, especially throughout here in Canada. Baseball is more of an American past time. But to have a downtown stadium where we have, you know, a professional baseball team, is a draw for our downtown area. And I, you know, want to see that continue. As mentioned to the delegation this morning, challenging to find other opportunities as well to bring other individuals downtown to use that facility, to support the other businesses that are in the area as well. So, again, I'm supporting this agreement that we have before us today and I encourage my council…council colleagues to consider doing the same. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As Councillor Rollins suggested, I am experiencing the full range of emotions on this. It has been a long process. It covered my term as my brief and unhappy tenure as chair of the Planning Committee, then Councillor Gilroy, then…now Councillor Rollins who, to her credit, is steering this through. Certainly raised a number of questions, voted against last time. So, I do…I want to thank Councillor Rollins. This probably hasn't been easy for her to try and steer this through. But the…to her credit, she also recognizes we had a long, interesting, productive debate on October 9th, 2020, and ultimately voted 12 to 4 to have a lease with the Goldeyes. That's probably the best question that could be asked. So, we'll come back to that. So, that debate has come and gone, I would suggest, and the decision…the direction was to proceed with a lease, a 15-year lease, that would begin July 29th of this year. I said repeatedly in 2020, there's no way we're going to leave this until a middle of a baseball season and you have this

unfortunate thing that the lease expires in July of this year in the middle of the baseball season. I think that answers one of Councillor Allard's questions which was, how long are we tied in with for…with Riverside right now. Existing 25-year lease ends in 30 something days, maybe a bit less, it ends in July. So, we voted for a 15-year lease extension, but there were some errors made at that time. It has taken years to sort out everything from the insurance, the force measure clause, to all sorts of things leaving the original four amendments. Councillor Rollins is right, we should thank Marc Pittet and Gord Chappell for all of their work. We should thank Mark Newman who was here earlier today on behalf of the Goldeyes. We should thank Gord for no other reason then this report contains the remarkable phrase, "The Public Service had also included an incorrect description." The Public Service had included an incorrect description; a rare admission of fault by our Public Service, to their credit. So, you have the four amendments that are relatively uncontroversial. The entertainment tax rebate should have covered both baseball and other activities. We didn't catch that at the time. That amendment had been made in…roughly in the year 2000. So, that's amendments one and three. Amendment two, you may remember when we debated this in 2020, we didn't make it a 15-year deal, we made it roughly a 15-and-a-half-year deal so that the council in 2038 isn't debating this in the middle of a baseball season. So, the deal is going to end at the end of 2038. Our staff said we should make it clear there's no 16th payment, it's a 15-and-a-half-year deal, 15 rental payments, done. Then, to be fair to Councillor Allard, he had indicated when we debated this three years ago, hey, we should make sure we still have the right to take some of those parking stalls that we need them for the rapid transit line. We retained that right under the lease. There was an amount payable to the Goldeyes. If you had been at PP&D committee or at EPC, the Goldeyes took issue, thought they should get more. They seem to have conceded on that one. So, we would pay them something, not as much as they'd like. It's a good problem. We'll be building a BRT or an LRT line, probably BRT, if this clause ever comes into play. Multi-billion dollar…possibly hundreds of billions for LRT and a small payment to the Goldeyes because we'll be using those parking stalls. So, four relatively uncontroversial. A change was made at EPC, switch it back to Riverside from Goldeyes. Councillor Santos, excellent question earlier today; is it with the Goldeyes? Why are you changing it? So, it has been with Riverside. If you're concerned about Riverside and their profit loss, solvency, you've had eight years on Council to ask about that. So, you had lots of time. So, the decision in 2020 was, let's switch it over to the Goldeyes. The staff had recommended that. The Goldeyes, at the time, didn't have a concern. A good question would be, what happened? Why do they want it back with Riverside now? Councillor Orlikow has answered that, I think pretty clearly. And if you'd been at EPC or PP&D, they…the Goldeyes said, it's the arts, culture fund that the Province currently has, you have to be a non-profit or a not-for-profit to apply. It can't be the Goldeyes, it's got to be Riverside. So, it doesn't cost us anything. Orlikow's right again, if they get a grant that actually increases the value of our asset, if they increase the netting so people like Councillor Eadie aren't hit by foul balls, that increases the value of our baseball stadium. If they update the score board, which they should do, that would increase the value of our asset. I've been lectured on this floor about, why are you complaining about things going up in cost at Assiniboine Park. We have a more valuable asset now, it's still our asset. So, somewhat the same analogy here. So, it was a good debate. I mean, yes former Mayor Katz is the owner of the Goldeyes, that's not a mystery. He is quoted in the paper in 2020 talking after we had our vote. Councillor Eadie is right, he's not going to be around forever, like all of us. So, I don't think it's a bad idea to move the party back to being Riverside Management. Hopefully they'll be successful in the grant application and they can upgrade the asset that ultimately belongs to us. I do want to say a couple of things, if there's any one who…who probably could have justified personalizing this, it's Councillor Orlikow. I mean, like, some of us, we were around. Jeff and I were on EPC with former Mayor Katz, John was not. John has, to his credit, never personalized this. John voted with this in…voted in favour of it back in 2020. So, to his credit, regardless of what happens today, I have a lot of respect for that. If we put aside the personalities, we would like to have a baseball team. I hope our staff is hearing that. This has been a very long negotiation. The staff didn't want it to be back with Riverside. I think the Council's going to speak on that today if it passes. Let's get going. Let's get this renewed, let's get this signed off. We thought we were there in '20, we weren't. But let's play ball. Let's get it going. It's a 15-and-a-half-year lease. All of the comments that were made previously make sense. It does bring people downtown. It does have a charitable aspect. We did use it for the Pan Am Games. We did use it for the Canada Games. It's…it's…we are trying to animate downtown. This is an asset that brings in a couple of hundred thousand people a year into downtown to watch baseball. Has attendance declined in recent years? Yes. They should probably invest some capital in it. They're not going to do that if they don't have a lease. The lease is going to run out in a matter of days, so I think we need to bring some certainty and some closure to this and say, yes, we want to have a baseball team here. Yes, we want to have it in that stadium. Yes, if they succeed in the grants that will increase the value of the stadium and probably bring more people, hopefully on transit, to our downtown, which we are trying to animate. So, I'm trying to…Councillor Allard also asked to the Mayor, well, what about a rebate? There's no rebate here to Riverside. In fact, this, unlike the dollar a year lease that's been in effect for 25-years, this is tens of thousands of dollars and it escalates over the arc of the 15 years. So, we will be getting a lot more in in rental payments than we have been getting. We are not on the hook for any maintenance. The Goldeyes are on the hook for that. They take care of the stadium. Mr. Kiernan standing here three years ago now said…excellent question by Orlikow, what if we have to take this over? There was quite a large cost in us maintaining a baseball stadium. We need a team, they need a venue. It's been a long negotiation. So, we might need a little more time, Madam Speaker, if I can get…what do I get…one?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Two minutes.

Councillor Mayes: Okay. So, I'd encourage Council today to vote for the amendment. It is not, as the Mayor indicated, as others have indicated, it's not going to cost Council, the city…the citizens of Winnipeg anything if we move it to Riverside. It has been with Riverside. If we had concerns about them, that could have been raised. As indicated, I think I've tried to answer as many of Councillor Allard's questions as I can. I have to take...perhaps I should be…certainly, in the debate around Starlight and North Portage, I had some questions. I got cut off asking those, as did Councillor Lukes because we had to get through, we had to get through it. I, to this day, don't know how much money Starlight makes a year because I wasn't able to ask. So, there were some people who didn't want some of those questions asked are saying now, let's have more disclosure. We've had the opportunity, there has been disclosure. We have finally arrived at a lease that took longer than the international law of the sea treaty or the free trade agreements to negotiate. Hopefully the staff is listening and we can say, yes, the Council, the elected officials have spoken. You know, that was a pretty...Mr. Newman's been on this as long as I have now, I think. There's a long history here. He's right to mention 1954, the Willy Mays era, that teams come and go. That happens, but we have it in our power here to, I think, say, look, let's make this relatively minor amendment. Hopefully, 15 years from now, there will still be a team and the council of the day will have a chance to decide what it wants to do with the stadium then. But again, my thanks to Councillor Rollins and Councillor Orlikow in a difficult circumstance for their support. And let's play ball.

Madam Speaker: Next speaker, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be supporting this. Having said that, watching all day today, I'm kind of perplexed as to why Councillor Allard's questions couldn't be answered. And I know Councillor Rollins did give some answer to that, but just to offer some information on key people, as of March 1st, 2020, my understanding is that Jason McRae-King is...was at that time, as of three years ago, three and two months ago…three years and two months ago, Jason McRae-King was the president of Riverside Park Management and Sam Katz was the chairman. Both of these two fellows have a long history with Riverside Park Management and the Goldeyes. In fact, both of them were involved back in 2008. My understanding is, in 2008, Jason McRae-King was the chief financial officer. For all I know, he still is. I have no idea. I'm just going by the information, and he is. So, that's the information we have from Councillor Rollins that Jason McRae-King is the current chief financial officer as he was in 2008. My understanding is as of at least as recently as March 1st, 2020, Jason McRae-King was the president and Sam Katz was the chairman. I got my information from Wikipedia. So, I just don't know why this information isn't offered out there. But…on that respect, I just don't blame Councillor Allard for asking the question. So, I don't know, I don't know why it was upon me to answer to that extent, but there you go. That's what I know. But I just got mine from Google. Now, yeah, this has been going on for a long time, eh. And you know, I'm slightly uncomfortable about…about these things. In terms of what we're going to see further on in this century is, at the least in the next generation, is the play…the interplay between profits and non-profit organizations. So, you're going to see more of what's already started is, is for-profit corporations owning or running non-profits in that they work conjointly. That's exactly what's happening with the Goldeyes and Riverside Park Management. Now, why would they do such a thing? Well, because whatever benefits there are working with governments, maybe the governments want to see non-profits to the extent that it limits the amount of expenditures or it limits the amount of profits. Having said that, I'm not saying this in terms of…in terms of this issue specifically, but just in terms of the concerns as raised by Councillor Allard in general, when for-profits are running non-profits. And what we're going to be seeing is non-profits running the for-profits. And there's that as well. So, let's face it, if anybody should be concerned about that and should be asking questions about it, if anywhere it should be causing some sort of frustration, it should be amongst politicians, elective representatives, because they are the ones who ultimately have to deal with this because usually a good reason why a for-profit would run a non-profit or a non-profit would run a for-profit, could…could…could be for grants. So, it could be for taxpayer support. So, don't be surprised if in the future these questions get asked again because, well, if it's not our job to ask that, whose is it? And that's not a rhetorical question, I mean, we need to answer that question for ourselves. What's the point of for-profits running non-profits and vice versa, if it's not to get…to receive…well, at least part of the point would be to receive grants from governments. In other words, taxpayer support. So, bear that in mind in the future because it's a trend. In this...and of course, when it comes to non-profits, you've still got to ask the question, how much do they make? Because non-profits, they could be making more than the people at city hall. You don't know until you ask kind of thing. So, these are legitimate questions coming from Councillor Allard. It seemed to me like it was kind of like pulling teeth to get the answer. Well, so far, that's what I can offer to Councillor Allard and to everybody. I offer that information to everybody because they are…those questions were asked on the public's behalf. I would assume they were decent questions. There was nothing ridiculous about Councillor Allard's questions. Fascinating he had to ask five times. That's all I can give him at this…at this time. But you know what, this information should be freely forthcoming. Thank you.

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

Councillor Wyatt: I just rise to get some clarification that might help. As it stands, under the Manitoba Not-For-Profit Corporations Act, if incorporated, an annual return must be filed with the Province. If a filing has not been done within over a two-year period, the corporation can be closed. I'm assuming that's by the government. But these are annual returns that have to be filed, an annual return fee of $40 is charged and due at…by the end of the following month in terms of…as

tied to the date of the month of when they were incorporated originally. And we heard today from Mr. Newman that it is an incorporated not-for-profit corporation. Therefore, the transparency in terms of actually a not-for-profit would probably be legally more effective versus a private firm that is not publicly traded. And to acquire the financials of a private firm not publicly traded and subject to those obligations of a publicly traded private firm, that's kind of a contradiction, that you would…it would be difficult for the City to obtain those financials under the legislation that governs existing not-for-profit corporations. The Province of Manitoba is actually fairly transparent. Secondly, I have to go back to the Riverside Park Management debate. There was a significant debate and I think it's worthy to mention this and raise it now because it is somewhat related. There was a concern at the time back in…leading up to a vote that occurred in September 24th, 2008, we as a city had originally decided that the taxes on the property be based on assessment values. Assessment values were very low. Assessment took off in the downtown and property values increased. There was a disagreement between Goldeyes, Riverside Park Management and the City in terms of what taxes should be paid. At the end of the day, there was approximately…determined by the City, it went back and forth. It went to the Board of Revision, which came in with a lower assessment, then went to the City's Taxation Department, appealed that decision to the Municipal Board. The Municipal Board ruled in favour of the Taxation Department of the City saying that the higher taxes should be paid and that was the decision Peter Diamond as a chair of the board of…the Municipal Board of the time, former member of this Council, made…his committee made that ruling and then a report came to Council calling for waiving partial or all in terms of the $230,000, approximately, in taxes over a period of about three years, $233,000 to be exactly. And the report is detailed. You can read it in terms of the lease and in terms of the obligations at the time. And I can tell you that it was a very hotly debated item. You can see the votes on Council at the time. The yeas and the nays, fairly consistently. Those who voted nay, including myself and a member of EPC at the time; was Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Pagtakhan, Councillor Smith, Councillor Thomas, Councillor Vandal and myself. And that was on the heels of a report being walked on to my committee in the summer that basically said, you know, make this change in terms of the taxation. And I refused to act on it. I laid the matter over and it culminated to this. Very tough time, but I still believe that the decision made by Council was wrong at the time. I think there was a lot of…but that's my own personal view. And the taxes…the arrangement was made in terms of taxes and we should have stuck by the decision of the Municipal Board. That's neither here nor there today. Today we're talking about the future of the Goldeyes, probably, in terms of where, you know, if the team is going to stay, is the team going to say in the same ownership, whatever, it's crucial that, in my view, that it's far more transparent to be linked to the not-for-profit corporation and that we don't jeopardize the team being here in the city or not. We have a beautiful ballpark that is for families to be able to attend, to have entertainment, is extremely economical compared to other entertainment options often now. I think it's something very positive for our downtown at a time when our downtown struggles with many issues. Our staff, I think, have done a good job in terms of this and making this recommendation to protect the interest of the City and to ensure greater transparency because of the fact that it is a not-for-profit versus a private company in terms of entering into an agreement with. And there is an element of risk that, yes, in the event the Goldeyes were to be sold in the future, that it's not linked to the…to the existing ballpark. But the reality is, there are other options that we can look at in terms of ballparks and ball teams if the event should occur. And there's many entrepreneurs in the city, not just one, thank goodness. So, those are my comments. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. Next is Councillor Allard to close on his amending motion, if you wish.

Councillor Allard: Yes. Yes, Madam Speaker, thank you to my colleagues for elucidating some of the questions or responding to some of the questions that I had earlier. I mean, I still don't know what I want to know in order to be able to support this report. I heard, I think, one of my colleagues say that the administration prefer to have the Goldeyes. That's what I think I heard. So, I still don't know why, but there must be a reason. And in terms of the committee process, if I'm reading the report correctly, the administration…the standing policy recommendation was to support the Public Service recommendation. The change happened at Executive Policy Committee which was five business days ago. I understand the rationale being given as grants. I don't understand the rationale from the Public Service in terms of preferring the Goldeyes over river…Riverside Park Management. I don't know if Riverside Park Management owns the Goldeyes. I don't know if the Goldeyes own Riverside Park Management. There must be a reason for the administration having preferred Goldeyes being over Riverside Park Management. I still don't have that answer. I mean, to respond...that's maybe, perhaps, cover one of the points made by Councillor Mayes, you know, if I had questions about river…river…Riverside Park Management, I could have asked them at any point over the last number of years. Well, I thought Council direction was to sign a lease with the Goldeyes, and that was the case until what, five business days ago. And so, I have outstanding questions. I think they're reasonable. Sounds to me like Public Service prefers to one option over the other. We're going with one option not recommended by the Public Service. And I don't know what we're signing today. Well, I know what we're signing, I don't what…who we're signing with and what this organization is. I still have that outstanding. I haven't had time to go and visit the corporation's office. Yes, there are requirements for not-for-profits to file in certain ways throughout the (inaudible) corporations which also have to file in certain ways. It also made it easier to ask a corporation for their financial statements. It may be more transparent if they have a more simple organizational structure, like that of a corporation. We don't know how many sub-corporations or...we don't know what's inside. So, anyhow, I've made my point. The Public Service has recommended that we sign with the Goldeyes. It's been five business days since Executive Policy Committee flipped the recommendation from standing policy committee. Still don't have the answer on why the

Public Service prefers Goldeyes Inc. versus Riverside Park Management. And I think we should be making…I think we should know that information before having this vote. And I don't think…I don't think it should take Councillor Schreyer reading from Wikipedia to inform me about some of the things that I have been asking about. And I think there is time to deal with this. It's true that it's not ideal, it's good that the timing will be better for the next time this (inaudible)…I mean, I can read the room. I presume this vote will not be going the way that I'm proposing, but I think there would be time to get answers to these questions. So, I will not be supporting this change that was made at Executive Policy Committee because I still have unanswered questions. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins to close or I can call the question.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In the words of Kenny Rogers, I will close by saying, he puts a bat on his shoulders and tosses up the ball and the ball goes up and the ball comes down and he swings his bat. Yes, Madam Speaker, please call the question.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of amending Motion 5, please rise. Amending Motion 5 by Councillor Allard.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, and Gilroy

Nays

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Lukes, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer, Wyatt, and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

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

Madam Speaker: Amending Motion 5 is defeated. On to the main item, Item 6. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Lukes, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer, Wyatt, and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillors Allard, and Gilroy

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

Madam Speaker: Item 6 passes. I'm going to pass the Chair to our Deputy Speaker for the next short bit. Thank you.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll just ask our Clerk, Mr. Prinsloo, are there any motions for this committee?

Clerk: No, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Deputy Speaker: No? Okay. Then we will move on to by-laws. Chairperson Rollins, second and third reading by-laws, please.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2ND AND 3RD READINGS

Councillor Rollins: Yeah.

Councillor Wyatt: I…By-law No. 8/2023, I have to declare a conflict. If you wish to read the first one, I can stay and then leave for the next one.

Deputy Speaker: We'll take care of it. Sounds good, thank you, mister…or Councillor Wyatt. I'll give you a moment to step out of the room.

Councillor Rollins: We'll read By-law No. 146/2020…oh, no, he stood down.

Councillor Wyatt: That one I'm not in conflict with.

Councillor Rollins: Okay, so we'll read By-law No. 146/2022 first, Mr. Chair. So, I'll move that it be read a second time, By-law No. 146/ 2022.

Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Nobody's oppose...is anybody opposed? No. That is carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 146/2022.

Councillor Rollins: Mr. Chair, I move the By-law No. 146/2022 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour. Is anybody opposed? That is carried. Thank you. Now we're moving on to the…

Councillor Rollins: Yes, Mr. Chair, I'm waiting for Councillor Wyatt to vacate the chambers and then I'll start the motion.

Deputy Speaker: Sounds good.

Councillor Rollins: So, Mr. Chair, I move that number…By-law No. 8/2023 be read a second time.

Deputy Speaker: Okay. All those in favour? Is there anybody opposed? No. That's carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 8/2023.

Councillor Rollins: Mr. Speaker, I move that By-law No. 8/2023 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be read and signed and sealed.

Deputy Speaker: Okay. All those in favour? Is there anybody opposed? No. That is carried. So, we'll give Councillor Wyatt a moment to come in. And we'll be moving on to by-laws for voting on all three.

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

Councillor Rollins: Okay. I'll…I can just carry on. Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 57/2023, By-law No. 58/2023, By-law No. 59/2023.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 57/2023, 58/2023 and 59/2023.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that By-laws No. 57/2023 to 59/2023, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 57/2023 to 59/2023, both inclusive.

Councillor Rollins: Mr. Speaker, I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 57/2023 to 59/2023, both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Is there anybody opposed one more time? No. That is carried. Thank you. So, we will now move in to…I don't think there's any for just one reading. Is there...does anybody have questions? Pardon me? Oh yeah, okay, go ahead.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Allard: Thank you. Mr. Deputy Speaker, through you to the chairperson, I am still curious to know why the Public Service for the goldeyes Corporation relative to Riverside Park Management I understand we've had the vote but I still don't know why the Public Service would prefer a Corporation over a not-for-profit corporation.

Deputy Speaker: Chairperson Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I mean the simplest action dated back to Council direction, right and the second one was in the words Mr. Chappell put on the record with respect to clarity. It's not, you know, for me to represent the Public Service but it was a subject and it was discussed at the Standing Policy Committee.

Deputy Speaker: Okay, do you have a second question?

Councillor Allard: Yes, I guess second question, is it not true then that I still don't have the answer to these questions?

Councillor Rollins: Mr. Speaker, you know, for instance in terms of some of the questions, you know, who are the directors of Riverside, that was asked and answered several times over the course so if one doesn't feel that they have the answers, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure additional meetings or time having asked and answered it several times in the course of the answers and every colleague from Councillor Schreyer and I attempted at answering the question and still it was in the summit of comments from my colleague, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure additional time would help. What is important though I think is that, you know, perhaps there is a different question there, I can answer some of the questions again in terms of Don Ferguson, McRae-King and Reagan Katz being on the board of the Directors of Riverside, again that would be the third time perhaps in this meeting that was answered, Mr. Speaker. So I do think that there have been efforts to answer in the main, Mr. Speaker, the concern around a political deterrent which was the case from the Public Service recommendations that was in part had its genesis through council direction and then changed at EPC, it was noted that that was changed at EPC also correct. I think that there is additional time to forward emails to the Public Service if the Councillor wants Mr. Speaker, can get, you know, the team that was here in delegation, the questions could have been asked right then and there of Mr. Mark Newman of who the directors were, for instance Mr. Speaker. So, there's still time for discussions, I'm willing to sit down and review what was on the record at Property and Development with Councillor Allard. Re-examine some of the questions and the Council decisions that led up to this one, but you know we did answer several times a repeated question to every chair but it…if it is answered and it's…of course posed again, you know, it begs the question if there isn't a fundamentally different question being asked or conclusion to be made.

Councillor Allard: Third question.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you Chairperson Rollins, go ahead, third question.

Councillor Allard: So, will the chair commit to helping me get the answer form the Pubic Service why did they prefer Goldeyes over Riverside Park Management? I think I heard that discussion.

Deputy Speaker: I heard it in the debate as well, Councillor Allard and others. Anyway, Chairperson Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Oh, Mr. Speaker. I'm always willing to facilitate questions and answers. I get paid a premium on Executive Policy Committee so.

Deputy Speaker: All right, asked and answered. Mr. Mayes wants to ask a question, is that correct? By all means, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I am somewhat troubled and perhaps should have plugged it at EPC and didn't, so wanted to ask the chair today about the item on expropriation of land and there's…it's Item No. 5 saying that the north garage we'd all like to see a north Transit garage. It's not entirely federally funded. That has been suggested elsewhere that we're in for a lot of this, a lot of that and the city going into this. There's no financial statement attached to Item No. 5. Obviously, if we have to expropriate there will be a cost, but we don't know that yet, but there's not even an estimate. So, I'm wondering what's, how are we…how are we proceeding on this in terms of how we deal with expropriation questions, and I know Councillor Rollins has expressed frustration in the past with the way certain financial statements are done at the back of these reports so I wanted to get her thoughts on it.

Deputy Speaker: Thanks for the good question, Councillor Mayes. Chairperson Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have indeed expressed frustration and I do have preference for, you know, Federal and Provincial Treasury Board Secretariat briefing notes and have indeed in emails described these creatures that I had to do as a senior policy analyst in Federal and Provincial Governments over the years. I do have a preference for…for a, you know, the department to look at fund sourcing and together with my council colleagues, I will be and tilt into that window again with the Public Service. I just haven't had time in June and certainly there have been public servants that I've met with that have prompted and I'll get back to those emails in the fullness of time. The report does concern the land embassy necessary to fulfill the city's ambition with respect to Transit. We have allocated particular land acquisition costs which I will endeavor to get back to the Councillor. The report you know has passing references to land costs that are ineligible so it's absolutely a fair question. The City has, like I said, allocated acquisition costs, but I can commit to send these to all of Council over email. What I also will say too is that you will see this again in the fall where staff will be coming back essentially to tell us the story of expropriation and purchase that are being processed, you know, concurrently to ensure Transit obtains the land.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Chairperson Rollins. Do you have a follow up question, Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: No, thanks.

Deputy Speaker: No? Okay. Is there anybody else who'd like to ask a question? No? I'll have one, but I don't know what the provisions are for Deputy Speaker so I will ask it off-line. We did pass the report already so.

Councillor Rollins: Go ahead, Councillor Eadie.

Deputy Speaker: Yeah, we could or the Mayor could ask it. The Mayor could ask it.

Mayor Gillingham: Mr. Acting Chair, if you could recognize me, I'll ask a question.

Deputy Speaker: Please, by all means.

Mayor Gillingham: Your question was what's the chance of the Province would waive the hearing process for expropriation?

Councillor Rollins: That's an excellent question. You know, there's probably not much of a secret that I have a pretty good case study on expropriation in my ward that I've been talking to over the years, something called the Ruben Block. The Expropriation Act hasn't been changed in a few years, several MLAs have been, you know, responsible for it over the years. I don't think there's much of…you know, on any given legislative agenda of the legislature. This is just not a top piece that I see being prioritized and I…in the legislative session is actually over. So, in the coming months in advance of an election, my question…my answer would have to be, you know, slim to none in advance of the coming election. This just would not be feasible. It will be, you know, the session is over for the year…the season sorry, and then we're in a blackout period when we return practically.

Deputy Speaker: Okay. Great. Thank you, Chairperson. So, if there's no more questions, I don't think our Speaker is back yet, so I will ask Councillor Orlikow to bring forth the Community Service report of May 31st, 2023.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED MAY 31, 2023**

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah, I'd like to move reports 1 through 7, please.

Deputy Speaker: Okay. Does anybody want to step one down at all? No? 6, okay. So, I'm not hearing any others. So, we're going to call the vote on reports, Items 1 through 5 and I believe it's 7. All those in favour? Is there anybody opposed? That is carried. Councillor Orlikow, report No. 6. Mr. Clerk with report…what is that?

Item 6 – Addition of 20 FTE Paramedic Positions to WFPS Staff Complement to Staff Two Additional 24-Hour Ambulances

Deputy Speaker: Excellent. Councillor Orlikow, you want to introduce or…?

Councillor Orlikow: I'll introduce it and look forward to hearing comments. It's a good news story.

Deputy Speaker: Okay. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker. I think this file is longer, Councillor Mayes and Councillor Rollins, than the Riverside Goldeyes file. This has been going for, I think, six years, about that, something like that. So, I just…I just rise, I'll be really brief, just to thank the Province of Manitoba for signing a new agreement on ambulances and for adding two additional ambulances and 20 paramedics to staff those ambulances. It was a very long process to get here. Former mayor, councillor…Mayor Bowman was pushing this file. I know many members of Council in the previous term were working on this file as well. Our staff, our CAO and our fire chief and our Corporate Finance Department as well, along with members of Shared Health were working on this matter for a long, long time. And I know it's the…over time, the collective voices of many members who are on this council, including Councillor Rollins and others who called for more resources to assist our fire paramedic staff in the workload that they're experiencing, especially through COVID. The workloads are very high. They remain high. The call volumes remain very, very high. And so, it's good news ultimately to have this contract signed and to add additional resources to ambulances, 20 paramedics. As our fire chief said, will it completely solve the problem? No, but it will certainly assist with some of the pressure that our staff are facing. And I'll say this finally, once again, I'll take the opportunity on behalf of all of us to express appreciation to the paramedics of the city of Winnipeg, fire paramedics and the city of Winnipeg, who do outstanding work all the time. 911 calls come in and they get to people in their desperate hour of need. And they're doing outstanding work, too, to help us. So, my thanks…our thanks to them as well at this time. Yeah, call the question.

Councillor Orlikow: No, that's Wyatt…Councillor Wyatt. Who wants to move…in my glorious comments. Yeah, so there's…no, it's not me. I didn't call it. I don't think it matters. Yeah, call the question.

Deputy Speaker: All right. Excellent. And I'm very happy. All right. All those in favour? Is anybody opposed? I hope not. All right, that's a very…Mr. Prinsloo, we have a notice of motion on the agenda next, I believe.

Clerk: That's correct, yes. Yes.

Deputy Speaker: That notice of motion, I think, is next in order. So, that would be moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah.

Deputy Speaker: On…what is that report called again…notice?

City Clerk: The notice of motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is regarding the four district police model.

Deputy Speaker: Right.

City Clerk: So, Councillor Wyatt would be introducing.

Deputy Speaker: Yeah, Councillor Wyatt to introduce the notice.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES
NOTICE OF MOTION

Motion No. 7
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Duncan,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg is currently suffering from an urban health crisis, including an unacceptable level of crime that is negatively affecting our neighbourhoods;

AND WHEREAS on July 23, 2003, Council adopted the "Four District Model" for restructuring the Winnipeg Police Service, being four geographic districts designated as East, West, North, and Central;

AND WHEREAS the Council motion adopted on July 23, 2003, provided that the restructuring of the Winnipeg Police Service to the Four District Model would result in a number of benefits, including improved public access to the police service, increased police visibility and public interaction, and cooperative partnerships with the community;

AND WHEREAS the North, West, and East District stations are currently "CLOSED", as stated on the City of Winnipeg website, at all hours;

AND WHEREAS public accessibility to front-line Winnipeg Police Service members is critical to building safer communities and an effective model of community policing, in accordance with the original intent of the Four District Model;

AND WHEREAS all City of Winnipeg services should prioritize "customer service" to residents.

AND WHEREAS City Council in the 2023 Operating Budget has asked the Winnipeg Police Service to find approximately $9 million of "efficiencies" and that this represents a significant financial challenge to the Winnipeg Police Service;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council request the Winnipeg Police Board to do the following:

1. *That the North District Station at 260 Hartford Avenue, West District Station at 2321 Grant Avenue, and East District Station at 1750 Dugald Road be reopened immediately to the public for 12 hours per day during the day shift, 7 days a week.*
2. *That each of the Four District stations install and maintain visible outdoor signage advertising that the Four District stations are available and accessible to the public within the said operating hours referred to in Recommendation 1 and that all websites and city public information be changed accordingly.*
3. *That clearly marked areas for free Visitor Parking be provided for the newer District Stations.*
4. *That financial resources and security measures be provided to ensure that any operational changes to the Four District stations' hours does not negatively impact front-line members.*
5. *That in the event the said office hours with staffing cannot be accommodated within the existing Winnipeg Police Service budget, that the matter be referred by the Winnipeg Police Service for inclusion in the 2024 – 2027 multiyear operating budget for consideration.*
6. *That the relevant by-laws or policies of the City of Winnipeg and Council be amended accordingly.*
7. *The Proper Officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.*

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the interest of time, FYI to clear up and make a better motion, another…a notice of motion has been tabled for consideration next month. Therefore, I'd like to move that the motion before us today be received as information.

Deputy Speaker: Oh, okay. And the seconder's good with that? Okay.

Councillor Duncan: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to move that the question be put.

Deputy Speaker: All right. All those in favour? Nobody's opposed, I don't think. That's carried. That's carried. All right. Do we have any other motions, Mr. Clerk on the...?

Clerk: No, sir.

Deputy Speaker: Well, we have a new notice of motion, right? Is that correct?

Clerk: Yes, we have new Notion No. 7, which is also a notice of motion under this committee.

Deputy Speaker: All right. Okay, or do we have by-laws? Sorry, do we have by-laws? Sorry.

Clerk: Yes, we do.

Deputy Speaker: Oh, we do have by-laws. Sorry. I've got to get down here. All right. By-laws, Councillor Orlikow. If I can get to that space.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Orlikow: Oh, you want me to do this now? I move that By-laws No. 56/2003 be read a first time.

Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Is anybody opposed? That is carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 56/2023.

Deputy Speaker: I'll get to that. Is that only a first reading or are we…?

Councillor Orlikow: First reading. Then I move that By-laws No. 56/2003 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 56/2023.

Councillor Orlikow: I'll move that by-law…the rules be suspended and By-law No. 56/2023 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Deputy Speaker: Signed, sealed, delivered. All those in favour? Nobody's opposed? That's great. That is carried. Thank you. I think that's all we had for by-laws. So, we'll move into question period for Chairperson Orlikow. Anybody have any questions?

Councillor Orlikow: I don't think so.

Deputy Speaker: I hear…well, okay, there's no questions, then I believe that is the last report, is it? I think that…yeah, I…Councillor Duncan is going to move adjournment. Thank you. All those in favour? Is there anybody opposed? No. Good. All ight. Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Eadie, His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer, Wyatt.

Council adjourned at 4:43 p.m.