

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

Thursday, October 26, 2023

The Council met at 9:44 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 Santos.

ROLL CALL

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, I would recognize you for your morning announcements.

INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Good morning to everyone. I want to start things off today with warm welcome back to Councillor Orlikow. It's good to see you back in action, feeling better, healthy and full of energy. Serving on this council is no small feat. We all know that it's demanding, it's challenging, but also is incredibly rewarding. And none of us could do it without the support of our families and our staff and of course each other, our fellow council members. So, Councillor Orlikow if you need anything, certainly we are here for you. By the way, the beard looks really good (inaudible) so. Let's take a moment now, Madam Speaker, to acknowledge a very special milestone. It was exactly one year ago today that each of us were elected or re-elected to this council. And I want to take the opportunity to thank all of you for your hard work over the last year and one member acclaimed, yes Councillor. Thank you very much for your hard work and your dedication, and the passion that you brought to this chamber over the past year. We've all tried to make a shift to the way we work together. There's been a renewed...two members acclaimed. There's been a renewed sense, so thank you very much. One was pointing them out to me, but we have tried to make a shift toward a sense of collaboration and teamwork. Obviously, we are not always going to agree nor really should we, but we are trying to work together and that has shown itself. Obviously in our adoption of our first ever Strategic Priorities Action Plan. And that plan, and the implementation of that plan, will make a real difference in our city. Together we've increased funding for our urban forest. We put more money into active transportation and today, we're set to make a decision on a new curbside composting program. We've launched a community safety team initiative, to enhance safety on our public transit. Boosted funding to downtown community safety partnership and put additional resources into foot patrol of the Winnipeg Police Service into our downtown. We have a tentative agreement in place for the potential redevelopment of Portage Place. We've incentivized housing on Portage Avenue East and a new hotel along Broadway. Air Canada Park is about to get a much-needed face-lift, and we've partnered with The Forks to create a new vision for the Alexander Docks. We've stepped up our policies on vacant and derelict properties, increasing enforcement, raised security standards and introduced significant fines for non-compliance. And now, property owners have quicker and easier paths to demolish problem properties. We've expanded our investment into 24/7 safe spaces, established an extreme weather policy and opened temporary warming shelter to provide for our homeless population. And after six years of negotiation, we finally signed a new agreement with the provincial government for ambulance services. Our council has accomplished a lot over the past year and we've done so because we all worked together. And I believe we've laid strong foundation for the work that we need to do ahead in the final three years of this term. Looking forward, we're all excited to start working with our new provincial government to develop a comprehensive, coordinated plan to address homelessness. This plan will be built on the key principles of housing first, wrap around...with wrap around supports and tracking data and sharing data. Helping Winnipeggers who are struggling with homelessness, addiction and mental health issues, is one of the most important things that we collectively can do for our community right now. But Madam Speaker, we also need to acknowledge the impact of external events, and global issues, and the impact that those events have on our work and on us personally, as elected officials and community leaders. The war in Ukraine has brought close to 20,000 people to Winnipeg, seeking safety and a new start. And I am incredibly proud of how our community has come together to support these who have fled Ukraine. The horrific allegations of serial predator targeting Indigenous women and the broader issue of missing and murdered Indigenous women, girls, and Two-spirited individuals, has galvanized significant part of our community over the past year. We now wait for guidance from the provincial and federal governments on how they oversee with the feasibility study to search the Prairie Green Landfill. In recent weeks, we have seen demonstrations here at City Hall, and at the Manitoba Legislature, on issues related to gender identity and expression. And I wanted to be clear, Madam

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
October 26, 2023

Speaker, though I value and while I value democratic freedoms to speak and to protest, there's absolutely no room for hate in our city, in the city that we are trying to build. Trans and nonbinary youth, like all young people, need to feel safe at school, at home, and everywhere else in the community. And now we're seeing the hostilities of the Israel-Hamas war spilling onto our local community. Local Jewish and Palestinian communities have been impacted by the loss of loved ones. Supporters on both sides have taken to our streets, and we've seen an alarming increase in the rhetoric and behavior that is anti-Semitic, anti-Islamic, anti-Palestine and anti-Israel. I acknowledge the passion and conviction that people bring to this historic conflict. And if you've had family or friends who've been directly impacted, I can only imagine your anger. But confrontation between groups during rallies, or any form of anti-Semitism or Islamophobia, is absolutely unacceptable in Winnipeg. It is critical that we remember our shared humanity, our collective love for this city, and our responsibility to maintain peace and civility. Winnipeg is and must always be a safe haven for all who love peace and the democratic values that our nation has fought for and given lives to defend. In the past two weeks, I've met with leaders of the Jewish, Palestinian and broader Islamic communities, and the overwhelming majority share a common wish for peace and the end to the loss of lives on both sides of this conflict. So, I'm asking everyone, no matter where you stand on these issues, to take a moment to pause, to reflect, and to commit to pursuing peace and respect in our community. We will get further with dialogue than with demonstrations. To my council colleagues, I know all of you have been hearing from residents about these issues, about these tensions. And it is a big weight for each one of us to carry. It's challenging to figure out what to do or what to say in these circumstances. But we're not always going to get it right. But I want to thank you for taking this responsibility on, and for doing what you can to help build a stronger Winnipeg. So, as we turn our attention to the second year of our mandate, we know we have a lot of work to do., but I'm confident that we have leadership around this chamber to continue to build a stronger Winnipeg for all of our citizens. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. And now Deputy Mayor Councillor Lukes, your morning announcement.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'd like to welcome Vivek Bhagria and Lytika Sharma to City Hall. Vivek and Lytika represented Team Canada, as they competed in the World Dwarf Games this past summer, in Cologne, Germany. Both won silver medals; Vivek for volleyball and Lytika for power lifting, and their medals are now on display in the Sports Hall of Fame. Prior to our council meeting, Vivek and Lytika met with the Mayor to receive congratulations for their outstanding athletic performances. This is Lytika's first year competing in power lifting, look out Vivek. And this is Vivek's I think tenth year competing both nationally and internationally. Vivek is a constant figure in Winnipeg sports community, and his role at South Winnipeg Community Centre. Both Vivek and Lytika are our inspirations, our true inspirations, for so many in the dwarf community, showing that everyone, that anything is possible. Yesterday was International Dwarfism Awareness Day, recognizing Little People throughout the world. Vivek and Lytika, we are so proud of you, for what you do, for your inspiration, for your commitment to the community. On a special note we all want to congratulate you on your upcoming wedding! Congratulations. (applause). Bravo! Keep up the good work. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes.

MINUTES

Councillor Orlikow moves that the minutes of the meeting held on September 29, 2023 be taken as read and confirmed.

MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: Our first delegation is Kevin Barske, who is appearing in support of Item 1 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee, dated October 17, 2023. It's regarding Regulating Short-Term Rental Accommodations. And before we get into that, I'd like to ask our clerk to first move a motion, read it into the record for the absence of Councillor Schreyer today due to a personal family matter.

**Moved by Councillor Browaty,
 Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,**

THAT Councillor Schreyer be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to a personal family matter.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Clerk, the delegation is online? Is the delegation online? And the motion, all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Welcome, Kevin Barske.

DELEGATIONS

Kevin Barske: Good morning. I was...I was born in Winnipeg, and I've lived in this beautiful city for all, but three years of my life. During that time, I lived in Windsor Park, St. Vital, Fort Garry, Osborne Village, and now River Heights. As a proud life-long Winnipegger, I appreciate the opportunity to speak here today. As somebody who owns a non-primary short-term rental, STR in Winnipeg, I'd like to start off by saying that I support the majority of the recommendations that are before you. There are a few things in here that I feel could use some tweaking, but I'll touch on those in a little bit. I see that there is a need for STRs in Winnipeg. They are important for vulnerable people such as refugees, survivors of domestic violence or people receiving medical treatment. They're important for tourists, as well as for traveling business people. Regulation will ensure that the same standards are followed across the board by all hosts and operators. I imagine the most responsible short-term rental owners have no issue ensuring that all the fire and building codes are maintained. After all, our businesses are based on customer service and ensuring our guest safety should be high up on the list. Regulation and licensing are good ways to hold owners accountable, and I'm all for it. The 5% accommodation tax. I don't know too many people that will be super excited about the idea of paying yet another tax, but I think it's fair to say that we understand where this one is coming from and why it's being introduced. If approved, this tax on STRs will create consistency and fairness in taxes for all accommodation types. If hotels and other such accommodations are subject to paying this, then I absolutely get why short-term rentals should be paying it, too. Zoning. I think STRs that are currently being operated in zones R1 and R2 should be allowed to continue operating after they obtain their licenses, provided they meet all the criteria to obtain that license. I was happy to see this included in the zoning by-law updates. On this subject, I'd also like to note, that just over half the people have responded to the City's public engagement survey, who live in multi-unit dwellings, such as apartments and condos, reported more negative impacts from STRs versus those who live in single detached dwellings, in which less than a quarter reported negative impacts. Also, according to the online survey, roughly 60% of respondents who live in downtown Winnipeg reported more negative impacts from short-term rentals accommodations, compared to roughly 30% of respondents who live in other neighborhoods, outside of downtown. The decision to include R1 and R2 zoning reflects what was reported in the public engagement survey, where the majority respondents felt that short-term rental accommodations should be allowed in all neighbourhoods and in all dwelling types. To me, these results from public engagement survey seem to indicate that single detached dwellings in R1 and R2 neighbourhoods are far less disruptive than what can be experiencing in multi-unit dwellings or downtown dwellings. I can see that a lot of thought and effort has gone into the proposed regulations that I just mentioned, as well as to the budgetary requirements, the fee structure and the enforcement framework. I look forward to seeing how these positively affect Winnipeg's STR industry, by providing a better experience for our communities, as well as for our guests that choose to stay in accommodations. Now, I'd like to change gears slightly and briefly, emphasis on briefly, touch on a few areas that I feel could use some improvements and offer up a couple possible suggestions on how to make them better. Instead of outright limiting the amount of STRs to three non-primary units owned before February 23, 2023 and not allowing any more ever. I would like to propose a merit to merit system, similar to what MPI does with their driver's license each year. If you prove yourself to be a responsible operator, then the amount of STRs you could own would increase at designated intervals over time. On the other hand, if you're not a responsible operator and your property is repeatedly being a problem, then the penalties you have proposed for non-compliance, seem fair and justified. Secondly, I have some safety concerns around having the owner's name and phone number posted on the exterior of the building. Again, I'll keep it brief, but I feel that doing this could potentially cause ST owner or sorry, STR homes to become easily targeted by criminals and possibly endanger the safety of the owner. Instead of the owner's name and phone number being posted outside of the building, perhaps it would make sense to have a registry of all STR operators in the city, available to the by-law enforcement officers and to the police, perhaps even 311. This way the owners can still be contacted and held accountable, without opening themselves up to the risk of predation. I'm also struggling to understand the harsh consequences where an operator could permanently lose their STR license without vocal revival or renewal, if a guest stays in their STR for 30 days or more, as indicated in Section 61.8 (4)(b). To me, it seems like these regulations were partially brought about in order to deal with people who are renting STRs to party and creating disturbances among neighbours. In my opinion, parties are more likely to occur in one or two day stay versus 50-day stay, for an insurance claim. Perhaps, having a minimum number of nights per booking would curb partying more than having a 30-day cap. Again, now I am speculating here because I'm not really sure what the 30-day limit accomplishes. The City of Winnipeg's public engagement survey from 2022 showed that the sample size that participated was statistically significant enough to say with 95% certainty, that the results were within plus or minus 4% percentage points of what they would've been, if the entire adult population of Winnipeg had been surveyed. These survey respondents, which are representative of Winnipeg's population, expressed that the development of regulations should include the following top three considerations. Number one: support the safety of the community and short-term renters. I feel that the proposed by-law amendments will do a pretty decent job of this, but I think they fall a little bit short in protecting the owners, by insisting that their names and phone numbers be posted publicly outside. I think we can do a better job coming up with solutions that really support both the safety of the community and the owners. Number two: mitigate noise, property damage and illegal activity. And I think the proposed regulations will do a great job with these. Number three: support the local economy and tourism. Here, I think that we may have missed the mark a little bit, by restricting the number of STRs on the market, and by limiting the length of stays to 30-days. My own STR is occupied four to five nights. This leads me to believe that there's a demand for these types of

accommodations in our city. These regulations appear to be aimed at the owners or small business owners. The majority of us don't want people partying in our properties. We strive to offer nice accommodations and we don't want our homes trashed. Most of us do our best to screen the guests, and unfortunately sometimes the bad apples sneak through. I don't think the entire onus for good behavior should be placed on the owners. There should also be some accountability for the guests, in the form of penalties or fines, imposed on those who choose to be disruptive. Only disciplining the owners is kind of like reprimanding a kindergarten teacher because they have rambunctious students. I'd like to alleviate today with a few quotes from survey respondents, that we're taken from the statistical survey appendices document. The first one: By and large, the property owners are not the problem. It's the people who come downtown to party for a night, leaving their garbage behind. We have seen blatant drug dealing, et cetera. Minimum stays need to be adopted to weed out the ne'er-do-wells. The second quote: Short-term rentals have been a great addition to our community. I work in restaurants and most of our guests are from the short-term rentals in the area, always kind people. And the third one: Short-term rentals are good for your city. I came to visit Winnipeg and stayed in one, and the neighbours were friendly and I felt part of the community, which I would not have if I stayed in a hotel. The short-term owners are valuable to the economy of the city. To summarize my thoughts about regulating STRs in Winnipeg, I came up with an acronym based on Winnipeg's current slogan: Made from what's real. Real, R. E. A. L. where R stands for regulations that are fair and make sense; E stands for equality across all accommodation types; A stands for accountability for both owners and guests; and the L stands for licensing to ensure safety and compliance. Thank you for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. First question. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Batske?

Kevin Barske: Barske.

Councillor Chambers: On short-term rentals. I just wanted to ask you a question with respect to being aware that Winnipeg is in an affordable and available housing crisis, and offering more homes, you know, to support good landlords or owners of these homes passed, you know, passed the date that this is adopted, is taking available housing off of the market for business enterprises. Are you aware of that?

Kevin Barske: I have heard that, yes. It is my understanding that the amount of short-term rentals in Winnipeg, represent less than half a percentage of all available houses. And I can only speak from my own experience, but the short-term rental home I operate is in River Heights, and I don't know if somebody who is struggling to find a home to meet, River Heights isn't necessarily the starting point on that journey for them, financially.

Councillor Chambers: Okay, are you also aware that in addition to short-term rental homes in the city, there are also people operating home-based businesses, there are more and more people working from home, and there are illegal rooming houses throughout the city, closer to universities and post-secondary education institutions, that have an impact on the neighborhoods that they're in in terms of, you know, families and children and all of those things that we want our neighborhoods to be, outside of a business zone?

Kevin Barske: Yeah, that's...that's a great question, and there is a need for more student housing, around the schools and having illegal rooming houses I don't think is a great option, but, you know, if there is some sort of solution where investors can find a way to legally increase the density around those neighborhoods, I think that would be a good thing having safety in mind for all.

Councillor Chambers: Okay, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I knew that surname, was Barske, so firstly, please indicate to your dad, who taught me three years of social studies, that I was paying attention. My presence here today indicated that I was paying attention. I would like to renew our debate about Neville Chamberlain with him sometime, from the late 70s though, please pass that on. You made a good point and a number of others have made the point, of the notice outside the house. And I have some sympathy with that. And I think...I just...are you aware...are you aware that we've got a mechanism here that staff report back in a couple years because I think that's...that concern was raised by a number of presenters and I have some sympathy. I don't know exactly what we can do about it, because I get the need that the neighbours need to be able to contact the owner. So, having it inside doesn't really work, but you're aware we do have...and I appreciate you coming down twice now and speaking to us. But yes, if you could...are you aware that we've got a mechanism, something that people can...that they will be reviewing this I believe in 2026?

Kevin Barske: Yes, I am aware of that, that we are going to be reviewing that in three years, I think it was. But to me, that having it posted outside, like where I live I don't know all my neighbours on my street. And if somebody has a party down the street, I don't have access to their parents' phone numbers to be able to call and say, hey look, there is an out of control party at your house. So, I'm not really sure what the difference is. I think owners should be held accountable, and I think that there should be a way to contact them. I just don't think that having the number posted physically outside will be the best way to go about it.

Councillor Mayes: Fair enough. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions. We'll move onto the next delegation. Thank you for your presentation today. Next is Stanislav Boluchevski, in opposition to item 1 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 17, 2023, it's regarding regulating short-term rental accommodations. Our delegation's in person. If I could please call you forward, and there will be 10 minutes on the clock. Welcome, Stan.

Stanislav Boluchevski: Thank you. Good morning. How are you today? Beautiful morning, celebrating our first snow. It's going to be a nice winter ahead of us. We're here to solve some issues and concerns that were raised regarding STRs. And I'm here to provide maybe some solution that makes everybody happy, right? A few points have been raised in our last meetings. So, I want to provide you four, a little bit of numbers. As what I just said before, in this opening, there is around 300 plus available housing units, there are about. And the STR accommodation is about around 1100 listings, active listings, that by the way, majority of them also, not the huge majority, those are rooms inside houses. Those are not full dwellings. So, the STR community is less than half a percent of the housing community. Please keep that in mind. The main concern, the biggest concern that we all have criminal activities, parties and disturbance to our neighbours, right? Parties, noise, prostitution and drug dealings. Those are major concerns, and I agree with all of you about those problems. But the STR community is ahead of this curve. We have the best tools to take care of it and we are already doing it, for comparison, noise detection devices in your house. When there is certain amount of time that there is a certain amount of noise, it will let us know that there is something fishy going on. And we will go there immediately and see what is happening. Security cameras, doorbell cameras, that will alert us on people going in and out of our houses, if there is drug dealing or prostitution. And of course, the best arsenal in our weapon against those problems, is our neighbours. Our neighbours are our best allies and best friends. I know that I know all of my neighbours where my STR, is so on, and also my friends. Those neighbours have our information, and, they will let us know if something fishy is going on, before it creates a problem. Let's be honest, nobody wants their house trashed. I can assure you that I have an STR for a while now, and that property for the last three years, I spent more than \$60,000 in it to make it, top of the line. Have (inaudible) best appliances, wallpapers, anything that I can make my place better and I do not... I did not do that to have some pimp have hookers in my house. I can assure you of that. Now, again another concern that's... just was talked about. Our name and information in the front of our houses. I will give you some information about me. I am a locksmith. I have a business. I run my own business and I can assure you, that the crime rate in this city, is up. Up and rising. And putting this information outside, will single out our STRs, to people who can check on any platform, if we have availability, or to break in and steal something inside, or just to squat in there. But more than that, our STRs we have are securities. But those people who come there, they are putting our neighbours in risk. Why? We need to find a better solution for that. I am not saying that don't have our information available, but the solution must be better than that, to protect our community. Now, there is a concern in my eyes. We, as a city, we take examples from other cities. And we need our own method of working things out. We are the centre of Canada. And instead of leading the charge, we are following it. Why? We should be better than everyone else. And everyone else needs to take example from us. I want to give you an example of what huge fight that was when innovation come to this city. Uber. When Uber first was introduced here, the idea of Uber coming here, there were a huge push back from taxi companies, right? Nobody wanted... oh, Uber, people will lose jobs and so on, but Uber is here. And look what innovation it brought to this city. Winnipeegers love Uber, and the Uber industry made the whole taxi industry better, because they made the taxi company up their game and provide better customer service. So, putting competition made everything better. Innovation is progress, and we cannot fall behind. The definition of STRs is a bit wrong. And this is the problem that everyone raised, the 30-day cap. Why? Why we have the 30-day cap? So, it starts from what I saw in the zoning definition of what is STR. STR is defined as rental for less than 30 consecutive days. And this is where the main problem. I rent my units for seven days, for fourteen days. Today, I have a company that booked my STR and they are starting their fifth month there. Now the definition of STR exempts hotels and motels from that. Why? If we are to pay accommodation tax, to be fair and level the playing field between us and the hotel industry, why are they exempt from that definition? Why are they getting the unfair advantage? Now most hotels and motels are over booked for about 127%. How is it possible more than 100%? That is simple. The moment somebody cancels, immediately somebody jumps in. They are overbooked. While STRs are around 70% booked. Now it's been also another concern that says that we are in the housing crisis. We are in a housing shortage. Words have meaning and we need to look at what we say. We cannot misinform people. And maybe some people are just misinformed themselves. There is no housing crisis in Winnipeg. There is no shortage of housing in Winnipeg. Open up today, the Kijiji app, and you will go to real estate long-term rental. And you will see that for today, 1284 units are available for rent. I agree that there is a crisis in housing and this is affordable housing. Canadian governments want to head on a plan, offer affordable housing. What is affordable

housing? When it's cost approximately less than \$1,000 for a unit, okay? Guys, short-term rentals that go on to the market will not go less than \$1,000. So, that will not solve the situation, with the fact that we all need, like I said, half a percent of the system, you will not solve that issue. That issue is there because of the federal government that printed money like it's a monopoly game, creating record high inflation and insane mortgage rates. You need to be fair. You need to be fair not only for the hotel industry, you need to be fair also to us. You represent all people of Winnipeg. Stopping that progress is not fair for us. Let's sit together, let's work things out. We, in the STR community, can help you get to be fair, to accommodate everyone, but sit with us. R1 and R2 zoning are unfair. Let the licensing work. Drop the restrictions. Have the regulation in place and give it time to work. Guys, Rome was not built in a day. People are running away from Winnipeg and from Manitoba. We are falling behind. We are a decade behind on innovation and progress. For example, people are running away for Alberta because they are innovating. They have progress. They have strong community. They are ahead and they're not behind. And we cannot let anyone pass us by. Canada was built on a free market called capitalism. I am an immigrant and came in Canada six and a half years ago from Israel, before the North American dreams. Two minutes.

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

Stanislav Boluchevski: Thank you very much. Canada was built on a free market of capitalism, and that is why Canada is the top five countries in the world. Canadians love Airbnbs. Winnipeg, Winnipeegers will love Airbnbs and short-term rentals. You cannot kill this industry, guys. I request you, humbly request you, please, do not choke the baby bird before it spreads its wings. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Stanislav, if I can ask you to stay on the bench? We'll hear from the next delegation and then we'll take questions. Thank you. I'd like to call forward Anthony Bertrand, also in opposition to the same item. If you're present here today, Anthony Bertrand. Mr. Clerk, is the individual present? Are you aware? Okay, and they're not online? Okay, we'll now take questions then, if I could please call you back, Stanislav? And the first question will be from Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you to...for coming to City Hall and thank you for your entrepreneurial drive and your hard work as a new Canadian, newer Canadian. And you know, my father used to say who had a Grade 10 education, successful small business person, that if you can make...you know, it's that expression? If you're aware of that expression, if you can make it in New York, you can make it anywhere? Well if you can make it in Winnipeg, you can make it anywhere. So, thank you for coming and whatever happens here, just keep going, right? No matter what. So, thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker...putting the question to our delegation, who expressed the very free capitalist system might be ideology, but anyway, I would beg to differ, it's a regulated capitalist system in Canada. Madam Speaker, I'm not sure, I'm going to ask this question, but do you think it's fair that a hotel has to pay...it's paying property taxes at a higher apportionment, at what is it? 65% rather and your residential properties are only apportioned at 45%. Do you think that that's fair competition?

Stanislav Boluchevski: Well, fairness needs to be extended for everyone. That's what I mean. If you want to level the playing field, you need to have everything leveled. If you want us to pay accommodation tax, everybody said no problem, but if you exempt the hotels from that 30-days, from that strict description of what STR are, because hotels and motels are short-term rentals. Most people that go to hotels are there. So, by property tax, I don't know the regulation about property tax. Hotels are also bigger, right? If you are saying maybe we should implement the same property tax on STRs, or at least on the properties that are STRs. If...by leveling the playing field on all accounts, it means that removing all the restrictions from STR and let them open whenever they want and operate under those regulations, raise the property tax. I don't really care. And for what you said about the capitalism, regulated capitalism. Regulation is important. We should regulate. This is not the wild west. We can't run around, doing nilly-willy what we want. Regulation is important, but restrictions make, give some, someone an unfair advantage, they create monopoly.

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

Councillor Mayes: To back up Councillor Eadie I think, I mean, you used the example of when Uber came, and that was not in the previous term of Council, but 2014-18 term of Council, we did pass regulations around vehicles for hire. And there was an immense effort made with Manitoba Public Insurance, to negotiate something with those vehicles for hire company, with Uber, with others. So, I appreciate what you are saying. We still need some regulation, but I didn't want to leave the impression that somehow, we opened the door and welcomed in vehicles for hire, Uber, Lyft, others. There was a debate here, there was a regulatory scheme put in effect. There was a special chart put on for safety. We allowed cabs to start using diamond lanes. Many other changes were made, so, I appreciate what you're saying about regulation and

vehicle for hire, but I think you'd agree. We did have a debate. We had...we imposed regulations on a vehicle for hire sector, I mean, it wasn't just sort of, as you say, was the wild west for Uber and others.

Stanislav Boluchevski: And exactly, I never said that there is no regulation. And again, I will repeat myself. Regulation are more than welcome. That is okay. The regulation will be to weed the problematic STRs from the good STRs. I am...my only issue is with restrictions. If you restrict us, you give the hotels and motels an unfair advantage. You hurt the competition, because we are the biggest competitor of hotels, and to give them, to make the hotel industry up their game, better their customer service. Up their outdated unions, to make it better, to make it more appealing. You need to let us open, of course, within reasonable boundaries. I don't have a problem with that, as long as I am not restricted, I will accept regulation. No problem. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you for your presentation this morning. You mentioned during your presentation, that next door neighbours, adjacent to your short-term rental, are a great asset in detecting when there is nefarious activities that are going on. If a short-term rental were beside your primary residence where you lived, would you be as accommodating in terms of, you know, continually contacting the owner of that short-term rental and letting them know when nefarious activities are going on?

Stanislav Boluchevski: Well, of course. Why not?

Councillor Chambers: And you'd be okay with people coming in. You've got a family in your primary residence and you'd be okay with the next door, you know, accepting people from all over, backgrounds and potentially, with nefarious intentions in mind?

Stanislav Boluchevski: Well, yes. But you're already looking at the worst-case scenario, right? But majority of people who come to Airbnb, first of all, are vetted through Airbnb. So, every person that comes to my property, I know that Airbnb verified their ID and verified that they are a person. Now they also have their review system. If the person didn't have reviews, I have the opportunity of not accepting you, but on your question, if I have an STR to my house...next to my house today, I have in my street alone, I have at least 10 properties that are long-term rentals. And with the Ukrainian refugees coming, with Syrian refugees coming, multiple years ago, refugees and people are coming in here and they're always in and out of those rentals. Now nobody vets them out. So, the question that you raised about the STRs, the same thing goes to the rental community and the rental community, by the way, is only...is about 30 plus percent out of the housing community, compared to the STRs, that are less than half a percent. And if you let us grow, maybe in the next two or three years, we will grow, we'll double sales. We will be only one percent, so it will be one STR for every 100 houses on the street. That's...that's a drop in the ocean.

Councillor Chambers: You mentioned that there is a vetting process by Airbnb and some of these platforms and a rating system. Yet, these parties or these activities that we're concerned with, as a City Council, continue to happen.

Stanislav Boluchevski: Of course. This is not the perfect system, okay? But licensing will work, guys. Let...I'll give you one example, one major example. Licenses for your cars. We know that teenagers from 18, younger, those from 18 to 28, they speed, they drunk driving, they do a lot of crazy stuff because they're kids. We all did that when we were that age, right?

Councillor Chambers: No.

Stanislav Boluchevski: And we cannot then come and say, well, until you are 28, you can't get a license, right? You give license to STRs, who do bad stuff, get the tickets, get fines. And you don't regulate their license. That's it. If I get caught drunk driving, my license will be taken away from me and I will not be allowed to drive, right? A responsible driver gets to drive and gets discounts with MPI, on the insurance and the payment for license. Bad drivers pay the price. The same thing with the STRs and licensing.

Madam Speaker: Okay, seeing no other question. That will conclude question period under this topic. Thank you for your presentation.

Stanislav Boluchevski: Thank you so much.

Madam Speaker: Next is David Grant, who is appearing before Council in support of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 17, 2023. It's Items 2, 3, 18, and 20. He'll also appear in opposition to the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 17, 2023. Items, 5, 10, 11, 12, and 19. David Grant, welcome.

David Grant: Thank you. Thank you all for granting us this...some of your time like this. I note that in the past, your agenda has included the text of written comments made on each of these topics, even if made at committee. There was important information in each of these, but that's missing today's agenda, so, maybe it will be fixed in the future. I'm in support of the following items, as the Chairperson pointed out, from the EPC, Item No. 3: Request to the Province re: arena operators. As they pointed out to EPC, there were two distinct needs in our arenas. Every hour the place is running, we need folks to detect problems, notify authorities and clear the buildings, if there's a problem. These places are in use many hours each day. Only part of the time, do we need folks to diagnose, adjust and possibly repair critical equipment. The answer is simple. Two categories of arena workers. One to babysit I guess, if you don't mind the term, and the other to fix. The Province can change the rules and I'm in support of you asking them to do so. Item No. 18: Riverbank Stabilization Kingston Row. In many cities, riverbanks are critical infrastructure, regardless to who owns the land nearby. It is in the public interest that they be protected. I know Winnipeg generally does this, but only when a road is threatened by the river crumbling away at the bank, do we act to protect the earth from being eroded. Winnipeg, in my opinion, should emulate those cities and do more to protect our riverbanks, so, I'm in support of Item 18. Item 20: Establishment of a Chief Construction Officer. We need big changes in how we manage construction projects. A building renovation that goes tens of millions over budget, makes the headlines, but it's only one symptom. The fact that a road is out of service for ten times as many weeks as is needed to do the work, is a bigger deal. You should invite public input into how this essential job will be defined, this Chief Construction Officer. It's in support of it and there's a lot to be gained by having this person and by getting that job. I do not support these items. Item 5: Flexible Workplace Program. They...the folks who are enjoying the benefits of not having to go to work every day, reported they are happier and more productive. Other workplaces need to...need 30% more staff to do the same work that they did before the flexible era. So, I'm calling into question the accuracy of the estimation that City staff are more productive when they are only in for a short time each week. On Items 10, 11 and 12 as a group, they involving...involve funding small things that were not in the budget. Since you're out of money and have no intention of buying land for parks, right away, the land purchase money should remain unspent. Diversion of funds in this way, has been the plot of crime stories and movies for generations. Please do not do this. Item 19: Programming and Activities for Winnipeg 150. Celebrating anniversaries is fun. Anniversaries are part of our history and they remind of us of our history. So, this is a great thing. The celebration should not mean throwing tax dollars to everyone with their hand outstretched. Please scale back the spending and giveaways. We can have billboards. We can have ceremonies, that's all great, but the idea of handing a pot of money to an organization so that they'll mention Winnipeg 150 in their newsletter, doesn't seem like good...good value for our money. On Item No. 2, Request for Funding, this is one I'm in favour of. Request for Funding to Conduct a Search at the Prairie Green, supporting volunteers in the search. The folks who work hard to get each of you elected, were volunteers. My wife and I have been two of those volunteers for folks like you, for decades. Motivated volunteers do a far better job than those paid a minimum wage. Stories on TV tell us there are many folks who support this search. As this process moves forward, with the Province and the federal government now onside, I suggest that all those who've spoken in favour of the search be consulted, and asked to provide sufficient volunteers to do the actual scanning of the material, whether it's on conveyer belts or other means. Anyone who's seen our recycling teams at work, scanning the conveyer belts, know us how essential it is to have sharp motivated eyes. Setting up the machinery and operating the heavy vehicles would have to be done by City staff, for a number of reasons. The folks who are so motivated that they spend weeks in the cold protesting, should be given the chance to actually scan material moving in front of them. The worst part of this thing would be if we commit to the spending and we have all this weight landfill material on a conveyer belt, or flowing out of buckets or whatever, and that the people who are actually eyes on the job, are so unmotivated that they miss something. That will be bad to spend all this money and not find anything that was really there. So that's my comments, and I wish you well for the rest of your day. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no questions. We'll move to the next delegation. That's Robyn Johnston, Director of Human Resources, Eagle Canada, in opposition to Item 2 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee regarding Request for Funding to Conduct a Search at the Prairie Green Landfill. Our delegation is appearing via zoom. Robyn Johnston, welcome.

Robyn Johnston: Thank you. Thanks for having me, everybody. It's nice to see you all, and congratulations on your one-year anniversary tomorrow. I'm here because I wanted to speak in opposition of the motion to have it as information. Sorry, I'm being a little bit...moving around a bit there, sorry. I'm in opposition of it being heard as tabled as information. So, that was Councillor Duncan's motion, I believe. And so, I just wanted to kind of basically talk about why I think that it should still go forward. Now I did...I did agree with what Rollins...Councillor Rollins and what Councillor Mayes shared last week. I was a bit dismayed to be honest, to hear Mayor say that you know because it was going forward with Canada and the feds and the Province, now with Wab in place, that we will just wait to see that get started. And you know, I think about...it felt a little bit empty. And I think about families and I think about the Indigenous communities. And I just wanted to mention that that was a little bit of a message, that maybe should have been thought of a little bit thoroughly. Just to go back to who I am. I do work for Eagle Canada, I am a CPHR, but I'm not here representing Eagle. I live in Winnipeg. I work remotely for National Human Rights Organization, and my like profession is Human Resources. So, I am a friend of the families of Morgan Harris and Mercedes Myran, and I am an advocated for MMIWG2S+, as well as all missing and murdered Indigenous people. Recognizing we have genocide across Canada, we have a huge crisis in Winnipeg itself,

and we have six women that have been either found or remain in landfills, and one of the landfill is Winnipeg. So when I see a motion being brought forward, the original motion of July 13, which if you actually...if you read what the, you know the bullets there, there is a message there, and to table that message, you know, is sending a wrong message and I think that it would be in opposition of all of your policies and procedures and by-laws, that are applicable to things like EDI and human rights, and if you open Winnipeg, you follow the you know you should be taking guidance from the Indigenous Relations Division, you should be taking guidance from the Human Rights Committee of Council. Your EDI policy is within Executive Policy Committee so, and that does address...it's Council that is affected by that policy as well, and it speaks to community as well and what you do within the organization, will always show outside of the organization, especially for city, like the City of Winnipeg, a municipality. So, the message or lack of message you're going to send, is one that's not going to be well received if it does go forward as being tabled or heard as information. I do think that there could be more information put in a motion, perhaps information such as Winnipeg will also take responsibility and support and prioritize funding of the search of the landfill, alongside the other two governments. You know, these women are still missing and these women are from Winnipeg, were missing from Winnipeg. We...this is...this was a huge campaign issue for the PCs. So, it's something that can't just be tabled. It was made to be political and it was made to be divisive and it was made and it created a lot of anxiety, a lot of stress, a lot of unnecessary mental health concerns for a lot of people. And we need to recognize that the City played a huge part in that. I understand there's just...the justice piece, a little bit. But I do understand what a critical issue it is, under the Police Board Commission. And if I am not mistaken, that should have been or may have been done and called in June 2022. Perhaps it wasn't a great time, and although it wasn't feasible for the court case, there was still an obligation for the City of Winnipeg to pursue any search efforts they could, and if it was proven unfeasible, based on the forensic search unit report, then let's call critical issue now. Let's take that forensic search unit report, that the police used, to decide not to do it, and share it with the people that are now preparing to do the search. The City of Winnipeg has to share, has to work with all three governments and has to work with the organization that's chosen to support Long Plain First Nation and the families proceed with the search at Prairie Green Landfill. So, I guess my question is, where are your priorities? What is Winnipeg going to do? And perhaps this motion that I would like to see go forward, perhaps this motion can be revised to be even more inclusive of Winnipeg's support and actual consider at Council supplementary funding.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentation. We'll now go to the next speaker and then come back for questions. I'd like to call forward Sandra DeLaronde, from the MMIWG2S+ Implementation Committee, also in opposition to Request for Funding to Conduct a Search at the Prairie Green Landfill. If you could please come forward, welcome to you. We'll have five minutes on the clock and then we'll take questions for both delegations.

Sandra DeLaronde: Good morning, Mr. Mayor, Council members. It's exciting that we get to present today, on your first day of your second year, and looking forward to the work that you will do on behalf of Winnipeg. We're here today, Giganaawenimaanaanig, it means in Ojibwe "We all take care of them", and we are the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls, Two-spirit, plus Manitoba Implementation Committee. So, we represent on our committee, both urban and rural, northern, and we also have on our committee, the MKO and the Southern Chiefs' Organization, as membership. So, today's presentation has been also shared with these members. We have with us in the gallery, one of our committee organizations, (inaudible) and the Winnipeg Indigenous Friendship Centre as well. So, we are here to express our opposition to tabling this motion as information. We are urging this council to act expeditiously to the motion at hand, to formally request the federal and provincial government to fund a search of Prairie Green Landfill. Mashkode Bizhiki'ikwe, Evan, Mercedes Myran, Morgan Harris, and Rebecca Contois were residents of Winnipeg. They called Winnipeg home for most, if not all of their days. The City of Winnipeg has an obligation to them and to...as it does for all of its citizens. It has almost been a year since the families were informed of the decision of the Winnipeg Police Service, not to search the landfill and despite promises to search, despite evidence presented that a search is feasible, we are here again with government's failing to take responsibility for the most vulnerable of our citizens. The City of Winnipeg signs the waste management contracts and agreements with waste connections, BFI and others, to utilize both the Prairie Green Landfill and Brady Landfill, and in doing so, accepts the obligations of the terms and conditions of such contracts. For those of us that are ordinary citizens, that implies that the City of Winnipeg has a legal obligation to search the landfill. As a contracting government, for the use and management of the landfills, the City of Winnipeg should have moved this matter forward months ago. The failure to initiate a thorough search of the landfill at the outset and the ongoing interjurisdictional disputes, are stark examples of what a gendered and race-based genocide looks like, within a Canadian context. Further to taking this motion enacting, I'm calling on Canada and Manitoba to provide financial resources to search the landfill. We are also requesting that the City of Winnipeg show leadership in the following: to chair the meetings and bring Canada and Manitoba to the table to ensure the timely search of the landfill; implement regulations that ensure searching and recovery of loved ones that's not subject to political or jurisdictional disputes. We recommend incorporating this into the Winnipeg Police Service Act, given the current circumstances. Review and revise City regulations to guarantee that all necessary environmental protections are in place to support an immediate search and recovery effort; allocate the necessary resources to facilitate the search and recovery of loved ones. Be...we're not talking about financial resources, but other resources that the City has at its disposal. And we also recommend that the City of Winnipeg examine the relationship of the Winnipeg Police Service to Indigenous communities which may be also informed by the Thunder Bay report, the

Roadmap to Real Change, issued in 2023, on policing, and also to review the implementation of the calls to justice, 9.1-9.3. Over the next few days, the families are gathering with their supports, to prepare for the court process.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor moves extension for...it is two minutes? I think you're on your last sentence. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Sandra DeLaronde: Thank you. Thank you for the extension. If you had any sense of the horrors that will be shared with the families as they prepare for the court process, I believe that you would do everything in your power and also, I believe you have the power to bring their loved ones home, without debate, without delay and with the dignity that is accorded to all human beings, as a fundamental human right. I call...we call on the City of Winnipeg to pass this motion, to call in the federal, provincial governments for financial resources. Thank you for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentation. We will take questions, and there's typically no representation...presentations from the gallery. Questions for delegations, please. Any? Councillor...

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, is to gather up all the speakers on this item. I think there are more.

Madam Speaker: No, that's the only speakers I have registered at this time, on this item. Any questions for our two presenters? Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Good morning and thank you for your presentation this morning. Could you just repeat the calls to...the Truth and Reconciliation you made a reference at 92-95 present?

Sandra DeLaronde: 94.

Councillor Chambers: Ninety...can you repeat that, please?

Sandra DeLaronde: I'm sorry. I didn't reference the Truth and Reconciliation report. I referenced the National Inquiry's final report. It's the Calls to Justice 9.1 to 9.11.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions?

Councillor Chambers: Thank you.

Sandra DeLaronde: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Seeing none at this time. Thank you, Roselyn and Sandra for your presentations today, Robyn, pardon me. Next speaker is...our next delegation is Kate Kehler, on behalf of the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, in support of Renaming a Portion of Bishop Grandin to Edward Schreyer Parkway South. Welcome and there's ten minutes on the clock.

Kate Kehler: Thank you. Good morning, everybody. For the record, I represent an organization with an over 100-year history in Winnipeg. Our vision is for a city that is sustainable, just, equitable, and caring. Our history has been one that began with a more patriarchal and charitable approach to social ills, one that evolved to an understanding that too many of those social ills were either caused or exacerbated by the very systems meant to address them. There's an ongoing debate about whether systems are broken and need to be fixed, or they are working exactly as intended and so need to be torn down. In speaking to you as representatives of a system of government, I hope my comments today lead you to consider that question, when considering bringing your own motions forward and seconding and when voting on those of your colleagues in the future. SPCW's more recent history is our 2016-17 strategic planning process, when we adopted a guiding principle's framework, one of which states, in solidarity: respecting and supporting the 94 Calls to Action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, SPCW aligns itself, actions, ideas and movements that seek to redress the harm, already caused by colonization and prevent any further systemic oppressions or injustices to Indigenous peoples. The Murdered and Missing Indigenous Women and Girls Inquiry had not concluded at that time, but the above principle speaks directly to the eventual Call for Justice 158, for non-Indigenous people to help hold all governments accountable, to act on the Calls for Justice and implement them according to the important principles we set out. The principles set out in the Calls, speak to the need for substantive equality, Indigenous rights, call for decolonizing approach, a recognition of distinctions, focus on inclusion of family and survivors, Indigenous-led solutions and services be trauma-informed and include cultural safety beyond appearances and the demand for the incorporation of services and processes that empower Indigenous peoples. The wording of the motion is a bit odd because of course, I am not in favour of renaming a portion of Bishop Grandin, I'm in favour of how the motion has been brought forward by EPC. And I'd like to recognize and congratulate EPC for your October decision to move the motion, brought by Councillor Wyatt and Eadie in September, to

rename a portion of Abinoji Mikinah for the right Honourable Ed Schreyer, to be filed, and in my preferred world, remain so forevermore. The motion does represent an ongoing lack of understanding of the truly transformative change needed in thinking, if that's a city we're ever going to make significant progress on Truth and Reconciliation, or if indeed we're ever going to there at all. Another motion that is on the agenda for today, is a motion on the need to move forward on searching the landfill. These agenda items are linked. At October's EPC, I expressed support for those members here, who've spoken in favour of the search. Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Santos, Rollins, Gilroy, Mayes, Wyatt. Please correct me if there are others. They were a bright spot in what became a very dark and harmful provincial election, so why back away now. This motion, a rather straightforward and more aspirational, as it delegates cost to both the provincial and federal governments, still failed at EPC. A motion that calls on the level of government, who are able to run deficits, whose incomes are far greater than the City's, still failed. Family members on the landfills, Indigenous leadership, academics, research and community members have said time and again, how damaging it is to have to fight for every bit of progress on Truth and Reconciliation. This is what I'm hoping to convey to you all today. Motions to Council do not exist in a vacuum. They're not intellectual exercises, as they affect people's lives. Some will be affected for the good and some, for some, there will be pain. However, all decisions should seek to minimize pain, in the fullest extent. Lack of initial support and or reversible positions on motions, emotional ones, does cause harm. I'm sure we all want the families to find peace, but it's not up to us to decide what is good enough. For example, memorial instead of search, was roundly and soundly rejected. And to be clear, this goes far beyond these four, and sadly perhaps even more families, should the search be conducted. There's a reason serial killers target Indigenous women. We as a society, for far too long, has demonstrated that we just don't care that much, that B.C. has a highway dubbed, the Highway of Tears, should be proof enough. By not doing everything within your power, to demonstrate that Indigenous women, all Indigenous peoples, matter just as much as everyone else, such as those Indigenous people who have been found, and let suppose non-Indigenous people who have been found in landfill searches elsewhere. Then you are not living up to your responsibilities as treaty people, or your commitments to the Calls for Justice. Coming back to Abinoji Mikinah, and why the two are linked. In March, you moved forward on Truth and Reconciliation, by voting to acknowledge one of the languages of the original people's this land. That Abinoji Mikinah translated to children...translated to children's world, acknowledges the truth of Bishop Grandin and the attempted genocide of Indigenous people, through the residential school system he helped to create. This was a good decision. However, the debate and discussion brought back the apologists and outright deniers of the harms done. That just continues the harm. So, to have a motion brought forward to take any of that relatively small success, as per example, the actual land of the road isn't in part of the deal, back was...it was hard to find a word to describe it. So, I don't have one. It is a perfect demonstration of the need for that transformational change of thinking. As a level of government, you committed to...so I don't drop that, this much. And then a motion was brought forward to renege on a portion of that. Sound familiar? It should, as it is indicative of our historical relationship with Indigenous peoples. We promise and renege. So, opposing, please do vote to file, as deeply as possible, the motion of Abinoji Mikinah. But I will add, that you must also vote not to table the landfill motion. I urge you to listen to Sandra DeLaronde and the people here that she represents and the people who could not make it here today, and act on those recommendations. Just like with the environment or poverty, we are long past the days when you can justify doing some harm here, if you're doing some good someplace else. That's not seeking balance. One does negate the other. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Kate. Any questions for our delegation? Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Kehler. I note that there is work being done by local MP, Leah Gazan, to establish an alert system for missing and murdered Indigenous women. Could you...do you know if...how that process is going and whether it's still moving through its way through the Federal House of Commons?

Kate Kehler: Sandra DeLaronde would have been the better person to ask. She has a little bit more information on that, but I was very fortunate on October 4th, to attend a conference, helped there and that the whole alert system was presented. Where it is now, I'm not exactly sure so I can't answer that question. I do know that there is lots of support for it, that it was presented very technically, it's something that can easily be done. So, that's what I know about that.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Chambers: And second question, second and final question. Are there in terms of preventative measures, is there a cacophony of ideas that might be available to assist us in moving forward, to ensure to the greatest extent possible that we can mitigate these occurrences through preventative measures, whether it's safe space, whether it's, you know, different opportunities that could present themselves that will help to reduce these occurrences?

Kate Kehler: And you're speaking specifically to murdered and missing Indigenous women? Yes, thank you. So, poverty eradication. Number one: Anything that you can do to eradicate poverty because poverty is what puts these women and girls in jeopardy in the first place. So that's what we've got to focus on.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Kate Kehler for your presentation.

Kate Kehler: Thank you all very much. Have a good day.

Madam Speaker: Next, I'd like to call forward Alexander Singbeil, in support of Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste and the Environment, the report dated September 8, 2023. It's regarding Residential Food Waste Pilot Results and Recommendations. We'll have 10 minutes on the clock. Welcome to you.

Alexander Singbeil: Thank you. Thank you to everyone present at this time and thank you to those watching by YouTube videos, on the most (inaudible) YouTube channel that exists. Be sure to smash that subscribe button. I also want to thank the Public Service, many whom are my former colleagues, for all your hard work and diligence in serving Winnipeggers. None of what I'm going to talk about today is in any way to insinuate that they're not doing a good job for Winnipeggers. As I was introduced, I'm Alex Singbeil. I am a small business owner, an independent consultant, and for disclosure, I have clients who work in organics waste possessing. I am speaking in support of the motion, or sorry, the recommendations, but I'd like to suggest also some, what I'm calling performance-enhancing, directions, PEDs. My motivation to speak today, comes in part, from a university work term I did in Germany, where I first had curb side organics collection. That idealistic young man would be devastated to learn that here we are in 2023, and I still don't have curb side composting and also, I have no hair. So, I would like to introduce an analogy. Councillor Mayes, I assure you that it's an analogy involves no guardrails and it would be completely understandable. I would like you to imagine that we are running a race. Maybe you should close your eyes, visualize. Germany is way ahead. They're out of sight. We can see many Canadian cities, although some, like Vancouver, are out there with those powerful European runners. Within striking distance are Saskatoon and Regina, but they are ahead of us. They're wearing straw hats and for some strange reason, Regina is running with a banjo. Can you see it? This is the race, but here's the thing, this isn't a race between cities. To set up our true opponent, I'll give you my favourite quote from Rachel Carson, both famous science writer and author of Silent Spring: "Man is a part of nature, and his war against nature is inevitably a war against himself." This race is a race against the natural laws of the universe. It is a race against physics. I love physics. I am an engineer, but we must not lose this race against this physical process we usually refer to as climate change. A process, that through the power of carbon dioxide, is turning the light of the sun into heat, and it's so much heat, that we are at risk of losing nature itself. Humans are a part of nature, and our war against nature is inevitably a war against ourselves. Physics is a tough competitor. It doesn't care where the emissions come from. It doesn't care if it is from Winnipeg or Germany or China. It's going to be hard to beat. So, in the revised recommendation, you've asked for faster timeline and that's good. That's running faster, but what's your competitive pace? In 2016, I moved to Lethbridge, Alberta, to work on waste reduction there. And at the time, that City had no equivalent of 4R Depot. They were without a MRF. There were certainly without curbside composting and they didn't even have curbside recycling yet. Seven years in, they are now doing all of those things and have all those things. So, in my opinion, the new timeline, to go along with the analogy, is like running at the speed of the rest of the field. But if you've ever run a race to catch up with the rest of the field, for us to get ahead of physics, to get ahead of climate change, we have to go even faster. At the same time, I want to note that our pace must be sustainable for staff and the public. We must not bonk or hit the wall. But make no mistake, this race against physics is a race we must not lose. So, I mentioned earlier, PEDs, my performance-enhancing directions. I don't condone the use of performance-enhancing drugs in sports, however, this is only a fictional analogy. And I believe that this is an existential race, that where losing is not an option, so we have to contemplate putting the recommendations on steroids. So here are my performance-enhancing directions for your consideration. Let's look at food waste. In the time it took me to say this, it will have taken me to say this speech, Winnipeggers will have thrown out more edible food waste than the weight of the entire starting line of the Winnipeg Jets. That's a lot, considering how short my speech is. Composting is great and it must be done, but it can also create the false sense of absolving us from our sin of wasting food. So, consider directions to further reduce food waste and give the Public Service funding so that they can track food waste through waste audits and adapt as necessary. Second, things like multi-family. Those apartments that are nine units and larger. We need to be recycling better at those facilities and we also need to be giving them composting. They have no access to backyard composting because they have no backyards. Planning this must be accelerated. At the very least, the very least, we should be requiring that new construction require providing space for multi-stream waste collection and provisions should be made in building designs, so that residents have easy access and can dispose of their waste, things like multi-stream garbage chutes. You could add recommendations today, to get Public Service researching and working towards this now, not in June, but now. Finally, industrial commercial and institutional and construction and demolition. I know that these were issues that somewhat derailed organics, when it came before Council back around 2017. This isn't an or. It is an and. We need to do curbside composting and we need to direct the Public Service to begin the process to implement mandatory recycling of things like paper, cardboard, wood and other recycle building materials from commercial construction industries, just as other cities like Calgary and Lethbridge, where I used to work, have done. Composting frequently needs wood. And construction and commercial generate plenty of that in form of cut-offs and pallets. So, those are my suggested performance-enhancing directions to get us running faster. Now I have a bit of time. I mentioned earlier that Germany was part of my motivation. Another big part of that motivation is thinking of my child. Sorry. She drew this beautiful picture for me this morning when I was practicing this speech. She didn't know anything about the speech, but she is in French immersion. It says "froid",

cold. And it's snowing on this beautiful...day in Winnipeg here. I said earlier, this is part of my motivation for our kids and for the future. I want her and all of our kids to experience cold. I want them to experience winter and I want to also have for her and all future generations in Winnipeg, the kind of seasonal variation that we've all grown up within the city so, sorry. When I think about her and that, it's a powerful thing for me. So, I just want to leave you with the same words again. Humans are part of nature and a war against nature is inevitably a war against ourselves. We are in a race against physics and we must not lose. So, thank you again for listening, for running this race in our minds with me today, and I look forward to any questions you might have.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Alexander. I will ask you to stay back on the bench and we'll hear from the next delegation and then take questions. Amanda Wolfe, if I could please call our delegation forward, from Compost Winnipeg, also in support of same item. Our delegation, Mr. Clerk, is via Zoom today? Okay, is the delegation with us?

Amanda Wolfe: Yeah, sorry, my video...it says that the host has stopped my video. I wonder...okay. There we go. Okay. Can you hear me?

Madam Speaker: Yes, we can. Welcome.

Amanda Wolfe: Okay. I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I am here on behalf of Compost Winnipeg and the Green Action Centre. We want to show our support for the City's residential food waste collection program. The Green Action Centre is a non-profit organization that provides environmental services and education, including composting and waste reduction programs. Compost Winnipeg is a social enterprise of the Green Action Centre, and we provide food waste collection for Winnipeg residents, businesses, schools and other organizations. We support the City's residential food waste collection program for many reasons. As the City has outlined in countless reports, including OurWinnipeg 2045, Winnipeg's Climate Action Plan and the Community Energy Investment Roadmap, this program is essential to retain the City's waste diversion in greenhouse gas reduction targets and more importantly, as Winnipeggers, human beings and global citizens, we need to urgently reduce our greenhouse gas emissions, to address the planet crisis that we are all facing. As a city, we need to take immediate steps to mitigate our impact on the environment and composting organic waste, instead of sending it to the landfill, is a proven and effective way to reduce emissions. As shown by the success of the pilot project, Winnipeggers are ready to move forward. This frame, the Green Action Centre hosted a letter writing campaign that had over 3,700 signatures, demonstrating broad public support across the city, for residential food waste collection. The momentum is building, and residents are ready and excited for this program. However, to build a long-term effective program, it's important to include the following components. The program should include food waste all year, and not stop collection service during the winter months. The program should accept a full range of compostable items, including meat, bones, dairy and compostable packaging. And the program should have an equitable fee structure and accounts for Winnipeg income disparities. The Green Action Centre and Compost Winnipeg can work with the City to advance the food waste collection goals. Compost Winnipeg can expand our collection service in the very near future, to include more Winnipeg residents. For example, restarting collection in the pilot neighborhoods, for adding community drop-off locations, such as the 4R Depots. We have confirmed that the class one compost facility at Prairie Green Landfill, has the capacity to process more food waste into compost. And in addition, Compost Winnipeg is looking into the idea of possessing food waste into compost on a community scale, which could benefit neighborhoods, businesses and small communities. This could advance the City's long-term plans to support circular and local economies, and further to this goal, the City could work with us, using set aside contracts outlined in sustainable procurement action plan, because we are a social enterprise, of a non-profit organization. We can support the City's plans to educate Winnipeggers on why and how to use the program. As shown in the pilot project, it's critical that Winnipeggers understand what items can be composted, how collection works and why it's important. The pilot project was a great success, having 94% of pilot participants in support of food waste collection. However, only 30% of green carts were set out on a weekly basis. Providing education and raising the profile of food waste collection can keep contamination levels low, which increases the household diversion rates and increases the City diversion rates. The Green Action Centre is a leader in composting education, with many years of experience. Finally, Compost Winnipeg can provide the City with input and lessons learned from our experience in food waste collection in Winnipeg. And as the City's program develops, we can be a valuable part of the discussion. Winnipeggers are excited to see this move forward, and I hope you will be the council that approves the program for a sustainable future for our city. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Amanda. We'll now take questions for each of the delegations. Alexander, if I could please call you back to the podium. First question is from Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Hi. I have a question for each delegate so...

Madam Speaker: Alexander, are you with us still?

Alexander Singbeil: Sorry.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Appreciate running analogies. You made a reference to guardrails though, that I didn't get as part of the analogies so.

Alexander Singbeil: Oh, just at the SPC public hearing, there was an extended analogy about guardrails that went off the rails. That was all. Apparently, I am the only one who was there and remembered it so.

Councillor Mayes: Maybe yours. Okay. My next question was for Ms. Wolfe. Can you talk to us a bit more...you had indicated that Compost Winnipeg is taking what it picks up curbside out to Prairie Green, can you just give us a little more information, as much as you can on that? And hopefully, if the motion passes later today, you will be one of the groups staff will consult so what...but I'm assuming outdoor pad and I'm...you said there was still room left. Any idea how much more room left and how many more houses, how many more units could be accommodated there?

Amanda Wolfe: So, we did talk to Prairie Green Landfill. They have the class one compost facility there. They are planning to expand it considerably next year. So, I think they are going to double the capacity that they have now. Right now, we are bringing them about 1500 tons per year. And we...they said they could double what we are bringing them, for example, they could accommodate that. So, they could...they also said they could accommodate the amount of residents that were in the pilot project. They could accommodate that volume as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Again, sorry, just a quick follow up. So, outdoor pad there, there's no...

Amanda Wolfe: Yes, sorry. It's outdoor windrow composting and industrial composting.

Councillor Mayes: Same firm doing...there's a huge complex outside Montreal that firm runs (inaudible) location, but that's a separate type. Okay, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you both for your presentation this morning. Between composting and recycling, would it be fair to say that there would be more waste diversion allowing for a bi-weekly schedule to occur in terms of the rest of the garbage or refuse collection for the average family?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Alexander.

Alexander Singbeil: I think that in general when you restrict the amount of volume that people have for throwing out garbage, that usually increases the amount that's captured for composting or for recycling. There are also though, some offsetting risks that then contamination can also increase if people don't have enough space. So, that is what I would say about that.

Amanda Wolfe: I think that in other cities there's been some really good results when they've paired their composting curbside collection program with bi-weekly garbage collection. So, a lot of cities, I think Regina and Saskatoon, as well as some others, they do bi-weekly garbage collections. So, they're in a way really incentivizing people to put less in the garbage and then you really see that curbside organics collection increase, and maybe recycling, too. I haven't looked at that data specifically, but I know that in other cities the bi-weekly garbage collection really helps to encourage recycling and composting so.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: So as this stands right now, this is for the residential, but you mentioned the recycle project...recycling materials related to construction, trying to get that out of the landfill. There's also though, the residential or sorry, the waste generated from restaurants, food wastes, commercial establish...both industrial as well, that is in the manufacturing of food and food products, that is not mentioned. And you also have...as you mentioned the industrial construction, but not just in terms of building materials, but also in terms of road materials and so on. None of that has been touched on this report. And then also just my last summary question I guess, part of that was what was just talked on this now, which is a bi-weekly garbage collection because we're going to be adding a whole new fleet, I'm assuming, to the City to collect

these bins, which if they are running on diesel, we're just adding to the environmental challenge that we are facing right now with climate change.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Alexander.

Councillor Wyatt: I was hoping...

Madam Speaker: And the question.

Alexander Singbeil: Sorry, I was completely confused.

Councillor Wyatt: That's okay.

Alexander Singbeil: That was...okay. So, the question is...

Councillor Wyatt: What are your thoughts on those matters?

Alexander Singbeil: Okay. So, I would say I introduced that idea because I think it's a good policy that the ICI and construction demolition do their part. I relocated and lived for six years in Lethbridge, Alberta, just for a job to make that happen in Lethbridge, Alberta. So, I think that speaks to my dedication to making that happen. So yeah, I think that's a pretty important part. I think everybody should be pulling their part...pulling their weight, but at the same time, I don't want to create division. I don't want to make it an or. I was very clear in what I was saying, it is an and. Both needs...both of these things need to be done. There's a lot of material from industrial and commercial. Regarding collection, sure yeah, I think any ways that can be looked at that will be acceptable to the public to reduce the number of trucks, it's safer, it burns less gas, damages the roads less. No question. Less trips would be better.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing...Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, through you to the delegation, I think I do know the answer to that in terms why it's beneficial to the climate to have a program like this one. Is the delegation aware that many jurisdictions end up having a less frequent garbage rotation because the organic waste that is normally in the garbage, is then diverted into separate stream and is the delegation aware that by managing those streams, you end up with the aerobic digestion in landfill with the organic composting and you have less frequent runs for garbage because a lot of garbage is organic waste. So, are you aware?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Question for each of the delegation who wishes to answer.

Alexander Singbeil: I guess I would. Yes, thank you, Councillor Allard for that clarification. My answer to Councillor Wyatt's question shouldn't be construed to say, we shouldn't collect those things. I think what you are getting at, is that the greenhouse gas implications of continuing to put those organics into landfill, is worse than some extra truck diesel emissions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, next question.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah. Are you citing a study specifically that can get...verify that?

Alexander Singbeil: I probably could, but I don't have that. I have this drawing, my notes.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Seeing no further questions. Final question, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes. Is the delegation aware that all things being equal, same number of trucks, same number of matter that anaerobic digestion in the landfill will create methane gas which is...well about ten times worse than CO2. And that given we're dealing with the same amount of waste, we can manage the fleets in a way where there is the net new, if any, will be beneficial in terms of greenhouse gas emissions?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I see Amanda has her...Amanda?

Amanda Wolfe: Yeah, I guess I just wanted to echo that. It's not like...a lot of people, maybe even the public, misunderstands. We're not like, composting is not creating a new waste stream or putting more trucks on the road. It's just taking exactly what is already being discarded, and just separating it into a different stream, and you know, it's so much more beneficial to have it composted, than in the landfill. It's...there's no more waste or less waste, it's the same

amount. We're just diverting it and it's just really important to do because the methane and all of the reasons Councillor Allard mentioned.

Alexander Singbeil: I might just add that Councillor Allard is being kind to methane. I think the number is more like 25 times worse to widely accepted number for methane versus CO2.

Madam Speaker: Thank you and that concludes our question period under this topic. Thank you for your presentations, both of you. Our final delegation is Peter Martin, on behalf of Manitoba No Stone and turn...No Stone Left Alone Coordinator, in support of Item 10 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated October 6, 2023. It's regarding Veterans Burial Plots. Our delegation is in person today. Welcome, and there is 10 minutes on the clock.

Peter Martin: Good morning, Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor and the City of Winnipeg councillors. I am actually delighted to be here speaking at the last council meeting before Remembrance Day. And I'm excited and the day before we kick off the poppy campaign. Poppy Campaign starts tomorrow, so I'm excited it ties in when we're discussing veteran burial plots. I'd like to acknowledge two other veterans who joined me, Mr. Dave Steward and Mr. Matt (inaudible), and he's a...Matt happens to be the Manitoba President of the tran...of the Last Post Fund. So, he's representing the Last Post Fund. He's a friend and I'm delighted that I have support from other veterans. So today, we are talking about a recommendation that's coming up later on your agenda, Veteran Burial Plots. I'm here to give you a little bit of history on that, because I think in a context of what you're going to read today, I think it's important to just take you back a bit for those who maybe weren't involved, as a reminder for those who were involved. I am Peter Martin. I'm the Manitoba Coordinator for No Stone Left Alone. And for those that don't know, No Stone Left Alone is a Canada-wide organization and ceremony that happens the first week of November. And we bring students out of the classroom, into a cemetery, into a field of honour, where individually they stand by the grave of a veteran, read the inscription and understand that the soldiers they read about in, the schools come down to individuals, individuals who served. So, they stand there and acknowledge, take a poppy and place it on the grave. I've been doing this for eight years in the Transcona Field of Honour. This year, I'll have amassed probably five thousand students over the eight years, and we bring them for a very significant emotional experience that's different than a classroom experience. I have organized 15 events in Manitoba, because I'm the coordinator. And in 2021, I organized a ceremony in Stonewall Field of Honour. I brought a student out there to stand by the grave and a resident from Stonewall approached me and said, "Do you realize Stonewall gives a free plot to a veteran in the Field of Honour? If that's where they want to be buried, we will give them a free plot." I said "That is a wonderful idea." I approached Councillor Nason at the time, suggested to him. I presented actually to the Council minutes that I came across and said, here it is. He thought about it. He made a motion at Council, seconded by then Councillor Gillingham, now Mayor Gillingham. Supported, discussed. I spoke at committee at that time. I spoke at EPC and I spoke at full Council. And in February of 2022, the motion was approved. And the motion the two key parts; one, we want to give free plots for veterans who want to be buried in Brookside or Transcona Field of Honour, and we're going to fund it out of the 2022 existing budget. And they did that. And 2022, we had 11 veterans take advantage of that. And once we heard the news, I was on CTV, Global, CJOB, Winnipeg Free Press, announcing to the world, world being veterans and their families, that the City of Winnipeg are doing something wonderful for veterans, something unique, something special, as an act of appreciation for their service and continued service. I thought it was wonderful, I had a lot of response from veterans saying, this is great the City is doing this. In 2023, in April, May of 2023, a veteran's widow approached me. Her husband, who was a...actually a Metis veteran, very proud, had passed away and she said, "Can you help me get his free plot?" I went to the cemetery branch and found there was no funding. It had ended after 2022. And the funding, that was supposed to happen, in my opinion, was in the decision that, to find funding going forward in a multi-year budget, didn't happen. I was shocked because I didn't know, it wasn't publicized. Then I started investigating and finding out what happened. And the first thing I had to do was, I had to let the veterans know and all the organizations know, the City gave something special for veterans for one year, and then stopped. In my opinion, you don't...it's not a good thing. It's one of the worst things you could do, so I had to let people know, don't apply. You're not going to get this, no money. So, I went on again, TV. I went to you veterans social channel, with all the veterans groups, and the great program I told you about isn't there. And then I thought, you know, I had so much response. Some Afghanistan vets and others saying, can we get it back? I'm saying, well, a way to get it back is to petition, in a nice way, the Councillors and the Mayor and say, please reinstate this program. So, we started a mission of letting people know and then the Councillors know and the Mayor's office. Please reconsider. Find the money somewhere. It's \$22,000. It was actually less in 2022, less than \$23,000 annually. Then Councillor Eadie approached me, after I had sent him an e-mail and all councillors, he said, I'm committed to finding money for this, \$23,000 for veterans, that's the least we can do, as a show of appreciation. He made the motion, and we have it in front of you today. It's a recommendation. Councillor Wyatt seconded the motion, and it's going to be discussed later today. And I really hope you will consider that, because you don't do something and then take it away, you know. The motion that is in front of you, and I just want to make this point clear, is...it's looking for funding again, going forward, in the multi-year budget, making it happen. But in his motion, I just want to clear up, excuse me, the whereas in his motion, because the whereas is seen like a last...because the last post fund is the meaning of this and that, we're doing this. I just want to make it clear, two separate things. The Last Post Fund has been around since 1909, and its purpose was to make sure

veterans could afford dignified, proper burial and funeral, if they didn't have the money. That's why it existed. It's there, it's still there. I'm actually helping a veteran's widow, the one who didn't get money from the City, helping her find money from the Last Post Fund. I'm working through the process. I understand it. I'm a mini expert on that, but that's different. This is saying, it doesn't matter how much money you have, it doesn't matter your situation. If you're a veteran and you want to be buried in a Field of Honour, Brookside or Transcona, we will provide you a free plot in appreciation for your service. Thank you. End of story. That's all that is about. So, I just want to put in your mind, don't think of last post fund. As Matt is here, the representative of Last Post Fund, he understands the process, as I do, but it's separate. We're working on a way of making it easier in some ways, but today in your discussion, try to remove the whereas out of your brain, as you're thinking and deliberating about getting the funding going forward, for veterans. They deserve that. In fact, what you are going to do is a nice thing to do for veterans, but more than that, it's the right thing to do for veterans. Lest we forget. Thank you for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. There are some questions. Councillor Lukes, followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. So, just to clarify. I know you're saying don't worry about it, but just to clarify, my understanding is the Last Post Fund ensures everyone, every veteran can have a funeral. That is my understanding of the Last Post Fund. Now, if that's the case articulated, so everyone understands why we need to put \$23,000 a year in, if the Last Post pays for funeral for every veteran. Maybe I'm not understanding it clearly, but help me get through that.

Peter Martin: Excellent question, Councillor. So, the Last Post Fund is there, if somebody feels they don't have the money to buy...pay for proper burial and funeral, they can apply. Anybody can apply to the Last Post Fund and it's very...it's complex, it's detailed, it's an asset-based organization. It's not income-based. It's asset-based, not including your house or car. There's a lot of complexity, but you apply if you feel you'd like support for funeral and burial, for your spouse who is a veteran, if you can't afford it. And that's always...that's a process...it is a long form. I have gone through it. So that's a separate issue. And then the one we're talking about today just says if you want a plot in the field of honour and you're a veteran, we will give you a plot regardless of going through a complex application process. So, the Last Post Fund is a very is detailed and it's always been there, and you know that answers your questions?

Councillor Lukes: Not really. So...

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Lukes: So, just with all due respect, you're saying it's just really complicated to apply to the Last Post Fund, so you want it easier to apply to a City program? Like if they get...if veterans can have funding for their funerals, and I think I brought this up a few years ago, connected...many years with involvement in the funeral industry. So, I'm really aware that veterans can access the Last Post Fund, so...

Peter Martin: So, actually Matt and I have discussed when the last motion went through in 2022, the head coach of the Last Post Fund sent an e-mail to the City saying, this is a wonderful thing you're doing for veterans, that's great. So, when somebody applies to the Last Post Fund, the way I understand it, you're going to submit the bills and invoices and things. So that will be, if you get a free plot, that will be minus that. So, you're getting stuff you can't afford, that's other than the free plot. So, it will cover what you're not being covered for. And so, you're going to apply, you say, here's what I've got to pay for, can you help me? And they ask, have you got any insurance, you've got this, you've got a free plot, I already provided then, that will come off with money that they're supposed to give you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Peter Martin: I have here Matt, if you want to clarify Matt...Is it okay, he is the president of the Last Post Fund in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker: Okay, we have other questions, Mr. Martin and they are for you. You are the presenter today.

Peter Martin: Okay, okay, I see.

Madam Speaker: So, the questions will be for yourself.

Peter Martin: He'll nod behind my back, and that'll be good too. None of your questions, and...it's separate, but I will provide any councillor who wants. I will provide documentation about the Last Post Fund, and provide information, and show you what the application actually looks like. But we're talking about, in my opinion, free plot for veteran, whether you've applied to the Last Post Fund or not, here is your free plot.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. We have another question from Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I'll have two questions. My first question, which is not related to...sorry, I put that one whereas in there, Mr. Martin. But can you give me a sense...I don't know, we haven't had to pay for a funeral in my family for quite some time. So, Madam Speaker, I am wondering if Mr. Martin knows approximately how much it does cost for a funeral, and is there any extra cost related to making it an honorary veterans burial, the funeral itself?

Peter Martin: I know for the pre-plot, I think it was \$1,500 for the person to have the opening and closing and the free plot. But the burial, I don't know...they range in a great number from \$15,000, \$20,000, depending how elaborate. But it will say, if you are a legion member and you are a veteran, we provide a lot of stuff free, including the meal, the hall, everything else, just to support veterans. It's all about veterans being them to have a dignified burial and funeral arrangement.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Eadie: My second question again is, I'm sorry, I put the whereas in there, but...you said it. I just want you to repeat it. Is there...this is about demonstrating the City's respect and contribution towards veterans who served our country, province, city. There's a lot of domestic military things that go on as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Martin.

Peter Martin: Thank you for your attention, and I appreciate your support, if possible, and happy Remembrance Day.

Madam Speaker: There's a few other questions. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, just clarification, and more on the lines of Councillor Lukes is asking clarification on. Basically, what you are saying is that, and maybe, correct me if I'm wrong to try to paraphrase and sum up I believe the intent and the request, is that...and how can I word this the best way, the veterans, those that have decided to give themselves personally, sacrifice their potential life, in the name of our country, to serve us, who are citizens of Winnipeg, that at the very minimum, the City of Winnipeg that operates two field of honours, should recognize that, by not charging for the plot to be in the field of Honour, withstanding, or notwithstanding, the Last Post Fund. That that be a universal type of offer, in light of that significant, previous sacrifice and commitment, provided by that individual to our country. Is that fair to say?

Peter Martin: I'm not sure if I understand the question.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay. Let me repeat it again. That I'm saying that you believe...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, is this a question? We're almost at (inaudible).

Councillor Wyatt: Sure. You believe that the individual who gave of their time and energy to serve in the Canadian military, potentially put their life on the line or indeed gave their life, and therefore wish to be in the Field of Honour, that that should be recognized by the City of Winnipeg and City of Winnipeg Council, by not charging for the Field of Honour plot, notwithstanding, the Last Post Fund, that you're saying it should be universal coverage in the basis of that, because of that sacrifice, that they referred to do. That's what you are saying?

Peter Martin: Yes.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay. That's...and I support that. And the second question, is that...when you were here, I wasn't on Council. You were here, you mentioned February of 2022, okay. So, the impression and, you know, I don't for one minute, it is confusing enough for us sometimes our own process, never mind the general public. But the impression was given, that Council didn't just make the decision at that point, but that it was going to be ongoing, but it was...but that you were really only being subject to one budget, to one budget only. That was the...when you walked out of the Chamber that day, you had the impression that this was done, and it was looked after, and you wouldn't be back here again on this matter.

Peter Martin: That's why I went to the media right after and said, great news folks, assuming it's forever. But I'm from Transcona. I don't know everything.

Councillor Wyatt: Oh, no, no. We do know everything. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, could you just take the chair for a moment? I had a question for you, too, Mr. Martin. Thank you so much for being here, first of all. The Last Post Fund, has that increased or decreased over the years, or has it sort of stayed the same?

Peter Martin: Thank you. Tomorrow, I will start wearing this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Thank you.

Peter Martin: Take care.

Madam Speaker: Okay. I think there's been enough questions for Mr. Martin. We know where to reach you. Thank you.

Peter Martin: Thank you. Appreciate it. I'll be watching livestream for later.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: You're having the chair back?

Madam Speaker: Okay, yes. Thank you. Moving onto the reports today. Okay. Mr. Mayor, the report on the Executive Policy Committee, dated October 17, 2023, noting that there is an amending motion, with Item 2.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 17, 2023**

Mayor Gillingham: Okay. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Then I would introduce report and move adoption of the consent agenda, Items, actually 1 through 19, Madam Speaker, because we'll deal with 20 separately as well, please.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. I'll call...Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Item 4.

Madam Speaker: 4 is Renaming a Portion of a Roadway. Councillor Allard, Regulating Short-term Rentals. Councillor Wyatt. Okay, one second. 13 is End Homelessness Winnipeg. 19, Councillor Wyatt. 4 has been stood down, and you said 19. 19 is Programming and Activities for 150. Item 6 – Funding Allocation to 311 Budget. Item 7 – Poverty Reduction Implementation Plan. Item 2 has been stood down already. Okay. I'll call the question on Item 3, 5, 8, 9 through 12, 14 through 18. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk. Item 1.

Item 1 – Regulating Short-Term Rental Accommodations

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

Mayor Gillingham: I wait to...I believe Councillor Orlikow, did he get the Clerk's attention, we're good?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Just waiting on an amending motion regarding this STR. They'll be here in a second. They are printing it now.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Mayor, this is your opportunity to introduce the item.

Mayor Gillingham: Okay. With that being said, Madam Speaker, I guess when I close then I could speak to the amendment that would be brought forward in the meantime. So okay, good. You know, I'll simply just wait to hear from council colleagues. I want to first of all thank the...all the delegations, not only who came today, but also who come to the various committees as this matter has been proceeding through to today. So, I'll wait to hear from colleagues. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I didn't stand it down, but Madam Speaker, I'm just going to be pretty short with this. The new market economy with the Airbnbs, the Ubers and all these new era-type businesses. They want to operate in a free, open market, which hasn't really existed in Canada for a long time, Madam Speaker. May have when it was the wild, wild west and people got carried away, and actually, in order to...anyway, I don't...but, I just wanted to talk about fair

competition. This is going a long way to ensure that there is fair competition for those who would stay at a short-term rental. They're not living there. They are staying. So, I don't know how we gave it a...it gets a residential class. But anyway, that's how it is and supposedly our City experts say it's residential, all right. But Madam Speaker, what's unfair and even today, it's an unfair competition between the traditional taxi industry with Uber and not all Winnipeggers like Uber, and I have been in the odd Uber, taken by a friend who prefers. And I don't get any different service level from them than I do, or have had in my vast history of taking regular taxicabs. So, Madam Speaker, some of the things I hear about, well, for the Airbnb and they want fair competition. Madam Speaker, it's still unfair, even with these regulations that we bring in. It's unfair to the hotels. I think before Airbnb and that style of finding a place to stay in the city for a short term. I hear about, you know, business people wanting to...they're here for seven weeks. And they rent an Airbnb, well business in the past had to pay a hotel, for a long stay like that, if they were staying in the city where they had no friends or knew anybody. So Madam Speaker, it's just...it's not fair competition the way the big short-term rental operators are working. They're really running a hotel. That's what they are doing. What we're doing here is, we're offering the opportunity for people to have short-term rentals, in their own owned property, and I could go on. But Madam Speaker, I will be supporting this report and recommendation. I'm not sure what the amendment is, but we definitely have to regulate it, and...and I believe that 30-day, I just wanted to mention, I believe the 30-day, technically, you can have a long-term, month-to-month rental agreement. Those exist in the city, where people, you know, they're staying...they'll stay in the same place from month-to-month, actually. And that's where they live, it's a long-term thing. So, I think that 30-days has something to do with that. Excuse me. Anyway, I'll be...I don't know if I'll be supporting the amendment, but I'm supporting the report, so far, as it's going forward.

Madam Speaker: Seeing the hour, is it the will of Council to recess now and reconvene at...?

Councillor Lukes: One o'clock. Reconvene at 1:00.

Madam Speaker: One o'clock. We'll reconvene. Take a recess for one hour and reconvene at 1:00 p.m. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
October 26, 2023, at 1:06 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I'd like to reconvene our Council meeting of October 26, 2023. We're on the reports of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 17, 2023. Item No. 1, Regulating Short-Term Rental Accommodations. The Mayor introduced the item. I'll now recognize Councillor Orlikow, to introduce amending motion 10, that was moved by himself and Mayor Gillingham.

Motion No. 10
Moved by Councillor Orlikow,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Gillingham,

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 1 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 17, 2023, be amended as follows:

- In Recommendation 1 add the following immediately after "be enacted"

"with the following amendments:
 - In Part 1, delete Section 61.15(1)(b) and replace with the following:
 - (b) the license number is posted near the door on the exterior of the STRA together with a telephone number that is monitored by the operator or an agent of the operator 24 hours per day. This signage is not required to be posted when the operator is in residence

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Pleased to be here. I'm actually hurting a bit today, so I'm going to try to keep it short. After listening to the delegations this morning, and thinking about some of the ramifications, especially those people that own short-term rentals, in the existing neighborhood that they are. I think it's a...it's important for us to understand that there may be a few people that would actually know where they live, in their own neighborhood, and go knocking on the door, and start harassing them a bit, just because they don't like the idea of a short-term rental. So, I don't think it's really warranted that we need to put the name on the plaque. I think the business license number and the phone number is there. I think that would be appropriate. Council would still be able to access the name, ourselves, but it's the

same thing when we don't do complaints, we don't tell the neighbor who complained on them. That's not right because (inaudible). It's on the basis of right now, and all neighborhoods are probably facing it. We have to do everything in the power to try to keep neighborhoods together, try to help them not find ways to have fights with each other. So, this is an idea, just so we can actually allow people that maybe don't understand, that you're not supposed to show up at a person's house, even though you know where he lives, and start knocking on the door to complain about a short-term rental. There is an avenue that they can do that through the process, but again I think it's a little bit much to put the person's name on it. So that is why it's just a small change of just removing the person's name and just using the license number. And that's the amending motion today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Next is Councillor Eadie, then Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Eadie: No. I'm...

Madam Speaker: No? Okay. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, so I'm speaking to the regulatory framework. So, we have an interesting scenario here today. The regulatory framework, on the agenda, is before us, but the public hearing for the zoning by-law is still open. So, the public by-law or the public hearing for the zoning by-law is determining if where, what areas of the city, and how many short-term rentals will be allowed. There was a downtown fire that the public hearing had to be laid over. I'm not sure why it was laid over again, but it's still open. So, the Standing Policy Committee on Property, Planning and Development will decide how zoning will occur for short-term rentals, on November 2nd. And because the public hearing is still open, people can still register and speak to it. Then of course, the committee zoning recommendation will come to EPC, and then should the December Council meeting, where we'll be doing a final vote on the zoning; where in the city, how many, what will, will and won't be allowed. So, but today we are looking at the regulatory framework, right? The licensing, the rules, the fines and more. I confirmed this with the clerk. Yes, it's rather unusual. We can proceed if something different percolates out of the public hearing, they'll have to amend the regulatory aspect today. So, this is Winnipeg's first attempt at regulating this industry. Cities all over the world are regulating the short-term rental industry, and they're refining their regulations, to enable stronger enforcement. Recently, British Columbia's regulatory act will triple existing fines for hosts who break the rules, and will implement other new requirements for operators, and this is important, in an attempt to return existing short-term rentals back into the long-term market. The Quebec government tabled a bill imposing fines of \$100,000 for illegal listings. Quebec's bill will make it illegal for anyone to advertise short-term rental online, without including the number and expiring date for their provincial certificate. Again, this is significant. It came in response to calls from cities, for limits on the number of Airbnb style rentals which have removed apartments, and houses from the long-term rental market, exacerbating housing shortages. So, the Public Service did a cross-jurisdictional scan of nine major Canadian cities on short-term rentals. We've all received many reports on this. In the reports, the Public Service previously brought forward; it said...that nine Canadian cities are allowing short-term rentals, in residentially zoned neighborhoods, only if they are the primary residents. Nine cities in Canada have said, no, only if you are a primary residence, can you have a short-term rental, in a residential zone. Hamilton, London, St. Catharines, Ottawa, Toronto, Mississauga, Kelowna, Vancouver, and Victoria. Just last week, the federal government announced that they are actively exploring options to help provinces return short-term rentals to the long-term rental market, and increase housing stock in the country, for the housing crisis. So, let's bring regulations and housing home to Winnipeg. I want to share this interesting fact. This is just one little snippet. So, many of you know I've been very involved in illegal rental house realm, world, industry, for many years. This isn't the sole reason we have a housing shortage. This isn't the sole reason that, you know, we want to limit our short-term rentals. But just listen to this. In 2011, at the University of Manitoba, there were 2551 international students registered as full time, full time, off they go in 2011. I was elected in 2014, to start dealing with illegal, that was...that was...a lot of people locked in before, deal with illegal rooming houses. In 2022, 10 years later, last year there were registered 6601 international full-time students. That's an increase of 4,000 students. Where are they sleeping? The University of Manitoba has not built one bed. So, 4,000 more students. So, it has the lowest housing on-campus now. There are great plans in the work, and you heard me speak about them, for the Southwood Circle lands. They're going to build apartments and condos and all kinds of things, for 20,000 people. But, just to make this even more clear, this concept of building houses. So, I've been here now, nine years. It has taken nine years, in a way, it was good that I was banished from a lot of the committee meetings for seven or...seven or six or seven of those nine years. It gave me time to work on development. I could do it again. You want to banish me? Okay. I'm okay with that. I know what to do now. So, it took nine years to build 2500 units on Pembina Highway and University Crescent. You've seen the North twin towers, the South twin towers, you've seen some stuff in between, a little bit on University Crescent. I rolled out the red carpet. I worked with Property and Planning Department, non-stop. Didn't have anything else to do. It was good that I was working on this. But the point is, 2500 units accelerated in nine years it takes, and now, only now, they're moving in. So...I want you guys to think very seriously. Today we're just talking about regulations. The next Council meeting, we're talking about how many we're zoning and where. The regulations are what is before us today. Zoning comes forward next council. So, I did bring forward an amending motion, that was received at EPC. The amending motion was brought forward to have the department bring forward annual data. In three years, it's great. They're going to do a comprehensive review, they're going to look at what's

the world situation, what's the Canada situation. They'll do a comprehensive review, but every year, like they do for illegal rooming houses, data will be brought forward, to show us and give us an annual perspective on the regulatory framework. In my opinion, we need to have stronger regulatory fines and actions, but, here we are today. It's a start. We'll see what comes out every year. And then in three years, it will be the comprehensive review. So, I will be supporting this today. We'll see what comes out of the public hearing when it closes, and what comes forward at the next council meeting. We may have to adjust this, maybe not, but today, I'm supporting this regulatory framework.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Speaker Sharma. I raise, almost, in support of this regulation. My primary concern is that ...I don't think...when I...first of all, when I see the word, well, if the word isn't there. When I know there is a moratorium that's happening on something, I suspect that there is some policy work that hasn't been done. And so, I would've supported this report and I've been talking to colleagues. And I don't think...it's come to a point where those colleagues would be supportive. I'm not sure there would be a seconder to my motion, which is why...normally, I like to put my motions where my mouth is. I think I may be...they want, unless somebody wants to agree with me, then we can have a motion, debate on a, I guess a third motion, if that's in order. Not sure that it is. But...essentially, my concern is that this is the...once again, doesn't...it's not articulated that way, but it closes the door on new, non-primary residence Airbnb. And I think that's...that's misguided, to just say no, and not have a way forward. I think that creates situations where people lose respect for the system. People don't have a way to legitimately pursue a business, if that's what it is they want to do. So, I mean, the non-primary residence...being capped. Like, I heard from many delegations in the public hearing. I've had personal experiences. I've shared with many of my colleagues. But, who...like who benefits from the cap? Possibly, the hotel industry, possibly, those who currently have grandfathered the Airbnb units. But who loses? Well, I think the City of Winnipeg does, because it's costing us money and, we're foregoing revenue, that could happen in the future. There's a cost of implementing this program, which...is costing us quite a bit of money, that could be reinvested in other, other things. Or the revenues could be leveraged towards debt, to build other good things. Rentals are already managed through Residential Tenancies, is another one of the points that I have. Like this is already permitted. Housing is rented across the city, without additional regulation. I guess the point that I would want to make, is that as we've seen with the short...the Vehicles for Hire, that there really is quite a bit of power in regulation. So, if a person registers their, now legal, Airbnb, if they have a legal mechanism, to register their legal, non-primary residence Airbnb. The City then has a...essentially, like contracts, and a host of opportunities to enforce such behavior. So, I've heard about the party house. Well, in a by-law scenario, the party house is, well, you call the police and the police are dealing with (inaudible) property. And it's a nuisance, and there isn't...there isn't a response. In an Airbnb scenario, where that non-primary resident registered Airbnb, you have a host of penalties already defined in Appendix D. So, I think some of this came from residents that were upset about certain types of behaviors in short-term rentals, but I think the outcome of not regulating will be simply taking a tool away from those neighborhoods that are having trouble, with what might be bad neighbours. So, I think the regulation is a powerful tool, and for us to close the door and never return, as it's written today, and I...my amendment, if it were to be considered, would be very simple. It would be for the Public Service to report annually on the possibility of limited consideration for new licenses outside of the single-family designation. I mean, currently, the single occupant rule benefits very specific slice of society. There are people that don't need their home, they're primary residence, as defined in the regulation here, which is different than the Canada Revenue Agency definition. There are people who may not need their home when they go to the cottage. They're people who may not need their home when they go south in winter. There are people who may not need their home for a variety of reasons. But, those are the...those are the ones that we will be allowing in the future. The ones we will not be allowing in the future, are those that I needed when my...I was living in a single-family home with my family and three dogs. And the water ice fridge broke and we had to be outside of our home for three months. And we tried going to an apartment-style short-term rental accommodation. Didn't work, because our dogs were barking, and it just wasn't pleasant. Neighbours were complaining in the building, and understandably, that the dogs were barking all day. And so, the company allowed us to rent, actually on Lanark, which was subject to public hearings this week, when the Planning Department recommending the establishment of two new houses with secondary suites of four units. And I moved for those to be approved. I was soundly defeated 3-1. And then the other motion was soundly passed at 3, and me as dissenting vote. So, we talk about housing, and we clobber housing, quite a bit around here. So, I think that's something that should be...that should be recognized when we talk about housing. And I think, I want to see a city that has all of the housing. That has way more geared-to-income housing, which is what, we say housing crisis. I think the biggest part of that, is that we need more geared-to-income housing. So that's...can be 27% of your household income going towards housing costs, no more. That's the classic definition. Yes, there's also a housing crisis, in that market housing is becoming more and more expensive. But I think the biggest part is the geared-to-income. So, I've raised this before. There are issues in the by-law, like, you requiring a license for any state reviews are under. That means that tenants, I think it was...it was mentioned earlier today, month-to-month agreements, three years out of four will be illegal, because February doesn't have the right number of days. And so, I mean, that should probably be fixed. So, there's probably thousands of rents that are going to be illegal if we pass this by-law today. And, just looking for a little window to say, to legitimize the need for places, where new Canadians can test out Winnipeg, in a single-family home. I

see I'm running out of time. And I'll respect the time, but there is a need and we are saying no to new. That's ill-informed. So, I'll be voting against this. I would have, but people don't seem willing to move.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker. Seeing none. Councillor Orlikow to close on the amending motion. Okay. Councillor...Mr. Mayor, your opportunity to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the comments of my colleagues. I want to thank Councillor Orlikow for his amending motion. Obviously, supporting it, as I seconded it here. I think what we've got before us today, after...this hasn't been months, this has been years of discussion. We have before us a by-law, that I believe represents a compromise. There's been a lot of delegations over the years we've heard from, a lot of debate at Council, a lot of work by our Public Service as well. We probably haven't...haven't...don't have it perfect. We're going to review it. We're going to review...get reports back annually. We'll get reports back, ultimately in a few years. Now a comprehensive look at our regulations and the by-law, to see if it's working. There is a need for long-term rental housing. There's a need for long-term housing. And I believe there's also a need for the short-term rentals that we do have available. Of course, based on a decision we made earlier this year, as of February, since February, anything new in the short-term rental market can only be primary residences. So, we've already made some changes to kind of curtail what was prior to that, an unregulated industry. But when you think of the fact that, if you get a year and a time in the year, where we have more Ukrainians, for example, coming into Winnipeg, that needs to stay temporarily at the hotel until they can find housing. Add to that at the same time, sometime there's fires in northern communities where there are floods, where northern community members have to come and live in hotels for a long time, unfortunately. Add to that, you add those two together, at the same time, you have something, like the World Police and Fire Games. And you talk to the hoteliers, the hotel industry, they say, "We're full. We've got nothing available." So, there is a market for short-term rentals, and in our community, a lot of times, the market can decide whether it can support a certain number of short-term rentals or not. And so, I think what we've got here before us, after a lot of debate, is a compromised position. And again, I appreciate the amending motion Councillor Orlikow had brought forward, and looking forward to supporting this report and the amending motion as well, and I'll invite you to call the question, please.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on amending Motion 10. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Councillor Allard, noted in opposition. And the main item, as amended, all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Noted. Councillor Allard, in opposition. Mr. Clerk, Item 2.

Item 2 – Request for Funding to Conduct a Search at the Prairie Green Landfill

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

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

Madam Speaker: First speaker is...Councillor Rollins. Was that circulated? Okay. Amending Motion 2, moved by Councillor Gilroy, seconded by Councillor Santos. Given that, Councillor Gilroy, you have the floor.

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

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 2 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 17, 2023, be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendation 1 in its entirety and replace with the following new recommendation:*
 - "1. That City Council formally request the Federal and Provincial governments to fund a search of the Prairie Green Landfill."*

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just rise because I do think that we should stand united here as Council, and send a really clear message that we are supporting these efforts. And so, I really don't want to receive this as information. I think it's being standing united. What we have heard that that some of this work might take place under new leadership through Wab Kinew, the new premier of Manitoba. I think at the federal level, there is an interest in this. I think we have seen an interest in this throughout the community, even global sectors, like the United Nations, have been involved in signing on the need for us an action, in this regard. So, I really just want this to be a united stance on sending a clear message that we are standing with women that are in our community, that are really suffering, Madam Speaker. And they are suffering more than some of our male counterparts, and then within the Indigenous community, even more than non-Indigenous women. So, I think this is an opportunity for us to really stand behind a lot of the commitments we

have made, as a city, through our partnership with UN Safe Cities Initiative, that looks at violence and sexual violence towards women in our public spaces, and our Human Rights Committee, and all the work that we have done with...through the murdered and missing Indigenous women. I'm going to recognize, you know, Councillor Rollins is going to speak, but she's been...she's helped spearhead some of that work, and looking forward to her speaking on this. But, I just think this is an opportunity for us as a Council, to really stand behind something united, knowing that there is an issue here in Winnipeg, that is far greater than anywhere else in Canada. And as a councillor that knows a lot of my community members have been impacted, and death happened at my doorstep, in my community. I want to stand united in supporting this effort. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next Speaker. Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just want to give a little bit of history on why I'd supported the original motion. I attended the memorial for Mercedes Myran's, last year in December. I was put in contact with the family, through Sandra DeLaronde, last year. And so, I had an amazing opportunity to meet and listen to Mercedes' grandmother, Donna Bartlett. I'd like to call her...she is a warrior woman. We shared stories...she shared her stories, her beautiful stories about her granddaughter and her family. We laughed. And most importantly, I cried...I cried because I asked for forgiveness for Mercedes, because she was a resident in one of the shelters, within my ward. I felt a sense of responsibility to her, as a city councillor for her, that I did not do more, in my previous term of office, to advocate for her safety, or for the other MMIWG2S+ people, who may have lived at these shelters. So, when my contiguous council colleague, Councillor Gilroy, asked me to second this motion back in July, I did so with no hesitation. So, it's my hope today, that the rest of Council support the amendment before us today, to formally request federal and provincial government to search the Prairie Green Landfill. As we also heard from our delegation today, we want to ensure that it's done in a timely fashion. The city is ground zero, with the largest urban Indigenous population. We as a municipal government entity, we must be leaders, as we are also equal partners at the decision making table, with other levels of government. We owe that much to signify our support for Mercedes Myran, Rebecca Contois, Morgan Harris, Buffalo Woman, their families, as well as our Indigenous relatives. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Santos. Any further speakers? Councillor Mayes, followed by Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Mayes: That was very well said by Councillor Santos. I have little to add. A few months ago, if...when this first came forward, I felt it had a bit of the election-nearing flavor to it. This was an attempt to get involved in the provincial campaign. As I said at EPC, that campaign is over. There was a pretty clear winner. This was an issue. This could...this is...this could not have been clearer in the election, and there's pretty decisive victory for the party that talked about searching a landfill. So, given the NDP's victory, given the fact to be...the election is over, today, as of EPC, I'll certainly be supporting the original...it's really the original motion that is back in front of us. The EPC vote was to receive it as information. But this is sort of resurrecting from some...thanks to my two colleagues, Councillors Gilroy and Councillor Santos, for bringing this forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Yes, I wish to thank my council colleagues, Councillor Gilroy, Councillor Santos, for bringing this forward, once again. You will recall, Madam Speaker, that we did attempt to try to do an emergency debate, back in July, to no avail. What I'm concerned with, Madam Speaker, is to make sure that there is a record at City Hall, to assure women in this city, that we have resounding unanimity that we want the landfill searched. Madam Speaker, right now in the ward, the Harris family and supporters are at the Museum of Human Rights. It is cold. Their fire keeper has pneumonia, and the supports for the family...with recent electric capability that they had, has been shut off. The trauma that it takes to sit in an encampment, to hold a mirror up to the city to say, please come and support our family, is a bit of what is at issue today. And there is a stark contrast, unfortunately, on our agenda, Madam Speaker, because the simple request, that we know and in the words of Councillor Mayes, that we know there's definitive movement, federal and provincial. The words that might be easy to say, you know, write this letter. There's a sharp contrast because the very next item we're going to deal with, Madam Speaker, is a letter to the Province, a letter to say, we need some more Zamboni drivers. And that's going to be the record, Madam Speaker. I too am looking for unanimity today, because there are two agenda items that are just back-to-back...like kismet. And one says, write the provincial government to search the landfill. And the other is to write the provincial government about a serious matter pertaining to the openness of the arenas. Giganaawenimaanaanig, the MMIWG2S+ Implementation Advisory Committee, its spokesperson, Madam Speaker, Sandra DeLaronde. Sandra DeLaronde really embodies, "We all take care of them", the meaning of the word. She not only is a national, international spokesperson for MMIWG all around the world, but she is a Professor of Development Studies, the first ever MMIWG class in Canada. She came to spoke...speak today. Thelma Morrisseau, Elder Thelma Morrisseau came to speak, brought her time and energy. Elder Thelma Morrisseau wants to see this motion passed. The Indigenous Friendship Centre was here today. They want to see this motion passed. Supporters of the Harris family was here today. They want to see this motion passed. It's really important to understand that all of us in this chamber signed an Indigenous accord that now

includes the National Inquiry calls to action. Some that Sandra DeLaronde asked us to consider today, nine through 9/11 series, talk specifically to justice actors. Madam Speaker, I'm calling on Council today to consider themselves justice actors. For urban Indigenous women for sure, for two-spirited voices that should be heard, and that we are called upon, in our signatures, that we hopefully did not do performatively. That we're called upon to act, to lead solutions, to create appropriate mechanisms, to ensure our responsibilities and accountabilities, that which we signed in the accord. They have asked for us to pass this motion. It's a motion that, I have no doubt, we will pass the one pertaining to Zambonis today. Let us pass this one. We could have resounding unanimity that we want the landfill searched today. I believe we should have resounding unanimity that we want it searched in recognition of all those who are imploring us to do just that, Madam Speaker. And on behalf of our residents that no longer have a voice, Madam Speaker. That we do all we can because we recognize the calls to action, the calls to justice call on all governments, and all governments include this duly elected body, Madam Speaker. I thank you for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Next speaker, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I will be definitely supporting the resolution. I want to thank Councillor Gilroy, Councillor Santos for moving it, and the words of Councillor Rollins just now. This summer I did have the opportunity to go to the demonstration at Brady Street, Brady Road landfill. And I think I spoke about it before on this floor of Council, that when I arrived, there was a big crowd, but what I maybe didn't speak about, were just how egalitarian the group was. People of all backgrounds, all colors, and from what I can see all faiths, altogether, young, old. It was on a Friday when I was there. I was there a number of times, but I recall that one because that was when most people were there, because the court order had come down, and everybody was expecting to potentially be arrested. But I think I mentioned on this floor of Council, I arrived and I looked up and saw somebody yell, shouted out eagles. I looked up and saw these two beautiful eagles flying above us. And apparently, they said, they've been flying over the site steadily. And an older gentleman, who is an elder, was standing beside me. I gave him tobacco. He entered into a prayer. It was an emotional moment. And I can only imagine that if they were my relative, my friend, in a landfill, I'd want to know and I'd want to find them. I am pleased with the new government and commitment to do this. I hope this Motion does pass unanimously. Thank you.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker Sharma. I think my colleagues have said many of the things I would have said. The one...the one thing I was thinking of is, what if it were our kid or kin, what would we want? I know that I would want to know. And I would want to have the appropriate rituals for my family, my friends, and I think we should...I think we should join other levels of government. I don't see why we haven't yet. And Councillor Mayes is right. It was resounding endorsement from the public. And I don't think I have ever seen so many orange shirts just prior to...just prior to the provincial election day. So, I'll be supporting. Thank you to my colleagues for having to (inaudible), for having brought it forward, and I hope that this passes unanimously. And if there are no further speakers I'd like to call for recorded vote.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank my colleagues for their comments. Respectfully, one of our colleagues mentioned comparing this item to Item No. 3. I don't think they are alike at all. The matter in Item 3 related to Zamboni is something within our jurisdictions, the City of Winnipeg. It's a...what we've got here is a motion that really calls upon the federal government. It's telling us, us telling the federal government to make a decision in another jurisdiction. And I have been consistent. I've met with two Crown-Indigenous ministers. I've met with two premiers on this matter. I've been with the families of the Myron family and the Harris family. Chiefs and Indigenous leaders continue to be in dialogue with them, and continue to provide ways to support and offer my support. And I called upon successive Crown-Indigenous ministers and successive premiers to make a decision. I didn't have to do that with Premier Kinew because he had made a decision to make some progress, but with the others to make a decision for the sake of the families. But they need...but the decision really rests with the federal government and provincial governments, as to whether to ultimately conduct a search, and to fund a search. What I'm pleased to see is that both federal government and the new provincial government have been indicated they are taking steps forward. I believe it's yesterday, perhaps today, that the families are meeting with the new premier. The federal government just recently announced that it was adding another 700 and I believe \$40,000, to further investigate and refine the feasibility study and the details related to that. As you know, we looked at the feasibility study, and the City of Winnipeg has already implemented and has in place, several of the recommendations from that feasibility study. And I've said consistently, and maintained my position consistently, that the Prairie Green Landfill, which is not in the city of Winnipeg, if the federal and provincial governments decide to search, they need to fund it. We as a city, will be there to assist as we can. If they need access to our Water and Waste staff, of course they can have it. If there's other things we can do as a city, we will do. I was asked by the leaders, some of the leaders of Treaty 1, that the City would investigate looking at perhaps providing some land, if possible, to assist them with their search. We are looking into it. The City of Winnipeg staff is looking into that right now. But I'm going to maintain my

position, maybe not everyone will appreciate the nuance of it. I'll continue to support the families, continue to do all I can as mayor, but the position that I had and maintain, is that it's up to the federal and provincial governments ultimately to decide, whether or not to search Prairie Green Landfill and to provide the full funding, the funding for such a search, and so because of that, I am going to maintain my position. I appreciate my colleagues raising this motion, but will not be voting for the amendment and maintain my position in my vote as I voted at the Executive Policy Committee.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour?

Mayor Gillingham: Of the amending motion?

Madam Speaker: The amending motion? Yes. Call for recorded vote. All in favour of the amending Motion 2, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Chambers, Eadie, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos and Wyatt

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Dobson, Duncan, His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillor Lukes and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 6.

Madam Speaker: Okay, the main item is amended, or pardon me, do I need to call the...yes, the main item, as amended. Do we need to do that, Mr. Clerk? Just one moment. Yeah, we do need to do another vote, yeah. Just a moment. Mr. Clerk, if you could articulate that to...

City Clerk: Just so as normal practice, we actually just voted on the amendment. The end result, in this case, happens to be that the amendment, or rather the main item is going to be the exactly the same as the amendment so. But we still need to vote on the main item, as amended. The recommendation before the Council was to receive it as information. Now we're voting on the item, as amended.

Madam Speaker: Is that clear? It's the same vote essentially. It's the same vote. All in favour of the main item, as amended, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Chambers, Eadie, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos and Wyatt

Nays

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Browaty, Dobson, Duncan, Lukes and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 6.

Madam Speaker: Item 2, as amended, passes. Next, Mr. Clerk.

Item 4 – Renaming a Portion of Bishop Grandin to Edward Schreyer Parkway South

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Gillingham: I look forward to the discussion, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: First speaker. Item 4. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I rise to make brief comments, Madam Chair. I'm not going to be opposing the Executive Policy Committee recommendation, I'll be supporting it. Sometimes communication is crucial. We often get very busy in our home body here, on things that we are doing. What's important to note, Madam Speaker, is that this entire Council Chamber did vote unanimously, in terms of the new name. Abinaji Mikanah is the new name of the former Bishop Grandin. And the intent of the mover, being myself of this motion and my seconder Councillor Eadie, was in no way to take away from that. We all voted in favour of it. It was unanimous decision. But rather was the fact knowing the history of the transportation route, the North-South Transcona corridor, knowing also that an individual who has done a lot for our community on many fronts, the Right Honourable Edward Schreyer, really hasn't been recognized by the City. Meanwhile, other first ministers of the Province of Manitoba, such as Sterling Lyon, has been recognized. Knowing also, Madam Speaker, and I want to be somewhat sensitive to this, that his Honour, on December 21, is going to be 88 years old. When I saw the road and the fact that it was built, wrongly named I would say, by probably the Public Service at that time, who probably came forward with the name of Bishop Grandin, when shouldn't have been there. Especially when the debate was going on at that time to put the new name on the new road that was just built, which is somewhat surprising. You know, I saw it as an opportunity to recognize somebody who had done a lot of service. You know, my motion outlines all the different things that he had accomplished for, largely I emphasize Indigenous community, recommended to me that it should go to Welcoming Winnipeg by the Mayor's office. I fully supported that. Mayor's office suggested it should be part of that process. I had no issue with that at all. Neither did the seconder. And the interesting thing is, is that so I wanted to, when I sat down with the Right Honourable Ed Schreyer, he spoke to me about the initiatives that he spearheaded when he had the opportunity to lead this province as premier. He was the first premier. Prior to that, no premier had actually had regular meetings with the leadership of the First Nations of this province. At that time, the Assembly of First Nations of Manitoba was called the Indian Brotherhood. It was a forerunner. Chief David Couchene headed it. David Couchene, his assistant, interestingly enough, was Phil Fontaine, who later on to...went on to great prominence. He started regular meetings throughout the year with the leadership. Never done before. Never done before. He wanted to send a message to them out of respect and equality, which he did. He initiated a program of ice road building into First Nations that had no ice roads, or had to operate on ice roads privately owned and operated, where the private property owner or the private owner of the ice roads would exempt a toll against the First Nations who were attempting to use that ice road. Prior to his government, none of the First Nations had airstrips into them. They had to fly in with a bush plane, to supply themselves with supplies. He built airstrips, gravel air strips in every First Nation in the North. He spearheaded multiple programs in Indigenous training, upgrading our universities and our colleges, also in language training that had not existed before. And not to mention the initiatives he did for the First Nation community. He also spearheaded many initiatives that benefited all communities. He built, literally, towards the end of his tenure in 1977, he was rolling out thousands of affordable family housing units, at a time where we can't even build hundreds. He created the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, which to this day, saves Manitobans, average families, thousands of dollars every year, depending on how many vehicles you have. He eliminated what was taking place before in this province, was the surcharge for medical premiums. We had a medical surcharge for Medicare. Every Manitoban had to pay a fee. He eliminated that. He brought in a host of new programs across the board and he changed the province progressively in the right direction. But he's never been recognized by this Council, in terms of all the things he's done. We recognized Sterling Lyon, but not him. So, my hope was, prior to him being with a...hoping to do something while he was still with us, was to recognize. I am still hopeful of that. I'm hopeful he's going to be with us for a long time, and we don't have to be concerned about that. But that was my motivation. And you know, as somebody who has two sons, one who's fully Indigenous, who's done a lot of work with the Indigenous community, and is very appreciative of all the work that they've done to help me over the years. In no way shape or form, did I want to do anything that would take away from that, which is why a motion recommending going through one of the Welcoming Winnipeg, so as that consultation can take place. It's unfortunate the timing. But had I been on Council last term, it wouldn't have been named Bishop Grandin in the first place, because it was a historic North-South Transcona corridor. It would have been Edward Schreyer. We should have never put that name on Bishop, especially when the debate about Bishop Grandin was going on, and that (inaudible). What do we do? We put Bishop Grandon's name on it. That made no sense. But I wasn't here. It should have been caught by my predecessor and it wasn't. I mean that's...it's not really members of the Council at fault; it was the area councillor at the time, who was here and should've caught it. But of course, maybe he didn't know the history of that quarter like I do. So, I want to state those matter of fact. I just want to...Chris Hurley was kind enough to show me a photograph of...that I think used to hang in this chamber. I'm not too sure, if it doesn't any more. But actually, it's the original Council meeting of this city. First council meeting held in this building. And what we have to also remember, is that Ed Schreyer created his government. He was a minister of Unicity. He was a minister of Inter-Governmental Affairs. He was a premier, and he also took on ministership. He was the one who actually shepherded the legislation through the House. And there he is in the photo, sitting beside...there you have Steve Juba sitting, back then the Mayor used to sit in the Speaker's chair. And near the Mayor is sitting where Madam Speaker is today, and to the immediate left of the mayor of the day, Steve Juba, His Honourable, His Worship Steve Juba, is the Right Honourable Ed Schreyer. The first council meeting of this chamber, which is really unique. So, it's a long overdue recognition of somebody who has served our country in more than one capacity, going on to become Governor General. By the way, the youngest premier at the time, ever elected. I don't know if that's still the case. I think it is. Going on to be Governor General for Canada, going on to be High Commissioner to Australia. Who's worked behind the scenes,

I know, on a lot of initiatives with regards to mental health, because I know how his own family struggles, in terms of some of that, with some relatives, and as well, who has done a lot of work I know, with regards to...

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

Councillor Wyatt: It's a lot of work behind the scenes with regards to green energy, and his concerns with regards to climate change and the environment. He's remained active, as a matter of fact, at one point he decided to run in the federal election. I think the only reason he ran, was so that he could stand up and call for a public inquiry into Crocus, which was a bit of a thorn in the side of the premier of the day, Gary Doer. But that's why he wanted to run, because he just couldn't believe that that scandal could take place without a public inquiry. I dare say that if we've been naming it after Gary Doer, might have...might have not been such a big issue. But I think part of the challenge we have, is as time goes on, we forget what others have done for us, accomplished for us. And I guess I speak to, and look back to, that idealism of that time. That he was an idealist, but he was also a practitioner. He was able to create opportunity and he was able to create progressive change through those ideals, of that early first democratic government of Manitoba. But he was also practical enough to get them implemented. And I dare say if all of us here had one tenth, one twentieth of legislative success that the Right Honourable Ed Schreyer has had, we would've had...we could stand up and say we had a successful Public Service career. So those are my thoughts, and that's it, yeah. Thanks.

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

Councillor Mayes: I'll try to be brief. I do hope we are able to name something (inaudible). Councillor Wyatt said it today. Councillor Wyatt now has got Sage Creek North neighbourhood, just north of the roadway in question. Roads that could be named without even going through the Welcoming Winnipeg process, street naming is outside of that. So, I would like to see something named for Ed Schreyer, not this...secondly, that there was a suggestion there that previous councillors for the area had been asleep at the wheel perhaps, about the naming of that particular stretch of road being Bishop Grandin. Well, frankly no. I mean that...it was discussed a number of times at the last Council, the expansion of that, the extension. So, Councillor Nason would have been to the north, I would have been to the south. You'll all remember that 2020 infrastructure plan, for example, at Item 26, Bishop Grandin Extension East Lag to Fermor. So, it's been there for a long time very publicly. the idea was, it would still be called Bishop, running from Lag all the way out to Fermor. So just for clarity, it wasn't any sort of error or oversight by me or by Councillor Nason, in terms of letting this extension get named improperly. But I support what we did at EPC. I would like to see something named for Ed Schreyer and probably some of other former premiers, in due course. But for today, I am certainly supportive of how we treated this item at EPC.

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

Councillor Eadie: I rise, Madam Speaker. I, as I said at Executive Policy Committee, I will be supporting the motion by Councillor Rollins, who moved to file it. But I'm not doing that because I am trying to apologize. It's clear that there's no will to name that extension from Lag to Fermor. So, Madam Speaker, given that, though I want to speak about something. There's not a day that goes by that I act as a city councillor, that I don't think about missing and murdered women and men for that matter, because there is a high death rate of men in the Indigenous population as well, Madam Speaker. I do consider, and when I considered seconding the motion, honest motion by Councillor Wyatt, if he had been around and if anybody looked back to when the original planning of that inner ring road, the completion was that south extension and then to come around and come on the north part of Transcona...meeting up with Lag, so you have that across Edward Schreyer Parkway. So, I don't think anybody really delved into the...looking at the time when Councillor Wyatt was around. He has been on and off Council since 2002. And I believe that it was a legitimate request that we would ask, and it would go to the right people first, before anything was done, to explore doing it. Now, I understand the Indigenous and Metis community in Winnipeg and in Manitoba. They've been fighting a long time, Madam Speaker. And a number of individuals that I heard speak, who tried to insinuate that I know nothing, that I don't understand the plight of Indigenous people or Metis people, when I live it every day in my ward. I'm on the street, I'm kind to everybody. If there is a woman in need and in trouble and she asks me, I help, Madam Speaker. As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, I believe when I was a young teenager, I often got beat up because I was the white guy, okay. And a lot of that had to do with anger from Indigenous families who experienced decades, for a very long time, the idiotic school system that was put together, taking kids away from their families. I understand all of that. So, when I hear the representative, the director of WAPSO, at the end of his speech to EPC, insinuating that somehow, I violated some sort of proper practice, code of conduct or anything like that. And again, I understand, I heard some women speak and I understand why they were very upset. But Madam Speaker, they are assuming that I didn't think about these things beforehand. I do think about these things, Madam Speaker. So, it's clear we could've had it and actually, if it was done properly that when that extension was being done, if they would've looked into history about that inner ring road that's been a...I don't even know if we are going to do it any more, but there is an inner ring road plan, there was. I think if you study some history on that. I would ask our employees and public servants, who would be critical of Councillor Wyatt and Eadie, that maybe they were remiss in not doing way more research about that extension, and about that inner ring road and proposed names in the future. That should've probably happened,

too, Madam Speaker. So, I just leave it at that. And again, I do understand why, especially the Indigenous Metis activists who came, I understand their frustration and I am going to forgive them for insinuating that somehow, I am a typical white guy, when I am not. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today to share my thoughts on this motion, recognizing and supporting what Councillor Mayes had said, but I do hope something gets named in honour of former Premier and Governor General and High Commissioner to Australia, Edward Schreyer. He was the first premier in all of Canada to establish or form an NDP government. First Manitoban selected to be Governor General of Canada, and of course, his role that he played as the High Commissioner to Australia, again first Manitoban to act in that capacity. Of course, Premier Doer acted as High Commissioner in the United States. Again, the...what we experienced or what the Indigenous community experienced, we shared with them the uncovering of the residential graves, unmarked residential graves, and then our call to action, in terms of acknowledging the loss of those children in residential school, and renaming Bishop Grandin, who had a role to play in this, Abinojii Mikanah, meaning "Children's Way". I think we should honour that, fully, and ensure that the section of roadway just north of Sage Creek, is also named Abinojii Mikanah, and that we work diligently as a Council or members of Council, to find a location that is more fitting, as an honour to former Premier, Edward Schreyer. I don't think we want to distract from our intent of naming Abinojii Mikanah, "Children's Way", to commemorate the loss of those young children in residential schools. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next, Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I won't be very long. Again, I don't believe for a second that my colleagues from Transcona or Mynarski had the intention of disturbing the anti-reconciliation in any way by this proposal. To my colleagues though, they are suggesting something else be named after Mr. Schreyer. I do want to point out that my wife is a graduate of École Edward Schreyer School in Beausejour. And if you look even today, if you go to 7-Eleven and grab a Sherlock map book, the north-south components of the inner beltway, which now connects up to Chief Peguis Trail, is already dotted in there and is named Edward Schreyer Parkway. I appreciate it'd be very nice to name something while he's with us, but I appreciate that you know, again, it has always been that north-south and not east-west pieces so, which again... Abinojii Mikanah is you know, considered to be an east-west component. So, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Any further speakers? Mayor's opportunity to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, I want to build on what Councillor Browaty has said. Certainly, Abinojii Mikanah was a very important and thoughtful decision made by this Council. And naming Abinojii Mikanah, maybe Bishop Grandin, Abinojii Mikanah, "Children's Way", is something we can do. It's within the city of Winnipeg. It's within our jurisdiction to effect, and so we've made that decision, and I'm glad that we have made that decision, within our own city. And the extension, when you look at the map, you know, contrary to what a couple of councillors, the councillor from Transcona had said, and perhaps what the councillor, other councillors have alluded to, when you look at the map from 2008, from the Transcona Area West Structure Plan, it contemplates in the Edward Schreyer Parkway, going from Lagimodiere South and then terminating in Regent. It doesn't contemplate it going any further south and to the Regent. And that is also supported in the 2011 Transportation Master Plan. If you look at the map there, that's included, it has the Bishop Grandin Way, with an east-west connection, and then the east-west extension just kind of dotted. But there again, in this map, in 2011, the Transportation Master Plan, it has Edward Schreyer Parkway going from Lagimodiere and terminating at Regent. And so, I don't think at any time there was error, as Councillor Mayes so eloquently put it. That was, you know, that this previous Council in the last term was guilty of any error, or kind of not defending something that was contemplated. Clearly, our decision to establish Bishop Grandin as Abinojii Mikanah, and then to support, just recently at EPC, that the extension be also named Abinojii Mikanah. I think we were consistent with the adopted plans of this Council, from 2008 and from 2011 as well. So, I want to thank again, Councillor Rollins for her motion at Executive Policy Committee and I'll be...continue to support what EPC supported. Thank you.

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

Item 6 – Funding allocation to 311 in Budget 2023

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

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

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I just stood this item down to allow the mover of the item to be able to speak to it, in terms of the ongoing challenges with 311, namely, the response and the need for us to address the need to ramp up 311 in the hopes and goals I guess, of what this will achieve.

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

Mayor Gillingham: You can simply call the question.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of Item 6? Contrary? Carried. Item 7.

Item 7 – Poverty Reduction Strategy Implementation Plan

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. Once again, I'll wait to hear from colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. With this one, I see that it's being laid over and I just have concerns with it being laid over. So, I'm just kind of asking through you, Madam Speaker, and maybe if the Mayor doesn't have that question, I can also ask it in a question period to the Chair, but maybe he can respond. He was at EPC and I didn't see the response from the administration on why it's being laid over. I am just concerned because there's probably a lot of those items in there that really need to go through to the budget process. And this is something that I really think, as we heard even our delegate here today, on issues pertaining to women, poverty is one of the biggest things, so our poverty reduction strategy is critical and how we move forward as a city. And I just want to make sure that those fundings are...those requests that are needed to implement the strategy are going to be able to make it through to our budget process. So that's my only concern about it being laid over. I just wanting to hear about if they are expecting that to come forward next month. That would be my question, Madam Speaker. I don't know if it can be responded through the answer, through the Chair.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 7 is an extension of time, not a lay over. Any other speakers on the item. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close?

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Even though it's not through QP, I don't mind trying to answer that. It is as you clarified, thank you, it's an extension of time to give the staff more time just to kind of respond and pull the report in. So, we should have that in the November cycle, thank you for that information.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on Item 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, next item is...

Item 13 – End Homelessness Winnipeg Annual Funding Agreement Report

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yeah, we had a good report at Executive Policy Committee. I appreciate that Mr. Jason Whitford of End Homeless Winnipeg and some of his staff came and reported to the City of Winnipeg some of the updates, that the number of people they've been able to house that right now, as they've indicated over the last few years, the number of people they have been able to house is being outstripped by the number of people who are ending up on our streets. And certainly, the pandemic had a very negative impact. Because of the pandemic, ultimately, through various reasons, more people have ended up struggling with homelessness and being unsheltered. I think it's important to remind all of us of all the work that collectively we have done, through the 2023 budget, to make further investments in helping people who are struggling with homelessness. The additional budget funding for 24/7 safe spaces, to add more 24/7 safe spaces, is really at the top of that list. Of course, we have hired a senior advisor on homelessness and addiction, Jarred Baker, who's doing really excellent work. In meeting right now, first of all, meeting with all the different organizations who are helping people on the frontlines. We also have a brand-new premier, whom I congratulate on his election with a...his election and his government's election. And Premier Kinew and I have met, and he no doubt, Madam Speaker, I've heard this and my colleagues have heard this as well. Tackling homelessness in a coordinated fashion is at the top of shared priority list. And I know that every councillor around this table shares that desire as well. And so, working with End Homelessness Winnipeg, all the agencies who are...most of whom are doing some good coordinated work with, and then adding to that now, provincial government who's prioritizing addressing homelessness, the federal government also has

given indication through my discussion with Minister Dan Vandal, who wants to talk about the work we collectively want to do. That to me is a good sign. We need everybody on board, one plan, one coordinated effort, shared data to get people off the streets into housing with wraparound supports. And so, I'm looking forward to the work that we collectively are going to be doing in the immediate future with everybody. I also want to commend the Premier for creating one portfolio, Homelessness, Addiction and Mental Health and Housing, and giving it to Minister Bernadette Smith, who I've grown to appreciate over the years, in various ways of working with her. And I believe she has a good handle on the situation in our city. That is a very big complex portfolio with a lot of moving parts, but I believe that bringing all of those different elements under one umbrella, under one portfolio is a good move. And I applaud the Premier for that decision. And so, there's a lot of work that we have yet to do. It is the collective we, all of us; the other levels of government, the non-profit agencies who are working on the frontlines, if we're truly going to make an impact on addressing homelessness in our city. So, I look forward to the debate today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next speaker. Item 13. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, I was the one who stood this item down, Madam Speaker. Simply, this is an item which I've spoken to many times before in the past. I stand it down all the time, to just to raise the consciousness level I suppose, in terms of this matter, that we have been voting on it, and for a while that we weren't getting annual reports that we requested. Now we appear to be doing that which is good. In 2014, when it was created at the end of 2014, with the new mayor at that time. There were high hopes in terms of this initiative. It has been very slow in coming, in terms of it getting up and going and get it moving in the right direction. It appears to be moving now in the right direction. My hope is that that will continue, and now as pointed out by the Mayor with the new government, hopefully, accelerate so that we can create the housing opportunities and the housing spaces that we critically need. Especially for those who are suffering from addiction, first stage addiction, in terms of second...first stage housing, second stage housing, in terms of mental health and addictions, as well plugging in the services. And I always like to tell a story of a friend of mine who had...came back from Europe a year or so ago. He was in Holland with his family there, and he was asked about where are the people who happen to be homeless. They said, well we don't allow that here. We just don't tolerate it. We build smaller units 250, 300 square foot. We provide very basic, you know, services for them in that unit. They have a door. They can close it. They can have their privacies. It's not an open shelter like we have here, where people go in and feel unsafe. And we plug in services. So, in a typical building, in the middle of a city, like Amsterdam or Rotterdam, the services will be plugged in below or beside, that they could assist to and if they want to be able to get help in any way, or assistance, or turn their life around, in any way or manner that's required. And so, this is the challenge we have. It's overcome the trauma of those individuals who are struggling on the streets. But housing is really the best way to do it. So, once you have somebody plugged into housing, you have an element of stability that was never there before. And that stability is the first step towards recovery and a new life. The idea that hundreds of citizens are wandering our streets, or thousands couch surfing, or living marginally, in housing which is tenement housing, like you see with the old hotels up and down Main Street, all tenement housing, something from the 19th century, something from a Dickens novel. Or the common housing that you see in a lot of the older neighborhoods, multiple units. And it's really not dignified housing in any way, shape or form. And we have...we have the folks who are blatantly homeless, who are clearly homeless, but then we have people who are just on the edge of it, and or who are living in...and who are, and also poor, living in conditions that are really deplorable. And we have a big challenge ahead of ourselves. Somebody, another person whom I...who's been very involved with this industry, the challenges of this industry, if I can call it an industry, who's given his life to Public Service in that area. You know, he said to me once, Russ, it would be nice if we as a country, if we believe in the right to healthcare, but we have not shifted yet to the right to housing. And that's a really, an interesting concept because if we did that, things would have to radically change in terms of how we fund and how we categorize it and how we treat it as a title right and so on. And so, we...I'm hoping, Madam Speaker, that even though we are only putting \$150,000 a year, we have kept this program since 2014, nearly 10 years now. And if it wasn't for our initiative to get it going, I don't think it would've started at all. But I'm hoping that it can ramp up and I'm hoping that we can see some major changes in the actual body of our streets that are out there right now. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Wyatt for his comments. I agree with the councillor from Transcona that housing indeed is the first step to helping people get to a place of stability. It's really, very hard, if not impossible, to treat someone's addiction or mental health issues when they're living in encampment, or in a bus shelter, other places that are...where they are precariously unsheltered, and certainly not housed. So, that is the goal. That is the ultimate aim, that any new or updated strategy that is comprehensive has got to focus on housing first, with the wrap around supports, if we're ever going to make an impact so. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. All in favour of item 13? Contrary? Carried. Next item, Mr. Clerk. Item 19.

Item 19 – Programming and Activities for Winnipeg 150

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. January of 19, nope, 1874, Winnipeg held its first Council meeting. It was incorporated in November of 1873, so, next month it will be 150 years since Winnipeg's incorporation. But we are planning some, some celebrations next year throughout the year. And we certainly have asked our Public Service to begin working on those plans, and they are working on those plans. And so, Madam Speaker, look forward to having dialogue I believe, with all council colleagues and some of the ideas that maybe put forward. Someone has suggested perhaps that, you know, the councillor from River Heights, as in east of Fort Rouge and I pardon me, I should say, Fort Rouge and East Fort Garry, has perhaps suggested even a ball or something to that effect. So, we're looking for some good ideas. We only get one opportunity to celebrate 150 years, and so, we want to make sure that we do that well. So, looking forward to discussion, not only today, but throughout the coming months and years, as far as all that we can do to mark this very important occasion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any further speakers? No further speakers. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close?

Mayor Gillingham: Call the question, please, without the ball.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on Item 19. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 20.

Item 20 – Establishment of a Chief Construction Officer

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

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. I know there's an amending motion here as well. I, if I may, I would like to move...I'd like to move a layover of this matter, with the amending motions as well, just to give us some more time to work on it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And for clerks to clarify the amending motion, the number, motion number.

City Clerk: Motion No. 8, Madam Speaker.

Motion No. 8

**Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,**

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 20 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 17, 2023, be amended as follows:

- *Add the following new Recommendation 3:*
 - “3. That the job description, including expectations and reporting requirements, be approved by Council prior to any hiring.”
- *Renumber the remaining recommendations accordingly*

Madam Speaker: Motion No. 8. Okay, so I'll call the question on the Item 20 and the amending Motion No. 8 to be laid over to the next Council meeting. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: Next, we have Motion 3, moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Eadie. It's an automatic referral. It's requesting the Province to expand scope of its public inquiry. Okay, you'd like to rescind Motion 3 perhaps, and replace with Motion 7.

Councillor Wyatt: If you don't mind.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so rescinding Motion 3, I'll get the concurrence of your seconder, Councillor Eadie. Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. So, the vote is on, pardon me, then it's a notice of motion, which is Motion 7, moved by

Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Eadie, requesting the Province to increase the scope of a public inquiry. Next, Motion 4, also an automatic referral, appointment of an independent auditor. And that will be an automatic referral to Executive Policy Committee. Motion 5, moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Eadie, regarding code of conduct for City employees. This is an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. We'll now get into by-laws. Okay, there's another motion, many circulated today. Motion 11, moved by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Eadie. It's regarding the installation of a portrait in the Council Chambers, and it's an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. Now, onto by-laws. Mr. Mayor.

Motion No. 3

**Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,**

WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba has indicated that that they will be proceeding with a Public Inquiry into the Winnipeg Police Headquarters construction project;

AND WHEREAS the Winnipeg Police Headquarters construction project was not the only project/initiative that should be subject to a Public Inquiry, during that same period of time of the same said administration prior to November 2014;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg formally request the Province of Manitoba expand the scope of their Public Inquiry to include:

- A. The Fire Hall Construction and Land Assembly*
- B. The land swap involving the Fort Rouge Lands and the Parker Avenue Lands*
- C. The East District Public Works Yard Capital Project*
- D. The Winnipeg Convention Centre Expansion Project*

Motion No. 7

**Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,**

WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba has indicated that that they will be proceeding with a Public Inquiry into the Winnipeg Police Headquarters construction project;

AND WHEREAS the Winnipeg Police Headquarters construction project was not the only project/initiative that should be subject to a Public Inquiry, during that same period of time of the same said administration prior to November 2014;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg formally request the Province of Manitoba expand the scope of their Public Inquiry to include:

- A. The Fire Hall Construction and Land Assembly*
- B. The land swap involving the Fort Rouge Lands and the Parker Avenue Lands*
- C. The East District Public Works Yard Capital Project*
- D. The Winnipeg Convention Centre Expansion Project*

Motion No. 4

**Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,**

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg Capital Roads Budget has seen significant inflationary pressures recently, and over the years;

AND WHEREAS the said program has had challenges with program delivery, with posted road project completion deadlines not being met;

AND WHEREAS the said program has been hamstrung with the need to contract via private consultants, even though the City has its own significant Engineering Division within the Department of Public Works;

AND WHEREAS the said program has seen, on numerous occasions, late tendering, and/or tendering following the tenders issued by the Province of Manitoba and their province wide road works;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council appoint an Independent Auditor to conduct an Independent and Operational Audit of the Public Works Roads Procurement Program, that will apply to both in-house work and private sector contract tendering and contract management;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Audit shall consider timing of tendering, administration of said tender projects, as well as provide options for both Public Works and Council processes to provide for earlier tendering procedures and requirements;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Auditor shall consider alternative service delivery options for the road procurement program, to increase efficiency and effectiveness of said budget dollars;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Auditor shall consider ways and means to coordinate program delivery with the Provincial Government, and their annual tendering for road works, along with addressing the issue of labour shortages and access to affordable aggregate.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Auditor shall conduct a random forensic audit of various road work tenders to ensure impartiality and efficiency.

Motion No. 5

**Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,**

WHEREAS members of Winnipeg City Council have been subject to the Office of the Integrity Commissioner and a Code of Conduct, as well as the Annual Statement of Assets, as required under Provincial Legislation;

AND WHEREAS in the past, issues have arisen with the conduct of senior members of the Public Service, yet are still not subject to the same level of accountability as that of elected officials;

AND WHEREAS senior members of the Public Service have been, over the years, not only been delegated authority, granting them powers to make decisions previously made by Council or by Council Committees, but are also responsible for the day-to-day administration of all approved Council Operating and Capital Budgets;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that all senior members of the Public Service, namely from departmental divisional managers, all the way up through, to, and including the CAO, be subject to a Council Approved Code of Conduct;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Office of the Integrity Commissioner be expanded to include all oversight and enforcement of said Code of Conduct, as the said office presently does for elected officials of City Council;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg request the Province of Manitoba amend Provincial Legislation so as to require senior management of the City of Winnipeg to be subject to the Annual Statement of Assets.

Motion No. 11

**Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,**

WHEREAS since the inception of the modern-day City Hall, the image of the Head of State, the Regent, has been on display on the wall directly behind and above the Chair of the Speaker;

AND WHEREAS since that time, we have seen recognition of the importance of Manitoba's Father of Confederation, Louis Riel;

AND WHEREAS the Head of the Indigenous community, who assisted early settlers, was the Honourable Chief Peguis, prior to the foundation of the modern-day City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS there exists a photo of the new Regent, King Charles, and of Louis Riel, but no known photo or painting of Chief Peguis exists, however a known signature of Chief Peguis exists, which he signed in his spirit animal name/clan animal name.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council again install the painting/photo of the new Regent, in the Council Chamber, but that it be combined, with equal recognition, of the painting/photo of Louis Riel, and of the Spirit Animal/Clan Animal Signature of the Great Chief Peguis.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. I move that the following by-laws be read first time. By-law 89/2023, 90/2023.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 89/2023 and 90/2023.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 84/2023.

Madam Speaker: We won't read 84 because it corresponds with the short-term rentals and we deal with that next month, but it's 85/2023.

Mayor Gillingham: Oh yes. Okay, thank you. I withdraw my comment related to 84/2023. I move then that the following By-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 85/2023.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 85/2023.

Mayor Gillingham: I move that By-laws number...By-law No. 85/2023 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 85/2023.

Mayor Gillingham: I move the rule be suspended and By-law No. 85/2023 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. Now, onto the Standing Committee Policy on Water and Waste and the Environment. Do we want question period for the Mayor? Sure, yes. Question period for the Mayor first. Any questions? Seeing none. Next committee is the...Councillor Wyatt, you've got your hand up? Question for the Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: Your Worship, recently there's been events, unfortunately because of the recent issues with regards to what's happening in the Middle East, specifically Gaza and Israel. I know your office has been contacted by varying individuals concerned about anti-Semitic behaviour and things being posted on social media that's not even worthy of speaking to on the floor of this Council, but nevertheless, I'm raising it only to highlight the need for us to be vigilant and

steps to be taken, especially with our Winnipeg Police Service, which I believe called a news conference today, to speak to it and maybe you might be able to speak to that more. Thank you.

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, I want to thank...

Madam Speaker: Okay, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I want to thank the councillor from Transcona for the question and yes, it was...the police did have a news conference at 1:00 o'clock, of course, we were all here, so, haven't heard that. But it was related to the rallies that have taken place and the counter rallies of protests and counter protests and I agree with Councillor Wyatt, that I think all of us need to be vigilant, I...of course, did take the opportunity at the outset, and I appreciate Madam Speaker, you granted me a little extra time this morning in my opening comments and at that time, did highlight the reality that in our community there are...there have been expressions or acts that are either anti-Semitic and or anti-Islamic, and we just...we can't have that. We...none of us around this chamber stand for any of that, or tolerate any such expressions and so, I believe the councillor is right, that it's incumbent upon all of us to be leaders within our community at this very difficult and tense time. I know many of...many in this room have had discussions with, and some...in some cases, both the Jewish community and the Muslim community, Palestinian community specifically in this case as well. And so if we continue as a Council to foster peace and dialogue locally and try to do all we can to make sure that we don't see acts of Anti-Semitism, acts that are Islamophobic in nature. I think it's important that we continue to maintain that stance. Thank you.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, just as a quick follow up to my last question, and I thank the Mayor for his response. It's been pointed out, and I know the Mayor meets with...constantly meets with different groups and organizations across our city, from different walks of life and backgrounds. The Israeli-Canadian Council, I don't know if they formally reached out to the Mayor's office or not, but apparently their represents some 4000 Winnipeggers of Israeli descent, that would be happy to meet with you, if available, but I just want to make a note of that for your information so.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I appreciate the Councillor bringing that to my attention. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions. Next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste and the Environment. Councillor Mayes, the report dated September 8, knowing...noting there's an amending motion.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT
DATED SEPTEMBER 8, 2023**

Item 1 – Residential Food Waste (RFW) Pilot Results and Recommendations

Councillor Mayes: Great day. Two separate reports from Water and Waste. So first up, we're No. 1. This is the report dated September 8 and one item only. And it's...

Madam Speaker: There's an amending Motion 12.

Councillor Mayes: Do we have that?

Madam Speaker: You can move consent if you'd like and we'll stand down the item.

Councillor Mayes: Do we have 12?

Madam Speaker: It's amending Motion 12 that goes with Item 1.

Councillor Mayes: So Madam...Madam Speaker, you'd prefer if I move it and then, we'll have it stood down and debate? All right. Well, fair point. To kick things off then, knowing indeed there is an amending motion landing on our desks, I'll move Item No. 1 from the committee agenda dated September 8, 2023.

Madam Speaker: Just the first item. Yeah, you have moved consent for Item 1. We thank you. And that will be stood down. Amending Motion 12 is being circulated, which is moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Eadie. Councillor Mayes, your opportunity to introduce the item and then, we will hear from the mover of the amending motion.

Motion No. 12

**Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,**

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water, Waste and Environment dated September 8, 2023, be amended by adding the following new recommendations and renumbering the remaining accordingly:

- "8. That bi-weekly garbage collection be implemented, in coordination with this program, to offset any new carbon generated by new truck collection fleets, and that the option of larger garbage bins be offered, via same program funding, for residents at that time, at no new net cost to them.*
- 9. That the City of Winnipeg through its purchasing power, purchase residential tumbling composters and then sell said composters, at cost, to interested Winnipeg homeowners.*
- 10. That the City fully explore an in-house collection system as to diversify the existing private sector collection system, therefore protecting the City from private sector price setting, and to report back accordingly to the Standing Policy Committee."*

Councillor Mayes: Yes. I'm not overly familiar with the amending motion as it's just been handed to me, literally now. So I guess, that's democracy. So speaking to the...no, we're on house. Understandably, this one...at least three different names, residential food waste, organics and compost, all the same thing. This is the discussion of the report that came through Water and Waste Committee. It was delayed at EPC a month and now it's in front of us. Heavily amended at Water and Waste, heavily re-amended at EPC. A number of important themes here. First, the go ahead. Let's go ahead and have a program is the major message here. Also, the...you'll see at the top there, further large financial commitment for consulting services. And then I think, good amendment, thanks to the Mayor's office for working on this with me and others. An amendment not going through a formal RFP process, which would take months or years, but rather saying consult with stakeholders. We saw some earlier today, Compost Winnipeg. God knows virtually every vendor of every compost probated service industry emailing or calling me. So there's certainly private sector interest in doing something with...with our compost. So, moving forward...there are just...to get a report back here by June of next year. We don't have to decide everything today. But I think we do have to make a decision by the time we're ready to go for renewal of the garbage and recycle contracts. So, I think that would be a window we just can't let go by, because we have to decide things like who is going to pick up the organic waste, is it private, is it public? We have to decide. How often are they going to come? Will the garbage come every two weeks? Will it come every week? Councillor Browaty is right in saying, in 2011 we increased cost with the pledge to increase garbage to every week, instead of 50 times a year. On the other hand, we're more than a decade later, we'll have less garbage and some...some of it will be diverted, which is the point, some will be diverted into compost stream. So a number of decisions to be made, including what to do with it once you have it, that's certainly still to be determined, private, public. Short term solution might be an outdoor pad at Brady, but would the provincial regulator let us do that. Comma, would we even want to do that given the odour concerns, as certainly in Quebec, at the complex there, outside of Montreal. They said, well if you don't have any concerns about the odour, you can do an outdoor pad for your 200,000 homes, but, you know, better to stand by for concerns about the odour. So, I think Councillor Lukes and others would rightly have concerns about that. So, we may not be able to get to the curb by '26. I'm hoping we can do some version by 2026, but let's at least for today, move it forward knowing we still have certain decisions to make, including how do we pay for this? And how much will it be? All of that needs to be hammered out in a specific form that we can debate. You'll notice at EPC, we did not go with Councillor Eadie's amendment at the lower level, that talked about having a progressive fee based on household income. The briefing we got was no, that would not comply with the Charter. So, it would be progressive. My house would not have paid as much as a million-dollar house, but that's not an option we have under the Charter. So, hence, we don't need to debate that today, but we will have a debate about taxes, fees, that will come. So, final point for now is the what are you doing about methane, would be a fair question. This has reignited, a clumsy pun, this has reignited our discussions around what we are doing, flaring at the Brady Landfill right now. I know there's a more formal name, but the Brady Landfill right now. You'll remember Madam Speaker, we voted back in March of 2022, to authorize our staff to negotiate with IGRS, the company that does the flaring, to get back with something, to come up with a plan to start converting this into renewable natural gas, start putting back in the pipeline, very much environmentally friendly, renewing methane into natural gas, instead of using more dinosaur natural gas. So, where are those discussions? We are to get an update in a few days at Water and Waste Committee. We've got to get going on that. That will help us with our emissions from the landfill, as Councillor Gilroy has deftly pointed out the past.

the biggest, the second biggest emitter in the whole province is Brady Landfill. So, it's not the biggest if you take all the buildings and all the cars together, but as a single point, Brady is something we have to get after. So, for today, certain decisions to be made, certain decisions yet to be made, and we certainly need an update on that, it's an awkward acronym IGRS and RNG at the Brady Landfill site, because that's...if we are able to get going on that this term, I think we can talk to people in 2026 and say, we are doing something about greenhouse gas emissions at Brady, even if we're quite ready to be at your curve on the...on the composting. I look forward to hearing about this amendment and speaking to it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I just...oh yeah, the amendment.

Madam Speaker: Yes. Councillor Wyatt would be first with your amending motion, then Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Wyatt: Sure. I rise only because I guess, maybe, and the Chair can maybe clarify, the way the report reads is what we are giving approval to the program here today, and I'm not really sure, he mentioned a number of times reporting back. But in the Clause 4 refers to report back in June of 2024, but doesn't indicate the method of that reporting back. Is that to the Standing Committee? Is it to Council, and is it to EPC only? What authority, but the way I read it, if we are approving this program today, we are delegating authority, as a Council, to approve the program in full, including all of the other parts of the program and the moving parts of it, and that possibly the reporting back is...looks, as the way I read it and I could be wrong. That it's on the progress of the program development. It's more of an update versus an approval. And therefore, I just want to point that out, the way the report reads right now, is that we are approving this, as it is, not knowing all of the different details of how this is going to work yet. Whether it be a bi-weekly pickup or we're going to put garbage bi-weekly, or what have you. Or whether it's, as the councillor mentioned, whether be in-house collection or through the private sector. The way where it's right now is kind of...is a little bit out there, and that's a little bit concern that I have, and reservation on voting for it because I don't know when this report is going to come back, and in what form. And what we are actually doing, in the way I read it today, is we are actually approving everything and we're giving the delegated...we're basically now giving the authority to the Public Service to go ahead. Even so it goes on to say, you know, in terms of tapping that outside of the regular budget process under Clause 2, for the development of the cart program, which is really the biggest part of this is, as well as then, and then we have Clause 4, which would be that we're already giving delegation, in terms of working with the industry and in terms of the processing and the implementation delivery time. That's been put to the Public Service already, so that power has been given there. Clause 4, report back on the progress of the employer development, including the results of discussions...and funding approaches for collection, but it doesn't say for approval for council. So I have some concerns there, in terms of that. Are we delegating the authority in today? And by the time we approve this, if it comes back at, as the report prefers to, anywhere from 88 or \$96 a home. What if it comes back at 115 or whatever? We've already given approval. That's the way I read this report. I could be wrong, in terms of the recommendations. And if I am wrong, I'd like to...if that could be clarified, or if new wording would be provided for us to vote on to clarify that Clause 4, in terms of the report back and what we're reporting back on. But it looks like we are giving full authority to the program as it stands right now. In terms of my amendments, in terms of my amendments, I spoke about this on the floor of council before. I think the bi-weekly collection program for garbage is good. Though I think residents may need to have a larger bin and I think program should cover that for them. We shouldn't charge them for the higher bid. I could tell you that the composter program, and so that would be a cost. Item 9, the new Clause 9, it's not a net new cost. I'm suggesting the Public Service go out, buy tumbling composters, those are the ones that you roll as a composter and sell it at cost. So that (inaudible) but we can buy in bulk. And hopefully, then sell at a cost of a reasonable price to encourage homeowners to compost at home. And then finally, to explore, and I know this is always a bit of a debate and Councillor Mayes is very well aware of this debate knowing, having been in many debates around the Handi-Transit, or the terminology now, what's the name? Yes, thank you. You know, the in-house system of collection, I am a supporter of diversifying our garbage collecting to protect our interest. There's some really good books out there by the way, on garbage collection and the industry in this country, but they are up to (inaudible), especially the political one. But anyway, that's another story. This is something which I would welcome. However, if there is going to be a report back, I could move this separately as information to the standing committee that can be considered at that time and be forwarded on. That's the other thing I could do, but I just need to get clarification. I would then ask the mover or the seconder of my motion if we could amend it, and do it as an informational motion towards the standing committee. And I don't have an issue with that rather than...I don't like moving amendments on the fly like this because I know a lot are all closing on the standing committee, however, I am doing one on the CSO one coming up as well, so.

Madam Speaker: We've got other speakers in the queue. Councillor Gilroy, followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So as somebody who's been sitting on the Water and Waste Committee, I just want to talk a little bit about this to maybe try to highlight some of the confusion that might be here today. So, and I will not be supporting the motion that's in front of us here today, because I think there's a lot of work and many years it has taken for us to even get to where we are today. So, first and foremost, what the City is doing with the motion that's in

front of us here today, is getting a contractor to build a building. And that is the most...the most cost of this program. This is what's going to cost us the money. It's not really the collection as much. It won't be the bins. It's going to be the facility. And so, it actually isn't going to cost the City any money because we're giving delegated authority to the administration to go and find somebody who's willing to build this building and do it kind of like a recycling facility. So that's what we're doing, that's what we're authorizing here today with this motion. So we can get started, and in the meantime, we know that it's going to take time for this building to be built. In the meantime, we'll be able to have those constructive conversations with our contract providers. You know, we will be having that come back to City Hall to establish how we're going to do that. Whether that is, it might be very well that we look at every second...every second week, we collect the garbage, that might be one of the proposals. But we need to have that dialogue with the contractors when we go through the bidding on RFP process. So, I really think that there's been a lot of work to get us where we are here today. I really don't want to see this stalled any more. As I said, we are the last major city in Canada to even have this. What we really need to do is get on the building of this building. And as much as I would love the City to own this building, I just don't think it's feasible on what we're...what we're up against in terms of our budgets. So, I think this makes a lot of sense. You have a...it's been working really well with our recycling facility. And so having this type of programing will be very valuable to the City. And in the meantime, we will have to come back to Council in order to look at...review our contract to see what kinds of service, how we're going to roll up the carts and get new carts and the purchasing of all that, will have to be funded during that time. And that will be part of our new RFP process. So, I'm sure Councillor Mayes will correct me if I'm wrong on any of these things, but I just want to really...really say this is very critical because we are yet again, the last city in Canada, we need to move forward. And so, as much as it pains me to see that we're not going to have a facility built for your way. This is the process we need to take to get our foot at least out the door. So let's do that today and if you have...if you have interesting projects in terms of composting, send that to Water and Waste, we will be happy to hear that through the Chair. But I'm on the committee as well, so I'd be happy to hear that, but let's not slow down the process of getting a compost facility. We are really needed...needing that to move forward. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I have been a long-time opponent to curbside organic collection, and the reasons are pretty clear. You know, when you're asking residents, do you want to save the planet and do curbside organics, yes, yes, yes. Do you want to spend \$5 to do so? It's like, no. I pay enough taxes already is the answer we get back. We did our test run. People seem to like the program. We ask them. Do you like it? We love it. We think it's great. How much are you willing to pay? Well, we can go as high as \$35. If you look at the report before us today, in 2030 they are suggesting it's going to cost \$96. So the notion that Winnipeggers are gung ho and excited about this, to do it for \$96 a year, is wrong. But regardless, whether you believe we are in existence...existential crisis because of a climate emergency or not. I think we can all agree that clean air, clean water, are existential for life. I do believe that. I believe we need to use technology that can deal with some of these big climate change. You know, how many degrees whatever. I don't think I get enough science to deal with that, but I do believe that clean air and clean water are the most important elements of human life. I will not be supporting Councillor Wyatt's motion today. I like the intention of clause, the new Clause 8. Looking at bi-weekly, I think that's when we should...we should look at doing. As Councillor Mayes had commented, you know, when we went to 2011 from...when we introduced the rolling carts in the first place, we originally had as of...a five-day rolling cycles. We did not do holidays. Right now, 52 weeks of the year, we do a collection. So we picked up extra two, two and a half cycles per year. So it wasn't additional cost because we were doing more frequent collection. And now people have gotten used to carts and they figured out how to work within the limits of 240 litres for garbage and 240 litres for recycling weekly. They've adapted. Same thing is going to happen when we introduce rolling carts for compost. So again, the reason I'm supporting this today again, is one of the amendments we made at EPC was that we are going to give the Public Service a chance to come back and look at alternatives. If you look at the report, one of the things that I found surprising was the costs of actually processing materials was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$35 million a year. Whereas the cost of the collection component of the contract was 18.4. So if we do something like bi-weekly garbage collection, whether it's year around or part of the year, there could be significant savings. I want to find a way to Winnipeg solution that's good for the environment and also responsible for taxpayers. I don't fault our Public Service. We have these overarching, you know, policy...policies here at the City that are very grand and very, you know, aspirational. But sometimes, when the river hits the road, and you know, we're talking about taxpayers and real costs, we have to find something that's more reasonable. You know, we've got our climate goals and reductions of this by that for this year. And they feel the best way to do that is to go for the absolute gold standard. That's very expensive. We have an opportunity here to come up with systems that make sense, as well as do the right thing when it comes to the air, the earth, the water we have in our country, in our city. So again, for today, I'm supporting this. We'll have to see what the eventual program is...oh, to Councillor Wyatt's other bullets there. I hear from a lot of residents saying that they already compost. And some of them do, but probably not as well as they would if they had the bins at their homes. Sorry, the bins where we come and collect them. My issue is, if we start assigning them bins, they're going to say, I already compost, I don't want to participate in this program, I want to opt out. Unfortunately, we can't with the economy this scale. The system doesn't work if people are opting out. That's not an option that was considered in any of the models we've had thus far. By providing them with the back yard one, it raises that expectation, especially if we're charging them money for it, even

if it's a break-even exercise. In terms of the in-house collection system...again, when it comes to the cost of that merchant facility, there's a very good opportunity for them to oversize capacity, to allow whether it's...other communities in the capitol region, whether it's businesses, commercial clients. By having a merchant facility they can, you know, take our load, as well as build and provide additional capacity for our region. We all benefit from that type of thing by partnering with the private sector on that merchant facility in particular. So again, I'll be supporting this today. I do want to see what the Public Service comes back with. I hope it's a good way to Winnipeg solution. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll say it at the end, but I seconded Councillor Wyatt's motion because there is some alternative stuff in there that I think should be in there. So, I will be, of course, voting to amend. But Madam Speaker, I want to first speak about...so I read the Charter in terms of charging fees for things like solid waste. And yeah, at first, we'll actually read it and yeah, it looks like you can only charge a fixed fee. But Madam Speaker, in our property taxes, we identified...and in this province and we talk about the assessed values of homes, that you can only buy the value of a home that you can afford based on your cash flow, Madam Speaker. One of the reasons I voted against the 2011 garbage plan was the fixed fee. What we were doing was, we were charging the fixed fee for collecting some of the solid waste that we paid for, based on the value of our house, so a million-dollar house, they paid more than a \$200,000 house, Madam Speaker. Then what we did is we stuffed those people with a fixed flat fee. Now, the user is identified in the property taxes under the program of solid waste, Madam Speaker. And now we have two separate ones. We've got the...what we call the garbage collection and then we have the redirection of recycling flat fee. Now, that all used to be the defined under our property taxes. The identified users owned houses of 200,000 and they only paid that much for garbage. Now, I'll just leave it at that. And maybe Councillor Eadie actually has to take the City to court on charging a fixed fee for that recycling diversion, Madam Speaker. Maybe that's what I have to do, Madam Speaker. But I don't think I should have to. To tell you the truth, and it could be a slight...if you believe it needs to be amended, a fixed fee in the Charter, let's immediately go and talk to the Province, who's trying to alleviate monetary issues for people, you know, who are struggling financially, not just people living in poverty. But also, you know, there's a lot of people struggling financially to pay their mortgages and so on. But I think people who own a million-dollar house, they have more wherewithal to pay more, Madam Speaker. Now, the amendments are changed. I just want to speak, you know, we did hear about the risk of a private, I'll call it a privately owned and operated facility composting plant. But we also heard there's a risk with that places in here in the city. My number one thing was I wanted to see something done at the Brady, what do we call it resource or whatever? Anyway...thank you. Anyway, so I just don't know, like it's already zoned 4. Solid waste operations. Yeah, there's no water...no underground utilities out there, but who's to say the private company isn't going to go outside of Winnipeg somewhere and maybe they're going to have to pay to get some piping in. I don't know. So, but we do know we're going to have it privately operated, but we're going to benefit from the net income, I believe, from the methane gas collection and feeding is biogas, I guess you call it, feed into our Manitoba and Winnipeg's natural gas system. So I'm okay with that. But so what I'm saying is, if you want to get something done by 26, it takes a long time to build one of these composting plants, and as I understand it, biofuels are usually produced out of the composting or whatever kind of operation you want to call it. It's not your pure composting concrete pad. But so, in here they're going to do a market study and they're going to find and look and we're going to find out that whole process, if it's done diligently and properly, I don't see how it's ready to go by 2026. What should have been in this amendment is, when you talk about trying to get something done started in 26, we should've just identified that at Brady Resource landfill in the meantime, we will establish a concrete pad out there, in garbage land. Who's going to be opposed to it? Because we heard that a private company was going to deliver services for another municipality and they got shut down. They weren't able to build it. So all these trucks and everything were purchased and low and behold, they've got no where to process...no processing plant. That's a big risk, right? So, it would have been better I think, just to identify that they're going to build it at the Brady Resource area which, you know, is going to be in operation for a very long time. And could probably use some kind of underground services out there, at some point. Who knows what the future holds for solid waste and so on, Madam Speaker. So I'm going to...I am concerned about moving this along. I know the funding decisions are being left till after these recommendations are done, and when they figure out how often to collect or whatever, but I mean obviously, bi-weekly is probably going to be...it's the way they do it in other places. So Madam Speaker, that is a way of saving taxpayers and fee payer and/or fee payers money. So it doesn't cost as much because make no mistake, whether it's a privately owned and operated facility, or if it's a City one, it actually, right? It...we will be paying for the capital costs, so when they give me this...when I hear people talk about how, you know, the private sector, da, da, da, da, da. Well, it's not cheaper. It's not cheaper, Madam Speaker. Unless you're saying that people who bid on projects for the City raise them just because they are charging the government. If that's what you're saying, is that a proper business practice? I don't think so. Anyway, neither here nor there. I'm still going to vote. I want this to move forward like my...a number of my council colleagues. But I also wanted to mention we are going to make mandatory curbside collection for residential composting material, and we are not going to do...make it mandatory for the industrial commercial institutional waste that is compostable. And it has actually the majority of compostable material coming out of the City of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, time is up. I'll go to the next speaker, which is...any further speakers? Mayor Gillingham moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: Actually, I want to thank the Mayor, Madam Speaker, for moving that because I'm going to say something that, you know, I think all mayoralty candidates didn't consider when they were campaigning for mayor. We have a problem now, like you're talking about 35 million, you're talking about a 6 to 7% property tax increase. For \$96 on everybody's bill, on 233,000 households. You know, that's pretty big. So, when I was listening to the campaigns and I hear people saying, well, we're only going to raise property taxes this much and that's it. We're not going to adjust anything. But on the other hand, we say we're going to do composting. Well, where's the money coming from, Madam Speaker? So, really, the only position that's left, if we have to start funding this in 26, let's say, right? It's going to be fixed fees. That's the only option. So, to say they're going to consider different ways of paying it, Madam Speaker, not going to happen unless somebody and people push because, again, to do this compost, to pay for, well, I guess we could pay whatever. Anyway, if you want to put it on the property taxes, which is the fairest thing we have with the city, then the problem, Madam Speaker, is nobody has already said they are willing to do it. And they probably won't be willing to do it and say it in a campaign in 2026. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next Speaker. No further speakers on this item? Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to well, I guess Councillor Wyatt, and through you to, the Chair Councillor Mayes, I will be supporting...the Councillor Mayes is trying to get out the door, let's say. I've talked about greenwashing earlier on this council floor. Greenwashing is the term that means an organization does nominal things or little things to appear to be acting on say, climate change and the environment. I believe this is not that. I think, Madam Speaker, through you to my colleagues, this is...this is perhaps the single...perhaps the single only major climate initiative that this council may embark on this term. That's why I will be supporting Councillor Mayes'...yes, well, I...so private vehicle transportation, 50% of greenhouse gas emissions, buildings are about 35, organic recycling is about 15, 5% is other. So, we're tackling 15% greenhouse gas emissions with this initiative. I believe that once the operational issues are sorted out, there will be no net new kilometers for trucks because families organize and they have a lot less waste once they start organic...recycling organic materials. I know I started...I started doing organic recycling for the composting, for what you can compost without getting into issues. I mean, you're limited to basically things that are...things that are green and things that are brown, that are plants. So, you can't recycle oils, you can't recycle anything that is not that. So, there is quite a bit of organic material being left on the table, even if you do compost at home, unless you are specialized...unless you're specialized at it and you're using other means, then simply having an outdoor composter. So, so I'll be supporting Councillor Mayes' direction because it is substantive, it is not greenwashing and I do want to lament that, you know, on the other hand, we are in our Strategic Action Plan, putting a major amount of resources into what is going to be increasing that envelope of 50% greenhouse gas emissions for vehicles with the Route 90 expansion and the Chief Peguis expansion. So, on the one hand, that's bad for greenhouse gases. And it will increase taxes. On the other hand, this is good to reduce greenhouse gases and yes, there are tax implications. So, I don't want to get in the way of something that...I think Councillor Gilroy said, we've been dealing with this for years. If I had my way...if I had my druthers, I would like to see the Toronto model, which I had previously pitched when...I think it was Councillor Wyatt when...two terms ago, was I think it's fair to say, opposing the program, as it was being portrayed or presented. What I would have liked to see, ideally, was a user pay system for garbage, like in Toronto, where you pay the size of bin for garbage and recycling and organic recycling is free. That's not happening. Despite that, I am supporting this. I'm supporting this because it is substantial and concrete action by the City of Winnipeg, to deal with that 15% of greenhouse gases that are caused by, and I stand corrected by the person who identified as physicist earlier today, I don't mean to be good to methane. I thought methane was 10 times worse than carbon dioxide. I stand corrected, by somebody who says he is a physicist. In fact, it's actually 25 times worse than carbon dioxide, so, there we go, a factor of 25-1. And that's what happens when we bury organic materials and it's digested without oxygen. That's digested anaerobically, creates methane, which I now know, is 25 times worse than CO₂, which is what you get when you organically recycle. So thank you, Councillor Mayes for your leadership on this. I do wish, in a general way, that we would take more substantial act...more substantive action on other issues and not actually make things worse, and the other precedence organization, but on this one, I think it is time to move forward and get it done, even if it is not the way we all would like to see it. I think we should do it. I'm pleased to hear Councillor Browaty is over the idea of stink juice, which he would've mentioned in past councils. And I guess, also like to say, if done well, organic recycling does not produce noxious odours, bad odours. So, I think it's direction thanks to my colleagues, Councillor Mayes, Executive Policy Committee colleagues, the Mayor, moving this along. It's a...this part of what we are doing is certainly in the right direction and I will be supporting it, despite it not being the perfect thing that I had hoped years back, but I think it's time to go and I think Councillor Rollins is right, that we should call the question. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I rise, Madam Speaker, to say that Motion No. 12, which has been distributed, has been withdrawn. I saw the body language from the Chair and Mayor. Recognizing that, it's being withdrawn. (Inaudible).

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: I would...I will be buying two boxes of Tim Horton's doughnuts for the Clerks, knowing that I've been doing all day. Anyway, the...and a new motion was being tabled, that basically says this would be referred to the other committee for information.

Madam Speaker: So Councillor...

Councillor Wyatt: But I do hope on the point that the report back means coming back to Council. I'm assuming that's what...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt rescinds Motion 12, with the concurrence of his seconder, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Wyatt: Assuming Councillor Eadie concurs.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Mayes to close on this item.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, so much for my grandiose comments about the amendment, other than to say, on the final point, we actually have requested a report from staff about jurisdictions that have had a mixed private public waste collection system, knowing this debate would be coming, I asked for that in the last council. We haven't got it yet. But knowing we will have presentations from CUPE saying, you should at least bring some of it in-house. Go through this two or three times and get little better at it maybe. So we've got a report coming about Calgary and Ottawa, at a minimum, for costs. So, I think we're...I think we're capturing, to some extent at least, on garbage, the final point in the amendment. What a great debate we can look forward to. A number of good points made. Thanks to Councillor Allard, for the kind words. I am perhaps seven to eight years late getting around to this position. But I'm...and to the credit of this mayor, we are going forward. I think...I think EPC of some years ago hesitated. But I think we can go forward now with this structure and then we will have a dramatic vote on this, hopefully next year, about all sorts of issues. Nobody talked about what's in the bin. If you are in Salt Lake City, the meat and dairy isn't in the bin, so does that get the odours at all. It probably does, but it means you're not diverting as much. So are you really making the point. Councillor Wyatt makes a good point about the diesel trucks going around. We should debate that as part of our bigger debate. The idea is not that this is just blessing it and it's an update to committee. The idea is...it's a full report back. We have to decide a lot of things. I kind of...I've been following Councillor Gilroy's philosophy on this, expressed some earlier meetings, which is, I'd really like to put it on the property tax, but I'm not going to ditch this whole thing over that. It's an important environmental initiative. I think everyone is trying to do some compromising here, Councillor Browaty included, so we can hopefully get this across the finish line. It is arguably...I agree with Councillor Allard, the most important thing we can do in this term of council. There are costs. How much are they? We don't know yet. It will depend on the collection site frequency, that sort of thing. But I do think we have pretty good sense of what's going in the bin, from what's in this report. Now, we need our staff to go out and talk to people in the industry and get back here by 24 and we can have a vote. And that will instruct how we go forward with our garbage, recycle and compost pickup. And if it doesn't pass, it doesn't pass. But hopefully, some version it will pass, but as you heard from Councillor Eadie, councillor it's still a lot of decisions to be made. The idea is not to pretend this is merely procedural and then claim later all the decisions have been made. Not at all. Fair question from Councillor Wyatt. No, this is going to come back. Hopefully, it comes back roughly June of 24 and we have a tumultuous debate on a number of things, like the cost and we then decide to go forward, is my hope. But for today, yeah, this is...this is a pretty big step forward. But we'll have one more big step to make after this, to actually implement the program. Hope everyone can support. It is a compromise of sorts. And one more...one step down. One small step achieved and one more big one to come next year, hopefully.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. With that, I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Call for recorded vote. All in favour of Item 1, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Item 1 passes. Next report, Councillor Mayes.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT
DATED OCTOBER 12, 2023

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is actually October 12, 2023 agenda. I'll move...I'd like to see No. 1 pulled, but I'll move Nos. 1 and 2. And I think there's an amending motion as to No. 1 anyway. So I think I'll move one and two.

Madam Speaker: That's right. So we'll stand down one. Call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 1.

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

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes to introduce the item and then we'll hear from the mover of the motion, Councillor Wyatt, and the motion is seconded by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Mayes: Mayor has actually offered to give my speech on my behalf, he's heard it so many times. Now, I mean yes, many of you have heard it, but it's worth highlighting it yet again. CSO, not the same as North End Treatment Plant debate, and we have these various items moving around, compost, CSO, North End. Former Mayor Bowman once said to me, "Go do your thing on CSO, but the main priority here is North End. Do not get some money, a small amount for CSO and jeopardize the bigger North End." He was right. I've talked to people from all sorts of different parties. People around here said, he was right on it. So this is...CSO is important, but I think getting money on that North End project remains our big ask of the other two levels of government. So CSO, what do we have here? We have the annual report, work is continuing. In some ways, it's good news. We are...we're working. We are increasing the budget by 50%, due to some work done when Mayor Gillingham was still Councillor Gillingham and the Chair of Finance. So we are going to \$45 million a year from 30, that would be focused on the Armstrong CSO in both Councillor Eadie and Councillor Sharma's area. Councillor Eadie has corrected me on this enough times that I've been listening. So it's not just in Councillor Eadie's ward, the Armstrong district is in both wards. So what am I...why was I upset with this report when it came out? A couple of things. The admin report isn't bad, but the admin report is attached to a report that went to the Province. The report to the Province says there was no changes to the CSO plan in 2022. Aside from the grammatical tragedy, the bigger problem here is the...there was a big change. There was a big change voted on unanimously by this council, after some thundering speeches around this room. And that big change was don't shoot for 2095, shoot for 2045. At committee, the director said, so is your shoot at...we're going to shoot for 2045 instead of 2047, because we had said 2047 and I laid in with some profanity that I had to withdraw, saying no. The issue is not the two year, the issue is the half century. I don't really care if you get it done by 2047 and 2045. I care a lot if you're going to keep targeting 2095. So, problem number one: the report of the Province feigned or was ignorant if Council had said, let's go. Let's get this done by 2045. Where's that date coming from? The then Minister of the Environment, Rochelle Squires, said get it done by 2045. The NDP in opposition criticized that as being too generous. So, Minister Schmidt may yet let us know that we have to pick up the pace. We'll see. The other problems I had where the...the report goes on to say, well, the Clean Environment Commission, under Terry Duguid in 2003, said that there should be a three-way split, feds, city, province, and the feds and the Province aren't contributing, therefore, we fall to 2095. There's two problems with that. Number one, we've never asked the feds or the Province for any money, so we can hardly fall back and claim a half century more is needed because it's their fault. We haven't been asking them. And maybe we don't want to ask them because we don't want to jeopardize North End. But we can't fall back and say it's all somebody else's fault that we're looking at this monument implementation time frame. The other problem...the other problem with quoting that report is, as I said to Tim Shanks, look at the next paragraph in the 2003 that report. It says the City should be done in 20 to 25 years. In other words, now or in five years. So, if you're going to quote one part, you've got to quote the other. So, our response should not be, can you just give us another 70 years, it should be okay, let's try to get this going by the reasonable date of 2045. The other two problems with the report. Said it many times here before, it uses a different contingency than what we use on everything else. The water meters, the transit garage. We put things in the budget saying, this may go up, it's a class five. Here we take the report, double it, 100% contingency, and then say well, it's too onerous. So, let's call it a \$1.15 billion program instead of a \$2.3 billion because we don't walk around here doubling the cost of everything else at the front end. So, for today, I would urge you to support the EPC changes, oh sorry, the EPC endorsed what was said at Water Committee. The final point is the...the report also says well, it was determined back in 2015, in an interim report, that if the City is to go alone, it's too onerous. And you have to dig this up, and then it uses a methodology average water bill per household, we haven't used that on anything else. We didn't use it last month when we were debating a \$400 million increase around North End. We don't debate...it's not in the report on water meters that's now public. So, let's try to be consistent here. Let's have an honest debate, in December part of the budget, water meter report. Should we go it alone on this? I have my views, I want to see the cost estimates based on a 1.15 billion, and then let's have the debate, but to sit back and say it's too onerous. It's all the Province and feds' fault. We'll need till, you know, this will take longer to build than Chartres Cathedral in the 1300, like

it's just not acceptable. I feel...I thought we knocked this off last year. Here we are again. So again, it's an important item. I have a bit more to say upon closing. I see there's some amendments, so I'll speak to that then. But let's have an honest debate. Let's try to get this done. We talk about our children here sometimes. We can't leave this to 2095. I mean, that's just...we can't. That's just not acceptable for our children or children's children. So, let's see what it would cost to get this done by the deadline, and the deadline may get tight, so I think we need to...I think we need to have an honest debate about what it would cost to go it alone. And if we aren't going to go it alone, then we have to ask the other levels of government. It's as simple as that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, we'll call the question or no? The amending motion, that's right. Councillor Wyatt, over to you for the amending motion.

Motion No. 13
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water, Waste and Environment dated October 12, 2023, be amended as follows:

1. *Delete Recommendation 1 and replace with the following new recommendation:*

"1. That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to prepare costing for the completion of the \$1.15 billion Combined Sewer Overflow project, based on a 2035, 2040, and 2045 completion date, and report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Water, Waste and Environment at its November 24, 2023 meeting with said projections unless more time deemed necessary for said accelerated dates."

2. *Add the following new Recommendation 2 and renumber the remaining accordingly:*

"2. That the Public Service explore potential funding options to scale up said CSO works, with both internal funding options as well as funding opportunities that may exist at both the Provincial and Federal levels of government and report back to Council, via the Standing Committee."

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank...I was listening intently to Councillor Mayes' comments. You know, I'm not a...I'm not a lawyer. I'm not an engineer. I'm an armchair lawyer, I'm an armchair engineer. I...and but, you know, what I never really understood is how the Province gets, with their environmental licensing, it gets so worked up about our treatment plant and the level of nitrates and phosphorus that we are emitting from the treatment plant, and that we are subject to the environmental licensing on that. However, we have all these combined sewers throughout the city that emit raw waste directly into the river, and there doesn't seem to be the same level of scrutiny or licensing or deadlines put on us, but no, let the raw waste flow right into the river. Now, I'm not an engineer, and as I said I'm not a lawyer, but to me, I would think that the higher level of priority from the environment's point of view would be to cease and end the emission of raw waste flowing directly into our rivers. Now, as we know, under jurisdiction, ironically the rivers are not our jurisdiction. And they're actually not provincial jurisdiction. They are federal. Therefore, I don't think we should hesitate to ask Ottawa for support and help, especially knowing what other jurisdictions have done, whether it be Halifax or Victoria, who have asked and received monies from other levels of the government, who previously were emitting raw sewage right into their oceans. So, the fact that we continually redo this is frustrating. I'm moving this motion to challenge us. I realize what Councillor Mayes has done and what he's done by moving the goal post up by 40 years, is huge, tremendous, it's huge. But I'm saying, let's even be more ambitious, and let's even be a little bit more ambitious or vision or take out a...take a thought out of this page book, and that is we've got all these failed streets throughout our city, and a lot of them, believe it or not, are in the older neighborhoods. And they are either failed or poor, and on top of that, we have a combined sewer system and believe it or not, where are they located? Under the very streets that are failed or poor. Now, wouldn't it be amazing if we could figure out a way, over the next 10 years, to fund all of those streets and repair them, and to roll out the program that Councillor Lukes has talked about, which is to build through designs, safety streets, not through speed limits, but through design to slow traffic down. And we could do that over the next 10 years, and combine that with a program to do the CSO at the same time. Maybe even engage in the private sector. I know Councillor Eadie is not going to be happy that I'm going to say this right now, but I am going to say it. And that is maybe public private partnerships because of the scale and the size of what I'm proposing for here. It would be large. But it would be something that would be quite unique, because why would we go in and fix somebody's street, if only a few years later, we're going to come to rip the street up, to fix a combined sewer. You know, what drives residents more crazy than that? I can tell you right now, Madam Speaker, this would...that would be exciting. Now, it was the Mayor of Edmonton, I forget it starts with S, I forget his name. The...he said, "Nobody gets excited about sewers." Nope, that was Calgary. No, he is the new mayor, old mayor, so former mayor. He spoke always about sewer, sewer and water. And he said nobody gets excited about it. Anybody politicians, they want to, know you, who wants to cut...who wants to...who wants to do ribbon-cutting at the

sewer, right? And nobody wants to, but he would get all worked up on, matter of fact, he was the one who got Trudeau to agree to fund sewers. Years, when Trudeau first got elected, so I've no...I'll let Councillor Browaty talk more about that. But anyway, so but you know, the reality is this, is something that has to be looked after. Ironically our gumbo has held us together for many years with these sewers, right. Manitoba gumbo, if it wasn't for that. But our combined sewers are failing, and we've got to get rid of them, Madam Speaker. And all joking aside, the fact that we still emit raw sewage when we have high water runoff, from high precipitation events, whether it be from the snow melt in the spring, or from major rain events, raw sewage is pouring into the Red River and Assiniboine. And that really should end. And if anything should be a high priority of the Province, in terms of environmental regulation, you think would...that would be it, but it's not. So we're out running crazy to get that North End Plant and I know we have a capacity issue there. We have to address it and Councillor Mayes has spoken quite eloquently about that in the past. But if there is a way for us to do this, combined with our existing residential street system, collector and otherwise. And much of it's under the regional system too, to upgrade and to bring those up just to basically the level that we would consider good or excellent. (Inaudible) eliminate over the next decade our fair and poor streets. That is something and do it in tandem with this. You know, you talk to Winnipeggers and they bring friends from out of town. What is the one thing they always say to me afterwards, you know. Geez. They always comment about the state of the streets. State of the infrastructure. They've never seen anything like it, compared to where they come from. Of course, the Americans come up here of course, the first thing they see, but even other Canadians from other Canadian cities. And it's something that would do so much towards and, you know, we know Winnipeggers look after their properties, you know, and they...the vast majority do and their yards. And we should really be doing the same, I guess. And that's in terms of spirit, in terms of perception, I would do...it would do...it would move the same (inaudible) and combine it with this program. So I'm supportive of the report. You know, I'm moving this to push the committee a little further, in terms of looking at funding options and as well as push...push the Public Service in terms of, you know, Councillor Mayes has got them moving in the right direction. Let's keep them. Let's see what we can do to move up this work and indeed if there is other money from other levels of government, and thus the amending motion. I want to thank Councillor Eadie for seconding that motion. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I seconded the motion so we could have a dialogue of one of my most favorite topics. Anyway, Madam Speaker, I didn't quite read it all. But anyway, Madam Speaker, we do know that Water and Waste has constant dialogue with Public Works, on what their capital programs are and what effect it may or may not have on street renewal versus combined sewer alleviation, I'll call it, separating the sewers, which really wrecks the street, absolutely, as Councillor Wyatt is alluding to. But there is coordination, Madam Speaker, in terms of road renewal programs and how soon they are coming off. And actually, I can give you one example where the sewer was separated in the Jefferson East along Hartford, from Main to Powers, I think it was. And just happens to be that Hartford's up for renewal...street renewal, it was the same year. So what we did was we postponed the actual street renewal until they were finished the sewer separation along Hartford. So that's all coordinated. I don't...this whole concept of P3 and all our roads or all our sewers or whatever like that, Madam Speaker. I mean, to me, well, why don't you just turn the city into a private corporation and we won't have to pay to have councillors govern the government entity called the City of Winnipeg or Council of Winnipeg as well? So, Madam Speaker, like the private sector, Madam Speaker, is already doing the work. They're already doing the work. It's not going to save any money, Madam Speaker, to P3 all our streets or all our...all our pipes, Madam Speaker. It'll be just as expensive, only...and to say that the private sector is going to organize it, I would also point out that, you know, I hear from my colleagues, Madam Speaker, about how we, the City, allow the private enterprises to dictate how contracting goes and those kind of things, Madam Speaker. So, anyway, I actually won't be voting for the amendment, and I think that Councillor Mayes is actually, it's his bailiwick on this one like...like we heard from that gentleman Alexander, Alex, about his daughter's picture. We know what motivates Councillor Mayes. And he will continue to push for city-wide sewer separation or I should say, overflow alleviation. We don't want that kind of stuff in our rivers. We don't and so, I think that's important. So anyway...that's all I have to say.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none. Councillor Wyatt, do you wish to close on your amending motion?

Councillor Wyatt: No.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Mayes to close on the main item.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Would...and on the amendment I guess. With some reluctance especially, well, Councillor Eadie says he's not supporting and he's the seconder, I'm a little less reluctant. I get the point of the amendment, but I don't...I'm not quite there. My fear is, if you ask for more data preparation, everything will get delayed and we need the information in time for the rate report. So I want that 2045 date, I don't want it delayed further, so. And number two, we do have to...we have to...I think that's part of this debate. I get the point in number two thing, start exploring other options, but I think we, the Council, have to at some point say what our priorities are. Sometimes feel like I'm the lead apologist for

the former mayor here. But I mean, I think former Mayor Borman was actually right and said, look, we got to do the North End, is a higher priority than the CSO. I think that's right. So I...it's awkward and that, you know, the Province may want to fund compost bins before any of this. I don't know but I...I don't really think it's my call. I think it should be the Mayor's call to go to the other levels of government with priorities, as expressed by Council and to try to sort out what the higher priorities are. So, with some reluctance, I don't...I won't support the amendments, though I like the spirit of it. And I think number two is kind of built into the discussions we'll have and we can have again when that comes back to Council. The...I think just by way of closing. You know, somebody got up at one of our meetings and said something about CSO and then said, "It really doesn't matter. We'll all be dead by the time this is finished." And I said, "Speak for yourself. I intend to be there in 2045 when this thing is finished." Knock on wood, you know, and I mean that. So, I think it's doable. It is the deadline. I know Cynthia Wiebe's devoted a good chunk of her career to this, would say, you may not want us to be done by 2035, given the road dislocation that will come with that. Fair enough. But we do have a...we do have a deadline for 2045 that the Province has set, and I think we should make every effort and act in good faith to...let's at least have a debate about what it would cost to get there on our own. It may require us to go it alone. But if the deal is we'll get the North End funded, well, maybe that's two pretty good environmental initiatives we can look back on and be proud of. So, I do hope to be there in 2045 when this is done. So I'll conclude with that.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. With that, I'll call the question on amending Motion 13. All in favour? Contrary? Motion 13 is lost. And the main item, Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: We have other motions. Motion 15, moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Eadie. It's regarding bi-weekly garbage collection with food waste pickup system. It is an automatic referral to the standing committee. No. Councillor Wyatt and Eadie. Next, Motion 14, moved by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Allard. This thing...this is about commercial industrial food waste collection program. This is an automatic referral to the standing committee. We have no by-laws under this committee. Now go into question period. Any questions for our chair? Any questions for Councillor Mayes? Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Councillor Rollins, the report dated October 6.

Motion No. 15

**Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
 Seconded by Councillor Eadie,**

BE IT RESOLVED that in support of and in tandem with the planned food waste residential curb pickup system, the following be implemented:

1. *That bi-weekly garbage collection be implemented, in coordination with this program, to offset any new carbon generated by new truck collection fleets, and that the option of larger garbage bins be offered, via same program funding, for residents at that time, at no new net cost to them.*
2. *That the City of Winnipeg through its purchasing power, purchase residential tumbling composters and then sell said composters, at cost, to interested Winnipeg homeowners.*
3. *That the City fully explore an in-house collection system as to diversify the existing private sector collection system, therefore protecting the City from private sector price setting, and to report back accordingly to the Standing Policy Committee.*

Motion No. 14

**Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
 Seconded by Councillor Allard,**

BE IT RESOLVED

1. *That Council request the Public Service to begin the process to expand the Food Waste Collection program to include commercial and industrial businesses, and report back on said process terms of reference within 90 days to the Standing Policy Committee on Water, Waste and Environment.*

2. *That the Public Service begin the process to expand recycling to include a recycling collection program for all Winnipeg business, both retail and industrial for all other waste materials, and to report back with a terms of reference for said program within 90 days to the Standing Policy Committee on Water, Waste and Environment."*

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED OCTOBER 6, 2023**

councillor Rollins: Yes, Madam Chair. I wish to introduce all the reports and move adoption of the consent agenda. I believe there is one item that has been stood down, but 1 to 10. So moved.

Madam Speaker: We'll be pulling four. It has an amending motion. Then all others are consent. Okay. All in favour of Item 1, 2 and 3, 5 through 10. Contrary? Carried.

**Item 4 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 1161 Grosvenor Avenue
File DASZ 20/2023**

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Lukes,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 4 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated October 6, 2023, be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendations 1 and 2 and replace with the following:*
 1. *That the subdivision proposed under Development Application No. DASZ 20/2023 be approved for preparation as a plan of subdivision (the "Plan") by a Manitoba Land Surveyor in accordance with the proposed by-law attached as Appendix "B" to this report and as shown on the map dated September 7, 2023 and attached as Schedule "B" to this report, with such changes as may be required, and registration in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office.*
 2. *That the Developer shall meet all terms and conditions as outlined in Schedule "C", the report of the Administrative Coordinating Group, dated September 11, 2023, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Property and Development.*
 3. *That The Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 200/2006 be amended by rezoning Proposed Lot 1 to an "RMF-S" Residential Multi-Family Small District in accordance with the proposed by-law attached as Appendix "A" to this report and as shown on the map dated September 7, 2023 and attached as Schedule "B" to this report.*
 4. *That, in lieu of the dedication of land, the Developer shall provide a cash payment in an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the appraised value of the Development Application No. DASZ 20/2023, as determined by the City's Director of Planning, Property and Development.*
 5. *That, upon instruction from the Director of Planning, Property and Development, the Director of Legal Services/City Solicitor prepare a By-law in accordance with this report (the "By-law") and bring same directly to Council by way of communication for first reading.*
 6. *That upon instruction from the Director of Planning, Property and Development that the Developer has submitted the Plan in accordance with Recommendation 1 and has paid the Dedication and all other associated ancillary fees (the "Fees"), and subject to s. 236.1 of The City of Winnipeg Charter, the Director of Legal Services/City Solicitor be directed to return the By-law directly to Council by way of communication for second and third reading.*

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
October 26, 2023

-
7. *That Development Application No. DASZ 20/2023 will be deemed to be concluded and all approvals in connection with same will expire if the developer has not submitted the Plan and paid all associated ancillary fees (the "Fees") within 2 years following the date on which Council gives first reading to the By-law unless the Developer applies for an extension of time before the expiration of the 2-year period and Council approves the extension.*
 8. *That the subdivision section of the by-law shall come into force when the Plan is registered in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office.*
 9. *That the zoning section of the By-law will come into force when the Plan is registered in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office.*
 10. *That the By-law will be repealed without coming into force 1 year after the date it is enacted if the Plan is not registered in accordance with recommendation 8 unless the Developer applies for an extension of time before the expiration of the 1 year period and Council approves the extension.*
 11. *That Development Application No. DASZ 20/2023 will be deemed to be concluded and all approvals in connection with same will expire if the developer fails to secure all necessary Plan approval signatures on behalf of the City within 1 year after the date on which the By-law is enacted unless the Developer applies for an extension of time before the expiration of the 1 year period and Council approves the extension.*
 12. *That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.*
 13. *That the variance order shall come into force and effect upon the coming into force and effect of the zoning by-law for the subject land under File DASZ 20/2023.*
- *Renumber the remaining recommendation accordingly.*

Madam Speaker: Item 4 and I'm going to hand this over to our Deputy Speaker Councillor Eadie. Take over. Item 4 and there's an amending motion that goes with that.

Deputy Speaker: All right. Report No. 4. Sorry, do you want to introduce the report, Councillor Rollins?

Councillor Rollins: Sure, Councillor Eadie, sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You know, there was a unanimous vote out of the Standing Committee of Property and Development against this, but I know that there's an amending motion for this property. So I'll let the speakers introduce it.

Deputy Speaker: So the amending motion...is that Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Mayes: Point of information.

Deputy Speaker: What's that?

Councillor Mayes: To the (Inaudible), I did not think there was a unanimous vote at planning committee.

Deputy Speaker: I'm sorry, say that again.

Councillor Rollins: Oh sorry, I apologize. There wasn't...no, absolutely not. I misrepresented, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It was 3-1 with Councillor Allard very much opposed. We've spoken about it before. It's late in the day and I need another cup of coffee, clearly. I'm misrepresenting the...otherwise, typically you know, speech is failing me at this hour. So it's a subdivision and rezoning, 1161 Grosvenor. It was...it comes to...it comes to Council with Property and Development having supported the appeal.

Deputy Speaker: I noted and I noted there was some opposition at Executive Policy Committee, so, thanks for the introduction. Is it Councillor Lukes that's moving the amendment? Okay, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Councillor Lukes, who represents Waverly West, who's got scars from everyone saying, oh, evil urban sprawl. So, I'm here to, with a motion that I'm putting forward, that basically reverts it back to the Public Service's recommendations. The Public Service recommended this project. It is an infill project. It is at the end of a street. It's a very

large lot, 9,086 square feet. The applicant's proposing to subdivide the land into two lots and to rezone...rezone one to residential multi-family, a triplex is proposed for lot 1 and a single-family dwelling is proposed for lot 2. So, this is an infill project. And you know, we receive a lot of challenges with infill projects. I think this is a good project. I'm very familiar with the area. I used to live on the Wellington Crescent side, right around there. I've walked that neighborhood countless, countless kilometers under the beautiful trees and the neighborhood. So, I do believe that this is a good project for the end of a street. And thus, the motion is basically reverting it back to what the Public Service has recommended.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Lukes. Mr. Clerk, who do I have up first to speak?

Clerk: Councillor Orlikow.

Deputy Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, please.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. It's...I'm trying to get ahead of some of the vitriol kind of comments we may meet today maybe, because I'm not sure if people saw the community committee meeting when we had. So, people are going to get into things This is a NIMBY thing. Well again, if you looked at the community committee that we didn't talk about that at all. What happened there, and my belief is, and still with, you know, we have this debate about blanket zoning going out in the near future, is that consultation is really, really important, especially when you take a property that has...this has never happened in this area. There's one small firehall that was done a long time ago. It was a co-op. It was done way before I was even born. So this is a really precedent setting change for the neighborhood. Again, change is hard. Change is hard. So again, I have many developments in the neighborhood that have done change. But what they have done is they've consulted with the neighborhood, and not...they didn't do at the neighbourhoods with...not at all times. Sometimes they did okay. So, what happen...I'll give you an example of this one and then two other examples. So example number one here is, we had a developer come forward to say, here is my proposal. All right. I wish you'd talk to me about it. I did talk to you about it, says the developer. When I was...I go, I don't recall that. When he introduced himself when I was door knocking. That was his consulting with me. Again, not...not going to...the developer, I don't think it's he did a bad thing, he just missed the ball on this one. And then he said, I did I consult with the neighbour. I did consult with the neighbour. Look, I have a letter here, from the actual neighbor, that supports this. Nice. I go, okay, that's important because again, when we look at consulting, the immediate neighbor is most important and it spreads out from there. Waverly West is lovely, but if someone supports or doesn't support Waverly West, they're going to be a little down the tier on (inaudible) inputs, the value of the input is. I look at more of the culture because the impact zone, I call it. So, and then, when the residents come up who are...got together, a few of them. They come up and they say, I have a letter from that same person that said no, I do not support this. So again, we already have...I consulted with the councillor, but they didn't really consult, whatever the terminology you use for consulting. They said they never had public open house. They never dropped wires in the neighborhood at all. They didn't consult really with anybody. Again, it's important especially when you are branching out into new areas. So, I have a number of developments, I'm still waiting for them to come through, that are also on Grosvenor. Some much larger ones. The developer has done an amazing job, an amazing job. They've reached out, a couple public open houses. They amend their plan. Okay, so you don't want back balconies? That's fine. If you can live without that, that makes the neighbourhood, because you are joining a neighborhood. This isn't some ethereal plan that comes out of the sky and ideologically we just do it regardless of what you think. No, we want to make sure we reduce the conflicts and have the opportunity for people to have their say and the developer is listening to them and changes stuff. I will continue to fight for the neighbourhood to make sure developers do that. If they don't do that, you're going to pay. And in this case, he did because it was completely off what he was saying he's developing. For example, and also, I have one on Centennial back lane. Neighborhood was not pleased, not at all. But the developer spent enormous amount of time working on traffic studies, which are their main issue. Resolved that, showed me the traffic studies. The trees were really important. Now we're going to have trees along that they didn't have before. He said it is huge kind of security wall. They have bollards now, opening it up to the public. They want a sidewalk so that they can get onto Grant. Neighborhood was not happy about it, but they had their opportunity to voice their concerns. Very important. Again, there's going to be more development in that area soon. Again, the precedent has been set now that you must do. You must engage with the neighbourhood. I had another development. Again, we're saying, all development is good development, no matter what the neighborhood says. That's not true. We had a beautiful, a very long-term important family for River Heights. The Turnbull...the Turnbull family. They wanted to take a place on Corydon. We say, well, we didn't have public input. Who cares? Because it's just rehabbing and increasing the commercialization on that corner. It's wonderful, part of Our Winnipeg, which again, is guidelines. We didn't do by-laws for a reason, but guidelines. Again, the developer did not talk to the neighborhood. Neighborhood came out in droves, very upset. We rejected it then, similar reasons, they had some fundamental problems with access, how they access the property. The developer was very upset. Developer comes back with a new proposal. Fantastic. Fantastic. He listened to the neighbourhood. They amended their easement in. They changed some designs elements that were concerning. Wasn't that a huge deal. Took a little bit work. And guess how many showed up in opposition? One. One, because they took that time. So when I spoke earlier, I'm trying to make sure that we reduce neighborhood conflicts. Everybody's triggered right now, especially when you're taking something as precious as their neighbour's home, their area and changing it. The neighbour...we must stand strong, and

I will, when a developer needs to take the time to understand that they're joining a neighborhood. This isn't just a realtor property. This is something that's fundamentally important for that neighborhood. So again, Councillor Rollins was very clear. Just said these building materials don't go with anything around here at all. Again, if the developer talked to them, that wouldn't be an issue for Councillor Rollins because he could have changed it. The neighbourhood would have told him that. But he didn't do it. So again, it's really important and we're going to have this debate when we talk about blanket zoning. We have to make sure that the residents have the opportunity to at least talk about some of the design elements. That when the developer decides to skip that process, and this developer is not brand new to the system. He's done...he knows what he's doing, but he chose not to. So, you're now in the penalty box. Come back later on. You can have...reapply if you'd like, but it wasn't about a lot split so much. We can have that debate another day. It wasn't about traffic. It wasn't about the height. It wasn't about all of those ideological, all development is good development. I'm not even entering that debate today. What I'm entering is, the debate today was, you are in the penalty box because you chose, in a very sensitive area, not to develop...not to meet with the neighbours. Not to actually have the courtesy for those people that have lived there, for those 100-year-old houses, and then say I'm going to change it and I don't really care what you have to say. That to me, got my gall up. And that's why I came back for that meeting, for the only meeting I was able to make it back from my La-Z-Boy chair, to come back for the meeting because it really, I want to send the message, and I'm doing this today, very loudly. I hope every developer who's going to come to River Heights-Fort Garry and to all our neighborhoods, understands the importance of consulting with the neighborhood before you decide to go jump in and decide, well, it's a great design. The Planning Department likes it, too. Planning Department, we have the area councillor, we have council and we have the neighborhood. You can't miss one of those pieces. And when you do, especially in a sensitive area, because there is no zoning like this, lot splits have already started in this area. Lot splits are happening all over the Fort Garry River Heights ward. Beaumont neighbourhood and (inaudible) neighbourhood, Sir John Franklin. I have...if I don't have second most lot splits, besides Councillor Mayes, I'd be quite surprised. They are happening at a record pace because of... just of property value now and how it's all working. Again, and those people, I would say right now on record, is you should also talk to them about design. Most people, when I first...two minutes?

Deputy Speaker: Councillor Dobson moves the extension. All those in favour?

Councillor Orlikow: When I first started, again, let's not be so derogatory to our residents. We get elected by them, but again, when I first started with...here, no one liked the idea of a lot split at all period. Now people have got a little bit more of understanding of the purpose of them. But what they would like to see is developers consult with them on the design, use of materials. Can you save this tree by moving this over here? Ideas like that, again, it goes a long way to building neighborhood harmony. It goes a long ways reducing the stress on all of us and including the residents. And it allows us to do more infill going future because it won't be a pit battle, which is this setting up to be. So I'm very...I understand that you just need to look at just triplex, just a lot split going this (inaudible). I can understand why people would say that, but that's not what we're talking about today. We're talking about the fact that the developer should have known better, does know better, decided not to consult with the neighborhood, especially in this area. So that's why in the penalty box, come back later, not saying never, come back later. When you...and next time, don't do this again. That's it.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Mr. Prinsloo.

Clerk: Councillor Allard is next.

Deputy Speaker: Monsieur Allard, please.

Councillor Allard: Mr. Deputy Speaker, through you to my colleagues. I don't know...I don't know how my position on this was misinterpreted, but I was hearing about how I had opposed an infill development. And I couldn't understand why, and I checked minutes. And I see the minutes were accurate. I think it didn't move up the chain with the...no, no, I know, not...I'm not...I don't...Councillor Rollins, sorry Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, through you through to Councillor Rollins, it was not reflected in the Council decision unless we look at the minutes from the Standing Policy Committee. I believe it's...

Deputy Speaker: You're referring to...

Councillor Allard: It's what I mean, but this...I think I'd like to make a few points. Well, maybe we need to raise the value of our land to reduce the tax burden or to be able to fund things that we want to fund, like recreation, parks, other amenities. And I think we need to stop talking about penalty boxes because I think...I think we need to start getting on board with infill and densification. We have...we have rule books. We have Infill Guidelines. Just this month, the Planning, Property and Development Committee has killed at least three, two, four, nine...nine units of housing, all with the...all with the endorsement of the Planning...all with the endorsement of the Urban Planning Division. So, in the case of the Infill Guidelines, we have had consultation, we had a process. And yet for some reason, despite all the benefits of infill and densification, for the environment, for the tax base, we quashed these developments. And I heard earlier a talk about

housing and the need for housing, and how Council now has voted to regulate Airbnb, and regulation is good. I don't think we should completely stop some of the Airbnb that's happening, which is why I didn't support the motion. But I think putting people in the penalty box gets the City of Winnipeg in the penalty box. I think we need to have clear rules. I think in the case of Infill Guidelines, one of the reasons we are seeing more and more lot splits, is that the Infill Guidelines serve as the guide, so that it wasn't only the residents of Glenwood who would be having lot splits happening in their neighborhoods, but the same rules would apply to the entire city. I heard about the types of materials that are being proposed. We can govern these at plan approval. We have tremendous powers at plan approval, to go down to which trees go where, how to orient a building, what type of glazing, what types of materials. There are solutions through design to many of the issues that may be of concern to the neighborhood. So, I mean, I moved the motion to approve this. I was defeated 3-1. I made a very similar speech. And in a similar fashion at Appeals, this month, I moved the motion, made a similar speech. In the case of appeals, we have the Infill Guidelines on top of OurWinnipeg Complete Communities, and the support from the Urban Planning Division, and lost that vote 3-1. And so, we're not building infill and it seems that when we don't build infill, it's slightly arbitrary, but perhaps not that arbitrary because some neighborhoods seem to have their projects, not move forward despite the Urban Planning Division, and other neighborhoods see the projects move forward despite area opposition from some residents. And so, I think there is so much value to infill and densification. I mean, I did a ballpark. If we...like a very low estimate of what the net, the lift is on nine units, but at \$250,000 a unit, which is approximately what you need to build a piece of affordable housing. Nine times \$250,000, that is \$2, 250,000 of permanently added net new dollars to our tax base. I'm not considering the current property values and I thought it was fair because...because some of these homes, as we saw in one of the...as we heard at one of the public hearings. Like the lot split homes are selling for anywhere from 550 to 750, but there's a lot split with two units there, and for young families, can't afford the entire home. They're just starting out. There is a way to finance that mortgage by renting one of the suites. And these houses in some of these neighborhoods are not appropriate for families of certain size, where the CMHC now recommends one bedroom per child. Gone are the days where the CMHC was fine with bunk beds. Like this is...this is what housing looks like these days. This is what the market is demanding in terms of housing these days...and there are limits. When developers come forward and they talk to the Urban Planning Division, they almost always impose height limits, setbacks, things that go over and above the envelope size of the building that we're denying. Like I recall recently we were talking about what the building could be, if it were just a new single-family home on one of these lot splits, and it was 35 feet. And that's to the, Councillor Dobson, tell me exactly what part of roof that is. But the point is, there are limits that were being imposed by the Planning Department on the developer who would've...would've...likely would've wanted more massing, so they could make more money. But the planners are there to keep that in line with our planning documents. So, I think the way that we can get out of the penalty box is by stopping to quash these perfectly good infill projects, raise our tax base, bring buildings up to current building code and benefit from...from net new taxes without the same type of infrastructure that you need for suburban growth. So, I will be supporting this motion to approve this development. I am often finding that I am the only one supporting the Urban Planning Division on some of these...on some of these proposed builds, and I don't understand why we're not going forward with them. And I don't want to impugn anyone's motives, so I will not, but it seems that there are some developments that get approved and others not. And I am out of time. But I recall at one time, where there was a lot split in Charleswood, I was the only person to speak in favour of that lot split, and that one was, as you might expect, denied. So let's stop doing stuff like that, please. One rule for everyone.

Deputy Speaker: All right. Thank you, Councillor Allard. Thank you. You are getting pretty close, anyway. All right, Mr. Prinsloo.

Clerk: Next, we have Councillor Wyatt.

Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, please go ahead.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Deputy Speaker: Well, thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: Oh sorry, no offense. Sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Yeah, I've listened to the debate and I would say that I think it's, I, as a member of previous councils, I've always strived to find ways to make development happen. I know that Councillor Browaty's aware of that. We sat in many public hearings at community committee, where we've moved mountains to find solutions to get a project done. However, I would say that what strikes me about this, well a number of things struck me about this report. First of all, the fact that we're moving the entire clause here, as an amendment, kind of surprised me and when I went back to read the report, the clause was actually missing in the report. What we're seeing is the arguments in opposition that the clause is defeated, but I've never seen it before, where the entire clause in the report coming out of the standing committee and EPC, is completely gone and that the only thing that we're reading in the first pages of the report, are the opposing arguments. That seems to be very odd. I would be of the mind, almost, that I've spoken to this now, I can't do that, but to have the matter referred back, so that the report can be cleaned up, because as far as I'm concerned, it seems very inconsistent with our practices, of what we have done in the past with these reports

and I'm not too sure what's going on there, and why the Public Service didn't follow the standard formatting that we have for these said reports. So I'm quite concerned about that. But number two, the fact of the matter is, I've reviewed the report and it appears that the developer in question, has brought forward from very high-level, preliminary elevations, which frankly, I feel are...fall quite short of what should be required in this area. (Inaudible) Councillor Allard does rightly point out, that we do plan approvals later on, but having said that, the details are here now. It would be hard for us to push back and community committee to push back, with the detailed plan approval, our elevations that have been supplied in this report, as it stands right now. I think that there are bare basic elevations for this neighborhood knowing what...having been in the development business prior to coming back here, what the return on investment is here for the developer. I thought the developer would want to have invested a bit more time and money into those elevations and those concept plans. I note, as been noted in the past, yes, we have allowed for density in neighborhoods. However, we are going from two lots to what, all intents, I'm not too sure what Councillor Allard's referring to, nine. I read five, three-unit apartment plus a two unit, assumed with a secondary or a unit single-family home, with a secondary suite. I count five units. I think that again, is a bit of a jump. But I guess I want to stress something that really is not part of this debate and that is that we do really need to look at, I'm not on the page of the Planning Commission that Councillor, the former Councillor Klein advocated. But I do see advantages to the Calgary model, where all of Council sits together and hears the zoning matters. And the benefit of that, even though it would...it would tie up our time in terms of that city wide, but what it does, is it gives us a...all of us, a greater appreciation for the challenges across the city, for city-wide thinking. Not only in terms of density and where density should be allowed or not, or how we accommodate it, but in terms of other issues related to each neighborhood that we may not hear because we're not sitting on that community committee, and the Mayor, who doesn't sit on any of the community committees. But a great appreciation of the transportation issues around the city, the housing issues, and the need for a practice that's consistent. I think that's what Councillor Allard is running at, a practice that's consistent. I've heard Councillor Mayes speak about this as well, that's consistent from neighborhood to neighborhood. I have suggested to our new directors, as a matter of information, the concept of maybe a pilot project, which I would be quite happy to volunteer my community, where we would go in and work with a block, maybe built in the '50s, '60s or '70s, to 50 foot lots, to down...to rezone those lots down to 25 foot lots, on the basis that we would need legislative change that they would not be taxed on it. But that their underlying lots would go from 50 foot lots to 25 foot lots, that would allow for infill. And that we really ramp up on our infill designs that would be on hand, ready in the planning, in the office of the Planning Department, when the time comes, similar to what the City of Portland has done for years now. But every time we go to a public hearing, we're always getting revisited with brand new plan approvals that seem to be done from scratch and in some cases, some developers really go above and beyond to make sure that those designs are par none, excellent. That is not the case from what I'm reading here. And so as somebody who regularly will support a motion like this, I am reluctant to do that, based on what I'm reading and seeing before me today. I would prefer the matter to be referred back, with the hope that compromises either be found on density and/or, and in terms of the elevations that this developer has provided, thus far to the city because frankly, they are not...not acceptable, you know. And I'm not saying that it's just because it's in River Heights and we got our nose in the air because it's River Heights. I'm saying this because frankly, I wouldn't accept those elevations in old Transcona, either. Right. Old Transcona has a character of itself as well. Every neighborhood has a character and I mean a good character, not like a city council character. Anyway, so you know, I'm very reluctant to...when I saw this motion come forward, the first thing I do when I see a motion like this, of this substance on a planning matter, is to stand up and move referral immediately back to standing committee, because frankly, I don't think any councillor could really, in their right minds, say, other than members of that community committee, that we know 100% of what's going on there and to vote comfortably on a comprehensive, mass emotion of this size and scale. I just...I'm very reluctant and I look at...and I guess, I was kind of 50/50 on this, until I started reviewing the documents and I saw the elevations being provided by the developer, and I'm going to take Councillor Orlikow for his word, in terms of the comments that I'm reading, in terms of the consultation, or the lack thereof, in that neighborhood, or any neighborhood, where it doesn't have a mobile family block, where you're coming in with a massive change, and a major change on that corner. I would think that there would have been extensive public consultations, especially knowing what the return on investment would be to the developer in that area. It will not be minor, especially if you're building, and let's be honest, what they're building is five units. They're not building a single-family house. They're building two units. the reason they put a secondary suite is to get the second unit. It's a multiple family. It's an R2. It might as well be called R2, but we created the system now where secondary suites can get a slide below the radar screen.

Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, nobody is moving extension so your time...oh, you're moving? All those in favour?

Councillor Wyatt: All those could slide, thank you, could slide below the radar screen as a single-family, with so-called secondary suite, when we know full well that it might as well just be called R2, right. I mean, this is a bit of a game going on by the infill developers in the city, that they're using our existing by-laws to play that game, so that they can get that extra unit and not necessarily have to pay the same fees that are involved with an R2. And so Madam...Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am reluctant not to support Councillor Lukes' and Browaty's motion. As someone who's always worked towards the chief, I listened intently to Councillor Orlikow, and I've read the...read over, looked over and I think there needs to be some work here and I would hope this could be referred back, so that the developer here does not going to be subject to an up and down vote because if they're subject to an up and down vote, and the matter is defeated, this individual can not

apply for a rezoning for another two years. Pardon me? Well, exactly or...no, any kind is. So no, out of courtesy to the applicant, that's why I would suggest the referral back. It can still be defeated, but at least they have the option to know that they can withdraw it, prior to the vote here today. As it stands right now, if it's defeated, they don't have that option to go back and that to me is also not necessarily doing business in good faith. So thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Deputy Speaker: All right. Mr. Prinsloo, is there anybody else who wishes to speak?

Clerk: Yes, next we have Councillor Gilroy.

Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, we just finished OurWinnipeg plan that we have ushered in and, you know, this is going to be a change for citizens and I'm not going to be supporting Councillor Browaty and Councillor Lukes' motion, because I do understand the complexities of the City Centre and what's going on in that City Centre. I am the lone wolf on that committee. I do not have the same development that Councillor Rollins and Councillor Orlikow has, I wish I did have more, but you know what, what I have learned, through the process of learning through all the developments they do have, is the need to consult. That's got to be critical because we aren't going to be starting upon a new change, where, you know, we're encouraging 50% of our developments to be infill. How we manage that is going to be critical to the citizens of Winnipeg and our older, aging neighborhoods are going to need to make sure that they have some voice, some control, and some say. Now, when they first start off in some of these communities, they know, they don't really know the rules of the road, but in Councillor Orlikow's and Councillor Rollins', a lot of these people do and they're okay with developments, but they do want to have that opportunity to consult and ask questions of their developer and that is...should be their right, and you know what, the product that I've seen when we do consult, is much better, and then at the end result, we have a better development for it. I have had a development in my ward that is just horrible and that's because they didn't consult. They didn't do the due diligence that they needed to do in the community, and now we're stuck with it and we're stuck with that development. So, I think that as we move forward, as a city, we have to send clear messages to the development community that, you know, we want to grow up and not out, but we need you to consult and work with the community because this is going to be tough on a community that isn't prepared for it yet. So we're going to have a lot more of these and if we can get the development community on board, working with the community and not against it, we're all going to be better off, especially us, as councillors. So I mean, eventually this is going to be in other developments, like Councillor Browaty's and I know Councillor Lukes has in some of our major corridors and stuff, but you know, it is impacting these aging communities and I just think that there needs to be some oversight on that and some control over the development of it and making sure that the community has...is able to ask questions. So that's why I'm standing in favour of the main motion, at Community Centre because I was there. I listened to what the residents had to say and I was pretty shocked that there was no community conversation on this and there should be. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Deputy Speaker: Yeah. Are you referring the amendment or are you referring the report?

Councillor Allard: I move everything back to Standing Policy Committee. I can't do that. Okay. I retract those words.

Deputy Speaker: Hang on, hang on. Mr. Clerk, Mr. Gameiro, could you please let me understand the rule regarding...is it an automatic referral back to standing committee, okay?

City Clerk: So, a motion to refer an item back to a committee would be in order, but that motion needs to happen prior to the councillor or member of council speaking.

Deputy Speaker: Oh speaking, thank you. All right. Okay, so do I have anybody?

Clerk: Yes, next we have Councillor Mayes.

Deputy Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: The word is arbitrary. That is the word that was used by Councillor Allard. I can't quite get my head around people saying we need to send a clear message. Do we? Are we? So we have the Infill Guidelines, that aren't being followed here. We have innumerable examples of four units being approved on much smaller peak parcels. I am supporting Councillor Orlikow, because Councillor Orlikow has had a pretty good conception of reality over the past five to six years and was certainly a much better Chair of Planning than I was. Councillor Orlikow has comprehended that things like gravel lanes are not the same as cement lanes. We have God knows how many provisions saying, you can't increase density on gravel roads, but let's just let you do that on gravel lanes, even though we're cutting off your access to the cement street and your only access will be down the gravel lane. Yay. It's more density, that'll solve everything.

There's a way of densifying intelligently. I don't think we're doing it. I think we're trying, on occasion, to do it. We are all over the map. This is become a completely arbitrary, inconsistent procedure. I don't care if we go with Councillor Klein's Planning Commission. I don't care if we go with the Calgary vision. I don't care about...but I do care that we cannot keep doing this, because I cannot keep having people from Glenwood call me saying, hey, they just keep approving things in our ward over and over again, but what's this about a Heritage Conservation District, where there are 100-year-old homes on Wellington Crescent? We have 100-year-old homes. Or hey, what's this about a Heritage Conservation District in Armstrong's Point because they have 100-year-old homes. We have 100-year-old homes. Hey, what's all this about rejecting five units on 9,000 square feet when we keep having four units, not even on 5,000 square feet. We've now moved to that, smaller than that in some parts of the ward. So, I think we're frankly...that there's a way to densify that you could do intelligently. I think the Infill Guidelines was at least an attempt to do that. Oddly, I find myself defending the Infill Guidelines, having worked heroically to at least defend it, which, to the credit of some people around here, I was able to get some notive reality in there saying no, we shouldn't be densifying on gravel lanes because that's just not realistic. The real danger though, is what Councillor Orlikow's talked about, with the blanket zoning approach, that if you start going down that, then you lose any ability to actually intelligently debate. Hey, this might be different. There's a gravel lane. Hey, this might be different. This street isn't on City sewer or City water, even though they're inside the Perimeter. Hey, isn't Kingston Crescent outside the protection of the primary dike? Doesn't Complete Community say we don't densify streets like that because of the risk to our coffers, so we shouldn't be densifying areas like, that that are outside the primary dike and, therefore, are much more susceptible to flooding. Why would we densify there? Or we can just say, it's all good, all the time and let's just do a blanket increase, as Councillor Orlikow has warned us. So, I think the procedure has become a kind of, I mean, what message are we sending to the development community? I can't even tell anymore. I mean, Councillor Allard has been consistent, but even he on that matter, that he had when it was still in his ward on John Bruce Road East. One house. City planners say, let's replace it with 24 units. Councillor Allard says, let's have a compromise. I vote with them. We have what, nine units I think that are there. I think that was approved, ultimately five houses got built. It is densification. I've had this joust with Councillor Allard enough, that he can probably give my speech and I, his. Councillor Allard is right. I voted to densify. Well, there's a way of doing that, but you don't have to do it to the max. You don't have to go all in and then call it gentle densification when you're doing it, after the fact. Surely, there's some respect for the democratic procedure here. There's some respect. I've never had anyone at the door say, I bought a house in this area in the very great hopes you would destroy it. I've never actually had someone say, that in the hundreds of thousands of doors. I've never had somebody say, I bought this because I thought it was in decline and declining and gee, can you just make sure it becomes a construction zone for the next few years. That would be awesome. No one's ever actually said that. It is ultimately still a democracy. So, we can denounce people as NIMBYs, and we tend to do that, right up until the time they live in our ward and then we start saying how it's the voice of the citizen needs to be respected. So, I think we need to be very cautious about blanket approaches, unless our approach is just all density, all good, all the time, everywhere. Well, then everywhere means let's repeal those Heritage Conservation Districts. Everywhere means let's put everybody, across the whole city, in. Councillor Orlikow used to talk about that with the Infill Guidelines. If you like it so much, let's just have it apply across the whole city, but there wasn't the will to do that, interestingly. So, I'm with Councillor Orlikow today on this, but my frustration is not hidden. My frustration is front and centre. I thought the Infill Guidelines, you know, Richard...were a good attempt. Richard Mahé said, and I've quoted him many times, because he is right. We have to build up and we have to build out, it's how you do it. Obviously, Lukes' ward in the Waverly, in the newest parts, isn't all new, despite her occasional suggestions. It isn't all new. In the newest parts, it's clearly denser than some parts further in in the city. Clearly, Sage Creek is denser than Royalwood, anyone driving there would know that, walking there, cycling there. So, I think we are getting smarter at how we build out. But to sit here and say, we need to build up and let's just bulldoze existing neighbourhoods from the '50s and '60s, it's frankly to deny reality, I think, in some sense. It is to defy economics. It's to adopt a Reaganomics perspectives that we'll just have more houses going up. We'll just build up. We won't even make more on revenue because we won't get the frontage stuff, we won't get the garbage levy, we won't have as much in property tax, but we'll just save so much in our expenditures that we'll just...we'll have tax cuts, we'll come out ahead. Did anyone actually pay attention a few moments ago? We had a \$1.15 billion bill that's coming. It's all in the older parts of the city. So, put more people in there, put fewer people in there, it's still 1.15 billion, can't blame that on Sage Creek or Waverly West. Anyone else notice we just voted for Aurora, further spread out into the suburbs. We seem to be quite happy to do that and then we turn around and say, well we have to...we've got to stop sprawling. Well, we need some coherent approach here, some actual connection between the Planning Department and the rest of the civil service, instead of our current bifurcated civil service model, where we get one set of priorities from Planning and one from everybody else, or at least from Public Works, incredibly frustrating. So, I think...I think we do need to build up. We also need to build out. I sit there at these meetings and people from Glenwood are told, we can't do any pacing. We can't control the pacing. We've got to let the market side. What's the next phase? We've got to stop building out. Oh, really? Don't...isn't there a market for that? Isn't that why we just approved Aurora and some other areas, or we can just say, move to...move to West St. Paul. We don't care. Go ahead. We don't care. We could say that, but then there are fewer of us to pay for that \$1.15 billion CSO bill, and other bills. When we did the Hemson report, I might need a brief extension, when we did the Hemson report, you know, they had items like Sage Creek fire hall in the cost of growth. I said, what about the three other new fire halls we're building? It's all just replacement cost. It doesn't...doesn't, thank you.

Deputy Speaker: Sherri Rollins would...Councillor Rollins, all right. All those in favour of extension?

Councillor Mayes: It's all well...those fire halls don't count because that's all just replacement cost. Well, guess what, if we decide to just stop building out entirely and say everyone has to move in. We've got to move in. I don't think we'll get the numbers people report that we will. And second, we'll still have costs. We still have to replace the fire halls, pretending that we don't doesn't make it go away. Calling it replacement cost doesn't mean it's zero. We'll still have to replace the fire halls. Look at Windsor Park. Look at west on Portage. So, I think we need a realistic debate here on how we want to grow and also, we need to avoid this sort of the blanket approach that just says, it's all good everywhere, and we'll just make a fortune off this. It's Reaganomics. Let's just be blunt. It's trickled down. It's developers going...go ahead and make a fortune, but what...not even that we'll get some of that in property taxes, not even that. It's our expenses will go down so much that we'll come up ahead. Yeah, seen that movie, opposed it in the 80's, continued to oppose. So, for today, I'm with Councillor Orlikow, but if we need to send a clear message, we better all sit down together and try to figure out what message that is, because all the...the only thing people in my ward see is the word arbitrary, when they see how we're acting right now.

Deputy Speaker: Councillor Mayes. Mr. Prinsloo.

Clerk: Next, we have Councillor Browaty.

Deputy Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I'm going to...I'll withdraw.

Deputy Speaker: You'll withdraw? Okay. Anybody else on the list, Mr. Prinsloo?

Clerk: No further speakers.

Deputy Speaker: No further speakers. To close on the amendment, Councillor Lukes...

Councillor Rollins: Amending first. Yeah, if I could...

Deputy Speaker: Okay. Close, Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Yeah, I just...I just want to close with a bit of glass half full. I know sometimes we...you know, we...Deputy, you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker through to Council, don't kind of count our blessings. And you know, this Council voted last term for our Winnipeg Complete Communities. We voted 60, you know, in City Centre, we voted 60/40 and we wanted to see more infill development, less greenfill development, the rest of Council voted 50/50. But as I stand as Chair of Property and Development, over the last five years, we have averaged a 58% intensification rate. And the high-end at 63.5%, so we did get a little bit higher than what we had initially supported and so, while I appreciate, you know, you could be super pure about it in terms of this vote, what I would, had called many times and struggled to call many times, was a problem in articulation. It was just not as attractive as I'd like, and I allow myself about two times per term going, not good-looking enough. And I can't support it and this was in that category unfortunately, but I wanted to just leave you with the good news, that we have seen a high end of 63.5% and low of 58% intensification rate. We're hitting our goals, and sometimes we, through you Deputy Speaker to my colleague, Councillor Allard, who's concerned about this, and to all of us that's concerned about it, you know, I'm keeping my eye on that prize. Thank you.

Deputy Speaker: All right. I'm going to call the question on the amending motion. All those in favour? Recorded vote, okay. All those in favour of the amending motion? Please rise.

Clerk: His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty...

Deputy Speaker: This is on the amendment, right? What happened...? Hang on, Mr. Prinsloo...is it for those in favour? Okay. All those opposed? Please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, and Browaty

Nays

Councillors Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Wyatt, and Madam Speaker
Councillor Sharma

Deputy Speaker: So what are the yeas and nays?

City Clerk: I apologize, Councillor Lukes off the vote. I think you missed your vote, Councillor.

Deputy Speaker: Pardon me?

City Clerk: I think we missed Councillor Lukes' vote.

Deputy Speaker: Oh, did we? She stood up.

Councillor Sharma: She stood up.

Deputy Speaker: It's her motion.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Deputy Speaker, Yeas 4, Nays 11.

Deputy Speaker: Nays 11, all right. So the motion, the amending motion fails. Okay, all those in favour of Report No. 4 to 1161 Grosvenor, is it? I said...I called the vote, anyway. All those rise who are in favour of the report.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Wyatt, and Madam Speaker
Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillors Allard, Browaty, His Worship Mayor Gillingham, and Councillor Lukes

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Deputy Speaker, Yeas 11, Nays 4.

Deputy Speaker: The report passes and now, was there any other reports to be done, Mr. Prinsloo?

Councillor Sharma: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll resume the chair, if I may.

Deputy Speaker: You will?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: Oh, please.

Madam Speaker: We'll now move on to By-laws under this committee. We do have Motion 9, just one moment. Motion 9 was circulated. It is moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Eadie, it's regarding City Hall wayfinding signage and it's an automatic referral to the standing committee. And now on to By-laws. Councillor Rollins.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
MOTIONS**

Motion No. 9
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS on a daily basis, citizens of Winnipeg come to the City Hall campus wanting to pay water bills, property taxes, etc.;

AND WHEREAS said citizens are often confused on where said services are located on the City Hall Campus, often asking questions for directions;

AND WHEREAS there is a need for better directional signage for said citizens.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Public Service be directed to install wayfinding signage in the Courtyard of the City Hall campus as well as directional signage in both the Susan A. Thompson Building and the Council Building, in both official languages, as well as Indigenous languages that are commonly used within the City of Winnipeg.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 86/2023, By-law No. 87/2023, By-law No. 88/2023.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 86/2023, 87/2023 and 88/2023.

Madam Speaker: Now having question period for our chair. Any questions for Councillor Rollins? Councillor Wyatt.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Wyatt: To the new director, how's the new director doing?

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. Madam Speaker through you to Councillor Wyatt, excellent. The new director is meeting at a break neck pace with almost everyone, and I'm really excited about the energy and the work she's been doing inside the department to really get us to be the economic engine that Property and Development should be. Supporting Winnipeggers and really the economic development of the City. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: Just as a way of more...I have to ask it I guess like this. Are you aware...I've had the opportunity to meet with her on more than one occasion, especially at the beginning, to reach out, give her whatever little bit of knowledge I may have and let's say that any assistance is there. Happy to help. Are you aware?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Excellent. Madam Speaker, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Seeing no further questions under this committee, next is the Standing Policy Committee on Community Services. Councillor Duncan, our chair on the report dated October 5.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED OCTOBER 5, 2023**

Councillor Duncan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 through 7.

Madam Speaker: Five is pulled. Any others? Call the question on 1 through 4, 6 and 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 5 – St. James Civic Centre Expansion Project – Construction Cost Escalation

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll wait to hear from my council colleague.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I've pulled this item, as I did at EPC, a slightly different speech today. I am supportive. This is a nicer project. We need to fund it. It is, however, an additional 3 million going into this project, which is already a \$14 million project, which is not going to be consistent with the other \$10 million that we voted on back in July, which was also over budget at the St. James Civic Centre. So, we're up to 27, 28 million. You'll remember, Madam Speaker, this was a priority No. 33 in the 2020 Infrastructure Plan, at a 45. Sitting just behind, at No. 36, was the Tyndall Park Community Centre, at a mere \$8.3 million. I do hope we give serious consideration to that facility. The report indicated, in December of 2019 when we debated it, that DCWCC Plan 25 identified significant shortages in Seven Oaks and Inkster West for recreational space. Hence, the proposal for the Tyndall Park, which I see is the north westerly cousin to the Southeast Community Centre that I keep talking about down on...down on Warde Avenue. So, I'm in favour of this. I just hope we keep in mind that we're finding another 3 million here, is 14 million in through the ICIP part of that. So, some of it's federal, some of it's provincial. We put in another...we, the City, have another 10 million in on St. James. The unfortunate...one project is St. James expansion and renewal and the other one is St. James expansion. So, understandably, a bit of confusion here, but I'm in favour of it. In fact, there's a bit more money with the arena, but that's neither here nor there. So, we're in 27, 28 million. I am voting in favour, but I do hope we come back. Councillor Santos has talked, perhaps, not quite as much as I've talked, but Councillor Santos has talked about this Tyndall Park project, 8.3 million I think, is the identified cost. She's certainly championed it for a number of years. I would like to back her up on that, knowing the growth up in that part of the city. I do think we should be giving that pretty serious weight, as we're giving...funding toward this project.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speaker? Seeing none. Councillor Duncan to close.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. To Councillor Mayes' points, the escalating cost through inflation is a huge concern, especially for these ICIP projects. And the Mayor has addressed this by sending a letter to the provincial government and federal government, asking for equal split in that inflation. I think that that's extremely important moving forward. I also think that this lends itself to potentially supporting the need for this Chief Construction Officer that has been laid over to our next meeting. So, for some consideration there. However, it does concern me that we are taking on more debt regardless and at a time when there is such a financial concern with the City. So, those are my comments and I'll call the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of Item 5? Contrary? Carried. We have no motions. We'll now get into by-laws. Councillor Duncan. No by-laws. No by-laws, either. Okay, question period. Any questions for Councillor Duncan? Councillor Eadie.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, through you to the Chairperson, how's he finding being the Chair and on Executive Policy Committee so far?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. To Councillor Eadie, through you, I find it quite rewarding, especially with the support of my senior councillors and yourself and Councillor Wyatt. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. No further questions. Next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works. Councillor Lukes on the report dated October 10.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
DATED OCTOBER 10, 2023**

Councillor Lukes: October 10, yes. Two items today folks. I'd like to do consent agenda of No. 1 and 2. No, now wait, there's an amending motion I think on 2. Okay.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, okay. Thank you. I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 2.

Item 2 – Speed Limit for Active Transportation Pathways

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes to introduce the item, followed by the mover of Motion 6, Councillor Allard to speak.

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

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 2 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated October 10, 2023 be amended by deleting the word "bikes" in Recommendation 1.

Councillor Lukes: Yes. So, you know, this is something that I dreamt about years ago and now unfortunately, it's happening. It's turning into a nightmare. So, we have so many people using e-bikes, scooters, lots of the e-mobility devices and it's fantastic because, I'm just going to relay my experience on Pembina Highway. So many students are using these to get around. They aren't buying cars. They're using these devices, the bike lanes, sidewalks, the pathways are full of them, and it's great to see that. Now, there are challenges, of course. We've got people calling and getting hit standing in the road, the dog's leash got caught up in an e-bike, that was one of the incidents. So, there are scenarios that are unfolding that are requiring us to look to see what other cities are doing, who have addressed this issue. I know Calgary has put a speed limit on e-bikes. So, what this motion is, is, and it came from Councillor Dobson, is to, just to do a jurisdictional analysis and come forward with some potential recommendations on how we should address this...these challenges that we're meeting. So, I think in the motion, it accidentally must have got in there, maybe the word bikes. We don't want to worry about regulating regular bikes. We're just looking at the e-devices. So, the amending motion is to remove that, but I'll let him speak to that. So, that's the intent of this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard, your opportunity to speak as the mover of Motion 6, amending Motion 6.

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Speaker through you to Council, I believe that this is a friendly amendment that saves a much larger debate. I do believe that some of these e-devices, particularly those that have been modified from the original manufacturer's specifications, may achieve speeds that are significant. I would hope that we do not move in the direction of establishing maximum speeds for bicycles because that would then mean...if you have a thought experiment of what it would mean, it would likely mean installations of speedometers on bicycles and all sorts of issues with enforcements and...well, generally details that I don't think the City wants to get into at this time. I do support the idea of looking into the e-devices, as some of them I've seen move very fast and as the Chairperson of Public Works has said yes to our compliance. I do see situations where those e-devices are used in ways that do seem safe as well, but I hope not to lump the traditional bicycle into the mix. So that's...I'll be supporting, well, the amending motion which I believe is friendly, but Councillor Dobson and I hope we can leave it at that. Thanks.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Yeah, thank you. I'll be supporting the main motion and the amending motion as well. I want to thank both Councillor Allard and Dobson for the amending motion and thank Councillor Dobson for the original motion as well. One of the things that Councillor Lukes has alluded to has been I think, positive as we have been making more investments, greater investments in our active transportation pathway and people are using them. It is a matter of cliché as it is, build it and they will come. I know I've gone to the point this summer where I went and bought a kind of a new bike

because I've been riding to the office so often and have really, really enjoyed that. And mine's just kind of, you know, I don't have an electric bike, so I'll never break a speed record, but I can appreciate that...the e-bikes, scooters, people can move along quite quickly. So, don't know ultimately, you know, what the outcome of a report back will be from our Public Service and don't ultimately know what either which way I would vote, will depend on the recommendations. But certainly interested to hear what our Public Service comes up with and I'll just take a moment again this to express appreciation to all the councils that have supported budgets. For a last couple years, I have seen an increase in our active transportation investments as well. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It was great to hear Mayor Gillingham talking about finishing the North Winnipeg Parkway, which is going to cost several million dollars probably, but anyway, Madam Speaker, because if you build it, they will come. I just wanted to...I only rose to speak because the consideration amending by taking out the word "bicycle". Madam Speaker, people riding bikes at higher speeds, when they make a mistake and they're not riding to the conditions of the active transportation trail. In other words, if it's a busy AT trail, I think they should be limited to 30 kph Madam Speaker, because I know my boys, both my boys, you know, they're proud that we went on a 5 k ride and our average speed was 36 kilometres an hour. So, they were probably riding 42 somewhere, probably down what's it called, the Pioneer through your word, Councillor Browaty. When they're flying down there, they're going...they're going 40 something kilometres an hour. If they make a mistake and hit a pedestrian, or get my cane caught in their spokes, well, I'm left with an inability to get anywhere after that, and if somebody gets hit by a bike moving really fast, believe me, it hurts because I have been hit by a bike too and it's not fun. So, and for our seniors and older people being hit by a bicycle, moving at high speed, which I am now, when I was hit, I was much younger and actually it hurt, but actually, the cyclist got hurt worse than I did. Now, but now that I'm older, if it ever happens, and I'm speaking on behalf of all seniors, the older you get, the worse the injuries are, okay. And I just want to leave it at that. So, I'm actually not going to support the amendment, but I am voting for the report, I think Councillor Dobson introduced a very important motion to Council. So thanks.

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

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, through you to Council, I hope...well, I hope you consider the amending motion. I think it's friendly. I think you heard support from the Mayor, from Councillor Lukes. I think I also heard support from my colleague, Councillor Dobson, as this being friendly. There's a big debate a few years back, about helmets with bicycles. I think key to that debate is, every time you add an impediment to using a bicycle, you have less people using bicycles, which hurts things like our modal shift target, which hurts things like our roads, because people are driving on them more, instead of using bicycles. And I think in terms of injury, I think we're comparing apples to oranges, in terms of orders of magnitude, if we compare auto vehicle traffic and bicycle traffic, and we are specifically talking here about active transportation facilities. So, I hope Council doesn't vote in favour of a report that could suggest that we should have something like speedometers on bicycles because that would be an additional burden on those who ride bikes, who want to respect the rules and I know that they are available on some e-devices, as those e-devices are regulated usually to a maximum of 30 kilometres per hour. So, I think...I think we are debating apples and oranges and I think if that's a metaphor, the apples can be bikes and the oranges could be the electronic devices, and I think we would all be better served if we considered them separately. So those would be my concluding remarks. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and for Council for your consideration. Thanks to Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Councillor Lukes, your opportunity to close.

Councillor Lukes: No, let's call the vote.

Madam Speaker: Okay, call the question on amending Motion 6. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And Item 2, as amended, noted. Item 2, as amended, all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, next is question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Lukes? Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, I rise to ask questions pertaining to, probably projects that were approved prior to my reinstatement as a councillor, but I see bike paths going up on major corridors. I guess, I mean Goulet is one. It's not in my ward, but pass it and I see plans, potentially on Marion, and I guess my concern here is, I'm thinking from the point of view of the small independent business person, who has a business, a mom and pop shop, where all of a sudden 50% of their parking has been wiped out and I have a lot of sympathy for those individuals. And I would hope that maybe, I

realize decisions were made under the previous council that have already gone forward, but I hope that we can reengage and reconsider some of these things that have been considered, so that the small business owner is not bearing the brunt of what I think is good intentions, but however, resulting in significant impacts on their ability to do business in the city of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: What is your question?

Councillor Wyatt: What are your thoughts on that?

Councillor Lukes: Oh, my thoughts on that. All right. Well, thank you very much for your question, Councillor Wyatt. All of these bike facilities that are going in on regional roads and secondary roads, there is a very robust consultation process for input, from the businesses, from the residents. I've, for long, have always said the best type of consultation is to put the bulldozer right out there and put the sign on the bulldozers, so people understand something's going on because a lot of times, you know, there's so much noise going on in the world, it's difficult for people to grasp everything, but from my understanding, businesses along a strip, anything that's facing that strip, receives notification and an opportunity to give feedback. We also formed, at the Public Works Committee, an advisory group for the goods movement aspect of goods movement on the roads. So, they are involved in a lot of the discussions now. They've got a really good advisory committee and they're involved also in a lot of the decisions related to goods movement routes, so it's a balance, it's not...it's a win-win, win-lose, win-win. It's a balance, so those are my comments.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Wyatt, second question.

Councillor Wyatt: Thanks, Madam Chair and thanks to the Chair of the committee. Thank you, to the Chair of the committee, for organizing our recent briefing on the Transportation Master Plan, which I attended and I know other councillors did as well. My question on it is, in light of the fact that the Transit Master Plan is working within the terms of reference of staying within existing transit budgets, but yet the Transportation Master Plan is attempting. Again, this is all the previous council, attempting to facilitate a modal shift, would you not agree that it's difficult to attain a modal shift, unless you actually make a relatively large and new investment in your Transit Master Plan? And I've got a follow up to that one, so, yeah.

Councillor Lukes: Sure. So, the modal shift to get to 50% modal shift, is going to be virtually, well, will be virtually impossible by 2030, which was brought forward. Any modal shift requires a huge investment by all levels of government. And the current high frequency routes that are going to go in place in the next two years, that isn't...that's at cost neutral where all the routes are going to be realigned. So that's at cost neutral. I think...I think that's good because that will allow us, without any major investment, it'll allow us to get a handle on high frequency, which will only be improved by greater investments further down the road. So, the modal shift, I think it's really important that we...everything we do is towards a modal shift, is to work in that direction. Will we reach our goals by the years we set out? The only way we'll reach those goals is if we've got supportive funding from other levels of government. The only way. I will reiterate again, that we could switch every single bus that we have in our fleet to e-buses, and we would not make any impact, less than 1% impact on greenhouse gases, less than 1% and we haven't even taken into consideration yet, the impact of the weight of the e-buses and their batteries on roads. And we brought that up in the Transportation Master Plan, I looked to Councillor Chambers because we saw how the regular bendy buses just shredded some roads in St. Norbert, that weren't built for regular transit. So, there's a lot of work to do. The Transportation Master Plan is where, the updating of it is a requirement by the Province. I wanted everyone to have an opportunity to have a look at it, there's many documents that are going to be coming down the tube to read and go over. But I've asked also to have another update presented on the Active Transportation component because that plan is being updated, and I've also asked transit to put together a paragraph or two, that'll share with you all on what is going to be happening by 20, hopefully 2025, to switch to this high frequency transit route. The Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor went on the high frequency plan the day the pandemic hit and we shut down. So there was, you know, there was an interesting adaptation of people...all the routes changed and then the pandemic came and then people started taking the bus again. So, there's a lot of things, lessons to learn, from what happened with the high frequency route that the departments will be applying when we hopefully switch in 2025, the entire city to high frequency, that'll be interesting. I have flashbacks of the garbage cans all coming in that era. But the Transportation Master Plan, it's an interesting document. It's been delayed. The pandemic was part of the reason, but I encourage you all to look at it and to take time when it does come out the policy document, the recommendations and everything, to read that really thoroughly because the other thing is too, we still have to have roads to put buses on. So as much as we want modal shift, we still have to have roads to put the buses on. So, you know, there will be a modal shift, to what degree? Depends completely on the funding, not completely, but a majority of it depends on the funding we receive from other levels of government.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, final question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, and along the same lines, maybe a bit of institutional knowledge, having seen the 2011 first Transportation Master Plan, what we're dealing with today, one that was 2011, more ambitious, if I may say, not as a knock to the last Council, it was more ambitious in terms of scope and scale what was being considered to what's being considered now, under the existing Transportation Master Plan. And yet, our city has grown leaps and bounds since then. Would the Chair be open to the concept, I'm going to ask a question, would the Chair be open to the concept, what other cities have done, to expand capacity on existing regional streets, both for buses, and for vehicles, and for trade vehicles, like trucks, instead of looking at these sweeping corridors and everything, is implementing a program of intersection upgrades where the regional street intersection upgrades are made on a program scale city-wide, that increases storage capacity, in terms of turning lanes, the ability for people to maneuver through intersections, that are yields and so on and overnight, city-wide, regional streets become more useable and more efficient. Just a thought.

Councillor Lukes: Well, you know, Councillor Wyatt, we're all armchair engineers here, so, I would be open to...I'm always open to sitting with the actual professionals and going at them and talking and having discussions, as you know, because I've had many, many non-committee type meetings with members of Public Works, to really dive into these issues, so absolutely. Like I'm no engineer. I don't know if anyone in here is, but you know what, we're...I'm more than welcome to talk to the ones that are.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Question. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if the Chairperson of Public Works, I think she is aware that when you make changes for better motor vehicle traffic flow at regional road at intersections, it often is contrary to the needs of persons with disabilities, in terms of getting across those intersections.

Councillor Lukes: So Councillor Eadie, actually I'm really aware of any widening to an intersection makes it worse, right? That's why we really are supportive and we've had a lot of (inaudible) go in on a lot of roads that we have. The other thing about intersections is, that's where the high collision death and carnage occurs. It doesn't occur on residential streets. It occurs at the intersection. So, you know, I'll take two high collision intersections in the city of Winnipeg. One is in Councillor Sharma's ward. The other one, the high collision one, and like I think we vary from one or two collisions a year, is at McGillivray and Kenaston. And so, we worked with the departments trying to...what can we do about these high collision intersections, how can we improve them for pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles, and basically, it's a complete re-design at the intersection. So, they've got a lot of camera monitoring that they're doing. They're looking at this and again, you know, everything comes down to money so. I hear you on the intersections, I'm really aware that from a vulnerable road user, widening them up is not ideal and I just have to add to that note because I get this all the time. Kenaston, from the Perimeter coming North through South Pointe, Prairie Pointe, the neighborhoods of Bridgewater, all the way up, what happens to Kenaston is it splits apart a whole bunch of residential plunked in the middle, allowing a whole bunch of commercial. So now we've got all these incredible sidewalks and bike paths and everything having to cross a trade corridor to get to go shopping or whatever. So, you know, I'm trying to slow traffic down in this section. I'm trying to make it safer, arrows, lights, you name it, and the answer I get back is Councillor, we actually did you a favour. We split Kenaston so it was not as wide, so you only have one lane, well, two lanes of one direction to grasp versus four lanes of two directions. So, I'm not an engineer, you know, what can I say. I will say though, that they wanted to put the high schools and the schools in the middle and I was coming down when I was involved with Winnipeg Trails Association and opposing that and I'm so glad I did, but now we have high density, so I don't know, you know, I don't feel like I won on that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes question period. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Finance and Economic Development. Councillor Browaty.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DATED SEPTEMBER 14, 2023**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce and move the report of Standing Policy Committee dated September 14, 2023.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Browaty.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DATED OCTOBER 11, 2023**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of October 11, 2023 and move...I move Report 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Browaty? Seeing none. Next is the Governance Committee of Council. Councillor Eadie, will you move the report on my behalf? It's the schedule of meetings.

**REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED OCTOBER 13, 2023**

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I'll move the one report, Schedule of Council Meetings, yes, Committee Meetings.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Duncan moves adjournment. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, roll call, please.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 5:01 p.m.