

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

Thursday, November 23, 2023

The Council met at 9:53 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

MOTIONS

**Moved by Councillor Sharma,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,**

THAT in accordance with Section 9.1(9) of the Procedure By-law 50/2007, Councillor Browaty be allowed to participate remotely in today's meeting of Council.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have the opening prayer. Please rise if you're able, and we'll hear from Councillor Schreyer.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Schreyer.

ROLL CALL

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Very moving, Thank you. Roll call, Mr. Clerk.

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

INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. We have pages with us today. It is their first meeting joining us here at City Council. Please welcome Koeun Lee from École secondaire Oak Park High School who resides in the Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood Ward and Kosi Udeh from Collège St. Norbert Collegiate who resides in the St. Norbert-Seine...St. Norbert Ward. Thank you and welcome to City Council here today. (applause). We'll now move onto morning announcements. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

Mayor Gillingham: Good morning. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. First of all, I want to Thank Councillor Schreyer for singing that prayer. I think we all admire and many of us envy his voice. So, Thank you so much, Councillor. Last week we hosted the annual Christmas tree lighting at City Hall. And I want to Thank all the Winnipeggers who came out and brought non-perishable bring food items or gifts to support the Christmas Cheer Board. For over 100 years, the Christmas Cheer Board has been helping families across the city by providing much needed Christmas hampers during the holiday season. I spoke to a couple of the members of the Cheer Board who indicated that last year, they delivered 18,000 hampers and this year, they expect to deliver more than 18,000 because the need is so great. So, Thank you to the Cheer Board. Thank you to all the volunteers who participate in making the Cheer Board's delivery possible. And Thank you to all Winnipeggers and all Manitobans who donate to the Cheer Board annually. Although the outcome was not what we were hoping for, I was pleased to attend the Grey Cup on Hamilton. I want to Thank the City of Hamilton for the warm hospitality and putting on a great event. Congratulations to the Winnipeg Blue Bombers, coaches, players and staff on another great season. Many people ask me if we have made or I've made a bet with the Mayor of Montreal. Thankfully, we weren't able to get in touch with one another so there was no bet. I didn't lose any bet, so that's good, but following the Grey Cup weekend, I did stop in Ottawa on Monday with mayors from across the prairies, the mayors of Edmonton, Saskatoon, Regina and representatives from Calgary as well. Madam Speaker, I think I've explained it here, told Council before that on a regular basis the five prairie mayors, we connect on Zoom calls and talk about the shared challenges and opportunities we have in our cities, the five major cities of the prairies share a lot in common. And so, we were in Ottawa speaking with federal ministers, several federal ministers including Minister Dan Vandal as well, talking about some of the pressing issues that our cities are facing like homelessness, addiction, housing and downtown revitalization, really calling upon the federal government to be true partners in helping our cities across the prairies address the needs and seize the opportunities. We also had an opportunity to sit down with the prime minister for a little bit as well

just to reiterate to him, but we had spoken to and talked about with the ministers. So, appreciate that Ministers Vandal, Minister Hajdu, Minister...and others were in the room that day and heard our concerns and our priorities. On Tuesday, I attended the new provincial government's first throne speech. I was pleased to hear commitments from the government once again in throne speech to work with the city to end homelessness, to invest in our downtown and to make changes to municipal funding. And I look forward to continue to work together with our provincial partners on our shared challenges and opportunities. Madam Speaker, around this table several councillors have good relationships with members of the provincial government. And I think those good relationships will be important to kind of foster that ongoing spirit of collaboration and for all of us around this chamber to keep pressing upon the provincial government the priorities and needs of the city of Winnipeg. I had the chance to be with Minister of Housing, Addictions and Homelessness, Bernadette Smith recently as well. Very pleased that she and her colleagues at the Province are on board with a need for one coordinated plan to address homelessness. She articulated her vision is the same to...that we work together on one plan. The provincial government, the City of Winnipeg, the federal government, social service agencies, non-profit groups and community private sector partners all need to be working together in unison on the same plans so that we can make a real difference, a real impact for those who are struggling with homelessness now. Finally, Madam Speaker, yesterday was a really great day, a very special day for all of us here at City Hall. I know some councillors were in a meeting and could not attend, but we were joined by and welcomed the Mayor of Lviv, Ukraine, and some of his contingents as well. Mayor Andrii Sadovyi, he was here to renew our sister city friendship agreement between our two cities. The ceremony was part of a celebration to mark the 50th anniversary of Winnipeg's sister city relationship with Lviv, Ukraine. And it was quite soberly and really put our lives in the context to hear the mayor and others talk about what they are going through. He said right now in their community, he said, "We're not prioritizing your infrastructure projects or other work that needs to be done because every month our city council sends money to the frontlines. The City of Lviv, 30,000 members of that community are men and women who are on the frontlines fighting the war to maintain their independence and to protect their nation against Russia's illegal aggression and war. So it was an opportunity for all of us to reiterate our unwavering support for the people of Ukraine and to continued to stand with them. Our city has deep connections to Ukraine and this renewed agreement serves as the testament to the rich history and shared values between our two cities. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next is our deputy speaker, Councillor Eadie, your morning announcement.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Thank you Madam Speaker. I am...I'm proud to announce that the Ross House Museum and the Manitoba Crafts Museum and Library have won the Governor-General's Award for history award, a history award for excellence in museums. Not often won by small could museums with budgets that we should all be proud of these. Ross House Museum is one museum that we fund, and we actually sit on the Ross family land that was provided to the city. So I would just point that out. So due to the conscientious work of Eric Napier Strong, curator of the Ross House Museum, Andrea Reichert, curator of the Manitoba Craft Museum and Library, and Margaret Firlotte, a community cultural artist. The exhibits went beyond the museum's...sorry, beyond the museum's colonizer presentations of artifacts trendsetting traditional museum practice. Pardon me. And fostering community and inclusion and reconciliation. Pardon my pronunciation, Indigenous and Metis people of Manitoba, māmawihitowin, Ganaagishkwadaadiwin, Asenbli, Rencontre Gathering, which is a gather of beadwork, quilt work, sorry, Indigenous beadwork, embroidery and quilt work. And it was an ambitious initiative by the three individuals. They researched exhibit, brought in people, offered various means for people to interact and even provided a private space for people to examine these pre-1900, well we'll call them artifacts, but they are really cultural artwork. And anyway, I just want to stand proud again. They received the award in Ottawa yesterday on Councillor Sherri Rollins' birthday as well in Ottawa. And can I call this to give an applause to Mr. Eric Napier Strong and Mr. Reichert and Margaret for that? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Next is Councillor Wyatt, and our final speaker, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, good morning, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to have been able to provide, Thanks to Paul Soubry, CEO of New Flyer Industries, a calendar for 2024 to all members of council. We were also able to provide them to our Transit senior staff and Public Works officials at Public Works Committee this week on Tuesday. I want to highlight the fact that the New Flyer Industries is located in the Transcona ward. It had...they have 1600 employees. These are unionized jobs, well-paid positions with benefit plans. New Flyer is an industry which is corporately headquartered here in Winnipeg in Manitoba. It's one of the few fortunate 500 companies that we actually have in Manitoba. They provide products across North America, indeed the world. It's also noteworthy to make a point that they all sold New Flyer a number of years ago, acquired MCI, Motor Coach Industries. So they're not only the largest bus manufacturer for transit services across jurisdictions of North America, they...in terms of highway buses, they are also the largest manufacturer there. And so these are thousands of jobs inside the city of Winnipeg with MCI and New Flyer. And Mr. Soubry has been an integral part of the business community here in the city of Winnipeg, him and his leadership team. And you know, I just want to stress the importance of having an industry like this in the city of Winnipeg that we are trying to deal with climate change and overcome the challenges that we face, but to work with New Flyer to be the hallmark city, the hallmark city, where we could actually promote and offer their entire product lines on the streets of the city of Winnipeg, wouldn't that be

amazing? Especially now they have throughout the calendar, you will see they highlight all of their zero emission buses. They have some amazing products that we have never seen on the streets of the city of Winnipeg, for example, their zero emission double-decker buses and their zero emission articulated buses which we don't have on the streets of Winnipeg. So, these are some amazing...amazing company. We should be very proud that they're located here in the city of Winnipeg. And I would like to take this opportunity, Madam Speaker, to Thank Mr. Soubry for his kind. This is under \$50 just so everybody knows for the integrity commissioner, you don't necessarily have to declare. And Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. Final speaker, Councillor Mayes, your morning announcements.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just rising to solute historic event in our sense, the Dakota Lancers football team has won its first provincial football championship. Former Councillor Pagtakhan is (inaudible) at alma mater. So combination of many years, the new field project going in back in 2017, so congratulations to the players and the coaches. And architects of the whole...of the field project (inaudible) major in (inaudible). They also won the junior for our city so program maybe reloading. They defeated the (inaudible) Grant Park Pirates who made final. It was a particularly odd game to be at the cheer and Councillor Orlikow and I have been trying to work with the Grant Park folks on a running track project, which we're hoping to bring to fruition, and so it was a bit odd to be cheering against them, but Grant Park certainly did very well to get to the final. And hopefully, we will...hopefully, I can atone to the community of Grant Park in the near future for cheering, against them and we will be able to announce something for those folks. So, Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes.

MINUTES

Councillor Wyatt moves that the Minutes of the meetings held on October 26, 2023 and November 1, 2023 be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: We'll now move into delegations. Our first delegation is here in the gallery. If I could please call you down, Chris Clacio. He's appearing in person here in support of Item 20 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 17, 2023. It's regarding the Establishments of a Chief Construction Officer and also in support of Items 3, 4 and 9 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 14. Welcome.

Christopher Clacio: Morning and afternoon, Councillors. Today, I am really honoured and hopefully to finally be able to present in person at City Council and on the record even though I followed what has happened in City Hall for many years, especially running for public office. This is a true honour to speak and just say Thank you for all your service. I would...I would really like to greatly talk about the report from Executive Policy Committee on October 17th, the establishment of Chief Construction Officer and EPC report on November 14th, on No. 9, road procurement audit. During the municipal election in 2022, I talked a lot about city procurement process. And if you see Mayor Scott Gillingham, he...his campaign promises during your time as mayor, congratulations to your council, to you, to your team and to city administration. To Item No. 3, Flexible Workplace Program - Year One Update, someone born in 1992. That makes me a millennial. I would like to briefly mention is that this demographic has outnumbered and outpaced the boomers in the workforce and the job market today, meaning the future of work has changed. And this council needs to make this type of policy and program a higher priority and a higher investment as Council plans for the city's future, well into the future. I have been part of several organizations, community organizations, inter civics Winnipeg, Functional Transit, Yes In My Backyard, Meet Me at The Bell Tower, Prairie Asian Organizers, On (inaudible), which is a new non-profit that I started working on that focuses on web-(inaudible) technology. And so again, talking about the work force in the future technology and future of work is changing. So, I think council really needs to prepare for that future. And to talk about the number...about the poverty reduction strategy. In the municipal election, I talked about, in my platform, I talked about expanding and rebranding the poverty reduction strategy to watch abolishing poverty strategy through local economic development and neighbourhood revitalization through practical urbanism. I know many of the people in the gallery will be talking about the housing accelerator fund and the libraries. And so, when I think about poverty, those resources are so crucial to the future of our local economic development. And I would quickly like to share a book, If Mayors Ruled the World by Benjamin Barber. He talks about how local government is the closest and the most important ways of again civic engagement. And so, I truly

believe this council has the good intentions of seeing this city prosper in the future. And this book is also the reason why I am so engaged in this city hall. And so, I really want to just Thank you to the work that you are doing and when I say abolishing poverty, when I talk about abolishment, it's not...nothing like something scary as like defunding police or not like that. I've worked with an organization called Prairie Asian Organizers. We attack or we address the concerns of the model minority myth. We can talk about that later, but what we talk about is also the movement abolishment, abolishment movement. Is that...it's not about getting rid of police or healthcare or institutions. It's about thinking about the future and what kind of world that we want to live in. So, when people talk about abolishing poverty, I think that is what I believe the city can do. And one of the reasons why I believe this city could end homelessness and poverty, abolish it all together. So, keep up the great work and Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Chris. I will ask you to stay behind on the bench and we will have questions momentarily. Our next delegation is in support of Item 4, the Poverty Reduction Strategy status update and implementation plan. Paul Loewen is joining us via Zoom and he is representing Make Poverty History Manitoba. Welcome.

Paul Loewen: Good morning. My name is Paul Loewen and I come representing Make Poverty History Manitoba and Siloam Mission. And Make Poverty History Manitoba, we have proposed the bolder recommendations for four key areas in the poverty reduction strategy: Expansion of social housing, investing in public safety that addresses the root cause of the crime, anti-racism and anti-oppression training for all City staff and more affordable public transit. What's included in the proposed budget we see as a bare minimum for the City to implement this plan. The four priorities we bring forward seek to end poverty rather than managing. In my role at Siloam Mission, I've spoken to over a thousand groups. One of the biggest questions I get is, "Is homelessness getting worse?" People are looking around seeing visible signs of poverty and getting the feeling that something is off. As good as organizations like Siloam are at housing people, we are working within a context. There are two keywords to demonstrate this. The first is the word, homeless. After World War II, the Canadian Government implemented multiple systems surrounding housing affordability. This worked so well that in the 1960s, the word, homeless did not mean someone living on the street. There weren't enough people to warrant it. In those years, the Canadian Government built between 15,000 and 20,000 units, and coming into the 1980s, things changed. First, we cut the public investment in housing. We believed that the free market would meet the need. Over the ensuing 30 years, shelters began to grow in response to the issue, treating the symptoms but never the root. Second, we shifted to treating housing as an investment through financialization. Homeowners don't want housing to be affordable because the downward pressure of the market might decrease the value of their home and their future financial stability, but the problem of people losing their housing began to grow. Because the word, homeless meant someone with housing, we needed to invest a new word, homelessness. Over time, the two words merged. Today, there is growing pressure to build affordable housing, which brings us to the second word, affordable. According to the CMHC, affordable housing is 30% of a household's before tax income. Most of the affordable housing program that exists today are not actually affordable to the lowest income households. We must instead focus on social housing or rent geared to income. In recent years, affordable housing has meant 702 for a studio, 1,002 for a one bedroom, and 1,259 for a two bedroom. Because affordable is no longer affordable we now commonly use the term deeply affordable. Since 2016, Manitoba has built 800 units of affordable housing quote unquote, fewer than half of those are social housing units. At the same time, Manitoba has lost over 9,000 units with rent below 750. Along with this, we see social housing continue to fall into disrepair or be sold to private investors. As of 2022, there were fewer than 100 units renting from lower than 750 per month. And there are 1200 people currently experiencing homelessness. The math just doesn't add up. Where are those people supposed to move to? At Siloam, we have shifted to being a housing focused organization. That is we work out of the clear belief that housing comes first. And that absolutely every human is houseable. Since earlier this year, we have seen nearly 100 people get housed. We are good at what we do, but we could be better. We are working within a context. That is just last week, I left the conversation with a large shelter in Calgary with my mind blown. Their shelter isn't at capacity. Their context is different. For every 20 low-income folks in Calgary, there are nine social housing units. In Regina, it's eight. In Winnipeg, it's three. The Houston model is not new. We are already doing it. The difference here is that Houston's vacancy rate was 16.5% when they started. Now it's 8.9% Ours is 2.7%. We need to expand our social housing supply. For this reason, as both a representative of Make Poverty History Manitoba and Siloam Mission, we suggest that the housing priorities in the strategy and the housing accelerator fund proposal do not go far enough. The following recommendations are in solidarity with the Right to Housing Coalition: 1. We need to increase the target for social housing to 750 units annually over 10 years, from 1,342 to 2,250 units and the housing accelerator fund. As a reminder, this does not get us back the levels of the 60's and completely ignore the deficit we put ourselves in. 2. All 2,250 units must be targeted to the lowest income Winnipeggers by making them rent geared to income. If these units are not rent geared to income, it's absolutely misleading to call them affordable. 3. All 2,250 units must be non-market housing by public, non-profit co-op or Indigenous led housing providers. We let the free market exclusively build housing between 1993 and 2010, and that's why we're here today. 4. We also call for the City to hire at least seven full-time permanent staff dedicated to development of new social and affordable rental housing as part of the poverty reduction strategy. 5. These changes coupled with more affordable transit, safety investments and community resources, and anti-oppression and anti-racism training for all city...

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

Paul Loewen: We'll go long way towards any poverty, almost done, rather than just managing it. So, homelessness is getting worse. But I don't teach folks about this reality to make anyone feel hopeless. I do it to remind folks that what we do matters. We need to take lessons we learned in the past and apply them here and then go well, well beyond until we forget what the word, homelessness means and we shut our shelters down. Thank you for your time and extension.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Paul. We'll now take questions. Chris Clacio, if you can please come back to the podium. Any questions for either of our delegations on their presentation today? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you. I Thank both of our speakers. Talked about important issue. They're obviously taking seriously. I haven't had a chance to listen to either of them before. I don't recall...and in the case of Chris Clacio, as I've been elected here to municipal politics, I always knew it was important. I realize it is more foundation of our economy and even the federal government has to take more serious consideration in terms of municipal issues and municipal responsibilities and we'll react on the City level. Where can I find that book?

Christopher Clacio: You can borrow this, Jason Schreyer so. I'm happy to give some resources to any city councillors. I have many similar books to this.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you very much. I also have a question for Paul Loewen. And that is, you know, he...I've been talking about this for years. I'm very grateful what he's talking about in terms of we've been in a more progressive era before very notably, very obviously in a more progressive era before. I'm so grateful he's talking about very specifically with real numbers because you can't talk about a budget if you don't want to talk about the numbers. And I'd like to ask to Paul Loewen if he is aware not only is it when we cut services, cut our housing budget that happens to be mysteriously the same time when our federal, provincial deficits soared. Has he taken that...has he made that correlation?

Paul Loewen: I mean that's an interesting correlation for sure and the answer to that is no, but I will look into it. Thank you for asking that question.

Councillor Schreyer: Okay. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentation today, both of you. We'll move onto the next delegation which is Kate...

Christopher Clacio: I'll just need to (inaudible) from this table.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. It's Kate Kehler, Executive Director of the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg. Also here with Michael Redhead Champagne, in opposition to Item 4 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 14. It's regarding the Poverty Reduction Strategy. Welcome. Is Michael here today as well?

Kate Kehler: No, I'm going to make Michael's excuses. He's held up on the North End Renewal Corporation business, so he sends his regrets for not being here, and I'll do my best to bring his point forward. So, good morning. Thank you all very much for the opportunity to be with you today. I'm here to speak in opposition to the Poverty Reduction Strategy report and recommendations only because they do not go far enough. The resource request for just under \$2 million is underwhelming. There are other investments being made such as in libraries. Better libraries should be...should also assist people in poverty. We're in full support of that resource request moving forward as long as the previous recommendations for fully funding the community connections space. at Millennium as well as the expansion of community safety hosts throughout the library system is also going forward. They have both proven to be successful. So, let's entrench those and replicate them. As a Make Poverty History Manitoba partner, we were very involved in development in 2018, Winnipeg without poverty. That work through consultation that brought out hundreds of people and culminated in a packed, marked gym for the launch demonstrated that Winnipeggers wanted the city to step up on poverty. While Winnipeg Without Poverty did make 50 suggestions on what the city could do, it was not a definitive list. It was only meant to demonstrate some of the levers the city has at its disposal to help end poverty. The overall call that's for the poverty lens to be placed on all existing and new policies and practices to end the barriers that too many Winnipeggers face. The current implementational report mentions two SPCW reports that (inaudible) had at Social Planning Council played new roles in. The 2023 street census that furthered the work from the 2018 and 2015 reports demonstrating the over representation of Indigenous peoples in our unsheltered relatives. All street census reports also demonstrate that family breakdown continues to be a leading cause of homelessness. Through the stories...and though the stories, participants told us poverty was often the main stressor in those families. The others, most recent Campaign 2000, poverty...poverty, the province and the pandemic. The statistics that demonstrate how racialized and gendered poverty is in Winnipeg are telling. The City's report also accurately notes that there has been a drop in poverty since 2016. However, I do want to be sure that

you all have the proper context. Campaign 2000 uses tax filer data for more accuracy. However, that means 2022 report is based on 2020 data. Our report clearly demonstrates the largest drop in poverty occurred between 2019 and 2020. That decrease accounts for 75.5% of the total decrease in child and family poverty in Manitoba between 2000 and 2020. The game changer was the pandemic. It took a global pandemic for the federal government to take a hued, but only temporary step forward on providing what many of us saw as a basic income which is the CERB. However, the postal code analysis we did on who receives CERB very clearly shows that the Federal riding with the highest rates of child and family poverty were also the most CERB dependent. Winnipeg Centre and North, in particular, but also Winnipeg South Centre, Winnipeg South and Elmwood-Kildonan. In other words, CERB went to people who were barely getting by. Before the pandemic, and while on paper their income went up, so did their expenses. As other support programs, such as food banks, school food programs, were shut down or limited. Our report also included 2022 data from Harvest which showed that food bank usage has doubled since 2019. However, now we have a Federal Government who is pursuing people for repayment regardless of their ability to pay. We had trouble getting traction for an income tested CERB amnesty in Manitoba because partner organizations feared that if the Federal Government forgave the debt, the Provincial Government would then decide to claw it back. My point is, that the city cannot rely on other levels of government. They have their own agendas and while we continue to work to get them to change, we need the city to step up more, and it can. My colleague, Josh Brandon, refreshed a table that we first table we first presented in 2018 at how the city and its residents could benefit from a more equitable property tax system. The refresh demonstrates the effect of the City's proposed 3.5% tax as well...property tax, as well as an additional 5% increase, and a \$100 rebate for homes valued less than \$350,000. Under this plan, approximately half of all homes would pay less in taxes than under the current preliminary budget plan. A home valued at \$350,000 would see almost the same tax increase as under the existing plan...\$73 increase as opposed to a \$71 increase. This plan could generate approximately \$5.5 million in additional revenue, while also making the property tax system more progressive and equitable. There are, of course, other resource generating opportunities that I would be happy to discuss. This is where I was going to end my comments, but I did want to reiterate the Make Poverty History of Manitoba calls that the poverty strategy goes deeper and the city goes deeper and bolder on the city poverty reduction strategy, particularly on housing. Josh Brandon also submitted in support of the housing accelerator fund...you should all have that on record...we agree with both Make Poverty History Manitoba and the Right to Housing Coalition that the target for the affordable housing needs to increase to 2,250 units. That will mean 750 units for each year, each of the half-funded years, to put Winnipeg on the path to meet the goal of the needed 7,500 units over the next 10 years. All must be targeted to lowest income Winnipeggers, so must be rent geared to income, owned by public, non-profit, co-op or indigenous housing providers. Just as a final heads-up for me, the next campaign in 2024 will be coming out in January or February and poverty is back on the rise in 2021 data. So, Michael was going to address, Michael was also a contributor to the campaign 2000 reports as well as to the alternative municipal budget. He was the co-author on behalf of Fearless R2W for the chapter on indigenous relations and reconciliation. So, Michael was going to point to out the...was going to point to the polling though as well for more information for council that forward the AMB. The CCPA did put out a polling question, "How willing are you, if at all, to pay \$100 more in property taxes per year, which is above the rate of inflation, for each of the following city services?" And of that, 75...74% were very or somewhat willing to spend more on roads, a given. However, the tree canopy came in at 70%, while housing for people experiencing homelessness was at 68%. In fact, four in 10 said they were very willing to spend more on housing and homelessness. And then of course there is the Police Accountability Coalition that demonstrated through a polling question that 62% of Winnipeggers understand that to increase public safety, we have to do more on poverty reduction as opposed to spending more on policing. So, 62% said more on poverty reduction, 19% said more on policing. Michael was going to point out...so given the previous data around who is experiencing homelessness and poverty, who is over-represented in both of those, Michael's question was going to be, so where is Indigenous Relations Department on the poverty reduction strategy? According to the dollar figures put forward, it's only 45,000 a year, which is incredibly low. So, we're not actually asking that or suggesting that perhaps the IRD takes over the poverty reduction strategy at this point, because so many of the community services...the services that can address poverty actually reside within community services. However, we do need the IRD to have the resources to play a much stronger role. So, there is a temporary position there now. We are asking that this be made into a permanent position going forward and to work very closely to make sure that they're connecting with the overall strategy and that they also have the resources to provide them with the autonomy to go out to the community and bring back those priorities to feed them in the future years in the poverty reduction strategy. IRD does need that autonomy, it needs the resources. It doesn't need just more money for projects if it doesn't have the appropriate staff in order to spend it well and bring back that important information. And of course, as you all know, but we do need to keep point out, that Winnipeg is the city with the largest indigenous urban population, and therefore, that always needs to be taken into effect. Thank you very much. The...He was also going to point, again, just the sad numbers from campaign 2000 report around the health effects of poverty, even a short stint of poverty experienced in childhood can have long lasting effects on children. And the...okay...sorry...can have those long-lasting effects. It does cognitive damage. Shouldn't be laughing at that point. It impacts decision making, it impacts impulse control, it means kids are not able perhaps to take best use of the educational system. They can end up in CFS care and eventually of course, unfortunately, also end up in jail, and sadly even dead because our data shows that of the youth who die by suicide, those in the lowest income quintile are more than four times more likely than the other four quintiles combined to die by suicide. So now is the time to address poverty, to dig as deeply as we possibly can, and in 2027, we can look back and say we did more than we even thought we could.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Kate. Thank you. We have questions. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. Topical today, we are hoping and I certainly want to be passing the housing accelerator fund amendments that were heavily negotiated. We applied to the Federal Government as everyone knows for \$192 million. How much we get we will be told hopefully good news if all things go well today, you know, in first quarter of next year. I understand there's calls from community to really increase the units up to 750. Would you agree it's important to land that money first and then maybe perhaps go and look at the percentage allocations critically again? We did so in July. Perhaps that went under the radar, and, you know, is that the order that you two would choose to do things around here?

Kate Kehler: Thank you. It's a really good question because I actually really do understand it was (inaudible), my former colleague, who also pointed out we understand that sometimes accepting money with too many strings attached can feel like it's hampered. But we've also learned that you can also go back to the funder to renegotiate, and that is something that community would be willing to do. This, especially around this particular Federal Government, at least in its early days, who knows where we are right now, they proved themselves to be wanting to work more with municipalities and really actually wanted money to be community-led and actually address the needs of that community as opposed to the cookie-cutter approach such as other federal programs that are out there. So, I think there is room to renegotiate and I think you would have ton of support from community in order to go back and re-look at those percentages and but also to then look at what other constraints that may not match...that may not meet Winnipeg's needs.

Councillor Rollins: With respect to the data that you presented with respect to these Federal programs, the CERB, do you have, you know, (inaudible) in terms of Make Poverty History Manitoba to the Federal Government, Provincial Government with respect to the same issues? We note a unique position in Winnipeg in history where housing money is coming directly to municipalities across the country. What challenges does that present to Make Poverty History Manitoba when traditionally you've been going through Provincial / Federal doors on these program like the CERB structure that you have already advocated that folks are, you know, being asked to repay?

Kate Kehler: Okay, if I understood the question is, do we have levers, do we have ins with the Federal Government (inaudible)? Yes. So obviously there has been a change in the Provincial Government so we are very much hoping that connections that we have there. We certainly tried to work with the past government. We certainly had some ideological divides on a number of issues. This government, we hope we have fewer, but actually the campaign 2000 is a national body, so we actually also have links through the feds... the Federal Government there, and we also have links to our Federal MP's here as well, so those are all doors that we work, and as I mentioned in our report, we still do engage with them as much as we possibly can on the issues that are under their purview such as the CERB amnesty.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Kate for your presentation today. We have another delegation. Thank you, Kate. Michelle Dallmann, if I could please call you down in opposition to Item 4, the Report of the Executive Policy Committee. You will have five minutes on the clock. Following that, we will hear from David Grant via Zoom, and then Albert McLeod. I'm sorry I didn't see your hand. We can ask it of the next presenter if you'd like. Michelle Dallmann, welcome.

Michelle Dallmann: Yeah, I was wondering, would I be able to get an extra couple of minutes or is it just strictly five minutes.

Madam Speaker: There's five minutes and the possibility for an extension.

Michelle Dallman: Okay Thank you. Just let me...

Madam Speaker: We do have a lot of delegations today.

Michelle Dallmann: Oh yeah. All I'll need is a couple more minutes. Good? Awesome. Thank you. My name is Michelle Dallmann. I am here to talk about No. 4 and actually also No. 16, the housing funding. A couple days ago, I presented to the Public Works Committee regarding the ignorant way that graffiti was framed as the reason for lawlessness in our city. The language used by that committee.

Madam Speaker: Yes, I was just going to say, you've been registered for Item No. 4.

Michelle Dallman: Yeah. Yeah.

Madam Speaker: Just No. 4. Councillor Lukes?

Councillor Lukes: There's a level of decorum in the chamber that I'm asking that the presenter adhere to.

Michelle Dallman: I don't understand. Can you explain?

Councillor Lukes: Let her continue.

Michelle Dallman: Is that...okay. Can I have some of my time back?

Madam Speaker: Go ahead. The clock is on.

Michelle Dallman: Thank you I appreciate that. The language used by that committee was problematic. My point was that the lawlessness in the city doesn't come from the people. It comes from inadequate support from government, specifically as a result of the choices made by persons holding seats within the government. You can look at those comments if you need to watch them in their entirety. This reality sits uncomfortable for a lot of councillors, especially it sat uncomfortably for Councillor Wyatt as he vehemently rejected personal responsibility of the effects of the decisions that are made, which is fair. I get that. When I hurt the people that I care about, I also feel ashamed for not doing better by then, but I do not choose to ignore the pain caused by my actions. I choose to change them as much as I am empowered to do so. Now my actions have never resulted in the deaths of anyone, but a lot of the decisions that have been made here indirectly do. And I feel especially saddened for our inner city and downtown representatives whose areas were once again used as a reason why people don't want to be in our city. Sorry, I'm just a little distracted. Thank you. I appreciate that the Public Works Committee, Mayor Scott Gillingham, and various BIZ directors and representatives outside of these neglected areas have unfortunately spoken often about attracting visitors to the outside of our city's core to our city's core. When you come from a more affluent neighborhood, it's easy to dehumanize people living in those poorer neighborhoods. As someone who has made a home across the city, as someone who knows these people very well, I take issue with this classist rhetoric. I have to wonder, when was the last time any one of you came down to talk to our broke constituents or the homeless constituents. Not for political gain, but because they are your people. You don't have to answer that question out loud. I get it, but you should be considering it in every single decision that you make. What do you know about the lives that you are responsible for? What the representatives outside of these neglected areas hold a responsibility specifically to the (inaudible) constituents of their ward. you also hold responsibility holistically to the people of the city. If you are making decisions based solely on the needs of your own constituents, then you are not doing your job. As I stated on the 21st, the root cause of violence, crime and the graffiti is not with the people, but with their circumstances, which may seem unbelievable for anybody under-educated about the reality of reality, but that is why we're here. That's why you have experts to refer to when you don't know what to do. You don't need to know everything and you can trust that your citizens know what they need when they ask for consideration. In saying that, I absolutely support the housing accelerator fund, and I second everything that Kate Kehler has said. Of course, and speaking for those who don't have the words, speaking for citizens who don't have the time or the energy to be here. Speaking for people living on the streets trying desperately just to survive, this vote, this amendment, is life or death again I wanted to do a little thought experiment, kind of exploring what the relationship of the government is with our constituents, and to put it shortly, essentially government, you are our parental figures and us as constituents are your children. If, let's say, in the middle of winter, as mothers and fathers, a minus forty, colder than Mars, thank goodness it's a El Nino year type of winter. Your child is late for curfew, and so to prove a point, like many parents used to do, mommy and daddy decide to lock their child outside of their house or to prevent access to housing, if you want to consider it that way, just to prove a point. But unfortunately, your kid's phone is dead, and their friends are asleep and it's only getting colder because they've had a little bit too much to drink, as we all have. It's only human and alcohol is everywhere.

Madam Speaker: We're going to take questions as well after the presentation.

Michelle Dallman: Okay. Can I get my two minutes?

Madam Speaker: There's no extension at this time. So, if you could wrap up.

Michelle Dallman: Great. Increase the target for affordable housing from 1,342 to 1,250.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy moves extension of one minute. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Michelle Dallman: Thank you, I appreciate that. Thank you. Sorry. I'm new to this. Thank you. I appreciate that. The point of this is that the responsibility that you guys have to our lives is essential that you take very seriously. When we think about neglectful parents, we want to protect our children. When we think about neglectful government, we want to protect our constituents. I know that you guys have the power. It's been proven through the CCPA research, through Make Poverty History, through all of these community advocacy organizations which have done the work for you. Doing and increasing the request for the housing funding and specifically making sure that this housing is dedicated rent geared to income, is going to change the lives of all Manitobans and I know... and Winnipeggers, and I know that the intention of this council is not to put people in danger but to save lives, and I appreciate the extension. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Michelle. If you could stay near by the podium, there are some further questions. Kate if I could call you back. First question by Councillor Schreyer. And we'll continue our question period. There's five minutes left I believe. We should be taking all questions after both speakers. Let's have (inaudible) Kate, are you still here? If you could come forward. There were questions specifically for Kate.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure, I guess I'll combine. I'm not sure quite how to do it. Pleased to listen to Michelle Dallman. We're used to listening to Kate Kehler. Not that we should take her for granted. Glad that you're both here.

Michelle Dallman: I'm sorry, I'm a little hard of hearing.

Madam Speaker: Michelle, the question I believe was if you could get Kate to the podium please.

Michelle Dallman: Yeah, I'm sorry. Yeah, I heard my name...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: I've raised...My wife...

Michelle Dallman: We'll figure it out. Go for it. (inaudible)

Councillor Schreyer: You know my wife and I have raised our family 30 seconds from right across the street from a homeless encampment and a block from another one, and more within five-minute walking distance. That's our neighborhood. I know people even in our own neighborhood believe that the reason our taxes are going up and we're going into further debt is because that's where our money, tax increases are going. It's not. It's not at all kind of thing. But people are convinced about that and I haven't seen us do anything about that to explain where our tax increases are going over the last generation. Certainly (inaudible) doesn't explain anything. Would you think it would be important, in fact essential for our governments, every level of government, including our city government, to explain where our tax increases have gone over the last generation (inaudible) get the impression that it's going towards the services of which we speak now?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Michelle Dallman: In my opinion, I think education is power, and I find that in my experience as well, it is like I said, it's very easy to see something so tragic as people living in the streets and say well where is my money going? Why isn't this fixed? I think there's a lot of privilege in that ignorance, and I think it is extremely important as representatives of the whole of our city to use everything in your power, you know, social media, phone calls, intimate conversations with your constituents, your neighbours. Hear that confusion and use, you know, organizations who are well educated who can support the knowledge of the reality of where our money is going and where it's not going, where it could be better used, and yeah, educate people. I definitely believe that it's empowering, and I think it also not just empowers the people who don't understand what our money is going towards too, but also empowers the people who are affected by that lack of understanding.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Yes, if she could (inaudible) my second question. Kate could add to that.

Kate Kehler: Yes, I would agree, it's very important, and just so folks know, at noon we're going to be holding webinar on the city budget 101, trying to educate people who are on the city budget and how to engage with you folks. So that is happening. Free advertisement there. But no, seriously is that it is very important and I think it speaks to your larger point, and back to that CCPA polling that I discussed earlier is that people are willing to spend taxes if they know, if they see results from the taxes. If they see where it's going and if they see improvement, then they're okay with paying the money. The problem is is they say I pay, I pay, I pay, and every year you come back to me and you ask for more. Unfortunately, with the city budget, you are in a particular bind with the operating budget because it is a pie. You know, there's that saying out there, "human rights is not a pie. More for one doesn't mean less for another", but when we're talking about actual dollars in the operating budget it does, and it does pit different departments against each other within community services. It actually pits the Winnipeg Police Service against other community services, unfortunately. That's how it is. So that's I want you to look at obviously other revenue sources, willing to work with you and the Province to get a fair deal for cities obviously, but, .back to that point is that it is a fact that if the police budget goes up, less money goes elsewhere, and so we need to find the money in order to then to make sure the police budget can go down in a safe and measured way. And that's why dealing with larger issues that better deal with public safety.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer anything further? Next speaker, Councillor Orlikow followed by Councillor Wyatt

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. Thank you both for your presentation. Just want to specifically to Heather regarding the application.

Madam Speaker: To Kate or Michelle?

Councillor Orlikow: Kate, sorry. Kate, so Councillor Rollins commented a little bit about the process going forward so, as we know that the money that's \$192 million is not actually real yet. I'm not sure if it will be that less or \$2. We have no idea at this point. So, when I put a motion forward and I just wanted your opinion on this one, is right now we've earmarked 25% for below market housing in our half report. Is there... (inaudible)

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

Councillor Orlikow: And then to your comment as well that you can always negotiate...renegotiate after. Would it be wiser to increase that 25% to 40% now as we're doing these other amendments regarding blanket zoning, which is part of the amending motion I put forward today?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Kate?

Kate Kehler: I haven't been in your negotiations with the Federal Government, so I don't know what that relationship is like. It's, you know, again, I'll go back to my experience as a not-for-profit. It depends on your funding officer. You have really good conversations with them and you know when to ask and when to put forward, so that, unfortunately, I know it's sounds like a dodge. We need to get to that number, but, and all I will point out, you know, I know the ask is for \$192 million. People are saying, well we might not even get that much. That's the perfect time to renegotiate, because you didn't give us what we asked for so now we have to renegotiate those numbers. So...if...my first...my blanket question though is if trying to renegotiate now is going to stop that money from flowing, then I would say no. I think you need to get the money and then there's time to renegotiate. Governments actually don't like it when you give them money back. They like you to spend it and you can move, as you move along you generally can convince them that you weren't able to fulfill this, but you will do this instead, has been my experience.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I also, and I think most of council and the mayor is the only one who has any knowledge firsthand of the negotiations with the Federal Government where they'll stand on it. But by increasing it to 40%, if the government doesn't like that they can say change that at a later date. Right now we secure 40% would increase their housing to 2,100 if we get the \$192 million, which I would be amazed. It would be very helpful if we did, but, so, I guess, you know, a little of this, a little of that. It depends which way you look at it, but don't you think it'd be good to say, this is really what we honestly, what we believe not that we don't really know...we don't really want 25% but hopefully we can negotiate later. I would prefer, maybe you could tell me...if not. I'm not trying to put you on the spot. I just want your opinion, that today we say, okay, I don't say okay to blanket zoning at all, but we want to make sure that the money's going to affordable housing which, as we know, is important for everybody, so let's put that number in, and then if the government has a problem which I haven't heard of, I read the letter, then we...we can have a debate and maybe Mayor Gillingham will tell us that this is a non-starter. That will also impact my vote going forward, but let's put the 40% in now. And then really, the money will come from private development. (inaudible) developers. That's where I see the money easily being moved from private developers to affordable house. So, I guess my question is, so would it be better to put in a number in you believe in, rather than a number you don't believe in to start the negotiations going forward?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Kate.

Kate Kehler: I think I'm (inaudible) my original answer for that. Sorry. I was just not aware of that negotiation, which to...yeah, I would just suggest you get the money first and then worry about it, because I don't understand why the government would not agree with the level of government most directly involved and again, I can pledge community support.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Thank you very much Madam Speaker. My question to Ms Dallmann. This chamber is one of the few places that you can actually come on the floor and ask questions. You can't go on the floor of the Manitoba Legislature. You cannot go on the floor of the House of Commons, but you can come on the floor of city council and speak to us.

Probably one of the most accessible levels of government. We are the most accessible levels of government. My objection in Standing Committee of Public Works was the terminology used where you basically said that we were personally responsible for the deaths occurring in the city today. You used different wording. You used the word that we were indirectly responsible. So, I take that as a difference in terms of your presentation, and this meeting is recorded by what is called a Hansard. So, I'd like to give you an opportunity to retract your statement that you made at the Standing Committee of Public Works in light of the fact that you made a statement that we are indirectly, not directly responsible for the deaths of people who are living in our streets.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. Michelle.

Michelle Dallman: Thank you. I'm not going to take that back because...

Councillor Wyatt: Point of Order Madam Speaker.

Michelle Dallman: Sorry.

Councillor Wyatt: I would like to ask the delegation to leave the chamber, because that's an insult to the members of this council, and frankly, if she is not prepared to retract the statement, I've given her an opportunity. I'm one of the few members of the council that does walk up Main Street, who's lived in the Main Street Project.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt. Thank you. This is not the Standing Committee...

Councillor Wyatt: (inaudible) and I will not stand here and be insulted by being accused of being personally responsible, neither should any member of this chamber. I ask the member of the public to leave immediately.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, Thank you. This is not the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works where that occurred, but I have heard you, and I will caution the delegation as well. She did mention earlier that it was her...one of her first times presenting this month to city council, standing committee and probably in city council, so I do want to caution you. There is a level of decorum that is expected here in this chamber, and I do want to...you should refrain from making such accusatory comments towards members of council, and I think you're hearing me today.

Michelle Dallman: May I ask a question?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Mayor Gillingham: The time is up on the clock. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: And the time is up. We are going to move on to our next speaker. So, thank you for your presentation today. Our next delegation is David Grant, who is speaking in opposition to Item 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11 of the Report of EPC dated November 14th, and also in opposition to Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee Water and Waste and the Environment dated October 30th, 2023. It's regarding Advanced Water Metering Solution Business Case. David Grant, welcome.

David Grant: Thank you. I'll get started. Thanks again for listening to delegations and Thanks also to my fellow delegates. Usually less controversial, but we all learn a lot here. I hope that everyone will keep the season safe by calling Operation Red Nose if you need a ride home after partying. My wife and I will be volunteering. We invite all listening to join us. This starts tomorrow. To the business at hand. Item 11 - portraits. It is good to display portraits of those who help make Winnipeg a great city. I suggest that we celebrate other folks, like my distant Metis relative Cuthbert Grant with portraits and some text to explain. Without the dedication of the Earl of Selkirk, many of our early residents would not have made the trip. So, we have here this motion is a good thing, but there are many others for us to celebrate. Thanks. On EPC No. 9, Roads Audit. As already explained, there are good reasons to support this request. The audit should also explore the way that delays extend road closures and how those delays are related to a company taking on more work than they can quickly complete. We can take a year to repave part of a street. Fargo repaved the length of Seventh Avenue in a day and a half. Long closures cost road users millions of dollars in wasted time and cripple businesses, as you no doubt hear from your local businesses. Road workers say that proper completion deadlines should be part of every contract. Here's a radical idea. Finish rebuilding one road before closing the only parallel option that transit and drivers have. Voters see the mess. Why do road work contracts not avoid it? On EPC Notice of Motion for an inquiry, as the notice explains, there have been several expensive projects which raised eyebrows over the years. While we cannot ask that everything be investigated, the listed projects are a good start. We also need to explore the soundness of the reasons for each project. If bad folks profited unduly from the execution, were they also involved in dishonesty at the inception of the project. On Community Item No. 3 on bikes, if staff cannot register bikes, should this be run by a for-profit group or volunteers? We register pets

with computers. The owner does most of the work overseen by paid staff. Should bikes be done this way too? We should consider why vehicles are registered. Cars are not just registered to deter theft. Keeping road users safe is a bigger reason. The same reasons apply to bicycle registration. Keeping a record who owns a bike may deter some sales of stolen bikes. It will not prevent theft. The bigger problem with bicycling is injury due to imprudent use. Nothing in item 3 will make anyone safer. You should explore making cyclists safer by requiring adult riders to wear a numbered vest. These have been in use around the world for decades. I wear one at events in the USA. This can easily be linked to the registration of a bike's serial number. Charging a small fee per year for the numbered vest would cover the minimum clerical costs. Wearing a numbered vest will deter cyclists from zooming through stop signs and red lights. It would save lives. On Finance No. 1...Item Number 1 - Entertainment Tax. It's good to see the data reported. You should note that it is a myth that fees collected on tickets are covering the amount handed out each year. Far more money is handed out from taxpayers to artists than is collected from concert tickets. Council should oblige staff to hand out no more money than is collected in a given year. What's the implication of this process? This report makes no mention of how much fund income was reduced by special exemptions. We hear quite often that pro sports teams get exemptions from paying that tax. Sweetheart deals result in the city not collecting tax from certain events. How much have those deals cost us? We don't know. Water Item Number 1. There are a lot of reasons not to do this. Home security is the big one. Others have focused on the EM radiation that new wireless meters may emit. They also decry the way that this pivotal report has not been made public in full. I share that latter concern. The actual meter autopsy data is missing from the public record. We spent a lot of money changing the River Heights meters and analyzing them, but the data is not published, the details. On the other hand, why have so many pricey reports not been made fully public or even offered in detail to councillors? Staff has presented you with a biased report. It suggests that a worn meter is a big problem. It under charges. A problem for the city. It suggests that only if you buy wireless meters for \$135 million, can you solve the problem. It ignores the fact that if you simply replace more of the oldest meters than usual for far less per meter, you solve the same problem at a far lower costs. The report ignores options. Install wireless meters if you want as the old bad ones are replaced. Gradually they will transition to being wireless without doing it in such a big way. The report ignores the other benefits of in-person meter reading. Attempts at tampering or by-passing the meter can better be deterred. If someone knows that city staff will not be back for a decade, you might be tempted to do unlawful things. With annual reading, and a visit by a city contractor, not so much. Unlawful grow operators and other criminals may be deterred by knowing that a meter reader will be coming. This is one of the most widespread data gathering systems in the city. It will be. How can the public be assured that no one will ever hack this data? This week we hear that Bel MTS customer data was stolen. Now that's a high-tech company with a fairly high value that have intellectual property in their records. Unlike hydro meter data, our water use pattern is a clear indication of the occupancy pattern of our residential spaces. For several decades, police everywhere have been saying that the best deterrent to burglars is to make our homes seem occupied. Some folks use timers for inside lighting and even radios and tv. That supports the myth that somebody who is outside the home casing it out, that someone is home. That keeps our home safe. If the criminal world is able to hack in and knows your schedule, when you're at work or on vacation, they can target your home. Wireless water meters will be the best source of that information if you bring in this program. If you decide to throw this much money at new meters, expect security conscious customers to be very vexed with you or to just say no. Many folks want to keep their absences very private. Please do not punish them with new fees. Items 5, 6, 7 and 8. Just a quick mention. Diversion of budgeted funds from buying park land, which is a good thing, to other uses has become routine at City Hall. Many see this as very wrong. I would personally like to see an end to this practice. If you have a need for expenses, we have our councillor own trunks of money, and I'd rather see that used than diverting the land purchase funds. Anyway, that's my little comments for today, and thanks very much for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, David Grant for your presentation today. Our next delegation is Albert McLeod in opposition to Item 12 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 14th. It's regarding Welcoming Winnipeg – Naming/Renaming Assets After Individuals and Groups of People. Our delegation, I believe, is here in person. Welcome to you.

Albert McLeod: Good morning Your Worship and Madam Speaker and the Councillors. A letter was sent to the Council from Dr. Erin Millions about the pending EPC recommendation and its regard to the work that I am involved in for the past few years of the Welcoming committee, committee of community members in naming or renaming parks, landmarks in our city in terms of the city's reconciliation to Indigenous peoples. And so, in terms of the EPC's recommendation, we are asking the Council to reject EPC's recommendation that the report of Winnipeg Public Service be referred for incorporation into the wider review of the Welcoming Winnipeg process in 2024, in order for the matter to be considered as a whole, and instead support the Public Service's recommendation That the Welcoming Winnipeg: Reconciling our History Policy be amended as per Appendix C of this report. This amendment reflects research including a survey of existing naming policies in major Canadian cities conducted by Indigenous relations, an assessment of public feedback in Winnipeg applications and extensive discussion of the committee. So, because these guidelines are still in flux, the committee has decided to pause any of the applications around individual or group naming until there is clarification or this has moved forward with the city council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now take questions if there is any for the delegation. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I'd just like to, more of a thank you for your service.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Albert McLeod, thank you for your presentation today. Have a great afternoon. Next, we have Tim Comack, representing Ventura Developments Inc. in support of Item 16 of the Report of EPC dated November 14th. It's regarding the Housing Accelerator Fund. Our delegation will be presenting via Zoom. Mr. Clerk, are they here? Welcome Tim Comack.

Tim Comack: Hello. Thank you for having me today Mayor, Council, Speaker. I wanted to speak today about the Housing Accelerator Fund and the associated requirements behind it and the decision that's being made today. I want to remind everyone today at the meeting about the HAF is the application process, the funding that will follow from that process. Also, I'm sure (inaudible) we understand that the municipalities demonstrating the growth will be the very municipalities that the federal government will continue to invest in, for infrastructure, transit, etc. Both the leader of the opposition and the Prime Minister have been quoted in saying this. So, to me this means that the decisions today are for a bigger, far greater than the HAF funding being contemplated. The magnitude is substantial and deserves careful consideration as to whether doing what's right leads the decision making versus pandering to politics of the minority, and in some cases, that can include the building community like myself. I want to talk about the implications of by right four floors. I think that's the bogeyman in the room, and specifically the fourplexes. I want to make sure that we speak to what those (inaudible) are. It's my distinct belief that you will not be seeing a proliferation of fourplexes at four storeys in height, and I'll explain that to you. (inaudible) from three floors to four floors are significant. I've spoken our architects and engineers and a number of other professionals that we work with. It would be nonsensical to develop a fourplex on four floors if you can accomplish it on three floors, which you can. The costs are huge, and this will impact the decision making. From three floors to four floors it all goes from part nine simple housing to part three commercial code, significant increases (inaudible) for engineering, architectural, HVAC, the electrical, barrier free design and fire separation amongst many other considerations. You know, for an example part nine housing, it contemplates private residences. Part three of the commercial side of it contemplates public access in a very high level, with many other contemplations, but by way of the public access and, you know, the involvement of a broader community use of the building it greatly increases the scope of these building specifications and requirements and ultimately those drive costs up significantly. So, as a result, I appreciate (inaudible) of duplex, triplex, maybe even fourplexes on likely three floors maximum. You won't see a proliferation of four-story buildings in the middle of River Heights, I assure you. Mark my words. In fact, I'm happy to review this if this moves ahead a year from now. For four-story buildings of greater unit counts, I want you to understand your building permit process will cover off a significant amount of the review criteria and provide ample opportunity for your city input. The processes for part nine building permits, simple housing is, you know, three to six weeks notwithstanding the odd glitch in the system or if something unique is being introduced to the (inaudible). You can easily extend part three housing, so complex four story and up buildings. You can extend that to three to four months or longer, and the review criteria are substantial. And the number of professionals involved on both sides, the developer side and the city side are also substantial. Engineers, architects, geotechnical, you name it. It's substantial. And there's a lot of opportunity there to handle a lot of the concerns that might relate to what's being done. I've also heard some statements, moving on, about made in Manitoba solutions. I'm not a fan of hearing that. I hear that and I think it's kitschy phrase that (inaudible) result in the watering down of what this HAF process could achieve. I hope we don't get sucked into these catch phrases. It only serves (inaudible) the politics of the day. I'm hoping that leadership (inaudible). Now, I also think as a business person in this opportunity, I've mentioned this in the past, but the opportunity to change the working dynamics at the City of Winnipeg and (inaudible) community and focus on some big picture thinking that often we don't have time for. I mean, that's demonstrated in many different facets of our interactions through our various organizations, UBI, HBA, you name it, Manitoba (inaudible). There's a lot of really big, big picture work that needs to be done. You know, folks (inaudible) poor services as an example. But as a business person, I'm often left wondering countless person hours that to go into producing visionary documents like OurWinnipeg (inaudible). It's monumental. I know the cost is huge. And then, the public open houses, the workshops, the surveys, and then the administrative time to correlate all that data and put it all together. And then all the council time that goes into that, then to then be replicated for, you know, a smaller scale neighborhood plan, secondary plan, PDO, where the same thing happens - open houses, workshops, surveys, and then administrative time, to then ultimately to be in a position where the administration is writing reports supporting a project. And I think the amount of time that goes into writing reports to support a project is substantial and I think often revealing with projects that would (inaudible) and advance forward, likely because in the majority, they meet vision of the community, and meet the vision of Complete Communities and OurWinnipeg, our Neighbourhood Plan Appeals. The amount of time that goes into dealing with these things. As an example, writing reports, fielding the calls, the time at community committee, etc. For me, I look at that effort in organizing these public hearings, possessing minutes, documenting, following through on the associated administration of an approval. In many cases, the process and application I previously met stated that the intended vision of these plans with minor adjustments based on unique attributes of real estate or to deal with, what we can all agree is an outdated zoning by-law. I urge you, keep these resources in place. This isn't a situation where to eliminate this workload, and there isn't work to be done. There's a substantial amount of work still left to be done; in fact, I think the more meaningful work. Also, I think that in many cases they need even further support, and I'll touch on that in a minute. Infrastructure studies, updating existing plans. Think of all the different work currently not being accomplished

that we talk about throughout the year. I think also the idea that there's an opportunity to increase level of customer service walking larger projects forward hand-in-hand, making sure that these investments are ultimately achieved, and (inaudible) long-range plan and ultimately getting ahead of the curve instead of being behind the curve as we often see. And then I look at the opportunity here to invest even further in the (inaudible) administration at City Hall, and I do support that request. I do think that our infrastructure needs some bolstering. To utilize this opportunity to focus on the resulting needs of the community as infill increases, generating policies, procedures, guidelines, requirements and control mechanisms to ensure good infill proliferates. I'm a fan of that. Good builders, all good builders, should be a fan of that. And I'm often amazed as (inaudible) of a larger sewer and water business, that we are (inaudible) need a license to cap a private sewer water line. We need licenses to do curb cuts and repair some sidewalks after we've fixed something, deal with road work and other items as we do sewer work. As an owner of a larger multi-family business, we need a license to subcontract with a demolition company, a license that just basically updated through the city, yet as a builder in the City of Winnipeg, there are no requirements. Anyone can do it. And I think a lot of problems stem from that. I've mentioned this in the past, that the requirements to build a Ladco, Marathon, Qualico, Waterside, Genstar, or Ventura subdivisions are far more onerous than what is required to build in the infill requirement environment. And I happily volunteer my time to help the city generate the normal criteria found in in Greenfield Communities and the right size that for infill. I want to make that clear as a partner here in the process and be happy to volunteer my time to help ensure that we bring to the infill all the control mechanisms and guidelines and requirements that help Greenfield happen smoothly. And bear in mind, you as the city require planners, lawyers, engineers, architects, accountants, demolition contractors, as I mentioned...

Madam Speaker: One minute.

Tim Comack: Sorry?

Madam Speaker: One minute left.

Tim Comack: Okay. Roadwork contractors, sewer and water contractors, so many more demonstrate the capacity for that to work. I urge you to rethink your approach to builders here as we grow the infill environment. If I could ask for a two-minute extension.

Madam Speaker: Moved by Councillor Chambers. All in favour? Contrary? Carried?

Tim Comack: Last but not least, I think what has to be considered is, as the infill proliferates, there's something that's also missing, a missing piece that hasn't been contemplated, and that's infrastructure increases for the councillors themselves that we deal with this associated growth. I do think that some consideration by the mayor, by council, by the administration, should be put forward about the resources that are required to be a councillor operating in a community that has greater loads on them, pressures on them for infill. We can speak about the pressures Councillor Mayes has experienced in Glenwood and the likelihood that his phone rings many more times than most as a result. And so, if this does go forward, my last act...my last point to bring forward is that you contemplate that using some portion of this funding or other funding to bolster the resources the councillors themselves have to deal with the community-at-large and ensure they are able to actually respond and adequately have the support in place to deal with the growth as it happens. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Thank you Mr. Comack. I'll ask you to stay in the background please. We're going to hear from the next delegation, and then we'll take questions momentarily. Next, we have Dylan Martin on the same topic. He's in support of the Housing Accelerator Fund item before us. We'll have five minutes on the clock. Dylan Martin, if you could come down to the podium. Thank you. And then we'll take questions for both speakers. Following that we'll hear from Kelly Ryback. Welcome, Dylan.

Dylan Martin: Good day, city councillors. To start off, I'd like to tell you a bit about myself. I'm an off-reserve citizen of Barren Lands First Nation, was born in Winnipeg and grew up in with the North End where I lived with my father until we moved to Thompson for my grade 8 and grade 12 years. I moved back to Winnipeg for post-secondary education during a time of disastrously low vacancy rates for renters, seeing the effects of an overly tight rental market on tenants, and doing a story on the topic for The Uniter. For all my time in Winnipeg, I have lived in mature communities, including the North End, Lord Roberts, the Talbot-Grey part of Elmwood, West Broadway and the Chalmers section of Elmwood. I see the promise and potential of mature communities under a policy agenda that focuses on smarter growth and renewed public and private reinvestment. Informed by this perspective, I urge city council to end exclusionary zoning in Winnipeg. Exclusionary zoning has been a nightmare for affordability and growing the rental housing stock and has prevented instrumental infill intensification and adaptation to changing needs in mature communities. Exclusionary zoning makes low-density Greenfield sprawl which over extends our infrastructure burden and can result in the clear cutting of agricultural and forest land on the fringe of the city, the most lucrative path of least resistance for developers who care about maximizing returns. Exclusionary zoning, which enforces single-family homes, is the only option in much of the city. It

doesn't serve many people's needs, particularly multigenerational households. I have older relatives who live in multigenerational households including one who lives in an attached secondary suite. It's an important arrangement for fostering family connection including through child minding. According to the Vanier Institute of the Family, Indigenous people and newcomers, both growing shares of the Canada's population, are more likely to live in multigenerational households. If we do the three zoning reforms recommended by the Federal Housing Minister, Sean Fraser, Winnipeg stands a better chance of getting \$192 million in Federal Housing Accelerator Fund dollars. The Manitoba Right to Housing Coalition has soundly argued for the need to earmark more of this funding for deeply affordable to those with low incomes, rent geared to income social housing homes. I would reiterate this request. Winnipeg city council must, of course, approve the three Minister Fraser recommendations to stand a good shot at getting the \$192 million in the first place. Some think a plan made in the supposed maritime megopolis of Halifax is just too bold for Winnipeg. I don't think so. Council needs to approve the additions to the Housing Accelerator Fund application. Let's do it for ourselves, for our families, for our colleagues and for our extended brothers and sisters across the city. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Dylan Martin for your presentation, and I'll call Mr. Comack back as well. We have a bit of a list going. Questions from Councillor Wyatt, Councillor Lukes and then Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Madam Speaker. I rise to first ask Mr. Comack a question. Putting aside the fact, Mr. Comack, that we have no administrator report attached to the motion that we're being asked to vote on here today, putting aside the fact that we are giving as a right, zoning based on a letter from a minister who has obviously no experience in development industry and he's advocating four units and saying at the same breath that if they could be four storeys high. Putting aside the fact that we as a council have not determined clearly or not understanding yet what the public hearing process will look like. Putting aside the fact that this has been brought forward with very little public consultation in advance, and you sir know what public consultation you've been asked to do in the past with regards to your development applications. Putting aside the fact that the planning department doesn't really have the resources or the capability, it seems right now, to be able to handle existing applications.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. The specific question now?

Councillor Wyatt: I'm...yeah I'm getting to that. Putting aside those facts. I've got a meeting with the director tomorrow about some application going forward. A developer was able to hire a draftsman versus an architect, and you've been forced to hire architects in the past to make sure it's done right. Now, putting all those and many other facts aside, you have never objected, in my mind, to having to pay for land dedication charges when you do an application. You have never, as a developer, objected to having to pay for service upgrade requirements where they're warranted. Do you have any forgiving? Do you see this as kind of a quick through the backdoor way of the development industry?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt. Specific question. The questions and answers will come through the Chair.

Councillor Wyatt: I'm asking the question. I'm asking the question. I appreciate that. Sorry Madam Speaker. Through this Chair, Madam Speaker, do you see this maybe as a back door for the development industry to avoid LDR, to avoid service requirements because as a right, means exactly that. Or do you believe that we should have the ability to ensure that the policies and the procedures of the past are applied as they have been based on good solid municipal policy?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Tim, your opportunity to answer.

Tim Comack: So I think I understand the question. I think that you're globbing onto the current tool that you use in the development approval process, and trying to deal with the fact that's where you're able to get (inaudible). I'd suggest you work with new provincial government to change where you're able to do so and how you're going to be able to do so, and that it shouldn't eliminate the opportunity here. I'd go a step further. Too often these requirements are pretty small in the scope of projects that we conduct. Over on Grosvenor it's \$100,000 waterline extension and that absorbs into, you know, a properly design project. We've never fought this stuff historically. So in response, no, I don't see this as a way for the development community to go through some back door, in fact I take offense to that statement. We're professionals much like your administration is a team of professionals. You're a professional, and we're happy to make our contributions towards growing a better city, and in all cases, we need to be at the table. We come to the table. So no, I don't see this as some nefarious federal developer approach to go through the back door, and I'd suggest that we work with you as an organization through (inaudible) and HPA to accomplish the goals and objectives that you need to accomplish to give yourself the certainty that where you have servicing issues, those can be addressed through the building permit process and if not through that process, then I'd urge you to look at \$192 million up to that you're being offered, and when we're talking about these issues, they are quite small dollar-wise considering the additional infrastructure investment that would follow from the federal government should we demonstrate the growth. I think we're talking about the pennies, not the dollars here. But I understand your perspective and I respect it.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Comack for your response, and as a way, correct me if I'm wrong. What you're saying is that the LDR has not posed a problem in the past, and, therefore it's something that should be somehow considered to going forward, even if you have as a right, but it should somehow be built in, and secondly, that the requirements for servicing with regards, especially since we just redid the development agreement parameters and those issues have been...were sorted out and confirmed again in terms of service obligations should also be upheld. That's how I read your response. Is that fair to say?

Tim Comack: Speaking on behalf of Ventura, I've got no issues with either of those. We quite frankly enjoy contributing to the growth of this city and don't look to skirt any of our responsibilities at any time. In the end, the consumer pays, so just bear in mind, all these costs that you littered down on a proper developer, in the end, you know, it gets financed by a bank, not once but twice, and the consumer pays it, so, we talk about housing affordability. These are the very things that have escalated the housing affordability. The city needs to zero in on its support services and focus in on benefit of growth on existing infrastructure and do some form of analysis that is to look at benefit could be to the tax base instead.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, and it's actually to Mr. Martin. I want to Thank you very much for your well thought out and professional presentation Mr. Martin first of all. And it's more an "are you aware" and if you're not aware, I fully understand why, because it's happening very quickly, but are you aware that let's say we get the \$192 million, from the briefings that we've had, that approximately \$72 million or 30 only 30% is going to go to actual affordable housing to make it available for people who are low income or struggling to get housing, to actually get housing, quality dignified housing. That there's a good chunk of the money, the majority of the money that will be actually used as a subsidy to the very for-profit developers that you were talking about. Is that something that you would support?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Dylan.

Dylan Martin: So my understanding again with the caveat of having not been in any of the briefings that you have been in, or others on the Mayor's votes, others at city council or on the Mayor's team, is that the big policy objective of the federal government is getting municipalities to do this zoning reform and land use reform, so with the Housing Accelerator Fund dollars being the carrot to get action on this front from municipalities. So, I would say not entirely clear on what the plan is for spending the money. I think that the feds again would probably be open to working that plan around to increase the rent geared to income, the portion of it going to rent geared to income because they just want you to do the zoning and land use reform. So that would be my response.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Lukes followed by Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you Mr. Martin for your presentation. I really appreciated it. I really appreciated hearing your perspectives and your stories about families. It's my understanding that we will have the opportunity, if we do secure the funding, to then make another decision on how much will be affordable, how much will be leveraged by private developers, so I guess it's not really a question, it's more a "did you know" I really appreciated your presentation. I do have a question for Mr. Comack. Mr. Comack, Thank you very much. I am glad you, too, realize that what's before us today is basically supporting an application. That's what's before us today that we're going to vote on is supporting an application, requesting \$192 million. We don't know if we're going to that or not, but that's what it is. And I appreciate you addressing the bogeyman in the room from the standpoint of the fourplex and helping councillors who may not be as much involved with development that the scope and cost implications related to four storeys, four units really, really...aren't going to be the devastation in neighborhoods that I think everyone thinks is going to happen because of the complexities and basically the cost related to doing a fourplex that can be done four units on two and three stories, so I appreciate you addressing that.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes the specific question please.

Councillor Lukes. My question to you, Mr. Comack, and I think this will be...maybe you can answer it, maybe you can't. I've asked the department, it's a bit difficult. How...like the funding that will go to private developers will leverage additional units, so, you know, if they had 100 million, let's say they have 100 million, is it...do you have any idea how much more it would leverage because this is really a stimulus into our economy.

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

Councillor Lukes: Do you have any idea what it would leverage? I mean, it's going to leverage more. It's a hard...I know it's a hard question.

Tim Comack: Well you've put me on the spot. So, what I do know is the application that was made, I sat on an advisory from BDI and HBA to help the city with that, and the initiatives that were put forward were all collectively agreed upon as very important initiatives, so both (inaudible) resources, technology improvements, permit and possessing timelines, etc. I don't see this as a subsidy to developers. Frankly speaking, we're trying to generate outcome here for consumers, for people to own a home or to live in a home in a housing shortage. I did a quick analysis on where our company is at as of the slowdown we've seen (inaudible). Substantially slowed down in the city of Winnipeg market, some would say up to 70%. But our large houses are still selling, you know, 1,800 and 2,200 square foot homes. Those are being built still. Everything else isn't, and that's the debt servicing issue that we have on our high interest rates that you see. \$100 million, if properly spent could leverage thousands of additional units. It would be a once in a lifetime scenario should that money be properly deployed and the resources put in place so it doesn't, become chaotic and handle the manner that we focus development, deal with infrastructure issues that are entitlements to development and try to work together as a team. I have respect for everyone that sits around the council table there, Mayor included, the Speaker included. I think all of us have different vantage points and viewpoints that, if everybody in the industry and council at large came together, we could work together and create a really magnificent outcome for the City of Winnipeg that I would think would be once in a lifetime.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Do you have a second question Councillor Lukes?

Councillor Lukes: Sure, sure. It's more of a "did you know". So, I've had the opportunity in the Waverley West Ward that over the last five years has been one of the fastest growing wards in the city, to work with many in the development community, and it's more of a "did you know". I really appreciate the investment of locals in our economy. I really appreciate the relationships that we have with city builders, because you are city builders, you are partners in developing this city, and I know that, you know, there's a lot of people, a lot of organizations, a lot of industries that get a bad rap around here, but you are a city builder and I really appreciate it, to all development community. I really appreciate what is being done to help build more housing in our city.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Lukes. Question for Tim Comack.

Tim Comack: Collectively we, as an industry, appreciate hearing that from council and the leadership of the Mayor himself, bringing forward that message in this new era. It's greatly appreciated and embraced (inaudible). We really appreciate the fact that we have a council that we can all work with collaboratively and I think we continue to work collaboratively, and together, even where we don't see eye to eye, I think we can accomplish some pretty great things.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Madam Speaker. I have a question for Mr. Comack. By way of introduction, I want to Thank Mr. Comack who has been one of the few people in this entire debate, perhaps in addition to Councillor Allard, one of the few people who have been consistent in this entire debate. And I want to Thank Mr. Comack for acknowledging what the Planning Department seems unable to realize, which there have been some problems in Glenwood. I'm told by the people in the Planning Department we think it's been a success. I say, I've gotten a thousand complaints. They say we don't get those calls. So I want to actually commend Mr. Comack, and I'm hoping, and I'll be asking Mr. Jack about this later that he's right. That the...keep some of the benefit local clause, and Thank you for mentioning that, should be in when we do the zoning work in 2025. It's not clear to me if that is, but I'll have my chance to ask Mr. Jack. My question is...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes moves five-minute extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, well without John Blumberg here for me to joist with, I'll have to talk with Tim, so, but, and I...you've also pointed out the gross inconsistencies, which have bedeviled this place. I mean you've been here when we have the Planning Department drop the heritage conservation district on in the middle of the night, the night before a hearing. The night before the wrecking balls come in on Wellington Crescent. You very much pointed out the inconsistencies there. So that is a fair point. So Thank you for recognizing that it hasn't been a bogeyman in Glenwood. There actually have been real problems. My question is, you talked a bit, not today, but on the radio, about problems with the infill guidelines. I voted for those. I've tried to live by them. Frankly this will leave them in rags, but I guess we'll see what survives into the zoning process. What were your issues with the infill guidelines? You had made some comments about that. I'd be interested to know.

Tim Comack: It's not what your professional planners at the Planning Department would've put forward as a best foot forward, notwithstanding the intervention of politics and the resultant politics that detected those guidelines, often watered down what the Planning Department likely would've put forward otherwise in investment, so under \$100,000 was invested if you factor overhead in cash, whereas cities like Edmonton are leading the charge on this. Spent \$800 to \$1 million on

resources, the number of staff that are allocated to it. I think, you know, hit pause on that statement. You'd mentioned some issues associated with the Planning Department. Frankly speaking, when you are grossly under-staffed, these are the outcomes. You get people that are doing their best to keep their fingers in the dam. And so that's why I continue to go back to investing in this very valuable resource at the city, that the city planned, the city built, future build, and to take visions forward, you need much more investment there. The infill guidelines have chased a lot of prolific infill builders away. They'd moved their business out of infill as a result. You reduced heights, you took them from 35 feet allowable to under 28 feet. You mandated a number of risers out of the ground, so you kind of ruined the quality of the (inaudible) environment for those living in a basement suite. There's a whole series of other issues that relate that I'd be happy to sit with you, explain to you that we're walking backwards, existing rights to get a document in, (inaudible) quote your Planning Department incremental changes to be made over time to improve them and get them to where they would like them...that's what happened with the infill guidelines that I sat on the committee for.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Tim.

Tim Comack: Notwithstanding the fact that we needed that instrument, and that the bigger picture was at play. Being involved in that process, that portion of that process was a little upsetting to me as a developer to see it happen. Otherwise though, working with them, I saw how talented of people you have at your disposal, and I put it akin to a doctor. A planner should be treated like a doctor, (inaudible) walk in to the doctor's surgical room and say, hey, you are fixing that knee wrong or that heart surgery, you should, you know, go through this vein instead of that artery, etc. I suggest that the planners, if left alone, would do some pretty exceptional work for the city.

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

Councillor Mayes: I think others have questions. So no I want to thank...Tim's done a lot of work over the years, and I do want to indicate my frustrations with the Planning Department should not be laid at the feet of the current head of the Planning Department who is relatively new. My frustrations with the seeming denial of reality around some of what's happened really relates to others things, and I've said in the past that I think (inaudible) and Devin did rather a good job on the infill guidelines...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, any questions for our delegations?

Councillor Mayes: Thanks Tim.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Tim Comack: I agree, I think they did exceptional given the tools that are given.

Madam Speaker: Next speaker. Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. I was dealing with a professional doctor and took all his advice except for one thing which was too much of a risk for my personal perspective. But, Madam Speaker, I have two simple questions. The first one is, do developers and builders base their decisions on return on investment?

Madam Speaker: This question is for Tim?

Councillor Eadie: Either one of them.

Madam Speaker: Tim or Dylan.

Tim Comack: That's one criteria. IRR, internal rate of return, return on equity, cash on cash, whether or not the bank will finance it, whether (inaudible) a private investor to actually put capital into it, whether or not it's buildable. There's a whole series of criteria. Yes, we are individuals that seek to make profit and that's how we pay our overhead and justify our work. I don't think that "profits" is a dirty word, and anyone that are wearing clothes today, unless we bought them, you know, off of (inaudible), I would guess that...I mean nobody could buy clothes without profit being generated. Everything we do, this whole world, is generated by profit, so to ignore that is silly. Respectfully speaking.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I don't think "profits" is a dirty word. Return on investment's important. I'm a business admin grad and understand it. My next question, Madam Speaker, is that, my next question is, is there actually an ability to make a decent return on investment in neighborhoods like William Whyte where you have streets like Manitoba,

Magnus, Pritchard, or like Stella or Flora in the Dufferin neighborhood? Is there a possibility to make the kind of return on investment you are looking for without any subsidy?

Tim Comack: Well that's a demand-based question. So, it's challenging right now because the willingness to pay on the dollar (inaudible)...

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

Tim Comack: So, the rule I was taught in business, and sorry, I wasn't trying to say that you thought "profit" was a dirty word. I was trying to make sure that it was being made clear by me that that is my feeling. The truth is, is that you have to first serve demand where it is, and that's grossly underserved due to exclusionary zoning practices that have proliferated the growth of our city for many, many years. I'm sure communities of Winnipeg are hindered by it in a very big way, and I think if you want to see growth in the broader communities in the areas that maybe have lesser demand you have to first serve the demand that exists for areas that people do want to live in and can't find the right housing. But ultimately in the end the answer would be yes, there is. Just at a lesser scale than other areas.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, anything further? Councillor Orlikow? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We heard that it's a chance of a lifetime, and in a sense, it is. That another very real sense it's not new at all. This used to be normal. In my life time. The lifetime of people here. In a non-hypothetical way, it was normal. In the 1970's, in this city, without the (inaudible) of the Provincial Government, we did a thousand affordable housing units a year. A thousand a year. And I mean that. It came down to within the Province of Manitoba. It was an eight-year period from 1969 to 1977, at least that's when the starts were, 14,000 affordable housing units. Bear that in mind. So, we're calling this a chance of lifetime, because we're not as much of a progressive era anymore as we. We're considering this a special moment. That's so unprogressive, the era we are, that we're living in today, so how do we explain this to taxpayers when their taxes have gone up and their services are gone down? And we have gone further into debt. Wouldn't we like to know, and this is a question for both, whom I got to see twice in the last two weeks about town, Tim Comack and Dylan Martin on different occasions, but now to be able to ask questions on a very serious conversation. Don't we think that taxpayers deserve to know why this is unusual and why we look at what we have to do to get the money to apply, to maybe get the chance to get the money. Don't you think taxpayers would like to know, should know, have the right to know, better know, why we are in these circumstances now but to do such a this is unusual now, even though our taxes have gone up, our services are going down, and we're going further into debt. Don't you think the taxpayers deserve to know why this is such unfortunate circumstances we have to go through this process? Question for both our delegates.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Dylan?

Dylan Martin: Yeah, I guess speaking personally, yeah, it would perhaps be beneficial to inform taxpayers of, yeah, the changes in housing policy over the last 30, 40 years. The Federal Government getting out of housing in a big way in the early '90's, downloading on the provinces and cities with much less fiscal capacity than the national treasury, and that ripple ricocheting councils and even provinces to some extent, can't raise revenue as efficiently, especially in middle and lower income provinces. Yeah, so I think, yeah, informing the public of that would be good. I would say that sort of you reiterate what the Executive Director of the Manitoba Non-profit Housing Association told the Executive Policy Committee on November 14th, is that this Housing Accelerator Fund, the direct funding that hopefully is up for social housing homes is a big part of it, but even the Federal Government's main objective with this the zoning and land use reforms, those will make it easier both for for-profit developers to build homes and for non-profit developers to build infill multi-family infill homes. And yeah, just to sort of circle back to Eadie's question. If they're a for-profit developer, they're doing it, return on investment. Non-profit developers, what they can get funding for and what won't absolutely destroy them.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing the time, let's move on to the next delegation. I Thank you both for your presentation today.

Dylan Martin: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Yes, Thank you. Our next delegation is Kelly Ryback. He is in opposition to Item 16 of the Report of Executive Policy Committee dated November 14th. It's regarding the Housing Accelerator Fund. Welcome.

Kelly Ryback: Thank you Madam Speaker. I'm not in opposition of pursuing the money. I'm not in opposition to densification or development. I represent three generations of home renovators and home builders. As far as densification, I grew up in a duplex. It's not NIMBYism. We didn't have a backyard, but what I'm in opposition of is as of right. Losing the opportunity for consultation. I'm in opposition of putting us under, with the status quo, and I'm in opposition of the criteria

that the Federal Government is placing on this. I purchased my home because of the size, affordability, location and the neighborhood. By this, I would lose the right to be notified if a fourplex is going up beside me. I would lose right to influence how that is done. My property value would go down. What I also see is, in St. James, there is a large quantity of infills, especially in the older areas. The target for infill with this going through, the price will go up, which will affect its affordability. I should be notified. Then also, if you go to as of right, then I need to have the confidence that the pins in the new by-laws are in place so that the Property Department will fully adhere to them and only approve these plans that are deemed acceptable ahead of time by the community through consultation. We've heard that, well other jurisdictions have it, but our jurisdiction, that's not an apples to oranges...that's an apples to oranges comparison. We don't know their by-laws were. We don't know what their by-laws are now. We don't know how those Property Departments do business, and they certainly, except for Regina, don't have our weather. Yesterday, I was speaking with a highly regarded delegate prior to the Property Standing Policy Committee, and I asked the situation, do you have affordable single-family home, and it's acquired for infill, and then they want to do a duplex or a fourplex or beyond? He stopped me and said, once you introduce new construction, it is no longer affordable. Then at SPC, he went on to talk about the quantity of boarded up properties, vacant properties, derelict properties that are sitting there. Things that go to tax sale. If you want to accelerate infill housing, affordable housing, then why not change it so that boarded up houses can only have that permit for one year and then have to move on it. Something needs done. There are hundreds of properties that are boarded up, all throughout the city. Council touts the need to maintain the tree canopy. We have the thousand green space pledge, we have the million trees, a new motion that came up from Community Services to protect our trees. Yet with infill, we see entire lots being excavated, trees cut down and replaced with structures that are two, three times the footprint and solid concrete at the back for parking. Thousands of cubic feet of biodiversity destroyed on these kinds of projects, be it to go to multi dwelling or just stay with single infill. That's...all of those things fly in the face of your pledges. Your Montreal pledge, your thousand acres and your million trees. Now let's talk about the performance of the Property Department when it comes to rezoning and permits. I did submit in writing with examples that are published. But here's what I feel. And I, you know, going back to councillors at the last EPC meeting and then the Council meeting, expressed the need that consultation needs to exist. But also, the councillors have been critical of property. I know the situation where councillors called the property owner to apologize for what the Property Department put them through. So, we were finding is that the Property Department is inconsistent. Minimum requirements are not required. They do variances on request. They build up the lots that disregard the neighbor. You'll get your permit when they feel like it. In character with the neighborhood? Ah, in character be damned. Who cares about what goes up? And, go twice as big and twice as expensive as what's around the neighborhood. Completely disregard for the neighborhood. Why does it take so long? I've seen between first and second reading, eight months go by. After second reading, eleven months later, there's no permit. We want to accelerate, or just also the victim of de-acceleration fund, as Councillor Mayes put it at EPC. That people are now going to sit on their projects because of what they could do and not have to go through if this goes through with as of right. Focus on, yeah pursue the money, have your own solution, focus on converting commercial to mixed-use or empty use, the vacant and derelict buildings, the south rapid transit corridor, accelerate CentrePort and accelerate the Polo Park and St. James area just for examples. Counter the Feds to eliminate the fourplex requirement. We learned that Halifax does not have the fourplex requirement, so why is it being instilled on us? Secondly, that the Federal Housing Minister is from Nova Scotia. How convenient. Four storeys with 800 meters, that's because it's close to a transit corridor, that's goes that's a very long walk, especially in January, and that 800 meters as the crow flies quickly turns into up to 1.3 kilometers, when you talk about coming from a side street or having to cross the road, or get to the bus stop once you're at the corridor because rapid transit's bus stops will be 700 meters apart. It's not that convenient. I am for you. Make this is a make in Winnipeg. Do it right. Take out some of that criteria. It is disappointing that in two weeks, we're at this stage without consultation, without a special meeting on an item like that, but you have one opportunity to do this. You have other challenges ahead of you, and but I do not support the criteria that the Federal Government has laid out on this, and I implore you, if you're going to do something, the Property Department has to be better. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Kelly Ryback. I'll ask you to stay behind on the bench, and we have another speaker on the same topic and we'll call you back for questions. Judith Blair is speaking on this same topic in opposition, and she will be here via Zoom. Mr. Clerk is the delegation with us? No? Okay, let's move on. Councillor Schreyer, will you move a motion that we work past noon just to finish this delegation?

Councillor Schreyer: So moved.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Kelly Ryback, if you could come back please, and we have questions from Councillor Schreyer and Councillor Eadie. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. I truly appreciate the comments made by Kelly Ryback. They're important. Very reasonable. In fact, let's face it. Councillors here are...we can't get this out of our mind that this debate that's taking place today. I guess a couple of things. One is, I'm going to ask this again and again. I've been talking about it for years and I am not going to stop because today, it sort of shows it's faced in another major expression, and I've just got to ask, we used to do this all of the time. We didn't go through the hoops of deregulating our development by-laws in

order to do it. We did this a lot. It was normal to do affordable housing. It hasn't been in recent decades. In order to really understand how the economy worked, and how politics works, you don't do a research or you don't do something looking at a thing over a year or two. You don't learn anything. But here you can learn something. Now we see something where we have to...where we're looking, we feel obliged to deregulate our zoning by-laws in order to get some important money for something that's really important, affordable housing. Do you think Winnipeggers, Manitobans, Canadians, (inaudible). What's the difference between now and then when it was completely normal to do this at a time when our taxes were lower, and we weren't going into debt. And we had higher services. And now, while we have higher taxes.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Schreyer. Your specific question.

Councillor Schreyer: You think people should know the difference. What's...where is our tax increases have gone, if not for affordable housing, because it hasn't? You think Winnipeggers should know.

Kelly Ryback: I think there should be an understanding but I also believe that is such a complicated question for a complicated answer. But specifically, to when we talk about our immediate housing crisis, one of the aspects, one of the contributors to that, and I am a proud Ukrainian, and I am so grateful that Canada embraced Ukrainian refugees. And we open the doors and what, 12,000, over 12,000 Ukrainians that come to Winnipeg. And the Federal Government hasn't provided funding. That's a brand-new city in Manitoba, when you look at just what came into Winnipeg. But there's no additional money for housing, no additional money for healthcare, no additional money for emergency response and other services. But I...you should know it is so complicated to answer your question.

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

Councillor Schreyer: It's also part of this motion that there is consultation that would be involved. This wouldn't happen right away. That there's a period of consultation. Do you have anything to say about that?

Kelly Ryback: I have a...I am concerned about my having faith in that consultation, especially if that if this is pursued as written by the Federal criteria, then we're held to that, regardless of what consultation takes place. My main two concerns is losing the as of right, losing my right to know what's going on in my neighborhood, and secondly, the lack of confidence in the Property Department.

Councillor Schreyer: Do you think that the councillors should understand the relevance of the consultation period that takes place before enacting this, before we have our vote today?

Kelly Ryback: Before enacting on this, there should be a consultation process. I don't know what the timeline is, but the Minister of Housing of the Federal Government is demanding a response from the city though to allow for that. But if Halifax didn't need fourplexes, then why does Winnipeg? Please, we elected you to come up with...to represent us. This is part of that representation but secondly, counter the offer and have a plan that would satisfy the Federal Government because there's lots of opportunities to accelerate housing without having to touch fourplexes on every single residential lot or four-storey high fourplexes. It's bad enough to have two story with a raised bungalow between two small bungalows on Ferry Road or Albany Street.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker? Now we do have...

Kelly Ryback: The mayor had his hand up. Was there a question?

Mayor Gillingham: We do have our other delegation back in the room now, so we will likely entertain that.

Kelly Ryback: Go back to the bench.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker. I want to Thank Mr. Ryback.

Madam Speaker: You have a question?

Mayor Gillingham: Yeah, I do.

Madam Speaker: I do have a bit of a list here. I have a list, but there was some technical difficulties as well with the previous delegation that was trying to speak. It's on the same topic, so maybe we could pause now and hear that delegation then finish the questions, or shall we...would you like to continue? So Kelly Ryback

Kelly Ryback: I'll return to the bench.

Madam Speaker: If I could ask you to stand down on the bench and we'll continue with questions. There was just a technical difficulty there. Mr. Clerk, we have Judith Blair in the waiting room. Okay. Judith Blair, welcome to you. I don't have anything on the screen, Mr. Clerk.

Clerk: The camera appears to be on. Judith, if you want to go ahead and unmute your microphone, you will have five minutes to make your presentation to Council. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Judith Blair, are you there with us? Okay I guess we're continuing with those technical difficulties. We'll pause that. Mr. Ryback, if you could come back and we'll continue with our question period that we have. Kelly Ryback? Are you in the chamber? Okay Thank you. Our next question was from Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Wyatt, and then I have Mayor Gillingham on the list. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to Thank the delegation for coming and expressing a number of concerns that I really did have. So, it's appreciated, but should council today pass this, it will be amended, I believe, Housing Acceleration Fund. Would you be more comfortable if council as a whole participated in the hearings that will come as a result of changing the zoning bylaw?

Kelly Ryback: If I would support all of council to be involved?

Councillor Eadie: In the hearings.

Kelly Ryback: Yes, so that they hear first hand and they are present to hear from the public and they can understand what goes on in other wards outside of their own wards. The wards are diverse. There are issues in the older wards that don't exist in the newer wards towards the Perimeter. And also, we have seen a large expansion in the rent communities in the RM's and the areas close to Winnipeg. There's reasons for that more than just taking a life style choice, but how the city does business or the cost to live in the city. So absolutely I would endorse it if every councillor and mayor is involved in the hearings and discussions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I want to thank you for coming to council. I appreciate your delegation the other day in standing committee. In the letter we...the Mayor received, and the Mayor's been placed in a difficult situation here by a Federal Minister, a Minister of the crown, that we as a municipality, we are not actually in this country considered a level of government. We are actually a corporation. We are part and parcel of Provincial legislation. So, constitutionally we're not even a level of government. If you read the minister's letter, he specifically uses the word "I want to give you an opportunity to bolster it by including the following elements." This is referring to the fourplex. "Bolster" is an interesting word. Now it's fair to say that back and forth, you get, you know, horse trading that goes on. However, I don't recall a time when a Federal Government has reached so far down into a municipal corporation to demand that they do certain things to get certain amount one-time Federal money. Is it fair to describe this really as political extortion?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, I caution you on the phrasing of your question.

Councillor Wyatt: I purposely called it political extortion, not extortion.

Kelly Ryback: My first concern is that the Provincial Governments have been taken out of the loop when they also have jurisdiction on housing and by-laws of municipality and the Municipal Board and beyond that. That's one concern. Secondly is, graciously, that the city put in an application, and now we have the Minister come back and say, you know really what we're saying is we're denying you unless you do this. Well, we're negotiating. So, let's come back with a negotiation. It doesn't mean you have to use all of their criteria. And maybe it's positioning. Maybe it's the spin on what the original application was. There's a better way of doing it.

Councillor Wyatt: And would it be fair to say sir that we have a Federal Government here, which when they approved their national housing strategy a number of years ago, they did absolutely nothing to start building affordable housing across the country, so is it fair to say that this government is now at the 11th hour of their mandate, and they're panicking, and they're throwing their blame and their responsibility that they've...sure. At the municipalities instead of them having done their job in the first place?

Kelly Ryback: That is a possibility.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question. Mayor Gillingham. Yes, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I rise to provide the proper terminology. It's called political-suasion. And it's acknowledged terminology from decades and decades ago.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, that's what you meant? Correct?

Councillor Wyatt: Political-suasion.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, Thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: I stand by it.

Madam Speaker: Mayor Gillingham.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I want to Thank Mr. Ryback for his presentation and for being here today. I was able to just explain to our delegate that on the Halifax website, the...I will be brief here. Thank you.

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

Mayor Gillingham: I think at Executive Policy Committee when Mr. Ryback was attending or watching, he may have heard something regarding...or was left with impression that Halifax did not have to do fourplexes. On the website, the Halifax website, indeed it does say council directed the CAO to expedite amendments to the planning documents so they enable a minimum of four units per lot in all residential zones within the urban service boundary. I was able to clarify that with Mr. Ryback. You had...got alternate information from EPC, so there was confusion. I am glad we were able to clarify that. I guess my question is related to Councillor Eadie's question on the public hearing process. I'm just wondering if Mr. Ryback is aware, through you Madam Speaker, that today we are making a decision related to an amending motion on the application that the City's put forward on the Housing Accelerator Fund but subsequent to that, there will be a very public hearing process as required by Provincial Legislation, that will allow all councillors to be involved. It even says it in the amending motion here and it will also allow the public to be involved in the public hearing process to make changes to Winnipeg's zoning bylaw.

Kelly Ryback: Now just so I can answer that and also to clarify, will that take place after, let's say, City Council accepts the Federal criteria, which includes as of right fourplexes, etc., and they agreed to provide the money, and now you're going to have consultation in order to take feedback. I don't know how that would be done. Could the Federal Government then rescind the offer if we come back from consultation and it does not meet their criteria?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to ask a second question?

Mayor Gillingham: I do. I'll ask it...we don't (inaudible) the delegates to ask questions, but I would say are you aware that in other cities that have approved the request of the Federal Minister, money begins to flows. Those cities, many of them have time to determine lot size and, you know, building standards and all of that in their subsequent hearing processes.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Ryback, this is your opportunity to share your comments, not ask questions to members of council. That ends our question period...

Kelly Ryback: Thank you. Okay.

Madam Speaker: ...under this section. Thank you for your presentation today.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Has the delegation finished?

Madam Speaker: Yes he has.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay.

Mr. Ryback: In your...

Madam Speaker: Mr. Ryback, you time...your time is up. Thank you for your presentation today.

Councillor Wyatt: We are now going to break for lunch recess. Lunch recess, and we'll reconvene at 1:30. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
November 23, 2023, at 1:48 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I'd like to reconvene our council meeting of November 23rd, 2023. We have a motion before us for Councillor Allard to participate remotely. That's moved by myself and seconded by Councillor Eadie. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Moved by Councillor Sharma,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,**

THAT in accordance with Section 9.1(9) of the Procedure By-law 50/2007 Councillor Allard be allowed to participate remotely in today's meeting of Council.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, you'd like to rise on a point of order?

Councillor Wyatt: Yes Madam Speaker. I'd like to rise on a point of order. I have a great amount of respect for this chamber, and therefore, I don't want to bring any disrepute upon the chamber and, respect for the chamber, and maybe not necessarily the Federal Minister, so I withdraw my statement "political extortion" out of respect for this chamber and the Mayor that sit's in it as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. That's noted. We'll carry on with our delegations. I'm going to go back to Judith Blair. We did have technical difficulties earlier, but she's here with us now in person. She is appearing on the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 14th regarding the Housing Accelerator Fund. We'll have five minutes on the clock please. Welcome.

Judith Blair: Thank you. Good afternoon. Honorable Mr. Mayor, Honourable Councillors, it's a privilege and a blessing to be before you. This issue, the HAF fund and the conditions or not conditions in the letter of Minister Fraser, I would submit are the most revolutionary undertaking that this council would ever undertake, and I would ask you, I would beg you, to take a pause and reflect and think about what you're doing, what the intended consequences and unintended consequences will likely be, and determine what your real course of action ought to be. I have prepared a written submission, and I do hope that each of you have read it thoroughly. It took me an age to prepare it. In preparation for it, I read the Rental Market Report by CMHC, I read the City of Winnipeg Comprehensive Housing Needs Assessment Report, I read OurWinnipeg 2004 Strategic Priorities Action Plan, and excerpts of The City of Winnipeg Charter. I'm not a municipal lawyer but I am a retired family lawyer. I know how to read, I know how to reason, I know how to speak to people, and I know how to negotiate, and I have read the letter from Minister Fraser. He has not imposed conditions on the money. The changes in by-law are not conditions. They are his asks. I would advise or remind council that Minister Fraser is a new minister to the position, starting July. He is not an economist, he's not a housing expert, he's not an expert in city planning. He's a lawyer. And I can tell you that lawyers know how to negotiate and they know how to push back. I know that in my experience as a lawyer, I have only gained respect from the other side by pushing back when somebody asks. I also know that when somebody imposes deadlines on me that are unreasonable, that's when you start to worry and that's where you just say no. I don't think we're at that stage. I think that council is in a perfect negotiating position right now, and I was listening this morning until I tried to get on Zoom. You don't need to know all the technical difficulties, but I did hear the delegation of Kate. I don't remember her last name. Remarkable person. I could be her best friend, and she knows about negotiating. She knows that you talk to people. You engage with people. She was saying that she had a good working relationship with ministers for poverty, improvement, addressing whatever. She should be engaged. She should be part of this process. Please, I hope that I have more time to present to you, because this is such an important issue, and I feel it's been getting really short shrift. Councillor Rollins, I hear you and I appreciate you so much and what you're doing for the poor. I think, however, that it is a mistake.

Madam Speaker: Judith, just if you could bring your comments through the Chair please.

Judith Blair: Yes, Thank you. Sorry. I'm not used to addressing council, but I think that it is a mistake to look at the bright shiny object in front of, the glittering gold that is just in front of us and say let's just grab it now and worry about the consequences down the road. In my respectful view, now is exactly the time to address and think about what are our real needs in this city? And how do we best address those needs? What is consistent with our governance. What is consistent with The City of Winnipeg Charter, what the city is mandated to do, what we're trying to do for this city. We all love this

city. That's why we're here. How do we make it better without making it worse? How do we bring people up without pushing other people down? And that is what I hear we would be doing by just acceding to the wish of Minister Fraser.

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

Judith Blair: Thank you. I would also just observe, in my opinion, that the July 13th, 2013 application by the city was really...it was bare bones. It said that you would take initiatives pursuant to your 2024-2027 budget, but it didn't give any details to the minister. I think that we can assume that the minister was giving a suggestion that would be open to other suggestions. I think that we at least need to try, and I don't think that a duly elected government official is going to just snatch the promise of money if we say to him, this doesn't accord with our needs. Our needs are as set forth in CMHC report. We don't have a crisis in land and building. We've got large tracts of land, as I've indicated in my submission. We have large tracts of land in Winnipeg that are capable of being developed. They're in process, some of them. Some of them are under development now. What we need is we need specifically to address the not-for-profit housing, the affordable housing, the social housing. That's where we need government to be involved. Not where the market is already addressing the needs of Winnipeggers. You've heard from other people about the consequences of the zoning to permit as a right. Like, we have to come to grips with...that means as of right. You can do it without having to go through processes. You can get it without.

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

Judith Blair: It's, I think, troubling to hear, well we don't have to worry that fourplexes will actually be built. You know, that there are going to be too many hurdles. Well, that doesn't sound like as of right to me, and it reminds me of the old expression, "this won't hurt a bit". We know where that goes. We've heard from other people, and I would reiterate that mature trees are going to be demolished, and it will ruin the life amenities of the neighbours. It will ruin the character of the neighborhood. It will pack four times the number of people and vehicles and garbage bins and recycling bins and recreational vehicles and noise and sewage into areas that were not designed for it, and I can't imagine that it's not going to contribute to stress between neighbours and strife. It will artificially create debris that will fill the landfills, that is contrary to the OurWinnipeg vision, and it would as intended, artificially financially motivate developers, including foreign developers to tear down viable single-family homes in thriving neighborhoods, and create enormous amounts of unnecessary debris going to the landfill. It will actually encourage the demolition of single-family homes which I would submit are why people live here in the first place. They aspire to it. People don't aspire to fourplexes, and I can speak from personal knowledge of immigrants who I've acted for, of indigenous people who I've acted for. They want to aspire to live in a single-family home. It arbitrarily makes certain very unlucky homeowners into big losers.

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

Judith Blair: Of their major financial and emotional investments. There's no question that they would have a loss of property value by an enormous fourplex being built next door. So, there's no need for the change in zoning. We've got an abundance of land, and that's clear, right within your own report, the Comprehensive Housing Report that you prepared, just a couple of years ago, that even within existing communities, there are large tracts of land, and I would also observe that although the Canada-wide growth in rental demand has exceeded the growth in supply, Winnipeg is the exception. Winnipeg's growth in apartments actually exceeded the growth in demand for apartments, so this...our city's proposal should not be in response to one size fits all. The market influences have already created housing density in new developments in the city, and that's the state of one of the stated goals of the half programme. Developers in Winnipeg have, on their own, calculated that it's more profitable, feasible, to build new high-density multi-family housing within the city limits, largely due to the cheaper land in bedroom communities outside the city limits. And where there's a shortfall, seems to be the single-family home. Nonetheless, according to your own report, Winnipeg remains one of the most affordable housing markets in the country. What the city has identified as being its needs.

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

Judith Blair: What the city itself has identified as its needs, are the revitalization of downtown, improving challenged neighborhoods surrounding the downtown, such as Centennial, Midlands and Lord Selkirk, housing the unhoused and providing subsidized housing for the income challenged. So, why don't we politely negotiate with the Minister of Housing and say Thank you. Yes, we would like to access this fund, but what our city needs is affordable housing that the market is not addressing without our help. We don't want to change the parts of our city that work. We don't want to wreck neighborhoods that are thriving. We want to address plainly and clearly and honestly and sincerely with you where we need to have the help, and this is what we think we need, just as you have identified in your own programmes. In neighborhoods that are not thriving but challenged, as you have already identified, the Fraser changes, zoning changes, could be considered to provide new affordable subsidized housing and improve the neighborhoods, because the negatives that are associated with the zoning changes would be outweighed by the deep needs that they would address. And this

would be consistent and coherent with your own Strategic Priorities Action Plan that you have identified and so thoroughly considered. In my view if the city's application were to flesh out such a plan, it would be accepted. How could it not be accepted? How can the minister say sorry I'd rather?

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

Judith Blair: How could the minister say, City of Winnipeg, I hear you but I'd rather change zoning than pay for housing for the poor? I can't imagine it, and the Liberal Government is going through a bit of an issue right now with their popularity. If that were known that the Federal Government would rather the city change its zoning than help the poor, God bless them in the next election, and I'm sure the press would be very, very pleased to be bringing out that drama. I heard Councillor Lukes in the hearing on the 13th say it's time for us to be bold, and I would respond to that by saying, yes, it's time to be bold. Being bold is to say thank you, yes, we need help for our housing, but we need help in these ways and not in those ways. That is what would be bold and it would be principled, and that is what I would urge you to do, not to be afraid that the minister is going to say, so sorry, so sad, you're not doing what I told you to do. I can't believe that that would happen in our democracy. So please do be bold, but please do not make those zoning changes which would only harm the city. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Judith, Thank you for your presentation. We do have a few questions. Councillor Wyatt first, then Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you Ms. Blair for your presentation and your passion and coming down here today. We are presented with something that is very unique in the sense that you're an attorney, I understand.

Judith Blair: Retired.

Councillor Wyatt: Retired. We also have a Minister who is an attorney, whose has presented this to us, but yet, under what I understand the constitutional framework of the country, the Minister did not go via the provinces, which govern municipalities 100%. And yet the Minister is asking us in his letter that we should legalize four units as a right city-wide. Now the first step though would be to say is it legal for a lawyer to take actions or to ask others to take actions which push the margins of the law? And what I'm saying is two-fold. Number one, the constitutional right of the Minister to be able to come directly to municipalities on such a dramatic thing. Second, the suspension of what has been historic property rights. He is implying that we as a right should pre-determine, prior to a public hearing, and we've been lectured on this many times by our own legal, saying you have to walk into a public hearing with an open mind, without prejudging, and be able to come forward to say, is he not also pushing the envelope with the terms of that as well and asking us, actually, to break the law, which I understand a lawyer is not supposed to be able to do?

Judith Blair: I am told by my law society that I can't give legal advice since I am retired, so I've got an easy out. I'm personally shocked and appalled by the behavior, but I am trying to take my shock out of the situation and deal with it in a practical sense. I personally happen to agree with you, that it's completely unconstitutional for him to do this, and when I first read the letter, honestly, I felt it was very bullying and very...bullying. I'll leave it at that, but then I took a step back and said no, he's not actually...he's not actually saying that this is a condition, and that's why I think you have the opportunity to push back.

Madam Speaker: Second question Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: He's not saying it as a condition. He uses the word "bolster".

Judith Blair: Yes.

Councillor Wyatt: But, in conversations, from what I'm understanding, it is...we'll go to the back of the list, was the terminology he used apparently, if we do not do this, so I guess I reiterate my question, that is, the suspension of private property rights, which is guaranteed through public hearing for residents to be able to come and speak prior to rezoning on their land, on THEIR land, he is asking us to prejudge that prior to get this funding. Even worse, right?

Madam Speaker: Your question Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: My question is this. Legally, do you believe that the Minister, if not breaking the law, asking others to break the law?

Judith Blair: I really don't feel comfortable giving an answer to that.

Councillor Wyatt: That's fine.

Judith Blair: I'm sorry.

Councillor Wyatt: That's alright.

Judith Blair: But, I think all the more reason to treat it the way I suggested. That would that would avoid the problem completely.

Madam Speaker: Final question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Do you have empathy for our Mayor and Mayor's Office who is, unfortunate...and every other mayor across this country who has been subject to these kinds of high-pressure tactics that no mayor or mayor's office should be subject to by a senior minister of the crown.

Judith Blair: I had no idea that the Mayor was being subjected to high pressure tactics. Obviously, I wasn't present when the phone calls were made.

Councillor Wyatt: (inaudible). I'm making an assumption.

Judith Blair: It obviously shouldn't happen.

Madam Speaker: Next speaker, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. Thank you, Judith Blair, for excellent, insightful presentation. Unique, was a little different from the others. Harmonious with others in what she says including with Kate Kehler. And I guess, once again, I have to ask the question, because it is really this harmonious yet again with Judith Blair's presentation. We're talking with something that she called revolutionary, because it would be a notable change in our system. And if you're going to say something like that, you have to take, I think, a historical context, even if that historical context is only a few decades, within a generation or the lifetime of people in this room. A generation ago, people in this room were already voting. They were already involved in politics. It's not too far away. You know, 25 or 30 years ago. So, I've got to ask the question yet again. Because it looks like we're told after this, should this pass today, that there's going to be a notable consultation with the public on this, and I'm betting on that. And in that process, maybe this is where we really open up the issue based on things just like what Judith Blair just said. Judith, would you think that it would be fair to the taxpayers of Winnipeg, for them to understand, since their taxes have gone up in the last 30 years. Their services have gone down. Their governments are going into debt unlike anything we would have perceived 40 years ago. We would've had no idea, yet that's the time when we used to do this. We used to have affordable housing. We used to have the money for it without going into debt. Only when we stopped doing affordable housing (inaudible)...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer your question?

Councillor Schreyer: ...bigger than this. Only after that did our taxes go up. Do you think taxpayers should know what happened in our economy, in our system, with our governments since we raised taxes and stopped providing mass affordable housing on the scale that we used to be, 30, 40, 50 years ago?

Judith Blair: I'm sorry, is that related to this point? I'm not following you (inaudible)

Councillor Schreyer: Well, my point is, and it's kind of related to you. I wouldn't be asking you this question if I wasn't, based on what you're talking about. You're talking about, saying, (inaudible) revolutionary here, in terms of deregulating the...sort of the development by-laws of the city in order to get some money. It used to be normal for the city to get the money. It used to be normal for governments to provide this money 40 or 50 years ago. It was normal. Now it's not. Do you not want to know the difference? Like, this used to be normal. Now we're...you're calling it revolutionary for us to deregulate the development industry in order to get a possibility...

Judith Blair: Take away property rights.

Councillor Schreyer: There you go. So, but we used to do this anyway. We used to provide affordable housing anyway. (inaudible)

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, the specific question, please.

Councillor Schreyer: Do you know the difference between 50 years ago and now, what the difference is? Do you want to know? I want to know.

Judith Blair: I don't think that I'm an expert in that. I don't feel comfortable with that.

Councillor Schreyer: But you're a taxpayer and so am I, and here we are, trying to do something for a brief amount of time that we used to do back when we paid less taxes, back when we used to have better services.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, question?

Councillor Schreyer: Back when we weren't in soaring debt. Do you want to know the difference, where your tax increases have gone? They're not going to...they're not going to...tax increases aren't obviously going to affordable housing like they used to. What happened? Do you want to know?

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Schreyer. We'll move on if you have a third question. Are there any other speakers? No further questions. Any questions for our delegation? Okay, seeing no further questions, Thank you Judith Blair for your presentation today. Next Mr. Clerk I'll check with you. Is Margaret Friesen here? Okay. I'd like to call them forward. Margaret is the Director of the Environmental Health Association of Manitoba, in opposition to Item 1 of the Standing Policy Committee on Water, Waste and Environment dated October 30th, 2023, regarding the Advanced Water Metering Solution Business Case. Welcome.

Margaret Friesen: Madam Speaker, Mayor Gillingham and Councillors. My name is Margaret Friesen. I'm a director of the Environmental Health Association of Manitoba, a volunteer-based, non-partisan, not-for-profit organization whose primary goal is to assist and inform about environmentally-related illnesses including electromagnetic sensitivity, often referred to as microwave sickness or electro sensitivity. The Canadian Human Rights Commission recognises environmental sensitivities as a medical condition and as a disability...by...and a disability, and that those living with environmental sensitivities are entitled to the protection of the Canadian Human Rights Act. It is estimated there are between 1 and 3% of Canadians who have this condition. Today I wish to speak to you about the proposed proposal about smart water meters for Winnipeg. My understanding is that the current read-only meters will be replaced by two-way microwave emitting meters at a cost of \$135 million. My presentation will be in three main parts. First, a request for a deferral of vote on Item 5, that the Proper Officers of the city be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing, which I understand it's to proceed with the project as outlined in the public service report regarding the water meter renewal project. Public consultation is needed with full disclosure of information including the illusive Diameter Services report that the public service has used for its plan. There are too many unanswered questions, and the public has not had the opportunity to become fully informed. There is a complete lack of transparency on the details of the project. A pilot study, with one type of technology, was conducted which appears to have provided useful information, but the public service has selected a different technology. These details may or may not be in the Diameter Services report, which the public has not had access to, and based on the feedback and people receiving responses from you, that you also have not had access to. This is a \$35 million project which needs to be fully examined. Now we don't have the City of Winnipeg's Diameter report, but the City of Cornwall had on its site its report from Diameter Services. We need to know what's in the Winnipeg report. All of this (inaudible) just assume that it's similar. All of the assumptions in Cornwall's Diameter Services report should be considered. There are assumptions that are being made that we are not aware of. And please note that cost overruns have been encountered in Cornwall as recently as June of 2023, and that's been reported in the media. Information on costs and cost overruns in cities where smart meter programs have been in place for some years should be provided. For example, Toronto and Red Deer, Alberta. Have realities met projections? These are not in the Winnipeg's public service report, and I doubt very much that they are in the Diameter Services report either. There is a financial aspect in the report, and I think we should be allowed to see that before a decision is made. We...the smart water renewal project should be on the City of Winnipeg public engagement website and there be a steering committee, and we would like our organization to have a representative on that steering committee, so that's something else we do not have details on. There's a question of liability and insurance issues. Can the city provide a legal opinion if people report and can prove that they've been harmed by these meters? Also, by-laws will be changed. Which by-laws? We don't know. It hasn't been put into the report. Secondly, we support the recommendation 4, that a detailed report be provided to opt out of this program, should it go forward. It is critical that Winnipeg residents can opt out at no cost and with no red tape such as having to provide a medical letter. We are electrical beings. Just think EKG's, heart activity, EEG's, brain activity, we are electrical, and some people are affected more than others. Now while this transmissions, electromagnetic fields are invisible, and we can't see, smell or hear them, but we do have meters, and this is a radio frequency meter.

Madam Speaker: Excuse me. Pardon me. We do not have any props of such nature at council. Thank you.

Margaret Friesen: Oh, I didn't know that. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I did not know that. So, what you heard is actually what our bodies are feeling. So many have reported becoming ill from the exposures to smart meters, headaches, sleep problems, ear ringing, anxiety, depression, heart problems. These symptoms can be disabling, and people need low wireless radiation environments. I cannot over-state the devastating impacts of developing electro sensitivity. Many lose their jobs, their homes, and become environmental refugees, and many seek MAID, medical assistance in dying. We have examples from Toronto. You've all been sent a report submission by (inaudible). I hope you will look at the 8-minute video that she has presented to you, and I think you'll understand. So, we desperately need an opt-out for people who are concerned, not only about electro-sensitivity but also about cancer. Microwave radiation has been classified as a Group 2B possible carcinogen. Medical doctors and scientists state that Canadian...state that there's scientific evidence is strong enough now for it to be classified as known carcinogen, the same group as cigarette smoke. Children are being exposed as never before, and parents want to ensure their homes are low using, as low as possible with wired connections whenever possible. People should have the right to choose a safer option. This should be a simple process with no cost because there can be hardship for low-income families and individuals. Our organization would like to have input into the report that the public service is reporting because we know of people who have opt-outs across Canada. So, the third part of my presentation here is to point out that there were 30 submissions that you would have received that were registered by the clerk. I know there are others that missed the deadline for whatever reason, so I hope that you can have a look at that. One of them is from Barry Malowanchuk, who is the former telecommunications engineer with Manitoba Hydro. He has many questions about this. He was involved with a pilot project of smart electricity meters in River Heights, and is very knowledgeable. Please refer to his report for some questions that need answering. When parents are concerned and one parent writes "my home is wireless opt-zone, my tech is wired not wireless and I minimize and mitigate radiation exposure for my children". Another parent, "this radiation is not something we can turn off, and we desperately need to have an opt-out". And I'd also like to point out that there is a safer option, which has somehow not made it into the city's awareness, and that is fibreoptics. Fibreoptics uses wired connections. I've just got a little bit more left.

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

Margaret Friesen: So, wired...one of the aspects is that this is going to reduce the amount of vehicles that are going to be needed to travel around the city. What has not been considered is the cradle to grave energy consumption of wireless radiation over wired. So, there's a bigger picture to be looked at in this, and I certainly hope that you don't just pass this on but have a very close look, a complete cost benefit analysis I think is in order, public consultation is in order. So, I certainly hope you will defer the vote until we have more information on this very important issue to Winnipeggers. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We have a few questions. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you Madam Chair. Through you to the delegate, can you help me understand if there's any medical research that's been done that tracks the phenomena of wireless radio waves on the human body, and why it impacts some people more than it impacts others.

Margaret Friesen: There is research being done in France. They are leaders in this, and there are markers that have been identified. So, for diagnosis one needs to have a medical history done, a thorough medical history, as well as there are objective tests. There are also brain tests that are done out of United States. Dr. Hoyser is one of those that has done that. There are clinics in Canada, in Toronto in particular, where medical doctors are looking at this and are collecting some data on that particular issue. You have to realize the technology hasn't really been as widespread until recently. So, this is a new, in some ways, medical phenomena. We know that radar technicians in the second world war reported these symptoms as well. So, but, they were at war so it wasn't...that...you know...we had, sort of, bigger issues at play there, but these symptoms have been reported. They're on the cusp actually, I think, of developing objective evidence. There's brain studies that are being done out of Alberta. There's...and out of California, the as I said with France, they're developing some object testing, and I think that, you know, once we get that objective test, this whole thing is going to open widely. We just have to protect people in the meantime.

Councillor Chambers: Second question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers. Through you to the delegation. you mention the word "symptoms". Is this symptomatic of something else or is this the diagnosis that it's the electric radio waves that is causing the problem or is it symptomatic of something larger?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Margaret?

Margaret Friesen: Well that can depend. So, there is there is electro-sensitivity, electromagnetic hyper-sensitivity. But this has also been implicated in other conditions like Parkinson's, Multiple Sclerosis and neurological conditions. Almost any part of the body can be affected. Doctor Magda Havas, who's a retired professor out of the University of Trent, she has studied this in people and has found that if they take away the wireless in their homes...she's looked at a number of people with Multiple Sclerosis, their symptoms go away. So, it doesn't work for everybody, but for some people it actually has been dramatic. So, it's something that doctors are starting to recognise that maybe if a child is not getting their sleep, can't sleep, that devices should be taken out of their bedroom, and the wi-fi turned off at night. And we have actually a mom from Winnipeg told me about that. Her little guy couldn't sleep, so she took him to the doctor and the doctor says, how much time does he spend gaming? And he says well, she told it was a long time, and so they took away all of his devices and his headaches went away.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further question? We do from Councillor Schreyer and then Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you. A number of years ago, we had a presentation here, a delegation talking about concerns over new 5G frequency for internet and 5G can also be pin-pointed. Is this the type of technology, related technology, we're talking about?

Margaret Friesen: Well 5G stands for fifth generation technology. And 5G means different things depending on whether it's industry or whether it's Health Canada. That's another thing that we do not know about what the technology is going to be about, what frequencies are being used. So, if you're talking about...if you're talking about 5G, that's being marketed right now for cell phones, for example, that's a wide range of frequencies. It goes down for about .6 gigahertz to up to about 3.5 gigahertz. Wi-fi is 2.5. The .6 gigahertz, by the way, can go through concrete. So, we don't know whether these transmitters are going to be outside our homes or inside our homes. And so, these transmitters can be emitting these frequencies which can be quite penetrating into our bodies. Now, when you're talking about 5G, which is the Health Canada defines 5G technologies as 5 gigahertz and above, those have not been widely used. Those are the ones that are small, very small. The ones .6 are probably this long. Wi-fi, 2.45 gigahertz about this long. The 5G that many people are talking about are very short waves that carry a lot of data.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Margaret. Any further questions Councillor Schreyer? Councillor Wyatt followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Wyatt: Are you familiar with the events that occurred, I forget how long ago, but it occurred with regards to the United States and it's...it wouldn't be called an embassy but they call it a trade mission in Cuba.

Margaret Friesen: Havana Syndrome.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah where...where there was suspected that the Cuban authorities had used electro-magnetic waves and caused actual American trade commissioners or staff to get ill in their building. Are you familiar with that, what occurred there?

Margaret Friesen: Yes. Yes. And so, this is...there is a Havana Syndrome, there were Americans and Canadians as well. There was an incident...also incidents in China. And I think that the American diplomats and some of their families are actually taking the government to court over that because they feel that they were not being protected enough. So this is the type of technology that we're talking about. It's not simple. Health Canada's standards, the guidelines, are based only on heating. They don't look at the other impacts that this can have on the body. And there is an example where they don't really understand, and we have to realize that there are top level CIA that are looking at this, and they don't even understand it. So here we're going to be bringing in this technology into our homes that has all of these different implications, and we should be as safe and as protective and proactive as we can be about this really unknown technology. Health Canada Safety Code 6 not only is based on just heating, although there is peripheral nerve stimulation at the lower frequencies. It's based on a 6-minute exposure. Six minutes for this type of technology. There's another guideline for cell phones by the way. I'm talking about (inaudible) here, so we have something based on heating, based on 6 minutes, they average out the peaks. Totally not protected. No long-term studies. Health Canada has not done one study on possible effects of smart meters on Canadians' health, although they have had many, many people contact them to say this technology is making me sick.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Margaret. Councillor Wyatt any further questions? I'll go to Councillor...

Councillor Wyatt: I guess more "are you aware", that the New England Journal of Medicine and also...I mean, whatever's been documented or what they're prepared to document in terms of their research and development both the American military and their establishments. Are you aware of...

Margaret Friesen: Of the military?

Councillor Wyatt: No, are you aware of any documentation to substantiate your arguments in terms of the New England Journal of Medicine, any kind of papers or...and/or?

Margaret Friesen: There are many publications indicating adverse effects. Something...so when we're talking about biochemical, talking about cellular impacts, there are many high-quality studies. Health Canada is turning a blind eye. But, if you're talking about epidemiological studies, which is what we desperately need, no, we don't have any in Canada. There's no money being put into this. Although the Federal Government is making billions, that's with a "b", on the licensing of spectrum, there is a pittance put into this, and if there's money put into it, they're studying heating.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Margaret.

Councillor Wyatt: Last question.

Madam Speaker: Final question Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: And are you aware that as early, I think, as the 1950's there were scientists warning of climate change or climate crisis and they were kind of laughed at then?

Margaret Friesen: I relate.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Ten seconds left Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'm wondering what the gigahertz is of a microwave.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Margaret Friesen: What's the frequency of a microwave?

Councillor Eadie: Yes.

Margaret Friesen: So that definition...

Madam Speaker: Margaret, if you could quickly answer.

Margaret Friesen: Well it changes depending.

Councillor Eadie: (inaudible) minutes. (inaudible)

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

Margaret Friesen: Alright. So, the question was about microwave radiation. So, the definition varies depending on who uses it. So, microwave radiation can be very narrow. So, for example, the microwave radiation coming out of your microwave oven is probably about 2.45 gigahertz, and that by the way is the same frequency as the lower level of wi-fi. Now what many people do, because they don't understand the term "electromagnetic fields, frequencies", they shorten that term. People relate to microwave terminology and so they use it for the right radio frequency spectrum.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie. second question.

Councillor Eadie: My second question, Madam Speaker, is I heard about China and all this stuff. Is there a difference between the actual wave hertz and the data protocols that get wrapped around and transmitted?

Margaret Friesen: So, is there difference between natural and the type of electromagnetic fields emitted by these transmitters, is that the question?

Councillor Eadie: Yeah.

Margaret Friesen: Yes, there is.

Councillor Eadie: Yeah...because you were talking about inch by inch (inaudible), but that's all about data protocols in the data that's being transferred over these electromagnetic waves, right?

Margaret Friesen: Right. Yes. The amount of radio frequency radiation we get from the sun is very, very low. The amount that we're exposed to now is actually trillions of times above that (inaudible) radiation. And what we're doing now with...and it's artificial. It's not same as the natural stuff. Dr. Dimitris Panagopoulos presented to the Parliamentary Health Committee in 2010, and he's written extensively about this that it's not safe...

Madam Speaker: Margaret if you could wrap up. If you could wrap up. The time is up for this presentation.

Margaret Friesen: Okay. Alright.

Madam Speaker: We thank you for coming to City Hall today.

Margaret Friesen: Okay Thank you very much. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Our next delegation, Mr. Clerk, is here with us via Zoom. Yes. That is Dr. Cecilia Rodd in support of Item 4 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Community Services dated October 31st. It's regarding the Review of Library Services Division for the Improvement and Investments. Dr. Rodd.

Celia Rodd: Thank you Madam Speaker. Thank you, Madam Chair. Councillors and Mayor Gillingham. As you understand I am in support of the four-year project to increase the funding to the Winnipeg Public Library. A little bit about myself.

Madam Speaker: Dr. Rodd. If you could please show us your visual please. We don't have any such PowerPoint presentations at Council. Just at standing committees. That's perfect. Just yourself. Thank you.

Celia Rodd: Oh, just myself. Oh, I'm so sorry. I'm so sorry. I submitted them. I didn't realize it. Sorry. Let me just...

Madam Speaker: All fine. Thank you. We can see you.

Celia Rodd: No, no, no, there. We're good. So, I'm a retired pediatrician and I've been intensively involved in childhood literacy here at the Health Sciences Hospital and also a member of the City Centre Library Advisory Committee, and I've been that for two years. And as I said, I support this report because I believe that Winnipeg is underfunded and that Winnipeggers are sub-optimally served. That the increases in this funding will harmonize and increase the hours across Winnipeg, which will help families considerably and all patrons and also improve some of the technology and the collections in the public library. In the report, there was a very nice comparison of Winnipeg to three sister cities in Canada: Edmonton, Hamilton and Regina. Fairly comparable size of those populations, and across all the scores in the report, Winnipeg overall did much poorly in terms of hours of opening for the branches, digital services, total numbers of projects, and the only exception was that Winnipeg was lower than Winnipeg in the digital services, but in all other metrics, Winnipeg fared poorly. Of note, we know that Winnipeg has a dichotomy of hours of opening in summer versus the winter. So, on average, it's 5.5 hours per day that the libraries open, and 6.5 hours in the winter time, and Hamilton, Edmonton, and Regina overall have 8.4 hours per day that the libraries are open. It's really unfortunate we have such glorious weather in Winnipeg but particularly in the summer, and that libraries are typically closed on Saturday and Sunday, and often also on Wednesday as well. This is the time when families and patrons really can easily get out to access the library and all of the services. In this report, increasing the services and hours of operation will only bring us up to 6.9 hours per day, but it will ensure that Saturdays are open and Wednesdays typically at all branches, which is wonderful news. I do want to mention about the summertime reduction compared to wintertime is really detrimental to children because there's something called the summer slide. So that children who are poor readers who do not have access to books during the summertime typically have a much-reduced reading level by the time they return to school in September compared to average, above average readers who actually do quite well over the summertime. And just having access to four to six books that these poor readers can read over the summer makes a difference when they return to school at least the same level when they left in June. There were a number of other really important comparisons in the report that Winnipeg scored lower in the amount of budgeted collections per capita by half compared to Edmonton and Hamilton. The number of full-time equivalents per 100,000 citizens was also substantially less. What was not in the report though was that the budget for the library on an annual basis per capita was substantially lower in Winnipeg. Hamilton and Edmonton are 50% higher, and Regina is two and a half times higher as well too, and it's not surprising that this translates into the number of visits per year per capita being substantially lower, being .8 in Winnipeg, but 1.7 in Edmonton, 3 in Hamilton and 5 in Regina. Always I know when you come to council there's always a question, what is this going to cost and what is the return on investment, and that's an excellent question, and I draw mention to the fact that there was a wonderful report by the Canadian Urban Institute published in October 2023. It cited the only Canadian work on this which was the economic impact of the Toronto Public

Library on the City of Toronto in 2013, and in that it said for every \$1 spent, that there was almost \$6 in economic benefit. So, there was a direct return of investment because of access to books, computers, programs and indirect because of all of the goods and services supplying the libraries, renovating the libraries, the librarians themselves working there, all contributed back into the investment back into the city. So, it's a huge economic boom. Importantly, this study is very comparable to those done in the United States, England and Australia. So really the library is a powerhouse, and that we really need to use it. As a pediatrician, I wear my child care hat, and that we know that a comparable investment in children's literacy reaps similar benefits. It's really important to focus on the youngest of children, because if a child reaches grade 3 and is not able to read, they're never going to catch up. And this is a huge economic loss for the city, because individuals will typically have lower paying jobs, lower taxes, and overall less quality of health in the long run as well too. So, libraries are really important. Winnipeggers have stated this in the comment box and also to the librarians themselves. Libraries, we need to think beyond the box that this is just books that are available, computers, printers, the librarians that are a great resource. People that are social workers. We are number four for top destinations for newcomers to Canada, and this is a great focal point and entry point for them into services. We're behind Toronto, Vancouver and Calgary, and I think that it's really important that we look forward to the next iteration of the report in 2027 because we want to improve library services even more, and there's been a request of 85 additional FTE equivalents to align our library services in Winnipeg to match national comparators. I appreciate the time that you listened to my comments on this, and also that I am very happy to be a member of the Library Advisory Committee and I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Dr. Rodd. I'll just ask you to stand by please in the background. We do have another presenter on the same topic, and then we'll take some questions. We have Kirsten Wurmman Mr. Clerk. Yes. You're here. Thank you. Representing Manitoba Library Association, also in support of the same item. Welcome.

Kirsten Wurmman: Thank you. Saved the best for last. So, thank you very much for this opportunity. My name is Kirsten and I am a librarian. I worked for 11 years with the Winnipeg Public Library and I currently work for the Manitoba Library Association. I am here today representing the Manitoba Library Association. MLA provides leadership for the promotion, development and support of library and information services in Manitoba. MLA also advocates on behalf of libraries, library workers and Manitobans. Winnipeg Public Library is a member of our association. MLA supports the recommendations of the report to increase investment in the Winnipeg Public Library system. The investments recommended though are just the first step that's required. While an additional 84.5 FTE's would really help WPL align with the other urban library comparator systems, investing in the proposed 12.4 FTE's as a bare minimum is a step forward to start working towards better hours of operation, programming, technology and collections. WPL has been operating on a minimum staffing for years now with increasingly large workloads. To say that staff are stretched beyond capacity is accurate, and we know that the current system is not sustainable. WPL staff deserve to be supported by their employer to work in a safe and appropriately funded environment. Increased staffing means a safer workplace. Increased staffing means also a less stressful environment where precarious...perhaps the library is not so precariously staffed so that one person getting sick could potentially mean that you have to close that branch. It's really impressive to see the unique programming and innovative work that staff are able to do despite these daily challenges and safety concerns and stresses. I think it speaks to their passion and their conviction in the importance of the public library. But overall the low workplace morale and stresses and impact on one's mental health does nothing to help retain staff. An appropriately compensated and adequately staffed library workplace would make it easier to recruit and retain library workers, including librarians who are required to have a master's degree to work. Winnipeggers deserve libraries that are open, libraries that provide materials and programming that reflect the communities in which they live, libraries that are safe spaces, libraries that are able to meet the needs where people are at, whether that be through technology use, literacy activities, support for job seekers, indigenous language learning, computers, and yes, space for leisure and rest. We have heard that the beautiful new Bill and Helen Norrie Library in River Heights has the highest circulation of library materials, even busier than the Millennium Library, and yet during the summer, that library is only open four days a week, and none of those four open days fall on a weekend. Without appropriately funding WPL, your constituents and your employees are being left behind. A recent (inaudible) research report estimates that for every \$1 invested in Canada's urban libraries, \$6 is generated in community economic impact, a return of over 600%. It's time to start recognizing the role of Winnipeg Public Library as community infrastructure, as critical as transit, water and waste and emergency responders. Libraries and library workers are important community builders and connectors. They reach those folks who might be at risk of exclusion. They make sure that access for all is made reached in a meaningful way. They gave us space and place for folks young and old to dream, to realize their potential, and to create connections with others. Libraries and library workers create community. The Manitoba Library Association urges Winnipeg City Council to hear and value those voices and the knowledge and lived experiences that have been shared with you based on the evidence and desperation for increased investment in the Winnipeg Public Library. We ask that you endorse the report for investment and that the increased funding for WPL is approved. It would be, at the very least, a very good first step. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now take questions if there 's any for either of our speakers. Okay. Seeing no questions. Thank you for your presentation today, both of you.

Kirsten Wurmman: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay, that concludes delegations. Let's move onto reports. The Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 17. Mr. Mayor.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. This is relating to the establishment of a Chief Construction Officer, and I want to thank my colleagues. We did lay the matter over for a month so we could have more discussion with the public service. What we have before you today is, I think, it's Motion No. 3 Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yes, so Mr. Mayor, you've moved Motion 3. We do have an amending motion with this item as well.

Mayor Gillingham: Which item (inaudible)?

Madam Speaker: The main item and then you have an amending motion.

Mayor Gillingham: So, 3 is the amending motion? Yes, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: That's right. Okay. So, go ahead and introduce...yeah, go ahead and introduce your...the main item and the amending motion, and then we do have another amending motion, moved by Councillor Wyatt and second by Councillor Eadie, and that's on the screen, not in paper copy, because it is from last month's council agenda.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, do you recall? Okay. If you want to withdraw it, you can certainly do that. Okay. So, Mr. Mayor, your opportunity to introduce the main item, Item 20, your amending motion as moved by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Lukes and as I mentioned, I'll restate it. There is an amending motion that was laid over from last month's council meeting. It's on the screen for all of you. And that was moved by Councillor Wyatt and second by Councillor Eadie. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

**Motion No. 3
Moved by His Worship Mayor Gillingham,
Seconded by Councillor Lukes,**

WHEREAS on October 17, 2023 Mayor Gillingham moved a motion at Executive Policy Committee that requested that Council proceed to hire a Chief Construction Officer to advise the City on construction and infrastructure strategy and best practices, and Executive Policy Committee unanimously recommended that motion for approval to City Council;

AND WHEREAS on October 26, 2023, Mayor Gillingham laid over debate on his Motion at Council pending further discussion on technical questions about the proposal;

AND WHEREAS Section 88 of The City of Winnipeg Charter gives City Council authority to determine the administrative structure for the City of Winnipeg via by-laws, subject to other limits in the Charter;

AND WHEREAS Council is permitted to specify exceptions to any rule by which new employees must report to the Chief Administrative Officer under Sections 97 (c) and (d) of the Charter and Section 17 of the Organization By-Law;

AND WHEREAS certain amendments to the Mayor's motion will confirm Council's statutory authority to create and fund this new Officer, reporting directly to Council;

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

- *Replace Recommendation 1 with the following:*

"1. That Council seek to hire a Chief Construction Officer as an employee of the City of Winnipeg, subject to City Council confirmation of a job description, priorities plan, including reporting requirements, and

process for hiring, and that the CCO office be financed through an addition to the City's Corporate Capital Overhead Charge sufficient to raise \$0.5m annually and that Council refer the authorization of 2 FTEs (1 CCO, and 1 additional FTE as support staff) for the CCO Office and any necessary budget approvals to the 2024-2027 Multi-Year Budget Process."

- *Replace Recommendation 2 with the following:*

"2. That Council establish a Chief Construction Officer (CCO) Search Committee, consisting of:

- *Councillor Mayes;*
- *Councillor Dobson;*
- *Councillor Schreyer; and*
- *One member of the Mayor's Office staff as the Mayor's designate,*

and direct Corporate Human Resources to assist the CCO Search Committee in finalizing a job description and salary range and to assist in executing a search for qualified candidates."

- *Recommendation 3 be amended by replacing the words "Hiring Committee" with the words "Search Committee".*

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*

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. Madam Speaker, I might just point out, as an opening statement, that the amending motion I have, Motion 3, incorporates Councillor Wyatt and Eadie's request from last meeting. So, it is contained within the motion under, really under section 1 and 2.

Madam Speaker: I hope the movers for that...I know there was some distractions. If you could just re-state the content in your motion.

Mayor Gillingham: The content in Motion 3 that I'm bringing forward today does incorporate the motion that Councillors Wyatt and Eadie brought forward last month.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor. Go ahead.

Item 20 – Establishment of a Chief Construction Officer

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. Yeah, so further to what I said a moment ago, we did lay this matter over for a month. That gave us the opportunity as a council and my office to speak with Mr. Michael Jack, our CAO, speak with the Legal Department and the CFO as well, just to make sure that we are proceeding in a way that's consistent with the Charter, and so some adjustments have been made. I want to Thank our public service for their advice and their hard work on this, and so what we have before us here is a motion. I won't read it. Councillors have it here, that would make sure that we are in accord with The City of Winnipeg Charter to bring forward and hire a chief construction officer that would be an employee of the City of Winnipeg to provide advice to council and then also, Madam Speaker, in Section No. 2, in recommendation No. 2, in the motion it does call for the establishment of a search committee. Not a hiring committee but a search committee, consisting of Councillors Mayes, Dobson and Schreyer and a member of my office who would assist with that as well, and also getting the Corporate Human Resources Department to assist with the search committee to finalize job description, salary range and assist in executing a search for qualified candidates, and you'll see that the funding related to that in section 1 of the motion and the authorization of two FTE's would be...would go the 2024 to 2027 multi-year budget process. So, this would really ultimately be captured ultimately at that time. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Wyatt. Do you wish to speak?

Councillor Wyatt: I would like thank the Mayor for incorporating the gist of our recommendation. Appreciate that. I'd like to speak...can I speak to the motion and the clause?

Madam Speaker: That's right.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. I'd just like to point out to the Executive Committee via this meeting, via the Speaker, that there is something...there is a report that was done by our Audit Department back in November of 2008 called the Capital Project Management Audit Final Report.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, just to be clear. Do you wish to withdraw your motion, or is it standing?

Councillor Wyatt: No, no. No, no, I...well...if the Mayor has adopted the clause we could withdraw it. Yes. That's not an issue.

Madam Speaker: We haven't voted on it yet but.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, I mean we could...how does one go about doing that if its incorporated?

Madam Speaker: Just for clarity. For clarity for Council at this point, if you want to withdraw it now.

Councillor Wyatt: Does the seconder agree to withdrawing it in light of the Mayor's comments?

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I would like to hear the Mayor close on this before...we can...I think.

Madam Speaker: We can let it stand. That's fine. It'll accomplish the same goal.

Councillor Eadie: We can let it stand (inaudible) discussion because there's one slight concern that I have and maybe the Mayor could answer it in closing after I speak to it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt continue.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Thank you. So, I want to draw attention to this.

Madam Speaker: The clock, please. The time clock.

Councillor Wyatt: Do I have the full 10 minutes?

Madam Speaker: Yes, it was paused.

Councillor Wyatt: I want to draw attention to the report of the Auditor back in '08. 'We recommend that the'...we already have a Manager of Capital Projects...'be provided with professional staff in the areas of Project Costing, Project Planning and Project Quality so that he may perform, they may perform, the responsibilities set out in Administrative Directive, FM-004." And it goes on to provide extensive recommendations in terms of, for example, "The Manager of Capital Projects should ensure the body of capital project procedures is codified." "The Manager of Capital Projects"...and it goes on..."the Manager of Capital Projects should develop and maintain a "Procedures Control." "The Manager of Capital Projects should establish document control." Goes on to say "The Manager of Capital Projects should provide guidance on monitoring the workload and the capacity of existing managers." Goes on to say, state this, "We recommend the Manager of Capital Projects oversee the revisions of the Draft Manual of Project Administration Practice to establish procedures pertaining to (a) project scope, planning, definitions, scope definition, work breakdown, structure, relative to scope definitions, scope verification, scope control. These procedures should be aligned with the administrative directives governing capital projects and with bid opportunity documents and contracts. (b) project schedule management and control processes. The existing procedures should be updated to reflect contemporary scheduling methodology. These procedures should be aligned with corporate project schedule management and control procedures and procurement documents. (c) project estimates by both the departments and its contractors and consultants. This guidance should be based on current industry standards for the preparation of capital construction estimates and be consistent with administrative directives governing cost management and control. (d) quality control and quality assurance. (e) project management staffing from a function and process perspective. (f) project communications that reflect currently accepted capital construction industry standards for progress reporting. The Administrative Directive FM-004 and project manual should be amended to include a section dealing with the responsibilities of the project manager to ensure that the Contract Administrator/Construction Manager provides the required periodic project progress and performance reports." I could go on Madam Speaker. (g), (h), (i). Then

it goes on to recommendation 24. "That the Manager of Capital Projects should examine project delivery methodologies". Anyway, what I'm saying Madam Speaker, I support the Mayor's resolution, I support his intent. I just hope that we're not reinventing the wheel of something that we should have already been doing with the position of Manager of Capital Projects, and if we are going to be...if there's a way to save money, or at least incorporate, there really needs to be a question of what the Manager of Capital Projects had...was (inaudible)...and by the way, the department by and large, except the majority of these audit, if you read through the response from the department to the Auditor's recommendations, and by and large the Public Works Department responded positively and gave a time frame in terms of when these recommendations were going to be implemented, and therefore, in light of the fact that there is continuing issues with regard to procurement as has been rightly identified, and I think that's part of the motivation driving the need for the Chief Construction Officer, that that is why I and the good councillor for Mynarski moved the motion calling for an updated, or new role procurement audit, because of the fact that our 2008 recommendations either have not been implemented or were implemented and then slowly have been moved away from. And so, I know EPC moved to receive that as information but I would hope when the time comes, that the member of Council may, when the item comes up on the agenda, possibly somebody might stand up to refer it somewhere. So, I think the discussion has to go live, especially in light of the fact that we want to get a handle in terms of our construction challenges in the city. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Thanks Madam Speaker. Councillor Wyatt has done a lot of research going back to that 2008 audit. And of course, he was on Council at the time as well. I read the amendment from the Mayor on this and I like what I read. I am looking at...you know, who am I to say who I should recommend, but you know, having somebody on the committee who has the kind of background of Councillor Wyatt, I didn't quite understand why I didn't see his name, but that's fine. Madam Speaker, so the only thing Madam Speaker I wanted to (inaudible), and again I did like it, but what I don't want to see is, I don't want to see this Chief Construction Officer get all tied in with any one department. They need to be at arm's length of the construction entity, so Public Works does work, Municipal Accommodations does work, and so on and so forth. Water and Waste and there are some major projects. I don't want to see them. We already have an advocate on the water, in the North Winnipeg...I'm just going to call it the North Winnipeg Sewage Plant. And, so we are paying somebody tens of millions of dollars to make sure that we're...or we're seeing to make sure we're getting what we are supposed to get out of a contract with the firms that are constructing these major projects, but, so I don't know if you want to limit the scope, but I'm pretty assured it's a difficult project out there and we all know about inflation and stuff lately Madam Speaker. And we know that before we moved into these, we only had a Clause 3 estimate. So, anyway, just...those are my concerns. I like it. I just...They need to be at arm's length from the actual procurement process right, for whatever projects they are. The people, so on, just to avoid any conflicts or any, I don't know. We have these policies and by-laws in place Madam Speaker because things can happen, so I'll just leave it at that. It needs to be at arm's length, and I don't know how we know of construction projects where the CAO got a little overly involved and shouldn't have been really involved in that way. So maybe the Mayor can answer a question. These major projects, there's a steering committee, and in the past on these big projects, I know they've included the CFO and/or the CAO, so I'm wondering if this Chief Construction Officer substitutes out for the CAO for example. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Gillingham: (inaudible) appreciate the question. I'll just clarify, I think, in my close to respond to two things that Councillor Eadie asked. Just to clarify, the motion that Councillors Wyatt and Eadie brought forward last month is captured in recommendation 1, "That Council seek to hire a Chief Construction Officer as an employee of the City of Winnipeg, subject to City Council confirmation of a job description, priorities plan, including reporting requirements, and process for hiring", and then it goes on from there. So that really, in many ways, captures what my colleagues brought forward last month. Councillor Eadie is right. The initial thought and vision of this individual is that they would kind of stand at arm's length, work with all departments including our Asset Manager, and many times probably confirm and affirm what our staff is doing, the good work they do. But other times be able to straddle both worlds and have a deep understanding as per the audit that Councillor Wyatt read from 2008, a clear understanding of best practices in industry, making sure that we are getting the best value. I know our staff does great work. That's not discounting the work that our staff does in any way. Really what this is about is ensuring that the people of Winnipeg are getting best value for money, and we as a city become a, kind of someone that's an entity that bidders want to bid on and work with us, and we get best prices because we're always getting competitive bids, to really position ourselves to be a purchaser of services that in such a way that there's no question that we are following best practices and first in class contracts and all of that work, so again, this is not to diminish in any way the work that our staff is doing. This is just to have someone who really serves as more of an independent set of eyes that can make sure that the public purse is being protected, we're getting best value for money and the work that we need to do in our capital projects because there are so many of them and there's limited dollars, that that work can get done. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Eadie: (inaudible) to withdraw our motion. If the mover so wishes.

Madam Speaker: So, the concurrence of the seconder?

Councillor Wyatt: Yes. I'd like to withdraw the resolution.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Thank you. So, the main motion before us is withdrawn. We'll vote on the amending Motion 3 that was moved by Mayor Gillingham. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Well there's no item as amended, they withdrew it. Okay. Okay. We'll call the question on the main item as amended. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. That's right, because you did have an amending motion to the original. Thank you.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 14, 2023**

Madam Speaker: Next we'll move on to the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 14th. We have amending motions for Item...pardon me. Motions 1 and 2 for Item 16. So, we'll stand that one down. Mr. Mayor, the rest of the report, please.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. Then I will introduce the report and move adoption of 1 to 15 inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: 15.

Madam Speaker: 15 is the Text Amendment –Winnipeg Zoning By-law. Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: (inaudible).

Madam Speaker: 9 - Road Procurement Audit. 10 - Code of Conduct for Senior Members of Council, and the other was...that's right, Senior Members of the Public Service, and the other one. 11 - Portraits in the Council Chamber. Mr. Clerk. I will call the question on the remaining. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 9 I believe.

Item 9 - Road Procurement Audit

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I rise...I spoke to this item in a sense just previously. I think...I realize EPC moved to receive this as information, however, I do believe that it would be ideal if we could keep alive even if referred to, not EPC, but to the Standing Committee. The motion in question is still, I think, very...the issues that we're facing are very real. The issues that the construction audit of November 2008, there is a number of recommendations that involve council that were not implemented, that would require a change in council direction. For example, it recommends to try to ensure predictable funding, that we don't adopt just one-year capital and a five-year forecast. That we adopt a three-year capital and a ten-year forecast. There are other recommendations here that if they were implemented, we shouldn't be running into the issues that we're still running into. Some of the issues as we know, Madam Speaker, are out of our control, namely, construction inflation related to the regular economy, related to the lack of labor, related to price of materials, and...but there are other issues that are related to our timing of both the terms of procurement, the issuing of our contracts, the timing of our contracts, the lack of coordination of our contracts with the Provincial Government. The fact we are de facto competing with the Provincial Government. Nobody on our size and scale competes with us for road procurement contracts similar, other than the Provincial Government. No other municipality in this province comes close to us, and yet we are also dealing with an industry that has seen a contraction in terms of the number of players in the industry, a consolidation in the numbers. Things have changed, also since 2008, that warrants us to do this. Sometimes when an audit is recommended automatically, the public servants who are being audited are somewhat defensive. It's an audit, but I've

never seen our audit process like that. The audit is there, not as a way, as a critique, but rather as a way to assist and to provide recommendations to improve procedures, to bring a department up to best practices in terms of the industry and to provide recommendations, not just for the short term but for the long term, to assist that department and provide that outside fresh eyes advice that an audit provides. Now, I know that that may not be the case in practice. Automatically sometimes there is a bit of defensiveness. Why do we need to be audited? That's, you know, audit, right? And I recall when we did the audit of the Winnipeg Police Service, that was the ultimate example of reaction back from the service. When we were coming forward with recommendations from an outside firm, and there was a big pushback internally. And I never saw it...it's not meant to, say...it's not "got you" politics, it's more like, okay, how can we make the processes better? How can we make things more effective? Because that's what we're hearing from our constituents, and I know we have...we are unique in many ways as a city because of the fact we have a very short construction season. We have soil conditions which are not ideal compared to other jurisdictions. We are isolated as a market in terms of having available construction firms to compete and bid on our contracts. We are...we don't have large municipalities nearby that assist and support a larger construction private sector industry to bid on contracts. We have a number of challenges that are unique to Winnipeg. And as I mentioned, 2008 is a long time ago in many ways, and it's understandable that procedures have changed internally that move away from the audit's recommendations. But I'd also like to state, that there are certain recommendations in that audit that were not adopted, and they were under our purview to move forward on, not the public service's. And so, I think it would be good, because I think automatically the previous audit would inform the new audit and be the basis of really being able to go forward to look at the issues that are challenging the department right now and challenging us right now. And I think in terms of, for example, just on the heels of the announcement of the closure of the Arlington Bridge, if anything, that speaks to our challenges of our existing infrastructure in this city. Some people may say that this should not have caught us by surprise but it really did. Nobody really thought that all of a sudden, boom, one day the Arlington Bridge is going to be closed, and we thought we shut it down for a number of weeks to do repairs, and now it's closed. So, this is a major piece of infrastructure that's been affected in the city. Are there other infrastructure bridges, what have you, roads, underground that we are not aware of? So, I think having an updated audit, especially tying it...it would be a huge resource to the new construction...chief construction officer position. It would allow them to come in with new material to be able to say okay, based on this, I can take this audit, work with the auditor and actually implement some very significant changes. It would be an asset, in other words, to that position and to that person to be able to work with an auditor going forward on this. So, I would think, again, I want to stress that it's...I'm not moving this to critique the members of the department, as the Mayor had earlier said. I do believe our staff work hard and do a good job with the resources they have. This is more to say, look, how can we improve? Where have we fallen short? One of the recommendations, for example, under the construction managers, we need to give more resources. We need to give more support. Did we do that as a council through our budget process? These are the sorts of things that I believe, Madam Speaker, makes the motion worthy of discussion and worthy of support. So, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. Next speaker Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I think we've all, having discussions with our City Auditor over the last month or so, or going into the next year of what their plan is for looking into in terms of what they believe and they're asking all of us what we believe should be looked at from an auditor's perspective. I'm not totally tied into having an external audit happening in this regards, in that, Madam Speaker, I just learned actually this week, Madam Speaker, that our now City Auditor was part of that 2008 audit that Councillor Wyatt is referring to, Madam Speaker, so I would encourage, if you're not going to vote for this motion, I would encourage all of us including the Mayor to recommend that one of their things to look into is how are we measuring up according to that audit in the past, and our Auditor, having had the experience, I think it wouldn't be as a cumbersome of a job to look in and delve into it to see kind of where we're at so that when we do get that Chief Construction Officer, they'll have something, you know, to base on. So, I'm willing to accept that EPC is asking us to receive this as information, I believe. But I encourage all of you, and I think Councillor Wyatt has brought up a very important issue. And you know what? Hey, it's 15 years since that report was released. That's a good time to look into it and see how things are going and measuring up and getting that status that Councillor Wyatt is talking about. So. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Schreyer, do you wish to speak?

Councillor Schreyer: Yes. Thank you.

Translation of French Spoken (3:19:13 to 3:24:41)

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers? Further speakers? Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close?

Mayor Gillingham: Just simply to say thank you to Councillor Wyatt for his comments, and my thought is that if we can get the Chief Construction Officer in place, get them at the beginning of their work, maybe subsequent to that, that looking

at whether or not there needs to be an audit related to roads and our contracts, I'd certainly be open to that discussion. I know, in fact, as happenstance, (inaudible) our auditors in the room today, and perhaps, you know, discussion with his department too in the future as to whether or not this can be an area of focus is something I'd certainly be glad to work with the councillor from Transcona on. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on Item 9. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Next item Mr. Clerk. Item 10.

Item 10 - Code of Conduct for Senior Members of the Public Service

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

Mayor Gillingham: I'll wait for (inaudible). Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker. I rise. This was moved by myself, seconded by Councillor Eadie. I think it's fairly self-explanatory. I recall when Councillor (inaudible) moved the motion, I seconded it, to call for, I think back then we called it an Ethics Commissioner and it became an Integrity Commissioner. At the time, it was a pretty...if you were on council, it was a pretty volatile, tumultuous...I don't know what would be the word, in terms of all the media, the headlines, you know, the real estate signs going up on land that we owned to sell without approval of council, swapping of land, building of a firehall on land that we didn't own yet. A whole bunch of issues related to construction of a police headquarters. It was a very tumultuous time. And when we moved that motion, it was...it wasn't easy to be honest with you. It was a tough one because there was a lot of pressure right. You know, from the powers that be, as I like to call it. You know, don't rock the boat. What are you doing kind of thing. You know, certain members of council receiving letters from certain people saying, you know, you crossed the line. We're going to threaten you with legal action sort of thing. It was a very difficult time in many ways. And, but nevertheless we did move that motion. Of course, it was received...it didn't go anywhere. It wasn't until the election, and I'll give him credit because I often don't give him enough credit on the floor of council until the election of Mayor Bowman in 2014. We actually brought in the Integrity Commissioner. And I think this is...even if this is received as information today, I believe this item...it is a matter of time before this happens. We've already had a situation where we had...I believe it was the Winnipeg Free Press hired undercover investigators to investigate, and permit staff, we had challenges there. This happened when I wasn't here in the last term. The delegated authorities, we have delegated to our senior management have increased over the last number of years. And when I've talked to the Integrity Commissioner about this idea, she thinks it's a good idea. I don't think she looks at it from the point of view of, okay this is going to expand powers of my office and so-called empire building. She looks at it from the point of view of good governance. And she's often said to us, as you all know, as we recently had a seminar with her, she's there as a resource. As a resource to bounce questions off of if we're not sure, to make sure that we don't fall into a conflict anytime. To get an opinion even from her in advance so that if there is a complaint, she will have given us advice. I see this as something that is...would be very useful to our management team, senior management team, of the City of Winnipeg. I think it would do a lot to restore public confidence that has been shaken over the last decade in terms of our public service, and it would allow us to ensure that they have the same resource that we have now been provided. And that is guidance, when they need to have that guidance. And, you know, no different than senior public servants. You know, we moved over a hundred years ago to create a professional public service away from one which was at one time, after every federal election, the post master of a certain area was somebody else's cousin became somebody else's cousin that got the job from the different political party, and all that moved away to the professional public service. This is, I see, in the same vein, the same tradition to move us towards ensuring that we have that safety both in terms of the public, for the public, but also in terms of for the public service, and certain revelations in the City of Winnipeg taking...going to court in terms of a previous senior member of our staff I think only bolsters the argument here of why we should expand the scope of the Integrity Commissioner to include senior members of the public service, namely, from the departmental divisional managers all the way up, knowing the authority we've granted them, knowing the budgets they manage. And that's the other point Madam Speaker. The budgets they manage. We don't have a treasury board, right. We have a...we don't have a treasury board model with the same oversight. We delegate a lot of authority, they have a lot of authority in terms of spending, and so I believe this is something that would be very useful, and though it may not pass today, I think it's only a matter of time before it does occur. And I hope that maybe, just because it was a member of...a non-member of EPC, it doesn't mean it's not a bad idea. Just maybe it has to come back in a different...in a different method or a different manifestation. Anyway, Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I can't tell you how eager I was to second this motion. Again, a number of us councillors lived through the term of 2010-2014. And there was a number of things that councillors were trying to work

really hard at to get underneath to what was happening. Councillor Orlikow was a very strong advocate for getting our public service to be accountable for what really looked like problematic conflicts and so forth. Even when we voted to hire a CAO, Madam Speaker. So, my disappointment with Mayor Bowman, who did come in and cleanup, but Mayor Bowman decided to just get hard on us members of council with our code of ethical conduct. I believe when Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Gerbasi were calling for, you know, some ethics, they were also talking about our senior management Madam Speaker. This is not to say that our senior management that exists today is causing any problems but I even had private meetings with Mr. Bowman...Mayor Bowman. And I insisted that the Employee Code of Conduct be strengthened, because there was not any way other than a mayor-controlled Executive Policy Committee who would be the committee if there was accusations of any conflicts by the CAO, by the CFO, by the Clerk, by the...I'm not sure about the Auditor, by the Auditor I believe. And so, when we went through that very tumultuous, my first term, Madam Speaker, Mayor Bowman let the CAO come up, they came up with new Code of Ethical Conduct. And there is no accountability, really, for that senior management. Now the Director (inaudible) is the one who evaluates whether somebody is in conflict or if there's whatever issues are happening Madam Speaker. The Director. So, the Director of Property and Development, for example. So now, they have that power, Madam Speaker. The CAO, who gives direction supposedly, actually hires the directors, Madam Speaker. Councillor Wyatt was getting the heads of divisions of a department, but I'm not sure that it should go that far. But Madam Speaker, I think they even took out of the Employee Code of Conduct that the Executive Policy Committee is the committee to take care of conflicts of interest with the officers under The Charter as well as senior management. I don't know for sure. But we're talking about the future, Madam Speaker. We don't know what's going to happen. I think everything is great right now, Mayor Gillingham. I think everything is...we are all above board, especially members of council. I know that for sure. And I'm quite sure that, you know, I don't know for sure, but you know, it would be good to have that external person like we have to evaluate any complaints because especially the Chief Officer of the City, the Mayor is, like, I'm just concerned about that. I don't know...we've seen what could happen. So, Madam Speaker, I just think that this is prudent thing to do. I don't know that I'd go down to the division level. I would probably just go to the director level and that they would be under our Code of Ethical Conduct, and I believe that our Code of Ethical Conduct, Madam Speaker, is way stronger than the Employee Code of Conduct. Have you read the Employee Code of Conduct that we voted on? And I spoke about the concerns of the new one that was come under...under...came at the direction of the CAO Madam Speaker, but anyway, I don't think it's as strong as ours, and if we subject our higher-level senior management, our officers, they should be part of what we're a part of, because we're governing and they're implementing what we're asking to do. And so, I think that they should fall under the same Code of Ethical Conduct (inaudible).

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Nine years ago, nine and a half years ago, I guess in winter of 2013, I decided to run for city council. A year and a half...I made a decision in minutes, literally in 60 seconds, something I thought I never would do, and then I changed my mind in 60 seconds and never looked back. That was in February of 2013. And it was as we approached the election, it looked like it was going to be a new era in openness and accountability. I thought, that's great, this makes sense, this is what I should be part of. And there's reasons for that, if you go back to the era before I got elected, and so what we ended up with is this Code of Conduct for Members of Council, so I voted for it. It's not long. It's good. In the spirit of openness and accountability, it's a good thing. But in all self-honesty, I can't say, I can't look at any constituent in the eye who talks to me. They want greater openness and accountability. They want that insurance of integrity. And I can't look them in the eye and say to them, you know, I voted for it. It's a good thing, it's the right thing, say, well this is the difference it made. I can't say that with any of my colleagues, I can't really think of anything that the Code of Conduct for the Members of Council has made a difference, because there already was going to be a certain vetting of accountability from the members of council. That doesn't make it wrong. I still voted for it in the spirit of, the principle of, openness and accountability. I don't really...I can't say to anybody, oh look at the difference it made so far. Look at this, because, you know, now look, it's better now. I can't think of anything that would have changed. Having said that, we don't run the city on day-to-day basis. There's a \$2 billion a year corporation that's being run on a day-to-day basis. This council does not do that. We stand in judgment once a month. It is being run every single day. And people want openness and accountability, and I don't blame them. What am I to supposed to do, saying that's a bad idea? What am I supposed to say, well we've got an openness and accountability through Code of Conduct of our Councillors; therefore, therefore, it's done. What more do you want? I can't say that to them. People have a right to expect a certain element of openness and accountability that I thought we were getting into when I first ran in 2014, but I can't tell them we have that. And I am not trying to blame any individual. I am just saying to be consistent with, and to provide that confidence of openness and accountability to the taxpayers that fund this whole thing, and it has a lot more to do with what we do in this council chamber, regardless of whether we're the supreme governing body of this corporation. We do not run it on day-to-day basis, and the taxpayers, let's face it, it's going to happen. It happens all of the time. They're worried, they're upset, they're scared, they're suspicious. Why should I blame them? If they weren't, why would we have brought in this Code of Conduct for the members of council in the first place? Because it's justified. That's why we did it, didn't we? Or is it just a facade? But if it's going to be meaningful, how can it just apply to these people who do not run the city on a day-to-day basis? How is that possible? I can't give people that answer. I voted in terms of the Code of Conduct for councillors because it's a good thing, but if we're going to do, that why? What is the purpose? Well, how are we going to be consistent

and when are we going to go there? Are Winnipeggers not justified in having their concerns, having their suspicions, distrusting the system, and blaming their councillors? Well what can I do about that? We don't have the tools of openness and accountability as we do for councillors. No, I've got to say again, I can't...I don't know what difference it would have made, but that doesn't make it wrong. That's why I voted for it. And that's the same for our administration. So, we say things are going well. That doesn't mean there's no reason to not have a greater accountability and openness, and procedure, for judging conduct for senior levels of the administration as there are for councillors. I don't get it. So, I voted for our new Code of Conduct for councillors. And I just know for the people that I talk with, for the people of Winnipeg, the citizens and taxpayers, they deserve more than that. Why wouldn't they deserve more than that? Why shouldn't they deserve more than that? We deserve more than that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah, I'll put some real-life experience in this one. I definitely agree with Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Eadie's motion. And again, we do hear, it's not about people per se. It's about systems and accountability in that regard. When I had the great opportunity of working, first getting elected and standing up to the CAO at the time, who was good friends with the Mayor, in that meeting, he indicated to me, "Councillor Orlikow, you don't understand how it works here. You do what I say", as the CAO told me this. And I go, "No, no Mr. blank. You don't understand that you actually work for council." And he goes "I'm going to make sure that you never win an election again in the future". Now what am I supposed to do? I'm lost. I have no one to report this to. Am I supposed to go to his friend, the Mayor and say hey, this happened? No. I had nowhere to go. I was lost there, demoralized, beaten, and I had no recourse here as a city councillor. So again, this would resolve that, where I could go to an Integrity Commissioner and say, oh, this can't be good. Then the other question I asked this Mr. blank, was, as we were doing some lands...land outside the City of Winnipeg, doing service-sharing agreements, I asked him, "You know, I've heard that you own land out there, outside of Winnipeg. Your family history is from the area. I'm wondering, you know, are you going to be benefiting by doing these shared-serviced agreements?" "None of your blank business." Again, it really was my blank business. Again, I had no resource. So again, it's not about a person or Mr. blank or anything like that. It's just that was a situation that I found myself in when I was here, which no one ever should have to face again. Worry that your CAO of your City of Winnipeg is actually out to get you. Unfortunately, or fortunately for me, it didn't work that way, it worked the other way. But again, so I see a lot of merit for this to come through. Now, I'm not sure about all of the steps here. I know we received information. I won't be voting to receive information on those principles, but I'd agree with Councillor Wyatt. This won't be the last iteration of this. I think it is important that we start looking at this in a way that doesn't demonize our public service. But just bring them to a standard that incidents like this can't happen again in the future, and as Winnipeg is going to expand to our capital region plans, the CAO's will be delegated to be able to do those deals. We should make sure that they don't have any vested interests like councillors do in those decision-making processes. I really like that idea about the annual statement of assets. I love the idea about the Integrity Commissioner, so when that happens, you know, you can have some avenue to go, because the Mayor, you know, in this case hired...I remember when he walked into the room, saying, "we're going to consult about who the CAO could be and, in walked Mr. blank with the Mayor. That was jaw dropping. It was jaw dropping a couple of years there. So, I say, yeah, we should really do this. Again, I am more than willing to talk about how we can make this happen. But I think it really is important for all Winnipeggers and all of us to know that there is openness, there's transparency and accountability when stuff happens sometimes between the bureaucratic wing, which I do appreciate now much better, separated from the political wing. When the bureaucrat wing and the political wing start merging together as one, that's again a huge issue that starts to happen, and we saw that quite a few years ago. So, I know we are in better shape today but that doesn't mean we'll be like tomorrow. So, I would like to see this move forward some way or another, so I won't be supporting the EPC's recommendation to receive as information today, understanding though, even if I lose this, there's more work to be done and hopefully come back in a different way that's more palatable.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you everyone. I want to thank you, Madam Speaker...pardon me, Thank everyone through you for their comments. I think Councillor...I think the councillors who have spoken about the fact this is not the end. Code of Conducts can always be reviewed. We should be looking at them and updating them, so, I'm going to support receiving as information today but knowing that this is something that can be discussed further again in the future. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. There is call for recorded vote.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Duncan, Lukes, Mayes, Rollins and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Nays

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Gilroy, Orlikow, Santos, Schreyer and Wyatt.

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

Madam Speaker: Item 10 passes. Next item, Mr. Clerk.

Item 11 - Council Chamber Portraits

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I know this was an item that was brought forward by the Councillor from Transcona. Just, was an item that we received as information at Executive Policy Committee for a couple reasons. I'll just explain them. One, the call for the painting of the portrait of the new regent, the King, is we found out it's not ready yet. There's an official process by which it has to be the portrait chosen, the portrait released and I think's Heritage Canada, that's going to go on Hansard though, if that's accurate, but I think it's Heritage Canada that is the body that through which Canadians receive the portrait. Apparently that's not ready yet, so we could move on that, and related to the formal painting of Louis Riel, or the signature of the great Chief Peguis, as a EPC we talked about the fact that we do have gifts that have been given by Treaty One, Manitoba Metis Federation and the Inuit community of Manitoba as well, and they were gifted in the last term of council to council, and they have taken their place, artifacts have taken their place in the Council Chamber, and I'm looking at them right now in two cases that are here to remind us of really the foundation of our city. The foundation of our province, then the founding peoples of this land. And so any addition to those, I'll use the word "artifacts" for lack of a better term, whether it be a portrait of Louis Riel or a signature of Chief Peguis, could be done and I believe should be done by reaching out to the respective organizations, Treaty One and the Red River Metis, Manitoba Metis Federation, just to see if they would like (inaudible) to sit in, adding to what they've already provided to the chamber, so for those reasons and I think there's still opportunity to do that, to have dialogue with those organizations to see if they do want to make an addition to what they've provided to this council already. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Just want to rise briefly state that I support the Mayor's comments and that I will be voting as well to receive it as information. I have...and just to follow up on the Mayor's comment about reaching out to organizations, absolutely. I think that's absolutely necessary. I have known the President, David Chartrand, for quite a number of years. So, I had the opportunity to call them and talk to him and he's very open to the idea, but of course, he realizes that he would like to talk with the Mayor's Office about this and work with the Mayor's office and he is excited to do that, and so it would be an exciting thing to maybe look at for our chamber. So, I Thank the Mayor for his comments, and I'll be supporting to receive it as information especially knowing that the portrait of the new King is not formally ready yet. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yeah, as second, I appreciate all the comments, Madam Speaker, but I just wanted to reflect why I second this one. So, being a student of history, Madam Speaker, Louis Riel, founder of Manitoba, or maybe that's not the right term, Councillor Schreyer, but so really, Madam Speaker, that's at the governance level of our Province, right? Then, Chief Peguis, who established the first treaty with the settlers in this Province, just along the Red River right along here. Just...I think I'm looking the right way, across Main Street, all along, up the way through my ward, through Santos' ward, all the way up into what is now Councillor Browaty's ward. And that treaty, that's the first treaty between the colonizers and the Indigenous peoples, and the thing is I learned this history from the former Deputy Minister Jean Friesen, who is a historian, and did the research and explained how Chief Peguis made and kept his governance side of that treaty, in that as the colonizers started to really seriously colonize, not just settle, but to really colonize, the spirit of that treaty with the settlers wasn't being followed, Madam Speaker, and so what would happen is Chief Peguis, as, you know, the governor for the area as the chief, he would go in, there would be even court cases to discuss about who really owns the land. And he would go in there and he would try to stop the real colonization and interject in these disputes to affirm again, issues of the land. And so, therefore, I believe deserves, one of the governors of this area before the City of Winnipeg existed, we should have a portrait of Chief Peguis. And so, how that looks, yes, whatever this motion called for, I believe, we would've been requesting from whichever communities are required, or governments now right? Of course, sorry, woops.

Metis is a government, Red River Metis, and so anyway, I will just leave it at that. So, we have other level of governors – the monarchy of course, King Charles will be up there shortly, but I just wanted to mention that. That's all. I'll accept the mover of our motion's decision to just receive it as information, but we really should, I think, acknowledge those two governors within the chamber of Winnipeg because this is the area from whence they came. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. January 4, 1972, inaugural meeting of Unicity Winnipeg right in this room, and Mayor Juba was sitting right where our speaker is right now, sitting beside the Minister Responsible for Urban Affairs at the time. Didn't know where to put him so they put him right beside the Mayor for the inaugural meeting. That photo is in the basement here of City Hall. A year and a half before that, busy times in this Province. Just a year and a half before that in the summer of 1970, the Manitoba Centennial of 1970 for the first time in the history of this country, a government officially declared by order in council the commissioning of a giant statute of Louis Riel on the grounds of the legislature to weigh out in size the statute of Queen Victoria in the front of the giant statute of Louis Riel facing the Assiniboine River which goes to Saskatchewan. And at that moment, it was an official change in the place of Louis Riel in the history of this country. The day before, officially, Louis Riel was a traitor, and that day, (inaudible) order in council, Louis Riel officially became a founder of Manitoba. Hadn't been recognized until then, but so fitting, I would think, that we should do something here one day in terms of Chief Peguis to acknowledge, it wasn't the same. The acknowledgment of the struggles that he went through and the feats were acknowledged before then, but still the evolution of that full acknowledgement, I think, has as way to go, and I think it's appropriate that we do something about Chief Peguis and what Chief Peguis represents. We're on our way. We've named the Chief Peguis Trail and I think there is more positivity to go in terms of recognizing the role of...the roles of Louis Riel and what that symbolized the struggle that is symbolized as well as Chief Peguis and the struggle and really the impressive feats of Chief Peguis for more than one or two reasons. Really, if you read the history of Chief Peguis, and that we should continue to do so and that we should be having this conversation at City Hall today is a good thing, and I think part of a positive evolution that I think we are all part of. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers on this item? Seeing none. Mr. Mayor to close Item 11.

Mayor Gillingham: You can call the question Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 15.

**Item 15 - Text Amendment – Winnipeg Zoning By-law No 200/2006 and
Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 100/2004 – DAZ 209/2023**

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: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I am rising today because we are amending the Winnipeg Zoning By-law to allow short-term rentals as a permitted principle-use in the R1 Residential Family and R2 Residential Family Zoning Districts. I do not support this by-law...I did not support this by-law change at the Executive Policy Committee, but due to a recent turn of events in the past two days, I will be...I will be. But before I get to my reasons why, I want to share some interesting facts with council to consider. How many short-term rentals are there in Winnipeg? According to the public service, in Winnipeg, as of this week, the current listings of short-term rentals is 1,573 listings on Air DNA. Of those, 1,573 listings, 73% are entire houses, which is 1,148 houses. 424 are rooms. So, all of the houses and rooms are housing units that are off the market. These mini hotels are located in many residential neighborhoods, causing much grief to surrounding neighbours. So, what is Winnipeg allowing for short-term rentals versus other cities in Canada? In Winnipeg, the majority of council voted to allow four houses per owner to be used for short-term rental, meaning the owner can rent out his primary residence, plus own three other houses and rent them out. Across Canada, nine cities in Canada are allowing one house only, and that being the owner's primary house. Not four, one to be rented out as a short-term rental. The nine cities in Canada are Hamilton, London, St. Catherine's, Ottawa, Toronto, Mississauga, Kelowna, Vancouver and Victoria. So today, 1,148 houses are off the long-term rental market to be used solely for short-term rentals. In light of the fact that we are in a housing crisis, and that we are listening to requests from the poverty reduction advocates to secure more affordable housing in our Federal application, and that we're applying to the Federal Government for tens of millions of dollars to secure more housing. So, I will say I'm beyond frustrated that the majority of council supported allowing four houses per owner when nine cities in Canada are only allowing one, but fortunately, I am not the only one

frustrated. So is the Federal Government...two days ago, in the Federal Government's Fall financial update, I was very, very pleased to hear that there is going to be a crack down on short-term rentals to free up more homes and beds. Property owners who are non-compliant with the local laws will no longer be able to claim expenses against the income they make from the rentals. Additionally, and this is very positive, the Federal Government will provide \$50 million over three years to support municipal governments in their enforcement of short-term rental regulations. Some of you may recall, I brought forward an amending motion to provide yearly updates on tracking the short-term rental issues, the licencing, the violations and other issues that arise from short term rentals. So please know, similar to the report that comes forward related to illegal rooming houses, I will be following this report with intense scrutiny. I will be working with the by-law officers to understand the short-term rental issues throughout the year and working to ensure any property owners whose are not compliant with local laws, will be reported related to claiming expenses they make from their rentals. The City of Winnipeg will be applying to the \$50 million fund. I'll be working with Mike Jack on that...I don't know where he went but I will be...to secure even more software to track and audit. Like many illegal rooming houses, where many landlords take cash for rent, short-term rentals will be monitored and reported to the Canadian Revenue Agency if the records are not clean and accurate. My office has made many reports to the Canadian Revenue Agency about rooming houses where students are giving cash. We're not sure what the landlord is doing, whether they are declaring it or not, but the Canadian Revenue Agency is checking into it. For sure, there is no silver bullet in the context of a housing crisis, but I think every unit available for long-term rental counts. The Chief Economist at the Royal Bank of Canada stated that governments at all levels should be looking at every possible avenue to get these short-term rental units quickly into the long-term rentals, and I fully agree. When we talk about the Housing Accelerator Fund, I'll tell you how long it takes to get 1,100 units built and up and running. So today, I'll be supporting this zoning by-law change because it aims to ensure that all short-term rentals advertised on platforms are registered. So, we have to support this, get them registered and then we can do high-level scrutiny and support the Federal Government in cracking down, starting January 1, 2024. I fully expect in a year's time, we'll be making additional adjustments to fines and to the regulatory regime, and it's my hope that Winnipeg will also move to be reducing the number of short-term rentals allowed to individuals and to come more in line with many cities throughout Canada and the world. Thank you

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. I rise and I'm not sold. The current Federal Government says they have money. I don't know what's happening in the future. We are going to have to regulate this and we're going to apply for money, that's fine, Madam Speaker. What still isn't clear to me is that your primary residence plus three can be short-term rentals, but, and maybe the Mayor, when closing, I don't know if I missed the whole discussion maybe. I don't know but, if I have a primary residence and I don't want to rent it out as short-term rental but I've got three other houses, Madam Speaker, that I can rent out on a short-term rentals, to me, that's very interesting, Madam Speaker, because if you're running a true bed and breakfast in your primary home, you could also have people staying in there, paying, and I could be cooking them breakfast. That's the traditional bed and breakfast that I stayed in in Pinawa, in, where was I, Creston, British Columbia, and other places, Madam Speaker. So, we have regulation now. What we've had is...and make no mistake, Madam Speaker. The people who are doing short-term rentals now understood that across the country, it's kind of risky at this point, so they're the risk takers, Madam Speaker. So, if you are citing numbers today, and then you go, Madam Speaker, with, well let's just say, we'll say four, right? So, we have the risk takers who came in. I still say it's a hotel, the wedding hotel on Wellington Crescent in Councillor Orlikow's thing. I don't know if that's a non-private, it's zoned residential but it's a hotel, Madam Speaker, for people who are getting married and can have wedding parties and it's big enough, and all that space and you can do the wedding in the yard and what a beautiful place right? So, it's an estate basically, but, Madam Speaker, I don't want to get into too much detail, but now, there is 760 something thousand people in Winnipeg right now, Madam Speaker, or is it more than that? Anyway, so Madam Speaker, if I look at this and I say, well the risk takers came in and now I know, Madam Speaker, I can get into the business and I will not be penalized for doing this. There is no...the risk is totally taken out now, Madam Speaker. So, a thousand people come in, you've got 4,000. Let's say a thousand people jump in. That's a tiny fraction of Winnipeggers. So, to think of it in that context is wrong, Madam Speaker. I don't know why we allotted three. One more extra I think was what we were moving ahead with and then now we've got this zoning that gets changed in there, Madam Speaker. I don't agree with that. I hardly even agree...was going to hardly even agree that, you know, if short-term rentals, that's not a residential space. They're staying there for a short period of time. They're not living there. Living is, yeah you can have a month-to-month rental agreement. That's living

Madam Speaker: Thank you

Councillor Eadie: These short-term things are hotel rooms for rent. I am not voting for this report at all nor will I vote for the by-laws associated.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie. Just reading the room, I want to take a ten-minute recess. I think people could use a short bio break. Ten-minute recess and we'll reconvene. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
November 23, 2023, at 4:32 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: I believe we do, right?

Clerk: We do. We have quorum Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Travis, count down. I'd like to reconvene our Council Meeting of November 23rd, 2023, after a short recess. We are on Item No. 15. Mr. Mayor, it is your opportunity to close on the item.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. Thank you for the break as well. I appreciated that and I think all of our colleagues did, and so I'll invite you to call the question on the matter please. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Now voting on Item 15. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Noted. Thank you Councillor Eadie. Mr. Clerk, next item

Item 16 - Housing Accelerator Fund

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker. It has been quite the journey for all of us.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, just before you get into that, there is...this is Item 16. Okay. There is amending Motion 1, moved by the Mayor and seconded by Councillor Lukes. There is amending Motion 2. It's actually amending Motion 1. Motion 2 is amending Motion 1, and that's moved by Councillor Orlikow and seconded by Councillor Eadie. We do have a third motion that was circulated. It's actually out of order as per Rule 27. We can only allow two motions on the floor at one time. Councillor Mayes you are requesting suspension?

Councillor Mayes: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Mayes requests suspension of the rules, so we can hear Motion 9 that's moved by Councillor Mayes and seconded by Councillor Dobson. We'll vote on suspension. All in favour? please rise. -

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Chambers, Dobson, Eadie, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Santos, Schreyer, Wyatt and Madam Speaker, Councillor Sharma.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Browaty, Duncan, Lukes and Rollins.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Motion 9 will be heard in sequence. Mr. Mayor your opportunity to speak to the main item and your amendment.

Mayor Gillingham: Okay, am I speaking to all of the motion amendments?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Mayor Gillingham: So, the main item, my amendments.

Madam Speaker: All of the motions.

Mayor Gillingham: Motions 2 and 9? Okay. Alright.

Motion No. 1

**Moved by His Worship Mayor Gillingham,
Seconded by Councillor Lukes,**

WHEREAS many other Housing Accelerator Fund-(HAF) compliant municipalities have design guidelines, lot size requirements and additional location specific considerations built in to their planning processes;

AND WHEREAS the 'as-of-right' amendments to the HAF application would be subject to required public hearings and public notification processes, as outlined in municipal regulations and provincial legislation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 16 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 14, 2023, be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendations 1-7 and replace with the following:*
 - "1. That Council affirm its support for the Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF) application.*
 - 2. That the HAF application be amended to legalize four dwelling units per residential lot be permitted as-of-right city-wide.*
 - 3. That the HAF application be amended to legalize four units of up to four storeys as-of-right within 800 metres of high-frequency transit corridors as outlined in the City's HAF application and informed by the initial network changes in phase one of the Winnipeg Master Transit Plan."*
 - 4. That the HAF application be amended to ensure that new housing zoning reforms targeted for mall sites and commercial corridors – as proposed in City Council's Strategic Priorities Action Plan – allow for as-of-right development to facilitate quick approvals and construction of new housing.*
 - 5. That as-of-right approvals specified in Recommendations 2, 3 and 4 be contingent upon applicable zoning and by-law changes that are subject to a public hearing prior to enactment, and upon reasonable standards for construction, servicing and design, consistent with standards adopted or projected in other cities with completed HAF agreements, including:*
 - A. Lot size specifications, requiring that four units as-of-right be limited to a standard lot size or greater, with dimensions to be determined by Council after consideration of recommendations by the City Public Service, with total dimensions sufficient to support four housing units.*
 - B. Building form standards broadly consistent with existing Infill Guidelines, modified where necessary to meet the spirit of Recommendations 2 and 3.*
 - C. Height limits for developments under Recommendation 3, so four-storey as-of-right allowances are no greater than 48' and apply only to developments of four units. (Permitted heights for zones covered by Recommendation 2 alone would remain consistent with existing Infill Guidelines requirements).*
 - D. Urban servicing capacity requirements (including land drainage, water service, paved roadway and laneway service, and sufficient wastewater and flood protection capacity to meet existing provincial and federal regulations).*
 - E. Environmental standards, including the application of a tree protection and replacement by-law if City Council adopts such a by-law in future;*
 - F. Retention of the City's right to require consent to standardized development agreements where these would already typically be applied to new for-profit multi-residential developments to recover direct infrastructure costs to taxpayers, especially for those developments contemplated under Recommendation 4.*
 - 6. That all five Community Committees engage in consultation on the proposals, as outlined in Recommendations 2-5 above, no later than year-end 2024.*

7. *That the Public Service be directed to schedule public hearings and report back to the appropriate committee of Council, with the required by-law amendments to implement the intent of the foregoing. Winnipeg Zoning By-law and Downtown Zoning By-law amendments should be brought forward, if possible, as part of the Rapid Zoning By-law Amendments process, targeted for spring 2025 as noted in the HAF application.*
8. *That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing."*

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, this has been a long journey for everybody in this chamber and many of the folks outside this chamber as well. I want to take a moment just to say Thank you to the members of council for the dialogue, for the interaction, for efforts to strengthen what is before us and try to shape the motion that I am putting forward today. I want to thank members of the public service as well for their contributions and their efforts, and specifically Mr. Michael Jack, Moira Geer and Hazel Borys, and I want to Thank members of my own staff as well for the excellent work that they have done. There's been a lot of discussion about the Housing Accelerator Fund, the application that we put forward and voted on in July of this year itemizing 7 priorities that we would tackle and initiatives that we would undertake should we receive the funding that we have applied for or even a portion of the funding we've applied for. Let's be clear. We've applied for \$192 million. It would be wonderful if we could get \$192 million. If we take a look at what other cities across Canada have received in relation to their applications, it's usually something less than that so, I don't expect to get \$192 million for the City of Winnipeg, though that would be excellent if we could. We know by now that the motion that is before us, Motion No. 1, is in response to minister Sean Fraser's request that we bolster our application by including the items that are here laid out in Items No. 2, 3 and 4 of Motion 1. In discussion with councillors related to that, we've also come up with Items 5, (a) through (f), Item 6, Item 7. Those are direct reflections of the input of colleagues around this chamber. I'll reiterate a couple of things. First of all, that today Item No. 1 is an amendment to the application. It's not an amendment to our zoning by-law. That's a separate process that will happen subsequent to today, should this motion pass, and the by-law process, the rapid rezoning by-law, the overall Winnipeg by-law, zoning by-law, those are separate processes that necessitate public hearings, where the members of the public can be involved, members of council will be involved, and in fact, when you look at this motion and recommendation No. 6, states that all five community committees will be engaged in consultation on the proposals and so there is a role for all community committees as well, and so I want to Thank the several councillors including Councillor Wyatt and others who raised that and I want to Thank them for their contribution, to make sure that councillors have a lot of opportunity to hear from the public, to engage and to bring forward ideas and recommendations related to the specifics of things like lot size, building standards and other items. What we have before us is an opportunity to receive Federal funding, and to take that Federal funding and to leverage private sector funding, and to leverage with it, non-profit sector funding. And so, the question is here is not really \$192 \$192 or 150 million or 120 or a hundred million dollars. The dollars at stake here are much greater than that. If we pursue the 7 goals that we have within our Housing Accelerator application, that will in turn leverage funding from the private sector and the non-profit sector and, therefore, multiply this investment across our city to do what we need to do and that is to build housing, much needed housing. In our application, which targets 25% going towards building affordable housing, or more affordable housing will be built and we would target buildings of affordable housing and getting more of it constructed in our city. I know colleagues have two amending motions, Items No. 2 and 9 that contain increasing the targets related to the number of affordable units that can be built. That, to me, can still be done after...after we approve this. It doesn't need to be done now. We don't need to set new targets. Now, that would be changing the targets in our application as well, but there is nothing stopping us subsequent to from this day, to looking at those targets and increasing them and to try to get more housing built that is affordable, so open to that discussion, but I won't be supporting the two amendments on that today. When we look across the nation, we see what other cities have done and we see their response to Minister Fraser's request and suggestions to bolster their own applications. Zoning changes across Canada, most recently, Vancouver, Kelowna, Edmonton, Calgary, Regina, Brampton, Guelph, Burlington, Kitchener, Waterloo, Vaughan, London, Hamilton, Mississauga, Toronto, Richmond Hill, Ajax, Moncton, Charlottetown, Halifax; all have moved to four units per lot. Some, Edmonton for example, has moved to up to 8 units per lot. Vancouver, 3 to 8 units per lot and all through British Columbia, the Provincial Government stepped in and moved all the province to 3 to 6 units per lot. I do not want the City of Winnipeg to miss out when all other cities across this nation are receiving funding for housing, when we have a housing shortage across the nation. We need housing money and we need to get building on housing, and we need not only housing, but I really appreciate the e-mail that we got throughout the day from our FCM representative, Councillor Browaty, who is joining us today remotely. The talks about the work that FCM is doing, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, to remind the Federal Government that not only do we need housing, but we need the growth enabling infrastructure to support that housing, and so I would ask my colleagues when we vote on this to take a look that this is not only about receiving money from the Federal Government for a Housing Accelerator Fund, but we also have other asks into the Federal Government. I penned a letter requesting the Federal Government make an increase to their contribution for the ISET projects that they have committed to fund, specifically the North End Plant. Not that long ago, we voted as a council to approve an increase to the budget in Phase 2 of \$482 million. We as a city and the ratepayers of Winnipeg cannot bear that increase alone. That is not a cost overrun. That's not mismanagement of a project. That is reflective of the cost increases on so many

different areas of that project because the prices are going up. That project is funded by all three levels of government, and so I've asked the Federal and Provincial Governments, on our behalf, to increase their funding contribution towards the North End Water Treatment Plant, and I think it's important that we understand that this is not just about one request of the Federal Government to access the Housing Accelerator Fund, but I really see them all tied together, because the housing, to build it, necessitates all the services that support that housing, including, increasing the waste water treatment plant's capacity. I think I'll leave it there, Madam Speaker, for now and just add further things in my close. I know colleagues will have comments today, so I look forward to hearing from them. Thank you

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow, your opportunity to speak to amending Motion 2 that you put forward and, of course, any other motions before us.

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

WHEREAS City Council approved a comprehensive application to the federal Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF) on July 13, 2023 including a request for \$192M;

AND WHEREAS the HAF application submitted by the Council targets 5,277 housing units being generated for \$192M;

AND WHEREAS City Council does not know how much of a grant will be provided;

AND WHEREAS the HAF application already approved by Council targets HAF funding for the following zoning changes including:

- *R1 zoning to allow duplex*
- *Reduce lot area to allow for lot splits*
- *Reduce lot size from 5000 sq feet to 4000 sq feet to allow for side by sides*
- *Allow tri-plex on 35' lots*
- *Allow detached secondary suite*

AND WHEREAS the October 24, 2023 Federal Housing, Infrastructure and Communities Minister, Sean Fraser letter, regarding the City of Winnipeg's HAF application, gave the City of Winnipeg an "opportunity to bolster its existing application" by including the following elements:

- *Providing development rights for four units on all residential properties city-wide;*
- *Providing development rights for four story buildings within 800 metres of transit on all residential properties city-wide; and*
- *Permitting as a right mid-rise housing for mall sites and commercial corridors city-wide*

AND WHEREAS Council can only speculate what amount of funding will be approved, number of units that will be generated based on that funding and amount of funding that would be increased by accepting the Federal opportunity;

AND WHEREAS the Federal opportunity is permanent, is not included as part of the HAF application targets and is outside the three-year funding grant;

AND WHEREAS the Federal government opportunity is not aligned with City approved policies including Complete Communities and in-fill guidelines which recognizes the uniqueness of different areas of the City, providing the basis for accommodating moderate growth and change in a way that is sensitive to its context;

AND WHEREAS the City has not provided Council or residents with information on the impact of the Federal opportunity;

AND WHEREAS accepting the Federal government opportunity would place more conditions for HAF funding on Winnipeg than other agreements reached in other Canadian municipalities;

AND WHEREAS alternative funding options and amendments to the existing HAF plan are available to assist Winnipeg reach its goal of 14,101 additional units;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg in-fill intensification targets are presently being surpassed;

AND WHEREAS HAF is a nationally competitive fund, Winnipeg has provided an ambitious plan to address housing access and homelessness without taking advantage of the Federal opportunity;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT amending Motion 1 to Item 16 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 14, 2023, be amended as follows:

1. *Delete Recommendation 2.*
2. *Delete Recommendation 3.*
3. *Add the following new recommendation and number accordingly:*

“That the Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF) application, be amended to increase the below market housing rental targets from 25% to 40% of incentivized units;”

4. *Add the following new recommendation and number accordingly:*

“That the Development Procedures By-law No. 104/2020 be amended to designate Council as the hearing body for the required zoning by-law amendments.”

Councillor Orlikow: Okay. Well Thank you very much, and I did want to Thank Mayor Gillingham has talked to. I have been able to work with some councillors, reached out to many. Some were open to the idea of talking some more and some weren't, and that's okay, but I do appreciate the ones that took the time to maybe sit down and say where are you coming from, Councillor Orlikow. So, where I am coming from is...and I went down the rabbit hole on this one pretty hard because I had no information. I wasn't given any information. I have my list of support and I take Councillor Lukes from the days of past. I have many, many questions that are still unanswered. Well they are, and they are listed (inaudible), we had a seminar, it was vague and really, I won't get down to too many detail points. It ended up being approve this today, trust me, it will work out later. That's kind of what I had to be left with. Now I had a few people over had a little bit of function to talk about this in my house, again, on my own accord trying to catch up with an incredibly short time line that we 've been forced to, or we decide...let's face it, we're deciding to make a choice here today. So, we did that, and when I tell them that's a reply to the very questions about, what will be a side yard. I don't know. Trust me. We'll work that out later. Oh, what about this? What about shadowing. I don't know. Trust me later. Will the variances be appealable? I don't know. Trust me later. That didn't go well, and nor should it didn't go well for me. It didn't go well for the residents that I talked to. So why are they so concerned? Well such a, you know, a glorious thing that we're going to do, exclusionary housing. It should all go bye bye. It's legal now because supposedly it was illegal before, the language that we're using. Well it's not. I actually really do enjoy and appreciate residents that come out and tell me why an application is good or bad. They're taking their own private time out of their day because a major investment is in that neighbourhood. They don't always win. Sometimes they do win, but I can't sit here today and say, well we're just going to approve this, the three main things from Minister Fraser, because you know what? I look at what we are actually planning to do in the HAF report we have now. It's fabulous, looking at some triplexes, looking at green stuff. I'm not sure it's all going to fly, but they all went through the infill guidelines. They've all been tested. We've all tried them a bit. So, there is nothing brand new, but again, how are we going to move forward on it and will we? That's okay, because we've tried. I kind of understand what it means when do you a detached secondary suite, you know, as long as you don't change the lot coverage. That can work. Again, these are things that we are doing. To remember the HAF application we have in now is not based anywhere in here about the units that have never changed the HAF application, so the units in here are based upon what was existing when we did this. Not within the Minister's mandate, or no sorry, not a mandate, a request to bolster the application. So, we have those numbers here. We have 8,000 (inaudible), 8,000 plus of existing, adding, if we get which I appreciate the Mayor agreeing, that \$192 million is a long shot but that's what we went for because we wanted to do that. Go for the long shot. We're not going to get that. If we do, wonderful, but we're worried that if we say no to Minister Fraser, that we'll get nothing. We'll be back of the bus. Well, again, there's 4 MP's here that need to be re-elected. I don't think that's going to happen, but we...I wasn't part of the negotiations. I trust the Mayor did the best he can, but I don't believe the negotiations were anything more than my way or the highway. I never play well with "my way or the highway". I never play well with short time lines. That's how you get in trouble. So, no, I understand what you people are saying. This is a big amount of money. We did a great application. It has so many good things that are based upon our own experiences, our own Winnipeg model. So, I appreciate that, I do support, at least (inaudible), but it's these other three things that they dropped on. Again, fundamentally, and you can say well maybe it won't be 50-foot yards. Maybe it won't. Maybe (inaudible) so don't worry about it so much Councillor Orlikow. Well I am, because if you put a four-storey building on a 50-foot yard in the middle of a bungalow, throughout all our neighbourhoods, with or without a back lane, it will be an amazing change. It will not be accommodating moderate growth and change that is sensitive to its context, which is our policies. We've gone through this for years, years. So I feel a little hood winked now that that was the thing we went for. It was very difficult to do, but now we're saying to you, eh, forget those policies. We're going to just accept Minister Fraser's request and we're going to

allow, maybe, maybe not, trust me, a 50-foot lot mid block by two bungalows. That's incredibly transformative and really detrimental to those neighbourhoods going in there. Nothing against the trees, the bio-diversity, trust me. Later on, we'll talk about that too. Again, it's a little too much "trust me". We should have slowed this down. We should've had some more information available, but I didn't get it provided. So, after weeks of trying to figure out how to get this done, to support the Mayor in his efforts, because I, you know, he is the Mayor and he's doing his best, I just could not come to a conclusion at the end where I can support the four-plex four storey as of right. I cannot. And so I explained that to the Mayor. Didn't go well. It was a hard meeting we had, but again, I cannot go back to the residents of the River Heights-Fort Garry Ward and say, don't worry about it, trust me, even though we said it as of right, we're going to change some kind of lot size massing, or whatever we're going to do, so it actually won't happen. That's disingenuous of the whole process, so again I have to believe that when we say that we're going to build, allow on a standard lot, which was 50 by 100-foot lot, we're going to accept the Minister Fraser's offer that that...we have to actually make that happen. Not that we're going to block it along the way, because again the public has a right to know before we start down this slippery slope, this path that they know what we're talking about, and I don't know, I don't. I don't know what any of this really means. Again, will it happen in River Heights? Will this...I know some councillors are talking about, you know, this will really help some of the inner-city housing. I sure hope so. I haven't any proof of that yet. Oh, we have a huge supply problem in Winnipeg. We don't. We saw today, the CMHC report says we don't. We have a below market housing, so that's why I added in the 40%. Councillor Mayes put a steep number in there. The reason why I didn't put those numbers in there, is because that is based upon getting \$192 million. We don't get \$192 million, those numbers are really off, so that's why I said 40% of whatever we get, regardless. So yeah, so and then we're already going to have to come back with a HAF report because some of the other items that we're talking about, the seven principles or the seven ideas, you know, contingency. \$23 million. That's interesting. We have infrastructure support, \$34 million. Land enhancements \$50 million. Concierge program \$2 million. Digitization and facilitation, whatever that means, that's \$23 million. Oh sorry, \$25 million. So again, we're going to have to move these numbers around when we come back, but right now, I'm going on this HAF application, but it also does not have anything which will dramatically change what we're doing if we have as of right housing in four-storey, four plexes throughout the whole entire city. So again, I'd love to be able to support this. I have been burned in the past. I won't be burned again in the future. The neighbourhood needs to be protected. They need to know that we're working in their best interests, not for the minister's best interests. I think we need to say to him, Thank you very much. We put a very good HAF application forward to you. I appreciate what you're saying. We can look at it at a later date but now, let's stay with what the application asks us to do. We did it for you. We did it in spades I think. It's a great program, not to say, not just to bow down and say yes sir, we're going to this without talking to the neighbourhood, without actually knowing what actually it means. We're just going to do it because we're (inaudible) these large statements about the housing crisis in Canada. Again, let's talk about Winnipeg, Manitoba. So that's what I said, that's why I want to raise the affordable housing units. Again, the minister may get upset about that, but again, that's negotiating. You want to do this to us. What are we getting in return? Well, I may give you more money. We don't even know what that money would be. You know, so at the end of the day, we have no idea if we got the boost that he's talking about, even if we go along with this. So again, I can maybe go with the corridors, that one is possible, but again, not those two other ones, the four-plexes and four-storey mid-block and bungalows. It was a ridiculous idea. It's terrible for the neighbourhood. It destroys what neighbourhoods do and it's completely opposite to our policies, and I don't...I cannot say I am agreeing with this now and go out to my neighbours and say trust me, it will work out fine later. I cannot believe that. It's too big of a thing to do that flying blindly. So again, I thank the Mayor for what he's tried to do. I know it's a difficult meeting for everybody, but I am willing to take that risk to get a few dollars less so we can actually make sure that this is a Winnipeg, made in Winnipeg program, and then we can go forward together and talk about other options later on. But this is not...I'm not going to be commanded by the Federal Government, who is outside its mandate to even do this, in my opinion, through...so, I am not...I can't, I tried but I think four-plexes, four storeys, mid-blocks, and remember also people think, ah it's 50. Again, we've seen throughout the neighbourhood...one minute? Just one minute. I'll wrap up.

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

Councillor Orlikow: What I would do if I was a developer, I would say, hey, I'll just go find two lots. I'll find three lots, because right now, our infill guidelines let you do three-lot amalgamations, the 150 feet. Well as of now, you have in the middle of a block, possibly, again not saying it will happen but I don't know any protection (inaudible) to stop it. You're going to have someone's going to wait to find three properties, row to row, to build a four-storey, fourplex that's mid-block, destroy the whole block. Again, I've got a fourplex in my neighbourhood, three and a half, I guess it is secondary. Do secondary suites count? Supposedly. Maybe not. We'll find out later. But do you know what? It matches what that neighbourhood is like, it has the side yards, not really a backyard anymore. Not a bad idea. Something to talk about. We are already talking about that with triplexes and duplexes and lot splits, and all the other things. So, if you want to take the risk. If you think it's worth it to get some unknown amount of money. I'm not going to begrudge you. That's your choice and that's fine, but I'm saying personally for myself and my experience around this table and council, that I will not take that risk for my neighbourhood in the River Heights-Fort Garry neighbourhood, where I believe, we will be the most impacted with the back lanes that we have and the other areas. So again, maybe when we have a chance to talk to people, I can't wait till after. I'm not willing to put this forward at this time. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Orlikow. Next is Councillor Mayes. We've got Motion 9, moved by Councillor Mayes.

Motion No. 9
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Dobson,

BE IT RESOLVED that amending Motion 1 to Item 16 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated November 14, 2023, be amended by adding the following new recommendation, and renumbering the remaining recommendation accordingly:

- "8. *That in order to achieve the 7,500 units required over the next 10 years to meet the need in Winnipeg for affordable housing, the number of affordable housing units be increased from 1,342 to 2,250 units, with all 2,250 units being non-market housing owned by public, non-profit, co-op, or Indigenous-led housing providers, and targeted to the lowest-income Winnipeggers by making them rent-geared-to-income.*"

Councillor Mayes: As indicated, I have two questions relatively brief for Mike Jack.

Madam Speaker: Okay. You've also got questions of clarification for our CAO, if you could come to the podium please. We will not start the clock for this question period.

Michael Jack: I don't think I've ever done this. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Mayes: Two questions. One, the documents we received last week made some reference to processes around zoning by-law changes being in 2026. Other documents have talked about first quarter spring. I'm not too worried about that difference. Let us say, first quarter of 2025. So, 2025, 2026. My concern is, if we are moving forward on the rapid amendments, including the Minister's insisted upon fourplexes and then the height limit, surely then we are moving at the same time on the various things that are contained in this amendment from the Mayor. The issue around the roadways, the issue around flood protection, the issue around development agreements. All of that should arrive at the same time. The conditioning of the as of right stuff should arrive at the same time as the as of right stuff. Could you clarify.

Michael Jack: Sure. Thank you to you Councillor through Madam Speaker. That is our intention and obviously the public service had some discussion and input into the...all the criteria you see under Clause 5 of Motion 1. All the other conditions, in addition to the as-of-right requirements or suggestions that have been provided by the Federal Government, and it would be our intention that those would all be in place at the time. Now some, if you notice for instance Clause 5e, it does qualify it, and indicate that, you know, including a tree protection or replacement by-law if council adopts such a by-law in the future. So, you also all have been privy to the discussions that have taken place around the comprehensive urban forest strategy and in particular, I note even the standing policy committee did direct further work to be done on something like a private property tree protection by-law. So ideally, all of these will come...the guard rails or the other conditions, ideally all of that is in place by the time we're going live with the rapid zoning amendments that are going to be in front of you for consideration in the first quarter of '25.

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

Councillor Mayes: So, take that as yes, since it does say the word "contingent" in here, in Clause 5 that the timing has to be the same, and to the credit of the head of Planning, she has indicated the same thing, the Director. Second question, the...one of the things that was in the original application under 6 of the, the Condition 6 under the original application includes the reference to "infrastructure improvements could also include public community amenities in strategic locations to enhance the marketability and quality of life around key projects". Perhaps I'll start...stop calling it the Cloutier Clause and start calling it the Tim Comack Clause, since he's the one who actually referenced this earlier today. So, I would assume that if we're going ahead, that is part of the parcel that is the expedited, not in some 2026 date that if we're bringing this other...we're bringing the package forward in '25, it was a terrific report by (inaudible), as you know, which you're familiar with, June 2021 about community benefits potentially coming to the communities that are experiencing infill. So, if we can just have your verbal reassurance, I guess, is all I can ask for that that, if there's a community benefits clause to be inserted, it would come at the same time as the other provisions.

Michael Jack: Likely, Councillor, through you Madam Speaker. It wouldn't...changes to that agreement infrastructure, you know, as...you're familiar with the report and thank you. You brought some of it to my attention recently. It was a...included a jurisdictional scan. They noted jurisdiction like B.C. where development cost charges weren't available,

similar to us, some of what you would include might be included in something like an impact fee model but we know we don't currently have something like that, and so the report made it clear that both the community benefit agreements and the community amenity contributions are things that could be considered in the absence of those things. So that could absolutely address it, and I would undertake that we would have that discussion. I wouldn't want it to be mired in Plan 6. In other words, it may require its own complicated discussions within industry. It...Plan 6 or Objective 6, I think, it's fair to say when you read it, has a focus of the upgrades that might be required for water, waste water and land drainage, but you are right in noting that the last sentence there in terms of other infrastructure improvements that would be useful that would benefit the community, I would undertake that we would reinvigorate that discussion. I note the report you were talking about, I believe, ended at the Standing Policy Committee on P and D in '021 and it was received for information and I'm sure it was received well, but nothing further came of it, and so I could undertake here and go on the record indicating I will work with the Director to...to reinvigorate the discussion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. One question from Councillor Schreyer as well.

Councillor Schreyer: Yeah. And Thank you, very...very briefly, we're told that there will be a consultation period should this pass and very briefly, what is the process by which the public consultation will come back to have potential impact on this, this by-law package?

Michael Jack: Through you, Madam Speaker, I will assume councillor, you are referring to specifically the zoning by-law amendments that we've been talking about, and so over the next year a number of activities would be undertaken by the department. It involves research, involves a fair degree of consultation, but then of course as required by The Charter, in and around quarter 1 of '025, that is when we would bring back both the amendments and then the public hearing process would occur.

Councillor Schreyer: So, excuse me. The public hearing process begins in the first quarter of 2025?

Michael Jack: Yes. Yeah. It would take place as per The Charter requirements. Prior to then there would be significant consultation in the community.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer final question.

Councillor Schreyer: Yeah sure. Thank you. So just it clarify, there will be no public consultation in 2024. It begins in 2025?

Michael Jack: Through you Madam Speaker, fair question. I don't want to confuse the terminology. There is a difference between consultation and a public hearing. To be clear, the public hearing, as required by The Charter, would occur, we expect and we will work towards the first quarter of '025. Consultation on all of these proposed changes would occur throughout '024.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Jack. I also want to draw Council's attention to the motions before us that do outline consultation as well, specifically Mayor Gillingham's motion. Thank you, Mr. Jack.

Michael Jack: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes your opportunity to speak to the item.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Madam Speaker. Thanks to Councillor Orlikow for his remarks. I'll try not to duplicate them. I agree with the vast majority of them and thank him for his efforts on this. Number 1, Thank you to Brian Kelcey from the Mayor's Office for trying to come up with a made in Winnipeg solution. I think there were good faith efforts made. Some more specificity was needed though. Councillor Orlikow made this point. There's a difference between saying we'll have to think about lot size. What do you mean? Do you mean 50 feet? Do you mean 25 feet? Do you mean 50 by 100 deep? Do you mean 50 by 200 hundred deep? All of that, had we been able to come up with something, I think I could have lived with the rest of it if we'd been able to come up with a few more sentences but unfortunately, that was not the case, but I Thank Mr. Kelcey for trying. Number 2, there is a loss of democracy here. There's enormous irony in hearing person after person come forward saying, and public delegation, you have to listen to us in public delegation, you have to have more as of right here...you have to have more as of right developments which will mean the loss of the ability to have any public delegation. The usual response is, oh they're just NIMBY's. So, in some months from now, if we're standing here and Mr. Wintrup comes forward with a fourplex, 47 feet high on the Lemay Forest, will we say Thank God we're not hearing from all those NIMBY's around there? No, we'll say, what, we're not hearing from these people? And Mr. Wintrup will say, it's as of right. It's as of right, as of January 1st. That is what he will say and he will be correct, so there is a loss of democracy here. There's no other way around it. On this I agree with the FAQ that was put out which is elimination of public hearings

is inherent to the meaning of "as of right" Expanding these as of right (inaudible) would mean hearings would be eliminated if land owners comply with all the design standards, et cetera. We don't have those design standards. That's part of our difficulty. Well might the Mayor say, you're the one who always says it matter what people run on. It was in his platform to do that. As of right, it's in there for main corridors and for parking lots of shopping centres, I believe, and that would be a fair comment, and the Mayor won and that was in his platform, but that wasn't in the platform around fourplexes and the height limits. So, I think ironically, a lot of this has actually fallen apart based on what the Federal Minister is trying to impose. I do think in a way, Councillor Orlikow's points can be summarised by another excerpt from the FAQ which is, the Minister is saying...and I gotta say it...I don't know the Federal Minister. I think the Federal Minister has out-bargained the hell out of the City of Winnipeg, so kudos to the Minister for whatever he's been doing. We just keep seem to be moving our position, which is unfortunate. I know Mr. Kelcey and others have tried, but I'll be interested to see how many of these conditions they are actually going to accept and if we'll then vote to remove all the conditions. But that is for another day. The condition from the Federal Government, in writing, legalizing four units as of rights, city-wide. Question 12, Could any fourplex be built anywhere? Answer, no. Well, obviously the answer to the question, legalizing four units as of right city-wide is yes. It could be built anywhere, except you want to have conditions. But we don't know the conditions, because they're not specified today, and we don't know if the Federal Government will agree to those conditions. So Councillor Orlikow is correct in this. Is it 50-foot wide lots? Is it 50 by 200? I have several of these in St. Vital? Is it something else. Is it 25-foot lots? We don't know. As Councillor Orlikow said, it's sort of a blind trust us, it'll all be fine. We don't know that, we don't know what conditions the Federal Government might agree to, so it is unfortunate that it's come to that point. I think as we go forward on this, certainly it's been from a St. Vital perspective, we do need more specificity. We cannot treat gravel lanes the same as paved. I think Mr. Kelcey tried to put that in the conditions. I appreciate that. Also, you could go through the infill guidelines, and I have spent rather a lot of time on these and so have others and I don't think they survive this vote. Among the highlighted items, that's just some of the reference to about a lane. Mr. (inaudible), Mr. Scott, put in a lot of provisions about how it's important to about a lane. It reduces the conflict with pedestrians. It increases the amount of on-street parking that's still available. All of these things. Why was Niakwa Park exempted? Sixty-foot wide lots, they don't have lanes, so none of that work (inaudible). That might not work in Councillor Orlikow's ward to be fair, but I certainly think that was an important consideration, very important. It's throughout the infill guidelines that there is a preference if you about a lane. That is not here. I think it should be as we go forward. I'll leave it at...I would hope people...the Federal Government is putting forward a position. Let's have the bravery to say we are voting here, everyone is free to vote as they see fit. It was a great Eric Church line, from Mr. Misunderstood, owning that path you're walking on, so let's...if you're going to vote on this today, let's own your vote. Don't blame the Federal Government for making you do something. That's some of my colleagues have been saying, well, we're just going to blame Dan Vandal. Hey you've got to vote here today. If you don't like the conditions, vote against them, but if the fourplexes start pouring in, no one's...nobody in the public is going to say, well you're the councillor. Oh, I'm just going to blame the Federal Government. Frankly it's a rather juvenile tactic, so if you're going to talk today and just blame the Federal Government, you have a vote. You have a vote. Own it. So, the Mayor has said to me, and I think it was good advice, stop rehashing past grievances. That's fair. I'm hoping Councillor Lukes listens to that with those speeches about being in exile, but we'll come to that some other day. But I'm trying to avoid some of the past grievances of what's happened in my ward. Good advice from the Mayor. I will say I think this is a pretty fundamental change in direction. It's a very fundamental change in direction for the City of Winnipeg. The Minister, the Federal Minister's tweet the other day, "the City is voting whether to legalize housing" is frankly pretty juvenile. I have to respect the Mayor's tweet which was "we are voting to apply for up to 192." Not "we're going to secure, we're going to get 192, we're voting to apply". That is correct. The Mayor is also saying it's a vote in principle. That is correct. My trouble is, the talk around here is well, we're going to have a public hearing. We're going to have one public hearing on this, and if it passes then see earlier comments about, there won't be public hearings for the as of rights stuff. There will be a loss of input a loss of democracy. So, there will be one public hearing. Either the Federal Government is going to write us a bunch of cheques over the next year and not care if we actually live up to what we vote on today, which means somebody from the Federal Government should probably be fired, or the Federal Government's going to write a bunch of cheques on condition that we do what we say we're going to do. And then we're going to have a very interesting public hearing where people are going to say, well I still have an open mind but I don't want to forfeit the \$90 million or whatever it's been. So, in which case, some of our people should be fired because we've been told no, no, no, no, you can just take the money and it doesn't matter what you do down the line. So, it would be extremely useful to have that clarified. The Federal Government hasn't done it. I think they've out-negotiated us to be frank. So either the vote's going to come in January, February, March of '26, the one vote on the zoning changes and we cannot do what we say today. Do we have to pay the money back? No one seems to know. Well if we don't have to pay the money back, I'm not sure who's putting in the conditions for the Federal Government, but that will be a very odd provision, and I have to say, I'm very skeptical that some how we'll just be able to take the money and run. I'll leave it at that. Two more things. I do think the amendment is well founded in terms of promoting social housing, affordable housing and certainly not wording from me. It's wording that came in from the Housing Coalition. We all got a series of those e-mails, so hopefully people can support the amendment. It will get a bit awkward with different amendments flying around, but we can think our way through that. I'll save some of my comments...I guess I get to close on this as well, so I'll save some of my comments until that point. A couple of things. If you're going to say be bold and we cannot be left behind by the rest of the nation, you can say that but with that comes an exciting opportunity for Councillor Wyatt and I to reintroduce

our LRT motion because, I mean, it's the exact same list of cities we deserve...like Vancouver, Edmonton, Calgary, Kitchener-Waterloo, Hamilton, Vaughan, Toronto, even Richmond Hill has some subway connections, so I guess we can not be left behind the rest of the nation on that as well. I mean that's generally the direction we seem to be heading. Or, frankly I might need one more minute Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Gillingham moves one minute. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Mayes: The other matter, frankly, was touched upon by Mr. Jack, which is fairly soon we will need then to have a vote about an impact fee. Other, see earlier list of cities. I know Councillor Lukes, then Councillor Gillingham voted against the impact fee. I voted for that. I think we shouldn't get left behind other cities as well if that's the case, and we should be bold. So, if we're making a zoning by-law change, that would seem appropriate. I do think as we move to perhaps a more, (inaudible) may ask of you of density in the city, we're going to have to revisit certain other things. Our commitment to Kenaston, our commitment to Chief Peguis, but perhaps those comments can wait for another day. So, in the end, I do support the amendment. I think there is a loss of democracy here. I don't know that it's worth what's being promised, but I'll have some more comments when I close.

Councillor Wyatt: I missed it but did Councillor Mayes speak to his Clause 9?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Wyatt: He did?

Madam Speaker: Amending Motion 9 and the entire item. Next speaker, Councillor...

Councillor Eadie: As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, I just rise. I didn't want to interrupt the council member from St. Vital, but utilizing the words, and we criticize other Councillors around the Chamber, to typify somebody's vote as juvenile is, I think, a violation of decorum, and I just want to make that clear. It's not that bad, but making comments like that, I think Madam Speaker, are not appropriate.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie. Noted.

Councillor Mayes: I didn't say anyone's vote.

Madam Speaker: Next speaker is Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you Madam Speaker. So, this week, I attended the top-off party at the ALIGN apartment block located beside The ARC apartment block at the corner of Pembina Highway and Bison Drive. A top-off party celebrates the completion of the top and final floor during construction. I want to congratulate Henry Morton and Neil Hilton on two beautiful structures, and Thank them for the highly needed mixed-use student-oriented housing towers. In total it took five years of planning, design, construction, but we have now added 1,100 beds of safe student housing to the neighbourhood, and to note, during the five years of these projects, the two towers, the developer was highly motivated to accelerate as fast as possible because the demand was and still continues to be high, but it took five years. So, I thoroughly believe Winnipeg is experiencing a housing crisis that is being primarily triggered by an increase in immigration and the overall cost of housing. I want to share with you one example in south Winnipeg where I think our housing crisis in the south end started in 2012. In 2011, 2,000 full time international students were registered at the U of M. Ten years later, in 2022, 6,000 full time students are now registered. So that's an additional 4,000 students, not including any part-time students, that are attending the U of M, yet the university has not added one additional dorm bed at all. So, I don't know where these 4,000...I know where these 4,000 students are living. That's another story. But, in addition to the students, the very successful provincial nominee program has resulted in a significant increase of immigrants arriving in Manitoba. Canada's Immigration Minister, Mark Miller, recently announced a national immigration targets for Canada for the next three years. 2023 - 465,000. 2024 - half a million. 2025 - half a million. Winnipeg is one of the top four or five, it's debatable, cities that immigrants choose to move to. Cost of living is a primary reason. Winnipeg has seen incredible immigration growth considering that in 2015, just under 300,000 people came to Canada. So the Federal Government's not backing down on these immigration numbers. So, when they come to Winnipeg where will they stay? What housing will there be? Will housing increase because there's a shortage? Will the prices increase because there is a shortage and if there is no housing, they'll move to somewhere else, wherever the accommodation is. We won't grow our tax base, costs will go up. This is really concerning. The Federal Government is offering cities millions of dollars to construct more housing to essentially support their immigration program, and to enable more affordable housing. Winnipeg has applied for 192 million, but observing what other Canadian cities are receiving, I anticipate we'll receive less. In order to receive the accelerated funding, of course, the Federal Government is encouraging council to support the Minister's request. Is it an overreach of the Federal Government to direct cities on zoning, to make these requests? Is it a loss of democracy? Some

perceive it to be. Others feel this approach is sometimes required to make significant bold change. I will be voting to receive the Housing Accelerator Funding. Upwards of 100, 130 million will leverage additional millions from the development community to build a lot of new and affordable housing. This funding will leverage additional millions and will be a significant stimulus to Winnipeg's economy through the trades and industry. This funding will allow Winnipeg to direct where housing is needed, which is a very, very rare opportunity, and I hear the concern that changes in zoning to legalize floor dwellings per...four dwelling units per residential lot will destroy neighbourhoods. I don't believe that will happen. I don't think as one of our presenters noted today, that this will be the boogie man everyone thinks it will be. Many, many Canadian American cities have implemented as a right four-unit developments, and neighbourhoods have not been destroyed but have gently changed. I have many scars from the evil Waverley West urban sprawl discussions that I came into when I started in this role. We don't want to build out. We don't want to build up. Sometimes we need a bit of prodding, and I feel that that is necessary. So, if we are fortunate to secure any funding, the city will then implement rules around tree preservation, lot sizes, form, design and details and guidelines related to the four dwellings per residential lot. There's a lot of work to work through. We can and we will, but I really believe we need to move on this opportunity, secure the funding, spend the next two years hammering out the details. It would be my greatest fear that if we don't accept the federal funding, our city will begin to decline. We need immigration to increase our tax base. We need affordable housing to help some many homeless, to get my kids out of the house, but we need housing to make this happen. We need the Federal Government's funding to support and stimulate growth in Winnipeg, through the industries, through the industries' spending. I won't be supporting Items No. 2 and 9 primarily because I really would like to see us secure the funding first and then determine the amount of affordable housing and other details, the amount of funding that we'll be investing and improving the systems and all of that. I'll be supporting the amending motion put forward by the Mayor to get the money, and I know that sounds...maybe that sounds greedy, maybe that sounds... I don't care about the rest of the details, but I think at this point in time, we are being offered money, we have been told if you don't want it, fine. There's an over subscription to the program. Many others do. So, I really believe that we can spend the next two years working out all these details, but I think it's really important today that we support the motion to move forward on this. Thank you.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you Madam Speaker. You know, for some time, cities have been advocating through the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to build housing, and today, the Chair of Big City Mayor's Caucus in Halifax, Mayor Savage, you know, really pushed back against his premier. Why? Because like we saw, Madam Speaker, last term, money, Ottawa money was left on the table, and when the water just couldn't flow, Federation of Canadian Municipalities, Big City Mayors, were really successful in their lobby to make sure we directed it to cities to flow out as quickly as possible, and that...that stayed with me last term and I had no greater voice, Madam Speaker, for my frustration with watching the Provincial Government not draw down money, then our current Mayor, Mayor Gillingham. I for one am grateful to the Federal Minister who is not only...and I believe, Madam Speaker, he is getting a bit of a rough ride today, and I want to say why I am grateful. My last conversation with Jim Carr, Madam Speaker, was about his faith in Sean Fraser as an immigration minister. At the time, I was frustrated, I was hearing feedback on visas being slow and he's like, it's okay, it's okay, Sean's got this, you know, and I want to say I was really excited that he became Housing Minister, Madam Speaker. Why? Because this is a pretty key moment, and I believe that through his, and just like Councillor Lukes mentioned, Madam Speaker...I believe that through his immigration role, he's a stronger housing minister because he believes in, like we do, Madam Speaker, the economic fulfilment in Winnipeg is somehow linked to newcomers coming here and making sure that they come here. We have to do something about their ambitions and the dollars that we secure through our positive vote today, make sure in part that there, you know, that there's some surety for newcomers in the city and no one has done more for immigration around this table than Councillor Markus Chambers, Madam Speaker, given his previous role in the Provincial Government. Mr. Fraser, then Immigration Minister, now Minister of Housing, really launched a program to accommodate higher immigration flows, Madam Speaker, and there is nuance to him as Housing Minister, and I want to acknowledge that today, and I want to acknowledge that we're going to be using this money for enabling infrastructure and there are places in St. Norbert and Seine River where Councillor Chambers has pointed out several times that there is no enabling infrastructure to build Madam Speaker. The last call I had, Madam Speaker, with Ed Schreyer was about The Bay building where we have envisioned to build housing downtown Madam Speaker. Now I have...I was actually kind of intimidated when Ed Schreyer gave me a call. I thought, my goodness, your son's on council, you're calling me. Thank you, but you knew it was my ward Madam Speaker, and he said...he said the following things and I'd like to quote him in the chamber today if I may, Madam Speaker, because his words really resonate, and I knew him to be a builder of housing and for his international work on Habitat for Humanity. And he says "The consequences of inaction are self-evident and sad. Across the country, too many families are in need of simple, decent, affordable housing. Owning a home helps reduce the burden on public housing properties, but it can't be achieved on a large and meaningful scale without the leadership of government." And that's what we're being asked to do today, Madam Speaker, and the words that were so relevant back in the 90's that Ed Schreyer spoke and the words that are relevant today for us. We have these programs. Programs that help, tax credit programs, that help with down payments like the Métis Nation, are given to their residents and then the Federal Government follows suit maybe to help Councillor Lukes' sons, Madam Speaker, and my daughter. We are donating suitable land to provide for housing, below market rate. We're doing these

things that Ed Schreyer talked about, Madam Speaker. But we need some grants, significant grants like Moira Geer has told us about, and no one's caught this ball from Mike Jack more than Moira Geer and I want to acknowledge her today. And the grants that this fund supports, Madam Speaker, base funding of 20,000, multi-unit housing near rapid high frequency transit 15,000. (inaudible) 12,000, and others, 7,000 and an affordable housing bonus of 19,000, you can get upwards of 54,000 per unit, Madam Speaker and I for one don't want to waste any time on grabbing those grants from the Federal Government and moving them out the door, Madam Speaker. I'll say it's daunting to follow Councillor Orlikow, Councillor Mayes, Councillor Gilroy, as the job of Chair of Property and Development, and I know Councillor Browaty also occupied the Chair. I have work cut out for me, Madam Speaker, on consistency of decisions around this chamber, and no one's been more consistent on our inconsistencies than my colleague, Councillor Mayes. The clarity on policy is also a focus and to always be making, made in Winnipeg solutions, Madam Speaker, and city building the way Winnipeggers can feel proud of, and I want to acknowledge the yes in Winnipeg folks that are still in this gallery today, Madam Speaker, to hear this debate, and I of course always acknowledge Councillor Duncan, Councillor Dobson and Councillor Allard at the Property and Development Committee for their very hard work. When and where zoning by-laws need the time, like we took for short-term rentals, Madam Speaker and regulating them for the first time in our city's history, I will take the time as Chair and I commit that today. We can take the time. But this is a three-year program, Madam Speaker, so time is a bit of the...in the essence. We have core housing need that needs to be addressed across the housing continuum and I want to conclude...oh before I do that, I want to acknowledge Westminster Housing who called me to pitch how successful four-storey projects have been for them in terms of wrap around housing supports and affordable housing and no one knows this I think better than Councillor Gilroy who is for apartment dwellings with the help of Wins Bridgman Architect, is serving women fleeing domestic violence. Could you imagine if we had a grant structure like this for Wins Bridgman and that type of project? The group of folks that wrote council, the group of folks that wrote council to say don't let the sector down by leaving money on the table in Ottawa to be distributed to other big cities, I'm just needing one more minute Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow moves extension, one minute. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Rollins: They wanted to underline how the Housing Accelerator Fund is important and the money is strongly needed. And further, they wanted to tell us about the positive council vote they expect and they see as necessary, and I want to...I want to acknowledge as rare, one of the signatories to that letter, Madam Speaker, and that was, that was the Province, the Province Housing and Addictions Minister, the Department of Housing, Addictions and Homelessness signed that letter, Madam Speaker. So, we're kind of different in Manitoba and this city in that we are working together. They're with us today in this vote. This is uncommon support, and I was so glad to see that support of the Province of Manitoba, Housing, Addictions and Homelessness along with a One Just City and Clinic and Siloam, and West Central Women's and more. To conclude, to them our job today is simple. Step up and vote in favour of the Mayor's Housing Accelerator Motion. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Rollins. Next is Councillor Dobson followed by Councillor Santos.

Councillor Dobson: Thank you Madam Speaker. There are many facets to this Housing Accelerator Fund. Our city proposed what I consider to be a realistic goal for densification that would have supported many of our priorities such as the Poverty Reduction Strategy and more affordable housing, to name just two. The Federal Housing Minister unfortunately suggested some conditions to add to our application for receiving money from this fund. I believe the exact wording was "I want to give you the opportunity to bolster it by including the following elements." Two of them are the four plexes as a right city wide and four storeys as a right within 800-meters of transit. What does this mean for affordability within the city? Let me break it down for you under my way of thinking. Let's start with housing starts. The CMHC's supplied gap report says we need 3.5 million more homes by 2030, and that's over and above the 250 or 300,000 homes that we are currently building each year. And the reason for the 3.5 million? That's to restore affordable housing to the levels we enjoyed in the early 2000's. Sounds good, but it has a couple of major flaws. The very conditions imposed on us by the Federal Housing Minister will decimate our current affordable housing. The four plexes and four-storey buildings were primarily tear down homes that are the cheapest for the developer to buy and conversely, they represent our most affordable homes, and the numbers just don't add up. GST reduction will produce maybe 300,000 homes over ten years. Another 300,000 homes from the Canada Mortgage Bonds. 200,000 or so right now from the Accelerator...Housing Accelerator Fund. 12,000 more for apartments. And even if we added a million more on to that number, we're still way under the 3.5 million we need according to CMHC to get our affordable homes. So, in conclusion, my thoughts are that the Accelerator Fund is a good program overall, but as a country we will never ever receive...achieve the 3.5 million additional housing by 2030 and therefore should not expect housing any time soon under that line...or affordable housing any time soon under that line of thinking. Fourplexes city-wide and four storeys within 800 meters of transit doesn't work either. Our most affordable properties will be torn down from this program and therefore should not even be considered. Building housing units on malls and commercial areas does work as it displaces no affordable housing. As a further note, as a journeyman carpenter, where is our made in Canada requirement in this housing accelerator fund? Canadian taxpayers are paying for this so all the lumber should be produced and sourced in Canada to support our own lumber

industry. Let Canada or Canadians be proud that this is a made in Canada solution that will benefit Canadians all across this country. Those are my comments. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Dobson. Councillor Santos followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Firstly, I would like to talk about the land zoning amendments. I like to reiterate some comments I made back in July of 2020 when the report of the housing needs assessment came forward where I interpreted that low-income families or low-income people should be living and staying in the core of the city. It was very clear to me that our goal was not to diversify the city, but to further entrench division. The only way to change this is to realize and recognize that the policies we have created years before my time on council must be changed. A policy that makes a broad stroke movement of completely eliminating single-family zonings across the city. Of course, new buildings must still meet height and lot coverage requirements, but the move creates a potential for more affordable multi-family housing types to be built on every street in every neighbourhood. These social divisions create structural racism in our city that acts as a barrier to opportunity and quality of life for many residents. If we want to find meaningful solutions that create more equitable cities, we must establish public policies that move us towards that goal. They may include making difficult and unpopular decisions such as the elimination of single-family zoning. I am also a big proponent of inclusionary zoning. This is another type of policy where we implement all new multi-family buildings that have a percentage of units that are for low-income families, no matter what the neighbourhood they are located in. It's time we accept that the new definition of neighbourhood character must become more diverse, both socially and in built form, driven by the creation of more diverse housing typology options. This is an important step starting point along the journey to an equitable city, which leads me to my next topic and the lingering question I always ask people - what is affordable housing? CMHC states that in their report entitled "Estimating Supply Gaps Report", we have a housing affordability challenge whereby much more housing supply is required to restore affordability by 2030. They want to restore affordability to levels last seen in Canada in 2003 when the economy was stable and housing costs were relatively low. Increasing housing supply to meet the demands of middle-income Canadians means that house prices will move closer to their construction costs over time and not be driven by the cost of land. Existing housing structures could also be redeveloped into multi-units...multi-housing units, ergo the zoning amendments in this motion. CMHC. Believes that if we dramatically and suddenly increase the supply of housing, it will put pressure on the costs of construction. Basically, CHMC. is using the supply and demand argument thinking that if you increase the supply of housing, the demand of construction costs will go down. Now, I don't do economics 101 but it doesn't make sense to me but nevertheless, this is what CMHC is stating in their report and that's why I believe this Federal Government is all of a sudden in a rush to increase the housing supply. But, I like to remind council, there is a report, and we heard from delegation, that here in Manitoba, one in five children live in poverty, and most of them are located in the Winnipeg centre, which includes Point Douglas. So when I have discussions with local leaders here in Winnipeg about what affordable housing means, they are saying government-subsidized housing like rent geared to income, transitional housing, housing first models and social supportive housing. Madam Speaker, which brings me to my next interesting point, did you know that the Province of Manitoba has 23,000 social housing units, currently in fair condition, that requires \$1.5 billion in capital funding to maintain and preserve. Most of these units are currently vacant, despite having high wait lists, and these buildings are at risk of loss through sale or demolition. We all know this to be true because we've seen how the previous Provincial Government has treated these units. Did you know the Provincial Government cannot apply for this grant to assist them to preserve and upgrade their housing supply? The fact that the Federal Government is now by-passing the province and going straight to the municipalities, this is, I dare say it, a transfer of wealth. The accelerator fund is flawed. The one size fits all solution that the Federal Government is imposing on us does not sufficiently address the government-subsidized housing crisis we currently face in Winnipeg because the report we voted back in July of 2023 states, to create 5,277 net new housing but only 1,342 are affordable housing, that's only 25% targeted to be affordable. What about the other 75%? Lastly, I want to make a quick note that it's about what it costs the city to continue to operate and maintain the current infrastructure with these new homes being built in our mature communities. Will the property taxes generated from these new homes be enough to cover the costs such as water and sewer, garbage collection, fire and police, et cetera, et cetera? With the influx of immigration from all over the world who are choosing Winnipeg as their home, we know that the capital investments in our recreational amenities and public spaces, as well as keeping our after-school programming affordable, is needed, and I'm just going to quickly talk about a couple of these motions. I will be supporting the amending motion from Mayor Gillingham and Councillor Lukes. I agree with going to the five committees and having that engagement. I think that's important. With the other two, talking about affordability just in my previous mention, I do really appreciate that in Orlikow's and Eadie's recommendation to add the Housing Accelerator Fund application be amended to increase below-market housing rental targets from 25 to 40% of (inaudible) units, I really do agree with that. I am a big proponent of it and like I said in my previous comments, I'd like to support just that one aspect. I can't support the other ones, and as well, to Councillor Mayes' motion. I do support that, you know, in reviewing the Federal letter, it doesn't mention how many units we need to build. I know we're talking about targets, but I think it shows a commitment to Winnipeggers that we're committing to exceeding our targets, so I can support Councillor Mayes' amendment. In conclusion, we know this plan will also make it easier to build affordable, supportive, and mixed-income housing. I do not believe Winnipeg has a housing affordability issue. I believe Winnipeg has an affordable housing supply issue, one that is specific towards government-

subsidized housing. My concerns are when we get access to whatever hundreds of millions of dollars we're getting from the Federal Government, we should be asking ourselves, will building 25% of new affordable housing units be enough? I personally think so because it's still better than none. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, it's Councillor Eadie...

Councillor Eadie: ...before Councillor Schreyer speaks, I'd like to move a...move that council meets past 6:00 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie. So moved. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: My speech won't be that long Madam Speaker. I don't think I'm going to get that many extensions. Unlike Councillor Santos who is perfectly in time and perfectly prepared speech, mine is not, but then again when's the last time I wrote a speech in this chamber? I write it here essentially based on what I hear. Now we've been talking about this awhile, and in a sense, I've been talking about this since I got elected, and here we go. Just one more expression of the dilemma we're in. I don't know where to start. Let's start at the beginning. Next year is Winnipeg 150, and Councillor Gilroy might be hosting city councils from capital cities from across this country who might be, if all goes well, hosting the Canadian Capital Cities Organization meeting next summer, and we can talk about 150 years of Winnipeg, which means, proof we've been building houses in this city for over 150 years, especially in the last 100. Especially since World War 2, when the baby boomers came, and the massive post-war immigration, so we got pretty good at building quality houses and accommodating people. We got really good at it. And then we got into an era where we got really good, a really progressive era of affording, keeping our debt down, keeping taxes down relative to today, and building affordable housing units the likes of which it's hard to believe today. If we are to do the same today, what would that cost us? It's almost ridiculous to think in those terms, to the extent that we're wondering whether it's worthy to support Councillor Mayes' amendment to increase the number of affordable housing units from 113, 142 to 2,250 over ten years. My God. In 8 years they built 8,000, over 8,000 in this city back in the 70's, just affordable housing units. Over 8,000 in 8 years. Over that. I don't exaggerate in this room so I'm just going to say over that. The reason is because it was 14,000 affordable housing units in 8 years, that was for the entire province, 2,000 of which were nursing care units, but that counts, because that was really, really important. This...so that's where we're at. That's where we're at. We're going to do something regarding changing the rezoning of the city for something that we...I don't know what to say. Back then, by the way, the community committee's, when they created Unicity Winnipeg back in the 70's, my understanding was the community committees actually had final authority over the development applications. It never came back to council as it does today. That was changed in the 1980's, 1990's under the Filmon government, just so you know. What you think of that is up to you, but that's how things changed over time. In other words, we had greater democratic control, more stringent zoning and more affordable housing and we were really good at building a lot of houses. So, are we in progressive times? No. How do we know? Today is the proof. For the chance of winning \$192 million, which we admit we probably won't get, this is what we have to do, to do one-fifth of what we used to do, back 50 years ago. Am I exaggerating? No, they're not my statistics. They're there for everybody to say. Anybody could just say what I just said. It's the reality of it. This is not the boogeyman but it's not the solution. This isn't solving what we're talking about in terms of affordable housing. But I've got to say, let's face it. In my first...in my first term, I was really having some struggles with some of the, some of the development issues that I was having in my ward or in our community committee of northeast Winnipeg, of Elmwood, of East Kildonan-Transcona. And let's face it. You can't accuse Russ Wyatt of being anti-development. You just can't. You can't accuse me of it either because I agreed to the most densely constructed apartment building I think in Winnipeg in my last term, and these are the facts. Now I'm going to let something out of the bag. I think I'm going to vote for this thing. I'm going to vote for the Mayor's amendment. I'm going to be voting for every single amendment. But I'm not going to pretend that I'm solving something. What I'm saying is...because I'm told, oh be bold and we're going to be a visionary. It's not that bold and it's not that visionary. I think it's kind of like, you know what? This is where we're at. It's kind of weak. That's where we're at. Well, you want to be bold and want to be visionary? It wouldn't be that bold and that visionary but apparently it is. We've got some sort of resistance to get out of...I don't know what kind of ideology it is, but not to tell the taxpayer and the citizen how we got here. It didn't happen in a couple of years. It's not because of COVID. It's not because of labour costs. What is stopping us from having...what is it boldness? Is it too bold, too visionary? To try to explain to Canadians or Manitobans or Winnipeggers how it is that their taxes go up, their services go down, their rents are going up, their mortgages are going up, food's going up? Okay a lot of this is private market stuff and that's the reality. It's all very well when the government's willing to talk about certain aspects of the private market. That's all very nice. They pick and choose, but when it comes to our own budget, when it comes to our own by-laws, it's our job to account for it. Ours. It's the City of Winnipeg's job. It's the council's job to account for why our...we're raising people's taxes. We're reducing their services, and going into debt or selling further debentures, reducing our reserves over the years. That's our job. Why should it be so bold and so visionary? But I'm going to tell you what. We're saying this as a solution. Well let's see where we are in five years. I'm going to vote for every single one of these just because that's where we're at. But I'm going to tell you something. This is going to be a very divisive issue come the next election unless we truly want to be bold and visionary and try to solve our problems. Keep your ideologies. Just don't let them interfere with providing the citizens and taxpayers with the facts. Why should that hinder people being allowed to know what their reality is, seeing our future

forecasts and then applying their values, their ideologies as they wish. If you are conservative, be conservative. If you're liberal, be liberal, be liberal. If you are progressive, be progressive. If you're left wing or right wing, be it. If you're a social democratic, be it. But I'll tell you something. There's no way we're supposed to try and get along and work together in this chamber. Well it's really hard to get along when we don't know what the information is. So what, we're going to base it on believing your own press releases? Believing the commentary in the media? Where do you think they're...we're the ones who are supposed to provide the information, tell people what the reality is, and when we don't do it, this is what you get. Well kind of. You know what? Laugh at me if you will, but I've been talking like this for 8 years. I remember, what was it? Chicken Little. Jason said the sky was falling. Well here's where we're at, so let's just...I don't have too much to say or I could go on for another 8 years. Maybe I will, but we're going to see what's going to happen next election, and let's face it. Let's be realistic, and this isn't the great solution. It's not the boogeyman either, but let's not pretend. Let's just accept the fact that, why were we put in this position in the first place?

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: That's where we're at.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I'm going to move that we break for dinner for 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker: So, we'll have a half hour-recess and reconvene just before 6:30. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
November 23, 2023, at 6:35 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Good evening, I'd like to reconvene the Council Meeting of November 23, 2023. We are on Item 16 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee – Housing Accelerator Fund. The next speaker is Councillor Chambers followed by Councillor Allard.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you Madam Speaker. I rise in support of the motion that is before us with regards to the Housing Accelerator Fund. You know, recently I returned earlier this week from a trip, a policing conference in Vancouver, and you know, just driving through the streets of Vancouver, I was afforded the opportunity with the Vancouver Police Department to go on a ride-along. Just seeing the level of homelessness there and speaking with Mayor Gillingham, his experience in Hamilton, two Canadian cities, major Canadian cities, that are experiencing homelessness. These are Canadians, our fellow citizens, that are experiencing, you know, living outdoors, and it's just, you know, heart-wrenching to see this across Canadian cities, and just speaking with other councillors from other cities and other representatives from other cities, the level of homelessness that is pervasive in our cities is just simply unacceptable. We know that immigration is a large part of our country moving forward in terms of the quickest (inaudible)...the biggest demographic is seniors aging and leaving the workforce. So immigration becomes necessary to make our country sustainable in terms of economic growth and people contributing to our social safety nets. We need to house these people. We need to find housing and build housing and be responsive in terms of our housing needs. You know, looking online here, I'm seeing that Winnipeg's vacancy rate is 2.7% here in our city. There's hardly any housing for people to live in, and then the affordability aspect of it with rising interest rates. It just makes it impossible for, because of the supply that we have right now, it's a bidding war. People who are selling their homes can sit back and the prices go up and up and up, and the affordability goes down, down, down. I draw comparison to my two sons, who in 2018, my older son was able to afford a home and purchased a home. My younger son is only four years younger. He's making good money, but in today's housing market, cannot find a home, an affordable home. So, like many other families here in our city, we want to look out for our kids. We want to look out for those that are coming here to support our economy through immigration and making sure that we have available housing stock for everybody going forward. Yes, this Housing Accelerator Funds comes with caveats, but the needs of our city have changed, and those that are purchasing or looking to purchasing houses don't require the big lots of days gone by. And so where we can accommodate in terms of different housing styles, varieties, affordabilities, that's what's going to help our city grow and alleviate the problem of homelessness that we're facing in our city, by making it affordable, by making a sufficient supply, that's what's going to turn the corner in terms of the homelessness and as well, our children and our grandchildren being able to provide homes and stay here within our city. So again, I support the Housing Accelerator Fund. I know that there are caveats attached to it and hopefully as we thoughtfully add amendments to the motion to make sure that contextually, the building that is...the development that happens in our city to create density that we're looking for is done in a way that satisfies everybody to the extent possible.

We have to reimagine our city's growth and do it in a way that we can accelerate the housing that's necessary and provide for those individuals that don't have or can't afford to purchase. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Chambers. Next speaker, we'll go remote to Councillor Allard and then Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Allard: Hello, can you hear me okay?

Madam Speaker: Yes, we can.

Councillor Allard: Excellent. So, I'll be supporting Mayor Gillingham's amendments. I will not be supporting the two amending motions. The reason why I won't be supporting the two amending motions is because I understand that the Mayor's proposal as it stands is the best chance that we have as a municipality in order to access these funds. So, \$119 million of funding from the Federal Government, do we get all of it? I hope so. If we don't get all of it, then we're still ahead. I mean, for every dollar in assessed value that...that the value of our lands go up, that's one less dollar we have to raise through the mill rate, so this is excellent. I want to commend the Mayor for taking the bull by the horns in this bullish housing market. Interest rates are high, inflation is high, and we have this potential infusion in our economy of \$192 million. I think it's...I think it's certainly the right direction. I want to address something that was said earlier today about the requirement for council to not prejudice applications. As my colleagues know because I think most of you have heard this speech before, but this particular jurisprudence in terms of keeping an open mind was first tested in St. Boniface all the way up to the Supreme Court of Canada. The issue is similar to this one. The then councillor from St. Boniface, Guy Savoie, voted at Finance Committee to give to a local developer, Alain Hogue, land for a dollar, which Alain then intended to build into housing. And so, when then Councillor Guy Savoie then went to the public hearings for this land he heard...he heard the public hearings. I suspect that there was quite a bit of opposition of these riparian lands in North St. Boniface being developed into housing, and he laid it over, heard the public hearings again and then made a ruling. The ruling was to approve the housing, and so that decision went to the Court of Queen's Bench. It was the residents' association with Greg Selinger versus Guy Savoie. If I recall correctly, they won. The Court of Queen's Bench then lost at the court of appeal, and then finally at the Supreme Court of Canada level, the Supreme Court ruled, and I'm paraphrasing, that a city councillor can keep an open mind, and must keep an open mind, and can take political positions that are in line with the decisions they may have to make in the future because that's our job. Our job is to make political decisions. Then our job is to keep an open mind during these public meetings, so this is, I think, it's been said by the Mayor, this is putting an application. A lot of the detail that isn't determined, is to be updated in the zoning by-law. So, there will be ample opportunity to talk about what types of changes we want. And yes, some of the changes will be likely be tied to dollars, but I think we can still keep an open mind about whether or not we approve these changes or not as we're looking to amend our zoning by-law. So, I want to commend the Mayor for his leadership on this. I know this is not an easy issue. I know that council is divided on this question. I think it would be a huge mistake to turn down the opportunity of \$192 million of funding. According to a local media news source, the Mayor said the funding would leverage several times the amount of private investment leading to the creation of affordable units. I think the Mayor is right. And I think that for every dollar that we raise, the value of our lands reduces our tax burden or it allows us to increase the amount of dollars that can be spent in other infrastructure and other services that are delivered by the City of Winnipeg. And so I think a lot of the things that the Federal Government is asking for makes sense, like having bigger buildings on arterial roads near the transit network. The four-plex issue, you know that's going to have to be vetted through the by-law process and looking at my ward, I don't see a whole lot of changes based on what the Federal Government is asking for. And so, I mean, I didn't think this day would come and I hope this vote goes through and I hope the zoning by-law...and I heard Councillor Rollins thank the Chairperson, Councillor Rollins say that we'll have a lot of time to amend the Zoning By-law, and it will take a lot of time to amend the Zoning By-law because it's a public hearing and there's likely to be quite a bit of interest in this change and in our zoning by-law, but there's nothing untoward about any of this. The government's offering \$192 million. If this is not for geared to income housing, it's for...it's going to make housing somewhat more affordable. But since I've been elected, and since I had to make my first major zoning decision, Councillor Mayes was there, it wasn't an easy one, when I approved a multi-family development and there was some opposition that night. That was before we had the North St. Boniface Secondary Plan. I believe that this is the way to make the city a better place. With densification comes things like the values of our lands going up. It becomes easier to provide transit, new housing. While it used to be more energy efficient, hopefully the Province of Manitoba updates the code back to at least what it was before the last government since they changed the building code, but this is exciting, and I look forward to the hearings if this vote goes through. I look forward to hearing what people have to say at the Planning, Property and Development Committee with Councillor Rollins and Councillors Duncan and Dobson. I think we're going to be able to figure out how to spend \$192 million in Winnipeg. At least I hope so, because if we don't, we're leaving money on the table, and it's money on the table that goes directly into our tax base, and if we agree with the Mayor and that it's leveraging several times the amount of private investment, then it's more than dollar for dollar. This is better than dollar for dollar. So, I hope we can get this through and the detail we will have to figure out through the zoning by-law amendments, and that will be up to this Council to decide whether or not we approve or we deny those amendments, and I think it is possible to keep an open mind, even when there are dollars on

the table. I mean, there are dollars on the table now. This Council, last month, voted to stop seven small scale developments that were supported by the planning development and then defeated by Council and defeated by the community council, and so...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard did you need more time or you are wrapping up?

Councillor Allard: Well maybe one minute.

Madam Speaker: Okay one minute. Moved by Councillor Schreyer. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Allard: So I really want to commend the Mayor for taking the lead on this. I know it's not an easy issue. I know that, you know, nothing gets people going like local politics and in terms of new development and neighbourhoods, that's certainly a very hot topic. And I think if you do the work up front with the zoning by-law, it will be as-of-rights and a lot of these discussions will have had taken place as opposed to now where we have a zoning by-law that is, if you talk to anybody who works with it, antiquated, like you need a variance to do almost anything, the zoning fees went up tenfold in 2017. There's a reason you don't see rezoning applications for duplexes in the city. It's \$12,000, and you're rolling the dice on maybe getting two units when two single-family houses secondary suites get you more money. Of course we're getting lots of (inaudible). Of course we're getting single families with secondary suites. They do better on the market.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Allard if you could just wrap up.

Councillor Allard: So please support the Mayor's motion. Please do not support the amending motions for the simple fact that, not that they're not well intentioned but I think that they prejudice or they hurt our chances of being successful with the Federal Government, and thank you, Mayor Gillingham, for your leadership on this somewhat difficult issue.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Eadie: Well Madam Speaker, can I do it within 12 minutes? Hmm. It's a complex...actually this is a big picture Madam Speaker. There's a lot of complexity, but as I understand it, which is true, the complexity is really going to have to be dealt with after we vote today. So, Madam Speaker, I will try to stay in general. I just wanted to first begin by saying that really what's happened from the Federal Government, and governments do this and when they want or whatever, like moral suasion, political suasion, is they're saying you can have money, right, but here's our expectations. And it's my understanding that Mayor Gillingham, Madam Speaker, was and has had several discussions, along with his staff, with the Minister's staff, in the way that a negotiation between the Federal Government and a Provincial Government would happen between a prime minister and a premier. So, I think that that's fair. But what's not fair, Madam Speaker, I just want to quickly and just say, what's not fair is that Mayor Gillingham has been the one that gets demonized, and I just want to say I think that's unfair. He's doing what he can. He made promises by homelessness and stuff through his election, and he's trying to get it done and he knows that...well I won't get into that...anyway, we need money to accomplish affordable housing, and my definition of affordable housing is rent geared to income for...if you want to keep talking about people who are homeless. Now, I asked the question of Ventura, and it would be the same as every developer. I'm okay with profits or, you know, a return on investment. But I want to discuss something because this is not a panacea. This is where I have a...I'm only going to talk about where I got problems. So, return on investment, the best return on investment is not going to be in the neighbourhoods where I need renewal and infill building. It's not going to happen in Dufferin neighbour, in William Whyte, in portions of North Point Douglas, in those neighbourhoods that struggle because the factors that go into...and you heard it from Ventura...it's not just the return on investment, but what they're looking at is, they're looking at these neighbourhoods and they're saying where I can make the best and so there's a bunch of factors that go into it. And those factors are ones that really exclude R2W, for the most part, although there's some nice pockets. So, the reality is, Councillor Orlikow knows, the reality is some of the best return on investment is going to be in parts of River Heights. It will be, actually in my ward it will be in neighbourhoods like Seven Oaks neighbourhood and Luxton neighbourhood. Neighbourhoods that are now the real estate agents call Scotia Heights. That's a real estate term. That's not an actual neighbourhood of my ward. So...and there's other pockets, good places that they would do this like Margaret Park, Garden City, you know. The houses are getting old enough. Nobody's going to go into Tuxedo and buy a million-dollar house and then go in and build a fourplex okay. I don't see how they're getting their return on investment, although they could probably sell each unit for a big price because it is in Tuxedo. I just don't see that working in the mix, so what I also wanted to point out about the fourplex, we have developers who are building neighbourhoods with character. Ladco, Qualico, Genstar. There's a lot of big neighbourhoods being built and this is going to apply to every residential property and there's all these secondary plans and all these plans for a neighbourhood with certain character where we built density but, even in R1, in Highpoint or Aurora, is subject to, before they build the single-family home in those areas, are they going to convert to fourplexes? What it does is, it doesn't mean that that neighbourhood's character is there anymore. And that will be the same for River Heights, anywhere in this city. What the Minister has asked us to do is going to change the whole character across the city of our neighbourhoods. And there will be market options. There's people who are going to move elsewhere,

outside of the city. They will, because they don't like the character of their neighbourhood anymore. So keep that in mind. It will happen to a certain extent. I also wanted to talk about the 800 metres. Well in my ward, and I know where I read through the master plan and I know where most of the frequent routes are, but in my neighbourhood from Redwood to Main Street, and this will cover the Seven Oaks neighbourhood and Luxton neighbourhood and the St. John's Park neighbourhood, and we do have density built along Main Street but, from the Red River to Main is less than 800 metres, all along it. It's less than 800 metres from Main, so it's less than 800 metres from Main to Selkirk. All of those are going to have frequent routes. Arlington, I don't think that's a frequent route, but from Arlington to McPhillips, that's over a kilometre, so I don't know what the potential is there but there will be a frequent route, I believe it's coming down Mountain Avenue. So, 800 metres to the north takes you into some pretty decent neighbourhoods. So keep that in mind. That's what's going to happen. So, what else can I say. I like the accelerated plan. We really need the money. Rent geared to income is it and somebody pointed out today, Manitoba Housing, Winnipeg Housing and Rehab. We tried to apply for money to CMHC through federal funding. We've got about \$54 million worth of serious renovations to do to Winnipeg housing's own stock. We also manage stock for Manitoba Housing. So we need a huge amount of money. Like, we could get those units up and running and solve the homeless problem with Manitoba Housing. It's solved already. It really is, if we directed our money that way. I can't remember if there's anything in our application to provide major renovation grants, but there's a lot of not-for-profits who are doing RGI and the subsidy doesn't cover off the cost to maintain the buildings, so, and that is the problem with those. Councillor Mayes has a motion there. I like it, but if we're going to do that, you have to make sure that the subsidy to get the RGI includes over the long-term, the ability to renovate and keep the buildings in good shape. What else could I say. You know, a lot of people provide lot of good arguments. I'm supporting Councillor Orlikow because he is right. We know where all this is going to happen. I wanted to maybe just finish. I'm not going to tell you how to vote. I hope we're voting on each clause, on each of the amending motions, the two amending motions to the Mayor's amending motion. Oh, it's exciting eh? But what I want to say is, there's a complexity (inaudible). And there's going to be lot of blame thrown around and it's going to be problems, and we need to get along, and I believe, and I hope you'll support the idea that when the zoning by-law hearings start, that we do it as a committee of the whole.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie do you need more time?

Councillor Eadie: Just one more minute.

Madam Speaker: Mayor Gillingham moves one-minute extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: No matter what happens here today, again, I am hoping that we all believe that, like Calgary, any major zoning issues, it's the committee of the whole in Calgary that deals with the hearings so that every member of council can hear what the public has to say, and then we'll vote and essentially, the changes to the by-law pretty well happen after we make our decision because committee of the whole is doing it. And that's a really fast way to expediate, and in this thing, they keep talking about expediting building permits and doing all that stuff. Well let's do that with the zoning hearing okay, and that's all I have to say, Madam Speaker. There is way more to say but that's all I have to have say today.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I report on the record of EPC my comments and disappointment that Ottawa is using their cookie-cutter approach across the country and that, you know, things are different from city to city to city. That said, again it is a lot of money, even if it's not the full 192, that we'll do a lot of good work towards the infrastructure needs that we're going to have in terms of being ready for all this new additional housing. You know, Canada is growing. I remember as a kid, you know, the number is always, you know, 26 maybe 30 million people. We're expecting to hit 41 million people in 2024. That's huge. CMHC is saying that, again, we need 5.8 million housing units to be built by 2030. The current track is 2.3 million. So that's more than double that we need. So, earlier today, new research was released by the Federation of Municipalities. I'm here in Ottawa working with FCM, and we've determined that municipal infrastructure required per housing unit is about \$107,000. Sure, there's roads and other pieces like that, but the biggest part is water, sewer, waste water infrastructure. We know that all too well, that in Winnipeg, you know, with the expansion of the North End Plant, those investments are huge. Sure, new lots (inaudible) pieces of that infrastructure, there's a lot of infrastructure that does not get picked up in this. So it's really this circular piece. Population growth is driving the demand for housing, and the demand for housing is driving that need for municipal infrastructure. So again, we need a new funding model that recognizes that and to some degree the HAF will help address that in the short term. So again, I'll be supporting the Mayor's amendment. I think there's some key pieces in there that will give some additional appropriate control while also picking up the spirit of the notion that we're going to be allowing a lot more intense development by right. I think there's places where we could go much further than what's in there, going through the whole zoning by-law exercise. I look forward to that. The North Henderson Highway Secondary Plan is so antiquated. It really pushes towards single-family homes on Henderson Highway. That is completely opposite to Complete Communities and other parts of, you know, good urban planning process...documents we have at the City, so I look forward to a robust

exercise of (inaudible) the current zoning by-law. So, I will be again supporting the HAF changes that we're talking about today as well as Mayor Gillingham's motion. Thank you.

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

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. Earlier this month, I spoke on this matter at EPC and at that time I expressed my concerns on the potential loss of public hearings on residential development. Public hearings and public consultation are arguably the most important part of the development process. Public hearings and consultation give Winnipeggers the opportunity to have their voices heard on builds in their neighbourhood, whether that be the height of a structure, the proximity to a shared property line, landscaping, parking, to defend the character of a neighbourhood, protection of a treed area, or to simply ask questions of the developer on public record. As I heard from the residents of Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood, I sought out the answers to some of their questions, and during that process, I asked myself the question, what is it that's before us? And I can tell you what it is not. It is not a by-law amendment at this time. This is an application amendment today. In laymen's terms, to Winnipeggers, this is an opportunity to say yes, we are wanting an opportunity to apply for the Housing Accelerator Fund. Yes, there are elements that are suggested to bolster, used in the letter, our application. Those elements are hot button issues including four units as of right, up to four stories, up to four stories within 800 metres of transit. But we are not here today to debate, in my opinion, the intricate details of the future by-law amendments. That time will come in '25 or '26 when the public hearings take place regarding those amendments. And when that time comes, be certain that we as councillors will have our say on what the conditions around the amending by-laws look like. Residents will come forward and speak on the public record to ensure that their input is reflected in that amended by-law. But remember, this is all hypothetical, because today we are voting on amending the application to the Federal Government. We are voting on an application, not a by-law, and this is all contingent, keep in mind, that that application itself is accepted by the Feds. Let's not convolute our application with details that can be debated and hashed out during the public hearing process that must take place during the zoning by-law amendments. This is my opinion, that today we are voting on whether or not to submit the application as amended. If approved, we will debate the details on height, on property lines, on landscaping, on lot sizing, on parking, on character, and on trees with certainty in my neighborhood. And at that time, if the details do not meet the expectations of this Council, and the amendment could be defeated I will continue to advocate for the ward of Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood to ensure that their voices are heard and that the qualities of our communities are protected. Today I will support this application amendment, and I look forward to a healthy debate during the by-law amendment public hearing process, to ensure that all of my colleagues' details are considered and implemented where appropriate. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Duncan. Any further speakers? Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. I rise. I want to thank Councillor Duncan for his speech. A very good speech, and just to pick up on where he left off actually, it works quite well. So, on the issue in terms of the clause, I will be supporting the clause. I will be supporting though one of the...Councillor Orlikow's breaks out his clause, which I understand he will be for separate votes. I will be supporting the concept of having the hearing of all of Council. I think that's absolutely crucial. The scenario without that is not one that I...I've seen happen here before, and it's not very pretty where if they go before one hearing body, and then the gallery is packed and they feel locked out, it could get quite nasty. The idea of residents having their ability to have a say, their day in court, is crucial. Now Calgary does that, and in the past when we did re-mapping of the entire city, when we did back in '06, Peter De Smedt was Chair of Property and Development. It was, the hearing body was EPC and that was a way for us to be able to ensure that the whole city was heard. I think in this scenario, because it's the remapping, it's much more dramatic. We have to look at a far more extensive approach to it. Not only that, it will ensure that we all work together in terms of all of our areas being affected, in terms of what's coming forward. It will put the onus on all of us to make sure that we work with our staff to ensure that we do have what's been cited in the Mayor's motion, specifically the requirement to have on his clause...we've got so many motions here today...on his clause 5, (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), these issues here are clearly sorted out prior to the public hearing. That puts the onus on all of us equally, not just members of EPC, not just members of the standing committee, not just members broken down through community committees. That it is coordinated and fair. And I think that is going to be absolutely crucial. I will say this...that I don't want...the reasons I'm not supporting the other parts of Councillor Orlikow's motion, though I have a lot of sympathy and concerns with what...support for what Councillor Orlikow argued and Councillor Mayes, is that what I heard from our Mayor, which is the kind of take it or leave it approach by the Federal Minister, which is really out of our control. Now what I want to say is this, Madam Speaker. We live in a country based on our hectare, our arable hectares, hectares of arable acreage, our hectared. We have over 38 million in this country. So literally about 1% or one person per hectare. In other words, we have some of the lowest densities in the world, and yet we have a phenomenon called a housing crisis. I want to take us back here to what we're really talking about here and that should be about affordable housing. The National Housing Strategy Act passed, became legislation on July 9th, 2019, and has wonderful stuff in it. Housing is essential and inherent dignity and well being of the person. Access to affordable housing contributes to achieving beneficial socio-economic health and environmental outcomes. Improved housing outcomes are best achieved through cooperation between governments, civil society as well as meaningful involvement of local communities. Now that's an interesting one.

National goals, timelines and initiatives relating to the housing and homelessness are essential to improving the quality of life of the people of Canada, particularly persons in greatest need. National Housing Strategy would support a common vision, key principles and a coordinated approach to achieving improved housing outcomes. A National Housing Strategy would contribute to meeting Sustainable Goals of the United Nations. National Housing Strategy would support the progressive realization of the right to adequate housing as recognized in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, to which Canada is a party. I know Councillor Mayes said don't blame the Federal Government, but you know, it's really hard not to, because it goes on to say the National Housing Strategy, they have a wonderful policy declaration, recognize...this is their policy declaration "recognize that the right to adequate housing is a fundamental human right affirmed in international law." This what the Government of Canada declared in 2019, "recognize that housing is essential to the inherent dignity and well-being of the person and to building sustainable and inclusive communities; support improved housing outcomes for the people of Canada; and further the progressive realization of the right to adequate housing as recognized in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights". And they spell out, Madam Speaker, four principles amongst the strategy: No. 1: "set out a long-term vision for housing in Canada that recognizes the importance of housing in achieving social, economic, health and environmental goals. Establish national goals relating to housing, timelines, priorities and initiatives. Desired outcomes; focus on improving housing outcomes for persons in greatest need. And provide participatory processes to ensure the ongoing inclusion and engagement of civil society, stakeholders, vulnerable groups and persons with living experience of housing need, as well as those with lived experience of homelessness." Madam Speaker, the Federal Government passed this four years...over four years ago, and now finally they're rolling out an initiative based on a 2021 budget where they announced \$2.5 billion over seven years. Now most housing experts have indicated that the minimum this country needs is \$10 billion a year to address what we're facing as a country. And most national governments who are serious about housing and provide housing actually build, they build affordable, quality, dignified housing for people, and by doing that, what does it do? It does a couple of things. It provides the housing. But it also acts as a dampening to the market forces which right now will, are really been driving...the last 20 years have driven up the price of housing in a country that has the lowest density...one of the lowest densities in the world. So, I come back to the fact of why we are here today. We're here today because we are talking about ensuring people have quality housing and affordable housing. The irony is 30% of the money the Feds are providing us is actually going to go to that? Why 100%? I know Councillor Mayes' motion calls for more. It should be all of it. I don't understand that. I just...we're getting Federal money and we've had every budget related to this saying, at the beginning of our budget...the issue is not supply, the issue is not affordability, the issue is people who are low income, marginalized or couch surfing and living in terrible housing or no housing at all. That's the biggest challenge right now in Winnipeg. Yes, we may have a situation in the future like in Vancouver where people are living in their cars right now who have jobs. It hasn't happened here yet, but we do know we have people right now who don't have housing, who are couch surfing, who live in miserable conditions or, worse, are on the street. Now that's what we should be concentrating on, and instead we're talking about subsidizing developers more? Really? When really they accelerated the process of the in affordability of housing over the last 20 years without a doubt, and we have put more land on the market as this Council, rezoned more land than ever before thinking that that would dampen the housing price and it did the exact opposite. When you got up in Councillor Sharma's area, lots going for \$175,000, unheard of before.

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

Councillor Wyatt: You know, that was Tuxedo prices at one time. Now up in Old Kildonan, up in the areas in her new areas of her ward. So, Madam Speaker, I want to say something else and that is this. I want to thank the Mayor for having to deal with a very tough situation, and for working with the members, non-members of EPC, and thank his staff as well who I have had a pleasure to work with. And I also want to mention the fact that for me, out of all (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f)...the (f) is going to be the really important one because that addresses the LDR, that addresses the services, that addresses how we're going to ensure...from what I understand we may do like we did the Impact Fee, pick it up at the end when we do the permit. Another big thing that's out there, Madam Speaker, that we really haven't really addressed yet is a concern of mine, and it won't happen overnight, but that is assessment and assessment values that if market takes off in the next number of years, probably not until five years out, I think real estate is dead for five years, but you're going to see a situation where if...someone maybe not the big Qualico's of the world, but the Ventura's and others of the world going in and buying up swaths of land. Those single-family homes that Councillor Dobson rightly spoke about, all of a sudden increasing in value because of the market being able to pay those prices, all of a sudden somebody gets a tax bill on a reassessment, they're going to fall out of their seat, we're going to actually be not just their house is going to be worth a lot more, they're going to be pushing them out of their house because they won't be able to pay their taxes. And that's something that we've got to be cognizant of, and there may have to be amendments to the Assessment Act on all this to address that when the time comes. But it's not impossible to deal with. I would say this too, Madam Speaker, that there is a real rush in our society on what has been called in the last 30 or 40 years, the new urbanist movement. The new urbanist movement which says everybody wants to live in density, everybody wants to live up and down and above each other, and in many ways it runs contrary to the first rate movement that was ever created challenging the industrial revolution of putting people

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Extension?

Madam Speaker: We'd have to ask for suspension of the rules for further extension.

Councillor Wyatt: Oh, did I get an extension already? One more minute. One more minute. I just want one more minute.

Madam Speaker: Okay, we need to suspend the rules to have a further extension.

Councillor Wyatt: I didn't know I got one already. I was on a roll.

Madam Speaker: Motion to suspend. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mayor Gillingham moves one minute. Contrary? Carried. One more minute.

Councillor Wyatt: I am beholden to my council colleagues. I will say this. One more minute. The Garden City movement of...it's a great, you know, you know you can't you can't help it when the fellow who developed it was Ebenezer Howard, and in 1898, but it was a movement that took off. The concept that people shouldn't live in slums. The concept that people should not live where there's no trees or green space. The concept that people should have green space. And he developed a bunch of principles that to this day, has affected urban change. but we have forgotten some of it, and some of his ideas actually were pretty profound at the time. Collective ownership, rail, rapid rail transit, limiting growth. He argued 32,000, and then you move and you connect it with rail lines so people have green space. We have new Canadians coming into this country. You ask them where do you want to live? Oh, I want to live in an apartment block with no where to go for my kids to play with. No, no. No. I want to live...I want a house, I want a place for my kids to have (inaudible), I want to be able to see them. Those are my comments, Madam Speaker. I'll be voting for Councillor Orlikow's fourth point because we've got to ensure some local democracy. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. We'll now go to Councillor Mayes, opportunity to close and then onto Councillor Orlikow and then the Mayor for final close.

Councillor Orlikow: And then...we're (inaudible) over?

Madam Speaker: Pardon me? Yeah. Councillor Mayes, your opportunity to close on your amending motion in the item.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I continue to support the amending motion. I do think that's...there are people much better versed than I on the particulars of rent geared to income, social housing, affordable housing. Councillor Santos has really researched the hell out of this, I gotta say. Gave a very good speech, so hopefully she is supportive of...I can't remember actually after all of that. There's so many different speakers. Look, maybe the best summary...this has been pretty polite so I don't want to pick on anyone, but a couple of things. There won't be hearings. There will be one hearing. Well, maybe two things. To have spent a couple of years on Airbnb issues, as we just saw, and then to have the concerns of Councillor Orlikow and I dismissed as bogeymen, like, I'm sorry, but it's a little much. I mean, people had concerns and we spent unbelievable amounts of staff time looking at the Airbnb issue, the STR issue, so have the breezy dismissal of concerns that have been very real and that we've both lived through, it's a little much. Anyway, we'll try and take the high road. If there's anyone I'm gaining sympathy for here it's probably Sean Fraser. So, here's our proposal to Sean Fraser. So, we've got this mighty list of things and in...at more than a year we're going to have a vote and we might renege, or we might put in stuff like there's a size limit for a fourplex, like 50 by 200, okay? I'm inclined to think the answer will be what is this? What are you talking about? The thing from the Minister says legalize fourplexes everywhere as of right everywhere. Our FAQ says does this mean you can have fourplexes everywhere? No. Well obviously it does. Anyone reading the English language would say yes it does, unless we can limit it. I think Mr. Kelcey has tried to limit it. He did the best he could. So that's...I think it's misunderstood what we're trying to do here which is we have tried to come up with some specifics and unfortunately, we have failed, and therefore we have put in a through f of stuff we'll have to work out. So, either it was all just a headline-seeking exercise by the Minister, and they don't really care what we do down the line, 50 by 200, 50 by whatever, we don't really care, or it will be interesting to see what the counter position is. It will be. We certainly, I think, been...well, I won't get into...and I'm not criticizing anybody's bargaining skills, but I have to wonder if this is all that this has been, some exercise so that there can be a headline saying we're flowing whatever it is and it's not 192, at least we're all being honest about that. I have to say what was the point of all of it, really? Was it all to just to seek headlines? So hopefully, we'll get a tree by law out of this. Hopefully we'll get some realistic limits on what's being proposed here, but we don't know, as Councillor Orlikow has said. All of it still up in the air. We'll work it out. That's going to be '26; as of yesterday, it became 2025. Who knows where we'll be in a day, but just trying to take the high road. I mean, so we'll see what the Minister has to say. I assume this will pass with this list. Councillor Wyatt is right on one thing which is f, which is the business about development agreements is extremely important. I called city staff to say, so if you have as of right

development rights at the St. Vital Centre, you don't need a development agreement. You don't. It's as of right. The answer was, no. It's like a single-family home. Then the next day, complete reversal from the various people within City Hall. We don't really know what we're voting on. It's been too rushed and that is the fault of the Federal Government. We don't know what the development...I mean, if you read f, I mean, I counter anyone to tell me what that really means and, you know, "where appropriate" was in the previous draft, this draft doesn't have that. It's an attempt to splice in development agreements but, frankly, my concerns remain the same on this. I should have praised Donovan Toews earlier (inaudible) Donovan Toews, is as good St Vital (inaudible), but rather, Donovan Toews. If there's anyone more consistent than Councillor Allard, it's probably Donovan Toews. I read a very good post about well, why didn't you just do this, or (inaudible) the main corridors and the shopping lots. I suspect that would've come through here 16-0, but maybe that will be the counter offer from the Minister. Who knows. Or the Minister could have just (inaudible) what was in Councillor Gillingham's platform. That probably would have sailed here pretty well. I mean, I (inaudible) love the as of right stuff, but to be fair to Councillor Gill...Mayor Gillingham, he did run on that. So I will support the amendment I put forward. I will support Councillor Orlikow's amendment and I continue to have real trouble. I think there was an attempt made to get a made-in-Winnipeg solution. Unfortunately, it fell short and we have a bunch of concerns, a through f, that have no specificity to them. We don't know if it's going to be 50-foot wide lots or 25-foot wide lots. That will affect all of your wards rather differently, I have to say. So, also, you'll notice the wording is within 800 metres of transit. Not 800 walking metres of transit, or we define transit as transit frequent networks, which I think is open to interpretation. As the Minister said it has to be within 800 metres of transit, so we will see what the Minister comes back with. Perhaps it will be considerably harsher than this. We don't know. In any event, we will put these conditions forward. I assume this will pass. We'll see what amendments pass as well, but I guess that, in closing, the hour grows late, Councillor Orlikow gave me the best advice I ever got here. You win a lot, but, man are you a sore loser. Don't be such a sore loser. I will likely win on this...Sorry, I will likely lose on this. Try to not be a sore loser, but as it is, there's a noted Liberal, I will quote. It's not Councillor Rollins. There's a...at what appeared to be at the end of his political career, Pierre Trudeau said, you know, amidst the sham and drudgery, it's still a wonderful life, and there's been some sham here, and I'm not attributing that to the Mayor. I'm not picking anyone out in particular. What's interesting, that actually wasn't the end of Pierre Trudeau's political career in February 1979. He actually went on to serve probably his best term as Prime Minister thereafter because he continued to fight, and I will continue to fight what I see as completely unequal treatment of different wards and a completely unspecific list of conditions here. So we beat on. Boats against the current. I want to thank Councillor Orlikow for his comments and we'll see where this lands, but we also still have to wait to see what the Federal Minister is coming back with, and I suspect we may be back here in December debating a different list of conditions. I guess we'll see, but in the end, this has been a relatively polite and respectful debate, so I will try to keep to that. I do think though it's worth noting a, that I'm pleased to put forward that amendment, because a number of people from the public brought it up, but also, I think if you're going to dismiss the concerns of hundreds and thousands of residents as bogeysmen, I don't think that helps the debate, frankly, so there have been some real concerns. I think that Councillor Orlikow and I have tried to articulate them. Not good to be a sore loser, but I guess that we'll have to continue the work.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Next, Councillor Orlikow. Your opportunity to close.

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah, thank you very much. The interesting part about this debate is it keeps moving all over the place. You know, we're talking about affordable housing but are we talking about the Minister's mandate? Are we talking about \$192 million? Are we talking about \$100 million? And everything moves around. So, when people talk about exclusionary zoning as being illegal or being legalized from some illegal practice of having dialogue before, and so I really have tried to work it backwards to the very basic here. And I respect people have their own focus, but the ones I have heard and, again, so the motion really is for myself and Councillor Eadie, which I will be doing requesting a vote one by one. I can group 1 and 2 together but we'll probably do the one separately. So, again, on the fourplexes, four-storey, I've talked enough about that. It's a terrible idea period. For River Heights-Fort Garry Ward, for many of our wards. You may think it's going to bring in more housing, solve some more problems, it's not. It's going to raise property values. There's going to be a lot of people looking to buy properties. It wasn't part of our HAF application for a specific reason. Because the specific reason we did put the HAF application in, there's some pretty tough to swallow stuff in here. It's going to be tough to get through the public hearing. R1 zoning to be changed for duplexes. Reducing lot areas to allow for lot splits. Well, I know Councillor Mayes has gone through his. I'm going through it tons. You know what? Those lot split houses, that \$350,000 house that's been split into two? No. They are now no longer affordable at all. They're coming in at like \$600,000 for these things. So again, we're talking about affordability in the general scheme. It doesn't make it more affordable but somebody is making a lot more money. So again, I see that. Reduced lot size from 5,000 to 400 square feet to allow side-by-sides. Again, it wasn't me. As of right now? Is that what we're going to come back with? I don't know. We'll see. Allow triplexes on 35-foot lots. Allow detached secondary suites. So that's already what we decided that we're going to go forward with to talk to the public about. But now, we're going to add the duplexes, four storeys, and I agree that commercial corridors is not a big deal for me either. We're going to add that to the list of public hearing. Good luck trying to make people feel comfortable with what we're doing here. So, again, I say that. I do want support to try to do diversity, try to increase the housing stock, but, boy oh, boy, it's going to be a toughie when you start throwing on the opportunity that the Federal Government has put onto us. So we'll hit that. And, no, I don't agree that we're going to be

able to not do this in the future by just saying, well we got the money already, too bad, so sad. That to me is not a way you should be governing. So, again, the No. 1 and 2, this is an accommodating moderate growth and change in a way that's sensitive to its context. Period. That's what all of our stuff says. Okay? So we're done with that one. I understand where the votes are. Now if we get \$100 million, I say to that, this is what number...this is the 40%, which, again, with the compromise, we were at 75% before. That's going to produce about 687 affordable below-market rent housing, 687. We're still going to be funding 2,000, over 2,000, we'll call them private for-profit housing. That's...our main goal is that level below, and this is excluding, again, so they're getting...also...we're going to give them 2,000 for the private sector. We're not going to affordable housing. But we're also going to give them all these rights throughout the city to build without having to go through public hearings. That's, you know, if I was a developer, I'd be really, really happy right now. This would be great. I'd be already looking around to properties throughout River Heights-Fort Garry (inaudible), where the couple properties together, where I could purchase those really quick at the property value that Councillor Wyatt has talked about and then convert those. It ain't going to create affordable housing. It just...it will not. They'll be very expensive. Again, rather than...I do like the idea, that's not in front of us, was the idea about a renovation grant. I actually saw my old motion on that, where we can renovate some of the bigger houses into triplexes. That failed back in the day. So that's why I put in the 40% as a compromise. It was just, again, to bring up the housing, so either it goes...they only give us 100,000...\$100 million, it's right now, at 25%, it's 687 units. For our main issue in the City of Winnipeg, that's ridiculous. We should be totally switching this around, but we're actually going to go, incentivise more private units that are really market driven. So, that's why I put the 40%. I hope you see that here, and I know the Minister may get upset and maybe we can do that later. We should go in heads held high saying this is our issue, Mr. Minister. We're sticking by. We want affordable housing. Do you want to do 100%? I'm good on that too, but I put 40% here for today. The last one is, and I'm happy to hear that some people are moving towards this...this is Councillor Eadie mostly...where we talked about this, is having the council body as a hearing. Well, if you're going to vote on pummelling River Heights-Fort Garry, you should hear from them. You should hear their concerns. All of us. Not just a body of three or four people. I think Council, you have 2 and 2. No, we should all have to suffer through that and be...and listen to what's happening in St. James, what's happening in Transcona, what's happening (inaudible). Again, I don't know how we're going to get away from the as of right zoning until the Minister...well the public didn't really like it now. Sorry. No, that's not going to happen, but again, we should do it as a group, as a whole. So, I'll take the 1 and 2 in my recommendations, that they leave recommendation 2 and 3. I'll bunch those together. I know where the vote is here. I respect you all. I don't like it at all but I'll respect your vote there if I have too, and then the other one is I'll take 3 and 4 (inaudible). Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Orlikow. Mr. Mayor, your opportunity to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker. I want to thank all my colleagues for the good discussion today, good debate. It's, a couple have said, including Councillor Mayes, that it was respectful, and it's about issues. It's certainly not about individuals, but the issues here. I'll maybe just start by clarifying. You know, in my opening comments, I said that I wasn't going to be supporting any of motion 2 or 9. One change I will make on that is listening to everybody, I'm convinced, and if Councillor Orlikow is calling for his motion to be voted on by clause, I will change my mind and I'm going to support No. 4, that Council be the hearing body required. So, I will be supporting that...Just a couple of comments to close today, just to say first of all, that it is Council that will shape the rapid zoning by-law amendments. This will be a Council process. To reiterate what has been said many times, what we're voting on today, ultimately, is changing our application. Amending the application that we have put forward. This is the beginning of the process in many ways, and not the end. The process will be shaped by Council. I note Councillor Mayes, through you Madam Speaker, raised a couple of comments regarding, you know, Fraser perhaps out-bargaining us. I would just take a moment again then to remind all of us that Vancouver, Kelowna, Edmonton, Calgary, Regina, Brampton, Guelph, Burlington, Kitchener, Waterloo, Vaughan, London, Hamilton, Mississauga, Toronto, Richmond Hill, Ajax, Moncton, Charlottetown, Halifax, to use those words perhaps of, you know, been in the same and are in the same position. What each of those have done is made changes to their applications to permit what we're looking to do today – four units per lot, at the request of the Minister. And it's got funds flowing into their communities to build much needed housing, and that ultimately is the goal here. To leverage funding that we will get from the Federal Government to put it to work in our community to build housing units. But our...something that I don't think has been brought up is that this is the current Federal Government's position. Councillors may or may not know that in September of this year, the Federal opposition leader, Pierre Poilievre, brought forward a motion, a motion that would require cities to meet new housing targets in order to receive their usual Federal funding. Not an increase to Federal funding, but just their usual regular funding. So, it appears that no matter right now, which of the main Federal parties would be in power, a Federal Government is going to be putting conditions on cities and tie housing starts and housing development to funding. The difference that we have right now is between carrot and stick. What we've got right now is the offer of incentive, not conversely what was being proposed by the opposition leader to withhold regular funding to cities. So, I think that needs to be pointed out as well, is there seems to be a change in Ottawa from the major parties that cities need to do more to get more housing built. I'd also point out that, I'll certainly own my vote, as has been, you know, we all should. I think that's a fair comment. I'm bringing this motion forward and certainly will stand behind it. Perhaps, I'll make one other comment before I close and that is regards to the target for affordable housing. In our application, we are looking at 25% of the units would be targeted to be affordable, and the target though is just that. We can exceed our target,

in fact, in a recent rapid housing initiative, we had three rounds of funding. The first round of funding our minimum target was 49 units. We built 79. In the rapid housing initiative, round 2, our minimum target was 51, and we built 59, and so there's nothing wrong with us exceeding our targets and change the targets or discussions with Moira, and CMHC. I believe it could still happen after this. We could exceed our affordable housing targets. We're making decisions today, certainly, and we're hearing from people in the community who want this, people from the community who are very concerned about this, and people in the community who just straight up don't want this. But what we need to be doing, I think, in a moment like this, is asking ourselves what decision do Winnipeggers 20 years from now need us make today, and let us make that decision.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. We'll now vote on the motions in reverse order. The first is Motion 9, amending Motion 9. Moved by Councillor Mayes and seconded by Councillor Dobson. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Mayes, Orlikow, Santos, Schreyer.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Duncan, Gilroy, Lukes, Rollins, Wyatt, and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

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

Madam Speaker: Amending Motion 9 is defeated. And now on to amending Motion 2. Moved by Councillor Orlikow and seconded by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Orlikow: I'd like to do it, I'd like to do 1 and 2 together and then 3 and 4 separate.

Madam Speaker: We can do that. We're going to vote on Motion 1 and 2. All in favour? Clause 1 and 2. All in favour of 1 and 2, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Mayes, Orlikow, Schreyer.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Clause 1 and 2 are defeated. Next is Clause 3. All in favour, please rise. [

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Mayes, Orlikow, Santos, Schreyer.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Duncan, Gilroy, Lukes, Rollins, Wyatt, and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

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

Madam Speaker: Clause 3 is defeated. Last clause, Clause 4. All in favour, 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, Schreyer, Wyatt, and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Nays

Nil

Madam Speaker: Clause 4 is unanimous and passes. Next is amending Motion 1, moved by Mayor Gillingham and seconded by Councillor Lukes. All in favour. It's one vote. Yeah. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Dobson, Mayes, and Orlikow.

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

Madam Speaker: Amending Motion 1 passes, and now the main item, 16, as amended. All in favour? Contrary? There's how many recorded in opposition? Councillor Mayes, Councillor Orlikow, Councillor Dobson. And that is noted. Item 16, as amended, passes.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTION**

Item 1 – Public Inquiry Request

Madam Speaker: Next we'll move on to the Notice of Motion. It's from the October 26 meeting. It's moved by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Eadie. It's regarding a request to the Province of Manitoba for the expansion of a public inquiry. The motion is on the screen I believe, as it was from last month's Council meeting. Councillor Wyatt, your opportunity to introduce the motion.

**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 to 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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Madam Speaker. I rise to speak on an item that's quite important. We had a debate earlier this year about public inquiry. It was an 8-8 tie on the floor of this Council. It was very narrowly defeated on a tie vote. I will say this is another opportunity for members of Council to vote on this item. The Government of Manitoba has announced that there will be a public inquiry. So far, what has been noted publicly and what I've read is that it's going to involve the Winnipeg Police Headquarters construction project. During that period of time, for those of who were on Council, it was, as mentioned earlier, a very tumultuous time where there was a lot of things happening that didn't seem quite right, based on procurement practices, best practices for procurement, and the running of construction projects. We had, for example, a fire hall constructed or under construction on land that we didn't own. We had issues with regards to land swaps, which were very controversial and how values were being assessed. We had a scenario where we actually swapped 10 acres of land for 40 acres of land. Our 10 acres versus 40, so we had another scenario where we also at the same time, while this was going on, we did a P3 investment in an east district public works yard, and we had a major construction project called the Winnipeg Convention Centre. All of these things were happening at the same time, at the same period of time when the Police Headquarters issue happened. It was all in those same years, in that same term where it all kind of was going...coming together if you like. At the same time when Councillor (inaudible) moved the motion calling for an ethics commissioner, is what we called it back then, and it was not an easy time to be on Council, but I can tell you this. It opened my eyes in terms of the need for accountability and the need for accountability at the municipal level. There is definitely issues that we now know that have come out of the Police Headquarters, because of the legal action taken by the City. I believe that there could be other issues with this. I can tell without prejudicing myself, without jeopardize myself in terms of legal repercussions since I do not have immunity on the floor of this Council, that there are members of the development community who have come to me and said, why...at that time...why are you giving the CAO such a hard time? These are individuals that we were also doing business with. I had scenarios where, one scenario, where I can tell you that when I was trying to get the Plessis Underpass built, it was competing with the very same dollars as the Winnipeg Convention Centre. And I had to reach out to the Federal Minister at the time, Vic Toews, who I have a lot of respect for, and to this day, and I had to remind Minister Toews of his commitment to build the underpass, but the pocket of money with Building Canada at the time was only so much. And the Executive Committee, and our friend on the Executive Committee, I was not on EPC, gave me a heads up that the mayor of the day wanted to put Convention Centre first and maybe Plessis Underpass later if there's enough money. Vic Toews made a point of coming down here on a Saturday to meet with the mayor of the day, so say to the mayor of the day, no. Plessis first and Convention Centre second if you can have enough money. At the end of the day there was not enough money for the Convention Centre. We ended up having to do approximately a \$30 million loan, if my memory serves me right, or maybe it was 50, to bail it out, to make it happen. So why the rush for the Convention Centre (inaudible). And I always look at those things and think about them. I think, Madam Speaker, I would like to see these added to the public inquiry, because if I were asked to come and testify, I would then have immunity and I could say some things that I cannot say now on the floor of Council. And so I would encourage members of Council to vote for this. To encourage the Premier to add these items for the public inquiry, because whatever comes out of the public inquiry, it's not about getting somebody, it's not about holding somebody accountable for their actions, though hopefully, there may be little bit of that. I can tell you right now, Madam Speaker, the issue here is to ensure good governance so what occurred does never, never occurs again. And that to me, and recommendations out of a public inquiry on ensuring good governance, not just in this municipality, but of all the dozens and dozens of municipalities across this province will be to the benefit of governments and local governments and local democracies. So I would encourage members of Council to support adding to the public inquiry, the motion says this. Therefore, be it resolved that the City of Winnipeg formally request the Province of Manitoba to 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 Lands; C. The East District Public Works Yard Capital Project; and D. The Winnipeg Convention Centre Expansion Project. And I think that there's no issues that are involved, but if there are, we also knew that there was an RCMP investigation going on that this information would flow through the public inquiry on some of these matters. It's crucial that the...that certain of these items are added to the scope of the Premier's commitment for a public inquiry. Those are my comments, and I hope that this can be...and I want to thank my seconder, Councillor Eadie, because he was here during that time as well and remembers it all very well. It was a time where...it was a time where we did do things in the city but, you can still do things without doing things a certain way where you're...well, I'll leave it at that Madam Speaker before I put myself in a legal position that I might regret. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I was so happy that Russ Wyatt has stayed diligent on these matters. I mean, it wasn't until after that first tumultuous first term that we really got to talk a lot, but Madam Speaker, one of the biggest problems was it was that "get 'er done" ideology. And that "get 'er done" ideology, you know, I hate to say it, it can...and more often leads to a lot of, I'll call them, bad decisions, decisions, you know, to move things along, forward, faster. Things can fall through the cracks. I had a discussion...I'm supporting this, but I'm going to use an example that happened, Madam Speaker, that is why we need to expand, or that the Province needs to expand it. There will be people, if they add

it to the inquiry, to actually hear, and John Luxteen Madam Speaker, has passed away since. If he was around today, he kept saying, Ross, if there's one, there's many. And he believed that was trying to advise the then Provincial Government the need for a much wider inquiry. The problem was, a number of things were influx investigations and (inaudible) decided not to call inquiries. Many of the things, there's no...some stuff there might be some legal stuff, but Madam Speaker, my example is going to be simply this. Gotta get 'er done, we're going to do the Waverley Underpass. So, okay, well, that's fine and legitimately, you know, Council voted that was the main project. It went ahead. And, but in order to get the project done, Madam Speaker, they needed to have a space, a staging space, to be able to do the underpass because we're dealing with the railway and there's all kinds of issues, and the city had quite some time prior to, after deciding, there was a piece of what they called unserviceable land, Madam Speaker. Unserviceable land. At the time I believed (inaudible) but, at the time we moved to build the underpass, somebody else owned that piece of property. Unserviceable land. All of a sudden, guess what? We paid a half a million dollars an acre for supposedly unserviceable land. I think it's tied up in what we call the Parker Land Swap. I don't know. But all I can say Madam Speaker is we need to open the inquiry and we should be all be very interested to convince the Province to open it up because there's a lot of people that probably will have a lot to say about what may or may not happen and maybe somebody's got some records nobody knows about because I know with some things, some records disappeared related to some matters outside of the city scope, however, records can disappear Madam Speaker. So, I'll leave it at that. I urge you all, let's vote to do this. I think it needs to be expanded. I'm not naming any names or anything because when they do an inquiry, which I wanted us...our...by the way, we under our Charter could have done an inquiry, or had the powers of an inquiry, which is the hold harmless the people digging at and seizing private records, people making comments that someone might sue you in the common-law court or would be protected. We could have done that. I tried to call on Council to do it all along, but no way. No way. That was in my first term. Anyway, Madam Speaker, that's all I have to say. Please colleagues, let's just vote for this. It's no harm to us. We're trying to make this city work better. The last mayor did some things. This mayor, he wants things to move along smoothly, but we really need to get underneath all these things that happened and actually, one last thing I'll mention. At the standing committee I was on, I was on Protection and Community Services, and then Chairperson Paula Havixbeck, we had the CAO right across the table. I was over there. We were in this chamber. And the only honest person I heard was our still head of Materials Management. I so appreciate that employee. We heard nothing but, I say, falsehoods about the fire, that whole fire hall thing. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Next is councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: I assumed others were going to speak. I wasn't going to speak on this, but it deserves something for the record. You know, it happens to be that in this building, we say we're here to find out about the taxpayers' money, say, this is taxpayers' money. We want to know about. And I've heard, I say that about trivial things, that really embarrass us as a Council, if you look at the record. If we really want to make meaning of those words 'this is taxpayers' money, and I want to know', this is the time. Otherwise, we should regret our words if we've ever used them. Because, we've used them for really bad trivial stuff. This is not. So, no matter what our suspicions or opinions are, this is a bona fide inquiry. That's what it is. That's when we say, this is taxpayers' money, and we want to know. And if we don't want to know, maybe the people we represent want to know. So what are we supposed to do about that? Ignore that? We've said more about less. Let's make some meaning out of this. This is my third term. This would be a legitimate. This would add some cohesion to us as a Council. It really would.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker. I want to thank my colleagues for raising this motion, and I wasn't here during the days, and many of us weren't, that Councillors Eadie and Wyatt speak of. So I can only appreciate certainly their reason for raising this. I'm not going to support this. Here's the reasons whys. The current Premier has indicated his sights are set on the Police Headquarters, an inquiry related to the Police Headquarters. So he's focused on that. My concern with adding four other items, four other areas to include, would be that it would broaden the scope so much that we would perhaps somewhat lose sight of the Police Headquarters, and an inquiry of this magnitude, with this broad a scope, I can only imagine, would go on for a lot of years. And my concern is the public would lose interest in it, with each passing year, the cost climbs, and so for those reasons, I'm not saying that this isn't worthwhile, and I'm not saying that my Council colleagues are wrong to raise this, but because I think the Police Headquarters needs a targeted focus, and the Premier has said that that's what he wants to do, I'm going to not support this motion at this time for those reasons. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I was here for part of that period. On this one, I actually agree with the Mayor. If you look at the Council agenda Special Meeting July 9, 2014. I remember driving in for this one. I'd been on vacation. There are 33 different sites that were investigated as part of the Real Estate Management Review. That's separate from the whole other report which we find in Item No. 2, which is Final Report from Ernst and Young on the Results of Interviews pertaining to

the new Fire/Paramedics Station, so this, I think, got pretty thoroughly canvassed back in 2014. I think Councillor Orlikow moved to refer it all then to the RCMP who I think referred it to the Police. It's long ago now. In short, I think the Mayor is right on this, that trying to expand the scope, will frankly take away from the more pressing issues. Some of these things I remember from 2014. There were intersections that didn't exist. Meadowood and Bishop Grandin as it was, you know. Some of these items that were...it was not time and money well spent shall we so, so not to slag whoever did these reports, or Ernst and Young and somebody else, but there were certainly some lack of specificity or at least lack of culpability in some of this, so I would agree with the Mayor. Let's move on. If the Province is going through the Police HQ, let's keep it to that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, do you wish to close? Okay. I'll call the question on Item 20, Public Inquiry Request. All in favour? Contrary? Do a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Orlikow, Schreyer, Wyatt.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Item 20 is defeated. We'll now move into the next motion. That is Motion 6. That was moved by Councillor Chambers and Councillor Wyatt. I believe they want to withdraw that motion. Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Chambers, they'll replace it with Motion 12. It's regarding transit and it is a Notice of Motion and it will appear on next month's Council agenda.

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Chambers,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS an equitable and sustainable public transit system is crucial for the well-being and economic vitality of the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the current funding model for transit, established via the leadership and vision of a previous New Democratic Provincial government, was unfortunately abandoned by the last provincial government, and has therefore shifted the burden disproportionately onto the City of Winnipeg, adversely affecting the quality and accessibility of our public transit services;

AND WHEREAS a return to a 50-50 funding model, as established by a previous New Democratic government would distribute the operating costs equally between the Province of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS this would foster a collaborative approach to enhancing public transit in the City of Winnipeg and directly assist the City of Winnipeg in addressing its responsibilities pertaining to Climate Change;

AND WHEREAS the 50/50 funding model provides the City of Winnipeg with a long-term, predictable funding source, so as to ensure stable, efficient and frequent public transit services to the citizens of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the Amalgamated Transit Union plays an important role in developing and supporting our transit operators who are the backbone of our public transit system;

AND WHEREAS with the newly elected provincial government, the timing of a request to restore the historic and vital 50/50 funding model for Winnipeg Transit, would reverse the unfortunate decision by the previous provincial government, in 2017, whereby the previous provincial government informed the City of Winnipeg, via a new policy directive, that they were immediately discontinuing the historic and vital 50/50 model;

AND WHEREAS the 2017 decision by the previous provincial government has directly affected the City of Winnipeg's ability to deliver public transit, both in terms of maintaining the existing core service, and its ability to plan for the future to address the needs of a growing city;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg request the Province of Manitoba to restore the historic and vital 50/50 transit operating budget funding model.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in light of the financial challenges faced by the Province of Manitoba, the City of Winnipeg indicate as well to the province, that we will entertain a phased-in approach, to assist the Province of Manitoba with the restoration of the said historic and vital 50/50 funding model.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg will work with the Province of Manitoba to preserve and enhance the Province of Manitoba's 'branding' on all of our transit infrastructure, including buses, so as to ensure the Province of Manitoba is rightfully and properly recognized for said 50/50 funding.

Motion No. 12

**Moved by Councillor Chambers,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,**

WHEREAS an equitable and sustainable public transit system is crucial for the well-being and economic vitality of the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the current funding model for transit, established via the leadership and vision of a previous New Democratic Provincial government, was unfortunately abandoned by the last provincial government, and has therefore shifted the burden disproportionately onto the City of Winnipeg, adversely affecting the quality and accessibility of our public transit services;

AND WHEREAS a return to a 50-50 funding model, as established by a previous New Democratic government would distribute the operating costs equally between the Province of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS this would foster a collaborative approach to enhancing public transit in the City of Winnipeg and directly assist the City of Winnipeg in addressing its responsibilities pertaining to Climate Change;

AND WHEREAS the 50/50 funding model provides the City of Winnipeg with a long-term, predictable funding source, so as to ensure stable, efficient and frequent public transit services to the citizens of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the Amalgamated Transit Union plays an important role in developing and supporting our transit operators who are the backbone of our public transit system;

AND WHEREAS with the newly elected provincial government, the timing of a request to restore the historic and vital 50/50 funding model for Winnipeg Transit, would reverse the unfortunate decision by the previous provincial government, in 2017, whereby the previous provincial government informed the City of Winnipeg, via a new policy directive, that they were immediately discontinuing the historic and vital 50/50 model;

AND WHEREAS the 2017 decision by the previous provincial government has directly affected the City of Winnipeg's ability to deliver public transit, both in terms of maintaining the existing core service, and its ability to plan for the future to address the needs of a growing city;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg request the Province of Manitoba to restore the historic and vital 50/50 transit operating budget funding model.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in light of the financial challenges faced by the Province of Manitoba, the City of Winnipeg indicate as well to the province, that we will entertain a phased-in approach, to assist the Province of Manitoba with the restoration of the said historic and vital 50/50 funding model.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City of Winnipeg will work with the Province of Manitoba to preserve and enhance the Province of Manitoba's 'branding' on all of our transit infrastructure, including buses, so as to ensure the Province of Manitoba is rightfully and properly recognized for said 50/50 funding.

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

Madam Speaker: By-laws under EPC Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker. I move that By-law No. 99/2023 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 99/2023.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2nd and 3rd READINGS

Mayor Gillingham: I move that By-law No. 68/2023 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 68/2023.

Mayor Gillingham: I move that By-law No. 68/2023 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. Mr. Mayor, the next section?

Mayor Gillingham: Oh there's another page. There we go. Sorry about that.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the following by-laws be read first time. By-law No. 93/2023, By-law No. 94/2023, By-law No. 102/2023.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Thank you. Noted. Councillor Eadie in opposition.

Clerk: By-laws No. 93/2023, 94/2023 and 102/2023.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I move that By-laws No. 93/2023, 94/2023 and No. 102/2023 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Noted, thank you.

Clerk: By-laws No. 93/2023, 94/2023 and 102/2023.

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 93/2023, 94/2023 and 102/2023 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. Thank you Councillor Eadie. Noted. We'll now have Question Period for the Mayor. Council Chambers followed by Councillor Eadie.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: We'll now have Question Period for the Mayor. Councillor Chambers followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you Madam Speaker. Through you, good evening Your Worship. One of the City of Winnipeg's highest honors, Key to the City, is meant to confer trust and honor for citizens who have made significant actions or contributions to our fair city, and it's synonymous with other cities across North America as well. In 2008 the Mayor of the day presented the Key to the City to former business man and fashion mogul Peter Nygard. Mr. Nygard's recent court proceedings, including his conviction, coupled with his pending legal troubles, call into question the trust and honor the Key to the City represents. My question to the Mayor is what measures are being taken to preserve the honor and dignity the Key to the City represents and the trust and honor maintained by all others who have received the Key to the City and have maintained the virtues by which the honor was bestowed. I also believe it's a measure taken to divest Mr. Nygard of this auspicious honor that sends a message of support to the countless women who have been victimized by this individual.

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, through you I want to thank Councillor Chambers for the question. We do take this very seriously. The Key to the City is the highest honor that we can bestow on someone, and so in light of the guilty findings of Mr. Nygard, I've asked that the Protocol Officer strike his name from the list of Key to the City recipients.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Next is Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. Amongst all the debatable items that have come...yesterday...was it yesterday or the day before? (inaudible) The Arlington Street bridge has been shut down indefinitely, and I don't see, Madam Speaker, how it's going to be open again. They're going to study it, we're spending 850 thousand to continue a study on a bridge that is obviously in need of replacement. So, Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if the Mayor could let us know if Arlington Bridge's replacement has become the number one major infrastructure asset that needs to be replaced.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, though you Madam Speaker to Councillor Eadie, as Councillor Eadie indicated in his question as pre-amble, there is a report that is coming to Council sometime in the first quarter of the next year we believe that will provide greater detail on the findings of the Arlington Bridge. We don't know what recommendations will be brought forward but the next step that we need is to get that report put in place. In discussing the fact that the Arlington Bridge is closed, in discussing with Councillor Lukes as the Chair of the Public Works Committee and with Mr. Jim Berezowsky, the head of the department, we did ask that traffic patterns be studied right now, as motorists have to re-route. I want to thank motorists for their patience, but ultimately, as far as what next steps will be, we won't know that collectively until we get the report from the consultant.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Second question Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if the Mayor actually knows that studies have been done as to what happens when the Arlington Bridge is closed, what happens to traffic. Already at capacity is the Slaw Rebchuk Bridge and already at capacity is the McPhillips Underpass. We know what the implications are and what we also know Madam Speaker, I'm just wondering if the Mayor knows this. We also know that I believe an ambulance could cross the Arlington Bridge, and what we do know is it takes seconds or minutes to ensure one can save a life, and the Health Sciences is the access there not to mention many other reasons that that bridge is needed. Is the Mayor aware of all those items, instead of talking about study, study, study. It's been studied. We know what happens to traffic.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I appreciate Madam Speaker, as the Councillor indicates that studies have been done on traffic pattern flows. This opportunity right now, because the bridge is closed, it's prudent for us to take the opportunity to make sure we're also keeping track of where the traffic is going and how it's re-routing.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Seeing no further question.

Councillor Eadie: ...this matter is...

Madam Speaker: Final question.

Councillor Eadie: Yep, final question is, will the Mayor get to the bottom of the economic impact that the closure and no longer existence of the Arlington Bridge will have?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker. First of all, let's get that report next...in the first quarter of 2024 and go from there.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, just as a follow up to our big debate on the HAF, I want to ask the Mayor regarding the Housing Accelerator Fund in light of the fact that the Minister was very forthright and had written the Mayor, you know, with specific requests, and in light of the decision of Council basically follow through. Is it possible that we could, as a city, request an...I realize that they're going to want to make an announcement at one point in terms of dollar value but at the very least, until that occurs, it would be, I think, good of the Minister if he could write to us number one, thanking us for the decision and number two, confirming that we have met his minimum conditions further to an announcement coming soon? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Through you Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Councillor for the question. My office will be in touch. The next step is to send a letter to the Minister tomorrow to indicate that we, Council did support the conditions and looking forward to next steps. Yes, like other cities across the country, when they have passed the requests of the Federal Government at their Council it is within short order, they had a sense of the numbers that they were getting in their Housing Accelerator Funding Application. I don't know the timing but yes, sooner rather than later will be my request to the Minister. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: And even if it's an informal email, but acknowledging at the very least that we've met his conditions and that there is no issue outstanding (inaudible). Just to confirm that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you very much. Yes, I will be following up with this informally with the Minister tomorrow. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next committee. We're going to go through the Standing Policy Committee on Finance and then after that take a 10-minute recess. Councillor Browaty, on the report dated November 3, 2023.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 3, 2023**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report, and Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Mr. Clerk? Item 1.

Item 1 - Entertainment Funding Tax Annual Report

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty to introduce the item.

Councillor Browaty: I'd like to introduce the report and Report No. 1.

Madam Speaker: Okay. And it's stood down by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. Okay in that case I'll certainly wait to hear what my colleague has to say.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty, I think you're on a delay. Maybe just check that.

Councillor Browaty: Oh.

Madam Speaker: Perhaps. Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: Sorry. Madam Speaker, before I speak to it, I would like to be able to ask the CAO a question regarding the Entertainment Tax and a question regarding one of the major event spaces in the city.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, it's typically shared with me ahead of time when there is questions of clarification. Is it a time sensitive question of clarification?

Councillor Eadie: Let me explain it. It is...it's sensitive to anything I'm about to speak to about the report, and it's in reference to True North and the Entertainment Tax Rebate that helped to build the...what's it called now? What's our arena called now?

Madam Speaker: Canada Life Centre.

Councillor Eadie: Canada Life Centre, that helped to build that, and I wanted to ask a question specifically. It states here that the contract is up in 2029. And I need to ask a specific question.

Madam Speaker: There will be one can question of clarification.

Councillor Eadie: That's all I'm going to ask.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Jack, you can come to the podium. Thank you.

Michael Jack: Thank you Madam Speaker.

Councillor Eadie: My question Madam Speaker is, I'm wondering if the CAO knows whether or not if the long-term contract with True North as to whether or not, did it...did the original contract have a clause about extending the time period of the contract without a need for negotiation?

Michael Jack: Yes, thank you. Through you Madam Speaker, I have seen the agreement years ago Councillor Eadie. I don't have the details at my fingertips at the moment. I can certainly undertake to determine that and get back to you and all of Council with that detail.

Councillor Eadie: Thanks Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Jack. Councillor Eadie if you want to continue with your speaking time.

Councillor Eadie: I'm going to do a quick speaking to it. So, just to (inaudible)...what I want to refer to here in the entertainment tax is, that entertainment tax did help build the wonderful Canada Life Centre. I think that True North and all or any entities associated with it, are quite profitable, are providing a great return on investment, and I just want to be clear that going into the future, we know that there's a bid from the True North Development Corp or whatever they call themselves, that they're looking at Portage Place, and I just want to mention that maybe it's time, seeing as how that group is doing so well in the downtown, and I appreciate the work that they do, but is it time that maybe they only get half of the entertainment tax back so that we can direct it to important things that we need in the downtown? That's what I'm going to...I just wanted to say that here. It says it expires in 2029. I don't know what's happening in the future, but I just wanted to point that out, but...and I note that, I note that the entertainment tax where there are no agreements with the three major...I'll call them sport event spaces. I will note that the entertainment tax is doing a good job providing funding to various organisations. I don't know if there's contracts with them that they're getting portions of that, but I guess we'll deal with that in the four-year budget process, but, so I just wanted to say the entertainment tax is being collected and being used for good things, and I'll leave it at that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty, do you wish to close?

Councillor Browaty: Sure. No, again, the entertainment tax at one point though did include some larger sport venues, it was my understanding. There were a couple of other things included back in '92. I know I worked at a laser tag place back in the 1990's and it also collected entertainment funding tax. Today it is really basically down to a...it is really just a movie tax. It's basically just cinemas. That's almost what the entirety of where the revenue comes from today. Again, I appreciate Councillor Eadie's concern that, you know, the old line (inaudible) billionaire sports owner, or millionaire sports owner to (inaudible) billionaire. They're not necessarily large money-making ventures. I think it's well known that recently, you know, attendance has fallen, yeah, you know, significantly at Jets' hockey games. Canadian dollar is particularly poor and salaries are in U.S. dollars, so in terms of how they have been doing, certainly way down, but again, certainly something to discuss and the CAO will come back with details on the agreement with True North.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Browaty. With that, I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: Now we'll have Question Period under this committee. Questions for our Finance Chair. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Councillor Browaty, through the Chair to yourself, I know you've been busy working on the budget with the working group as well. In light of the challenge that we always have of funding revenues to meet our expenditure projections, it's fairly clear what drives our...other than our fixed costs for materials and supplies, by and large, always a challenge we have to close the gap between revenues and expenses. It's being driven by contracts and contracts that we sell. Maybe is it not time just to simply say that we will build in, in the future property tax increases automatically whatever we have the courage to vote on for a contract, we should have the courage to be able to say to citizens of Winnipeg that this is our fixed cost, this is what's going to go up by, this is how we're going to find the funds, whether it be through fees or whether it be through property tax or whether it be utility charge or what have you. Isn't there a way our method we should be looking at to recover those costs, especially when we have the largest union we just voted on over a number of the extent of the contract over \$60 million and so on. Otherwise we are going to continue at that shortfall in terms of the budget process. So, any thoughts on that?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. Through you Madam Chair, Madam Speaker, to Councillor Wyatt. Municipal funding is certainly a challenge. We spent much of this week here in Ottawa with municipal colleagues from coast to coast to coast discussing the challenges that are out there. I know, you know, in the throne speech this week as well back in Manitoba that there was indications that we'll have some predictability. We did mentioned growth. It wasn't mentioned growth in the throne speech, but there have been some positive inclinations that the previous freeze that was under the Conservatives is over and we will see some level of incremental funding. The reality is, you know, taxpayers are...have fatigue. We've paid a lot, the cost of everything is going up and, you know, we have our (inaudible) that we've got a motion coming up on, on transit fares. You know the CFO has the ability to raise different fees up to the rate of inflation, which means without going to Council, it could be raised as much as 0.25 cents. So, again, things are tough for people. Talking about property tax increases above that is difficult. Municipal governments, even though we have a huge portion of the country's infrastructure, we do that with, you know, 9 to 10 cent dollars of all the tax (inaudible) coming in. So again, I...we definitely have our challenges. How we are going to find those revenues is up for discussion. I'm not going to give you my full dissertation of how I feel that can be done tonight, but I thank Councillor Wyatt for the question.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: Let's keep in mind, as you are aware of, we...the Province gave half of the property tax back to the school taxes and we never really took that opportunity. In light of that, and in light of the fact that we vote, and if there was a...my question is this Madam Speaker. If we linked property tax to contracts, there would be a direct incentive to this Council to keep contract costs down in order to keep property tax increases down. Can you follow me? Could we see a scenario and maybe I put it this way. Are you open to further discussions on this matter? How about that?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I don't think there's any need to close any doors when it comes to finding ways to fund the services that Winnipeggers depend on.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, and that concluded question period under this committee. We're going to have a 10-minute recess and we'll continue with Water and Waste.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
November 23, 2023, at 8:38 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good evening. I'm reconvening the Council meeting of November 23, 2023, after a short recess. We are at the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste and the Environment. Councillor Mayes, on the Report dated October 30th.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT
DATED OCTOBER 30, 2023**

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I will move...noting that Item No. 1 does have provision for an opt-out that we are coming back on, I will move Items No. 1 and 2.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

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

Madam Speaker: We'll now get into question period under this committee. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Mayes: Councillor Allard had indicated to me he had questions.

Madam Speaker: Seconded or...next is Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Allard: Thank you Madam Speaker. Through you to the Chair, the City of Winnipeg display board presented for Kenaston widening in 2023 claimed there would be 148.5 million of sewer work performed as part of the total cost of this project. The boards mention only combined sewer work as part of this cost, no other type of sewer work. This work would be done in Doncaster sewer district. When is that work supposed to take place in Doncaster under the current schedule?

Councillor Mayes: Thank you to Councillor Allard for advanced notice of the question. Perhaps my hanging the CFO's schedule outside of my office has prompted some interest. In the CSO issue, Councillor Allard is correct that the display boards did talk about combined sewer work as part of the cost of the Kenaston widening. They talked only about CSO, not any other sewer work. I had to research this actually, so yes, the sewer work is only for Doncaster sewer district, not Ash which is actually up above and kind of over so only for Doncaster. So, fair question which is if we do that sewer work as part of a Kenaston widening, when was that on the...when is that on the schedule. On scenario 1, which is the accelerated get done by 2047 schedule, Doncaster is to be done in 2038, but rather more dramatically, if you look at scenario number 3, which is the one the staff has been on and which we complete by 2097, Doncaster is due to be done in 2074. So, moving it forward to do it as part of the Kenaston widening would actually move it forward by 50 years. So, it is a cause for some pause. I think it's a fair question, and I think Councillor Allard had indicated he may have follow-ups.

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Allard: Through you to the Chair, thanks for the response. If the work in Doncaster is getting moved forward, what's supposed to be done in the next 2020's for CSO work and won't it get delayed?

Councillor Mayes: Fair question, yes. The question is if we do Doncaster out of sequence as part of a Kenaston widening, and I'm beginning to feel good about not having to defend the Kenaston widening at the first Climate Committee meeting that I'm going to be chairing, so some advantages to that vote earlier today. Question was, with Doncaster going ahead as part of the Kenaston widening, what gets delayed, and the answer is, as you can see from the chart, Mission which is, as you know, hugs the Seine River, very big project, very big project that is actually in the eastern part of St. Boniface ward, maybe even a bit of Transcona, I don't think it gets down to mine. I'm sure it doesn't. So yes, If Doncaster gets done first, something's got to be done later, and that would be Mission.

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, I don't like the sound of that. Just to follow up on that. The CSO Master Plan says Doncaster is supposed to cost 49.9 million with a 100% contingency for 99.8 million, yet the city is giving a cost of 50 million higher for sewer work. How is this possible? If the city is applying for Federal and Provincial funding for this project including CSO work, wouldn't this mark the first time we've asked the Federal and Provincial government for CSO to be funded and hasn't the North End Sewage Treatment Plant work always been a higher priority for Federal funding. Why are we now asking for CSO funds related to road expansion?

Councillor Mayes: Someone's been listening to my CSO ramblings in here. So yes, I don't have an explanation for why the number is 150. The number in the 1,300 page CSO report published in 2019 is 49.9 million and then you add the 100% contingency to get to 99 million. Where's the other 50 million that is part of this package of cost for Kenaston. I honestly don't know, and yes, as I've spouted off about here in the past, then Mayor Bowman used to say well go and do your CSO thing but do not go looking for Federal and Provincial money because the higher priority is North End. When Minister Klein, then Minister Klein was Minister, he'd asked me about that. We talked about that, and yes, that has consistently been the city position, North End higher priority than CSO work, so it does beg the question of, if we are looking for Federal and Provincial help for Kenaston widening and part of that is Doncaster CSO work possibly being moved up half a century, are we looking to put Federal and Provincial money into that. That is not something I put together before. I want to thank Councillor Allard for asking... well letting me know in advance about this. It does cause me concern, I have to say. Are we going ahead with the project with 150 million-ish of CSO work where we're asking for Federal and Provincial money toward the CSO work. That to me does not hang together with our approach to date on CSO projects. So, thank you for the advance notice to Councillor Allard. It's quite the series of questions that is going to cause me to ask some more questions of the Water and Waste staff. So, thank you

Councillor Allard: Thank you Madam Speaker, this is concerning for St Boniface ward and for taxpayers who need those funds going to the water treatment facilities.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard do you have a third question?

Councillor Allard: No, I'm good with that.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Next is Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker my first question is, how happy is the Chairperson of Water and Waste that there's no more lot grading hearings at Water and Waste?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Someone noticed what we were voting on in No. 2. Excellent question. I'm very pleased with that. I hope we can do some more of that. Councilors shouldn't be hearing these 26-dollar matters that don't set any precedent so lot grading wasn't one of those so yes. Well spotted by Councillor Eadie. Yeah, there are some other items, mostly in the planning portfolio where we have full-on deck of Councilors and City Clerks and staff, and we're hearing matters for \$26 and none of it sets a precedent so, we should be cleaning up some of that as well but thank you Councillor Eadie. Yes. Thank you for your support in cleaning up the lot grading by-law.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, related to the report we just voted on, everybody's very tired Madam Speaker, but the next question I'm going ask is, is it wise to actually have water and waste manager whatever on the appeal body. It is that very department that is the one pushing lot grading certificates and stuff, and I don't think they should be on the hearing body. They are the ones who are standing up from the city's side as to why the city is pressuring something, so do you think, Madam Speaker, do you think it's wise? I don't know that that's a fair hearing process is it?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Well in just 12 hours, Councillor Gilroy and I and Dobson and Santos will be here starting the Water and Waste Committee meeting, so perhaps we can ask that very question to the Director. It's a fair question. I hadn't thought about that, so take a look at that but certainly I think the CAO and designee, are the key people here on that, to start hearing these appeals along with the long grass cutting appeals that the staff are already hearing.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, we do listen to the Chair of Water and Waste whenever he speaks. At a previous Council meeting, the Chair indicated that we have to get moving on the North End Treatment Plant because we are going to hit a wall by 2030, I recall the number. In light of the position that our engineers of Water and Waste have given the previous Provincial Government or Governments that our policy has been to de-facto suppress infill development so as to accommodate existing growth in the city in terms of water and waste and accommodate green field development, that that has been the policy, that has been the position of our Water and Waste engineers submitted to the Provincial Government in terms of our environmental licensing. Are we going to entertain or is there going to be discussions at your committee in terms of having to reverse that position in light of the recent HAF decision?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes

Councillor Mayes: I'm hoping to give a 12-hour long answer to...we're just right into the discussion of bio solids which is on tomorrow morning's agenda. That's completely unfair to the staff man. Like you can't say they've been de-facto suppressing infill development. No, they haven't. I mean that's crazy. I mean its...there's limits in the system. There are limits in the system. There's one at John Bruce Road at St. Anne's Road, there have been limits south of the Perimeter in St. Norbert, there are limits on Belliveau on the south side but not on the north side...or the other way around. So no, no, they haven't been suppressing it. I mean, I've...after the water and waste staff I've talked to are somewhat worried by the HAF saying we're going to get blamed for everything, everything we're going to get blamed for everything, and they're right so I guess we'll see what comes of the HAF money and see if we get some or all of it and how we decide to allocate that, we haven't decided how to allocate whatever it is we do get. They'll be of course horrific competition between private players for no, you gotta expand capacity here at Nova Vista and St. Anne's, while someone else (inaudible) at Moore and St. Mary's Road. No one's been suppressing infill development, in fact, one could argue the sewer by-law, which will be...which has not been amended (inaudible) the HAF application, the sewer by-law requires you to put in a discharge control device if you have a triplex or a fourplex. The sewer by-law does not require you to put in a discharge control device if you put in two infill homes each with a secondary suite. This is the famous why is three greater than four debate. Why is the triplex owner putting in a discharge control device but the person who does the lot split with four total units not required. Very thing came up on Moore as a matter of fact in relation to a couple of properties. So no, no one's suppressing it, in fact, like I've argued that the same respect for the CSO system should apply for the lot split homes. That didn't carry the day. We'll see what the new Provincial Government has to say about what sort of draw they want to put onto the CSO system. I mean the real danger here is hey let's keep allowing development in the CSO area. We're spending a billion dollars to get from 75% capture to 80% capture. What if it's all wasted? What if you just keep putting more and more infill in and pouring into the CSO system. So now you've spent a billion dollars basically to subsidize the development community, so a rousing defense of the Water and Waste staff who I think have not been trying to suppress infill development. They've been applying the sewer by-law and they've been applying the reality that we have hydraulic limits in places like St. Anne's Road and John Bruce.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, I'd be happy to table communications that have occurred in the last four or five years between our staff and the public service at the Province of Manitoba whereby de-facto they've accepted policy with regards to, maybe suppressing is not the right word, but rather putting the pressure on the infill so as to cap and to consolidate so we don't over tax our CSO system. My second question Madam Speaker is the RM of Rosser from what I understand is now charging back an area charge on developers in Centreport for sewer services. We as a city just about a decade ago, maybe just under a decade, agreed to extend an interceptor out by Inkster. Is the city going to be compensated or is the city being re-compensated or compensated for the cost of that interceptor upgrade or are these fees being collected by the RM of Rosser that will be staying in the RM of Rosser. Are you aware?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Is this the thing up in the Speaker...is this the Fernbank, Fernbank interceptor thing? This one literally outside the city.

Councillor Wyatt: (Inaudible)

Councillor Mayes: Okay. God knows we've debated the Fernbank interceptor more than enough for one lifetime, so I'm not sure about that. What I am sure about is tomorrow again, we have on the agenda a discussion of how much the various RM's are putting into the system due to the Council vote of December something or other 2011 to allow the other neighboring RM's to start getting into our city sewer system. It would appear some heavy using industry has closed down so actually the usage isn't quite as much but yeah, the bio solids capacity report that comes tomorrow is saying, you know, we said we had 6 to 8 years, now we've got 5 to 7 years I think it is, so it's still roughly on track to lights out in 2030 if we don't get going on this thing. So, lights out rather than being an F1 racing term in that sense is rather a reference to (inaudible) develop anything in the city if you don't have biosolids capacity if you don't have that built by 2030, but we are underway. Kudos to Bowman for getting us some Federal and Provincial funding on that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer moves extension of two minutes. All in favor?

Councillor Wyatt: The practice of the City...the practice of the City in the past...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, there was no suspension.

Councillor Wyatt: Alright.

Madam Speaker: That's the end of Question Period.

Councillor Wyatt: I'll ask tomorrow morning.

Councillor Mayes: Sounds good. I'll be here...sleeping here.

Madam Speaker: That's the end of Question Period under this committee. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 2, 2023**

Councillor Rollins: Thank you Madam Chair. I move Consent Agenda Items 1 through 6.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now moving to by-laws under this committee.

**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 first time. By-law No. 95/2023, By-law No. 96/2023, By-law No. 97/2023, By-law No. 98/2023.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 95/2023, 96/2023, 97/2023, and 98/2023.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS**

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Yes Madam Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 101/2023, By-law No. 103/2023.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 101/2023 and 103/2023.

Madam Speaker: Madam Chair.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I move that By-laws No. 101/2023 and 103/2023 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 101/2023 and 103/2023.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 101/2023 and 103/2023 be read a third time, and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
November 23, 2023

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Any questions under this committee, for Councillor Rollins, our Chair? Seeing none. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Community Services. Councillor Duncan, our Chair.

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

Councillor Duncan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce the Report for Standing Policy Committee on Committee Services and move adoption of Consent Agenda for Items 1 through 5.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now onto by-laws for all three readings Mr. Chair.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
COMMUNITY SERVICES
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

Councillor Duncan: Thank you Madam Speaker. I'd like to move that By-law No. 91/2023 be read the first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 91/2023.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Chair.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you. I'd like to move that By-law No. 91/2023 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 91/2023.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Chair.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you. And I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 91/2023 be read and third time, and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Any questions under this committee? Seeing none. Final committee I believe. Standing Policy Committee on Public Works.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
DATED NOVEMBER 9, 2023**

Madam Speaker: Madam Chair, Councillor Lukes. It's the Report dated November 9. Two items

Councillor Lukes: Sure. Two items. I'd like to move Consent Agenda for Item No. 1 and 2.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Browaty: Madam Speaker, I'd like to move that Motion No. 4 (inaudible) be dealt with today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Yes, Motion 4 has been circulated. It is not a referral but Councillor Browaty is moving suspension of the rules to hear it today. It is on the transit on WINNpass specifically. All in favour of the suspension? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Lukes to introduce the motion.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS in accordance with the Fees and Charges By-law 196/2008, the Chief Financial Officer of the City of Winnipeg is authorized to increase annually any fee imposed by an amount equal to or less than the rate of inflation;

AND WHEREAS the annual inflation rate is defined as the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the previous calendar year;

AND WHEREAS the CPI for 2022 was 7.8% as per Statistics Canada Table 18-10-0005-01 which would equate to a 25 cent increase to the full cash fare;

AND WHEREAS the Chief Financial Officer for the City of Winnipeg has directed Winnipeg Transit to increase the cash fares for Winnipeg Transit by 10 cents effective January 1, 2024 to bring the full cash fare to \$3.25;

AND WHEREAS the average income of bus passengers in Winnipeg is \$36,360, which is significantly lower than the national average for transit users across other cities, according to Statistics Canada;

AND WHEREAS lower income Winnipeg residents are experiencing continuing inflationary pressures;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That effective January 1, 2024 the WINNPASS rates for both the monthly pass and e-cash rate be held to 2023 dollar amounts for 2024 (providing a discount rate of 51.72% off the full fare equivalent products).*
2. *That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.*

Councillor Lukes: Certainly. We've been advised by the Chief Financial Officer that we should be bringing this forward because it is freezing the...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, just if I could just pause you for a moment. There were some amending motions that were circulated, and I understand they've have been withdrawn. So that would be...Mr. clerk if you can verify. It's Motion 6, Motion 10, Motion 11 and Motion 5 I believe.

Clerk: Motions 10 and 11.

Madam Speaker: Okay, the motions that were moved by Councillor Allard, as amending to the...

City Clerk: So Motion 10 amends Motion 4. It's moved by Councillor Allard, seconded by Councillor Gilroy, and Motion 11 also was an amendment to the Motion 4, and that one was moved by Councillor Gilroy and seconded by Councillor Allard, and both movers and seconders have advised that they wanted to withdraw those motions.

Motion No. 10
Moved by Councillor Allard,
Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,

WHEREAS more people who choose riding the bus results in reductions in traffic;

AND WHEREAS Council voted to direct the transportation master plan to achieve a modal shift by 2030 of 50 percent;

AND WHEREAS in the May 26, 2022 Council Minutes, on page 6 of Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated May 4, 2022, the public service has indicated that should a reduction in fares be determined to be a policy that Council wishes to pursue, significant additional study would be needed, and it should only be undertaken in concert with the transition to the WTMP route network";

AND WHEREAS transit has identified opportunities where the transit utility could increase revenues to transit by

reducing fares and require a consultant assignment in order to present a plan to Council;

AND WHEREAS this confirms that transit is losing riders to due transit fares being too high;

AND WHEREAS increases in transit fares reduce demand, to the point where transit has confirmed in an administrative report that in some cases, the utility is losing money because the rates are too high;

AND WHEREAS there is a new provincial government that has demonstrated that it is interest in making life affordable for Manitobans, and Council should be ready to ask for transit fare reductions or free transit to Provincial and Federal Governments;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Motion 4 regarding maintaining 2024 transit rates at 2023 levels be amended as follows:

- *Delete the first resolve and replace with the following:*
 - "1. *That WINNpass users have their fees adjusted to \$0, so that they may ride the bus for free;*"
- *Add the following resolves and renumber the remaining resolves accordingly:*
 - "2. *That the \$1.4 million that have been freed by the former government funding for net new road expenses for the Route 90 Road widening and the Chief Peguis extension, and that in the event that spending authorizations have already been given by Council on these new funds, that the funds required for the consultant study be funded by the mill rate stabilisation reserve fund;*
 - 3. *That the consultant report assignment that would assist Winnipeg Transit to consider the reduction of cash transit fares by approximately \$0.25 cents annually until such time as the cash fare reaches the optimal rate for the utility referenced in the May 26, 2022 Council Minutes, on page 6 of Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated May 4, 2022.*
 - 4. *That this consultant assignment explore the budget implications of having a free transit system."*

Motion No. 11

Moved by Councillor Gilroy,

Seconded by Councillor Allard,

WHEREAS the May 2023 report from the Provincial Government indicates that the cost of living increase was 3.4%;

AND WHEREAS the public service projects the WINNpass costs to be \$4.1 million in 2023;

AND WHEREAS WINNpass applicants need to meet the low-income cost of living threshold before being eligible and that inflation affects this population more than households with higher incomes;

AND WHEREAS the cost of reducing the projected cost of the WINNpass transit fares by the 3.4 % increase in the cost of living, would be \$139,400;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That WINNpass rates for both the monthly pass and e-cash be reduced by the cost of living increase, or 3.4%, effective January 1, 2024.*
2. *That the Low Income Transit Pass Council Policy be amended to reduce WINNpass rates by the cost of living increase for every year thereafter.*
3. *That the reduction in WINNpass rates be funded by the annual transit funding increase.*

Madam Speaker: Yes. Was there anything further that was drafted earlier that was circulated Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk: (inaudible) Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay thank you. So those...Councillor Allard, they have been withdrawn?

Councillor Mays: Is Item 8 withdrawn?

Councillor Allard: The amending motions, yes. I have a...

City Clerk: So that will be after? So Item 5, Motion 5 has been withdrawn. (inaudible) has asked to be withdrawn to be replaced with Motion 8, but we will deal with those items after this motion.

Madam Speaker: Okay. So for this particular motion, there are no amending motions. They've been withdrawn. That's right. Okay, and Motion 4, Mr. Clerk, if you want to read into the record so we're all clear. Mr. Clerk? Yes, just the resolves.

Clerk: Therefore be it resolved: 1. That effective January 1, 2024 the WINNpass rates for both the monthly pass and e-cash rate be held to 2023 dollar amounts for 2024 (providing a discount rate of 51.72% off the full fare equivalent products); and 2. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes to introduce the motion.

Councillor Lukes: Well it's pretty self-explanatory, I guess. The Chief Financial Officer has indicated that we need to set these...set this fare now because they need to print up the materials and have it printed for January 1st. She did have...she has the delegated authority to put an increase on the fare of 7.8%, which would equate to 25 cents, but she's directed transit to increase the fare rate by 10 cents. So, and then of course the request to freeze the WINNpass rate.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. any further speakers? I see you, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I appreciate this motion and I appreciate that the Mayor inspired this motion, I believe, and we have...it's there, but anyway, Madam Speaker, I am voting for this WINNpass provision, which is a reduction in a program which has a number of products in it. In effect, really what it does is it increases the discount rate, what, to 51 point...what is it? seven again? Anyway, Madam Speaker, I appreciate that this is here, and the 10-cent increase over the last, I don't know how many years, we've only been increasing the regular fare, cash fare, by 5 cents, Madam Speaker, and the CFO, I think, has made a very good decision as our CFO does realize that a huge increase to the regular cash fares of 25 cents, which she's quite capable of doing, that's not making things affordable, and appreciate that. But I thought that this might be an opportunity at this point to actually...to have increased the discount rate for the WINNpass program, which has several products, to have discounted it to...for 2024 to 55%, and hopefully maybe we'll see in the future through the four-year 2024 to 2027 budget that we'll be able to see it over a number of years incremental at 5% increases to the discount rate for the WINNpass program. Anyway, I'll leave it at that. I am voting for this. I think it is good to hold it flat because the people who are most susceptible to inflation are the people who are applying for the WINNpass program, so anyway. Thanks to the movers and I think it's at least it keeps its status quo for the WINNpass users.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Wyatt followed by Councillor Browaty and Councillor Allard.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, I'm going to rise of course to support the clause. I guess I could ask the question directed at the Chair if she could follow up on her follow-up comments. Is it possible? When we record "be it resolved motions," we typically, what stays alive is the "be it resolved". "Whereases" tends to sometimes drop off. In light of the significant commitment by the CFO to limit the increase on January 1, 2024, to 10 cents, is there a possibility that we could have that in the form of a communication that would be submitted as information to the next Council agenda in December, as we have communications at the front of our book, just simply to have that recorded and so that it's noted and so, and not lost for the record for the future. And those are my comments, and by way of a question to you. Hopefully we could have that follow-up. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Browaty followed by Councillor Allard.

Councillor Browaty: I'll be super brief here. Again, any time we raise transit rates, we hear from people, you know, who struggle with living in Winnipeg that have, you know, they're at the fringes of being able to live. The WINNpass is an important program because it does give a significant discount to full-fare transit rates for those who need it absolutely the most. So again, inflation on everything is getting more expensive. Our support of transit has grown exponentially, and our fares are on the low side within Canada. We are introducing some new transit services over the next year, including the transit security team, so I think this is a good time to help those people that need it, and that's what this motion is today. I appreciate that we were able to suspend the rules to deal with it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard. Yes, Madam Speaker, through you to my colleagues, I will not be supporting this motion. I do...I do appreciate the direction it's going in, but having read reports from Public Works over the years, I know that we are losing transit riders. I heard from the Chair of Public Works in this chamber that one of the things being said about it by administration, about our climate action plan and our hope to achieve mode shift of 50% by 2030, one of the things that I heard in this chamber was that we would have to actually close down roads to achieve that mode shift objective, and I think that's patently false. I think we can induce demand for transit by making it more affordable to ride transit. I do appreciate the efforts of my colleagues to freeze the WINNpass rates. I do still see that as a 7.8% increase in the amount that de facto or in facts the people who are in low-income cut-off families, LICO families, they are feeling the same inflationary pressures as everyone, so as we know, in municipal politics, zero is actually a cut because of inflation, so when we freeze taxes, we're actually cutting taxes. When we freeze the WINNpass program, we're actually cutting the WINNpass program as it pertains to the people who benefit...beneficiaries of it. I know from reading Public Works reports that we're losing transit riders. I know that the public service has said that in modelling that they've done, they've actually seen scenarios where transit makes more money by lowering fares, and they have said that they need a consultant's assignment to model the whole city. They have said that we could do that during the Transit Master Plan. We have the Transit Master Plan. We voted on the Transit Master Plan, and so I think we should get going with that, and it I'm opposing fare hikes...it's because I know that we're losing transit riders. Every time we lose transit riders, that means more cars on the road. That 7.8% inflation Councillor Browaty was talking about, people on the fringes, well, not everybody's eligible for the WINNpass and for those people that are just outside of LICO, that's going to be a double whammy. That's going to be a 10-cent increase, and then it's going to be 10 cents on top of having 7.8% inflation, so that means there's less money to spend in the family. That means there's decisions that have to be made sometimes between groceries and taking the bus. And so recent media coverage has demonstrated that most vulnerable people in Winnipeg are...need transit, and that's not just LICO families. We see the cost of housing is through the roof. Councillor Wyatt said that we have the lowest densities almost in the world of any major city. These are all things that are compounding, and so I'd like to see that modelling done. We've known about it for years. We still don't have the consultant's assignments. We have money that we could be spending on that consultant assignment that hasn't been re-budgeted, to my knowledge. If not, we should be spending it, because how many dollars are we losing by not following the public service recommendations to look at those modelling scenarios where we're making more money with a transit utility because fares aren't too high and we're not losing those transit riders, so it's going in the wrong direction. We see huge dollars for roads and we see increases for fares, for transit users, and so we're doing the opposite of inducing demand for transit. We're inducing demand for new roads. This is in contravention to our climate action plan. This is in contravention to what makes for a sustainable city fiscally and in terms of climate change. So, I mean, those are some of the reasons I'm voting against this report. I was also...well, I now...I also understand, talking with the public service, how successful the WINNpass program is, and when I first started it was a nominal amount of the budget, but we're up to around \$4 million of budget impact on WINNpass revenues coming in, from what I understand from the public service, so, I mean, it is an opportunity to work on the WINNpass program. I appreciate what Councillor Eadie is saying about making deeper reductions to WINNpass. I think that's part of the solution. The other part of the solution is to look at fares generally, because we're losing ridership, and losing ridership means more cars on the road and losing ridership means less revenue for the transit utility, and we have it in writing from the department that they need a consultant's assignment in order to find that optimal rate where we're actually making more money. We're raising fares, we're losing riders. We could actually be, what is it...well, I guess it's penny wise, pound foolish, so, we raise the fares and then we lose fares because people can't afford the fares, so they find other means, or they don't ride the bus. So I'll leave it at that. Thank you for your consideration. I know it's late, and I think this is the wrong direction when we have money for other things, and then we hurt transit. I don't think that's the right direction for the city, and when I hear, you know, we can't hire enough bus drivers, I also hear, well, supply and demand says that you can't attract the workforce. You need to offer better benefits, and so that's with the Executive Policy Committee and the collective agreement process. I think we need to pay our transit drivers better. I talk to them. I ride the bus, and yes, safety is important and it is going to be addressed by new inspectors, but also if you're choosing a career, benefits and pension. Benefits matter, and if we're not meeting the demand, which I understand we're not, then we need to better our offer, and I don't see that happening with this Executive Policy Committee. And so I see a transit system where fares may be comparatively lower but the service is comparatively also much worse, and so I'd like to see us move on the Transit Master Plan. I'd like to see us hire more bus drivers, and I see big money going to other priorities, and those are some of the reasons I'm going to vote against this motion today. So I do appreciate its...it could have been worse. but it could also be better.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Appreciate the remarks. It's a really important issue, because we're coming down to the crux, just like earlier in the day today, we're talking about affordable housing, we're talking about the essence of affordability for people, the base of affordability of basic life. Housing and transportation. Often the transportation is to keep a job. Why is someone taking transit? Ideally because they choose to because it's the best way in terms of resource efficiency, therefore environmentally. That's not always the reason they do it. Ideally more people do take transit, but what we're really dealing with here is the affordability of transit, and that's something else. Madam Speaker, just something to bear in mind while we try to solve these problems, I'm going to say it, I'll never stop saying it. I hope everyone can say it, or at least agree with me. You can't solve a problem you can't explain. You can't solve a problem you don't understand. For government, we have to be able to explain what we understand. This is what I understand, and this is what I know we're not talking about. We haven't explained this yet. We haven't explained why, and this is it. In my lifetime, the cost of bus fare has increased between from 5 cents to almost \$3, depending on 5 or 10 cents to almost \$3, so it's gone up 30 to 50 times. The cost has gone up 30 to 50 times in my lifetime, okay? So the cost of taking the bus has gone up 30 to 50 times. Let's deal with this. Let's say it's almost, at maximum fare, and I'll talk about the WINNpass, but at maximum fare we're approaching \$3, but it was \$5 for wintertime the year I was born. In the wintertime, it was \$5 to take the bus...sorry, 5 cents. It will be \$5 soon, but 5 cents to take the bus in the wintertime in 1967. So that's the truth, 5 cents to take the bus back 56 years ago. So, guess what? While we're approaching maximum \$3 to take the bus. So, while that's an increase of 60...so it's almost 60, 50 times, but depends, you know, if you got a discount rate, depending on the season, et cetera. So it's gone up by at least 30 times in my lifetime. Okay. The price of gas has gone up since 1967 about 10 times. So we know it's not gasoline costs that are creating the increase in bus fares, right? Now Brian Mayes was asking questions of another department, and he was asking, what's causing the increases? And he said, well, it's labour and oil. And he goes, well, there's more to it than that, isn't there? Well what is it? And as he was given...and as he said, and I hope I'm not putting words in his mouth. I know I'm not. It's all on the record here. He said well there's more to it than that, and the answer he was given was well we don't know. Well, we do know that the cost of labour and gasoline is not the reason for the cost of increase in bus fare, because we know that the cost of gasoline didn't go up 50 times. Cost of gasoline has gone up 10 times. And we also know that the wages for bus drivers and mechanics, which pretty much drives the industry here in Winnipeg in terms of the service...providing the service of buses here, has gone up, what would you say? How much do you think the wages of bus drivers and mechanics have gone up at Winnipeg Transit? Do you think they've gone up 30 times or 50 times, like the bus fares? Do you think they've gone up 10 times like the cost of oil? No! They haven't even gone up 5 times, something between 3 and 5 in the last 56 years. So they've gone up even less than the cost of oil. So we know that if you look at weighted averages, we know that it's the cost of labour that's kept an efficiency, some semblance of efficiency in the transit industry in the way that the government provides transit service. What's our saviour here? Labour costs. If labour costs went up at the same rate of even oil, I don't know what would happen, but weighted averages, we...what is the average? What proportion of labour costs, what proportion of our bus fare goes to labour cost? I'm going to estimate, and I hope I'm corrected one day (inaudible) say that I'm wrong, and I will thank anybody to explain it. I'm going to say somewhere around a third, something like that. So we know that (inaudible), it's less than half, and that means that by weighted averages, that means that...I still got two and a half minutes left? All right. Oh, we're getting my point. I think people are getting it. So we know it's not labour. That's saving us from extra inflation. That's the way it is in construction too, by the way. It's funny how the pattern goes, and when it comes to the oil, well, that hasn't gone up at the same rate as the increase in bus fares either, so even though the cost of gasoline has gone up significantly more than the cost of labour, it's still much lower than the increase in a bus ticket. And by weighted averages, that means that there's some things within the cost of a bus ticket that have gone up more than 50 times, and I dare say there's some things in the price of our bus ticket that went up 100 times in my lifetime, and I think we owe it to ourselves to find out what that is, to talk about it on this floor, so that we can say: here's a problem and we can understand it, therefore, we can talk about it, and therefore have a (inaudible) chance of solving it.

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, seeing the hour, I would encourage, through you, the Councillor to stick right to the WINNpass and the bus pass, please. Thank you. 0

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: That's what it's all about. This is our problem. We're trying to solve it today. We're trying to minimize the cost because we've got a problem, and all I'm saying is what we're doing here is important, but it's kind of a band aid solution. We're not actually dealing with the problem. We're saying it's too high. Therefore, well, let's just keep it lower, let's use tax money to subsidize it. Well, Madam Speaker, if my point (inaudible) to say that subsidies sometimes subsidies aren't the solution. They actually, abet, inflation, and if we don't accept that, we're going to abet the problem year after year after year. That's my point Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I'm not sure what exactly was being attributed to me there. Here's the question somebody should have been asking or I can ask it now, or I can raise the point now. If we've been told in the past that the number

one variable in the elasticity of demand, (inaudible) the number one variable in the elasticity of demand for transit taking is the cost of gas, one would want to ask what are our ridership projections looking like in light of the NDP's announcement that they're going to take a 14-cent-per-litre reduction on the price of gas? Surely that should influence the elasticity of demand for transit service. As the price of gas goes down, we have been told many times over the years that that's the number one variable. So (inaudible) I feel like I'm starting to connect with Councillor Allard across some weird mutual brain space here, but that's the better question, surely, is that...is that our projection in the budget? Are we still holding to that? Do we still think the ridership will keep increasing? Because the Provincial Government, whether for good reasons or not, I'll leave that to others, is announcing a change in the price of gasoline. So if that, accompanied by an increase in the cost of taking transit, is both coming at the same time, what ramifications will that have? That said, given the hour, I'll vote for...what are we moving here Lukes? I'll vote for the Lukes motion here, but I think that, frankly, has a pretty serious implication for the budget.

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

Councillor Allard: Recorded vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Seeing none, Councillor Lukes, do you wish to close?

Councillor Lukes: I'll just ask for the vote.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Allard: Recorded vote please.

Madam Speaker: Call for recorded vote. All in favour of Motion 4, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Allard, Gilroy.

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 4 passes. We'll now get right into Question Period under this committee.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: First question, Councillor Eadie for our Chair Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if the Chair of Public Works, Madam Speaker, will ask the public service to calculate the economic outfall as a result of the closing or keeping open, closing the Arlington Bridge, while it's closed over the term, just like traffic flow.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you for your question Councillor Eadie, I don't think the Public Works Department has the capability to estimate the economic output. That's not really something they do, so I think that would be better directed to, well Matt Dryburgh and company but, you know, I don't think the Public Works Department can do that.

Councillor Allard: Well I'd like to get in there then.

Councillor Eadie: Alright. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for our Chair? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, if Mr. Allard would just, you know, let me handle my question period he can have his own.

Councillor Allard: I want to add to yours Councillor.

Councillor Eadie: Well, Madam Speaker, this is a "did you know" for the whole Council Chamber. Did you know that when Councillor Dobson was 13 years old and I was 11 years old, that the...did you know that it was 10 cents, 10 cents to take a bus in those years and what is the price now? Bus fare has gone up over 3000%.

Madam Speaker: Right into the question please.

Councillor Eadie: That's my question. Did you know?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Finally, someone's going to ask me how I've been managing to hold off the snow till now, but no one's asked that yet, so thanks Councillor Eadie for your questions. I don't know.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions under this committee?

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Speaker. I've been inspired by (inaudible).

Madam Speaker: Final question for Councillor Eadie first.

Councillor Eadie: Sorry for being a bit frivolous, but I just thought I'd interject like crazy. Anyway, Madam Speaker there is a motion on the floor that's going to Public Works and I just want to ask what the Chairperson thinks of the motion to move forward on replacing the Arlington Bridge?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: At this hour Councillor Eadie, I don't really have a lot of thoughts on the Arlington Bridge, so let me think about that and I'll definitely have something to say at the Public Works Committee when the motion appears.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Ah yes Madam Speaker, through you to the Chair, thank you very much to Councillor Eadie for raising this question. Surely if we can do a cost benefit analysis on Kenaston, I wasn't going to go here but Councillor Eadie brought it up, surely the logic works, that if we can do a cost-benefit analysis on a road widening for Kenaston and net new road in the Chief Peguis extension, surely if we can do the cost-benefit analysis on spending a billion dollars or more, we can also do a cost-benefit analysis on the impact of the closing of a very similar piece of infrastructure in the Arlington Bridge.

Madam Speaker: Your question Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: The question is, I heard the Chairperson say that Public Works doesn't do cost-benefit analysis. Well how can that be if we're doing it for Kenaston and Chief Peguis Trail?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Madam Chair?

Councillor Lukes: I didn't hear the question.

Madam Speaker: Could you re-state the question Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Chair, and Madam Speaker. I found the exchange ironic and interesting. I've heard the Chairperson say that Public Works doesn't do cost-benefit analyses, yet we are going as a council to invest 1 billion dollars in net new roads subject to a cost-benefit analysis. Is the Arlington Bridge not a road? Is it not the same kind of infrastructure as a road widening or a road extension?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: I'm still not clear on the question but I'll take it under advisement, and listen to tomorrow on audio, and if I come up with an answer, I'll call you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. No further questions?

Councillor Allard: Don't I get a third or?

Madam Speaker: Sure, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Okay, so, If I'm to understand correctly, we are capable of getting a cost-benefit analysis.

Madam Speaker: Right into the question please. Question please.

Councillor Allard: (inaudible) but not on the Arlington Bridge closure. Is that a (inaudible). Yes or no.

Madam Speaker: You've already asked. Do you have a different question?

Councillor Allard: Well I heard advisement. That's not...that's a yes or no question.

Madam Speaker: That's an answer. We're going to move on to Councillor Eadie now. Councillor Eadie, your question.

Councillor Eadie: Yes I will re-phrase the question Madam Speaker. Why can't we do economic analysis, which is really a cost-benefit analysis of the Arlington Bridge, if we can do...so why can't we, for Arlington Bridge, but we can for Kenaston and Chief Peguis Trail.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Lukes: I'll get back to you on that.

Madam Speaker: Councillor, the Chair had already answered the question.

Councillor Allard: That's the same question I had. It's just not computing.

Madam Speaker: It was answered. Any new questions? Seeing none. No further questions. Okay.

There is motions that we missed. There's lots of paper here on the desk. It was Motion 8, moved by councillor Allard and seconded by Councillor Gilroy. That's being withdrawn. 5? Yes, Motion 5 is being withdrawn. Is that correct Councillor Allard and Councillor Gilroy?

Motion No. 8
Moved by Councillor Allard,
Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,

WHEREAS more people who choose riding the bus results in reductions in traffic;

AND WHEREAS Council voted to direct the transportation master plan to achieve a modal shift by 2030 of 50 percent;

AND WHEREAS in the May 26, 2022 Council Minutes, on page 6 of Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated May 4, 2022, the public service has indicated that should a reduction in fares be determined to be a policy that Council wishes to pursue, significant additional study would be needed, and it should only be undertaken in concert with the transition to the WTMP route network";

AND WHEREAS transit has identified opportunities where the transit utility could increase revenues to transit by reducing fares and require a consultant assignment in order to present a plan to Council;

AND WHEREAS this confirms that transit is losing riders to due transit fares being too high;

AND WHEREAS increases in transit fares reduce demand, to the point where transit has confirmed in an administrative report that in some cases, the utility is losing money because the rates are too high;

AND WHEREAS there is a new provincial government that has demonstrated that it is interest in making life affordable for Manitobans, and Council should be ready to ask for transit fare reductions or free transit to Provincial and Federal Governments;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That effective January 1, 2024 the WINNPASS rates for both the monthly pass and e-cash users be adjusted to \$0, so that they may ride the bus for free;”
2. That the \$1.4 million that have been freed by the former government funding for net new road expenses for the Route 90 Road widening and the Chief Peguis extension, and that in the event that spending authorizations have already been given by Council on these new funds, that the funds required for the consultant study be funded by the mill rate stabilisation reserve fund;
3. That the consultant report assignment that would assist Winnipeg Transit to consider the reduction of cash transit fares by approximately \$0.25 cents annually until such time as the cash fare reaches the optimal rate for the utility referenced in the May 26, 2022 Council Minutes, on page 6 of Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated May 4, 2022.
4. That this consultant assignment explore the budget implications of having a free transit system.”

Motion No. 5

**Moved by Councillor Allard,
Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,**

WHEREAS more people who choose riding the bus results in reductions in traffic;

AND WHEREAS Council voted to direct the transportation master plan to achieve a modal shift by 2030 of 50 percent;

AND WHEREAS on page 6 of Item 3 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated June 8, 2023, the public service has indicated that should a reduction in fares be determined to be a policy that Council wishes to pursue, significant additional study would be needed, and it should only be undertaken in concert with the transition to the WTMP route network”;

AND WHEREAS transit has identified opportunities where the transit utility could increase revenues to transit by reducing fares and require a consultant assignment in order to present a plan to Council;

AND WHEREAS this confirms that transit is losing riders to due transit fares being too high;

AND WHEREAS increases in transit fares reduce demand, to the point where transit has confirmed in an administrative report that in some cases, the utility is losing money because the rates are too high;

AND WHEREAS there is a new provincial government that has demonstrated that it is interest in making life affordable for Manitobans, and Council should be ready to ask for transit fare reductions or free transit to Provincial and Federal Governments;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That effective January 1, 2024 the WINNPASS rates for both the monthly pass and e-cash users be adjusted to \$0, so that they may ride the bus for free;”
2. That the \$1.4 million that have been freed by the former government funding for net new road expenses for the Route 90 Road widening and the Chief Peguis extension, and that in the event that spending authorizations have already been given by Council on these new funds, that the funds required for the consultant study be funded by the mill rate stabilisation reserve fund;
3. That the consultant report assignment that would assist Winnipeg Transit to consider the reduction of cash transit fares by approximately \$0.25 cents annually until such time as the cash fare reaches the optimal rate for the utility referenced in the on page 6 of Item 3 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated June 8, 2023.

4. *That this consultant assignment explore the budget implications of having a free transit system."*

Councillor Allard: I just have one motion left standing.

Madam Speaker: Okay, and it's replaced with Motion 8 and is on transit fares, and it's an automatic referral to the Standing Committee. Thank you.

Councillor Allard: Yeah.

Madam Speaker: Motion 7, moved by Councillor Eadie and seconded by Councillor Gilroy. That's also an automatic referral to deal with the Arlington Bridge. Correct? Okay.

Motion No. 7
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,

WHEREAS the closure of the Arlington Bridge will have a negative effect on the surrounding community in terms of social and economic outcomes;

AND WHEREAS the Arlington Bridge is vital to the overall traffic plan for the north segment of the City, which is growing;

AND WHEREAS emergency service vehicles require use of the Arlington Bridge;

AND WHEREAS the City has been focused on building roads for new developments while at the same time, the City has not maintained its older infrastructure;

AND WHEREAS the City would require capital investment from other levels of government for the replacement of the Arlington Bridge, and direction should be given to explore various sources of funding;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the cost for the replacement of the Arlington Bridge be referred to the 2024-2027 Multi-Year Budget Review Process.

Madam Speaker: I just want to take a moment to thank our City Clerks team, Mayor's Office's staff has been here quite late, and also our CAO Mr. Jack. Thank you so much for your service for this very long Council meeting, and with that, Mr. Mayor, you move adjournment?

Mayor Gillingham: I sure do.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Roll call please?

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 9:31 p.m.