# COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
# Thursday, January 25, 2024

**The Council met at 9:42 a.m.**

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

## MOTIONS

**Madam Speaker:** We have one motion before us to allow Councillor Schreyer to participate remotely. Moved by myself and seconded by our Deputy Speaker Councillor Eadie. Mr. Clerk, could you read it into the record, please?

**Moved by Councillor Schreyer,**
**Seconded by Councillor Eadie,**

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

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have a leave of absence motion for Councillor Wyatt who is away due to a personal family matter. Mr. Clerk, if you could read that motion into the record.

**Moved by Councillor Browaty,**
**Seconded by Councillor Sharma,**

*THAT Councillor Wyatt be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to illness.*

**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 Allard.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Allard.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Allard. Roll call, Mr. Clerk.

## ROLL CALL

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

## INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Clerk. We have new pages with us today attending their first Council meeting. Please welcome Saylem Meleck of Dakota Collegiate, who resides in the Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry Ward and Taylor Moore of Collège Pierre-Elliott-Trudeau, who resides in the Transcona Ward. Thank you for joining us and for serving Council today. We'll move in to morning announcements. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Good morning, Madam Speaker, thank you so much. As this is our first Council meeting of the new year 2024, I want to begin by wishing all my council colleagues and you, Madam Speaker, and all those watching today and those in attendance a very happy new year. Last week, we held an event to mark 150 years since the very first meeting of Winnipeg City Council. It was held on January 19th, 1874. And I was honored that so many current and former councillors, community leaders and special guests took part in the celebrations. The theme of 2024 to mark our anniversary of Winnipeg 150 is our shared stories and our shared future. And I look forward to celebrating this occasion throughout the year. I want to thank our Archive staff for all the work that they have done in preparation for this year and allowing us to have great information on Winnipeg's past as we mark this great occasion. We also unveiled the Winnipeg 150 logo last week. It was graphic designed by artist, Jordan Stranger. And this 150 graphic will be used throughout the year to mark this very significant occasion. As many people have seen already now it's…the graphic has been put on banners which have been put on City Hall. It will also be on merchandise that will soon be available. I want to encourage everybody

to visit the City of Winnipeg website to learn more about the meaning behind Jordan Stranger's artwork. And as I said a moment ago, there will be many events throughout this year, throughout the city, and in each ward represented by council colleagues around this chamber. So, residents should stay tuned for an event coming to a location near them. I also want to acknowledge the hard work of our Finance Department and thank them for their successful issuant of their first long-term debt in nearly four years, that was completed last week. These funds were earmarked for projects like the South End Water Pollution Control Centre, the new North District Police Station, the renewal of the St. James Civic Centre and the construction of Bill and Helen Norrie Library and many other long-term capital projects that will serve not only this current generation but future generations as well. There was solid market demand for this bond issue and it speaks for the strong financial management and the prudent debt policy of the City of Winnipeg. This Saturday, January 27th is International Holocaust Remembrance Day and the Winnipeg sign and Esplanade Riel Bridge will be lit in yellow, flag will be lowered to pay tribute to the memory of the victims of the Holocaust. It's an important reminder that we must all work together to fight anti-Semitism, racism, and discrimination in all forms. The preliminary city budget will be released on February 7th and I know that we've had a very busy couple of months. We will have a very busy, probably, couple of months ahead once the budget is tabled. I want to thank Councillor Jeff Browaty, Finance Chair for his work and his leadership of the budget process so far. Also want to acknowledge the budget working group and members of EPC and all councillors for their input. Inflation, labor costs that have been rising and other pressures continue to impact the City's finances, and so I want to again express appreciation to all who have been involved in the budget process in any way, ensuring value for money and ensuring that, to the degree we can, all things are considered so we ensure that we continue to deliver the services of the City of Winnipeg that the residents of our community depend upon. We remain committed to maintaining the essential services and making strategic new investments, but please understand that these are very difficult decisions. Finally, some of you might have heard the news that this morning the United Airlines will be resuming its direct service between Winnipeg and Chicago and Denver starting in May. This is great news for Winnipeggers who are looking obviously for leisure travel but also for business travel as well. But it's also great news from an economic development perspective because having more connections to more locations throughout the world is good for local tourism industry but it also helps to attract business and other industry as well. So congratulations to Winnipeg International Airport for its work on this. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next speaker is Councillor Chambers.

**Councillor Chambers:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just to let you know and others in the chamber here today. Sunday, January 28th is a kickoff to Black History Month 2024, and will be the 43rd year of events planned by the local organizing group here in our city. The global pandemic had an impact on the ability to host in-person events throughout the month of February, known as Black History Month, but since 2023, we are now back to in-person events and February 2024 will be full of activities and events for everyone to attend. Black History Month is a crucial annual observance that highlights the invaluable contributions and rich heritage of those from African descents throughout history. Celebrating this month serves as a powerful reminder of the need to acknowledge and appreciate the struggles, triumphs and cultural achievements of the Black community. By actively participating in Black History Month, individuals and communities can develop a greater understanding of the historical injustices faced by the Black community, encouraging empathy and promoting social justice. Black History Month was created to focus the attention on contributions of African and Caribbean communities throughout North America. Black History Month seeks to honor all Black people from all periods of history from the enslaved people first brought over from Africa in the early 17th century to Black populations living in North America today. For 2024, one of the Canada's themes for Black History Month is Black Excellence, a heritage to celebrate, and a future to build, celebrating Black history today and every day. Moreover, Black History Month provides an opportunity to amplify the voices of Black leaders, scholars, artists, and activists who have played pivotal roles in shaping the world we live in today. Recognizing and celebrating the accomplishments of Black Canadians helps challenge historical biases and stereotypes, contributing to a more accurate and inclusive narrative. This celebration also offers a platform for education, inspiring people to delve into the stories of individuals who have overcome adversity and made significant contributions from various fields, from sciences to literature, to politics, to the arts. It was dark to reverend Martin Luther King who stated, darkness cannot drive out darkness, only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate, only love can do that. What a fitting sentiment to consider the (inaudible) that a lot of communities are experiences global events impact local communities. We are not immune here in Canada and education is a great equalizer that provides room for empathy and humanity to grow. I encourage all of my council colleagues to consider participating in any of the scheduled in-person and or virtual events throughout the month of February 2024 organized by Nadia and Rhonda Thompson and the volunteer organizing committee of Black History Manitoba. Black History Month is not only for the Black community, it is an entire month of education and sharing to increase the equity and inclusion. Participating Black History Month is not just commemorating the past, it is a call to action for the present and the future. It encourages individuals to actively engage in discussions about racial equity, diversity and inclusion by learning about the challenges faced by the Black community and celebrating their achievements. People can work toward building a more equitable society. Through education and dialogue, cultural exchange, Black History Month fosters unity, expels ignorance, and encourages a shared commitment to dismantling systemic racism.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Chambers. You're wrapping up.

**Councillor Chambers:** I'm wrapping up. So, again, I encourage all my council colleagues to participate in this month of Black History Month throughout the month of February. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Next speaker is Councillor Mayes, and our final speaker, Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. February 7th will not only be the launch of our budget but it will also be about an hour before that or two hours before that the launch of the new Climate Action and Resilience Committee. Long time coming, it talked about for a number of years, funded through the budget a year or two ago. Finally, we're going to meet, I get to be the chair of that committee, but I want to thank two staff members, Laura Rempel and Becky Raddatz who have been getting this ready, pursuing this, interviewing people. We have six people named now to sit on the committee, and I also want to thank three of my colleagues. In my memory and perhaps I'm missing someone, and I apologize if I am. I don't see myself as a great champion to this, I think it was really Councillor Gilroy, Councillor Rollins and Councillor Allard who pushed for this over the years, so, we don't know exactly what we will debate, we don't know exactly what we'll recommend. It's a bit of a trial and error process, but it's there to provide advice to council and some sober second thoughts so I look forward to it and, yes, one more acronym to remember around here, so if you hear us using CARC, that is, you will hopefully become familiar with that as the new acronym for Climate Action and Resilience Committee, so. Meeting, first meeting February 7th.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Final speaker, Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** I'll just be very brief. Starting February 10th is the Lunar New Year. So for the month of February, every weekend, mid-week, we'll be selling many, uh, celebrating many celebrations for Year of the Dragon. The year of the Dragon is considered one of the luckiest animals, creatures, in the Lunar New Year celebration for it, the Chinese community, also Korean, Vietnam will also be celebrating and Japan, so I encourage you to, if you want to come to any one of the many, many dinners, and you're not sure of the dates, contact me. Thank you.

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

## MINUTES

Councillor Browaty moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on December 14, 2023, be taken as read and confirmed.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll move into delegations. Our first delegation…yes.

**Councillor Gilroy:** A suspension of the rules, please, to have Gord Delbridge.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Gilroy moves extension of…suspension of the rules to hear Mr. Gord Delbridge with respect to the living wage. That'll be five minutes, no questions. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Our first delegation, Niall Harney, senior researcher with the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives in support of the Executive Policy Committee notice of motion. Moved by Councillor Gilroy, and seconded by Councillor Allard, it's the living wage. Here with us in person, welcome.

## DELEGATIONS

**Niall Harney:** Hi. Okay, this podium is not quite tall enough for me. All right, well, good morning. Can you hear me?

**Madam Speaker:** Yes.

**Niall Harney:** Yeah? Okay, good. Good morning Mayor Gillingham, and members of Council. My name is Niall Harney, as the speaker mentioned. I'm a senior researcher with the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, where I hold the Errol Black Chair in Labor Issues. I'd like to begin by thanking Councillors Gilroy and Allard for bringing forward this motion to adopt a living wage as the minimum standard for employees of the City of Winnipeg. The CCPA of Manitoba has played a foundational role in developing the Canadian living wage framework alongside other CCPA offices and our community partners across the country. This is a widely used concept that's been adopted across North America. Here in Canada,

we calculate living wages across the country in every province. And to date, we have over 850 employers across the country who have adopted the living wage and have been certified for our living wage framework. Here in Manitoba, we've been using the living wage framework to calculate our living wage since 2009. And as the motion notes, Winnipeg's living wage recently updated in December 2023 as $19.21 an hour. Since 2009, we've been advocating for the living wage to be used at a minimum standard for employers and governments across Manitoba. So, what I want to do here today is I want to stress what the living wage truly represents. $19.21 an hour, the living wage is based on a bare-bones budget, and represents the wage required for a family of four with two working parents and two young children to avoid poverty. The calculation is based on ten expenses including basic necessities such as food, shelter, clothing, child care, transportation and a very small emergency fund. The living wage does not provide sufficient income to cover loan or debt repayment, saving for retirement, caring for an ill loved one, entertainment or any holiday expenses. At its core, the living wage is based on a principle that full-time work should provide families with a basic level of economic security and not keep them in poverty. Last night, I took a look through CUPE 500's collective agreement and found 13 positions of the City of Winnipeg that offered less than living wage. These positions were concentrated in library, recreation, and 311 services. As I'm sure many of you are aware, in-work poverty has ballooned across our city over the last two years. Harvest Manitoba put out their annual report in December which found that 40% of their clients are working while using the food bank, a 60% increase since last year. Full-time work for the City of Winnipeg should not contribute further to this problem by offering less than a living wage. As a large employer, grant funder, and purchaser in the city, the City of Winnipeg is in a unique position to provide leadership and city-wide working standards by becoming a living wage employer and adopting a procurement policy that includes living wages. As the motion before us today points out, both the city's poverty reduction strategy and our Winnipeg 2045 identify the living wage as a tool to achieve poverty reduction, enabled economic self-sufficiency and community participation. Our research with CCPA finds that workers who are earning around a minimum wage are increasingly older and established in their jobs. They're increasingly educated and they're more likely to support a family than even a decade ago. Living wages provide significant local benefits ensuring children are not living in poverty while boosting spending in local economies. In 2022, CCPA of Manitoba released a report looking into a real wage decline at the City of Winnipeg and connecting this and its connection to widespread staff vacancies in the city. This is a problem that I'm sure you're aware has persisted this year. Our office continues to advocate that the City of Winnipeg should be offering a living wage to ensure that we can attract high-quality staff to provide the services Winnipeggers rely on. If any Councillors would like further information about the living wage framework, how we calculate it or the data that's used, I encourage you to get in touch with myself or you can read our reports at policyalternatives.ca/manitoba. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, I'll take questions. Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you for the presentation. You made reference to the report that was found in 2022 by CCPA what that report did not contain was any mention whatsoever of the motion City Council passed in October 2020, in which the majority of my motion and a number of my colleagues supported it, a number opposed. Former mayor supported it. That motion was to increase the minimum wage for City of Winnipeg employees to $15 an hour effective Jan 1 of '23 at the time, the minimum wage in the province was 11.95. So, pretty substantial 25, 26% increase to the bottom-paid city employees. There's no mention of that at all in the CCPA report. There's mention of the provincial government moving the minimum wage to $15 an hour in October of 2022. Was that a deliberate omission or was that just, someone didn't do their research? Because I have to say, having been involved in a fairly bruising fight over increasing the rate to $15 an hour from 11.95, I see no mention of it whatsoever in the CCPA report. And we wonder if that was a deliberate omission. It wasn't moving to the living wage of 18 or $19, but that really isn't the question. The question is, if the provincial moved to $15 an hour was felt worthy of mention, why wasn't the City of Winnipeg decision to move to $15 an hour found even worthy of mention in the CCPA report?

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

**Niall Harney:** Thanks for the question, Councillor Mayes. I believe we've discussed this with you in the past, we discussed when we released the report. We welcome the motion to have a discussion about living wages here at the City of Winnipeg. At the time in 2020, the living wage according to our calculations from 2018 was 16.15 an hour, and that's, we continue to advocate on the living wage as the basic framework for this discussion. The living wage is a robust calculation that's based on these 10 expense categories and we continue to point to that as our baseline for raising wages (inaudible). Excuse my voice.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, please provide your responses in the question through the Chair.

**Councillor Mayes:** The question was now, what is a living wage, what was the living wage of 2020, the question was, did you omit it deliberately when you wrote the report in 2022 or was it just an oversight that you're coming here and making presentations to us. A number of us voted and got criticized for it pretty robust in the media for moving a 25% increase. The question is not, what was the living wage then? A. you didn't move it to a living wage. The question was, did you omit it deliberately or did you just not do the research?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Your response through the Chair.

**Niall Harney:** Sorry, Madam chair. It was not omitted deliberately. This was an oversight in our research and it's something that we would like to rectify in the future.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, any further questions for our delegation? Seeing none, thank you for your presentation today. Our next delegation is David Grant who is appearing via Zoom in opposition to Items 4 and 9 and the notice of motion under the Executive Policy Committee, as well as Items 1 and 6…1 and 5 parson me, of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works and Items 1 and 2 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Welcome, David Grant.

**David Grant:** Thank you. And greetings and thank you all for listening. It is my hope that we all want to what is best for our city. I hope that the next few minutes will help you make good decisions by making you aware of issues that do not seem to be in your staff reports. On Public Works 5, photo enforcement. It seems very wrong that the city would ask for Manitoba to prepare a report when the city is now obliged to make such a safety report on every place PE has been used every year, starting 20 years ago. Does anyone here find irony in this item? Has anyone here ever asked WPS or the services committee for such a report? There is now more than 20 years of data to use. Has any Councillor ever asked for an explanation of why the system has been violating the law, the enabling legislation for 20 years? Media coverage says that the greatest dangers to the public on the road do not involve the places where PE is used. Perhaps that fact is why no one wants the report to (inaudible) the enabling legislations. Reporting the fact might prove that the whole PE speeding ticket system has not prevented a single serious crash. On EPC number 4, it was suggested to EPC that fiscal caution be applied. Considering that the coffers are near bare. It was suggested that every new request for funding be accompanied by an explanation of the consequences of a year or multi-year delay in funding that item. We've seen no such reports under Item 4. I ask why not, rhetorically. On Number 5, riverbank protection. I support protecting our riverbanks. Since the province bungled the chance to prevent deeper flooding on the Red, after the '97 flood, edges of properties everywhere have been slumping and washing away in every high flow season. We need to help by protecting the river banks in every way. Charging the share of the cost to the property owner is fair. The work must be done. In the past century, we have drained thousands of wet lands and installed drainage pipes in fields all over the valley. This has drastically increased the flow of water arriving here on a bad day. Rebuilding the wetlands that once held back surges in water flow was rejected by the NDP's MFA decades ago. I know they did contemplate it and it was explained to them how it's been applied elsewhere. We must better mitigate the flooding issue. Riverbank protection is good and within the power of the city. On transit funding number 6. There should be a sign inside and outside every transit vehicle, Winnipeg transit vehicle, reminding the public that city and provincial taxpayers are helping pay for operations. These signs are a polite thank you for donating to transit. I have seen these inside the transit vehicles I've ridden everywhere outside of Manitoba. If the NDP will pay the city more, please sign the deal. The RT has been a monster's waste of taxpayer funds. We are now spending a lot of tax dollars on plans for more PRT. If you devoted a fraction of that money to making real improvements in operations, we would now enjoy a much better service. Ask the Premier for an increase if you want but please do not approve this plan. To continue spending on plans to make more of a mess of the system is to willfully do the wrong thing. Please don't. On Items 7, 8, 9, you folks passed the budget in which you said you would spend this money on buying parkland. None of these three items involve buying parkland. One day soon we may be buying new parkland and should not have squandered away, when that day comes. Items 7 and 8 at least involve the way that the public enjoys public lands. Item 9, it does not involve that. There is no explanation why it is taking half the year for this matter to come to Council in the documents provided, and why the work was done before permission was granted to fund it. Replacing old carpet is the service spending that a small company or a family would postpone if they are out of money. The city is essentially out of money. Small companies and families, which most of your taxpayers are, would not want to pay to replace someone else's carpets, especially when they are out of money. Please do not approve this improper diversion of funds. EPC Notice 1. If you don't think about it much, giving more of someone else's money to low paid workers seems like a good idea. On the other hand, I remind you that interfering with small businesses can have dire and unexpected consequences. We see on the news recently that federal plans to make daycare more affordable are putting providers out of business. When this happens, it makes things disastrous for parents. California bumped up their minimum wage and benefits packages for private employers. This led to laying off tens of thousands of workers. For Manitoba companies that depend on city contracts and which must compete with low wage competitors expect disaster if this motion happens as it's written. Changing Manitoba's minimum wage might harm some businesses, but this plan is far worse. Public Works No. 1, WINNpass. Simple logic should tell you that if you drop the price on transit, you'll have more usage. We all know that we have too many riders on some routes at the busiest times, anybody that's tried to get on the bus when it's really busy during rush hour. Anyway, anyone who is paying attention also knows that for many hours each day, most busses are mostly empty. Years ago, Transit held an info session in the U of W science building. I explained the merits of an off-peak near-zero fare system. Sadly, this is converted by the Public Works Committee a few years ago into a 24/7 reduction for some usage, not all. This makes congestion incrementally worse and does nothing to achieve time shifts by those seeking to save money. I suggested you convert the WINNpass into an off-peak near-zero fare plan that we need. On Property 1, while I enjoy our parklands, I also note that the City has committed to providing more housing. We must do so

urgently. Council has made a major commitment to building infill homes in every part of the city. City Hall has told us all that we must accept infill, even St. Norbert. The proposed construction is consistent with this goal of Council. If we cut no trees, we will fail to meet the City's infill commitment. Because even if you take an established neighborhood and you flatten a house and put up a fourplex, there's going to be trees cut for that purpose. The owner of a small fraction of the vacant land north of Lemay wants to provide desperately needed special needs housing. This is an ideal place for these folks to live. The remaining 60 acres includes the precious riverbank. Those acres would remain well, as they can do a long miles of the La Salle River. I see that the plot near Lemay is the small fraction of (inaudible) woodlands. Some would have you believe that this is the only forest south of the Perimeter. It is not. On Property Item 2, Wilkes. This item does not make clear any conditions which would apply to the sale of the lands south of Wilkes. Do we need to move Wilkes south as someday, as was called for by your former CAO, Mr. McNeil? We desperately need to have tens of thousands of new homes by selling this land and not obliging the new owner to fill residential on it and do it soon, are we making a mistake? And I'd like to leave it at that. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Grant. There's no questions today. There is one, sorry. Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you Madam Speaker, and thank you to Mr. Grant for his contribution again here this morning. I just want to focus on one item I believe he spoke on Item No. 6, transit funding. And the idea that it wasn't a good idea and I thank Mr. Grant for his critiques on a regular basis. In this case, I didn't quite understand what he meant by we should not be in support of this. It is requesting a 50/50 returning to a 50/50 funding model for Winnipeg Transit 50/50 with the Province, and I understand he said something regarding the dysfunction of the system. There's different parts of something...he alluded to, the capital funding which is one thing but then there's the operational funding. I'm asking Mr. Grant if he could explain what his concern is over what is primarily looks to me like a return to a 50/50 funding model for the Winnipeg transit system with the provincial government.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. David Grant, your reply, please.

**David Grant:** Sure, sure. Thank you. Again, through the Chair, the concern I had was the general direction and this returning to 50/50 is one element of that, and I think that the changes and the changes in funding needed compromise the transit service are not as simple as 50/50. The 50/50 we understand would provide a little bit more provincial money to help run the system or to buy new stuff, and that's why I said in the details of my comment that if the premier is willing to offer us more money, we should sign that deal. But the 50/50 is not the answer and that's the only reason for my being not only opposed. As you may have noticed in the text of what I said on most of these items, the choice that we have to make when they ask to speak is, are we in favour or against? And a lot of those are compromises because in some of the cases I really like idea, but there's some stuff we have to think about, so that's…so sorry about that, Madam Speaker. But that's what I meant by being opposed.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Second question.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you Councillor Schreyer, and if you could mute your mic after your question that would be great. Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Yeah, thank you. So just to be clear, it's not in terms of the, when you say buy stuff that's, again, that has to do with capital investment, which is a different aspect of this. This refers to operational budget, and I understand it's kind of binding right here, you got to go either for or against or information, so I understand that just can be confusing for anybody in delegation, for those listening. But just to be clear, there's a difference between buying stuff or just helping with the day-to-day operations. So, it would be clear Mr. Grant, you think it's essentially wrong in the day-to-day operations that the city return from more traditional relationship with the Province regarding just affording our day-to-day operations of our transit system?

**David Grant:** The point there was, and buying things does not necessarily mean major roadways. Buying things as simple as bike racks for the front of the bus. And if we could, if I could put my bike on the front of bus securely, I would be using that as a two-mode transport means, but we don't have that. Other cities have them on every bus. And, so that'd be one of the buying things, that instead of planning an extension of a new bus road somewhere, more money could be spent on that. And that's where I was going with that. Thank you.

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

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. We'll move on to the next delegation. Thank you, David Grant. Next, I'll call forward Claudia Allen, Director of Winnipeg Lost Cat Assistance who is appearing in person in support of Item 3 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Community Services, the report dated January 10th, 2024 regarding the Responsible Pet Ownership by-law amendments that are before us. Welcome.

**Claudia Allen:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good morning, Mr. Mayor and Councillors. Thank you for allowing me to be here one last time, I'm going to be brief today. I am very optimistic for the future of our city's homeless cats, seeing how this motion has come to City Council. I am in full support of the by-law amendment regarding community cat management. Just a personal story to illustrate the entire point of community cat management. The temperatures these last two weeks have been hard on outdoor cats who do not have adequate shelter, food and water. Fortunately, for the cats in my managed areas, they do have warm shelter, food, and fluid water year-round even if, in these very wicked temperatures. There were four cats who needed attention in one area and I brought three of them in just before the cold snap. These three did not have winter coats. They did not act like feral cats and would not have fared well. These cats were abandoned at some point in their lives for a year in marking or making kittens or just because they were no longer wanted. One of the cats is now available for adoption at the Winnipeg Humane Society. He was treated for a skin infection. Another is in a foster home recovering from a bad case of ear mites and a dietary allergy. He will be neutered, vaccinated and put up for adoption. And the final cat is learning to live in a home again, after having been trapped, neutered and returned by someone three years ago without being assessed for adoptability. Although I'm grateful she was spayed rather than left to make kittens outside. She didn't belong on the streets in the first place. She is a gentle girl who, with a little time and patience, will soon make a great companion. The final cat is still outside. He has a winter coat. Looks in good condition and will be trapped in the spring. He too may wind up in a new home but if he's feral, he will be neutered, vaccinated, treated for parasites, and returned to the community. This is community cat management. When it's done right, it's surveillance, it's detective work, it's triage, it's about doing the right thing for each individual cat at the right time. They're not all going to be candidates for a home environment, but those that don't qualify will live their best lives in the place they call home with oversight by people who care about them and are trained to monitor them for illness or injury. Our organizations, Winnipeg Lost Cat Assistance, Craig Street Cats, Feral Friends Sanctuary, and so many individual citizens, we do great work. We genuinely care. We spend hundreds of thousands, but having to do this important work under the radar is limiting. With your support of this amendment, people like myself will no longer have to hide what we do for fear of being fined. Non-profits will be able to obtain charitable status and access grant funding so they can pursue TNR on a larger scale. It's the right thing to do, and I hope you will all choose compassion and support the RPO by-law amendment for community cat management as drafted. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. If you could still, if you could stay on the bench please behind you, we'll hear from the next speaker, and then we'll call you back for questions. Next, we'll have Chantel Touchette who's also appearing in person in support of the same item. We'll have five minutes on the clock. Following that will be Josh Brandon. Welcome.

**Chantel Touchette:** Good morning. So thank you for allowing me to speak again. I've already had the privilege to speak before Council to demonstrate and support the need for this amendment to the Responsible Pet Ownership By-law that will allow trap, neuter, return and management of community cats. So today, I would like to express my gratitude to Council for allowing us to speak for those who can't and to share a brief story to support how this model has worked for both cats and people. I've been fostering cats and socializing feral and semi-feral kittens and young adults for 20 years. When kittens are removed from colonies early enough, with patience and time, they are able to learn to trust people, to become normal social house cats. I've had young adult fosters who were found outside, suspected as feral, that turned out to just be scared and trying to survive the only way they knew how, after being discarded or lost. Of the hundreds of cats I've socialized, all but two were adopted into homes. The other two were more suited as barn cats to chase mice and socialize on their own terms. In late 2022, a terrified and possibly feral cat without any ID, who is unneutered, we will call him Remy, was discovered with his front paw crushed in an illegal leg-hold trap in the Garden Grove neighborhood of Winnipeg. He had been seen in the area for a week dragging around this cruel torture device. It took distraught homeowners to barricade him under a deck, a few experienced rescue volunteers, and several hours to crawl under the deck to get him to immediate veterinary care. He is one of the few lucky ones who survived an ordeal like this, losing only a couple of toes by amputation. He turned out to be a very friendly cat who was someone's pet at one point. He's since been neutered, healed up, and has been happily adopted by his original finder. It was Remy's incident that could not contain my outrage and heart break at the community cat problem in Winnipeg any more. From this, I started contacting MLAs and city councillors to present the magnitude of this problem and offer solutions that have worked in other cities. I want to sincerely thank all of you for listening and voting in favour of this amendment so far, but I especially want to thank Councillor Santos for listening to what probably seemed like two crazy cat ladies at a Tyndall Park McDonalds a year ago. She took the matter seriously, showed compassion, and understood the end goal. Citizens and rescues working with community cats are watching this vote very closely today and we hope this amendment is passed so we continue to do the work that we've been doing this whole time. Thank you for your time.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you for your presentation. We'll have both of you back. Are there any questions of our delegations? Seeing none, thank you for joining us today. Next is Josh Brandon, Community Animator with the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, he's appearing via Zoom in opposition to Item 2 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste and the Environment dated January 8th, 2024, it's regarding 2024 to 2027 Water and Sewer Rates. Welcome, Josh.

**Josh Brandon:** Good morning and thank you, Councillors and staff for the opportunity to present.

**Madam Speaker:** The clock, please. If we can have the clock run.

**Josh Brandon:** Am I started?

**Madam Speaker:** Yes, you are.

**Josh Brandon:** Okay great. Thank you for the opportunity to present this morning. The important issue of water and sewer rates. I think beginning this discussion, it's important to remember and acknowledge that our water does come from Shoal Lake and it's thanks to the First Nations there who often lacked access to clean drinking water that we enjoy the benefits of clean water here in Winnipeg. Access to clean potable water is a primary condition for health and well-being. However, water utility bills impose a barrier for access for low-income families. The cost of bills for households to do without other basic necessities and risk cut-off or eviction. One of the principles of the City of Winnipeg should be a poverty reduction lens that views all of our policies, through the lens of how they impact people living in poverty. And if we look at water utility bills and how they're structured, they especially affect people with lower incomes. Well, for wealthier and middle-income residents, utility bills may represent a reasonable cost for services for too many Winnipeggers, water bills are an unaffordable burden. This is particularly acute in households in deep poverty. A recent campaign 2000 report found half of children living in poverty, living households with income more than $12,000 below the poverty line, depending on the family competition. And for these households, water and waste bills can eat up several percent of up to 10% of total household income. And water bills that exceed 4% of income are considered unaffordable by water and inequality researchers. The cost of water bills have been rising for many years far exceeding the rate of inflation. The cost of water bills gone up more than 5 times the cost of other goods and services between 2005 and 2021. Inflation increased only 30% over that time and has increased 152% for water and waste bills over that period. If water and sewer rates had matched inflation, instead of a $315 quarterly bill, households would instead pay approximately $119 and that gap would represent a $500 annual gap. And the proposed increases will only increase this gap. Winnipeg does have significant water and waste infrastructure cost, but even with these increases, Winnipeg is not keeping up with the infrastructure demand, and that's partly due to diversion. We have, in 2012, the Manitoba Public Utility Board found that the City transfers tens of millions of dollars into the utility, from the utility into general revenue every year, including the 11% total dividend from the utility as well as other charges including charges for office and land grant drainage charges and other cross subsidies that amount to tens of millions of dollars, over $45 million the PUB found in 2012 and that's fairly increased since, given that the diversion be alone now, it's over $40 million. In 2015 as well, the City began applying a lease diversion fee to water and waste bills for garbage and recycling programs, and that's increased every, periodically, since then. While water and waste bills keep climbing, the City has maintained property taxes that have been flat or low. There was a freeze on property taxes between 1999 and the 2012, and since then property taxes have approximately matched inflation. With the bulk of increases directed towards visible transportation priorities and other departments have not received sufficient funding. So, the City's taxation policies mean that the City relies on, increasingly on, user-based revenue streams to maintain existing services, and one of the effects of this is that water and sewer rates go up every year to pay for those dividends and other services. For many residents, this may seem like a trick-dare trade-off, ultimately you pay through the water bills or your property tax bills but collecting revenues through user fees can place an unequal burden on those with the least ability to afford to pay. Property taxes represent a portion of disposable income and tend to be moderately regressive, utility fees are massively regressive. Household cost as a portion of income decrease as income rises, so lower income residents pay a larger share of their total income on utility bills. We need to have a better understanding of the distribution of those costs and how they impact low income fees, because we know that having your water cut off can have a devastating impact for households. Unpaid water bills can haunt low income households for years affecting credit, ability to rent in the future. Although the City does have a program administered through The Salvation Army to assist low income residents paying off undue water bills, access to this program is limited. Households receiving EIA are ineligible and households can only receive a maximum level of support once every five years. For those facing chronic water bills beyond their ability to pay, there is no relief longer term, universal solutions are needed. So our recommendations are that, we should freeze water bills during this four-year period. We should conduct a study on the issue of water poverty and affordability to determine its extent and who is most affected. Winnipeg should remove charges not directly related to the provision of water and wastewater services from utility bills and these should be funded through general tax revenue. And especially Winnipeg should return the 11% dividend to utility so that it can invest in the needed infrastructure upgrades to fulfill its environmental obligations and protect the ecosystems we all depend on. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Josh. We're going to proceed to the next speaker, and then we'll come back for questions so please stay online. Our next delegation on the same topic, also in opposition, is Glen Koroluk, Executive Director of the Manitoba Eco-Network and, you are in-person I believe today. Welcome.

**Glen Koroluk:** Thanks, thank you Mayor, Madam Chair and Council, and thank you Josh for the great presentation. You know, this is a very serious matter. I would assume that Winnipeg is 150 years old and they've had water and sewer problems for about 150 years. And many cities across North America are facing these issues. Rates are going up. You know, there's nearly 1,000 cities in North America that have combined sewer overflow issues and, you know, the pollution has to be treated, environmental liability is increasing, we're using more petrochemicals and different types of chemicals so we have to treat our water properly. So, Mr. Brandon did refer to some of the severe rate increases and, you know, I was looking at the chart, the report, the 2024 to 2027 water and sewer rates report as attached to your package. And, you know, just going back in the last four-year budget cycle, we're paying $1.82 per cubic meter for water, and by 2027 that's going to go up to $2.23. So that's a 23% increase, but if you look at our wastewater sewage charge, in 2020 we're paying $2.80 a cubic meter, and by 2027 that's going up to $4 so that's a 43% increase over two budget cycles of 8 years. That's five and a half almost 6% increase per year so it's phenomenal increase. And going through this document, you know, there are many other questions I would have about a councillor. I mean, it has some good information but it's missing a lot of information and if we really want to assign proper cost and do a cost of service study, we need to look at the bigger picture. So one of the things that I would like to know is some of these rate increases are going towards the CentrePort upgrades for sewer and water. So I'm wondering, as someone…why would I be paying for that upgrade? So why is that included in the rate increase? Another question that I would have is, and this is alluded to by Mr. Brandon, is the profits that are taken from both utilities and put into the general revenue so by 2027, that's going to be almost $50 million, so, I mean, why aren't we using that money to fix the problem at hand with our water and sewer utilities? So, that's another question that needs to be really to be addressed. A third question, we looked at the charts, Appendix B. The average daily indoor per household water use. So, I mean, I look at this and yeah, it's good information, you know. Most of the water in the household during the indoor period is from the toilet. But, you know, there's no information here about our outdoor water use, there's nothing about commercial and industrial water use. You know, this document doesn't talk about the industrial wastewater surcharges and if those could be increased or if heavy polluters of water are paying a fair rate, so all that kind of information is missing in this document. So, I just want to briefly say that, you know, this is an issue that many cities are facing and we need equitable water rates, and I did send a handout to Council yesterday. A great document from the Natural Resources Defense Council and, you know, it's about equitable water rates, and four things they say is avoid over reliance on fixed charges. And second thing they say is using tiered inclining block rates. So, we have a flat rate right now for our water and sewer. Adopting life line rates, so providing, you know, a basic amount of water at a low rates for people's consumption and establishing separate rates for stormwater. And I notice that the City is looking at that and that should have been reflected in this document that was given to Council, they'll make decisions on that, how does that affect our rates? So, in conclusion, we really support what the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg is also saying. We are concerned about the escalating water and sewer rates and their impacts on lower income households. We feel that the wider public and citizenry of Winnipeg should be engaged in setting long term water and sewer rates. We ask that there be a freeze on water and sewer rate increases. And we call on the City of Winnipeg to involve the public in developing a water affordability study, two more things please.

**Madam Speaker:** If you could wrap up quickly, thank you.

**Glen Koroluk:** The dollop with outside consultant expertise and public involvement of cost of service study for water rates and sewer rates, and lastly, lobby the Province of Manitoba to call on the Public Utilities Board to initiate a hearing with a degree of funding for Winnipeg's water and sewer rates. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, any questions? If we could also call Josh Brandon back to the podium. Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Mayes:** Yeah…

**Madam Speaker:** Josh Brandon is actually (inaudible).

**Councillor Mayes:** Question for Mr. Koroluk, I had expected some criticism of our proposal from environmental groups, not this criticism I think we could be criticized because this great proposal allocates literally zero dollars toward the billion-dollar nutrient removal project at north and it does not speed up our CSO work which is 50 years behind, if we continue on our current path, it assumes we'll get $279 million from other levels of government, so wouldn't we all love to freeze rates for four years? We would, but either you're going to have to do even less on the environmental front than what this is proposing which I do not support or B. you're saying well, stop the dividend. Well, that is a 6% property tax increase and as Mr. Brandon pointed out, you're looking at a regressive model on the property tax side or slightly regressive in terms of incidents. I guess my question is, if you're calling for us to freeze, aren't you admitting there's going to be less environmental work done or are you just saying increase property taxes up to 9.5%? I would encourage you to read Councillor Eadie's motion today which talks more about ability to pay but that will require some provincial moves, so are you presenting any of this to the province which is mandating us to do some of these billion-dollar initiatives?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Mayes. The response?

**Glen Koroluk:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Mr. Mayes. Yes, I mean, you're correct. The environmental upgrades we require with the City's North End Plant especially is important and is costly. I think the argument we're trying to make is, before we set the rates the way we are, we do it in a fair and equitable manner. So that this is why we want the Public Utilities Board involved in this and this is why we want a proper cost of service study done. And then we could plan from that as to how the rates can be raised to pay for those capital expenses. You know, once we have a fair idea of who's paying for what or who' s supposed to be paying for what based on these cost of service studies. Then, we could sort of divvy up the different models. I mean, these studies would do different scenarios, you know, it would factor in sort of the drainage fee which shouldn't be flat, it should be (inaudible). Drainage is happening. So, once we get all these different scenarios, then we could start looking at the big ticket items that have to go, we have to move on. Combined sewer overflow as you mentioned is a perfect example. Right now the City is paying for it all, and it's important for the other two levels of government to kick in. Maybe they'll kick in more than 30% a piece, maybe they'll, maybe they'll…maybe they should be paying for all of it, I mean, who's making that argument? So, there's different scenarios that could happen with the proper study and with the public involved in making these important decisions.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, next question. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do have a motion seconded by Councillor Gilroy regarding ability to pay. But I would just like to first state that water is a right. However, it is a commodity, and in that context that it is a commodity, and the wastewater is how we measure dealing with the sewage, and there is huge cost pressures, but I'm wondering, my first question would be this, well, previous council removed the one-time forgiveness on a water bill that was totally not able to be paid by a water customer. Would you be in favour of reinstating better programs for those who actually can't pay their bills?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. The response to the question?

**Glen Koroluk:** Thank you, Madam Chair. So, there's two approaches and I think the city could do both of them. One is to build a fair and equitable rate structure for water and sewer which will impact lower income families. And then the second thing they could also do is what you're saying, is develop a standalone program that assists lower income families. I mean, you know, it could be retrofits in the home, it could be payment forgiveness, it could be, I mean I think the city used to subsidize low flow toilets. I don't think they do that anymore so there's a whole host of things that could be done outside the utility rate setting so. The City should be looking at both options. I consider Winnipeg to be a poor city, relatively speaking, to other cities in Canada. We have our challenges. Manitoba is, you know, receives a high percentage per capita of equalization payments, so we need to keep in mind that when rates do go up for many utilities and energy, we have to make sure that does it impact poor families?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question, Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Well, for both the delegations. Do you understand that there's a difference between providing services such as waste diversion versus the cost of a commodity?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Your response, please.

**Glen Koroluk:** Thank you, Madam Chair. You know, I would consider waste management being a health issue so that's something the public should be 100% providing a service to. So, it's not a commodity, so my personal vision would be as a city and as a community, we view these not as commodities but as public goods that we have to take care of.

**Josh Brandon:** Yeah, if I could add to that. The view of the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg is that access to clean water and a healthy environment are rights that we should all enjoy and to the extent that we turn them into commodities or treat them as commodities. We limit our ability for…to ensure that there's universal access to those goods. The public benefits, a clean environment, and access to clean drinking water are something that we all benefit from and parceling it out from as to individual households is not always the best way to pay for the costs of those services.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Next question, Councillor Eadie, then we'll go to Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Eadie:** Final question I have is for both, whoever wants to answer. I hear property taxes they're saying they're regressive, but it's the most progressive means that the city has in applying you know, tax bills and so on. Can you please explain to me how it's regressive?

**Josh Brandon:** Well, property taxes I said are…can be somewhat regressive. You know, people, the wealthiest households in Winnipeg have most of their wealth not in their homes, but in stocks and shares and other investments. For middle class households, you know, the vast majority of your wealth is in your home and so if we're taxing that using the wealth of your home as the basis for revenue, we are putting an onus on middle income households. But ultimately as you point out that's one of the few streams we have to raise revenue. The alternative that we have as a screen for raising revenue are user fees which are even more regressive, so when we ask people to pay based on their usage of water or a flat fee for recycling, that is a very regressive way of raising taxes because I'm paying the same recycling user fee as some of the people that I work with that are living on less than $10,000…

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Josh. Our time is up.

**Josh Brandon:** And some of my neighbors as well, they're making over a million dollars a year.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. That concludes our time for questions under this delegation. Councillor Eadie moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Schreyer. And then there's also a question Councillor Mayes would like to ask.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm very, very pleased for Josh Brandon and Glen Koroluk's presentations here. When people hear this information, I find they're astounded. They're both talking in terms of, that the city should do a report on the state of the future projections of Winnipeg Water's rates and allocations. Are these things that should be done, maybe they're looking at the separate, well, course individually, independently, but in terms of a City report or through to the Public Utility Board?

**Josh Brandon:** Well, I think that the Public Utility Board has a role here in setting rates. It has expertise in how rates are set and cost of service and those sorts of things. The City of Winnipeg may want to go beyond what the Public Utility Board is looking at to looking at things like the impact on low income residents of its own internal policies.

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

**Madam Speaker:** Final question, Councillor Mayes. Fifty seconds on the clock .

**Councillor Mayes:** Yeah, just the, even the materials that were sent to us by Mr. Koroluk last night, largely American, the second document talked about how higher income users use more water. They talk about watering the lawns, they talk about pools, so I think there's really a, please listen to Councillor Eadie is my point because Councillor Eadie seems to have a conception of what's going on. There are at least three different mechanisms here. Property tax is, which the flat tax, it's not regressive, as your property goes up in value, you don't pay less. B. a user fee for water, if you use more water, you pay more, so that is different than its $70 a household, garbage, recycling pickup. These are all different concepts and the, again…

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

**Councillor Mayes:** If you don't…if you don't…if you don't have the dividend paying in, that is…that creates a 6% hole in our operating budget, that's how we pay our staff, that's how we grant wage increases, that's how we operate, so that would result in a 9.5% property tax increase so. I appreciate we're trying to do something progressive for the environment because that's being talked about too, but at some point, you have to have the money to do these environmental initiatives. So, I guess the question is you would…just you're clear then that there's a difference between a fee for consuming something as Councillor Eadie has said, and a flat rate fee per household. Certainly, that at least I want to make it clear.

**Josh Brandon:** I think it is pretty clear that there are households that use more water than others and there are mechanisms that we could put into place. Glenn Koroluk mentioned that there could be a lower tier rate for lower income households or there could be a…and that's something Ross Eadie's brought up in his motion as well. There could also be a rate for the first X number of liters that, you know, basic needs to flush your toilet every day and have access to clean drinking water and beyond those number of liters per quarter you might be paying extra, so that if you want to fill your pool, you might be paying more. But I think in the short-term, we need to freeze the rates, do the study, do the cost, and service study, do the affordability study and figure out what our options are and maybe look to other levels of government for changing the powers that the City has for how it allocates rates.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, and that concludes our questions under these speakers. Thank you for joining us today. Our final delegation, Mr. Gord Delbridge, speaking on the notice of motion, the Living Wage, you're in support. There's five minutes on the clock. Welcome.

**Gord Delbridge:** Thank you. Thank you, Mayor Gillingham, Council for giving me the opportunity to speak and suspending the rules to do so. Also want to say happy new year, being the first Council meeting of the year, to all of you. CUPE 500 has been encouraging the City of Winnipeg to adopt the living wage standard for some time now. Supporters in the 20…in a 2018 election survey we did, supporters of Council included Councillor Mayes and Councillor Chambers, Councillor Allard, Councillor Orlikow, Councillor Eadie, Councillor Rollins and Councillor Gilroy. You're all in support and responded to a 2018 survey we did, so I want to thank you all for your leadership on this position. I also want to commend Councillor Santos for taking a strong supporting role at a 2019 Council meeting speaking in support of the City becoming a living wage employer. I also want to thank Councillor Gilroy and Councillor Allard for bringing this motion forward. A Probe Research poll down in 2018 showed 81% of Winnipeg citizens supported the City of Winnipeg becoming a living wage employer. I suspect that those numbers might even be higher now. In our Winnipeg the 2045 development plan document under economic prosperity, it speaks to poverty reduction and achieving a living wage minimum standard for employees of the City and for those providing City services. In Manitoba, the current legal minimum wage is $15.30 an hour. This is an amount that's insufficient to meet the family's basic needs. In 2023, the CCPA announced that a living wage for Winnipeg is now at $19.21 an hour. In 2019, the minimum wage was $11.65 an hour. City Council projected it would cost $350,000 to raise minimum wage for City employees to $15 an hour then, and that was the $3.35 an hour. So, if you look at today's minimum wage being $15.30, that'd be at $3.91 an hour. So, we have a pretty good indicator of what those costs may be. It could cost very little. And also now, if you take into perspective that the, we've already budgeted for, and we're going to be accounting for a $1 million special wage adjustment that was negotiated in the last CUPE 500 collective agreement so. If you look at some of these costs, the costs are going to be minimal. Our, already I'm taking into account. Currently there are about 13 classifications that make less than a living wage with the City of Winnipeg. City staff, especially the lowest income earners will spend the entirety of their paychecks here in amongst our local economy. I've received numerous calls and e-mails from members, City staff that work for the city that are crying out for help because they're having a hard time trying to access food banks. Food banks are becoming more harder to access, the lineups are becoming longer, and City employees at the end of their shift are having a hard time trying to access food banks. People that are able to eat the balanced meals and…are more productive employees. People that aren't over stressed about whether they can make their rent or feed their families or have electricity when they get home, they're more productive employees. It helps with recruitment. It helps with retention and right now we're having a lot of issues in these areas. It's time for those who provide us with the services we need to get the support that they need. It's time for the City to lift working families out of poverty and start paying a living wage. It's time for the City of Winnipeg to go back to being an employer of choice and look at becoming a certified living wage employer. Lead by example. You can do this with pride, some honor, wear it like a badge of honor. The City of Winnipeg is one of the largest employers in Manitoba. We need to lead by example, lift people out of poverty and support the staff and the people that serve the citizens of Winnipeg. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Gord Delbridge for your presentation today. There's no questions. That wasn't the vote.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, if I may?

**Madam Speaker:** You're right. Councillor Schreyer, we're moving on to reports of Executive Policy Committee. To allow…We had a vote on it, we can certainly have another vote if that's the will of Council. We had suspended the rules and it was five minutes, no questions.

**Councillor Schreyer:** That's fine, Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Allard has motion. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. This isn't going to be a practice going forward. Questions? Who's got questions? Councillor…it's the same thing you just said, actually. We already…yes. Councillor Schreyer, your question, please?

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. This morning during our morning announcements on the budget we've heard that specifically the wordage inflation, labor costs, and other factors, the only one that was specified was labor costs. Yet, last year, I asked Councillor Browaty whether, while he has been on council, whether labor costs were ever the highest rate of inflation increases on the city budget. He could not recall if that ever was the case. And it's because it never was. Labor costs have never been the highest rate of increase, of inflation increase on the city budget. From my understanding, Mr. Delbridge, to your understanding, have label costs ever been the highest rate of inflation to the City budget.

**Gord Delbridge:** Anyone that's paying attention to the City budget knows that is not the case. I also took note of that, that was specifically referenced labor costs in that statement. What I found interesting about that is, we're currently paying poverty wages to many City staff as I just mentioned here. So, we know that's not the concern. We know that we'd be willing to pay less if we could because well, we currently were part of the legislation coming in to increase what the minimum wage is. When we're looking at, we looked over our recent garbage collection contracts, and you know when

we're looking at some of these increases, in many of the contracts, which are, like soaring to 10 and 20 times what we're seeing with respect to labor costs. We know that is most certainly not the case for anyone that's paying attention.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you, Mr. Delbridge. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

**Councillor Allard:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you to the delegation. Is the delegation aware that, as far as I recall since I've been on Council, Councillor Mayes had actually brought this motion forward and was told, you know and, I'm going to say not in no uncertain terms, but with a report that had a lot of words in it, that essentially can be done, it's too expensive, and shortly after that, the words appeared in OurWinnipeg which is our foundational document which is supposed to be the document that rules them all, and all of the documents that flow from OurWinnipeg coming from that so. Does the delegate have any idea why it's been so long, so difficult to get this policy through? It's been motion after motion, and here we are, years later. One report says we can't do it. The master document says we should be doing it. Does the delegate have any idea why this might be taking so long?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Delbridge.

**Gord Delbridge:** Well, first of all if I'm going to say it, I mentioned this earlier that the costs are going to be quite minimal for the City of Winnipeg to become a certified living wage employer. When we go back to, you know, when we did the minimum wage increase to $15 an hour, it was estimated or calculated at $350,000. We're in and around those same wage differentials right now, so we can, you know, suspect that we're going to be probably within that same zone. But now also keeping in mind, that we've already budgeted for, and have, in the books right now, pending, a $1 million special wage adjustment which would be going toward some of these lower income earners. It may not cost next to nothing. I mean, we're looking at $350,000 in, we've got a million dollars in the budget right now for this. I would ask the administration to come back with some of those figures because it should be much less than we're projecting back then. Why it's taken so long? I don't know if it's just ideology, but I think it's time for people to show some leadership. Lift some of our people out of poverty. We've got, you know, the highest rate of recruitment and retention issues that we've ever seen before. We're paying some of our 311 workers, some of the lowest wages of any 311 employees anywhere in any other municipality in the country. We got people that are trying to access food banks, municipal workers that are working a 40-hour workweek, we should be ashamed of ourselves for that. It's time that we step up, do the right thing, show some leadership, and let's lift, you know, Winnipeggers out of poverty. We know that 81% of Winnipeggers in the Probe Research poll support this, so why are we not doing it? Now is the time to do it. We got to do it.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you Mr. Delbridge, second question.

**Councillor Allard:** Final question?

**Madam Speaker:** Second question.

**Councillor Allard:** I get another one after?

**Madam Speaker:** If there's time, yes.

**Councillor Allard:** Okay, there's not much time, so I will ask one question. Madam Speaker, through you to Gord Delbridge, I think I heard it in the last response, but would Mr. Delbridge support this motion being referred to committee so that it can go through the system, so we may ask for a report, and have a more thorough discussion? I heard the word report. That's where it would be ordered.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. If you could answer briefly.

**Gord Delbridge:** Most certainly I would support that.

**Madam Speaker:** Ten seconds.

**Gord Delbridge:** No, I would support that, you know, we get the constant report back and I think you'll find that it's going to cost a lot less than you might expect.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Thank you for your presentation today. We'll now move forward with the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated January 16th. Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 16, 2024**

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you. I'd like to introduce the report by the Speaker to move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 through 14.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Eadie, 1 - Essential Services. Councillor Gilroy.

**Councillor Gilroy:** Item 6.

**Madam Speaker:** Item 6 - Transit Funding. I'll call the question on the remaining…I'll call the question on 2 through 5, 7 through 14. Councillor Allard, do you need to be in your seat? Which number?

**Councillor Allard:** Well, I was speaking with the person who is giving me the information required which is why I was not in my seat.

**Madam Speaker:** Which item?

**Councillor Allard:** Five.

**Madam Speaker:** That's Riverbank Stabilization. I'll call the question on 2, 3, 4, 7 through 14. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 1.

**Item 1 – Essential Services – New Legislation**

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

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

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes, Madam Speaker. I stood down this report just so I could be recorded in opposition to the decision of the Executive Policy Committee.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further speakers? I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Eadie noted in opposition. Item 5, lerk.

**Item 5 – Local Improvement – Riverbank Stabilization along Riviera Crescent**

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Mayor to introduce Item 5.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm not sure why this matter was stood down, but I'll wait to hear from perhaps Councillor Allard can shed some light on it. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

**Councillor Rollins:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. In the city of Winnipeg along the riverbanks, there is, you know, an opportunity to improve stability. Homeowners, Madam Speaker, have been doing this as have high schools, such as Westgate and Armstrong Point, Madam Speaker, where they've taken it upon themselves to improve riverbank stability and improve instabilities behind them and ensure that long-term integrity of areas at risk for properties along the riverbank. Properties in Riviera Crescent, Madam Speaker, had had some good luck. Several governments ago, Madam Speaker, with Kerri Irvin-Ross who was then MLA for the area in Fort Garry and had really petitioned that treasury board for some local improvements on the instability along that riverbank in Fort Garry, Madam Speaker. Residents along the Crescent had written me saying, look, you know, you're doing, the City of Winnipeg is doing some rip rap and stability. For the rap, can you help us out? And the answer Madam Speaker is that that is seen as their property but there was, Madam Speaker, a fund in the provincial government to look and partner with the City of Winnipeg on local improvements. This is the motion, does that for the properties along Riviera Crescent, their privately-owned properties, and it is subject to funding from the Province of Manitoba, the federal government being secured as a local improvement or local improvement district. So, and you see before you in this, Madam Speaker, the legal boundaries from 940 Riviera to 1030 Riviera Crescent. And you

see before us to the outlines of the City of Winnipeg Charter for local improvements that Council knows well, those of us that engage in this little policy like my council colleague Councillor Mayes, Madam Speaker. You will see also being passed out that Councillor Allard has an amendment to this motion. I'm unfamiliar with this section of St. Boniface. Some of it is for sure a property but it is, it's slightly different than that which is before us. I would ask, this motion for me is years in the making. Started consulting with the Crescent last term, Madam Speaker, certainly met with Ms Kerri Irvin-Ross and thanked her for hard work at cabinet at the time and looking for sure to the future. Perhaps meetings with cabinet ministers equally as interested like my contiguous colleague in the legislature now, Mark Wasyliw, Wab Kinew, Uzoma Asagwara, and more, Lisa Naylor, all who also have a riverbank property has been in this case, my colleague Mark Wasyliw and I, along with Ben Carr have Riviera Crescent, Madam Speaker. So, looking for some riverbank stabilization work. I hope this passes. My colleague Councillor Allard likely will introduce the amending motion. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you Councillor Rollins. As noted, amending motion 4 has been circulated. Councillor Allard, your opportunity to speak to the Item and your amending motion.

**Motion No. 4**
**Moved by Councillor Allard,**
**Seconded by Councillor Rollins,**

*BE IT RESOLVED that Item 5 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated January 16, 2024 be amended as follows:*

- *Add the following new Recommendations 4 and 5 and renumber the remaining accordingly:*

  *"4. That funding from the Province of Manitoba and the Federal Government be requested to address slope instabilities and provide additional protection and necessary stability improvements to ensure the long-term integrity of areas at risk for properties from the northern most point of 451 Rue Notre Dame up to La Fleche Street."*

  *5. That subject to funding from the Province of Manitoba and the Federal Government being secured, a local improvement or local improvement district be initiated pursuant to Section 408(a) of the City of Winnipeg Charter, as follows:*

| *Local Improvement or Local Improvement District* | *Location* |
|---|---|
| *Flood protection and riverbank stabilization work* | *Boundary from the northern most point of 733 La Fleche Street, to approximately 131 meters south west of the northern most point of 451 Notre Dame.* |

**Councillor Allard:** Yes, so thank you Madam Speaker. Thank you to Councillor Rollins for raising this issue. Reading the Council agenda, I noticed that we had a very similar issue in St. Boniface where we have a private home affected, but also active transportation which is adjacent to the houses that are described in the amendment motion, and so I know that often riverbank stabilization work given our paltry budget for riverbank stabilization is often done in conjunction with projects that involve either Water and Waste or subsidies or projects from the Province of Manitoba, and so I'm hoping this can be supported by Council so that in the event that there is interest from other levels of governments, that we might find a solution that works for residents of the City of Winnipeg and other levels of government so. That's my pitch, I saw what Councillor Rollins was doing and I thought it was an opportunity to do a similar motion for St. Boniface work. Thank you.

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

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wasn't going to stand it down, but it's here. Madam Speaker, I will be supporting this report, and Madam Speaker, I just…the councillor for the area has done a lot of work quite clearly in trying to attempt to get this local improvement perspective from three levels of government for these private properties in the stabilization, but Madam Speaker, many of us can cite sections along the river of private properties where the people can't afford to do such, in my ward, there's quite a few and, incidentally, Kerri Irvin-Ross who lives across the street from me on the riverside of Scotia behind the…she lives behind the primary dike, but this riverbank was flood prevention and stabilized by establishment of a secondary dike called the berm along, behind those properties. However, there are properties where erosion and they're higher up out of the flood zone. There are a number of people that cannot afford to take care of their properties and depending on the, you know, how wet the ground is and fluctuations, there are severe cracks that you could fall in, step into and twist your ankle on a number of properties along Scotia. And Madam Speaker,

I appreciate the work, and…but we should really be looking at whole sections of helping these private properties because, you know really, if the riverbank's falling in on my property, I'd be going to tax assessment and say, Madam Speaker, the value of this property is not very high. It should be reduced in value because it's eventually going to fall in the river because that's reality Madam Speaker. So, you know, there is an important tie, but so, I just, you know, I don't know how many different things that one city councillor's office can work on, Madam Speaker, but one thing I've been pushing behind the scenes is that, and we do have, you know, to establish more money in the budget to deal with riverbank stabilization of our own city-owned properties. And when we do that we should be inviting the private properties adjacent and around those to allow them in to do some of the work that way. One of my concerns though is, if the city is putting in dollars into these private properties, my, you know, really, my question is, is that going to take away money from the top five riverbank stabilization projects that need to get done in this city? I'm quite concerned about that, but I will be supporting the motion of course. A lot of work went into this and I think it's good, and other wards have had or do have, had similar efforts, so, anyway. I just wanted to cite some of my concerns if the city is putting money into this as well, I'm just worried about those other projects that we heard at Water and Waste that are at the top of the list where it's totally falling in. Thank you.

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

**Councillor Allard:** I think I've made my point, thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? I'll call the question on the amending Motion 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And the main item as amended? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, next item.

**Item 6 – Transit Funding**

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

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

**Councillor Gilroy:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just rise because I'm hoping that maybe, in closing, the Mayor can just give us a little bit of a briefing on some of the discussions around transit, I understand that there might be some different kind of funding models available. I just am worried because I do know that we have a lot of work to do in regards to transit. I know that in my area, we, you know, our service isn't fully running yet. And we're very impacted between service delivery and the safety on transit which I know we're working on. But we really, really need funding from the provincial government to make sure that our service can be, to be a better service, and I think that we're moving into being a very big city, having a functional, fast, efficient, and safe and affordable transit is really key to this city and the economic engine of our city, so I do want to, before I vote on this, I'm hoping that there might be some other discussions that have taken place regarding funding because I do think the province needs to participate this more than they have so. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Allard:** Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. Thank you to Councillor Gilroy for having seconded this motion. Thank you for the patience of clerks, and yourself, Madam Speaker, and any others who may have seen multiple motions flying at the last Council meeting. When I first drafted this motion, I thought it might be possible to easily bring WINNpass down to zero dollars since…my last recollection, it was a very small program. I understand now that it's ballooned to be I think $40 million if I'm not mistaken? I may be mistaken. Nonetheless, the actual number is much greater than I had originally anticipated. And I wanted to speak to transit in general because as you may…as you might see if you read the motion, there are several ideas in there. We are on 6, right? We're on Item 6? Okay. I'll take Item 6 as my opportunity to speak to the other motion which we are not discussing. It's got similar themes. Our public service has at least one said that there is a way where transit can make more money if we can find the right fare. Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Santos, Councillor Santos had the courage to bring forward a motion, which I hadn't seen before, which was bold, which was to bring in free transit in Winnipeg. The 50/50 program wouldn't do that. I'd also be worried with the 50/50 program, the growing contribution of the City of Winnipeg to the transit operations might be backfilled, meaning any increase in the provincial funding for transit might go to simply other departments. So transit not being a winner in the 50/50 cost share arrangement, so I would be worried about that. I think there's opportunities that we're not getting ready for, I moved a motion a few times asking for us to use the money as freed by the Province of Manitoba that had paid for cost benefit analysis for, well, two road mega projects which are looking to be over a billion dollars now, and take that money and do what transit administration has said they could do, which is modelling to see what is that point where transit's making more money, and maybe as well, what would it look like having a free transit system? Because right now, and it was a heartbreaking vote when it happened, Madam Speaker, at the Public Works Committee of Council, where Councillor Santos came to present and I was the only member of the Public Works Committee at that time, to vote for a study, just a study on what free transit might look like. And if I recall, Madam Speaker, you yourself voted against it,

Councillor Chambers voted against it, and Councillor Browaty voted against it, just to study the idea of what free transit might look like. And here we are years later, after multiple motions, after funding source has been identified, to give transit the tool it needs to see what, either, a better fare system that increases transit revenue is, what it might cost to provide free transit in Winnipeg, and we have nothing to show them. We're not ready. We have reams of consultant reports on road mega projects that will never be built. Sterling Lyon Parkway Expansion Project. Marion and Archibald Road Expansion Project. A few years ago, I did the math on how many consultant assignments we had on mega road expansions that we don't have the money for. We don't have the budget for. Perhaps Kenaston, perhaps this council manages to squeak Kenaston and Chief Peguis through. I don't know. We'll see. But I fail to understand why this council can't commit to a small consultant study that will look at different fare structures including free, including the fare structures recorded in our own public service reports that says that there is a sweet spot where transit makes more money. And despite motion after motion after motion, we still don't have that consultant assignment that we need to know what to ask the province for. And I'd like to point out again, Madam Speaker, perhaps I'm starting to sound like a broken record, but the nice thing about broken records is that you tend to remember what they said, so. Other municipalities that have free transit have state support. We voted now, multiple times, to not do the reports required to ask for state support. And so, we're not in a very good negotiating position with Province of Manitoba right now, where we might have two documents. One, here's how we provide free transit in Winnipeg. Can you imagine Madam Speaker, a policy that would be as liberating as a free transit policy, for Winnipeggers who now know they can get anywhere around the city using the transit system? Currently the WINNpass is very popular because clearly so many people are not in a position to pay that full fare and I think we should grow that program and there are many who might take free transit if it were available. It's called induced demand, the same as building more roads will induce demand and in a short period of time there'll be roads, regional roads, that are packed again with cars. And so I think we do need to ask for help from the Province of Manitoba and more help from the federal government for transit. The transit master plan is an excellent plan, but on fares, the provincial government ran on affordability. The provincial government wants to see opportunities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Transit, diesel buses transit, according to our latest information which is quite old at this point, is only 0.8% of our greenhouse gas emissions. 50% comes from private vehicle travel. It's the lowest hanging fruit that we have. And when I say increase funding to transit, and I hear the answer well, we can't get the drivers, I think we need to go past that and find out how we get those drivers, and I think part of that is better compensation that, despite our recent agreements, if it doesn't pan out, we need those drivers. And as I posted on Facebook this morning, it's challenging to use transit if you need to get to a certain place on time. I had a bus simply cancel, and so, I had the opportunity or I was able to call a cab to get to work on time, but not everybody has that benefit. So we…so Council, please, let's do better on transit. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

**Councillor Chambers:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I was the originator of this motion. I talked about the 50/50 transit model that was secured under the previous NDP government. When I came into office in 2018, this was something that was changed by the government of the day, but I'm responding more so to the mother who had sent me information about her daughter that attends University of Manitoba living in south St. Vital, that up to three buses pass her by on her route to the University of Manitoba, the 75 bus at St. Vital Centre. Recognizing that there is a new ATU contract that had been signed. It talks about enhancements to maybe recruit drivers, you know, and get us back to full frequency where the pandemic had slowed us down and we cut some of these fares. We're now seeing much more reliance on transit to get us to and from our destinations. For this young woman who is attending university, it's not a matter of standing outside in the cold during the winter months. It's the information that she is missing from attending these classes because she is ending up late based on her reliance on transit, so I'm seeking a better option for this young lady, for this family, with respect to transit, and I recognize that frequency is one of those issues that we're going to have to resolve, so that competence in transit can be instilled, so that when a person gets to the bus stop, and a bus is coming, it's not going to be densely packed, and it's not going to pass them by, so if there is a better funding model out there that will allow for more drivers to be hired and more frequency to occur, I'm all ears. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Next is Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be actually short. I would, as this is intergovernmental affairs motion, I would like to hear how progress is going because we know the Mayor does worry about the cost of everything. So Madam Speaker, but just I wanted to speak to something I heard. Free transit, which means, actually, free fare transit, because transit has a cost so it's not free, but the fare could be free, and there are other countries with cities who offer up free fares. Now, one of the things that it dispels, Madam Speaker, while there may be somewhat of an increased ridership, Madam Speaker, through the Vehicles for Hire International Association, I get e-mails all the time, and a bus is a vehicle for hire. Anyway, in this one city, for example, a report came back, and it was in the European news. When they did a study after offering up the free transit, to everybody who wants to use it, what they discovered though, there was no reduction in the use of fossil-fuel vehicles. People were still using the vehicle because, more convenient, quicker to react to do things. Yeah, you'll have the odd person who will say well, we'll ride our kids, you know, to soccer from West Kildonan way down to Waverley Heights, let's say for example or whatever. Madam Speaker, alls I'm saying is, if people believe

that free transit is somehow going to reduce the amount of carbon going into the air, they would be mistaken based on at least one report from one city in Europe. I just thought I'd put that point out there. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Next speaker. Seeing none. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close?

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you very much Madam Speaker, and a lot was discussed so I'm going to try to cover quite a bit here in my response. First, to…through you Madam Speaker to some of the matters Councillor Gilroy raised, I appreciate that, and Councillor Eadie touched on them as well I did have a meeting in my role in intergovernmental lead with Municipal Relations Minister, Minister Bushie, back on January 9th earlier this month, and transit funding was one of the topics that I did raise and did raise with him and it was really related to two things. Specifically, I think that there is a shared priority that we have as a city and they would have as a provincial government, related to reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and transit can assist with that. But specifically, transit is the primary means of transportation for a lot of Winnipeggers, especially those that are of low income, and I know that is important to our council and certainly to the provincial government as well. So, as we've said before, transit is a priority for us. I raise this matter with the minister and ask that they as a government make transit funding to the City of Winnipeg a priority for them as well, and frankly asked, laid out the fact that, as I've laid out back in December prior to, you know, us really talking in full about the budget. This fact that Winnipeggers can rest assured that transit will be a priority in this budget. And that means that Winnipeggers can expect to see our tax supported subsidy to transit, the amount of cash that we take from tax dollars, put it into transit, they can expect to see an increase to cover off the fact that we don't have enough funding coming from other levels of government, we don't have enough funding coming from fare revenue either to cover that off. I think it's important to note also that when we announce the fare increase for 2024, we also announce that we are freezing the WINNpass rates at 2023 levels and so now those that are using WINNpass fares are receiving a discount that is greater than 50% of a full fare, and so we have taken a further step therefore to protect those who are low income earners and using transit. That's important. We're also been very clear about the fact that we're trying to make transit safer, means of transportation also, our transit or our community safety officers are being trained right now. They'll be deployed sometime in February. They're in their training regiment as we speak, and that is a means, that's an effort, to make sure that transit users and also our transit operators know that this…that the bus and the bus stops are safer spaces for them. Councillor Allard raised the matter, touched on the fact that we just come through negotiations with ATU and one of the outcomes of that new collective agreement is an increase in fare, substantial increase in salary not fare, but a substantial increase in salaries for those who just start in the transit system, and so for brand new bus drivers, they're making more money through their hourly wage in an effort to attract more transit operators. And yes, the shortage of bus drivers right now is an issue, it's the primary reason that we cannot get back to full-service at this point. And so, we're still just below offering full-service, but we're making every effort. And I know that through Councillor Luke's committee, there has been a lot of discussion with transit about the extent to which they are making efforts and the type of efforts they're making to recruit, retain and to train bus operators and so, a lot of focus is going into hiring more bus operators, training them, and retaining them as well, so. Those are some of the many efforts that we are making. We'll continue to discuss transit as a priority in my ongoing dialogue with the Province of Manitoba when it comes to their funding. A couple matters that I think were raised as well that through you, Madam Speaker, Councillor Allard raised. And I think, you know, it's fair to say that to, frankly to get things passed here, we need to get enough colleagues to vote for things. And, I wonder if anything has changed, you know, with his dialogue with Councillors that had voted no previously that would vote yes, you know, this time. Has anything changed? I don't know if he'd had any dialogue with councillors to change their minds. But we…you can't go both ways. We can't say we're prioritizing the transit master plan and a better transit system that is going to take substantial investment. Multiple millions and millions of dollars to improve the system. On one hand, and then say, and let's completely eliminate fare revenue. It's just illogical. We can't do it. We need money to build a better transit system. So, we can't say we're going to build a better transit system, but let's just have nobody pay through fare revenue. In fact, this year, 2020 or probably this past year, 2023, our tax supported subsidy to transit was $102 million. If you eliminate that fare revenue, that would equate to about a 15% property tax increase just for that year to make up for that fare revenue. And so, we have…I'll be…we have voted down free transit. We have voted…we've talked about it, we have debated it. I don't see that that has changed. I don't see that there's been a great swath of councillors that have changed their mind or councillors that are advocating for, changed the minds of other councillors, and so I want to be clear that we are committed to a better transit system and better transit service, but free transit is not the way to get there because to replace that revenue, would need…we would need some other major source of revenue so that we could invest in transit. So, when it comes to this motion specifically and the reason that I voted in favour of receiving this information is because our dialogue with the Province of Manitoba is different about funding. They have not given an indication through their campaign, as a provincial government, that they would restore the 50/50 transit model, but they have said they're open to dialogue with the City of Winnipeg on a new funding formula. That is my focus. What we need as a city is we need a new funding model, a new funding formula with the Province of Manitoba that includes funding not just for transit, but includes funding for all of our services and is based on really one that allows us to participate more readily in the economy, a funding formula that is predictable and it grows with the economy as well. To me, that is a more important and mature and a long-term, least a more long-term viability and stability as a funding formula rather than grant funding or basket funding. We need to move to something different and I'll continue to advocate for that because right now the City of Winnipeg is short on revenue

options. Primarily property taxes as we know, and then some grants from federal government and provincial government. That's not sustainable in the long run and so, we need to have a conversation. I'm having conversations with the Province of Manitoba about establishing a new funding formula, one that looks different and is different and is better for the people of Winnipeg so we can continue to provide the services the citizens of Winnipeg need and depend upon including transit.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on Item 6 – Transit Funding. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Next, we'll get into the Notice of Motion under EPC from the December meeting. The motion was moved by Councillor Gilroy and seconded by Councillor Allard regarding a living wage. Councillor Gilroy, your opportunity to introduce the motion.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE**
**NOTICE OF MOTION**

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

*WHEREAS policy 3.13 of the economic prosperity section of the OurWinnipeg 2045 development plan states the following policy goal with respect to poverty reduction: "Develop criteria to achieve a living wage minimum standard for employees of the City, for those awarded contracts and subcontracts to provide City services, and for organizations who receive City funding, to enable economic self-sufficiency, and community participation.";*

*AND WHEREAS the Public Service has indicated that through the OurWinnipeg public engagement process there was overwhelming public support for the concept of a living wage;*

*AND WHEREAS a living wage is the hourly wage a worker needs to earn to cover their basic expenses and participate in their community, and generally exceeds the legal minimum wage;*

*AND WHEREAS Living Wage Canada, a federally incorporated non-profit organization, has established a national methodology for calculating a community's living wage;*

*AND WHEREAS becoming a Living Wage Employer requires ensuring both direct employees and contracted/subcontracted employees earn a living wage.*

*AND WHEREAS on October 29, 2020, Council directed the Public Service to take the necessary steps to implement a living wage of fifteen ($15) dollars per hour, beginning January 1, 2023.*

*AND WHEREAS on October 1, 2023, the Manitoba legal minimum wage became $15.30 per hour, exceeding the City of Winnipeg's adopted living wage;*

*AND WHEREAS the Canadian Centre For Policy Alternatives (CCPA-Manitoba) has calculated the 2023 living wage for a two-parent, two-child family in Winnipeg as $19.21/hr;*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:*

1. *That the Public Service be directed to review the Canadian Living Wage Framework and report back to Council annually with an updated living wage figure beginning in September 2024.*

2. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to take the necessary steps to implement: a living wage requirement for:*

    A. *City of Winnipeg employees effective January 1, 2025.*

    B. *Contractors and subcontractors providing city services in all new and renewed contracts effective January 1, 2025.*

    C. *Organizations receiving City funding effective January 1, 2025.*

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

**Councillor Gilroy:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. As you know that this motion is reflective of our Winnipeg and our guiding policy throughout Winnipeg and also, our poverty reduction policy. So, us looking at a fair living wage is critical for us to meet I think those objectives that we all kind of…we all agreed on. In the motion, as we can see, that this is starting a dialogue on what the fair living wage framework should look like. And I think that we had some good presentations today on why CCPA's model might be, a little bit more reflective of what's going on here in Manitoba and making sure that we provide a fair living wage for our workers. I think it's critical that we become good, a good city that provides a good fair living wage for our staff. I think that that's critical for a healthy city. As you can see in the motion that we're also giving time for us to have these discussions. This isn't something that's taking, we don't have to worry about it impacting this budget that's coming forward here, it's looking forward, so it's being able for us to have the discussions, do a little bit of our due diligence on what the cost may be. I do…I do agree with Gord Delbridge, I don't think…I think the cost would be very minimal, and I know that that's something we would all want to have and know and understand before we make these decisions here at council. But I think we should have that dialogue happen, how our administration do their due diligence and, quite frankly, look at a framework that works for us here in Winnipeg. And I hope that my colleagues support this. This is something that we all believe in. We all supported OurWinnipeg, our guiding document. It was something we talked about in our strategic plan moving forward and also to our poverty reduction strategy. And I think it is critical when we look at our 311 operators that I think are the face of our service a lot of times, and knowing that they aren't making a fair living wage and knowing that they're dealing with some really tough things. I know our offices got a deal with the same things that our 311 operators are dealing with and they're not making a fair living wage. And I think that that's something I know I would like to see that changes, and I do believe that it's important for retention. So we make sure that we have good workers that, you know, want to stay with the City of Winnipeg. There used to be a time when the City of Winnipeg, when our jobs were something people were proud of and would stay for a long time, they would start off very early in their career and maybe at Community Services, you know, working at the, you know, at the local community club and working their way up through library services and then working their way up in the City because we were a place that people were proud to work at. And I really want to go back to those days, and I think, Madam Speaker, it's critical for us to do that when we look at the retention of staff that we need and also looking at what we need to do in terms of poverty reduction here in Winnipeg, and just making sure that we're doing what we need to do with our own staff, being the leaders, as we know we are one of the primary employers here in Manitoba. We need to be the leaders and show that leadership. So, I think this gives us enough time to do our due diligence. I know Councillors don't like to be rushed into this. This is looking at January 2025, and so I hope that my councillors support this, and I look forward to the greater dialogue that we'd be having as this moves forward along through EPC. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, I'm rising in support of this motion. And Mr. Delbridge, I campaigned several times talking about living wages, Madam Speaker, and…but I want to put it in terms, it is Winnipeg 150. So, not 150 years ago, however, this city of Winnipeg and elsewhere around the country, we did have what's called the 1919 strike. Now a lot of that, Madam Speaker, was about worker, workplace safety and health, and many other issues, but one of the major issues again had to do with earning a living wage. Not having to work, you know, for regular wages for, you know, 60, 80 hours a week, Madam Speaker. All kinds of issues like that. Now things have progressed in the city. And after that strike, Madam Speaker, one of the things that happened, and if you look at the 1919 strike, what you'll notice is there were a lot of immigrants coming in to the city. And there were a lot of them that were living in working poverty, doing their best to raise their families. And what the City of Winnipeg did and what they did, like when I was young, and I'm the second oldest on Council right now, so I'm going back into the…when I first started to realize this and I started going to junior high school at St. John's High School in the North End, where there was a lot of poverty, but not so much poverty anymore going back into the 1970s and why? The City of Winnipeg was an employer of many of those people who grew up in the North End. I have friends whose fathers worked in garbage, for example. And they made a good wage, Madam Speaker, and I was jealous that some of my friends from high school got in on garbage because they were getting paid good money, hard work, hard work, but good money. Their parents made good money so that they could raise a family. This…you know, and then, you move out of the 70s and you continue on into the future, Madam Speaker. And what do we do? We're privatizing things like garbage services. Yeah, we get a better price and you can say well yeah, well what were they doing? Probably, more likely, paying minimum wage. Those really good wages don't exist with those companies, but people need jobs, Madam Speaker, to take care of their families. Right? But we privatized it. I look at this motion, and there's three parts to it. And I agree with all three parts because, you know, you can't…like if you want to alleviate poverty and you want a poverty reduction plan from the City, do what we did in the past! We hired those people living in poverty. They were making good money. They could raise their kids. They could pay. They could buy a house, they could afford to do a lot of things, Madam Speaker. And so, a living wage is very important. And if we're doing that for our City employees, we're contributing to lowering poverty in this city. We are alleviating a number of issues that we hear. For example, we just heard about the water bill and water rates. Well, if people are making a living wage, they can afford to pay the commodity price, Madam Speaker. That's what a living wage is about. It looks at, what is the cost to live? And you have to live with water. And there's water sewage goes out of the house, Madam Speaker. So, it's all connected. And I'd like to thank Councillor Gilroy and I believe the seconder was Councillor Allard. I'd like to thank them for putting this on

the table once again. I think this is really important. It really goes to our SPAP plan too, Madam Speaker. We need to really look at, it says, let's get the report, you vote for this, first thing it's going to do is get a report. It's going to come back and say what is the living wage? We can figure out, you know, what is the added cost? But there are added benefits Madam Speaker and this is what I'm talking about. There are benefits, and there's benefits to these groups on the other side. Madam Speaker, actually, for this Green Team season this year, the Selkirk Avenue BIZ will be looking at paying their employee whoever gets hired will be looking at paying them, well not the $19 or whatever, but we're looking at paying $18 an hour because we know that even these young people who are doing this work who are going to university, you see how much it costs for a kid to go to university nowadays, Madam Speaker? My goodness! I think you have some going to university. Anyway, like, it's expensive. Anyway, I'll leave it at that. I'm supporting the motion and I hope my colleagues, Council and majority will vote to…for this motion. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Orlikow.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Madam Speaker, I'd like to move this to refer this motion to blank committee, I'm not sure who.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Orlikow, you are moving it to, I think it would fall under Executive Policy Committee.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Okay.

**Madam Speaker:** You're moving referral with no instructions. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Okay, next is a second notice of motion from Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Chambers. It's regarding the placement of religious holiday symbols here at City Hall. This motion actually lapses as the mover is not present so we will not be dealing with it today.

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

*WHEREAS the Menorah is an important symbol for a significant religious holiday;*

*AND WHEREAS the Menorah's location at City Hall, in front of the building on Main Street, ensures its significance;*

*AND WHEREAS the Menorah is directly related to an Old Testament story;*

*AND WHEREAS Christmas is a season that has a reason, namely the birth of our Lord, the Christ, Jesus;*

*AND WHEREAS the Manger scene is directly related to a story from the New Testament;*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council establish it as policy that the Menorah shall always be installed, at its season, at the front of City Hall, outside, facing Main Street.*

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Christmas Manger scene shall be installed outside at City Hall, at its season, and that this shall be Council policy.*

## EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
## MOTIONS

**Madam Speaker:** Next, we'll move onto motions under Executive Policy Committee. We have Motion 1, moved by Councillor Eadie and seconded by Councillor Gilroy. It's a request to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter. It's an automatic referral to the committee.

**Motion No. 1**
**Moved by Councillor Eadie,**
**Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,**

*WHEREAS a city-as-a-whole needs to work towards being a place where individuals give according to their abilities, and receive according to their needs in order for all those who live and visit to flourish;*

*AND WHEREAS a user's ability to pay can be measured in several different ways including income, property value, and affordable rent;*

*AND WHEREAS programs designed for individuals to come and plead poverty for reductions or waiving of fees are cumbersome and generally ineffective when considering systems wide need to consider the various levels of ability to pay, but the programs are used to deal with the inability of a user to pay their bills in arrears;*

*AND WHEREAS prior to 2012, all residential solid waste collection was funded by users' property taxes;*

*AND WHEREAS the vast majority of Winnipeggers buy homes based on their ability to pay, which is reflected in the market value assessment of the property;*

*AND WHEREAS flat fees make city services unsustainable for those with a lesser ability to pay, including renters who pay the lowest rents in areas of the city where the value of the properties are lesser than other areas of the city;*

*AND WHEREAS solid waste diversion services have been charged as a flat fee, depending on the type of residential property, since 2012, with a future curb side compost collection service being considered as a flat fee;*

*AND WHEREAS Legal Services reports that it is illegal to charge variable fees depending on ability to pay measurements such as the assessed value of a home as laid out in the City of Winnipeg Charter (excerpt attached as Appendix A);*
*AND WHEREAS section 210(1)(a) of the City of Winnipeg Charter states:*

> *210(1) The city may, if authorized by council, establish*
>
> *(a) the method of calculating the prices, rates, fees, deposits or other charges, which may vary depending on the type of use or consumption, the quantity used or consumed, or the type of property in which use or consumption takes place; and*

*AND WHEREAS a potential amendment may be to add the text ", and the user's ability to pay" at the end of subsection 210(1)(a);*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council request the Province of Manitoba to amend section 210(1)(a) of the City of Winnipeg Charter so that a user's ability to pay is also taken into consideration.*

**Councillor Chambers:** Madam Speaker, seeing the hour, is it the will of Council to work past the noon hour?

**Madam Speaker:** I think it's the will of Council to break now perhaps, thank you, and…one hour.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Sorry, before we do Madam Speaker, I'm sorry, did you make a statement regarding No. 2 that it's timed out? You did?

**Madam Speaker:** Yes. It's lapsed, yes.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you. Councillor Gilroy was distracting me.

**Madam Speaker:** We will now recess and we reconvene at 1:00 o'clock and if I can ask those to stay back for the photo. You're all aware of the photo? 1:00 o'clock, we're coming back. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of**
**Winnipeg City Council of**
**January 25, 2024 at 1:20 p.m.**

**Madam Speaker:** I'd like to reconvene our Council meeting of January 25th, 2024. We're on the Executive Policy by-laws section, Mr. Mayor.

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

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move the By-laws No. 5/2024 be read a first time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 5/2024.

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Mayor.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE**
**CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS**

**Mayor Gillingham:** I move that the following by-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 4/2024, By-law No. 6/2024.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 4/2024 and By-law No. 6/2024.

**Mayor Gillingham:** I move that By-laws No. 4/2024 and No. 6/2024 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-laws No. 4/2024 and No. 6/2024.

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Gillingham:** I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 4/2024 and 6/2024 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.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE**
**QUESTION PERIOD**

**Madam Speaker:** We'll now have question period under Executive Policy Committee. Questions for the Mayor. Councillor Chambers.

**Councillor Chambers:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to His Honour Mayor Gillingham, the recent events in Edmonton are a cause for concern as their city council experienced a heavily armed individual that entered the council chamber or council building and fired a shot. Given the amount of times, instances, like this occur across Canada, what measures have been taken to increase security here at our own council building?

**Mayor Gillingham:** Through you Madam Speaker, I want to thank Councillor Chambers for the question. Councillor Rollins emailed all of us recently with a…just earlier this morning with a similar question as well. First of all, I just want to say that on behalf of all of Council, this week, I reached out to Mayor Sohi of Edmonton after the attack took place and offered our support as a council to him, to his council and to the City staff members in Edmonton that were in the city hall building that day. And yes, it certainly made us think immediately of our own security here. I've been in conversation over the last couple days with our CAO, Mr. Michael Jack who has confirmed that in fact, tomorrow he'll be sending an updated package of the work that they are working on. The changes they're considering as well. Also, he's confirmed that right now he's in the process of recruiting a professional, dedicated to managing and coordinating security at all civic properties, certainly the primary focus being a robust program for security in place here at City Hall and in the City Hall campus. What the CAO indicates he's been doing with his staff is kind of pulling together the existing practices and policies that are in place and reviewing them, and so, more to come from the CAO tomorrow, and I think subsequent to that obviously as councillors, you and I, as Mayor will have follow-up questions of our CAO and, you know, so that we can start the process of next steps to make sure that our campus here can be safe and secure and that we as elected officials and our executive

assistants in our offices and all City staff and the clerks can be protected and the public who come and access City Hall, both the Council Building and the Susan A. Thompson Building can be confident that it is a secure space.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move to the next committee. Standing Policy Committee on Community Services. Councillor Duncan, on the report dated November 20th.

**REPORT OF THE**
**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES**
**DATED NOVEMBER 20, 2023**

**Councillor Duncan:** Good afternoon, Madam Speaker and thank you very much. I'd like to introduce Item No. 1 from report of November 20th and move adoption of the consent agenda on Item No. 1.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Allard, you are standing down 1?

**Councillor Duncan:** We're not there.

**Madam Speaker:** It's just one item on this report. Okay? Call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Yes, carried. Thank you. Next committee, report. Councillor Duncan.

**REPORT OF THE**
**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES**
**DATED JANUARY 10, 2024**

**Councillor Duncan:** Thank you very much. I'd also like to introduce the report of January 10th and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 through 4.

**Madam Speaker:** No. 2 – Risk-based Fire Inspection Process has been stood down. Item 3 – Responsible Pet Ownership By-law. Any others? We'll call the question on 1 and 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 2.

**Item 2 – Risk-based Fire Inspection Process**

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Duncan to introduce the item.

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

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Allard:** Yes, Madam Speaker, thank you. I would like to move this back to committee, but then I lose my ability to speak to the item, and so I guess I will speak to the item and hope somebody perhaps wants to move it back to committee. I was there when the Speedway International fire happened. I've circulated to you all photos of the event, some media coverage of the event. All the history is in the administrative report in terms of why City Council at that time decided to do what it did. The report notes that at the time, the inspection process for F1, F2, F3, which is properties that are industrial risks in reverse order so F1 being, I guess the most risky, F2, a little less risky, F3, little less risky than F2, and it's clear by the report that the revenues that were hoped to do the cost recovery were generally not there, and that there would require an adjustment in terms of the City of Winnipeg paying for the service. When I speak to residents of St. Boniface ward that are abutting the St. Boniface Industrial Park, they have several concerns. They have concerns, many of which are related to industry that would likely fall in the F1 category, those that require provincial environmental license. But they also have general concerns about the Industrial Park, and what I read from this report is that there would be a move from inspections in industrial areas that, according to the public service are statistically less likely to be at risk of injury and fatality related fires, and I think I can grant that as a point to the administration. But I think what I can't agree with is a reduction in the level of service to…in terms of inspections in the St. Boniface Industrial Park area. I don't think residents in St. Boniface would forgive me for voting for this report. There's language in the report about how there's no evidence that inspecting industrial properties leads to less fatalities and injuries. It's a wonder that no one died in the Speedway International fire. I mean, it's like a mushroom cloud of a fire that you can see there, and there's a lot of industrial activity going on in St. Boniface Industrial Park. Residents are comforted, to some extent, that there are, I don't know if you'd call them statutory, mandatory inspections by our administration to ensure everything is there that needs to be done.

And that also gives me comfort as the person who is representing the interest of residents of St. Boniface. And so, I also want to grant the administration the point that there does need to be more work in the areas in which they say there are higher probabilities of fatalities and death. Yes, I think that's true as well, but I think we should be doing both. And fundamentally I think that's my point, so it was passed as something to be cost-recovery back in the day back when there was a political crisis. Fast forward a few years. Apparently, there isn't a political crisis any more. And so, we're going to reverse a regulatory…reverse in part a regulatory regime that was brought in to protect the residents of St. Boniface, to give comfort to residents of St. Boniface, that they would be protected by inspections. And I think even having the presence of the City of Winnipeg in the area may alert them to issues in the surrounding area. Whether there…issue is the attending property or not. And so, well as, you know, as per my e-mail to you, ideally, I'd like to send this back down to committee to have more conversations, but given I prefer to speak to this than to probably lose a referral back to committee vote, I'll put my comments on the record and why I was opposing this. I mean, I don't. Year after year, the City of Winnipeg, starting with Susan Thompson, has frozen taxes which has meant cuts in services year over year over year. And if there isn't the money to do both, I think that's because we need to find ways to the Mayor's point hoping for growth tax. We were hoping for a growth tax with, well, Mayor Katz tried something, and it was killed right out of the gate by the Province of Manitoba. Former mayor Glen Murray brought the fight national and we still didn't get a growth tax, Winnipeg or any other, well, perhaps other municipalities. I heard the Mayor today say, he'd like to see a sustainable tax system. Well, I think we had a tax system that was, to some extent, sustainable, if councils past had raised taxes to, let's say, cost of living, as the direction to the administration per council policy on (inaudible). Ironically, the room that could've been the municipalities room that could've funded things like regular inspections of potentially dangerous industrial sites was taken by education tax, and there was only so much room on the property tax role. If you look at realtor assessments throughout the country, who ignore the property versus education tax portion, our taxes are either middle of the pack or maybe even relatively high. That's not because of municipal taxes. So, all that being said, I think it's unfortunate that Council made a commitment when everyone was watching, when everybody saw the fireball in the air. And a few years later, when things have cooled off, we're going to be reversing in part that inspection regime that gave residents of St. Boniface some comfort that there was a higher level of inspection of the industrial properties which in some cases are a stone throw away from residential properties. Residents fear a community evacuation from some of the activities happening on some of these sites. And I think those fears are not unfounded, given what we have seen in the past. And yes, some of my colleagues who raised some points, there are other parts of the city that also need more inspection, enforcement. Thank you.

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

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. We did have a lengthy discussion at community committee on this, Madam Speaker. Our committee, at Community Services Committee, and I don't want to really beg to take too much difference, but Madam Speaker, the particular fireball and massive fire that monsieur…Councillor Allard is talking about, I have a friend who was a captain at the time. And the firefighters who had to fight that fire, you know, they were in extreme danger as well, Madam Speaker, not just the neighborhood, but the firefighters. I believe the fire did occur while nobody was at work at the time, Madam Speaker. But I will point out that this particular move, and my colleagues on Council do know that if the firefighters union had a problem with this, and remember they're the ones, it's their…they're the ones fighting the fires, Madam Speaker. If they were concerned about it, they would've stepped up and let us know. The inspections will continue to happen and there was also a huge fire that scared all of Transcona that happened in the RM of Springfield. I believe it was the asphalt plant that had a huge mass of fire with all clouds of who knows what floating over the city of Winnipeg. And I'm sure that the Government of Manitoba, because that falls within the office of the fire commissioner's inspection regime outside of the City of Winnipeg I'm not sure if the City of Brandon's firefighters do inspections there or not, but Madam Speaker, I'm voting for this because I'm confident in the recommendation that the Chief of our Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service and his team have put forth, and I would point out that it is also essential to have and I know in St. Boniface and the residents of St. Boniface, I have friends who live in some of the old multi-family apartment blocks in old St. Boniface. There should be a higher inspection and, you know, whether it's an allocation of money or whatever, but the reality is, is that we have this real problem with multi…certain multi-families. We're not talking about rooming houses because that has its inspection regime. But we're talking where they're shared facilities, but what we're talking about here is this city and thank goodness, thank goodness, it's not happening in St. Boniface, but you know, like the old multi-families in North End, West End, Central, it's a real problem, Madam Speaker. So, most of them are, you know, older, we heard of some multi-families where new ones where there's been some fires, but issues, but anyway, I'll leave it at that. Oh, and one last thing that I will mention is that I'm sure at the particular industrial business, high level industrial business, that there is constant workplace safety and health inspections happening to ensure that the workers remain safe at these potentially very dangerous buildings that might catch fire. So, I'll just leave it at that. I just felt that I had to speak to it because I'm voting for this and I just want to let…I have no concerns about this report and this decision that's recommendation from the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service. Thank you.

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

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be brief. I think Councillor…actually Councillor Eadie summarized it really well. What the report clearly indicates is that our staff through their expertise and their work, who really want to focus on what is statistically the higher risk, and that's structures, buildings, multi-family buildings and cabinets where people are living. And when you take a look at even, you know, 2023, you just…we think back and there were individuals whose lives were compromised or lost through fire in residential areas. One, I read one report about someone who died of smoke…carbon monoxide, poison as well in a home. And so, I support our staff on this and their focus to the residential multi-family buildings especially is really, really critical. And so, I'll be supporting the report as the committee recommended.

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

**Councillor Chambers:** Thank you, Madam Chair. It wasn't until Councillor Eadie spoke that it kind of triggered my mind in terms of, you know, these types of inspections that are duly needed. My area, St. Norbert-Seine River and specifically the Fort Richmond area has…is somewhat problematic in terms of illegal rooming houses for students. And certainly, there are issues that come up in terms of the amount of people that are living in these homes paying cheaper rent and living in proximity to the University of Manitoba and the associated risk in terms of living in basements and having food heating utensils such as bocce's or other equipment to heat food. This has been problematic again in the area close to the University of Manitoba. You know, in terms of businesses and industries, there are codes that regulate, you know, the issue of fire that could happen in, you know, industrial areas. So, the focus should be on safety of individuals in residential dwellings. Notwithstanding what Councillor Allard had alluded to back in, oh, the early 2000s where that big fireball happened at…in St. Boniface where there was commercial fuel stored, that has the potential to create quite a hazard not only for that area, but also for the residents that live around the area, but again, you know, human life in terms of the residential context is much greater and that's where the focus of inspection should be. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

**Councillor Duncan:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate Councillor Allard raising these concerns today and at Standing Policy Committee, we did raise these concerns with WFPS. And they were answered quite thoroughly, and I commend them for acknowledging that back in 2014 when this recommendation came forward, it was appropriate at the time and times have evolved, and now it's time to reallocate resources. So just so everybody is crystal clear here on this, Madam Speaker, is that F2 and F3 inspections occur on 36-month and 60-month intervals or when a complaint is brought forward. And high risk F1 complaints will not change. They are on a 12-month interval exceeding the provincial expectation of 24 months. And just to give some numbers of context around here on why WFPS is allocating these resources as our Mayor touched on, and Councillor Allard touched on, saying that we're lucky that there has been no deaths in these industrial fires. There have been 22 deaths since 2015 in high risk residential areas, so. Again, I commend the public service for saying, hey, times have changed. We need to reallocate these resources, and we'll continue to do the work in the industrial areas, but at this point in time, our priority needs to lie with those high risk residential areas that include encampments so that we're keeping Winnipeggers safe. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Duncan. With that, I'll call the question on this item. All in favour? Call for recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

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

**Nays**

Councillor Allard

**Councillor Chambers:** Order, Madam Speaker, (inaudible)…return or have Councillor Schreyer return, by feed?

**Madam Speaker:** No, he's ill.

**Councillor Chambers:** Okay.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you.

**City Clerk:** The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 13, Nays 1.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. That Item passes. Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Schreyer absent. Next Item, Mr. Clerk.

**Item 3 – Responsible Pet Ownership By-law Amendments**

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Duncan to introduce the item.

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

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition of recommendations to amend the Responsible Pet Ownership By-law 92/2013 to allow community cat management, considering both animal welfare and community livability. A 2013 study by Scott R. Loss and the Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found that free ranging domestic cats are the top threat to birds and small mammals in the United States. Killing an estimated 1.3 to 3.7 billion birds and 6.3 to 22.3 billion wild mammals annually. So globally, we know for a fact that cats have contributed to directly to the extinction of 34 species of birds. That study found that the majority of these doomed birds and mammals fall into the jaws of cats that are caused by unowned cats. The hunting action in cats is an instinctive action. They may not eat the birds, but they still hunt. Now, that was an American study, bring it closer to home, the Canadian data is similar. A 2013 study published by Environment Canada scientists, in the Aviation Conservation and Ecology Journal, list cats as the number one killer of birds in Canada. Cats are the largest cause of bird mortality. Cats accounted for an estimated 200 million bird deaths, compared with 25 million bird deaths due to window collisions. In North America, bird populations are declining due to a variety of human activities. Accessing data from monitoring networks, researchers found that North American bird populations have decreased by 29% since 1970. This is a loss of close to 3 billion birds in Canada which suggests an urgent need to address factors that are contributing to bird mortality. And for those of you that may be unaware, Manitoba is located on a major North American migratory route for birds. Birds are helpful indicators of environmental health because of their important role in food webs, ecosystem services, pollinating plants, dispersing seeds and controlling insect populations. Without direct conservation action, research has predicted the bird population will continue to decline. Now this is really important to all my councillor colleagues who are actively listening to the discussion about birds and cats. Cat hunting has not received serious conservation attention that it deserves, according to the Smithsonian Conservation Biology. Because, policymakers, that's us, often dismiss cats as a minor threat compared to the other mortal dangers that wildlife faces. However, both American and Canadian studies clearly show data identifying that it is cats that are killing the birds and that the cats outstrip bird deaths from pesticide poisonings, collisions with windows, communication towers or vehicles. So, I know this will be a difficult decision from any of us here because I dare say we all love birds and cats. But harboring cats will have a dramatic effect on our bird population here in Manitoba and we're on a major migratory route. So, I won't be supporting this.

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

**Councillor Duncan**: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This was a very informative topic for me. I learned a lot about cats. I'd like to thank Councillor Santos for bringing this forward and championing it along the way. At the end of the day, we have a cat population, community cats we'll refer to them, as a community cat population issue. The solution is that we put this motion forward, and have it passed to have individuals who care about these cats and who otherwise would be taking care of these cats do it legally under our watch, to trap them, and then work with an agency to have them spayed or neutered. There is no other way at this point in time to control the cat population in Winnipeg, and therefore this is the option that's been put forward. I am not prepared at this point in time to advocate for euthanizing cats in our community. I don't think that that's the right way to go about it. You know, a culling of cats has taken place in other regions in the world and has proven to not work. It is, you know, it is done and soon enough the cat population is back, so. I would hope that there would be support here to move forward in promoting the spaying and neutering of our community cats so that we could attempt to at the very least get a control on the cat population here in Winnipeg. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Call the question.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Lukes in opposition. We'll move into By-laws. Mr. Chair, Councillor Duncan on the By-laws.

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

**Councillor Duncan:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move that By-law No. 1/2024 be read a first time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 1/2024.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Duncan.

**Councillor Duncan:** Thank you. I'd like to move that By-law No. 1/2024 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 1/2024.

**Councillor Duncan:** Thank you very much. I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 1/2024 be read a third time and that same be passed and order to be signed and sealed.

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

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

**Madam Speaker:** Moving to question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Duncan, the Chair? Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Allard:** Madam Speaker, through you to the Chair, having not been privy to the private conversations of the budget working group, and hearing, well, what I read in the news according to one of my colleagues said and documents that he shared as far as I understand, I'm worried about, well, specifically cuts to Community Services, and I know the Mayor ran on customer service to Winnipeggers, and I'm wondering if the Chair has any knowledge, anything that might be shared to Council about whether or not our community services will be protected, like libraries, like pools, like the things that keep our citizens engaged in productive activities and really make for a healthier Winnipeg.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Allard. Would you like to direct that to Finance Chair under that Standing Committee?

**Councillor Allard:** Madam Speaker, I would prefer to direct it to the Chairperson for Community Services as I understand he likely has had a very key role in terms of Community Services.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

**Councillor Duncan:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Thank you to Councillor Allard for that question. Without going into detail at this point in time, I want to remind everyone in this council chamber and Councillor Allard that I'm a strong advocate for our Community Services. As a father of three, I'd like to see our Community Services do as best as they possibly can in Winnipeg here for the people, and I look forward to that discussion in the budget process.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move to the next committee, Standing Policy Committee on Public Works. Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** Yes.

**Madam Speaker:** The report dated January 9.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
DATED JANUARY 9, 2024**

**Councillor Lukes:** January 9. I'd like to move Items 1 through 5, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** No. 4 - Arlington Bridge. Number 1 - WINNpass Fares. Any other items to be stood down? I'll call the question on 2, 3 and 5…2, 3 and 5. All in favour? Five is the Review of Image Capturing Enforcement Regulations. Calling the question on 2 and 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

**Item 1 – WINNpass Fares**

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

**Councillor Lukes:** I'll wait to hear what my colleagues have to say.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And Councillor Gilroy marked, noted in opposition. Mr. Clerk, Item 4.

**Item 4 – Arlington Bridge**

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Lukes to introduce the item.

**Councillor Lukes:** Yes, as most of us are aware here, there is a report or a study underway, and we were told at Public Works we should be expecting this report in the spring to give us an overview of what costs would be and what would be involved to maintain the bridge as is.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

**Councillor Gilroy:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I won't be supporting this today. We have done so many reports on this. We had many different studies on this. This is now after…with it taking it passed into the spring, it'll be passed the budget, which this was asked to be brought forward to the budget. So, so…I'm just, you know, I don't feel that, you know, that's right. We should be putting this towards the budget for us to do…make sure that we are properly financing this and making sure that there's some money in the budget in order to do this. So, very concerned about us just leaving this alone. Especially, when we have a bridge that isn't open that is really desperately needed for the North End of Winnipeg. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the Public Works Committee and EPC wanting to see a report, but Madam Speaker, you know, there's different things being thrown out. The last thing that I heard about the Arlington Bridge was, you know, don't worry for 10 years, the yards are going to move. That's what somebody said to me who's supposedly on the committee working this out, and trying to think that, you know, jobs will be saved by keeping the yards. You know, this dialogue, every time there's a need to actually go ahead and replace the Arlington Bridge, we get this talk. It's an excuse for politicians to delay making an appropriate decision. What's going to come out of that report, seen as how they had to totally shut it down. You know what that already tells this lay person, Madam Speaker? It already tells me as what I thought was going to happen if you want to keep it with its dysfunctional working as it was, you know, last year, where a bus can't go up there. So like, the bridge can't be used for various purposes that a bridge should be available for, right? So, to extend the life 25 years, it's going to be hundreds of millions. I know what Council's decision will be. Well, we don't want to spend hundreds of millions, well oh, we can't afford that, oh no, oh no, oh we can't afford that, Madam Speaker. Well, we had a study done. We spent some millions of dollars, looked at all kinds of options, did the study in the traffic, did everything. I don't know if you've been listening to traffic calls on McPhillips lately or on Salter, Isabel. And putting all that traffic, extra traffic on the McGregor and Salter through residential areas, what's the risk and harm in that? How many had more accidents do we need to see Madam Speaker? Like really, so, the idea was, we'd replace the bridge. There was two options. More expensive one was 340 million. In 20, whatever it was, 16 dollars after it was completed, whatever, maybe that was 2017 dollars. It was a Class 3 estimate Madam Speaker, which is what we require to go to other levels of government. But what stalled that? We should talk about moving the CPR rail yards. Like, and even if they do get moved, it's going to take 10 years so what we're talking about is, forget it West End, forget it, actually forget it City of Winnipeg. This is a City of Winnipeg thing here. Everybody, you know, well I don't' care, it's not in my area, I don't use it. It's actually part of a route that people can use from north of Templeton all the way, over there, you can end up on Kenaston, Academy Road. People do it all the time Madam Speaker, when it was working. It's a good path

to go because I don't know if you ever tried it, but do these, Salter, Isabel, Memorial, Osborne, like, the congestion. It takes a load off of that. But without an Arlington Bridge, forget it. Madam Speaker, what we needed to do is we need to make the right decision here waiting 'til after the budget passes because that 60 days is going to take us passed there, Madam Speaker. And then what do we do? We need to make provisions and the right thing to do is replace it, for 40 years or even more for years? Like the bridge never worked functionally worked in the first place. It was supposed to run transit over top of it. But it never happened. I'd like to see a 71 Arlington bus Madam Speaker, which goes through our area, goes through West End, you know, and actually under the new service I think it goes even further, it might end up, I can't remember where exactly it ends up, but ultimately it'd be a good bus route and shave the time on because the thing is, going all around all the time, it's not functional. And actually, the 71 Arlington, because it's such a slow route going around there, the 71 every once in a while runs down every other, runs down McPhillips only. And why is that? Because of the way, it's just…it's a faster bus to take if you want to get somewhere that you could get to if you were going over the Arlington Bridge. Madam Speaker, so I just…I'm going to vote no for the extension. I appreciate the consideration here, but I already know what's going to end up happening here and you know what, frankly, Winnipeggers are sick and tired of this. The Arlington Bridge should be the number one bridge to be…should be replaced. We should be putting money into budget. We should put a dollar for frontage foot to in there to look at covering the cost of replacing the Arlington Bridge with a functional, over functional and provide, actually, the delivery of goods within the city, I'm not talking about trade between provinces and cities and so on. The Arlington Bridge should be functional in that we could get a 5-ton truck moving around, delivering goods from Kenaston all the way that, you know, going over the Arlington Bridge and dropping stuff off on Hillhouse. You know, you could take the Arlington Bridge, 5-ton truck, deliver some really nice furniture over around Hillhouse. It would work really well. It would save a lot time and the drivers would be much appreciated because they won't have to deal with McPhillips, they won't have to deal with Salter. So, you know, like, it's an important bridge. It's functional. It just, you know, this whole thing is being treated inappropriately and, the railyards is not being the divider it's people's minds, and, you know, moving the yards that's another great example of a place that provides…the 1919 strike, the Weston Shops, CPR. So, we fought for good wages. The wages working for CPR are really good. And they provided a very important living for North-Enders, West-Enders, other Winnipeggers, and even people who live outside of Winnipeg. It's provided those kind of really decent paying jobs you can raise a family and you can afford to pay your water bill. Thank you.

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

**Councillor Lukes:** Just call the vote.

**Madam Speaker:** Call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And that's noted in opposition, thank you. Next Item.

**Item 5 – Review of Image Capturing Enforcement Regulations**

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Lukes to introduce the item.

**Councillor Lukes:** I'll wait to hear from my colleagues.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Chambers.

**Councillor Chambers:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just rise on this occasion just to indicate that we're moving layover for 60 days to get the Winnipeg Police Service the opportunity to speak with provincial government on this matter.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, any further speakers? Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Allard:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wanted to put on the radar, no pun intended, really, that was an accident. Anyhow, so this issue has been discussed, I guess at length or periodically, depending on, I don't know, oftentimes with the media cycle when there's a particular intersection that tends to get many tickets. And it's been, my experience over time having had many conversations regarding this matter and as Chairperson of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, that there are specific locations and I think the review is a good idea, as there are specific locations where year over year over year, the amount of tickets for an intersection don't seem to change much and there are very high levels of well, revenue for the City or fines, they're issued at those intersections. I think and I hope we consider this as part of the review that we should look at those as opportunities and look at the design of the roads where those infractions are occurring, look at the signage around the roads where those infractions are occurring, but really mostly on the engineering. Mayor Gillingham in his election platform his credit said that, we shouldn't need to wait for roads to be renewed for the roads to be safe or up to engineering standards and I'm not saying exactly the way that it was written in his campaign but I think it's something like that. And so I think most drivers respond to the shape of the road, the geometry, the engineering of the road. And if there is a place where there are a lot of tickets, it suggests that there's probably an engineering problem with the road. And with that, comes potential risks to the public that are using that intersection, if these violations are

occurring. And so, I looked at the legislation around photo enforcement and where the revenues can go. I've moved motions in the past to look at using money from photo enforcement or at least some money from photo enforcement to look at allocating some of that towards remediation of roads where those tickets appear to be chronic and I…and use the expression, canary and the coal mine, where coalminers used to apparently go in the coal mine with the canary and the canary died or lost consciousness. It was an indicator that they should get out. Well, I think if there's too many photo enforcement tickets at an intersection, it's likely an indicator that the engineering is wrong and that something should be done in order for those infractions to go down. And I understand that there's a safety factor, there's a revenue to the police factor, but I think there must be a way to tie at least to some extent the revenues that come from photo enforcement infractions to fix the problems that we have on the road. And I think if certain legislative changes are granted like photo enforcement being allowed to be deployed in other places other than red lights or school zones or where they're allowed to be now? There could be redeployments of these photo enforcement units and we might find even more canaries and coal mines, and even more opportunities to fix the engineering streets and yeah, sorry, and yeah, potentially save lives, avoid, you know, high fines for those drivers that may be speeding without knowing that they are speeding. I used to be sort of a firm belief that if you're speeding, you're speeding and therefore you should pay the fine. After many conversations with people who have studied these things for much time, I now understand there's a percentage of the population that drives to conditions and they don't pay a whole lot of attention to the maximum speed. And I think it's some of those people that are getting tickets time and time again because I don't think, Winnipeg is not a rich city if you look at the median income of Winnipeg, it's not very high. If you look at the average income of Winnipeg, it's not very high. And I don't think people are getting these tickets because they want to. I think they're getting these tickets because they're making mistakes and I think that if we had proper engineering at these intersections, that we could help Winnipeggers not make those mistakes. I mean, it is their statutory obligation to, or it's their obligation to follow The Highway Traffic Act including maximum speeds. However, there are many examples where there are a high number of tickets and that does not seem to impact behavior over time and I think that's the goal, is to impact behavior over time. And I think the best way to do that is to find the hotspots, engineer them in a way where these tickets will not occur anymore and the legislation does allow us to use the monies for safety, so. Past councils, and I guess current council by confirming the practice has sent the money to the Winnipeg Police Service. And I think they have a significant role to play in safety. I also think that there is safety in engineering and that road safety would be compatible with legislation. And so I rise to speak to this as I think it is true that we need to review the policy. I think I've heard the public service say in the past, they would do better if they were allowed to go in different places than specific places where they're allowed to go today. But I would also like to point out that engineering changes can really reduce the number of tickets issued. I'd point perhaps, I see my time's ending, since we lengthened the ambers just a little bit, and we still have the shortest ambers in Canada I think, in terms of comparable cities. Some of the red light tickets dropped to almost nil. And so, I think there was a case where Winnipeggers didn't want to get a ticket, but they didn't know if they should start or stop on a high speed road with a short yellow. And that's a place where engineering can be fixed as well, so. So, to those that are involved, I hope you take my comments into consideration. I think this program needs real reform and some of it's got to go to helping people not make mistakes.

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

**Councillor Lukes:** Thank you. I'll just make a few comments on this. I'm fully supportive of image capturing enforcement of regulations, photo radar as it's called. We've seen cities all over the world that use this effectively get very good results. They identify the areas that need engineering improvements and then they address it. So, the former government was to do a study and they didn't do the study I'm not sure what happened it didn't happen is what I am sure of, is it didn't happen. Councillor Chambers and I are in discussion with current minister, other people, the Winnipeg Police Service is in discussion with the province. I think we all recognize that it was, in my opinion, it was an ill-conceived program to begin with. So, I too am very supportive of, if there is the opportunity through legislation or that we have that power, that a percentage of whatever we take in goes to road safety, to our improving the roads to improving the built environment. So, with that, I ask that you call the question.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Lukes, By-laws for this committee.

## STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
## CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS

**Councillor Lukes:** I'd like to move that the following By-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 2/2024, By-law No. 3/2024.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 2/2024 and By-law No. 3/2024.

**Councillor Lukes:** I'd like to move that By-laws No. 2/2024 and 3/2024 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-laws No. 2/2024 and 3/2024.

**Councillor Lukes:** I'd like to move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 2/2024 and 3/2024 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

## STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
## QUESTION PERIOD

**Madam Speaker:** Any questions under this Committee for our chair, for Councillor Lukes? Councillor Chambers.

**Councillor Chambers:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to the Chair of Public Works, this has been one of the strangest winters on record in my 60 years on God's green earth. We didn't get snow really until December and got a lot of snow in January, which is now melting at a rapid rate and leaving our roads in very treacherous conditions. I'm asking the question to the Chair whether or not Public Works will be clearing or scraping the excess snow that's on our primary routes so that if it does freeze, we're not into a situation where we have lots of ruts and icy road conditions.

**Councillor Lukes:** Sure. So, in my discussions with Public Works on Thursday, Wednesday…Tuesday, they…I was informed that they were going to wait one more day so that the ice build-up on the road would melt. I've really been on them about using a lot of salt, but if they allowed it to melt, then they could do a P1 plow. So last night, they did a P1 plow. I took the bus and I walked part of the way. The roads, the P1's are beautiful. Right now, they're also working on the active transportation network. So, they're doing touch-ups wherever is required. There was some blowing. I know on Pembina, there was a lot of blowing on the sidewalks. So, they are in a plow scenario right now. And I just want to comment to that also, that because we purchased 15 more plows, and because we now plow when there's 5 centimeters versus 8 centimeters, and because we now do a double plow on many of the active transportation routes, and because it's mandatory for both contractors and City staff to take the training sessions annually on effective snow removal on the active transportation network, that I have received many, many compliments on the removal of snow and ice on the active transportation network. I don't know if other people have, but now we haven't had tons of snow like we've had in the past, but I'm very optimistic that the changes that I believe everyone unanimously supported are really proving to be paying off. So, thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question, Councillor Chambers.

**Councillor Chambers:** This is more of a "did you know". Did you know…through you Speaker to the Chair, did you know that I have received quite a few emails and social media tags in response to the plows that have occurred stating what a better job it is this year than it has been in previous years.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** That was a "did you know" right? Yes, I know. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Yes, Mayor Gillingham is next followed by Councillor Gilroy, and we can certainly come to you, Councillor Allard.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. We cover a whole wide range of topics here at Council. That's my preamble to my question. Councillor Lukes and I were on the bus together for a media interview, and we stopped at Harkness Station and we got off on the Harkness…Osborne Station, pardon me…Osborne Station, which is covered…it was quite remarkable, it was really filthy with bird waste, and when we talk about Winnipeg Transit, we talk about the transit system and service delivery. When you think of it, it is a matter, and so I wonder if the Councillor could talk about just the idea of how that's being addressed, how that station is being…if it's being cleaned up, if it's being addressed, because it really is…it's a service delivery, which it really is, so I invite the Councillor to kind of let us know.

**Councillor Lukes:** So, yes, the Osborne Station is very open and welcoming to birds, to pigeons, and so when we got off, there was a lot of pigeon noise there. So, the Transit Department has a couple of things on the go. They've put in a

lot of spikes to prevent the pigeons from sitting there. They have got a cleaning service that comes through there and they're doubling now the cleaning service. They have, I guess, in very good-hearted spirit, people bringing bird feed and leaving the bird feed there, so now we're putting up signs, and in a recent discussion with them, I've suggested that they maybe move some feral cat colonies into the covered facility to get the birds…I'm kidding. But it is an issue and it's been an issue for a while, and they're also looking at netting. So, this is a problem that we're trying to deal with. I do think cats might help.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor for that question. Next is Councillor Gilroy followed by Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Gilroy**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I can…the Councillor doesn't have to…or Chair doesn't have to respond right away. But I just…is she aware…I am getting…I know we've done maybe some good job on some snow clearing, but here's some lessons to learn and maybe something we can improve on. I am getting lots of complaints around snow clearing in terms of people having…like not being allowed to park any more on our winter routes, and a lot of my neighborhood has very old apartments and they don't have parking, so they really rely on the winter routes. And I guess in some cases, they've been told, and they've been told even though we're not so quick. So, I would like us to look at more of an approach where, okay snow clearing is happening. I understand that these vehicles need to be towed. Of course, we want the streets cleaned, but if we don't have snow clearing, I really don't believe that people should be towed and ticketed, and I think we should give some leeway. We have some older neighborhoods that really, people really rely on parking on some of our winter roads, so I'm asking our chair to maybe look at that for future discussions because I know we've changed some things around, but maybe this isn't really working out that great in some of the older neighborhoods, so if we can kind of re-look at this issue and maybe see what solutions are for the next snow clearing.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** So, this is on the winter snow routes that Councillor Gilroy is speaking about. She's in a very dense area where people park on the street. They use the street a lot. Very similar actually to the neighborhoods of Bridgewater. Very dense and people park on the street. We had one guy park on the street and had his car covered up with his tarp for three months until it got moved. But anyways, so the idea of the snow routes is for emergency vehicles. And what Councillor Gilroy is saying, and I hear what she's saying, is that when it's not snowy and stormy, people want to park there. So, we can take it up with the public service. We did make a change. For the longest time they were, you know, professing through media releases and announcements not to park on the snow route or you'd be ticketed and towed, yet they never did ticket and tow. So that sends a mixed message. Now, they aren't ticketing and towing on these snow routes, so we as a city have to decide, you know, how we want to proceed with this I guess. This was the change for this year, and I'll talk to the department further on it with Councillor Gilroy and we'll look at that.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Next is Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Allard:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to Councillor Lukes, I recently wrote an article that will feature in one of the local papers, and I referenced the journey of sidewalk snow clearing as I have lived it in city council. Councillor Gilroy and I have moved a motion. The motion is calling for improvements in our snow clearing service. My question is, does the Chairperson agree that we should have the same level of service for sidewalks as we do for Priority 1 roads?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** While we have a Priority 1 for our active transportation network. We've got routes identified. It is a P1. The Policy is to get out there and do it when the event is done. We have more machines, we have more equipment. We never had that before, and that was the problem. It was a problem for when I was Chair of Public Works, I would go out and I would see when they start, and then 30 hours would pass, they'd be nowhere near even touching some of them, so I think now, you know, we're going to give them this rest of this winter. They've got an app that they're working on that we're going to be seeing within 5 to 10 minutes when a route is done, but I think that as a P1 it should be cleaned as soon as the event stops.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question.

**Councillor Allard:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to Councillor Lukes, and I do want to acknowledge that I have seen what I believe to be a higher level of service since we've gotten the new plows, and that that's a good thing, but does the Councillor not acknowledge that a person who is walking on a sidewalk may have problems doing that, where a person driving in a motor vehicle, whether there is snow on the street or not, can get around the city much more easily than a person who has to trudge through a sidewalk that may not have been plowed because it's not a P1?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** Sure, I acknowledge that.

**Madam Speaker:** Any further questions for the Chair? Final question.

**Councillor Allard:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to the Chairperson, after many motions last year on the idea of plowing the pavements that were filed for information, there was a motion to refer to the budget more money for sidewalk snow clearing, so is the Chairperson fighting for those monies to be in the budget, and what's the plan for when the sidewalks become slippery, angular, treacherous? What are we going to do and has our policy addressed that?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** Just to assure you there Councillor Allard, I've been fighting for increases in the active transportation budget since 2003. So, I'm on the budget working group, and I hope you'll be pleased at what you see. I don't want to give anything away, but it's something that I'm constantly, constantly, whether it be road safety or active transportation, one in the same often, fighting for more funding in the budget.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. That concludes question period under this committee. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. Councillor Browaty.

## REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DATED JANUARY 12, 2024

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of January 12th and move Reports 1 and 2.

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

## STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD

**Madam Speaker:** We'll get right into question period. Any questions for the Chair? Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** I just would like a recap, please. I noticed on the City website that there's nothing on the front page about the budget, the four-year budget. I'm not sure why that's not happening. I've directed the question to our CAO. Maybe could you recap the timelines on what's happening with the budget there…public reveal and discussions and such, Councillor Browaty?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. You don't have long to wait. The budget will be tabled on the afternoon of Wednesday, February 7th. There will be a council seminar in the morning and I think the invitations for that should've gone out to all members of council. Various committees of council will have meetings where the public can come and give feedback on that budget. It starts, in fact, with your committee in fact, with the special meeting on Friday, March 1st for Public Works, followed by Finance and Economic Development as part of the regular meeting on March 8th. The Police Board meets March 8th on the budget. Monday, March 11th is SPC Community Services special meeting. EPC will deal with their budget items on March 12th at its regular meeting. Wednesday March 13th will be SPC on Property and Development, a special meeting. Thursday March 14th special meeting, Water, Waste and the Environment. March 15th, EPC will hear delegations on the budget. Tuesday the 19th will be an Executive Policy Committee, a special meeting for final budget recommendations, and all of Council will have an opportunity to debate the budget in full on Wednesday, March 20th.

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

**Councillor Allard:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I was inspired by Councillor Lukes in this question. Thank you Councillor Lukes. At the Governance Committee of Council, we had talked with the public service about engaging with groups who normally wouldn't have had the same access to the budget process. People who may not be on the web, people who may not be…people that are high turnouts for voting, people who may be, for whatever reason, not be that engaged in the budget process and at that time, my understanding was the public service had made a request for a budget, and that that budget had been denied. We then heard that the budget actually hadn't been denied and that it was there, and so I guess my question is, did the outreach happen to those communities that we were told as a council would happen and for which there was a budget.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much for the question. I do believe there is some consultation being planned throughout February that is beyond the opportunity to come to City Hall and to engage in, I guess more try to get the pulse of the general public, not necessarily targeting specific groups but the general public overall. I should add, I did miss answering the second part of Councillors Lukes' question. There will be a button apparently obviously on the Winnipeg webpage starting early next week for the budget stuff.

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

**Councillor Allard:** I mean I don't mean to be disagreeable, but I guess it's my job. My understanding from our conversations at Governance Committee, Council, on this council floor was that there would be specific outreach to under…to communities that are specifically not as engaged in the budget process as other parts of the community. Councillor Gilroy, I think you were there in those meetings. I don't want to put Councillor Gilroy on the spot…

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Allard. You've posed the question. Thank you.

**Councillor Allard:** Well, what I heard is…

**Madam Speaker:** You've posed the question…

**Councillor Allard:** …there is nothing special for those groups. That's what I heard.

**Madam Speaker**: Yeah, let's let Councillor Browaty answer your second question.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you. I mean, every member of Council has an opportunity to consult with whomever they like. In fact, and again we have put out the offer to all members of council, if you want to have a meeting in your particular ward, myself as well as members of the Corporate Finance team will be available to do a community consultation. At this point, only Councillor Mayes has taken me up on that offer, but that offer does still stand. There are still some available times in February and March, so if there is a particular group that you want me to attend with that, you know, is important to you and your constituents, please don't hesitate to reach out.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Anything further? That concludes our question period.

## STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
## MOTIONS

**Madam Speaker:** I'm going to go back to Public Works Committee for a moment. There was a motion that was circulated, Motion 2, moved by Councillor Allard, seconded by Councillor Gilroy regarding sidewalk clearing. That will be an automatic referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works.

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

*WHEREAS the Universal Declaration of Human Rights include freedom of mobility, equal access to government services and freedom to participate equally in society;*

*AND WHEREAS the recent acquisition and operation of new plows dedicated to sidewalks and active transportation pathways have not achieved a snow clearing service that is the equivalent to snow clearing on roads;*

*AND WHEREAS the current Snow Clearing and Ice Control Policy gives the Winnipeg Public Service the discretion to wait up to 36 hours to begin a sidewalk plowing operation even along P1 roads;*

*AND WHEREAS some residents need to use sidewalks to access transit;*

*AND WHEREAS a city that does not provide equal freedom of mobility and equal access to government services is violating resident's human rights;*

*AND WHEREAS residents are injured and suffer as a result of slips and falls where the level of snow clearing and sanding for sidewalks is not adequate;*

*AND WHEREAS some injuries, like hip breaks, lead to fatalities in a majority of cases in populations 65 years and over;*

*AND WHEREAS some contractors at times dump snow on sidewalks during road clearing operations, externalizing a cost to City crews that need to clear sidewalks after these occurrences;*

*AND WHEREAS it is the City's practice to clear snow in accordance with the Snow Clearing and Ice Control Policy;*

*AND WHEREAS snow and ice control activities have exceeded the adopted budget for the last 10 consecutive years;*

*AND WHEREAS the practice of in-year adjustments to the snow clearing budgets impact other departmental budgets and corresponding City services;*

*AND WHEREAS establishing a Snow Clearing Reserve would provide more transparency to the amount that is spent on snow clearing, rather than the amount that is budgeted, which often is less than required for the snow clearing operations of that fiscal year.*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:*

1. *That all future snow and ice control contracts require contractors to remove snow that has been pushed onto sidewalks as a result of their snow clearing operations, and that contractors be subject to appropriate levels of enforcement including, but not limited to, fines for a failure to comply.*

2. *That the Snow Clearing and Ice Control Policy be amended for the clearance of snow and ice on all sidewalks and active transportation pathways along P1, P2 and P3 streets city wide require an equivalent level of service as P1 roads.*

3. *That a Snow Clearing Reserve be established to fund the snow clearing costs in excess of adopted budgets.*

**REPORT OF THE**
**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT**
**DATED JANUARY 11, 2024**

**Madam Speaker:** Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Our chair, Councillor Rollins.

**Councillor Rollins:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to move consent agenda Items 1 all the way through 14, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Item 1 is Purchasing or Expropriating Private Lands to Preserve Forests. I'll call the question on 2 through 14. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 1.

**Item 1 – Purchasing or Expropriating Private Lands to Preserve Forests**

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

**Councillor Rollins:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, we discussed at the committee some motions pertaining to, in particular, the Manitoba Habitat Conservancy and acquiring Lemay Forest at the Property and Development meeting. In particular, we discussed the Council objective that we have in our Winnipeg 2045 to increase

the amount of public reserve land within the city by 1,000 acres, something that I think many members that were here at the time probably ushered in with respect to the park strategy. We also discussed the hard work that the Executive Policy lead for the environment, ward councillor, St. Vital did when he lobbied other levels of government in particular the federal government and the provincial government to secure funding that will allow the acquisition of forested areas. This is a key move and I frankly would encourage all councillors to meet with their contiguous colleagues in the legislature, Madam Speaker and parliament Madam Speaker to work on joint objectives and in this case that net add of green space, Madam Speaker. We discussed the NGO that is hard at work mostly in rural areas, Mr. Carlyle, of the Manitoba Habitat Conservancy. And, you know, this is the beneficiary of funds from the federal provincial government. They're an independent charity and they focus on land, conservation, Madam Speaker. Really key, Madam Speaker, this discussion why? Because some of the objectives we were talking about that day and thanks to a motion by Councillor Chambers, we absolutely had before us the objective of what. Getting more acres into the city of Winnipeg for green space, Madam Speaker. And with that objective, I as Chair Madam Speaker really looked at what would be needed? To meet Council's objective. Now Madam Speaker, sometimes that means writing a tactical motion and making sure that we have the objective that should HFC be successful in purchasing the land, that we would actually have the outcome that Councillors wanted, Madam Speaker. And so, it was within consultation to the mover of the motion, Councillor Chambers, and in consultation obviously with the committee, that that day we were focused on one outcome. Adding acres. Like, adding green space to our complimented green space our parkland, Madam Speaker. To do that, we currently have to authorize all land acquisition programs as set out in the acquisition of property policy. And so technical language is sometimes required, Madam Speaker. And so while it was great motions coming out of Community Committee, the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development ultimately said, what is our objective here? Our objective is adding green space. Who's going to do that? Well, HFC's going to do that, and if they do that, we don't want them to incur holding costs et cetera., we want to direct the public service to, as soon as possible, land that plane, so to speak, Madam Speaker. So, to do that, we need to provide the authority to the CAO to accept land. Any donations actually has to go through the CAO. We know this. We do this all the time. Well, from time to time, Madam Speaker, especially with other governments and NGO money. So, to that end, before you is the motion passed by majority of Councillors on Property and Development that the CAO is delegated to accept and approve the donation from Manitoba Habitat Conservancy and that the public service is directed to report back to the SPC on Property and Development in 180 days, with what I expect is good news Madam Speaker that we may have bought a forest. Now, Madam Speaker, technical motions sometimes aren't reported well in the media sometimes they're misunderstood in terms of what needs to happen. In this case, this motion absolutely has to pass, right? And there is positive news ongoing externally that I'm keeping up-to-date with, right? The other piece in terms of green space funding, Madam Speaker, I am also engaged in and working shoulder to shoulder with Mr. Dave Domke who we know is really the king of our parks, the Manager of the Park Service for the City of Winnipeg. So Madam Speaker, I'm looking for a unanimous motion here and I'm looking for the commitment from all our council colleagues to work on the green space provisions that we have in terms of that objective of adding green space but sometimes, Madam Speaker, we have to really focus on the nuts and bolts, the nuts and bolts that perhaps get misreported in the media and the nuts and bolts that might be misunderstood. The rest, in terms of the broader policy conversation can and should follow, Madam Speaker. We should be working on increasing the mechanisms of funds, working with NGOs to get them what they need, and sometimes what they need is specificity and technical language. That's what was done at Property and Development, Madam Speaker. I'll introduce it and be happy to close.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yeah, I support the motion. I want to thank Councillor Rollins and members of the committee who voted for this, said some generous things about me, so I should say some generous things about others. This has been a long road both on the Sumka Forest which is south of the Perimeter on the east…southeast part of the city and the Lemay on the southwest, both south of the Perimeter, both still in the city, both still forests. I think this motion goes about as far as we can to try to see if we can secure Lemay. Good work by Councillor Rollins to sort of combine two or three different stands that were going out there. Want to commend Mr. Carlo and the, I always get the acronym wrong. It's simpler now, right? Manitoba Heritage Conservancy. Very good work there. They're trying, they're usually doing rural work, they're trying to fit this together, they're not in the business of running parks, they're in the business of saving green spaces and turning them over so we would be picking up the land if they're able to secure a sale. I know there was an original direction sort of saying, public service go and negotiate a sale price. Well, it's not really fair to the public service because Mr. Wintrup's know who will on the other side he's going to say what's $20 million, $40 million, take it or leave it. You want a report back saying, you couldn't do it, go ahead but there'll be some inflated value given to it. And then we'll get this report back and it will be widely in excess of the assessed value, so. We've gotten, that that was problematic, expropriation was problematic so this I think is a good approach, unless they want to thank, amidst, we all have our regrets here. I'd still love to get the Sumka Forest purchased, I want to thank our former colleague, Kevin Klein as Environment Minister, very much supported getting some money and did set aside some money to help try to get Sumka purchased. Those negotiations did not succeed. I want to thank our current minister Minister Schmidt for being open to the idea of well, the money's there, time's running out, we should look at another option for that. And lastly Terry Duguid who has listened to me and I've listened to him on this file for some years now back and forth. We'll see if the sale

price or sale can be negotiated for all or part of the property I don't know. I do think the money is federal and provincial, so that's commendable from our partners at other levels of government. Hopefully, we can make something work here, but I do think nothing has been abandoned here. It's an attempt to try and take some money that's been allocated and see if we can save some of this resource. I don't know if I leave here my list of regrets from 2017 had the word, Sumka at the top. Most of the rest of the list has been crossed out, including that some theatricality by Jim Berezowsky on a couple of items but that item remains, so hopefully before I go from this place, we can see if we can secure that forest. That's not today's debate. We're trying…the Lemay is very much of the moment. It's working its way through the system. Hopefully, we can make something work there, but I want to make sure to put on record my thanks to Councillor Rollins and people on the committee and also to the former Minister Klein and the current minister Schmidt who've both been very helpful on this and we'll see if we can get it across the finish line.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Any further speakers? Councillor Chambers and then Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Chambers:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Rollins and her committee for all of the hard work, because I see this motion is complimentary to the motion that was passed at Riel Community Committee concerning Lemay Forest. It's also complimentary to the work done by Councillor Mayes for Sumka and I know that he has been a champion of Sumka Forest and, you know, now that it's in my ward and I'm the steward of that forest, so to speak. All of the work that has been done by the three levels of government in partnership to save these forested lands. This motion provides a runway so that we can land some of these deals in the sense that we have to create a strategy that looks at all of the inventory of privately-owned forested lands in our city with, you know, and doing the evaluation in terms of the species of trees, the quality of trees, the age of the trees, and how it adds value to the City of Winnipeg. So again, this motion is very comprehensive in providing direction to the public service in how we create that strategy. I'm thankful as well to this current government in terms of the willingness to sit and talk and discuss and strategize about how we save Lemay Forest, but not only Lemay Forest. Again, Manitoba Habitat Conservancy or Heritage Conservancy is providing great work in terms of some of those strategies, not here just in the City of Winnipeg, but throughout the Province of Manitoba, so great work on their part. Great work on behalf of the area MLA Billie Cross who has been working with other potential funding partners such as the Manitoba Metis Federation and other private donors who see an interest in preserving our environment. So, again, I stand and supported this motion. Again, feeling it's very complimentary to the motion that was passed at Riel Community Committee and I want to urge all council members to vote in favour of this motion. Thank you, Madam Chair.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Allard:** Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you as well to my colleagues Councillor Rollins, the other members of the Planning Committee, Councillor Chambers. Councillor Chambers had moved a motion to, I mean if I'm to summarize, how the City do what it needs to do to buy the Lemay Forest. I as in tandem move the motion thinking, we should apply a city-wide approach to how we do these things, and I thought, why can't we put trees on the same level as roads in this city? When we approve a road project or building project and the City of Winnipeg needs land, the City of Winnipeg…the City Council approves the plan, which includes a map and the necessary land in order to achieve that plan whether it's building a road, usually roads. And then the public service go, endeavors to try and purchase those lands, and if that's not possible then we go into expropriation proceedings. And so, I thought, well, I've seen this happen before. Something on private land is of value, it's privately owned, and the City has known this for some time yet, there hasn't been any action on it. And currently, as it's been pointed out, the private land owners can go and clean-cut a forest if they own the land and there's no protections for that. And so, it's in that view that I had moved a motion to do what we do for roads, to do for trees what we do for roads. And so, a recent CBC article had $3.1 million in federal provincial funding allocated to Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation, a registered charity, for the purchase of it...different plot of privately-owned land known as the Sumka Forest. I'm using that as, that was a recent media following the discussions of Planning, Property and Development I believe. And I'm using that number to try, well, compare what we do for roads compared to what we do for trees. And so, I'm not going to say construction inflation, but I will say Kenaston and Chief Peguis Trail more than a billion dollars in net new road. What would that mean for trees? I took out my calculator because I'm millennial and I didn't trust my math without taking out the calculator. But at $3.1 million, if we were to spend that money and it's capital to capital, so apples to apples, we would purchase 322 Sumka Forests. And so, I'd like to see this council have the tools. We seem to priorize roads over other departments' priorities. We formalize the Council's wishes around lands, around roads. And then we have excellent aspirational plans like we have in the urban forestry strategy. I'd like to see us get more aggressive about trees. I'd like to see us be as aggressive on trees as we are for roads. I'd like people to know that Kenaston and Chief Peguis Trail net new roads means 322 of these forests. And so, I put a couple motions forward recently trying to, looking at system-wide approaches we might use in order to protect trees. Thinking more functional designs. In the two terms that I've been in an office, we've spent millions of dollars just on road functional designs, some of which, many of which have not even been approved by Council. That's forests worth of...that's forests worth of trees and engineering reports. Not to mention the engineering reports themselves requiring the trees in order to be printed out only to be put on a shelf. So, I guess I don't feel my motion got a fair shake. I think there was my motion which was about

looking at functional designs, areas that we would highlight for trees and then Council endorsed as being required by the City for trees, and then sending the City to go and purchase the lands, so that we may have the trees. I realize there's the risk that once the City puts its sights on private land, that those trees might not be protected. But at some point, it's a chicken or the egg question. Like we want trees, some people own private lands that have trees. We're spending enough in roads to buy 322 forests, at least that's what the Council Strategic Plan said. And so, it's hard to understand why there's such a priority given, a formality given, functional designs for roads and buildings, yet we don't have that same level of formality of engagement. As we do for other assets, like forests. And unfortunately, I see us react a lot of the time, and I think to some extent, we are reacting, the community's reacting, but we know where the trees are, we know where they should be purchased. But we haven't said as a council, these are trees that the City wants and we want to buy them. And trees have market value. And so some landowners will want to sell us their land, that may not be suitable for other uses. And yes, currently there is a risk to trees. And we should do something to ensure that trees on private lands are protected. I think it's been two or three years that we've been, well maybe longer, Councillor Orlikow would know how long we've been talking about private trees. In other jurisdictions, you can't touch a tree without having the permission of some government entity. There are jurisdictions that use the heritage designations to protect trees, and I have a motion coming on that. And sum up, I think this is a strategic opportunity to purchase hopefully the Lemay Forest. (Inaudible) the Sumka Forest. Councillor Mayes may not have to be your biggest regret. But to do that, I think we need to have the same level of desire, respect, formality, for trees as we have for roads, 325 forests worth of roads is what we plan to do. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

**Councillor Rollins:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I definitely…I heard a lot more than you will find in the report that the recommendation that was coming to Standing Policy Committee, you know, that was really just a report to purchase and or expropriate private land that is heavily forested or contains an abundance of mature trees. So certainly, Councillor Allard here and at committee did put more on the record in terms of what he meant in terms of consumption of the work, but that day Madam Speaker, we had that opportunity. And I heard him too saying two things, get aggressive and don't have just aspirational plans, have real tangibles. This is that motion Madam Speaker. I'm looking for a recorded vote.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. With that, I'll call the question on Item 1. 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, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

**Clerk:** The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 14, Nays 0.

**Madam Speaker:** Item 1 passes unanimously.

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

**Madam Speaker:** Next is Motion 3 that was circulated today, moved by Councillor Gilroy, seconded by Councillor Allard. It's regarding solar panels for residential developments. This will be an automatic referral to the Standing Committee.

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

*WHEREAS residents are, through new builds or major renovations, constructing homes that are ready for the installation of solar panels on roofs;*

*AND WHEREAS at the time of the initial installation, residents may be under the impression that no additional permits will be required for the future installation of solar panels;*

*AND WHEREAS increased costs deter some residents from choosing solar power in order to reduce their energy costs;*

*AND WHEREAS solar panels increase affordability of utility costs over time;*

*AND WHEREAS solar panels generate green electricity while reducing demand with Manitoba Hydro who may then sell electricity in jurisdictions where fossil fuels would be used to generate the electricity required by those jurisdictions;*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Public Service be directed to report back with options to streamline and expedite the approval process for solar panel installations and permit requirements for wall mounted, roof mounted and ground mounted installations for both housing applications.*

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

**Madam Speaker:** Onto By-laws for second and third reading. Councillor Rollins.

**Councillor Rollins:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Pretty good day today. I just want to point out that we're going to hopefully pass the Naawi-Oodena secondary plan today, so let's get going. I move the adoption of the…sorry, I did that already. I move that the following By-laws be read a second time. By-law No. 26/2023, By-law No. 96/2023.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 26/2023 and By-law No. 96/2023.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Rollins.

**Councillor Rollins:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-laws No. 26/2023 and 96/2023 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

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

**Councillor Rollins:** Madam Speaker, I move that the following by-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 7/2024, By-law No. 8/2024, By-law No. 9/2024.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 7/2024, By-law No. 8/2024, and By-law No. 9/2024.

**Councillor Rollins:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-laws No. 7/2024 to 9/2024 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-laws No. 7/2024 to 9/2024 both inclusive.

**Councillor Rollins:** Thank you. I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 7/2024 to 9/2024 both inclusive be read a third time at that same time be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

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

**Madam Speaker:** Question period under this committee. Any questions for our chair, Councillor Rollins. Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a kind of follow up to my colleague Councillor Allard's line of questioning. I'm wondering if the Chair is aware that between 2022 and 2023, our budget for the urban forest went up 22% for trees, while our roads budget was reduced 4%.

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

**Councillor Rollins:** Oh, I really appreciate the question put forward by the Mayor, and yes, as former Chair of Parks and I had Urban Forestry in that portfolio Madam Speaker, I also had, Madam Speaker, my contiguous colleague, Councillor Orlikow, looking constantly over my shoulder, Madam Speaker, and no one has watched the budget for trees more than my colleague Councillor Orlikow, so I appreciate the question very much.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none. Next Committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste and the Environment. Councillor Mayes.

**REPORT OF THE**
**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT**
**DATED JANUARY 8, 2024**

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you. I'd like to move…I'll introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 and 3, pulling No. 2.

**Councillor Eadie:** Madam Speaker, I'd like to pull down 1 and 3.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you.

**Councillor Mayes:** Call the question (inaudible) none of the above.

**Madam Speaker:** That's right. Got to have a big bang at the end of the day here. Mr. Clerk.

**Item 1 – Approval of Contract Extension No. 1 for Integrated Solid Waste Collection in the City of Winnipeg Request for Proposal No. 302-2016**

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

**Councillor Mayes:** Well, the Water and Sewer reports are on an olympian four-year cycle. This…this, the garbage and recycling contracts come about once every two council terms if one is lucky. Our colleagues who were here last four years were not even able to visit this, so we will, in the life of this council, come to a major decision I think on what we want to do in terms of garbage recycle compost collection. There are a number of complexities out there right now. For example, we have not yet decided on, what are we going to pick up in terms of compost, how many months, how often? That line of questions, that will in turn influence the amount of garbage we may need to pick up. Provincial producer musings about taking over recycling or at least giving us the option to opt-in or opt-out on recycling collection or possibly even separation services. So a lot in play. Understandably then, we've decided to extend the current seven-year contracts, Miller, GFL, we've decided to extend for another two years. You see the prices in before you there. Mr. Delbridge at other levels has pointed out correctly that what was 25 million for the whole city, when we got started on this, at the end of nine-year arc it will be 40 million, a 60% increase, so well above the rate of wage increases. For the complicating debate then I think which is, if you know we are looking at bringing potentially some waste collection back in-house, as part of this process that report coming back to us roughly the same time as the compost report so, many different pieces in play. We're going to have to make some decisions by June or July. But for today, I think all we can do really is approve the extensions for Miller and GFL, and then sometime mid-2024 we'll have to turn our mind to, if we're going to go into market, do we want to have for recycling, compost, the whole city for garbage, et cetera. So, if there can be exciting times in the field of waste and recycling and pick-up, this is an exciting time. So, what you see before you is a two-year extension for Miller and GFL. And the point Mr. Delbridge made is completely correct in that the costs certainly are greater now than they were when these contracts started back in, I believe it was 2018. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Councillor Eadie, you stood this down.

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes, Madam Speaker. And Madam Speaker, I stood it down for the purposes that I missed the opportunity during announcements. And so, I can't vote against it because the collection needs to be happening. And, I mean, it's pretty clear the inflationary, you know, like, it's the reality is there, right? That's what it is, it's private collection. If this is where it becomes really lucrative for Waste Collection Services to make more money especially given that maybe their equipment is lasting longer so they don't have to buy new equipment, and so on and so forth. So, they're really making more profit going on two years extension, but we have no alternative at this point. So Madam Speaker, all is I wanted to do is rise. At the last Council meeting, I erroneously made a statement that GFL Environmental had bought Miller Waste and I'm standing up right now, Madam Speaker, on this report just to retract my statement, as I have some personal friends and we were having a dialogue prior to the last Council meeting and without checking myself, I was listening and maybe I misheard, but that individual does know people who work for various company and, but I was really taking what was just simply a rumor, and I just wanted to retract that statement that never happened and I think the media followed through and tried to discover if the purchase happened and anyway, so I retract that. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Any further speakers on this item? I thought there was another hand up. No further speakers? Councillor Mayes, back to you for close.

**Councillor Mayes:** Please call the vote.

**Madam Speaker:** I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 2.

**Item 2 – 2024 to 2027 Water and Sewer Rates**

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

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you. Yes, we've had some delegates. I think at all three levels on this one so it's worth…I pulled this one. It's an important item. It comes to us once every four years. I suspect when they have to revisit these rates though over the next four years. So first, I want to talk about some of the limits to this report and then get into some of the criticisms that were made earlier today and at other committees. To me, a lot of work goes into this. It's a mix of operating at capital and reserves so it's always a rather complicated debate. Sure, we would all like the rates to be lower. We'd all like the increases to be lower but, to be honest, the problem here is there are three assumptions built in which are keeping these rates down and we may have to come back and revisit them. Three major environmental projects in play here. The report assumes that we'll get to $279 million from the federal and or provincial governments to help with the biosolids building up at North End. This is not biosolids down at Brady, right, this is the biosolids water treatment building. The Mayor has commendably gone to the other levels of government saying this project's costing more than what we thought it would. It's an ICIP project, all three levels of government involved, so therefore, help us out with the 400 million-ish of cost…the excess that we, it's not an over-run because when we were building it, that's an increase in the budget. So, we built in that assumption that we'll get some help. Number two, we built in the assumption of zero dollars on Project 3 at North End which is the phosphorus nitrogen nutrient removal phase. We are still mandated. We are still licensed to do that by the Province. Again, a major initiative. Question came up at committee. So, if we get some federal and provincial help, the rates will go down. No. If we get the federal provincial help then we'll have to kick in, perhaps, 300 million or so, the rates will go up, so perhaps a good problem to have getting that much out but we don't know yet how much, if any, help we'll get on that. So, if we do get…if we have to contribute toward that, the rates would go up again. Thirdly, and you know I can't leave the CSO file alone, so this report does not cost in the cost of going it alone. It does commendably provide a number for that which is roughly equal to what I had estimated per household. It's substantial. It's somewhere $100 $150 a year per household to get the CSO work done while some of us at least are still alive in 2045 as opposed to the 2095 arc that the staff have had us on. So, that…if we're going to pick up the pace on CSO, these rates will either have to pick up or will have to get out from other levels of government. Councillor Wyatt would want me to do my Churchill reference here saying we may if necessary have to do this for years and we may if necessary have to go alone. I'm certainly thinking we need to have that debate on CSO. But again, it's not built into these assumptions. Some of the criticisms that, unfortunately we just got some of this material last night, making it very difficult to respond I want to commend Lucy Szkwarek and Tim Shanks who are e-mailing me and I'm e-mailing them questions about the rate setting. As far as we know it's not the Charter that requires us to just set one water rate, but the administrative difficulties of trying to charge different water rates by each household and trying to figure out the income and, what if I go next door, I start getting water from them. I mean, there really are a number of administrative difficulties that you can't downplay. As our staff pointed out, we used to do the reverse, we used to give you a bulk in discount so the more you used, the less you paid. We don't do that anymore. So, I appreciate what the speakers are saying. Hey, wouldn't we all like to have a rate freeze for four-years? But we have important environmental initiatives. Some of which are mandated by the province like Project 3, like the CSO. We don't have the luxury of just saying, well, we won't do them. We have to have a plan, and I frankly find it a bit misleading to say well, my position is I want a zero percent increase and I want you to pick up the pace on the environmental initiatives.

I don't think that really goes together. So, a lot of, you know, attempts by the staff during the day to answer some of those questions that came up, there was some American examples used. We don't have a big flat rate fee that we socialize across everybody and then you're charged by what you consume. There is a little standard daily charge. But otherwise it's pretty much based on what you consume. I appreciate that low income households have to consume water. I also, in the materials that we're presented by the delegates, it says, higher income households tend to use more water, than lawn water, pools, that sort of thing. So, there's a balance here, this is not like a head tax or flat rate. You have a million-dollar house you pay $1,500 for water. You have a $100,000 house you pay the same flat rate, no it is based on consumption. So, I think we have in front of us a report that goes as far as it can for today. I'll say some more when closing, but in terms of the Public Utilities Board, I can't remember that 2012 report if that was cited, so I'd want to go back and doublecheck that's being cited accurately. I have said some years ago I would support the Public Utilities Board review. That has not been the decision of Council. That has not been the decision of this provincial government. We'll wait and see what they have to say. But we can't just stand around and say, well, I favour a freeze, and then say, where's the money going to come from? So in my close, I'll come back to the whole dividend idea, but we have some important environmental work we need to do. I was kind of expecting that criticism. And the Mayor I think is trying to respond to some of those pressures. Hopefully, we'll have some announcements this term. But for today at least…wouldn't we all love a lower increase? Yes, but to be realistic, I think we have to approve what's in front of us.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Councillor Eadie then Councillor Rollins.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I voted against this report in the other four-year (inaudible). This year, Madam Speaker, this particular rate change, I will be voting for it, Madam Speaker, because as our chairperson has quite appropriately described our situation, that's what it is. Now, there could be a simple way, Madam Speaker, to reduce the cost per unit of water if the Province actually gave us a specific grant to clean, deliver water to our homes, to our businesses, to anywhere. You know, they could take income tax money, so could the feds for that matter. You can take income tax money and you can reduce the City's cost because we're not making a profit with these water rates here, Madam Speaker. Well, I'll get into the dividend. But aside from the dividend, there's not really a profit being made here. We have immense costs in delivering water and sewer services to this city of Winnipeg and to every residence. I really…well, water's actually, you know, a rate. So, if somebody can't afford to pay their bill, I mean, we should restore some provisions, that we took away, that would assist people living in poverty who might get stuck. I know of a woman just last year. She doesn't know how, whatever. Somehow, either somebody stole water from her because she didn't shut her outdoor valve off, but she got hit with a $7,000 bill. She's already…purchased a house she could barely afford. She owns her house. She can barely afford, is a retired woman. She lives in a house on a street that is actually, you know, a neighborhood that most people don't want to live in because it's not safe. But she lives there. And what did we…she went to this program, The Salvation Army, and what happens? Well, they can't help her. They could give her $150. They could give her $150. So, she can't pay her tax bill because they put it on her tax bill. There you go, voila, right? I guess the city councillor should donate $7,000 out of his own pocket to help the woman? Like, man, it's sad when those things happen. And we took that provision away. She could have used the one-time forgiveness. She'll never make that mistake ever again getting a $7,000 bill. One-time forgiveness. Anyway, I digress. So, when we look at affordability in water. It's important and then we have to, the only way to really calculate the sewer…I mean it's the water we use to flush it through into our sewer and so, you know, there's a price per unit of water for sewage. And so, again, if the government wants to give us money to offset the cost because again, we're not making a profit, we're trying to, you know, treat the environment properly. So, this is the difficulty in that, and everybody, like, the same people that I hear complaining about this were the same people demanding that we stop harming Lake Winnipeg, by having CSO flood out into the river by, you know, sewage, raw sewage ending up in the river from our plants because they couldn't process and handle it properly. So, I mean, we have to realize that. That's the reality and that's what this report is about. But I want to say one thing about a dividend, which I was opposed to…right from the beginning when they first introduced it, I believe that was 2012. And then 2015 or '16, the new mayor and finance people decided to jack that dividend way up rather than raise property taxes. And at a time, Madam Speaker, actually when this city was booming, booming. It's way before COVID. We made these choices because what? Because politically they didn't like it, but practically, it should have been done. So, I have ideas on how to slowly reduce that so-called dividend. And I believe that our current chair of Finance probably has an idea how maybe to approach that. But we're, oh how can I say it, we're hooked on the tax on the water fee. It's really what we are. We're hooked on it. Like, and really, it's a tax on a service fee, not a dividend. So, because the government's charging it. Anyway, I'll leave it at that, but there is a way we could slowly reduce that, even starting ahead and maybe we'll have a dialogue about that as the budget moves through once it's tabled February 7, maybe we can have a dialogue about, you know, water rates because water is really important. I mean, people having to pay property taxes are a lot of things, but Madam Speaker, renters who are having to pay the water bill, they don't have to pay the property taxes, they're paying rent and they're paying rent, most people who are living in poverty, they're paying rent where the housing crisis are much lower than in places where, you know, people can afford to rent the two bedroom for $1500. That's cool, you know, but if you're renting an apartment or renting, you know, a unit out of four units in William Whyte, you're not having to pay that much, so. Anyway, just want to point out some of those things and I think that…and, I heard about having a proper report about the rates. You know, alls you got to do is look at all the reports. There's a lot of reports that Water and Waste brings to the

Standing Committee. And I know that our chairperson I'm confident, he reads everything. He does. Everything. So, he's in touch. And that the Water and Waste does support, Water and Waste…

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

**Councillor Eadie:** Sorry, my hearing's going. I didn't hear the beep. But I'm just concluding here. Water and Waste does provide large amounts of rationalization for what they bring forth as the water rates. And so, I have confidence in that. What they can't do, alls they do is they do the bidding of Council who told them, you're going to charge 11% on your revenues and call it a dividend. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Next is Councillor Rollins followed by Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Rollins:** Thanks, Madam Speaker. I just want to echo some of the stuff that Councillor Eadie put on the record. In particular, the confidence he has in the Chair Madam Speaker. We know as Council that the water and sewer rates are reviewed each year, we know changes in funding from other levels of government or our own internal finances impact these rates, and we know that public service will report back to Council with adjustments to rates. In this report, we see too that the major assumptions used for the recommended rates are increasing cost sharing from provincial and federal governments to the full one third of current costs for the North End Sewage Treatment Plant Upgrade, biosolids facilities project. We know it's increasing funding for CentrePort South servicing and the Southwest Interceptor Project. We know its inclusion of the impact of the water meter renewals, Madam Speaker. We know there's no new funding for NEWPCC Upgrade nutrient removal project and we know there's no changes to the current funding for combined sewer overflow program, something my ward benefits from Madam Speaker. We're doing the responsible thing here, if we pass this report, folks will come to Council, Madam Speaker, to talk about some things that are a little easier, like living wage. And I think in part they do that because tackling affordability in that manner is just much easier than considering a third, a third, a third structure, of you know, municipal infrastructure that we have to share with other levels of government, Madam Speaker. The ability of low-income families to pay for basic water and sewer services is a subject of increasing concern because affordability is, Madam Speaker, it's tough economic times and we know that…we know that affordability and water and sewer service for low-income households have gotten tougher. We know a lot have gotten…things have gotten tougher, Madam Speaker. We saw that in data reflected in Council last term, and we saw exactly where geographically those folks that were having difficulties live, Madam Speaker. So, we know they must spend more of their disposable income. We have that community level demographic and economic data, but what we don't do well here or really elsewhere in Canada is look at, you know, our utility size, relative income inequality. I'll endeavor to do better Madam Speaker, but part of doing better is putting words on the record where there are complexities and this is where the rubber hits road. Rate changes are due to major capital and operating cost increases that pressures upon us. And we can talk about it through government, but no councillor does it better than Councillor Mayes, and Madam Speaker, I just want to prop up brother where he deserves it.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Next is Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Allard:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you to the chairperson for, I think somebody mentioned he reads everything I think that's correct or quite close to…quite close to perfectly correct. I just thought I was moved by what Councillor Eadie said on the example of the senior citizen who had a quite a big water bill, and who was not aware and who is not looking at a large bill on their property tax. I know there used to be a program the City of Winnipeg phased out at some point on exceptionally high water bills for residents, I believe. And as I understand and I think Councillor Browaty in the past has made this point on public record that the water system costs what it costs and, for the most part, consumption is not a big factor in those costs and that if we were to say half our consumption of water, the water rate would necessarily have got to pay for the system. Maybe that's oversimplifying things. Perhaps not, so. I do plan on supporting the increase. I do think that scenario that Councillor Eadie raises is terrifying for somebody who may not have capacity to pay for a bill that size and I've heard the story a few times from different people, from different parts of the ward and I wonder if there's a way to perhaps bring the program back and on compassionate grounds or on grounds related to income. It seems to me in that particular case, if all the things that we heard are true, that that particular individual really shouldn't have to pay. Like that's hardship on that one particular individual. And it would be nice if we did have a program as we used to, if I recall correctly, for residents specifically, to forgive at least one-time some of these exceptional water bills or have means to work with those who are not in a position to afford the bill so. We're raising rates. I understand we do have to raise rates to pay for the water treatment plant and our infrastructure. I do wonder if there's a way, like we did with low income cutoff for transit, like we did for low income cutoff community services. Could there be a low income cutoff for exceptional water bills, could there be another avenue we could take. Because the way I see it, if this one person doesn't pay their exceptional water bill or perhaps they pay what they have paid historically, it just…it would be a drop in the bucket that compared to what the entire utility would be collecting so. Other than that, it's just a very specific case, but as Councillor Eadie brought it up, it's…it made me think…I…that I wouldn't want to impose a fee on somebody in that situation and I don't think the system needs us to impose a fee like that. And there must be. If there's a will, there must be

a way to find a process for compassionate dispensation of exceptionally high water bills especially if it's never happened before, and especially if it's a resident, and especially if it's somebody with a low income, so I'll leave it at that. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Allard. With that, there's a request Councillor Wyatt will be participating. No, it's not working? Okay. There's a technical issue. He was ill for…earlier today. Continuing with the meeting. Next speaker. Any further speakers on this item? Councillor Mayes to close.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you. Some years ago, probably around 2016 I think Councillor Gerbasi and I were denounced in the media because we didn't care about poor people or something when we voted on the last or one of the two water rate reports ago and, I want to cut that off at the past and say, we are taking some measures. Everyone's getting the new water meter here. The risk of the leaks, the horrific $21,000, $7,000 water bill, that scenario will be reduced. So, we can certainly ask at the committee for some sort of report some sort of follow up from the staff in terms of, is there…when (inaudible) appeal, like what Councillor Allard is saying, right if we could do a low income bus pass, could we…is there something we can do in this area? Well, we can at least ask. I mean, there are all sorts of, how do you define fair and equitable though, I mean…if we…there are people who get city water but not city sewer right now there are people who get neither city water nor sewer. All of the complexities. So, we can certainly ask what sort of low income measures are in place now and what to get it. We didn't have these delegations at EPC or at Water Committee. We got some material last night, so we can I think follow up. I don't want to sound dismissive. I don't want to sound like I…indifferent to the plight of low-income households. So, that does…we did have a delegation, rather a good one from Mr. Snyder at the committee on…it was quick, it was factual, it was like a minute long, it was about the dividend, saying, well, if you just kept the money that's in the dividend, you'd be hundreds of millions ahead in the utility. And that mathematically is true, and Councillor Eadie might be off a year on his calculation, but the summary is about right Councillor Fielding Minister of Finance brought in the dividend. It was increased if memory serves from 8% to 12% under as Councillor Eadie referenced under Councillor Morantz and Mayor Bowman and I voted for that budget I'm not going to try and just lay it off on them. I think it was Councillor Gillingham as Finance Chair, we reduced it to 11, and that's still where it's at. We have I think tried to shave down the amount we're taking from the dividend. The trouble of course is and I do listen here I think and the trouble of course would be if you get rid of the dividend, you got to find the money on the property tax side. That's an additional 6% on the property tax side. Councillor Gillingham, sorry Mayor Gillingham, third of the way through the term, I'll get it yet, Mayor Gillingham did run on a 3.5% property tax increase so that's pretty easy math that would be a 9.5% property tax increase that would affect everybody across the board. I heard Councillor Santos say with considerable passion that her residents don't want the current property tax increases. They're not looking for that kind of number in some of the lower income areas that she represents and I know she knows those people well and speaks for them. So, that's the balancing act we face, is we're not directed by Public Utilities Board to make any change, but it's not as easy as saying well, if you just took the money from the dividend, yeah, you'd have to go over to the property tax side then to find it and that would affect everybody. A more productive discussion might be if people are upset to go to the Province to say, well, maybe we should have some of the measures Councillor Eadie is seeking. Maybe we should have the ability to set a differential mill rate once…for the amount of your house that's valued at over $400,000 then $500,000, a million dollars, then that portion is taxed at a higher mill rate. Well, we don't have that ability. It's a flat tax that we said, so. That's the weapon that we have to pursue or to use to try and, weapon's a poor choice of words. That's the ability we have, we can set one mill rate, we can't set it the way you would a progressive income tax, so. I think Councillor Eadie spoken on this pretty accurately, so for today, I think we can undertake to go back and ask the staff well, what exists for low income households is there something more we can do. Always difficult to define fair and equitable I'm sure the people living south of the Perimeter in Councillor Chambers' ward, they don't pay water bills, aren't going to want a 9% property tax increase and no change at all in their cost for water and sewer disposal, others might feel differently. So for today, I think we need to go forward and approve the rates so we can come back to it at the committee I think and talk about some of what might be possible for low income residents. But at the end of the day as Councillor Rollins said, we have these big environmental projects. Well, actually it was really Councillor Dobson who summarized it pretty well at committee saying, something along the lines of, it's like a buffet. We have all these different environmental initiatives, compost, the CSO, North End, can we afford to pay for all of them? What are we mandated to do? That's a good discussion. So, this answers some of that. I suspect we're going to have to revisit these rates before this four-year period is out though. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Mayes. With that, I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 3. Just a moment. We're having technical issues earlier, for a while now. Is Councillor Wyatt there now?

**Clerk:** Councillor Wyatt, can you hear me? I'm just inviting you to start your video, unmute yourself.

**Madam Speaker:** I would like to ask for a rescinding motion, a suspension of the rules to rescind the motion from earlier today, that we moved for a absence all in favour? Contrary? Carried. And there's a motion Mr. Clerk. Councillor Gilroy, we've been having technical issues for just a little while. I don't know, but…anyone can join during the duration of Council meeting, and that has occurred on many occasions. So, the motion to allow Councillor Wyatt to participate remotely is

moved. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We can certainly have further conversations online. The item, Mr. Clerk. Thank you.

**MOTIONS**

**Moved by Councillor Eadie,**

*THAT Rule 19 of the Procedure By-law No 50/2007 be suspended and the motion to grant a leave of absence for Councillor Wyatt be rescinded.*

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

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

**Item 3 - Recycling and Garbage Collection Services Expansion**

**Councillor Mayes:** Item No. 3. And I know Councillor Allard at least has one question for question period, so we're not quite done yet. Despite all that rouse and rhetoric about what a great job I do as chair on the previous item, everyone on the committee voted against me on this one. So, No. 3 is…I actually voted with the original motion. The committee…none of them voted with me, so I thank Councillor Duncan for actually moving this to EPC so. I'm not in favour of it, but it's on the floor.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. First speaker, Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** I'm (inaudible). The original mover was Councillor Wyatt I believe, but Madam Speaker, so this report says that it's to be received as information, and as I understand it from standing committee member, Madam Speaker, the idea was just receive it as information until, supposedly, a plan and a report will be coming from Water…from Solid Waste. Now Madam Speaker, I was part of getting the commercial industrial institutional composting to become a mandatory program just like we're doing to residents, and I want to move on it quickly. Now, Madam Speaker, the reason I'm voting against the way this is being brought to Council is…we had a dialogue while I was on the standing committee. So, provincial law doesn't say that we have to make it mandatory on residents nor does it say we have to make it mandatory on commercial industrial institution, Madam Speaker. But it does says, in the Charter and under provincial legislation, it does say, we, the City of Winnipeg may enter and deliver solid waste services. Now, way back, when we got the first garbage master plan let's call it, I think that was 2011 we voted it in. And I forgot I thought it was 2012 when we first brought in the fixed fee, but that aside. In that policy and in that overall plan, Councillor Wyatt was on Council at the time too. This is after 2014 we were looking at it, and there was supposed to be a review. But in that policy, it said, it said, within five years we're going to explore and get into the commercial…didn't say we're going to get into it. We were exploring and getting into delivering those solid waste collection services that're important for the environment to that private sector, to, well, institutionalist public sector actually. Now, most of it, and I would point out that we've done nothing. Now, what was explained to me when I demonstrated my…I got a badge says be kind, so I'll be kind. So, the idea is, once they build this production plant to compost material and probably produce biofuels or whatever they're going to do. The idea, the plan, which I, you know…they kind of gave me an idea. Oh, the private company who's going to be owning and operating that plant will go out and contract with commercial industrial and institutional. It'll be a private…it'll be a market-based approach. What that means is it won't be mandatory, Madam Speaker, won't be mandatory. So are we going to get…we do know that commercial industrial and institutional compostable material is the vast majority. If we want to help the environment that we all say we want to protect around here at Council, what we need to realize is we need to make it mandatory so that we can say, we contributed to reducing climate change, Madam Speaker. Leave it up to the private market. You know. Some of it'll get done, some of it won't. But we know that that big plant's going to need lots of compostable material to produce a product that they're going to sell. So, I'll basically leave it at that. Well, no, I won't. Actually, I've been trying to move on this commercial stuff since we were talking about it in 2015 and even before. And I still cannot understand the rationalization that somehow we can make everything mandatory on us poor residents, but we can't make it mandatory on business but, not just business. The big corporations are the ones who're pumping out lots of compostable material. So, we can't go after those, we can't go after that? So, I think it's bogus. I think we can move on this and get ready and do it in time, that when we implement the residential. I see no problem with that, Madam Speaker, not at all. So, I'll leave it at that. Like, I don't know why we're just accepting this as information. We should demand that the public service is doing something on this. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further speakers on Item 3? Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Allard:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to join Councillor Eadie in his comments. I've always wondered why there was a certain standard for residents and a certain standard for businesses. I don't know if I've wondered really why, but I think residents do want to minimize their impact on the environment, and I think businesses have…certainly many businesses have different imperatives. Like, to say…like, there are two environmental problems to solve, one is, and they're both externalities. Externalities being costs that are pushed out of the corporation or the entity that's making money, producing products, giving a service, that, we then as taxpayers, and or future taxpayers have to deal with. And I thought for a long time now if we could just find a way, find a political consensus, find a political majority, to have those externalities, mostly corporate, also individual. If we could just capture that, and basically do a full cost accounting for the impact of people's actions and companies' actions on the environment, then, we'd have a pretty good system. But given that we don't have that, the externalities go to taxpayers and future taxpayers, and sometimes they're not even recoverable externalities. So, with that in mind, I'd like to support this. And I think we should endeavor to have all waste considered in the city, not just residential waste which is only a part of the puzzle, so. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Allard, thank you. Any other speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Mayes to close.

**Councillor Mayes:** Please call the question.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour, Item 3? Contrary? That's carried, and three noted in opposition. Four in opposition. Okay, we'll have to have a recorded vote. So, all in favour of Item 3, please rise.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

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

**Nays**

Councillors Allard, Eadie, Gilroy, and Mayes

**Clerk:** The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 4.

**Madam Speaker:** Item 3 passes.

## STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT
## MOTIONS

**Madam Speaker:** We have no By-laws under this committee. No motions. We'll now have question period. Any questions for the Chair, for Councillor Mayes? Just a moment. There was something circulated just now. Thank you. It was just recently circulated for the motion section. If you just give me a moment, Councillor Allard. It's Motion 5, and it's moved by Councillor Allard, seconded by Councillor Eadie and it's regarding high water bills. That will be an automatic referral to the standing committee. And now onto questions for our Chair, Councillor Allard.

**Motion No. 5**
**Moved by Councillor Allard,**
**Seconded by Councillor Eadie,**

*WHEREAS at times, residents are faced with extremely high water bills for reasons that they are not aware of and may result in the resident losing their home*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Public Service be directed to report back on options to protect residents against high water bills on compassionate grounds and or using the low income cut off as a requirement.*

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

**Councillor Allard:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to ask follow-up questions to those that I asked last Council meeting. I did have the opportunity to ask whether or not the Mission Industrial sewer separation work was going to be delayed or cancelled or if taxpayers would have to pay more given the probable or obvious increase or increase requirement for that work to be done if the Kenaston widening were to occur. And so, I believe I heard from the public service that no, it will not move the Mission Industrial Park CSO work, but that it also won't impact taxpayers, and it seems like a "cake and eat it too" scenario that I don't quite understand. I wonder if Councillor Mayes may elucidate us on the matter.

**Madam Speaker**: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Yeah, thank you for the follow up and it's the other question I think is coming. I spent a good chunk of the lunch hour researching. This one, it's difficult. There is a chart. It's posted outside of my office, of the schedule for CSO work. Councillor Allard's completely corrected the next step after Armstrong, which we're getting into, is Mission which is in his ward. I think justifiable question which is hey, if we start doing some of Doncaster, and it's appropriate that we pass that Naawi-Oodena Secondary Plan because it talks about this very issue. Councillor Allard's question, in essence is, isn't…is Doncaster cutting into the line ahead of Mission and therefore delaying us getting to Mission? And Doncaster was due to be done in like 2075 or something, so it's a fair question. The staff have said if…tried to explain to me this sort of engineering aspects of this, so their answer is no. We do have money in the reserves. Some of this is just the ability to get planners, designers, people to do the work. We're bringing in people from Ireland to do some of the big drilling. So, they are adamant that if we do some of the…if we do that work around Kenaston, it will not delay us getting to Mission at the risk of being a non-engineer and trying to discuss the engineering concepts, the…there's less design work as I understand it around some of the work at Kenaston, and I think that's the follow up question, is some of this is just land drainage that's arising out of the widening of Kenaston. There's less design work so we will continue to get to Mission. It's not going to be delayed due to the work on Doncaster. Probably just gives it away that the projects work, and we do have some in reserves. So, I was saying like, we've got like 160 in reserve then that we can just go and do Mission now? And the answer was, we don't…we have more than we're spending in the reserve, but we don't have that much, but we have enough that we can do this work associated with Kenaston without delaying Mission. Again, non-engineer trying to interpret some of the engineering response, but the other question that I think is coming around Kenaston, I think I got a clearer answer.

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

**Councillor Allard:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Second question, will there be any implications regarding land drainage? We're looking at reducing the amount of permeable space with the Kenaston widening. Will that be yet another cost and is it or is it not included in the asset management report that has it at $566 million?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** This has been a productive line of questioning. And I certainly learned some things from this so I thank Councillor Allard for raising it. So, the Kenaston project, Kenaston widening project, if you look at the slides, roughly 550 million. A chunk for the road widening, a chunk for the bridge work and then 27 percent for sewer. And the gist of it, if you look at it, or the suggestion is well, we'd be doing the sewer work anyway, so we're just going to get to it earlier. It's not really an additional cost. True in part, but there's the easy mnemonic, a word I've always wanted to use…there's an easy mnemonic device which is 27% of the total project is sewer, 27% of the sewer cost is just what Councillor Allard is saying. It's just land drainage because we're building a wider road. It's more impermeable space. It's not the Naawi-Oodena bit. That's separate. It's not the Doncaster, hey we're going to do Doncaster anyways. Not that bit. There is roughly 45 million here that isn't work we were going to do anyway if we didn't widen Kenaston. It's a direct result of widening Kenaston. So, it's…it's not a fatal flaw to the debate about Kenaston but I think it's an important point to make, which is no, there's roughly 45 million, 27% of the 27% is roughly 45 million here, that is just due to the widening of Kenaston that's sewer related. So, I think that's a fair question from Councillor Allard. It will become part of our larger debate about Kenaston. You know those America's Cup yachting races they used to have that the boats would like go…before you hit the starting line, you weaved around behind the starting line with all the other boats. It's like that's our phase at Kenaston right now. There's always this sort of preliminary weaving around before we get to the actual debate. This is part of it and I think it's a completely fair question, which is, yeah, there's 45 million that I don't think you can attribute just as being stuff we would have done anyway.

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

**Councillor Allard:** Okay, on the scheduling and the “cake and eat it too”, I had asked the committee, are we robbing St. Boniface to pay for Kenaston in terms of the CSO work? Well, if we’re not, I don't have a preamble any more. Apologies. Who then loses? Because surely someone else is going to get dropped off in the schedule as proposed, so, which ward here will be impacted if not St. Boniface? Who is supposed to go next?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** It’s a fair question in that there is a chart, and when we first decided to put 15 million more a year for four years, when then Councillor Gillingham was Chair of Finance, and I appreciate his support for this, I said to staff, give me one of the ones that’s scheduled in like in 2095, like (inaudible) one of the ones that…you know, then we can move it forward 60 years, and they said it doesn't work that way. There’s a schedule. You do it for the bang for the buck. That’s why we’re doing Armstrong. That’s like a third of the total problem. That’s why we’re doing Mission next. Then to which you say well then, what’s this Doncaster thing? Well, when opportunities present themselves, we try and do the work. You’re tearing up the road anyway, so I get all that. As I understand it nothing will be delayed by doing the Doncaster work now instead of decades from now. But the actual technical scheduling of that and a lot of this hinges on what we have in reserves and the design element so…I think the answer is, hopefully no one’s being delayed as a result. Hopefully we’re moving the thing forward a little bit. But it’s certainly…it’s a two-part answer. I don't think Mission or anyone else is being delayed, but there’s 40, $45 million here that isn’t really CSO work we’d be doing anyway. There’s the larger question of hey, if we start asking other levels of government for help with Kenaston, doesn’t that…where does that leave us in the CSO debate for another day? But yeah, I think the short answer is no I don’t think anyone’s being actually delayed by a result of getting to Doncaster earlier.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none. That concludes our agenda. Councillor Mayes, do you move adjournment?

**Councillor Mayes:** Yes.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Stay for roll call, please. Mr. Clerk.

**ROLL CALL**

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

**Council adjourned at 3:55 p.m.**